

Liberation

Sov

April, 1968

1. *Agrarian Reform In Liberated China*
2. *Marxism In China Today*
3. *Lin Piao's Speech*
4. *Soviet Union Under Revisionist Rule*
5. *Widespread Peasants' Struggles In India*
6. *History Of The CPI*
7. *Principal Contradiction In The World Today*
8. *Rebellion Is Right !*
9. *Why The Demons Are Laughing ?*

LIBERATION

Combat Liberalism— <i>Mao Tse-tung</i> ...	3
Notes :	
<i>They Stand Unmasked</i> ...	6
<i>The Budget for 1968-69--An Analysis</i> ...	13
Agrarian Reforms In Liberated China ...	17
Marxism In China Today— <i>Prof. George Thomson</i> ...	40
Lin Piao's Speech On the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution ...	60
Why the Demons Are Laughing ? ...	68
Soviet Union Under Revisionist Rule :	
<i>The New Tsars In The Soviet Union</i> ...	72
<i>Capitalist Restoration In Agriculture</i> ...	76
New Assessment of the History of the CPI— <i>Bande Ali Khan</i> ...	82
Widespread Peasants' Struggle In India ...	92
Rebellion Is Right ! ...	96
The Principal Contradiction In the World To-day ...	110
"Unity In Action" With Whom—Revolutionary People Or Revisionist Clique ?— <i>Partha Choudhury</i> ...	116

Editor-in-chief

Sushital Ray Choudhury

Whoever sides with the revolutionary people is a revolutionary. Whoever sides with imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism is a counter-revolutionary. Whoever sides with the revolutionary people in words only but acts otherwise is a revolutionary in speech. Whoever sides with the revolutionary people in deed as well as in word is a revolutionary in the full sense.

—Mao Tse-tung

Combat Liberalism

—Mao Tse-tung

WE stand for active ideological struggle because it is the weapon for ensuring unity within the Party and the revolutionary organizations in the interest of our fight. Every Communist and revolutionary should take up this weapon.

But liberalism rejects ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace, thus giving rise to a decadent, philistine attitude and bringing about political degeneration in certain units and individuals in the Party and the revolutionary organizations.

Liberalism manifests itself in various ways.

To let things slide for the sake of peace and friendship when a person has clearly gone wrong, and refrain from principled argument because he is an old acquaintance, a fellow townsman, a schoolmate, a close friend, a loved one, an old colleague or old subordinate. Or to touch on the matter lightly instead of going into it thoroughly, so as to keep on good terms. The result is that both the organization and the individual are harmed. This is one type of liberalism.

To indulge in irresponsible criticism in private instead of actively putting forward one's suggestions to the organization. To say nothing to people to their faces but to gossip behind their backs, or to say nothing at a meeting but to gossip afterwards. To show no regard at all for the principles of collective life but to follow one's own inclination. This is a second type.

To let things drift if they do not affect one personally; to say as little as possible while knowing perfectly well what is wrong, to be worldly wise and play safe and seek only to avoid blame. This is a third type.

Not to obey orders but to give pride of place to one's own opinions. To demand special consideration from the organization but to reject its discipline. This is a fourth type.

To enter into an argument and struggle against incorrect ideas not for the sake of unity or progress or getting the

work done properly, but in order to make personal attacks, pick quarrels, vent personal spite or seek revenge. This is a fifth type.

To hear incorrect views without rebutting them and even to hear counter-revolutionary remarks without reporting them, but instead to take them calmly as if nothing had happened. This is a sixth type.

To be among the masses and fail to conduct propaganda and agitation or speak at meetings or conduct investigations and inquiries among them, and instead to be indifferent to them and show no concern for their well-being, forgetting that one is a Communist and behaving as if one were an ordinary non-Communist. This is a seventh type.

To see someone harming the interests of the masses and yet not feel indignant, or dissuade or stop him or reason with him, but to allow him to continue. This is an eighth type.

To work half-heartedly without a definite plan or direction; to work perfunctorily and muddle along—'So long as one remains a monk, one goes on tolling the bell.' This is a ninth type.

To regard oneself as having rendered great service to the revolution, to pride oneself on being a veteran, to disdain minor assignments while being quite unequal to major tasks, to be slipshod in work and slack in study. This is a tenth type.

To be aware of one's own mistakes and yet make no attempt to correct them, taking a liberal attitude towards oneself. This is an eleventh type.

We could name more. But these eleven are the principal types.

They are all manifestations of liberalism.

Liberalism is extremely harmful in a revolutionary collective. It is a corrosive which eats away unity, undermines cohesion, causes apathy and creates dissension. It robs the revolutionary ranks of compact organization and strict discipline, prevents policies from being carried through and alienates the Party organizations from the masses which the Party leads. It is an extremely bad tendency.

Liberalism stems from petty-bourgeois selfishness, it places personal interests first and the interests of the revolution second, and this gives rise to ideological, political and organizational liberalism.

People who are liberals look upon the principles of Marxism as abstract dogma. They approve of Marxism, but are not prepared to practise it or to practise it in full; they are not prepared to replace their liberalism by Marxism. These people have their Marxism, but they have their liberalism as well—they talk Marxism but practise liberalism; they apply Marxism to others but liberalism to themselves. They keep both kinds of goods in stock and find a use for each. This is how the minds of certain people work.

Liberalism is a manifestation of opportunism and conflicts fundamentally with Marxism. It is negative and objectively has the effect of helping the enemy; that is why the enemy welcomes its preservation in our midst. Such being its nature, there should be no place for it in the ranks of the revolution.

We must use Marxism, which is positive in spirit, to overcome liberalism, which is negative. A Communist should have bigness of mind and he should be staunch and active, looking upon the interests of the revolution as his very life and subordinating his personal interests to those of the revolution; always and everywhere he should adhere to principle and wage a tireless struggle against all incorrect ideas and actions, so as to consolidate the collective life of the Party and strengthen the ties between the Party and the masses; he should be more concerned about the Party and the masses than about any private person, and more concerned about others than about himself. Only thus can he be considered a Communist.

All loyal, honest, active and upright Communists must unite to oppose the liberal tendencies shown by certain people among us, and set them on the right path. This is one of the tasks on our ideological front.

(Written on September 7, 1937)

NOTES

THEY STAND UNMASKED

In the month of April, 1968, our "Marxist" heroes are going to arm themselves with an ideology. Perhaps, if left to themselves, they would have preferred to do without this rather inconvenient thing, for absence of an ideology, like ignorance, is sometimes a bliss to a certain type of persons known as opportunists. An ideology, rather an open formulation of it, is often unhelpful to their cause, for this may unmask their true faces.

Four years ago, when the Party Programme was adopted, an unequivocal stand on ideological issues was considered too premature. Lesser Communists might feel troubled for want of an ideology and might think that there could be no Party Programme without an ideological basis but the ways of the "Marxist" leaders are different. So in the resolution *On Ideological Differences*, which they adopted at the Seventh Party Congress in October-November, 1964, they declared :

"The Tenali Convention which decided on convening this Seventh Congress rightly came to the conclusion that within the short time between them and the Congress, it would not be possible to organise *a thorough-going discussion on these differences*, which was absolutely necessary to come to proper conclusions." (Italics ours)

Their *Draft Programme* was prepared and circulated in April, 1964, and a little over six months was considered sufficient enough for discussing and adopting the programme but not quite sufficient for "a thorough-going discussion" on the ideological differences and for clarifying their stand on these issues. Ideology seemed irrelevant to the Programme! So these rank opportunists could embellish the programme with various Khrushchevite gems like the following :

"If only the peoples of these countries that have won their independence take their destinies in their own hands, they can,

NOTES

7

with the disinterested assistance of the mighty socialist system with its ever-increasing capacity, rapidly overcome their economic dependence and backwardness, defend and strengthen their national independence and trail a bright future for the people." (Para 6)

Thus, on the plea of a lack of sufficient time—a characteristically false plea—the "Marxist" leaders shelved all ideological discussions and pushed through the Party Congress a Programme replete with contradictions, revisionist formulations etc. Their purpose is now sufficiently clear. They and the Dange revisionists are birds of the same feather, but in their factional fight against Dange and the Dangeites they wanted to exploit the deep resentment and the just revolt of the rank and file comrades against the renegade clique—the unashamed propagators of Soviet revisionism. A clear ideological stand would have given the game away.

So, when the ideological struggle was raging fiercest within the international communist movement, our sham Marxists were prevented by lack of sufficient time from taking an unequivocal stand! *In words*, they were neutral between the Marxist-Leninist camp headed by the great Communist Party of China and the treacherous revisionist camp led by Khrushchev and his men. But *in deeds*, they were a part of the revisionist camp, continually attacking the CPC on the issues of the Sino-Indian border, the Kashmir issue etc., etc. And, among other things, they peddled all the time the revisionist filth that Soviet neo-colonial aid to the Indian reactionaries is socialist aid that strengthens India's national independence, declared time and again that they fully supported the India Government in its efforts to strengthen the defence of the country (efforts which actually amount to robbing the toiling people in order to pay the imperialist monopolies, the comprador big bourgeoisie and the big landlords), fully supported the Soviet-U.S. plan for the Tashkent conference, refused to recognise the right of self-determination of the Kashmir people (and of other nationalities like the Nagas and the Mizos), were quite enamoured of the Congress variety of

parliamentary democracy and of the Indian Constitution,* advocated, like the Dangeites, the peaceful path to People's Democracy and Socialism,** and sent their General Secretary P. Sundarayya immediately after the Party Congress in 1964 to Nanda to give a sort of undertaking to the Home Minister that though these sham Marxists might raise the slogan of a People's Democratic Revolution, they would really "act as a legal party and function openly." (Sundarayya Answers Nanda, *People's Democracy*, 19. 9. 65). "The proletariat's right to revolution", to use the words of Lenin, "was sold for a mess of pottage—organisations permitted by the present police law." (*The Collapse of the Second International*). Heroics for the consumption of the rank and file comrades turned into a whimper before Sundarayya's masters in New Delhi!

Behind a mask of sham neutrality between Marxism-Leninism on the one hand, and revisionism, on the other (as if such neutrality is possible) this bunch of crafty opportunists have been tirelessly peddling all kinds of revisionist filth and

* In his *Reply to Nanda*, Basavapunniah accused the ruling Congress Party of "trampling underfoot the civil liberties and the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution" (sic!), and of "making a mockery of democracy and the democratic way of life in the country" and declared: "We stand by democracy and we defend it against every assault on it, as it is valued by us not only in the long-term interests of our cause but also in the immediate interests of our Party." "The unjust, unwarranted and wholesale arrests and detentions of the leaders of our Party", added Basavapunniah, "is nothing but a beginning (sic!) of the attack on democracy and its future in our country".—*People's Democracy*, February 6, 1966).

** In his *Letter to Nanda* Basavapunniah bewailed that though section 113 of their Programme dealing with the path of transition is almost the same as sections 99 and 102 of the Dangeites' Programme adopted in Bombay and though "the same phrases, almost akin passages" are found in both the Programmes, Nanda chose to spread the 'base slander' that the "Marxist" heroes were advocating the path of violence! We hope our readers will forgive us for quoting some lengthy extracts from Basavapunniah's *Letter to Nanda*: "It is true, as Nanda states, that there has been a new orientation in the world communist movement

pursuing the revisionist path of class-collaboration and betrayal of the Indian revolution. When during World War I, and after, Lenin was fighting the great ideological struggle against the leaders of the Second International and the established Socialist Parties of Europe, that had betrayed the cause of socialism, Marxism demanded of every Marxist that he should rally behind Lenin and Lenin's Party. An even vaster and more difficult struggle faced the Marxist-Leninists when the leadership of the Soviet Party and of many other Parties was usurped by the revisionists, bitter foes to the cause of socialism. During the last few years Comrade Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Party, aided by Marxist-Leninist Parties and groups in different countries, have waged a heroic struggle against most of the old, established Parties under the sway of the revisionists, smashed them ideologically as Lenin had smashed their predecessors, and carried the struggle

on this question and the same is incorporated in the Moscow Declaration of 1957, the Moscow statement of 81 Parties in 1960 and such other documents. *Unlike the earlier rare and exceptional possibilities of the peaceful transition of the Socialist revolution, new additional possibilities of it in some countries has been visualized, under the new world conditions that are obtaining today.* The reasons given for this change are the following: In view of the rapid change of the strength between the forces of world socialism and imperialism in favour of socialism, in view of the restricted possibilities (sic!) for the export of counter-revolution by the imperialist states, and in view of the ever-expanding ideas of socialism gripping more wider (!) sections of the people, it is expected that all this would greatly restrain the ruling classes from resorting to the adventures of violence, and *in some countries at least certain possibilities have arisen for such a peaceful path to be explored and utilized by the Communists of those countries. It is exactly on the basis of this new assessment that we have introduced this new concept of peaceful transition to socialism in our Party Programme. The formulation of this concept as well as the general warning against the danger of violence, usually unleashed by the ruling classes, is exactly similar to the one put forth in the Programme of the Dangeites. Then where does the question of our opposition to the 'new orientation' and some others supporting it arise? It is an outright slander.*—*People's Democracy*, January 30, 1966).

to a victorious end. Today Mao Tse-tung, Marxist-Leninists all over the world agree, is the Lenin of our era and Mao Tse-tung's Thought is the Marxism-Leninism of our age when imperialism is crumbling to dust and socialism is marching towards final victory. Far from rallying behind Mao Tse-tung and his Party during this historic struggle, as Marxist-Leninists throughout the world have done, these wily, crafty opportunists, who talk the language of Marxism, have in actual practice, served, like their Dangeite counterparts, as "running dogs of U. S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism and lackeys of the big Indian landlords and bourgeoisie" (to quote the words of Peking's *People's Daily*).

An analysis of the *Central Committee's Draft for the Ideological Discussion* will reveal its hypocritical, deceitful character. While pretending to accept Lenin's teachings in the abstract, it repudiates them in the concrete. One may recall Ranadive's own confession made in 1950 : "My pose to accept Stalin and C.P.S.U. (B) only and at the same time attack on Mao was nothing but a *subtle* repudiation of Marxist-Leninism—for I was rejecting the concrete application of the teachings of Stalin on the colonial question. And this has been the essence of all bourgeois trends which masquerade as Marxism—accept in the abstract to repudiate, amend, ignore, revise in the concrete." (Italics ours). The sting of the *Draft* is actually in its tail. While pretending to rebuke the Soviet Party for its "deviations" from Marxism-Leninism, it concentrates all its fire against the Chinese Party for refusing to respond to the revisionists' slogan of 'Unity in Action' and for "interfering" in the affairs of our Party. The long series of articles in defence of the *Draft* published recently in *People's Democracy*, are even more venomous attacks against the Chinese Party (though the CPC is hardly mentioned in these articles) and all other Marxist-Leninist Parties and Groups. We are publishing in this issue a few articles unmasking the true character of the notorious ideological draft adopted at Madurai.

Here, we may refer to the method by which this anti-Marxist-Leninist, and rabidly anti-Chinese draft is going to

be imposed on the Party comrades. "The only way," said Comrade Mao Tse-tung, "to settle questions of an ideological nature or controversial issues among the people is by the democratic method, the method of discussion, of criticism, of persuasion and education, and not by the method of coercion or repression." (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*). "This unity of democracy and centralism, of freedom and discipline", Mao Tse-tung said, "constitutes our democratic centralism." (Ibid). He further said, "This democratic method of resolving contradictions among the people [not only among Party members] was epitomized in 1942 in the formula 'unity, criticism, unity.' To elaborate, it means starting from the desire for unity, resolving contradictions through criticism or struggle, and arriving at a new unity on a new basis. In our experience this is the correct method of resolving contradictions among the people." (Ibid)

What is the method of Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Basavapunniah and Co. for resolving differences on ideological issues? It is the same old bureaucratic method of theirs, which is the very antithesis of the Marxist-Leninist method and which has stifled the growth of the Party. They adopted the same method while pushing their Programme through the Party Congress: no Forum was published, no views contrary to those of a handful of usurpers of the organizational machinery could find expression in the Party press, while the Party journals in different languages and all other Party publications made it their sole business to circulate and popularize the official document and various articles in defence of it. And this (plus the rigged elections within the Party) these shameless men tried to palm off as democratic! This time, too, the same method, utterly undemocratic, bureaucratic and anti-Marxist-Leninist, is being followed. This time, too, the Party journals and Party publications in different languages have devoted all the space at their disposal to propagating and defending the anti-Marxist-Leninist views of a handful of usurpers of the Party machinery. All dissent,

all resolutions repudiating the C.C. stand, have been completely suppressed.

Hundreds of Party Committees including the Andhra State Plenum and the Assam State plenum, besides thousands of comrades, have rejected the official draft and adopted resolutions opposing it. From the Party press one cannot have any inkling of this fact, for the Party journals only announce the names of Committees and Plenums which have supported the C.C. Draft and not those which have rejected it. *People's Democracy* and other party journals have published a long series of articles defending the Draft and attacking its critics but without mentioning who these critics are and without publishing what they have actually said. The other day, Sundarayya thundered out at a Press Conference in Calcutta that the Andhra alternative document was "untenable and anti-Marxist" and threatened Andhra comrades with disciplinary measures (*The Statesman*, March 20, 1968). These arch-revisionists, who withhold the Andhra document from the Party ranks out of fear, violating all Party forms, have the cheek to sit in judgement over it! To these disguised counter-revolutionaries, Party democracy means *their right* to dictate and *the duty of all other comrades* to obey them. This is bourgeois democracy, the exploiters' democracy, which is opposed to communist democracy, and the duty of a communist is to rebel against it.

We have seen what "a thorough-going discussion" these agents of reaction within the Party have organised. Comrades are also aware that in many States, plenums at the district or the State level were held with hand-picked men. For example, in West Bengal, district plenums were held only in six out of sixteen districts and these, too, with comrades not elected at local conferences but with men selected by the usurpers of the Party machinery. Besides the members of the State Committee, the other participants from West Bengal at the Central Committee Plenum at Burdwan will be those nominated by the arch-factionalist Promode Dasgupta and men of his ilk. Comrades are also aware that thousands of Part-

members have been expelled or quietly dropped and hundreds of Branches, Local Committees and District Committees in West Bengal have been formally dissolved or quietly disbanded for the 'crime' of opposing the counter-revolutionary political line or the ideological draft of these disguised agents of reaction. Similar things have happened also in other States. So the entire Central Committee Plenum affair is a rigged one.

Revolts are brewing within the Party against the counter-revolutionary political line as well as the bureaucratic and dictatorial methods of functioning of Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Promode Dasgupta and Co. Naxalbari raised the banner of revolt and revolutionary comrades throughout India are rallying round it. The year 1967 marked the historic turning-point in the Indian revolution. Comrades all over India are realizing the truth of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's words: "An erroneous leadership that endangers the revolution should not be accepted unconditionally but should be resisted resolutely."

In 1915, Lenin was saying:

"The building of a revolutionary organisation must be begun—that is demanded by the new historical situation, by the epoch of proletarian revolutionary action—but it can be begun only over the heads of the old leaders, the stranglers of revolutionary energy, over the heads of the old party, through its destruction." (*Collapse of the Second International—Lenin's italics*). The Communist movement has suffered too disastrously and too long because our comrades allowed themselves to be deceived by the revisionists and Right opportunists, who "pay lip service to Marxism" but who have really been "attacking the quintessence of Marxism." Our comrades may well remember the words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung:

"As for criticism, do it in good time; don't get into the habit of criticizing only after the event."

THE BUDGET FOR 1968-69—AN ANALYSIS

The Indian Budget for 1968-69 has only one surprise element—that is its pompous way of presentation. Otherwise, it is all an affair of satellite economy faithfully implementing

the directives of its financial metropolis. The picture of an austere Finance Minister talking of financial rectitude possibly even in his sleep blandly presenting a huge deficit in the budget is more or less like that of a teetotaller betting a few shots of whisky when nobody is looking—with the difference that this time everybody indeed is.

Of course, it is nothing strange that the budget will reveal the servile, comprador character of Indian economy. We can mention in passing some of its features like huge increase in defence expenditure, unusual emphasis on indirect tax, relief in tax burden on companies on the pretext of simplification of the tax structure, abolition of distinction between earned and unearned income, various concessions to agro-based industries and export industries to provide, needless to mention, incentives to brave investors etc. But the virulence of the exploiting classes has found its free outlet in the enormous size of deficit financing. Indeed the deficit of the order of Rs. 315 crores is unsurpassed even in the long history of indebtedness of a perpetually needy country like India. Actually, Mr. Morarji was joking when he talked about reducing this amount to Rs. 290 crores through proposed fiscal measures and he knew it. One can clearly see that deficit financing is becoming an usual feature in the framework of an Indian budget (be it state or central) in spite of all protestations of financial chastity of our 'frugal' Finance Minister.

This is, however, inevitable, since deficit financing has to be an integral part of the exploitative machinery set up by the comprador bourgeoisie. It is customary to use inflation as a technique of internal exploitation, just as devaluation lends itself to be one for external exploitation. Deficit financing can create an inflation of more or less a pre-determined order. During inflation, there occurs a general dilution of the purchasing power of money. But since the excess money gets concentrated in a few hands in the form of high prices for goods purchased, what really happens is the redistribution of real income in favour of the richer classes.

Obviously, a financial agent of imperialism, wherever operating, has to see that the process of inflation goes uninterrupted in a satellite country.

Apart from that, further tightening of the tax belt around the neck of the poor just to relieve the pressure on the pot-bellied flunkies of foreign capitalists will be all too naked. The artistic point in the finger-work of a finance ministry is that the hand must not show. That is where the fiscal strategy of deficit financing comes almost patting you on your back in your spending spree on defence and so-called capital development projects, without placing a too obvious burden on common men.

Mr. Desai scores another budgetary 'first' in allocating more than 1000 crores on defence. The amount will be spent on purchase of arms, military construction in which surplus engineers will be inducted and to raise a large standing army. This fits in the master-plan of the grand imperialist-revisionist alliance for 'containment of China'. Experience of Vietnam war has shown them the need for a large army in a satellite country apparently to be raised in the name of defence of the realm, but capable of being switched over to the offensive as the imperialist task force.

Another aspect of defence spending is to create demand of a specific nature—the demand for the products of collaboration industries nurtured by foreign capital. The allocation for the Bokaro steel plant is also to serve this end.

There is, of course, an intimate connection between the formulation of the present budget and the world-wide recessionary trend highlighted by the dollar crisis. Our 'collaboration' industries are rigged up for the sole purpose of providing dumping ground for high-priced foreign monopoly products like machinery and industrial raw materials to maintain an artificial level of demand in these industries. A huge allocation on non-competing items like defence, sterile capital projects (like the Bokaro steel plant) has to be provided for in the budget.

To complete the picture, one has to connect the fact that during the last five years the total public debt has doubled itself.

mainly due to unusual rise in loans from foreign sources, principal components of which are PL 480 and U.S. Government loans.

Even a cursory analysis of the budget will reveal a relatively greater emphasis on indirect tax. Placing a heavier tax burden directly on the poor and at the same time providing handsome relief to the rich would have looked too indecent. Hence an item like even 'postcard' has to be singled out for indirect taxation, which even the poorest cannot avoid buying.

Increasing the tax rate on imported wine, Mr. Desai claimed to have salvaged his confirmed aversion to drinking, which he was allegedly losing (and his God only knows how). This, however, drew a round of applause from the House. It is a pity that our revisionists and neo-revisionists could not stay in the House to share the joke. They had already left the House in a huff over a flimsy issue.

Concessions to agriculture and agro-based industries and export industries are designed to serve the foreign monopoly interests. Limited tax exemption on increased consumption of fertilisers is calculated to popularise certain brands of fertilisers, chiefly produced from costly imports from the U.S.A. A rebate to the extent of one-third of the costs of export promotion drives will be granted. The central point of export subsidy is to pay for costly imports by exporting more at a cheaper price. Hence the slogan: "Export at a loss"; to complete the idea one may add, "the Government will bear the loss from tax levied on common men." With such custodians of foreign capital as Mr. Desai, these matters are sure to be taken care of.

The business circles are expecting some accretion to investible funds due to abolition of the Annuity Deposit Scheme. A sum of Rs. 140 crores, purportedly earmarked for building up a buffer stock in food-grains will be utilised to support a large bureaucratic organisation like the Food Corporation of India, as also to provide finance for hoarding and black-marketing in food-grains by the exploiters in the countryside.

(Continued on page 116)

Agrarian Reforms in Liberated China

[We are reprinting below two documents of 1933 republished by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China with notes by a special decision in May 1948, which may be of practical help to the organisers in the rural areas in our country. —Editorial Board, Liberation]

DECISION ON TWO DOCUMENTS OF 1933 BY CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

The two documents of 1933 are (1) *How to Analyse Classes* and (2) *Decisions on Some Questions regarding Agrarian Struggle*. They were issued by the then Democratic Government with a view to correcting certain deviations in the practice of Agrarian Reforms and to properly solving problems concerning Agrarian Reforms. These two documents had been distributed to all the ranks of Party Organisers in December, 1947 as reference documents. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has now decided to promulgate them as formal documents for practical purposes. Certain minor parts of them that are found inapplicable, having been omitted, the two documents fundamentally hold good for the Agrarian Reforms of today. Some portions have either been slightly altered, or added with "CC notes". For problems that are not mentioned in these two documents, as well as details about the demarcation of kulak (rich peasant) and the middle peasants, see other CC documents concerned and the Address by Comrade Jen Pi-shih on January 12, 1948, "Important Questions Arising During the Agrarian Reform". —Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, May 24, 1948.

1933 DOCUMENT—1: HOW TO ANALYSE CLASSES

(1) *Landlord*

A landlord is one who possesses land but does not labour on it, or labour on it only on a secondary scale, and lives

on exploitation. The principal form of exploitation by a landlord is by means of rent. Besides, there are many other ways of exploitation, such as, granting loans, or doing manufacture or business. But the rent collection is the principal form of the landlord's exploitation. Those who act as the trustees of communal land, or collect rent on school-owned land, also belong to the category of landlord.

Bankrupt landlords are regarded as landlords, provided they do not labour but live on rapacity, extortion or support from their relatives or friends, and their standard of living exceeds that of an average middle peasant.

Warlords, bureaucrats, local ruffians and oppressive gentry, being the political representatives of the landlord class, are the most notorious among the landlord class. (Lower ranked ruffians and oppressive gentry coming from kulaks are however not uncommon).

Domestic managers or rent-collectors who work for landlords depend on the latter's exploitation of peasants as their principal source of living and whose living standard exceeds that of an average middle peasant, are regarded as landlords.

Those who depend on lending money at usury as their source of living and whose living standard exceeds that of an average middle peasant, are usurers. They are regarded as landlords.

(2) *Kulak (Rich Peasant)*

A kulak in general possesses land of his own. Many kulaks also lease land from others in addition to his own. Some of them even possess no land at all, only leasing land from others. The two latter kinds of kulaks are however, less common. Most of kulaks possess better means of production and certain amount of capital as well. They themselves take actual part in labour, but they constantly depend on exploitation as one of the major sources of living. The kulak's principal form of exploitation is labour-hiring. Besides, they also lease out land for exploitation, grant loans, or engage in manufacturing or business. Many kulaks are managers of communal land. Chinese kulaks do not generally hire labourers,

but exploit peasants by means of rent and interest. Exploitation is the constant and principal part of a kulak's life.

(3) *Middle Peasant*

Many middle peasants possess land. Some middle peasants possess land, but at the same time lease land from others. Some middle peasants are even landless, cultivating only on land leased from others. A middle peasant generally possesses certain amount of implements. They entirely or principally depend on their own labour. Many of them are exploited by others through small amount of rent or debt. Most of them are not employed as hired labourers while some of them (well-to-do middle peasants) some times even engage—though only slightly—in exploiting others. But the latter cases are occasional and not principal in nature by themselves.

(4) *Poor Peasant*

Some poor peasants possess meagre land and inadequate implements. Some of them possess inadequate implements but no land at all, and generally have to lease land from others. They are exploited in the form of rent, interest and as hired labour on a small scale.

The basic difference between a poor peasant and a middle peasant lies in that while a poor peasant generally has to hire out a small portion of his labour, a middle peasant does not generally have much need.

(5) *Rural Labourer*

Rural labourers, including hired farm-workers, in general possess neither land nor implement. Some of them have very negligible amount of land and implements, but depend entirely or principally on wages from their own labour.

1933 DOCUMENT—II :

DECISIONS ON SOME QUESTIONS REGARDING AGRARIAN STRUGGLE

There are many practical questions arising from the struggle of land distribution and land investigation. Mistakes have been committed in the execution as a result of the absence of

definite instructions on these questions in previous documents, or as a result of the instructions being often too vague, or as a result of the misinterpretation of them on the part of government workers. With a view to correctly carrying out the land struggle and retrieving and preventing possible errors, the People's Committee, apart from ratifying the document "How to Analyse Classes", has specially made the following decisions :

(1) *Labour :*

When a family with one or more of its members spends one-third or more of its time in the year in essential labour, it is defined as a "Labour Family". When a family with one or more of its members spending less than one-third of the year in essential labour, or spending one-third of its time in non-essential labour only, it is defined as a "Secondary Labour Family".

NOTE : 1. A kulak (rich peasant) engages in labour himself while a landlord engages, if at all, in secondary labour only. The nature of labour that they engage themselves in is, therefore, the principal criterion for distinguishing a kulak from a landlord.

2. Whether a family is to be classified as "Labour Family" or a "Secondary Labour Family" (Kulak or Landlord Family) depends upon the extent of labour undertaken by any individual member of the family. The family is regarded as a Labour Family, when one of its members is engaged in labour. The assumption that a Labour Family must have more than one of its members or even all its members engaged in labour is, therefore, incorrect.

3. The standard period should be one-third of the year. Whether a family is classified as Labour Family (Kulak) or a Secondary Labour Family (Landlord) depends upon whether its annual total essential labour (by all its members) exceeds or stands below the standard period, i.e., four months. It must be pointed out that previously even families spending one-half of their time in the year in

essential labour were sometimes classified as Secondary Labour Families. This was incorrect.

4. The term "Essential Labour" is the labour generally of the process of production, such as, ploughing, planting, reaping and various main labour in other sorts of production. It is not confined to agricultural production. Wood-cutting, carrying, transporting, spinning, weaving, medical work, teaching and others are "Essential Labour".
5. The term "Non-essential Labour" includes various kinds of auxiliary labour which have only a secondary importance in the process of production, such as, helping to cut wood, to plant vegetables, to look after cattle, etc.
6. Labour is a principal indication to distinguish Kulak from landlord. Thus, those who employ hired labour, without rent and interest exploitation, directing and managing the production themselves, but do not undertake any essential labour, must be classified as landlords.
7. Time prolongation required for constituting the status of a landlord is three years. Those who have been living as landlords for three consecutive years immediately before the establishment of the revolutionary power, acquire the status of a landlord.

Many mistakes committed during the Movement for Land Distribution and Land Investigation are derived from the problem of distinguishing the Labour Family from the Secondary Labour Family. Some Labour families are mistaken for Secondary Labour Families and regarded as landlords. Some Secondary Labour Families are regarded as Labour Families and misjudged as kulaks. All these are due to lack of a definite standard to distinguish a landlord from a kulak. Basing on the above-mentioned decisions, such possible errors may be avoided.

However, the above decisions refer to general cases only. Under special conditions, special treatments are needed. First, there are big landlords with their family members participating in production. For instance, there is the case of one who exploits a large sum of rent and interest, say over 100 piculs (6 tons altogether) of grain as rent, or over 1000 silver dollars

as principal of loans, while his family and its expenses are not too big. Even though in this case family members undertake essential labour over four months every year, it is still a landlord, not a kulak. In the case of a big family with a large amount of domestic expenses, even though getting 100 piculs of grain as rent and 1000 silver dollars as principal for lending, he is not a landlord but a kulak if, and only if, the family members undertake essential labour.

Secondly, there is a dispute when a person judging from his exploitation looks like a landlord, but from his standard of living he cannot be classified as a landlord. For instance, there is the case of one who has been a kulak or middle peasant, but during years before revolution his family was abruptly deprived of some man-power due to death or illness and he is obliged to lease all his land to others or to employ hired labourers to cultivate his land; consequently, his family looks as if it is a landlord's family. If such a family is treated as a landlord, it is not fair. He should be regarded by his original status. A certain family is nominally a landlord, but his land has already belonged to others. His incomes derived from exploitation has become very meagre. His standard of living is even inferior to that of a peasant. Such a family may be regarded as a peasant even if it is a Secondary Labour Family.

It will be unfair to neglect these special cases in the Land Distribution and Land Investigation.

Central Committee Note 1948 :

A big family with more than 15 members and one-third of its total man-power undertaking essential labour every year, is to be classified as a Labour Family.

(2) Well-to-do Middle Peasant :

Well-to-do middle peasants are a section of middle peasants. Their living conditions are above those of average middle peasants. They do exploit others but slightly. Their incomes from exploitation are not more than 15 per cent of their total annual incomes.

However, under certain conditions those whose incomes from exploitation exceed 15 percent but not over 30 per cent of

their total annual incomes, are regarded as well-to-do middle peasant, if the masses express no opposition.

Under democratic power, interests of well-to-do middle peasants are to be well protected in the same way as common middle peasants.

- NOTE : 1. Well-to-do middle peasants are a part of middle peasants. The difference between them and other middle peasants is that they live better than average middle peasants, with slight exploitation from others, while other middle peasants generally do not exploit others.
2. The difference between well-to-do middle peasants and kulaks is that the annual income from exploitation of the well-to-do middle peasants is not over 15 per cent of their total annual incomes of the whole family, while that of the kulaks exceeds this percentage. Such a margin is necessarily to be introduced to distinguish classes.
3. The term "slight exploitation by well-to-do middle peasants" denotes employing herd boys, hiring day-labourers or month-labourers, granting small amount of loans, collecting small amount of mortgages, managing small amount of school-land rent, leasing small amount of land to others etc. But these incomes from exploitation are an insignificant portion of their family income, i.e., less than 15 percent of their total income. Their principal source of living depends on their own labour.
4. At the time of the establishment of revolutionary power, those whose incomes from exploitation have reached the same level as that of kulaks in the period immediately preceding for not longer than two years are regarded as well-to-do middle peasants.
5. Under certain conditions, those whose incomes from exploitation exceed 15 per cent but not 30 percent of their total annual income are regarded as well-to-do middle peasants, if the masses express no opposition. Here the expression of "under certain conditions" denotes that although their incomes from exploitation exceed 15 per cent of their total annual income, they are big families, with

few man-power, and their living conditions become worse due to famine or illness: under such conditions those whose incomes from exploitation do not exceed 30 per cent of their total annual incomes should not be regarded as kulaks but middle peasants. In case such conditions do not exist, however, he whose incomes from exploitation exceed 15 per cent of their total annual income is a kulak, and not a well-to-do middle peasant. A fair judgement of such cases depends on the public opinion of the masses in that locality.

In villages there are well-to-do middle peasants of a certain number. In many localities, during the Land Distribution and Land Investigation Movement, well-to-do middle peasants are treated as kulaks. This is incorrect. There are cases where common middle peasants have been classified as well-to-do middle peasants. Such mistakes should immediately be corrected.

EXAMPLE A: A family with six members has two persons' man-power. It possesses some land yielding 35 piculs (4700 lbs altogether) of grain. This is worth 140 silver dollars. The land is cultivated by the family members. This family possesses five rooms, and one buffalo, and a water-tank yielding 12 silver dollars annually. From his coarse cereals and pig breeding he has an income of about 100 silver dollars annually. He grants loans of three piculs of grains to others at a rate of 50 per cent as interest per annum (totalling 1.5 piculs a year). This is worth six silver dollars per year for four consecutive years. He grants a loan of 100 silver dollars at an interest-rate of 25 per cent per annum for five consecutive years. The annual interest of this money loan is 25 silver dollars. **JUDGEMENT:** This family depends on its own labour as the principal source of living. Its annual incomes from its own products amount to silver 520 dollars, while its annual incomes from loan exploitation amount to only 31 silver dollars. Thus, the income from exploitation is less than 15 per cent of total annual income. The living condition is rather prosperous. Because its exploitation

is not on a large scale, it is a well-to-do middle peasant rather than a kulak.

EXAMPLE B: A family with five members but possesses only one and a half man-power. It possesses some land yielding 17 piculs of grain annually. It also leases some land from others yielding 42 piculs at an annual rent of 25 piculs of grains for ten consecutive years. Incomes from coarse cereals and pig breeding amount to 50 dollars annually. This family hires a herd boy for three years. It grants a loan of 60 silver dollars at a rate of 30 per cent per annum, with an interest of 18 silver dollars annually for four years. It has five rooms and one buffalo. There is a peach-orchard yielding 30 piculs of peaches annually. **JUDGEMENT:** This family depends on their own labour. The annual incomes from exploitation are very insignificant—about 20 silver dollars. But it is exploited by others to an amount of 25 piculs of grains and rent. There is hardly any surplus. This is merely a common middle peasant rather than a well-to-do middle peasant.

(3) *Time and Quantity of Exploitation by Kulaks:*

Those who undertake to do labour and depend on exploitation as one part or a large part of their living sources and whose annual incomes exceed 15 per cent of the total annual incomes for three consecutive years immediately before the establishment of the revolutionary power, are kulaks. Under certain conditions, their annual incomes from exploitation even exceed 15 per cent but not 30 per cent of their total annual incomes; they are well-to-do middle peasants but not kulaks, if the masses express no opposition.

NOTE: 1. To determine the length of exploitation, only the time of the establishment of revolutionary power should be taken as the starting point. No other time should be taken as the starting point. No other time should be taken as the starting point to determine the period of exploitation. It is incorrect to take into account the exploiting behaviour in unconsecutive years far back in the past as a basis to determine class status.

2. The period of time for constituting the status of a kulak must be three consecutive years of exploitation. In case it is less than three years or it is three un consecutive years, even though the quantity of exploitation is the same as that by a kulak in the corresponding period, he is regarded as a well-to-do middle peasant.
3. Those whose income from exploitation is less than 15 per cent of their total annual income even for three years or still longer are not kulaks but well-to-do middle peasants.
4. The term "Total Annual Income of a Family" denotes the sum that includes their own products and incomes from exploitation. For instance, in a family the total annual self-production is 400 dollars, and the income from exploitation is 100 dollars making a total of 500 dollars. This is the total annual income. Because the income from exploitation is 20 per cent of total annual income, this family is a kulak.
5. The term "Under Certain Conditions" denotes that the family is big and man-power is few, the living conditions are not prosperous but worsened due to famine or illness. Under such conditions those whose income from exploitation exceeds even 15 per cent of total annual income but is less than 30 per cent are regarded as well-to-do middle peasants, if the masses express no opposition. On such problems the public opinion is very important. Such cases should be very carefully considered. Well-to-do middle peasants should not be mistaken for kulaks to cause discontent among the middle peasants. At the same time, no kulaks should be mistaken for well-to-do middle peasants to cause discontent among the poor peasants. A careful deliberation and agreement from the masses are necessary. During Land Distribution and Land Investigation Movement, many disputes over the problem of time and quantity have been caused by the absence of clear-out distinction between kulaks and well-to-do middle peasants in the past. The above-mentioned decisions may serve to avoid such possible shortcomings.

EXAMPLE A: A family of 11 members with 2 persons' man-power possesses some land yielding 120 piculs of grain (worth 480 silver dollars), two tea-gardens yielding 30 silver dollars annually, and a water tank yielding 15 silver dollars annually. Income from coarse cereals and pig-breeding amounts to 150 silver dollars annually. It employed a hired labourer for seven consecutive years up to the revolution. The annual surplus value from this exploited labour is 60 silver dollars. It grants loan of 250 silver dollars at a rate of 30 per cent per annum, with annual interest of 75 dollars for five years up to the Revolution. *JUDGEMENT:* This family undertakes working labour themselves, employs hired labour, granting large amount of loans. Its income from exploitation exceeds 25 percent of its total annual income. Although this is a big family, there is still a large surplus after all the expenses have been met. This is a kulak.

EXAMPLE B: A family has three members. One of them undertakes essential labour for four months every year. It possesses 60 "piculs" of land of which 30 "piculs" are cultivated by themselves yielding 18 piculs of grain, while the other 30 "piculs" of land are leased to others at an annual rent of 12 piculs of grain for five years. There is one buffalo yielding two piculs of grain as hire charges annually. It grants loans of 120 silver dollars at a rate of 30 percent per annum, with an interest amounting to 36 dollars annually for three years. *JUDGEMENT:* The incomes from exploitation of this family exceed its own production. But there is one member undertaking four months' essential labour. This family is a kulak.

(4) *Reactionary Kulak:*

Kulaks having a record of serious reactionary deeds, before and especially after the Revolution, are defined as reactionary kulaks. Landed properties belonging to reactionary kulaks and those belonging to their dependents who participated in reactionary activities are to be confiscated.

This provision is applicable to reactionary capitalists.

- NOTE: 1. Only those kulaks who have a "record of serious reactionary deeds" are regarded as reactionary kulaks. For instance, during the Revolution, directing local militias to slaughter workers and peasants; obstinately resisting the revolutionary governments, especially after the Revolution, organising reactionary societies; or conducting serious reactionary activities individually, such as, assassination, espionage for the enemy; guiding the enemy forces voluntarily; fleeing to KMT [Kuomintang] areas and working for KMT; actively and systematically fighting the Land Distribution and Land Investigation Movement and Economic Reconstruction, are serious reactionary deeds. Among kulaks, land properties of those who have a record of reactionary deeds but not playing as leading elements or whose deeds are not very serious, are not to be confiscated.
2. Land properties belonging to those elements and exclusively to those elements who participated in such serious reactionary deeds among reactionary kulaks, are to be confiscated.
 3. Kulaks, temporarily going over to KMT areas for seeking a way of living, are not to be treated as reactionary kulaks.
 4. The above provisions are applicable to reactionary capitalists.

In some localities, land properties belonging to kulaks having no record of serious reactionary deeds, were confiscated. Even the land properties belonging to some kulak elements in reactionary kulak families who did not participate in reactionary deeds, were confiscated. These are incorrect. Such errors are derived from the "Act of Land Confiscation in the Kiangsi Province, Article 3", which reads: "Properties of all Kulak families who participate in reactionary organisations are to be confiscated." In this provision the ring-leaders and followers, participants and non-participants are not discriminated. Regarding the problem of their dependents, although the latter half of the article pointed out that "the confiscated properties belonging to the dependents of the reactionaries)

who did not participate in reactionary organisations, did not take part in reactionary activities, and cut off the relations with reactionary family members, may be returned to their owners, if the masses express no opposition", there is still no proper measure. Thus, such an article should be altered into the present form. Moreover, before now in some localities, the category of reactionary capitalists was over-simplified, so that some commercial stores necessarily to be left intact were confiscated. This is also incorrect.

EXAMPLE: There is a family with 9 members, one of them undertaking working labour and another undertaking secondary labour. It possesses 160 "piculs" of land, of which 80 "piculs" are cultivated by themselves yielding 56 piculs of grains; another 80 "piculs" are leased to others at an annual rent of 30 "piculs" for ten years. It possesses some hill-land yielding annual products worth 70 silver dollars. It constantly employs one hired labourer. It borrows 425 silver dollars at a rate of 25 per cent per annum for three years. It lends 390 silver dollars to others at a rate of 30 per cent per annum for five years. One of the family members has enrolled himself as a captain in the Tsin Wei Tuan (KMT local garrison) for two years, having fought against the Red Guards five times. Another one of the family members has joined the AB Society (Anti-Bolshevik Society) for one year. But he is not an important element in the society and without much activity. Other members in the family have no apparent reactionary activities. *JUDGEMENT:* This family is a kulak. One of the family members has undertaken serious reactionary work. Thus he is a reactionary kulak. His properties are to be confiscated. But the properties belonging to other members in the family are not to be confiscated. The reason is that one of them did participate in AB society, but that he is not an important element and without an active record in it. His properties are also not to be confiscated.

Central Committee Note 1948 :

This provision is similarly applicable to other criminals from among landlords and people of other class status.

(5) *Land, House, Cattle and Implements Possessed by Kulaks :*

Kulaks, in observance of the government acts, enjoy the right to treat their land, house, cattle, implements etc., and are allowed to possess them. Nobody may violate such rights.

NOTE : 1. In recent time, farm-workers and paupers in some localities exchange their own land, house, cattle, implements etc., even clothes and fertilisers for those which have been decided as kulak's properties. This is improper.

2. After land problems have been properly solved, lands allocated to kulaks and improved by them, should not be exchanged by others. Cattle, implements, houses set up by kulaks after the Revolution must not be confiscated again nor be exchanged, even though there is a surplus.

Central Committee Note of 1948 :

This provision is similarly applicable to landlords.

(6) *Bankrupt Landlords :*

Landlords who have lost all or most of their exploitations from their land properties before the Revolution, still undertaking no working labour, but depend on deception, extortion, or support from their relatives or friends, and whose standard of living exceeds that of an average middle peasant, are defined as bankrupt landlords. Bankrupt landlords are a part of the land-lord class.

NOTE : However, landlords after bankruptcy depending on their own labour as a portion of their source of living, reaching one-third of their annual living expenses, may be regarded as kulaks.

NOTE : 1. It is incorrect to regard landlords who are partially bankrupt as bankrupt landlords. The reason is that such landlords still have some property for conducting exploitation, but there is only some quantitative change in the income from their exploitation.

2. It is still further incorrect to regard these landlords who undertake essential labour for one year after bankruptcy

as bankrupt landlords. The reason is that a landlord undertaking essential labour for one year before the Revolution has already changed into a worker, or a pauper, or a peasant from a landlord.

3. It is also incorrect to treat those bankrupt landlords who have already undertaken some working labour as landlords. The reason is that if their own labour has attained the level sufficient to sustain one-third of their annual expenses, such families should be treated as kulaks.

(7) *Paupers :*

Besides workers and peasants, those who live entirely or mainly on their own labour, or depend on a small amount of fund running business themselves in order to earn their living, are paupers. Jobless paupers in villages and small towns should be allocated land.

NOTE : 1. There is a large number of paupers in cities, and a number of them in villages and small towns. The professions of paupers are multifarious. Professions of some paupers are changeable according to seasons. Living conditions of the paupers are generally very hard. Their incomes always fail to meet their expenses.

2. Besides workers and peasants, independent producers, free professionals, peddlers, small businessmen employing no shop-keepers, and other kinds of labourers are included in the category of paupers. The so-called independent producer denotes various small craftsmen producing and selling their products by themselves. Such small craftsmen sometimes employ auxiliary labour, but principally depend on their own labour. The so-called free professionals are those who do not exploit others, such as physicians, school-teachers, lawyers, journalists, writers, artists etc. Free professionals sometimes employ assistants or employees to share their household work. Such employment is not included in the category of exploitation.

(8) *Intellectuals :*

Intellectuals should not be regarded as a class. The class origin of intellectuals is determined by the class status of

the families in which they are born. However, the class status of an intellectual himself is determined by the method which the intellectual employs to secure his principal source of living.

Intellectuals, born of landlord and bourgeois families, in observance of the laws of democratic governments, should be fully employed to serve the democratic government. They should be educated to overcome their landlord, bourgeois or petty-bourgeois ideology.

When intellectuals are doing some work without exploiting others, for instance, as teachers, editors, journalists, employed staff, writers, artists etc., they are intellectual labourers. Such intellectual labourers should be well protected by the laws of the democratic government.

NOTE: 1. In recent times, in some localities, intellectuals are expelled. This is improper. It is a policy beneficial to the popular revolutionary movement to attract intellectuals, who though born in landlord and bourgeois families are willing to serve the democratic government. During their work for the democratic government, it is necessary to solve their living problems.

2. The class origin of intellectuals is determined by the class status of their families in which they are born. For instance, those whose families are of the landlord class, are of landlord origin; those whose families are middle peasants are of middle peasant origin and so forth. However, the class status of the intellectuals themselves is determined by the method which they employ to earn their principal source of living. For instance, one who personally is a landlord, is of the class status of landlord; capitalist—of the class status of capitalist; and so forth. The class status of intellectuals who depend on their family support as principal source of living, is determined by the status of their families. It is incorrect to regard intellectuals as an independent social element. It is also improper to regard the offspring of working people having been educated in schools as unsound elements.

3. It is incorrect to regard the work of school-teachers, physicians, etc., as not a kind of labour.

(9) *Vagabond Proletariat* :

Workers, peasants and other sections of the people deprived of their land and jobs due to the oppression and exploitation by landlords and the bourgeoisie, and depending mainly on corrupt means to earn their living for three consecutive years, immediately before the establishment of the revolutionary power, are defined as vagabond proletariat (colloquially, rascals).

The policy towards the vagabond proletariat adopted by the democratic government is to win over the masses and to fight against its exploiting classes and active reactionary elements to which they are affiliated. The principal measure for winning over the vagabond proletariat are to recall them to production and allocate them land and work. However, only those who may settle in villages and cultivate the land themselves are to be allocated land.

NOTE: 1. The term "depending on corrupt means as the principal source of living" denotes employing themselves in stealing, robbery, deception, beggary, gambling, prostitution, and other abnormal occupations. It is improper to regard as vagabonds some persons with jobs or semi-jobless who employ themselves partially in abnormal occupations, but do not depend on them as their principal source of living. It is still further improper to regard as vagabonds some workers, peasants and paupers who are addicts to bad habits such as brothel-going, gambling, opium-smoking.

2. In some localities, active reactionary chiefs of the vagabond proletariat (the so-called gangsters) are not punished, but on the contrary, are allocated land. This is not correct. In some localities, demands for land allotment by the common vagabond proletariat are rejected. This is also not correct.

(10) *Religious Professionals* :

Those who employ themselves as priests or catholic priests, monks, Taoist priests, wizards, geomancers, fortune-tellers,

necromancers,—in various professions thriving on superstition as their principal sources of living for three years immediately before the Revolution, are defined as religious professionals.

(11) *Land and Red-Army men of Landlord-Kulak Class Origin :*

Red-Army men of landlord or kulak class origin, on condition of firmly fighting for the interests of workers and peasants, no matter whether as a commander or a soldier, themselves and their dependants enjoy the right to the land allotment.

NOTE : 1. According to the "Red-Army men Treatment Act, Article 1", "retired Red-Army men with their families in the democratic areas, themselves and their dependants should be allocated equal share of land, house, hill-land, forest, water-tank as that given to local poor peasants." Here, all Red-Army men are included without discrimination. But in some localities land distribution is based on class origin and regardless of their political behaviour. Even the land allocated to Red-Army men, born of landlord-kulak families but firmly fighting for the interests of workers and peasants, is confiscated anew. This is incorrect.

2. The term "Red-Army men's dependants" denote their father, mother, wife, son, daughter, and brother and sister below 16. Relatives other than these should not enjoy such right.

(12) *Workers Born of Kulak-Landlord Families :*

Workers, born of kulak or landlord families, together with their wives enjoy the status of workers entirely and unconditionally. However, other members of the family remain to be treated as landlords or kulaks.

NOTE : 1. Of landlord or kulak families, one who sells his labour for one year immediately before the Revolution, is regarded as worker. He himself and his wife are treated as workers. Other members of his family remain as landlords or kulaks and must not enjoy the right of a worker. In case there are various elements, they are treated according to their respective class status. For instance, one member in the family depending on rent and interest as his principal

source of living for three years is a landlord ; the other one depending on wages for his own labour as the principal source of living for one year is a worker ; another running a small craft-workshop in a town as his principal source of living is an independent producer. Class status of respective members is determined by the nature of his source of living during a definite period. They are treated under the law of the democratic government according to their respective class status.

2. Village-workers, independent producers, primary school-teachers, physicians, etc., possessing small amounts of land, who have left the village and leased their land to others not as the principal source of living but due to difficulties of maintaining their living in the village, are regarded as common peasants and to be allocated land. They should not be regarded as landlords.

(13) *Class Status After Inter-marriage Between Landlord, Kulak, and Capitalist on One Side and Worker, Peasant and Pauper on the Other :*

1. Class status after inter-marriage between landlord-kulak-capitalist class (LKC) and worker-peasant-pauper (WPP) is determined by the time of marriage, whether before or after the Revolution, by their original class status, and by the living conditions after marriage.

2. Daughters of LKC class married to WPP class before the Revolution, undertaking working labour as the principal source of living for one year, are acknowledged to be of the status of WPP class. Class status of those who do not undertake working labour or undertake working labour for less than one year, remains unchanged and continues as their original status. Daughters of WPP class married to LKC class living the same life as that of their husbands' families for five years are acknowledged to be of the status of LKC class. In case they live the same life as that of WPP class, i.e., depend on their own labour, as the principal source of living, or live the same life as that of their husbands' families for less than five years, their original class status remains unchanged.

3. Daughters of WPP class married to LKC class after the Revolution retain unchanged their original status. Daughters of LKC class married to WPP class undertaking working labour as the principal source of living for five years are acknowledged to be of the status of WPP class. In case they do not undertake working labour or undertake working labour for less than five years, their original class status remains unchanged.

4. The class status of sons and daughters is the same as that of their fathers, no matter about the time of marriage and class status of their parents.

5. Before the Revolution, sons or daughters of WPP class who have been sold by their parents to LKC class, and sons taken by WPP class or by LKC class as sons-in-law living with wives' parents, are treated according to the above provisions (from 1 to 4).

6. Before the Revolution, in the case of sons of WPP taken by LKC class as adopted sons, no matter about the age at which they are adopted, who live a life same as that of their step-parents for five years from the time they are ten years old, their class status is the same as that of their step-parents. If they live a life same as that of their original parents, their class status remains unchanged as that of their original parents. Sons of LKC class adopted by WPP class as adopted sons living a life same as that of step-parents for three years, have the same class status as their step-parents. If they live the same life as that of their original parents, their class status remains unchanged as that of their original parents.

NOTE: The above-mentioned "labour" includes house-hold labour.

Central Committee Note, 1948 :

When article 3—the decision on the class status of daughters of WPP class married to LKC class after the Revolution, remaining unchanged as their original one—is applied at present to those who are married to landlord and kulak families, then the term "after

the Revolution" should be explained as after the present Land Reforms; while those who are married to capitalist families will be treated in accordance with Article 2.

(14) *Landlord or Kulak Concurrently Industrial or Commercial Entrepreneur :*

1. In case landlords are concurrently industrial and commercial entrepreneurs, their land together with house and properties connected with the land are to be confiscated. But their industry and commerce and shops, living quarters, and properties connected with industry and commerce are not to be confiscated.

2. In case kulaks are concurrently industrial and commercial entrepreneurs, their land together with houses and properties connected with land are to be treated as that of a kulak; their industry and commerce together with shops, living quarters and properties are to be treated as those of industrial and commercial entrepreneurs.

(15) *Managing Agent of Communal Land :*

Communal Land Managing is a kind of exploitation. But it is necessary to distinguish communal land managing controlled by the LKC class from that controlled by the WPP class.

NOTE: To manage land properties of some clan, ancestral temple, monastery, community, and society is defined as Communal Land Managing. Doubtlessly, Communal Land Managing is a kind of feudalistic exploitation. Landlords and kulaks by means of communal land concentrate in their own grip immense amount of land and property, constituting one of the principal forms of feudalistic exploitation. Whenever communal lands are monopolized by a handful yielding a large amount of income from feudalistic exploitation, Communal Land Managing must become a factor constituting a class characteristic of their managing agents. But there are communal lands in small acreage alternatively managed by WPP class

elements with the least sense of exploitation. This cannot be a factor constituting the class characteristic of their managing agents. Those who regard all managing agents of communal land as LKC class elements, are incorrect.

(16) *Living Problems of Some Revolutionary Workers :*

Workers in democratic government and various revolutionary organisations, who are not allocated land and whose living is very difficult, themselves together with their dependants may be allocated land. Their difficulties may also be solved by other means.

NOTE : The living problems of government workers allocated land have been solved by the orders of the Central Government (i.e., to encourage the masses to cultivate their land for them). Here it denotes only those workers yet to be allocated land. The term of "dependants," denotes their father, mother, wife, son, daughter, and brother and sister below 16.

(17) *Public Land :*

During land distribution, a certain amount of land must be reserved for meeting the expenses in public utilities in villages, such as, bridge repairing, ferry boat, tea-drinking station, etc.

NOTE : Expenses in public utilities are decided by sub-district governments. A part of the public land may be voluntarily cultivated by the masses.

(18) *Debt Problem :*

1. Money or goods lent by the LKC class elements to the WPP class before the Revolution including the principal and interest are to be cancelled except the credits provided by shops. But money or goods deposited by the WPP elements to landlord or kulak elements should be repaid.

2. Those who depend on usurious exploitation as the principal source of their living and whose living conditions exceed that of the average middle peasant are defined as usurers. Usurers are treated as landlords.

3. Debts after the Revolution without violating the Temporary Lending and Borrowing Act adopted by the Democratic Government should be repaid.

NOTE : 1. Most of the debts in KMT areas, in the past and at present, in cities and villages, are usurious exploitation. But those who do not depend on usury as the principal source of their living are not usurers. Such money-lenders are treated in accordance with their class status. Those who suppose that whoever undertake usurious exploitation are "usurers" are incorrect.

2. The class status of those who have both debit and credit is determined by the sum of their balance and income from other forms of exploitation.

3. The account in shops must be repaid lest commerce should suffer. Moreover, goods accounts (sale on credit) are included in the category of usury.

4. Debt disputes among the WPP elements are settled by two parties. Those which cannot be settled by the two parties will be settled by the democratic government.

Communists must be ready at all times to stand up for the truth because truth is in the interests of the people; Communists must be ready at all times to correct their mistakes, because mistakes are against the interests of the people.

—Mao Tse-tung

Marxism In China Today

By Prof. George Thomson

Fifty years ago Lenin wrote :

Marx was the genius who continued and completed the three chief ideological currents of the nineteenth century, represented respectively by the three most advanced countries of humanity: classical German philosophy, classical English political economy, and French socialism combined with French revolutionary doctrines.

In this lecture* I shall suggest to you that since Lenin's time the three ideological currents mentioned by him have been joined by a fourth, namely Chinese classical philosophy; and that this fourth current is the source of some distinctive features of Marxist theory as developed by Mao Tse-tung and as applied in practice by the workers and peasants in China today.

Ideological Environment

IN HIS REPORT on the new Party constitution in 1945, Liu Shao-chi says :

"What Comrade Mao Tse-tung has done as a disciple of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is to unite the theories of Marxism with the actual practice of the Chinese revolution, thus giving rise to Chinese communism—the thought of Mao Tse-tung—which has guided, and is guiding, the Chinese people to achieve complete emancipation. It will make a great contribution to the struggle for emancipation of all peoples, and particularly the peoples of the East.

* *Reproduced from The Broadsheet, May 1965. Professor Thomson is Professor of Greek at Birmingham University. This paper was first delivered on March 15, 1965, at a lecture sponsored by the China Policy Study Group.*

"The Thought of Mao Tse-tung, from his world outlook to his style of work, is Marxism applied to China in the process of development and perfection... It embodies his analysis of the present world situation and China's special conditions. It is his theories and policies in regard to New Democracy, the emancipation of the peasantry, the revolutionary united front, revolutionary wars, revolutionary bases, the establishment of a Republic of New Democracy, Party-building, and culture. All these theories and policies are as thoroughly Marxist as they are Chinese and are the highest expression of the intellect of the Chinese people as well as their highest theoretical attainment."

To put the matter in another way, the ideological environment into which Marx and Engels were born was capitalist and predominantly Christian. In their youth they were pupils of Hegel, the great bourgeois philosopher, whose work can be traced back through Plato and Aristotle to Heraclitus and Pythagoras, the founders of the European philosophical tradition.

The environment into which Mao Tse-tung was born was predominantly feudal and Confucian. As a young man he had studied the writings of Confucius and the other classics of Chinese philosophy, which had had as long a history as European philosophy, Confucius being a contemporary of Pythagoras; but the two philosophies had very different histories, the differences corresponding to the differences in the historical development of European and Chinese society. Mao Tse-tung read *The Communist Manifesto*, the first of the Marxist classics to be translated into Chinese, when he was in his twenties, and by that time he was already well versed in Chinese classical philosophy.

Materialism and Idealism in Greek Philosophy

The most distinctive contribution of Mao Tse-tung to Marxism, from a philosophical point of view, lies in his treatment of dialectics: and of course dialectics belongs to the very essence of Marxism, which is for that reason also known as dialectical materialism in order to distinguish

it, on the one hand, from the mechanical materialism of French bourgeois philosophy and, on the other, from Hegel's dialectical idealism. It is therefore necessary for me to say something about the history of dialectics in European philosophy, from Heraclitus to Hegel and also about the place which it occupies in classical Chinese philosophy.

The standpoint of the earliest Greek philosophers may be described as primitive materialism or proto-materialism. It differs from the materialism of later times in that it is not consciously opposed to idealism, which had not yet emerged as a philosophical principle, and it was inherently dialectical. It may be summed up in the famous saying of Heraclitus, "It is and it is not." All things are continually being transformed into their opposites, and therefore it may be said of everything that "it is and it is not."

With the consolidation of slave society in ancient Greece, the ruling class, cut off from the labour of production, developed an outlook which was predominantly idealistic and metaphysical: that is, it asserted the primacy of spirit over matter and denied the reality of change. This new tendency culminated in Plato and Aristotle, whose work exercised a lasting influence on the subsequent history of European thought. Plato was the father of philosophical idealism, Aristotle of formal logic.

According to Aristotle, a thing "is either A, or not A", that is, it cannot be both A and not-A. This was a direct denial of the principle formulated by Heraclitus, that 'it is and it is not.'

Plato's theory of ideas and Aristotelian logic formed the philosophical basis of Christian theology, which dominated European thought down to modern times. Thereafter, with the rise of the modern bourgeoisie, the conflict between materialism and idealism, between dialectics and metaphysics, was renewed. It culminated in the work of the great German philosophers, Kant and Hegel, and, with the rise of the proletariat, it was resolved in Marxism, the new dialectical materialism, the theory that points the way to the communism of the future.

Thus, Marxism may be regarded as a reaffirmation, at an infinitely higher level, of the outlook inherited by the earliest Greek philosophers from primitive communism and subsequently obscured by what Marx calls the 'mystical veil' of class society.

Sense of Dialectics in Ancient China

Turning to China, we find there too, among the earliest philosophers, an outlook which may be described as proto-materialist with a strong sense of dialectics, and for the same reason: that is to say, in China, as in Greece, philosophy began with the formulation of ideas inherited from pre-class society. But the subsequent history of philosophy in China was different. There, slavery did not develop to the same extent as it did in Greece: hence the rupture with primitive modes of thinking was less complete.

It is true that, from the time of Confucius onwards, idealism prevailed, but the outlook of Chinese philosophers remained empirical rather than metaphysical, and they never evolved a system of formal logic. In this there was gain as well as loss. In particular, the sense of dialectics was preserved.

Take this passage, for example, from one of the greatest of the Chinese classics, the Tao Te Ching:

"Existence and non-existence generate one another, the difficult and the easy complete one another, the long and the short demonstrate one another, the high and the low explain one another, the previous and the subsequent follow one another."

To this let me add Dr. Joseph Needham's comment on Aristotelian logic. Aristotelian logic, he says,

"Provided the natural sciences with an inadequate tool for handling the greatest fact of nature, so well appreciated by the Taoists—Change. The so-called laws of identity, contradiction, and the excluded middle, according to which X must be either A or not-A and either B or not-B, were constantly being flouted.....The natural sciences were always in the

position of having to say, 'It is and yet it is not.' Hence in due course the dialectical and many-valued logics of the post-Hegelian world. Hence the extraordinary interest of the traces of dialectical or dynamic logic in the ancient Chinese thinkers...(*Science and Civilization in China vol. II, p. 201*)."

Mao Tse-tung's Distinctive Contribution

It is against this background that we should evaluate Mao Tse-tung's distinctive contribution to Marxist philosophy, which lies precisely in his treatment of contradictions and his dialectical theory of the relation between theory and practice. In his notes on Hegel, Lenin wrote :

"The identity of opposites...is the recognition, discovery, of the contradictory, mutually exclusive, opposite tendencies in all phenomena and processes of nature, including mind and society. The condition for the knowledge of all processes of the world in their 'self-movement', in their spontaneous development, in their real life, is the knowledge of them as a unity of opposites. Development is the 'struggle' of opposites..."

To western students of philosophy, trained without any knowledge of Marxism, as most of them are even today, this statement is almost devoid of meaning; but it would have presented no difficulty to students in the old China, brought up, as they all were, on ancient Chinese classics.

Before leaving the subject of classical Chinese philosophy, I must add a few words about Confucianism, which from the Han Dynasty down to the present century was the established religion, if we may call it so, of the Chinese Empire. Confucianism is concerned with man's conduct in relation to nature and with the conduct of the individual in relation to society: it is humanistic and this-worldly, in contrast to Christianity. The individualism of western ethics—whether the self-effacing individualism of Catholic mysticism or the self-assertive individualism of Calvinism—is alien to Confucian ethics. Confucianism differs also from Christianity in being essentially unwarlike.

Stalin's and Mao's Expositions Compared

Let us now compare Mao Tse-tung's exposition of dialectics with Stalin's. The comparison is all the more

instructive because the two treatises in question—*On Contradiction* and *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*—were published about the same time, in the years 1937-8, and therefore were written independently of one another.

Stalin's exposition of the four principles of dialectics may be summarised as follows: (1) all things are interconnected; (2) all things are always changing; (3) development takes place through the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative changes; (4) development takes place through the struggle of opposites, through the growth of internal contradictions.

Stalin's formulation of the fourth principle may be quoted in full:

"Internal contradictions are inherent in all things and phenomena of nature for they all have their negative and positive sides, a past and a future, something dying away and something developing: and the struggle between these opposites, the struggle between the old and the new, between that which is dying away and that which is being born, between that which is disappearing and that which is developing, constitutes the internal content of the process of development, the internal content of the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative changes."

Mao's treatment of contradictions is subtler and more profound. It may be summarised in his own words:

"Contradiction is present in all processes of objectively existing things and of subjective thought and permeates all these processes from beginning to end; this is the universality and absoluteness of contradiction. Each contradiction and each of its aspects have their respective characteristics; this is the particularity and relativity of contradiction. In given conditions, opposites possess identity, and consequently can coexist in a single entity and can transform themselves into each other: this again is the particularity and relativity of contradiction. But the struggle of opposites is ceaseless: it goes on both when the opposites are coexisting and when they are transforming themselves into each other: this

again is the universality and absoluteness of contradiction. In studying the particularity and relativity of contradiction, we must give attention to the distinction between the principal and the non-principal contradictions and to the distinction between the principal aspect and the non-principal aspect of a contradiction; in studying the universality of contradiction and the struggle of opposites in contradiction, we must give attention to the distinction between the different forms of struggle."

Presented in this condensed form, the argument is abstract and difficult to follow; but in the extended exposition, of which this is the concluding summary, each step in the argument is illustrated by simple, concrete examples.

I would draw special attention to Mao's insistence on the different forms of struggle. This rests on the distinction between antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions—a distinction which is not mentioned in Stalin's treatise on the subject, though it had already been made by Lenin. Not only does Mao draw this distinction, but he points out more than once that, in the development of a thing, antagonistic contradictions, if correctly handled, may become non-antagonistic, and conversely non-antagonistic contradictions, if incorrectly handled, may become antagonistic.

"On the Correct Handling of Contradictions"

He developed this point later in his treatise *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People*, which was published in 1957. I believe that this is one of his most important contributions to Marxism, deserving much closer attention than it has yet received from Marxists in the west.

It could, I think, be shown, on the one hand, that Stalin's errors were largely due to his failure to deal correctly with antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions and, on the other, that Mao Tse-tung's development of this aspect of dialectics would not have been possible without the historical experience of the October Revolution and of socialist construction in the Soviet Union: in other words, he was building on the work already done by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Further, it is not, in my opinion, an accident that this

development of Marxist dialectics was made in a country with an ancient philosophical tradition which differs from the European precisely in that it had never abandoned the dialectical mode of thinking. It is, in short, an example of the enrichment of Marxist theory that may be expected to follow from the successful application of the universal truths of Marxism to the concrete conditions of a formerly backward country.

In order to show how Marxist dialectics are being applied in China to political problems, let us consider Mao Tse-tung's much-discussed characterisation of imperialism as a paper tiger.

Lenin had described imperialism as 'a colossus with feet of clay'. A colossus is a gigantic statue made of stone and therefore very strong; yet this statue has feet of clay and is therefore liable to collapse. It is both strong and weak. This is the unity of opposites. The idea of colossus is derived from the ancient Greeks. It belongs, therefore, to the European tradition.

The Chinese use a different idea, drawn from their own tradition. Imperialism, they say, is a 'paper tiger', but at the same time it is a real tiger; it is and it is not a tiger. This is how the matter has been explained by Mao Tse-tung:

"Just as there is not a single thing in the world without a dual nature (this is the law of the unity of opposites) so imperialism and all reactionaries have a dual nature—they are real tigers and paper tigers at the same time. In past history, before they won state power and for some time afterwards, the slave-owning class, the feudal landlord class and the bourgeoisie were vigorous, revolutionary and progressive; they were real tigers. But with the lapse of time, because their opposites—the slave class, the peasant class and the proletariat—grew in strength step by step, struggled against them and became more and more formidable, these ruling classes changed step by step into the reverse, changed into reactionaries, changed into backward people, changed into paper tigers; and eventually they were overthrown, or will be overthrown,

by the people. On the one hand, they were real tigers ; they ate people, ate people by the millions and tens of millions.... Were not these living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers ? But in the end they changed into paper tigers, dead tigers, beancurd tigers...Hence, imperialism and all reactionaries, looked at in essence, from a longterm point of view, from a strategic point of view, must be seen for what they are—paper tigers. On this we should build our strategic thinking. On the other hand, they are also living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers, which can eat people. On this we should build our tactical thinking.”

Theory of Knowledge

Let us now turn to the Marxist theory of knowledge as expounded by Mao Tse-tung and see how it underlies the Chinese theory and practice of ‘the mass line’.

Human knowledge springs from social practice, that is, through physical contact with the external world, particularly through the labour of production. In its initial stage it consists of perceptual knowledge, that is, knowledge based directly on sense-impressions ; but through reflection and discussion, together with further practice, it is raised to a higher stage, the stage of rational knowledge, giving rise to theories. This rational knowledge is then applied in practice with the aim of changing the external world and in the course of doing this the knowledge itself is deepened and enriched.

The external world includes society as well as nature, and the human agency which changes it and is changed by it consists not of isolated individuals, but of individuals living and working together in a group or community or social class ; so their knowledge includes not only what they have themselves acquired from practice, but also what they have inherited through speech and writing. Thus the whole process consists of a cyclical interaction between knowledge and practice.

In Mao’s own words :

“Discover the truth through practice, and again through practice verify and develop the [truth, start from perceptual

knowledge and actively develop it into rational knowledge ; then start from rational knowledge and actively guide revolutionary practice to change both the subjective and the objective world. Practice, knowledge, again practice, and again knowledge. This form repeats itself in endless cycles, and with each cycle the content of practice and knowledge rises to a higher level. Such is the whole of the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge, and such is the dialectical materialist theory of the unity of knowing and doing.”

Practical Application

This theory of knowledge has been applied systematically by the Chinese Communist Party in its practical work for the purpose of giving correct leadership to the masses in accordance with the principle of the mass line.

To quote again from Mao :

“In all practical work of our Party, correct leadership can only be developed on the principle of ‘from the masses, to the masses’. This means summing up (that is, co-ordinating and systematising after careful study) the views of the masses, (that is, views scattered and unsystematic), then taking the resulting ideas back to the masses, explaining them and popularising them until the masses embrace them as their own, stand up for them and translate them into action by way of testing their correctness. Then it is necessary once more to sum up the views of the masses so that the masses give them their whole-hearted support...And so on, over and over again, so that each time these ideas emerge with greater correctness and become more vital and meaningful. This is what the Marxist theory of knowledge teaches us.”

Further, in order that the Party may carry out the mass line effectively, it is necessary to take note of the contradictions that exist within the Party, within the masses of the people, and between the people and the remnants of the former ruling classes, namely the landlords and the capitalists.

Resolving Contradictions

Within the Party there is a contradiction between the leadership and the rank and file. This is resolved on the

principle of democratic centralism, which is a cyclical interaction of same kind as that which operates between the Party and the masses, except that within the Party it operates at a higher level.

There is also a contradiction, both within the leadership and within the rank and file, between the more advanced members and the less advanced. This is resolved on the principle of criticism and self-criticism.

It was Lenin who insisted that, without criticism within its own ranks conducted with a view to recognising its mistakes and drawing from them the necessary lessons, it is not possible for a Party to fulfil its obligations to the masses. In the Chinese Communist Party the systematic practice of criticism and self-criticism has been cultivated to a higher degree than in any other. Indeed, it has been carried far beyond the ranks of the Party and taken over by the masses of workers, peasants, soldiers and intellectuals, who employ it habitually in their day-to-day activity to a degree that visitors from the west often find astonishing.

Here, too, the Chinese Marxists have been drawing on the ancient Confucian tradition of the self-cultivation of the individual in the service of the community.

Among the masses there is a contradiction between the industrial workers and the peasants, which is now being resolved by the mechanism of agriculture and the development of people's communes. Without an alliance between the industrial proletariat and the peasantry the revolution would have been impossible.

Contradictions Within Alliances

I speak of the contradiction between the industrial proletariat and the peasantry, and at the same time of an alliance between the industrial proletariat and the peasantry. Contradiction is inherent in the nature of alliance. The workers and the peasants unite together in order to fight the common enemy, thereby overcoming the principal contradiction, but at the same time there exists between them a non-principal contradiction, resolved through ideological struggle, in

which the more backward class is raised to the level of the more advanced.

This question of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry is a decisive factor in the socialist revolution. How, it is often asked, did it come about that the socialist revolution succeeded in a country in which the industrial proletariat formed such a tiny minority of the population as it did in China before the liberation?

To this it may be answered that the important considerations are two: first, the contradictions present in the objective situation, creating the possibility of a revolution, and secondly, the nature of the *leadership* given by the proletariat—in other words, not its numerical strength but its political strength. Its leadership depends on its ability to utilise correctly the objective contradictions, both the contradictions between the people and the enemy, and the contradictions existing within the people.

When Marx and Engels wrote *The Communist Manifesto* they believed that Germany was on the eve of a bourgeois revolution to be followed immediately by a proletarian revolution. Things turned out differently; but note that, in their opinion, the first proletarian revolution would break out, not in England, which, being the most advanced capitalist country, had the largest proletariat, but in Germany, which was still feudal, where the old contradiction between the peasantry and the feudal aristocracy coexisted with the new and growing contradictions between the feudal aristocracy and the bourgeoisie and between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

A bourgeois revolution, followed immediately by a proletarian revolution, did come eventually—not in Germany, however, nor in any other of the advanced capitalist countries, but in backward Russia, where the numerically small but politically advanced proletariat was able, under Lenin's leadership, to forge an alliance with the peasantry, to overthrow the Tsarist autocracy, and turn the bourgeois revolution into a proletarian revolution.

Combining Unity with Struggle

As Mao Tse-tung has said, it was the salvos of the October Revolution that brought Marxism to China. At that time China was even more backward than Tsarist Russia—not only feudal but semi-colonial. Its proletariat was numerically insignificant, but it was led by a Party which was armed not only with Marxism but with the experience of the practical application of Marxism provided by the October Revolution.

In this way, taking full advantage of all the contradictions, it was able to rally to its side the peasantry, which formed the vast majority of the population together with a substantial section of the capitalist class, the national bourgeoisie, against the landlords and the foreign imperialists, isolating the main enemy and combining unity with struggle in its handling of contradictions among the people.

Thus, as the socialist revolution spreads across the world, the small size of the proletariat in the countries still exploited by imperialism is offset by the intensity of class contradictions and the accumulation of revolutionary experience. This is what makes the 'Thought of Mao Tse-tung' so important for the peoples of Africa and Latin America still struggling for liberation.

Theory of Armed Struggle

All this was not achieved without setbacks and mistakes. The nation-wide victory of 1949 would not have been possible without the preceding years of armed struggle and the experience of administering the Liberated Areas. It was then, under the leadership of the Party, that the People's Liberation Army took shape and developed a new theory of armed struggle which was continuously tried, tested and further developed through victories and defeats in the further course of the struggle—a force adapted also for peaceful construction, first in the Liberated Areas and later over the whole country, active not only in productive labour but also in raising through its example the ideological and moral level of the whole people.

Again, in the formation of the people's communes mistakes were made owing to inexperience and overconfidence, combined with objective difficulties; but through the application of the mass line these mistakes were recognised and corrected. It was the people's communes that enabled the economy to stand the strain of the three bad years 1959-61 without loss of life; and at the same time the difficulties of those years forced into the open the weaknesses in the communes and made it imperative that they should be rectified. In this way a bad thing was turned into a good thing.

Continuing Ideological Struggle

It must not, however, be supposed that in China today the class struggle is over. The economy has been reorganised on a socialist basis, but bourgeois and petty bourgeois and even feudal ideas survive, and therefore the struggle must be carried on at the ideological level as well as at the economic level. The consolidation of the socialist system and the transition to communism is a lengthy historical process, which may be arrested, and even reversed, if there is any relaxation of the ideological struggle. This, too, is in accord with Mao Tse-tung's theory of contradiction.

In general, as he explains, the economic basis is the principal aspect of the contradiction in the movement of society, as opposed to the ideological superstructure, which is the non-principal aspect; but in certain conditions the non-principal aspect of a contradiction may be transformed into the principal aspect, just as a non-antagonistic contradiction, if incorrectly handled, may become antagonistic.

The old ideas will not disappear of themselves: on the contrary, they persist, and, if they are not fought, they will reassert themselves even to the point of reacting on the economic basis, and so bring about a revival of the old class divisions.

In this matter special attention is being given to the upbringing of young people. On the one hand, the young people enjoy an advantage over their parents in that they have been brought up and educated in a socialist environment.

On the other hand, for that very reason they have had no direct endured of class oppression or of the sufferings and sacrifices educated by their parents and grandparents in the struggle for socialism.

In the schools, special measures are taken to ensure that they grow up fully aware of the struggle that had to be fought to create the opportunities which they enjoy. In the factories, elderly workers who participated in those struggles are given special positions—working in the factory library, for example—and special opportunities for passing on their experiences. In the people's communes, when new houses are built, one or two of the old hovels are preserved, so that the old people may point to them and say, "That is where we lived before the Liberation." In all this the aim is to ensure that the revolutionary spirit shall be transmitted to the rising generation.

The ideological struggle is conducted by means of discussion—discussion between members of a working group, discussion in the factory newspaper, discussion in the local press, discussion in the national press. Everywhere there is discussion, not only of current issues, both national and international, but also of theoretical questions such as those I have been discussing in this lecture. It is with the theoretical discussions, and particularly with the study of Marxism, that I am concerned now.

"Theory Grips the Masses"

Marx said that, when theory grips the masses, it becomes a material force. This is what is happening all over China today.

It may be added that, when theory grips the masses of the working class, the intellectuals are encouraged to reunite themselves with practice, and so the division between manual and mental labour, which is characteristic of class society, begins to disappear.

Ten years ago I spent six months at Peking University, studying Chinese. My room was looked after by a worker about thirty years old, whom I got to know quite well because we used to meet several times every day. He was attending

evening classes, learning to read and write, and we used to help each other in our struggles to master the script.

As for Marxism, he used to say he *believed* in Marxism—how could he help doing so, seeing that the Party believed in it, and the Party had done so much for him; he would then tell me, with tears in his eyes, of his life in the old China and the changes that had been brought about since Liberation; all this he owed to the Party; but as for Marxism he could not hope to understand it because he was only just beginning to read. Last September I revisited Peking University and saw him again. He was now studying Marxism.

Class-consciousness and Educational Levels

By comparison with the intellectuals the class-consciousness of the workers and peasants is high, but their educational level is low. For a long time this made it difficult for them to study Marxist theory, but now this difficulty is being overcome.

In 1958 some shipyard workers in Shanghai organised on their own initiative a class on philosophy, and it was a great success. Reports of it were published in the press, and their example was followed by groups of workers and peasants all over the country. The movement suffered a setback during the hard years 1959-61, but since then it has recovered its impetus and now it is stronger and broader than ever.

Early last year Yang Hsien-chen, a member of the Central Committee of the Party, published in one of the newspapers an article on dialectics which has given rise to a nation-wide controversy. Starting from the formula 'two combine into one', taken from classical Chinese philosophy, Yang Hsien-chen interpreted it in such a way as to suggest that the main task in dialectics is not to disclose the contradictions between opposites, but on the contrary to stress those features which they have in common; in other words, he held that the unity of opposites is primary and the struggle between opposites is secondary.

This view was immediately challenged. Hundreds of articles appeared in the press in all parts of the country, most of them from workers and peasants. At first the opinions expressed were more or less equally divided between the two points of view, and so the controversy has come to be known as 'two-into-one or one-into-two'; but then the balance began to shift, and in the last few months the great majority of contributors have supported the second point of view, corresponding to Lenin's interpretation of dialectics, that in the relation between opposites struggle is absolute and unity relative.

Never before in the history of philosophy has a theoretical question been discussed on such a scale among the masses of the people.

Applying Theoretical Knowledge to Production

During the past few years, on an ever-increasing scale, in the factories, in the fields, and in the units of the People's Liberation Army, the workers and peasants have been applying their theoretical knowledge directly to problems of production. Again and again it has been found that a series of classes on Marxist philosophy has been followed by improvements in production.

The most popular textbooks are *On Practice*, *On Contradiction*, and *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*. I was told of a factory worker who, after studying *On Contradiction*, set himself the task of identifying the principal contradiction in the production process in which he was engaged and so succeeded in solving certain problems which he had previously left to the technicians in charge of the machines. He discussed the results with his workmates, and the group put forward proposals for rationalisation which were adopted by the management.

I was told of a peasant woman, a mother of five children, who during the intervals of her work in the fields studied all the works of Mao Tse-tung and all the main documents, from both sides, on the international controversy. She has since been invited to open discussions in other parts of

her own commune and in other communes, explaining how she has succeeded in integrating theory with practice in such a way as to raise the level of production.

Such people, after raising their own theoretical level, improve their practice, thus serving as an example to their fellow-workers, who in their turn become the nucleus for ever wider study groups, leading to further improvements in production and gradually raising the ideological and moral level of the whole community.

Thus, the cyclical process described by Mao—practice, knowledge, again practice and again knowledge—is now spreading all over China. And this is only a beginning.

Bridging Gap Between Manual and Mental Labour

Apart from the worker whom I have mentioned, my closest friends at the Peking University were members of the teaching staff, most of them young, and all except one of petty bourgeois and bourgeois origin; the exception came of an ex-landlord family. They were well read in Marxism, but they had no contact with the workers. This was a great problem for them. It had been proposed that they should take classes in Marxism for the workers, but such classes had been tried and were not successful, because they did not understand what the workers needed. We discussed this problem many times without finding any solution.

This, too, is now changed. For a number of years past all Party and government officials have been required to spend a certain amount of time engaged in manual labour. For recurrent periods—say, a month in the year—the factory manager works on the factory floor, the chairman of the people's commune works in the fields, the general serves in the ranks.

Among other sections of the professional classes manual work is voluntary, but there is no lack of volunteers. The professors and lecturers of Peking University go to a village in the Western Hills—a poor village short of labour, because almost the whole of the adult male population was killed by the Japanese. There they work, and live with the peasants,

helping them on the land during the day and organising classes and lectures for them in the evenings. Through this contact with the workers they have raised their class-consciousness.

So with the students. All of them spend a month or two every year working in the factories or in the fields along with the workers and peasants in accordance with the principle of the three 'togethers'—'live together, feed together, work together'.

Meanwhile, the number of working-class students at the universities is increasing steadily, and recently experiments have been carried out with a new type of school, in which the children combine study with productive labour. In this way the mental workers are becoming manual workers, and the manual workers are becoming mental workers.

Effect on the Arts

Outside the universities and schools the movement for participation in manual labour embraces all professional people. Writers, painters, architects, actors, musicians, dancers—all are involved. Although it began only a few years ago, its effect on the arts is already apparent.

China has a very ancient tradition of painting, poetry and music. In painting and in opera alike the traditional style is being adapted to contemporary themes. It is understood, of course, that it is impossible to effect changes in the content without effecting changes also in the form—here, too, we have a unity of opposites; but the aim is to develop the content as the principal aspect of the contradiction in such a way as to evolve organically a new unity corresponding to the new unity between the artists and the people.

There are, of course, many problems to be solved, and with the opening of every new exhibition of paintings, with the production of every new opera, these problems are eagerly discussed. But the first step has been taken. The artist has learnt that in order to inspire the people he must himself seek inspiration from the people. And conversely, thanks to these closer contacts with the artists, the artistic level of the people is also being raised.

In all parts of the country, popular songs and dances, arts and crafts—some of which were on the verge of extinction fifteen years ago—are being revived; western music and

ballet are being introduced, both for their own sake and because they contain elements which can be used in developing the national traditions. In this way the artistic talents of the workers and peasants are finding new channels of expression. The arts are becoming more and more a creative activity of the whole people.

Evidence of this was to be seen in the great procession on October 1. I had been present on this occasion in 1952. That was the third anniversary of the Liberation. The second time I was present was on the fifteenth. The changes were immense.

The Gate of Heavenly Peace now opens on to a vast square, flanked on the left by the Museum of the Revolution and on the right by the Hall of the People's Congress, and looking towards the monolith which has been erected at the end of the vista to the memory of those who gave their lives in the War of Liberation. The procession began punctually at ten and finished punctually at twelve—seven hundred and fifty thousand people passing in wave after wave of colour, movement and music, drawn from all sections of the people and every sphere of national life—an imaginative display that sometimes took one's breath away, it was so beautiful—a brilliant manifestation of an extremely ancient and rich civilisation which has suddenly burst into new life, reinvigorated by Marxism.

The same evening the square was filled again under a cascade of fireworks with over a million people, who danced all night long, hour after hour, rejoicing, a living embodiment of the last movement of Beethoven's Choral Symphony with its prophetic hymn to the brotherhood of man.

Among the spectators, together with other national leaders and foreign visitors from all parts of the world, was Mao Tse-tung.

Let me conclude with his words:

"This process, the practice of changing the world, which is determined in accordance with scientific knowledge, has already reached a historic moment in the world and in China, a great moment unprecedented in human history, that is, the moment for completely banishing darkness from the world and from China and for changing the world into a world of light such as never existed before."

VICE-CHAIRMAN LIN PIAO'S Speech at Peking Rally Commemorating 50th Anniversary of October Revolution

*Following is the full text of the speech made by
Vice-Chairman Lin Piao at the Peking rally
commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the
October Revolution.*

COMRADES,

Young Red Guard Fighters and Friends :

TODAY the Chinese people join the proletarians and revolutionary people throughout the world in grand and solemn commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The October Revolution led by the great Lenin was a turning point in human history.

The victory of the October Revolution broke through the dark rule of capitalism, established the first state of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the world and opened a new era of the world proletarian revolution.

For more than one hundred years since Marx and Engels formulated the theory of scientific socialism, the international proletariat, advancing wave upon wave and making heroic sacrifices, has been waging arduous struggles for the great ideal of communism and has performed immortal exploits in the cause of the emancipation of mankind.

In his struggle against the revisionism of the Second International and in the great practice of leading the October Socialist Revolution, Lenin solved a series of problems of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat as well as the problem of victory for socialism in

one country, thus developing Marxism to the stage of Leninism. Leninism is Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. The salvoes of the October Revolution brought Leninism to all countries, so that the world took on an entirely new look.

In the last fifty years, following the road of the October Revolution under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the proletariat and revolutionary people of the world have carried the world history forward to another entirely new era, the era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing to world-wide victory. It is a great new era in which the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are locked in the decisive battle on a world-wide scale.

Led by the great leader Chairman Mao, the Chinese people have followed up their victory in the national-democratic revolution with great victories in the socialist revolution and socialist construction. Socialist China has become the mighty bulwark of world revolution. Adhering to the road of the October Revolution, the heroic people of Albania have raised a bright red banner in Europe. By their war against US imperialist aggression and for national salvation, the Vietnamese people have set a brilliant example of struggle against imperialism for the people of the whole world. The movement of national-democratic revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America is developing vigorously. The ranks of the Marxist-Leninists are growing steadily, and a new situation has emerged in the international communist movement.

Compared with half a century ago, the world proletarian revolution today is far deeper in content, far broader in scope and far sharper in its struggle. The new historical era has posed a series of important new problems for Marxist-Leninists. However, in the final analysis, the most fundamental problem remains that of seizing and consolidating political power.

Chairman Mao says: "The aim of every revolutionary

struggle in the world is the seizure and consolidation of political power." This is a great Marxist-Leninist truth.

The struggle between the Marxist-Leninists and the revisionists always focuses on this fundamental issue. The modern revisionists, represented by Khrushchov and his successors, Brezhnev, Kosygin and company, are wildly opposing the revolution of the people of the world and have openly abandoned the dictatorship of the proletariat and brought about an all-round capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union. This is a monstrous betrayal of the October Revolution. It is a monstrous betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. It is a monstrous betrayal of the great Soviet people and the people of the world. Therefore, if the proletariat fails to smash the wanton attacks of the modern revisionists, if it does not firmly defend the road of the October Revolution opened up by the great Lenin, continue to advance along this road under the new historical conditions and thoroughly solve the question of how to seize and consolidate political power, it will not be able to win final victory, or will probably lose political power even after seizing it, and, like the Soviet people, will come under the rule of a new privileged bourgeois stratum.

It is our good fortune that because Comrade Mao Tse-tung has comprehensively inherited and developed the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the most fundamental issue of the world proletarian revolution, that is, the road to the seizure and consolidation of political power, has been brought to a higher stage in theory and in practice. Our great leader Chairman Mao has developed Marxism-Leninism and raised it to an entirely new peak. The ever-victorious thought of Mao Tse-tung is Marxism-Leninism in the era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing to world-wide victory.

In the course of leading the great struggle of the Chinese revolution, Chairman Mao has with genius solved a whole series of complicated problems concerning the seizure of

political power by force of arms. Under his leadership the Chinese people went through the most protracted, fierce, arduous and complex people's revolutionary war in the history of the world proletarian revolution and founded the red political power, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The way the Chinese people seized political power by force of arms under Chairman Mao's leadership may be summarized as follows :

Under the leadership of the political party of the proletariat, to arouse the peasant masses in the countryside to wage guerrilla war, unfold an agrarian revolution, build rural base areas, use the countryside to encircle the cities and finally capture the cities. This is a great new development of the road to the seizure of political power by force of arms indicated by the October Revolution.

Chairman Mao has said : "As a rule, revolution starts, grows and triumphs first in those places in which the counter-revolutionary forces are comparatively weak." Since in our time all the reactionary ruling classes have a tight grip on the main cities, it is necessary for a revolutionary political party to utilise the vulnerable links and areas of reactionary rule, fully arouse the masses, conduct guerrilla warfare, establish stable revolutionary bases and so build up and temper their own forces and, through prolonged fighting, strive step by step for complete victory in the revolution. Hence, reliance on the masses to build rural revolutionary base areas and use the countryside to encircle the cities is a historic task which the oppressed nations and peoples in the world today must seriously study and tackle in their fight to seize political power by force of arms.

Not only has Comrade Mao Tse-tung creatively developed Leninism on the question of the seizure of political power by the proletariat, he has made an epoch-making creative development of Leninism on the most important question of our time—the question of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and preventing the restoration of capitalism.

From the first day of the victory of the October Revolution,

Lenin paid close attention to the consolidation of the new-born Soviet state power. He recognised the sharp and protracted nature of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat, pointing out that "the transition from capitalism to communism takes an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch is over, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope turns into attempts at restoration."

The biggest lesson in the history of the international communist movement in the last 50 years is the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This harsh fact has strikingly brought the Marxist-Leninists of the world face to face with the question of how to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent the restoration of capitalism.

It is Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the great teacher of the world proletariat of our time, who in the new historical conditions, has systematically summed up the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the world, scientifically analysed the contradictions in socialist society, profoundly shown the laws of class struggle in socialist society and put forward a whole set of theory, line, principles, methods and policies for the continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. With supreme courage and wisdom, Chairman Mao has successfully led the first great proletarian cultural revolution in history. This is an extremely important landmark, demonstrating that Marxism-Leninism has developed to the stage of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

The victory of the great proletarian cultural revolution has opened up in China, which has a quarter of the world's population, a bright path for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and for carrying the socialist revolution through to the end. The proletariat and the revolutionary people of the world who are fighting imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction resolutely support our great proletarian cultural revolution. They find in the victory of this

revolution tremendous inspiration, bright prospects and greater confidence in victory.

The imperialists headed by the United States and their lackeys the modern revisionists and all the reactionaries have taken great pains to curse and vilify our great proletarian cultural revolution. This proves by negative example that our victory has dealt the enemy a very heavy blow and that they are nothing but a bunch of vampires that are bound to be destroyed.

The world is moving forward. And theory, which reflects the laws of the world, is likewise developing continuously.

Mao Tse-tung's thought is the banner of our era. Once Mao Tse-tung's thought—Marxism-Leninism at its highest in the present era—is grasped, the oppressed nations and peoples will, through their own struggles, be able to win liberation.

Once Mao Tse-tung's thought—Marxism-Leninism at its highest in the present era—is grasped, the countries that have already established the dictatorship of the proletariat, will, through their own struggles, be able to prevent the restoration of capitalism.

Once Mao Tse-tung's thought—Marxism-Leninism at its highest in the present era—is grasped, the people of those countries where political power has been usurped by revisionists will, through their own struggles be able to overthrow the rule of revisionism and re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Once Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought is integrated with the revolutionary practice of the people of all countries, the entire old world will be shattered to smithereens.

Comrades, young Red Guard fighters and friends :

The fifty years since the October Revolution have been years of fierce struggle between socialism and capitalism and between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism, with the former winning one victory after another. The imperialist system resembles a dying person who is sinking fast, like the sun setting beyond the western hills. The emergence of Khrushchov revisionism is a product of imperialist policy

and reflects the death-bed struggle of imperialism. Although imperialism and revisionism will go on making trouble in collusion with each other, the reactionary adverse current can, after all, never become the main current. The dialectics of history is irresistible. Henceforth, the proletariat and the revolutionary people of the world will raise still higher the great red banner of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought and march forward in giant strides along the road opened up by the October Revolution!

Those who betray the October revolution can never escape the punishment of history. Khrushchov has long since fallen. In redoubling its efforts to pursue the policy of betrayal, the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique will not last long either. The proletariat and the working people of the Soviet Union, with their glorious tradition of revolution will never forget the teachings of the great Lenin and Stalin. They are sure to rise in revolution under the banner of Leninism, overthrow the rule of the reactionary revisionist clique and bring the Soviet Union back into the orbit of socialism.

Comrades, young Red Guard fighters and friends!

The situation in our great motherland is excellent. Under the guidance of the latest instructions of the great leader Chairman Mao, the great proletarian cultural revolution is forging ahead victoriously.

We must raise still higher the great banner of the October Revolution and the great banner of Marxism-Leninism. Mao Tse-tung's thought, and carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end.

We must build our great motherland into a still more powerful base for world revolution.

We must give ever more vigorous support to the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and people of all countries.

We must, together with the revolutionary people everywhere, carry through to the end the struggle against US-led imperialism and against modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist renegade clique as its centre.

We must intensify our efforts in studying and mastering Mao Tse-tung's thought and disseminate it still more widely throughout the world.

These are glorious tasks entrusted to the people of our country by history, and they are our incumbent internationalist duty.

Our great leader Chairman Mao has given the call: "Let the Marxist-Leninists of all countries unite, let the revolutionary people of the whole world unite and overthrow imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction. A new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without exploitation of man by man will surely be built."

Let us fight with courage for the realization of this great call of Chairman Mao's!

Long live the great October Socialist Revolution!

Long live the great proletarian cultural revolution!

Workers of all countries, unite!

Workers of all countries, unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations!

Long live the invincible Marxism, Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought!

Long live the great teacher, great leader, great supreme commander, great helmsman Chairman Mao! A long, long life to him!

Why the Demons are Laughing ?

History is a mirror of life. With the approaching 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, one can have a better understanding of the reality of today by reviewing past history.

50 years ago, the salvoes of the cruiser "Aurora" sounded the death-knell for the capitalist old world and announced the birth of the socialist new world. When the oppressed people of the whole world were hailing and saluting the Soviet of workers, peasants and soldiers of Petrograd, the bourgeoisie in London, Paris and New York were infuriated and ganged up under the black banner against the October Revolution.

In those days, the bourgeois press of Europe and the United States rabidly cursed the Bolsheviks as a group of "arrogant day-dreamers", "cold-blooded murderers" and "the enemy of civilization". They fabricated horrible lies about starving Petrograd citizens vying with one another in buying human flesh and about a decree of the Soviet regime on the alleged practice of cannibalism. Counter-revolutionary fanaticism had driven the *New York Times* to predict the impossibility of the continued existence of the new regime. British economist J. M. Keynes, a notorious advocate of capitalism, frankly clamoured for the use of armed force to seal up the Russian breach. While the remnant gang of the Tsar from the dark corners of Moscow offered one million roubles for the assassination of Lenin, the chieftains of the imperialist powers, Lloyd George of Britain, Clemenceau of France and Woodrow Wilson of the United States, conspired to kill the newly born Soviet regime in its cradle with fire and sword.

How much malicious vituperation, how much base slander and how many wild attacks the enemy had heaped on the great Socialist Revolution which opened up a new era in

This article by Wan Shan-hung first appeared in "People's Daily" of October 29, 1967.

human history, on the great teacher of this revolution, Lenin and his successor Stalin, on the glorious Bolshevik Party and the heroic Soviet People since then ! But the lies and bayonets of the enemy failed to prevent the Soviet state from marching forward triumphantly and instead, they aroused the Soviet people's hatred for the old world and determination to build a new world and brought out in bold relief the Soviet people's heroic mettle as grave-diggers of imperialism and a shock brigade of the international proletariat. It was precisely the curses by imperialism and the sabre-rattling in the anti-Soviet crusade at that time that inspired in the oppressed peoples of the world a warm love and respect for and confidence in the first socialist state.

The salvoes of the cruiser "Aurora" are still resounding in the world today, 50 years after the October Revolution. However, what Moscow gets from Washington, London and the entire bourgeoisie of the West now is no longer malicious vituperation and slander but paeans and warm applause. The Soviet Union which had made Woodrow Wilson and Lloyd George tremble then has today become "a law-abiding citizen in the world community" in the eyes of Lyndon Johnson and his like.

Can it be that the imperialist demons have changed into benign angels ? No, it is the renegades' degeneration and betrayal that have brought forth the laughter of the demons.

Today, with the approach of the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, its native land, which is trampled underfoot by the Soviet revisionists' renegade clique, is changing in every respect to the delight of imperialism.

The October Red flag was cut down by the October renegades. The Red star which used to shine on the world at the top of the Kremlin has disappeared. The Red Soviet ship which had been sailing full sail towards communism has been sunk. The glorious socialist state has been turned into a den of vice where demons have their day and which is rife with corruption. The old world order is restored on the soil of the new world.

It is precisely in this "jubilee" when the Soviet revisionist ruling clique is trumpeting loudly about celebrating the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, that they have surpassed other years in acts of betrayal: Nikolai Podgorny prostrated himself at the foot of the Pope, Alexei Kosygin became a new "comrade" in the Buckingham palace of Britain and a guest of honour of the U.S. President. The blood of the south Vietnamese people and sovereignty of the Arab states have been used by Leonid Brezhnev and his ilk as capital for operating the Soviet-U.S. counter-revolutionary joint-stock company. Japanese imperialism, which had its spine broken by the Soviet Red Army then, easily obtains the right to open up resources in Siberia today. The fascist butchers of Indonesian revolutionaries have become the fellow travellers and bosom friends of the new aristocracy in the Kremlin and so forth and so on.

The Soviet revisionist ruling clique, which has long opened the door to the Western way of life is throwing itself more speedily into the lap of the West. Hollywood films are shown in every two out of three cinemas in Moscow. Paris and New York fashions are worshipped by the new bourgeoisie. School children are indoctrinated with Bible stories, while the pampered sons and daughters of the privileged strata are mad after jazz and twist. Hotel "Sovietskaya" is busy welcoming pot-bellied tourists from the West, while the paper under the signboard of *Leninskoye Znamya* is keen on introducing "up-to-date hairdos in the present world". The Soviet revisionist bosses applauded and praised the exhibition publishing the American way of life. For this, a London paper wrote with great satisfaction that the Soviet Union has begun to taste the sweetness of Western life. The propagandists of Kremlin are incessantly peddling the necessity of "peaceful co-existence" and Soviet and American opera singers are presenting jointly *Romeo and Juliet* in fine co-operation.

Moscow, which was called in the past the centre of the "East" by Western bourgeoisie, has today become a branch

of the Western world. When Kosygin visited London in February this year, the British bourgeoisie couldn't help hailing him: "Our world is your world.....let's drink to the future, yours as well as ours." After the Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Glassboro, Western newsmen noted in high glee that Johnson now understands more and likes better the man at the helm of the Soviet Government. This handful of renegades, Khrushchov, Brezhnev and Kosygin, have won the applause of imperialism because they have acted as agents of the Western bourgeoisie in selling out the cause of the October Revolution which imperialism has always been trying to strangle for half a century.

Chairman Mao has said: "There is absolutely no such thing in the world as love or hatred without reason or cause."

It is exactly from imperialism's love and hatred that people can see more clearly the Soviet Union of today as compared with the past and the hideous features of the Soviet revisionist renegades. While commemorating the 50th anniversary of the great October Revolution today, we should hate whatever imperialism loves and love whatever imperialism hates. We should expose to the world the crimes of the Soviet revisionist ruling clique in betraying the October Revolution and commit it to a severe trial by history.

Soviet Union Under Revisionist Rule

I

The New Tsars in the Soviet Union Can Never Cover Up Their Hideous Features

CHINA'S great proletarian cultural revolution, like spring thunder, has awakened the broad masses of Soviet working people who are suffering deeply. They have come to see ever more clearly that the clique of the Soviet revisionist renegades headed by Brezhnev and Kosygin are new Tsars savagely oppressing and exploiting them.

To hide its own counter-revolutionary features and hoodwink the Soviet people, the Soviet revisionist clique has on the one hand claimed that the Soviet Union is "a society without privileged classes or strata" and that "the Soviet people know neither exploitation nor unemployment." On the other hand, it has been hurling the most scurrilous abuse at China's great proletarian cultural revolution, alleging that it has "attacked the working people's rights and interests" and "ravaged the Chinese people's fruits of socialism." However, no amount of lies can deceive the clear-sighted Soviet people.

A Moscow working woman has angrily charged: "We workers know best that our factory directors and government leaders are capitalists, almost the same as in Tsarist days." This working woman has indeed hit the Soviet revisionist ruling clique where it hurts most.

This pack of renegades headed by Brezhnev and Kosygin are today riding on the backs of the Soviet working people and imposing sanguinary fascist rule on them. Troops, police, plain clothes men and "motorized police corps" act as bullies over the entire Soviet land, and laws and decrees are issued one after another against all those who resent revisionist rule.

Broad sections of working people are deprived of their elementary political rights and subjected to all kinds of persecution. Large numbers of revolutionaries have been cast into "lunatic asylums" and concentration camps where they suffer endless torture and misery. Does not all this constitute the most savage attack on the working people's rights and interests? What difference is there between this and the use by the tsars of whips, exile and gallows against the revolutionary workers and peasants?

The "new economic system" introduced by the Brezhnev-Kosygin renegade clique has resulted in an all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet national economy. Socialist State enterprises have now become capitalist concerns in which people of the privileged strata manage to amass enormous wealth and the workers are trodden down under the tyranny of the new blood-suckers, the "directors" and "managers". One of such people bluntly declared: "I'm the boss here, I have the right to do whatever I please."

The captain commanding a fleet of whaling boats even forced workers to do hard physical labour at the equator in a scorching 50 degrees C. temperature while he and his wife were relaxing in the cool water of the white procelain tiled swimming pool built on his boat. He repeatedly howled with great hatred: "I will kick out these grumblers just as I would chop cabbage leaves."

Ruthless exploitation and arbitrary dismissal of workers are common-place in the Soviet Union today. A considerable number of the unemployed live by doing casual jobs, by pawning their belongings or selling their blood. Some have lost all hope and committed suicide. Isn't all this arelentless attack on the rights and interests of the working people? Is there any difference between this and the rule of the tsars under which the pot-bellied capitalists fattened on the blood and sweat of the workers?

In the Soviet Union today, the socialist agriculture built up by Lenin and Stalin has been completely destroyed by this group of Soviet revisionist scabs. Collective and state farms

have been converted into capitalist estates for the new kulaks, where land is re-divided among the "teams" and the renting of land, the hiring of labour, speculation and profiteering are widely practised. The polarization of the peasantry has brought about an appalling gap between the rich and the poor and the great majority of the peasants are subjected to merciless exploitation and squeezed dry. The chairman of the "Baku Workers" Collective Farm in Azerbaijan draws an average monthly salary of 1,076 rubles, while the monthly earnings of the members of the farm average less than 38 rubles.

The director of the Jambul State Orchards and the Party Secretary there appropriated 2.5 hectares of state land as their private plots which were tended by farm hands paid by the State Orchards. Don't all this, too, relentlessly attack the rights and interests of the working people? It reminds one of what the landed aristocrats said in Tsarist days: "Don't let the muzhiks grow shaggy; they should be shorn like sheep."

Flaunting the tattered flag of "culture for the whole people," the Brezhnev-Kosygin renegade clique has flagrantly introduced filthy "Western civilization" and the decadent bourgeois way of life into the country. Soviet society is now being swamped by vulgarized jazz music, obscene dances, pornographic motion pictures and fancy clothes. With the revisionists striving to poison the minds of the Soviet people with bourgeois ideology and counter-revolutionary revisionist thinking, such ideas as how to seek personal gains at the expense of others and how to go after fame and fortune have become an accepted philosophy of life. Is this any different from the tsarist days when the ruling classes tried to enslave the people mentally by means of religion and reactionary decadent culture?

Under the guise of "international economic co-operation," Brezhnev and his kind are selling out Soviet territory and sovereignty cheap to international monopoly capital. There has been no end to their treasonable acts in pursuit of personal aggrandizement. U.S. monopoly capital under various labels has entered the Ukraine, which was once ravaged by the fascists in

the last world war. Siberia, which the Red Army and guerrillas once defended with their lives and blood against the Japanese fascists, is now open to Japanese plutocrats for plunder.

The big sell-out by Brezhnev and company, a course of action which humiliates the nation and forfeits its sovereignty, has subjected the Soviet working people to dual oppression and exploitation. There is not a shade of difference between what the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has done and the evil deeds of the traitorous government which before the October Revolution sold forestry and mineral resources in the Urals and Siberia to the United States and offered the petroleum resources of Baku to the British and French capitalists on a silver platter.

These horrid realities show fully that the fruits of socialism gained by the Soviet people at the cost of their blood and lives have been completely forfeited and the working people are again subjected to capitalist enslavement and oppression. The root cause of this tragedy of history lies in the fact that the Soviet Party and State leadership has been usurped by the handful of top capitalist roaders in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with Khrushchov and his successors Brezhnev and Kosygin as their representatives.

It is precisely by summing up the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in other countries, and the lesson of capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union in particular, that our great leader Chairman Mao has put forward a whole set of theory, line, principles and policies for the continuation of the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and has, with matchless sweep and wisdom, personally initiated and successfully led China's great proletarian cultural revolution, thus opening up the bright path to the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the prevention of the restoration of capitalism, and to communism. The victory of China's great proletarian cultural revolution has upheld at their very foundation the rights and interests of the working people and has consolidated and increased the fruits of socialism.

Our great leader Chairman Mao teaches us: "I would advise comrades to remain firm in the conviction that the masses of the Soviet people and of Party members and cadres are good, that they desire revolution and that revisionist rule will not last long."

Today, more and more Soviet people are drawing inspiration and encouragement from China's great proletarian cultural revolution. They have not only come to realize that a second revolution is necessary to overthrow revisionist rule and re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in their country. They are already struggling in various ways against the Soviet revisionist renegade clique. It can be safely predicted that a revolutionary storm still more violent than the October Revolution will sweep the Soviet land. Under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, the Soviet people will clear away the handful of pests like Brezhnev and Kosygin, and the red star of the October Revolution will once again shine forth with still greater radiance.

II

Capitalist Restoration In Agriculture

The Soviet revisionist ruling clique is fast breaking up and destroying the socialist system in agriculture and bringing about the complete restoration of capitalism in the Soviet countryside.

For many years now the Soviet revisionist ruling clique, from Khrushchov down to Brezhnev, Kosygin and their like, by introducing measures to undermine socialist economic planning and socialist ownership in agriculture, have been moving in a big way to bring about the restoration of capitalism in agriculture.

PROFIT TAKES COMMAND

As early as 1955, Khrushchov launched the attack on socialist planning in agriculture as "bureaucratic", and

decided that the state should only fix the yearly quota of agricultural and animal products which the collective and state farms were required to sell to the state, and leave the farms to work out their own production plans. In 1958, he abolished the system under which collective farms were obliged to provide the state with a fixed quota of agricultural and animal products and replaced it with a new system of state purchases from the farms. He then declared: "We shall buy grain where it is cheaper." In 1962, with his blessing, a big "debate" concerning Liberman's recommendation that profit be put in command took place. This "debate" was aimed at preparing public opinion for the introduction of the "new economic system" based on profit in agriculture and other branches of the national economy.

The new Soviet leadership headed by Brezhnev and Kosygin has closely followed in Khrushchov's foot-steps. At Supreme Soviet sessions and plenary meetings of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, they urged enforcement of the "new economic system" with the accent on profit, declaring that "the rate of profit should be made the basis of objective assessment of the operations of collective and state farms", and that the state will protect and stimulate the free purchase of agricultural products, and ensure the vigorous development of commercial relations.

The Soviet revisionist chiefs, from the higher to the lower echelons, and the Soviet press all harped on the need "to educate the people with the ruble". They called on state and collective farms "to be good at running their affairs profitably and finding the best way of doing this", and also, "to be good at dealing with the ruble cleverly and investing it where it will turn a quick profit." Again and again they demanded that the collective and state farms be given greater "independence" and that they be gradually given an entirely free hand in selling their produce so as to develop "the initiative of the enterprises in choosing the most profitable fields."

ENFORCING THE "NEW ECONOMIC SYSTEM"

The new Soviet revisionist leadership has, in the last two years, passed a number of resolutions to enforce in agriculture the so-called "new economic system" with the rate of profit as the main economic index. They allowed all collective and state farms to determine independently the direction in which their production would develop and draw up yearly plans in accordance with the principle of developing production in those spheres 'which' yield the highest profits. They now allow the farms to sell on the open market or to the state at high prices their surplus of agricultural and animal products after fulfilling the state purchase "quotas". They have authorized the state farms to decide how many workers and staff they want, to recruit or dismiss workers, plan the labour productivity and costs of production, decide on forms of payment for work and the organizational forms of their productive system, and distribute the bulk of the profit in any way they deem fit.

At the end of 1965, the Soviet revisionist ruling clique placed a number of state farms, on an experimental basis, under the "new economic system". In mid-April last year, they adopted a resolution on gradually switching state-run agricultural enterprises to a full business accounting system and introducing the "new system" to 390 state farms and other state-run agricultural enterprises embracing a total of 9 million workers and employees.

Encouraged by the Soviet revisionist authorities, more and more collective and state farms have, in the past few years, divided up the land among the field teams or even among the households and adopted the system of fixing output quotas and giving bonuses for the overfulfilment of these quotas. All this has subverted socialist ownership in Soviet agriculture.

FREE COMPETITION ENCOURAGED

These regressive measures of the Soviet revisionist ruling clique have pushed agriculture on to the capitalist road of free competition, the free market and profit-seeking. According

to Soviet press reports, in the past two years, many collective and state farms in the Russian S. F. S. R., the Moldavian and other republics of the Soviet Union have, for the sake of profit, arbitrarily reduced the acreage under crops which are less profitable, though the most important in the locality, and increased that under more profitable crops, thus exploiting their "freedom" to draw up their own production plans. Many of them, under one pretext or another, refuse to honour their contracts with the state and sell their products at high prices in the open market instead. During the autumn of 1966, the farms in some republics, regions and territories, "acting as if in agreement", stopped supplying Moscow and other big cities with tomatoes, cucumbers and other vegetables. It turned out that these farms had decided to build their own canneries and sell their canned vegetables in the market for bigger profits in competition with the state shops. In the Latvian Republic, many collective farms have set up their own shops or joint-stock companies to make fat profits by selling their agricultural and subsidiary products at open market prices.

In the Soviet Union in the past few years many collective farms and state farms have, for the sake of profit, been engaged in a big way in lucrative business on the side and exploited hired labour. It is reported that workshops for making rings, ear-rings, brooches and other luxury goods, have become the main occupation of many farms in the Kostroma Region in the Russian Federal Republic. In some farms, more people are working in side occupations than in the fields even in the busy farming season. The management of some state farms in the Moldavian Republic did not scruple to employ teenagers at very low wages to do heavy physical labour and threaten to fire them if they showed the slightest dissatisfaction with their living and working conditions and pay.

PEASANTS HEAVILY EXPLOITED

As a result of the steps taken by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique for the all-round restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R., a new bourgeois privileged stratum has emerged

in the Soviet countryside and is heavily exploiting the peasants.

As Soviet press reports show, this privileged stratum usually comprises the chairman, specialists and other leading personnel of the collective farms. Their pay is 10, 20 or even 30 times that of an ordinary member. Enjoying unfair and excessive remuneration, they are actually expropriating the fruits of peasants' labour.

In 1965, the leading personnel of the Baku Worker Collective Farm in the Azerbaijan Republic, for instance, received the following average monthly salaries: chairman, 1,076 rubles; chief accountant, 756 rubles; chief agronomist and livestock technician, 391 rubles each. By contrast, an average farm member received less than 38 rubles.

This high-salaried stratum shows little interest in collective production. While receiving regular salaries from the collective farms, some of these people do not even bother to perform their duties at the farms. The chief agronomist of the Burana Collective Farm had been on the Farm's payroll for two years, but he insisted on living in town and only dropped in at the farm like a guest for a few hours each day. During the busy sugar-beet season, the agronomist of the second brigade of the same farm failed to turn up in the fields for four or five days running. One day he went to a wedding and another day he was at a christening party. The farm's output and income declined considerably and there were not enough funds to finance production or settle accounts with members.

Farms are often overstaffed with non-productive managerial personnel. Administrative expenses of the Ak-Beshm Collective Farm in Kirghizia amounted to 17 per cent of the total sum paid out to members. In the Bolshevik Collective Farm in the Minsk Region of the Byelorussian Republic, there was one administrative worker for every four members. The number of administrative personnel at the Gulyaev Collective Farm in the same region came to 12.6 per cent of the total membership, yet they received 42.8 per cent of the total sum paid out to members. Thus, nearly half the income earned by the peasants in the fields went to the top administrative personnel.

Thus heavily exploited, the collective farmers naturally lose interest in so-called collective production. In Byelorussia and the western regions of the Ukrainian Republic, the collective farm peasants generally work less than 160 days a year for "collective production".

Those in the Brest Region worked 138 days a year. In the Azerbaijan Republic, 93 per cent of the able-bodied collective farmers did not take part in "collective production" in the period under review.

This state of affairs is worrying the Soviet revisionist ruling clique. On May 16, 1966, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Council of Ministers passed a resolution on increasing the material interest of the collective farmers in the development of collective production. This "may deprive its individual members of all or part of the supplementary remuneration and bonuses." That is, in order to drive the peasants to work, the authorities have even resorted to fines.

Resenting such exploitation, Soviet peasants and young people in particular, are quitting the farms in large numbers and going to the cities. Some agricultural regions have reported that the number of people leaving the farms was 30 or 40 per cent more than the number of people entering them. And this gap continues to widen.

SOVIET REVISIONISTS' CRIMES WILL PUT THEM IN THE DOCK

Fifty years ago, the great Lenin founded the first socialist state in the world—the Soviet Union. After his death, Stalin carried on his work and brought about the collectivization of agriculture in the country. These tremendous achievements have now been forfeited by Khrushchov and his successors. The state farms and collective farms in the Soviet Union have degenerated into capitalist enterprises and *Kulak* economies. Still, the Soviet revisionist rulers have the impudence to talk about "building communism." Fish eyes cannot pass for pearls, as the Chinese saying goes. The capitalist degeneration of Soviet agriculture will help more and more Soviet people to see what sort of thing is this "communism" advertised by the Soviet revisionist chiefs. Sooner or later, the great Soviet people will rise in rebellion and put the revisionist renegades in the dock for the crimes they have committed.

A New Assessment of the History of the C. P. I. : 1919-1928

—Bande Ali Khan

[Continued from the previous issue]

X. Strategy of Socialist Revolution for India : Roy & Dutt

Although a Central Committee of the CPI was formed at Kanpur at the end of 1925, the most important question of strategy (*i.e.*, the stage of Indian revolution) still created a lot of confusion. Although Stalin's famous speech at the Communist University of the Toilers of the East in May 1925 clearly formulated the question, it is doubtful whether it produced any effect on the Indian Party leaders at that time. These leaders—Muzaffar Ahmad, Dange, Ghate, Usmani *et al*—were wholly incapable of thinking for themselves. They looked for guidance from abroad and this paralysing feature became ingrained in their character.

In the above-mentioned speech Stalin divided the Indian national bourgeoisie in the new situation into two sections : a conciliatory group, the big bourgeoisie, which had already betrayed the national cause and gone over to imperialism ; and a revolutionary bourgeoisie, that section of bourgeoisie which could still play a revolutionary role.

In 1926, two books were published : one was Roy's *The Future of Indian Politics*, the other was R. P. Dutt's *Modern India*. In his book Roy ignored Stalin's formulation and stuck to his old anti-Leninist strategy. Roy puts the whole bourgeoisie into one bloc, and excludes the revolutionary section of the bourgeoisie from the national front. He says :

"Practically, the bourgeois bloc seeks to make a united front with the imperialist forces of law and order to make the country safe against any possible revolution....The future of

Indian politics (of national liberation) will, therefore, be determined by the social forces which still remain and will always remain antagonistic to imperialism. These social forces are composed of the workers, peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie (small traders, artisans, employees, students, petty intellectuals, etc.)"¹

Then again, "Both the leadership and organizational form will naturally be determined by the social character of the movement. The social elements that will henceforth compose the movement for national liberation are the petty intellectuals, artisans, small traders, peasantry and the proletariat. In the existing condition of Indian society, these all belong to the oppressed and exploited class. The movement for national liberation will take place on the basis of the struggle between the exploiting and exploited classes. Henceforth the fight for national freedom in India becomes a class struggle approximating to the final stage."²

Thus, once again Roy wanted to skip over the bourgeois democratic stage of the Indian revolution and flatly gave a call for a socialist leadership.

R. P. Dutt, on the other hand, came nearer to Stalin. On the question of strategy, he said : "The fight for national liberation is a fight of many social strata of workers, of peasants, of the lower middle class, of the intelligentsia and even of a section of the bourgeoisie."³ But in spite of this assertion, Dutt was not at all clear on this point. In the preface which he added afterwards to his book, he put the entire bourgeoisie in one bloc and said self-contradictorily : "The Indian bourgeoisie is today a counter-revolutionary force : they fear the social revolution that would follow on national independence more than they desire and therefore they have made their terms with the imperialists and are all supporters of the Empire."⁴

1. Roy, *The Future of Indian Politics*, London, 1926, p. 96

2. *Ibid*, p. 95

3. R. P. Dutt, *Modern India*, London, 1927, p. 129

4. *Ibid*, p. 17

Thus we see that like Roy, Dutt also did not agree with Stalin, and both of them held more or less the same position on this most vital question.

As to tactics, Roy said that the proletariat will, of course, have its own party—the Communist Party. But apart from this, the Party must also organise the forces of national revolution in a democratic party. “None of the existing Nationalist parties [i.e., the National Congress, Swarajya Party etc.] can serve the purpose.” Roy suggested the formation of a new Congress in which “the proletariat will stand side by side with the petty-bourgeois and peasant masses, as most advanced democratic class.”

As on the question of strategy, so on the question of tactics, Dutt was self-contradictory. At first Dutt was opposed to the formation of a new mass party in place of the Congress. He asked the CPI “to carry on a battle of clarification within the existing movement and organizations. Within both the Congress and the Swarajya Party, the Left-Nationalist elements should gather themselves round a popular national programme. When the time comes the new forces will have to find their form of organization and expression. It is a matter of indifference how this will arise...”²

But in the preface to his book Dutt says the opposite thing which is much nearer to Roy. The formation of a new mass party was no more “a matter of indifference,” but was an “immediate problem.” Dutt said, “Only a new National movement, based on the workers and the peasants, and with a political and social programme expressing the interests of the masses, can bring new life. The conditions for this are ripe.”³

XI. Roy's Decolonization Theory

Soon after returning from China, Roy came out with a new theory which became known as the Decolonization theory. In the discussions which preceded the Sixth Comintern Con-

1. Roy : *The Future of Indian Politics*, p. 114
2. Dutt : *Modern India*, p. 148
3. *Ibid*, p. 18

gress and in the debates of the Congress itself India and the colonial question occupied a prominent place. Around this question both strategical and tactical questions were focussed. This theory was not very new, but there was novelty in Roy's interpretation.

It was actually a further development of what Roy had said earlier in his *India in Transition*. Roy's version of the origin of the decolonization theory is as follows :

“While I was away in China (1927) a new comrade [Soumyendranath Tagore] from India came to Moscow. In his report he emphasized on the rapid development of modern industry in India.... In summarizing the debate on the report of the Indian delegate, Bukharin [then Chairman of the Comintern] suggested that the Commission set up for examining the question should report on the process of such ‘decolonization.’”¹

Soon after, Roy returned from China and took up the matter with enthusiasm. In an article Roy said that since the First World War there has been increased industrialization in India and this has created a manufacturing bourgeoisie which finds itself competing with the imperialists in the exploitation of the masses. This created a revolutionary situation that frightened the imperialists, and as its revolutionary potential increased, the imperialists granted concessions. The new bourgeoisie were thus brought nearer to running their own affairs—hence the term “decolonisation.” They were, moreover, drawn more and more into partnership with the imperialists in exploiting the masses ; in exchange for imperialist concessions, the bourgeoisie would dampen the revolutionary ardour of the masses and help imperialism maintain its foothold. “The new economic policy of British Imperialism in India”, said Roy, “sharpens the class differentiation and ripens the class struggle in the face of which nationalist struggle based upon capitalist antagonism loses its importance.”²

1. Roy : *Our Differences*, pp 29-31, Calcutta, 1938
2. Roy : *The Role of the Indian Bourgeoisie in the National Revolution, Masses of India*, Nov., 1927, p. 7

All this means, and Roy had always maintained it, that the bourgeoisie was not a revolutionary factor and could not be regarded as an ally in the revolution. The following quotation makes this clear.

"The National Congress, in the coming annual session, is going to declare peace with British imperialism...The bourgeoisie are not only withdrawing themselves from the national revolution, the withdrawal is but a prelude to a definite stand against the national revolution together with British imperialism...The bourgeois nationalist movement is split up into half a dozen parties all of which are opposed to a revolutionary struggle against imperialism...It (the bourgeoisie) is no longer a revolutionary force. Not only from the point of view of the internal conditions of India, but from the point of view of the present world conditions also the Indian bourgeoisie is rallied on the side of the counter-revolution. It cannot and does not lead or participate in the struggle for national freedom... Indian National Revolution has passed its bourgeois stage. It must still realize a program which, objectively and historically, is the program of bourgeois revolution, but it is no longer a bourgeois revolution, because it can and will succeed only by breaking the bounds of capitalist society."¹

By putting all the "half a dozen parties" in the same basket and by discarding them all equally, Roy discarded also the left-wing of the bourgeoisie as a counter-revolutionary force. The history of the next few years proved how wholly wrong Roy was in his reading of the Indian situation. The bourgeois democratic stage of the Indian revolution was far from being complete—it had hardly begun in right earnest. The only strategical and tactical imperative of the decolonization theory was to give a call for proletarian revolution (*i.e.*, socialist revolution) which was nothing but Trotskyism with all its 'revolutionary' verbiage.

In this connection it is pertinent to ask what were the objective conditions which led the Trotskyite brains of Roy

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 5-8

and Tagore to come to the conclusion that India at that time had started a general process of industrialization and then to formulate the theory of decolonization?

The fact is that in order to secure an additional seat on the governing body of the International Labour Organization which had just been set up by the League of Nations at Geneva, Lord Chelmsford on behalf of the Government of India, manipulating highly dubious statistics, declared at the session of the Council of the League of Nations in October 1922: "It remains to justify India's specific claim to inclusion among the eight states of chief industrial importance." Chelmsford gave the figure of "20 million industrial wage-earners" in India. It was obvious to anyone who knew anything about India that this number included craftsmen, artisans, domestic servants etc. The total number of workers in establishments employing more than 10 workers was 2.6 millions, of whom nearly 1 million were plantation workers, not industrial. Actually, the total number of workers coming under the Factories Act was 1.3 millions.

An examination of Indian statistics¹ of those days shows that what was going on in India was not a process of industrialization, but a process of de-industrialization—the gradual and steady decline of India's cottage industries without the compensating advance of modern industry. Moreover,

1. The following figures taken from the Indian Census, though misleading, point out to the gradual decline of Indian industries and decreasing number of workers.

	Percentage of Variation 1921-31			
	1911	1921	1931	
Total population (in millions)	315	319	353	12.1
Working population (,, ,,)	149	146	154	4.0
Persons employed in industries (in millions)	17.5	15.7	15.3	-12.0
Percentage of workers in industry to the working population	11.7	11.0	10.0	-9.1
Percentage of industrial workers in the total population	5.3	4.9	4.3	-21.8

merely a consideration of the quantitative factor is not enough. The main contradiction lies in the strategic hold of foreign financial capital on Indian industries.

At the Sixth Comintern Congress in July 1928 the question of Decolonization was much debated. One point of view had already been presented in an article by Eugene Varga in *Inprecor*. Varga argued that industrialization in India had been much exaggerated by Roy and his supporters and that the actual British policy at that time was to arrest the short-term trend towards a little industrialization which it had permitted during the First World War. But as to the attitude towards the Indian bourgeoisie, Varga was not very clear. Like Stalin, he did not divide the Indian bourgeoisie into a compromising bourgeoisie and a revolutionary bourgeoisie. The Indian bourgeoisie, Varga said, was opposed to British imperialism, it was not for a "revolutionary fight against it", their struggle was only "for an improvement of their position within the Empire".¹ It was the Indian proletariat which would lead the nationalist struggle. Of course, proletarian leadership in the Indian national struggle had to be established—the dispute was not on this point; the question was about the phase of the Indian revolution, whether it was bourgeois democratic revolution or socialist revolution.

Varga's formulations were discussed at the Comintern's Indian Commission which met in March-April, 1928. The British and Indian members of the Commission opposed them. R.P. Dutt, as the representative of the CPGB by now had more influence with the CPI than had Roy. In a long article Dutt partially agreed with Roy. He said: "Today we are faced with a noticeable arrest in the development of the policy. ...There is a noticeable hardening against concessions and conciliation towards the Indian bourgeoisie." But Dutt hastened to say that this did not mean there was no industrialization in India at all. "The whole character of the

1. Varga, "Economics and Economic Policy in the Fourth Quarter of 1927," *Inprecor*, March 14, 1928

British policy of industrialization in India is to secure industrialization under British control."¹

Then Dutt concluded :

"From every sign of what is going on at present we can build with confidence on our diagnosis of the continuing capitalist and industrial evolution of India, with the accompanying political revolutionising consequences, and in particular on the growth, both in numbers and in consequences, of the industrial proletariat, alongside the intensifying agrarian crisis."

The theory of decolonization revolved round the attitude to be taken towards the Indian National Congress. (Roy's definition of the Congress was that it was a bourgeois organisation with a petty bourgeois leadership. For Roy the class-orientation of the Congress was the same as that of the Kuomintang.

Like Roy, Dutt also did not see that a division had taken place between the compromising (big) bourgeoisie and the revolutionary bourgeoisie (as was pointed out by Stalin). This is how Dutt formulated it in the same article :

"In general, and on all fundamental questions, the role of the Indian bourgeoisie since the collapse of the Non-cooperation movement has evolved in the direction of becoming more and more clearly counter-revolutionary....But at the same time within the general framework of capitulation, there takes place a process of friction and antagonism which has recently grown sharper....Thus the role of the bourgeoisie in the national struggle is not yet exhausted, and may even extend under certain conditions ; but it remains permanently limited in scope by its fear and hostility towards any wider mass revolutionary movement, and, therefore, very dangerous to the real struggle against imperialism. It becomes the task of the mass movement to exploit to the maximum the opportunities presented by bourgeois resistance, as in the boycott of the Simon Commission, but under independent leadership."

1. R. P. Dutt: *Labour Monthly*, June 1928 ; emphasis in original. Later, it seems, Dutt discarded this theory. He wrote in his *India Today*, 1947, p 123, "it is impossible yet to speak of any general process of industrialization having taken place in India."

Dutt further said that though the Indian bourgeoisie was becoming more and more counter-revolutionary, the petty-bourgeoisie was becoming more and more revolutionary.

From Roy's theory it logically followed that, the Indian bourgeoisie (the Congress) being treacherous, the workers and peasants must have their own party. Since 1922, Roy had been working on the idea of a two party system—a mass party to be called Workers' and Peasants' Party and an illegal CP, "an illegal apparatus of a legal mass party," and all members of the CP would automatically be members of the WPP. The WPP should form "working alliance" with "bourgeois parties" (i. e., Congress, Swarajya Party etc.) during the anti-imperialist struggle.

The ECCI did not agree with Roy and was opposed to the formation of a mass party rival to the Congress, but it approved of the idea of the workers and peasants having a party of their own, because they can no longer remain mere adjuncts of the bourgeoisie, but "the working class must come forward as an independent political force and take up the leadership" in the anti-imperialist struggle. "In leading this movement the political party of the workers and peasants must act in co-operation with, and give the fullest support to the bourgeois parties in so far as they struggle against imperialism in some way or other."¹

The discussions on the decolonization again brought up the question in the Colonial Commission of the ECCI just before the Sixth Congress. The decision of the Colonial Committee was included in the 508-page report of the ECCI which was to serve as a basis for discussions at the Sixth Congress. In this report it was stated that :

"In the advanced stage of development [in India] it is no longer possible for the bourgeois parties to force themselves on the masses as the leaders of the national revolutionary struggle. Neither is it possible to impress them with revolutionary slogans of independence unless they are accompanied by an effort at revolutionary actions. With the independence

1. Quoted by Overstreet, p. 65.

slogan the bourgeois endeavours to keep under the influence of the bourgeois leaders the Left nationalist elements composed of the mass of the petty bourgeois and the intelligentsia."

Regarding the WPP, the ECCI report said : "The main weak point of the Workers' and Peasants' Party is that, in practice, it is acting more as a Left-wing of the Congress than as an independent political party. The WPP cannot develop into a party of mass national-revolutionary struggle unless it emancipates itself entirely from the influence of bourgeois politicians and becomes transformed into a bloc of the working class with all the exploited masses under the leadership of the proletariat. On the other hand, it is entirely out of the question that the WPP should be a substitute for the Communist Party the organisation of which is absolutely necessary."¹

1. *The Communist International Between the Fifth and Sixth World Congresses*, London, 1928, pp 468-76, quoted by Overstreet, pp 109-10.

Widespread Peasants' Struggle In India

The development in the Indian peasants' revolutionary struggle is a great prelude to the Indian people's advance on the road charted by Mao Tse-tung, declared the "People's Daily" Commentator on February 26.

He adds that the road of the Indian revolution to victory can only be the one pointed out by Mao Tse-tung, the one traversed by the Chinese revolution, that is, under the leadership of the proletariat, to boldly arouse the peasants, build revolutionary rural base areas, wage a protracted armed struggle, encircle the cities from the countryside and finally seize them, and thus win ultimate nationwide victory.

Commentator writes :

Since Naxalbari, the flames of the Indian peasants' revolutionary armed struggle have been fast spreading in the country. Guided by the great thought of Mao Tse-tung, the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party recently led the peasants in a northern sector of Bihar state to engage in heroic struggle to seize land by force of arms. To date, the peasant movement of the Naxalbari type has broken out in 50 places in eight states and union territories.

The mounting peasant struggle to seize land by force of arms sweeps over India like a thunderbolt that pierces the darkness enveloping the country and shakes the reactionary rule of the Congress Party Government to its very foundations. An excellent situation, never seen before, has taken shape in the Indian revolution. We cheer and greet with elation the revolutionary storm that is rising among the Indian peasantry.

India is a semi-feudal and semi-colonial country. The Indian peasants amount to over 70 per cent of the 500 million population. The peasant problem is the fundamental problem of India's national democratic revolution and the peasants are the main force of this revolution.

The Indian peasants are leading an extremely miserable life, groaning under the three big mountains of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism. More than 75 per cent of the land is owned by a handful of landlords, rich peasants and rajahs, while the poor peasants who form more than 80 per cent of the rural population own less than 25 per cent of the land. The land-poor and landless peasants have to give 50 to 90 per cent of their annual produce to the landlords as rent. Savage exploitation has led to vast fields lying as wasteland. Rural economy is on the verge of bankruptcy and starvation threatens the whole country. Millions of rural toilers die of hunger every year and more than 200 million people are living in the agony of starvation. At least 40 million out of the total 50 million people, mainly peasants, of Bihar state are hunger-stricken. The broad masses of the Indian peasants throughout the country are languishing. Their only way out is to rise and make revolution.

This is exactly what the famished Indian peasants have done or are beginning to do. From Bihar in the north down to Kerala in the south, large numbers of peasants in the vast rural areas have unfolded struggles for land with whatever primitive arms they can lay their hands on and have violently shaken the foundation of feudal rule in the country. They have trampled underfoot all "laws" and "orders" protecting the interests of the landlord class and have overthrown the rule of the imperialists, local tyrants, evil gentry and patriarchal landlords in their regions. The revolutionary peasants in a number of areas have organized peasants' associations to collect taxes from the landlords and seize grain and land from them. They have set up people's courts to try the die-hard landlords and evil gentry and punish them, formed themselves into people's armed forces with bows, arrows, spears and captured modern weapons to fight against the landlords or hit back at the troops and police in their campaigns of "suppression". In all places swept by the storm of peasant revolution, the slaves of yesterday—the poor peasants—have risen to their feet.

Chin
ness
Part

The Indian reactionaries are greatly alarmed by the surging peasant revolutionary movement which they called a "national catastrophe". They grinded their teeth, shouting "It's terrible!" But the Indian revolutionaries and all other revolutionaries in the world declare with joy: "It's fine!"

Our great leader Chairman Mao Tse-tung pointed out 41 years ago: "The national revolution requires a great change in the countryside... This change is now taking place, and it is an important factor for the completion of the revolution."

It is likewise with the case of India at present. In India today, the feudal system is deep-rooted in the countryside. The rajahs, the patriarchal landlords and the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie constitute the main social foundation of imperialist rule in the country. The landlord class cruelly exploits and oppresses the peasants by means of the feudal system and obstructs social progress in the political, economic and cultural fields. In order to attain liberation, and social progress and development, it is imperative for the Indian peasants to overthrow completely the foundation of the reactionary rule and bring about a great change in the countryside.

Only by making such a cataclysmic revolution, completely overthrowing the landlord class, local tyrants and evil gentry, thoroughly smashing the feudal rule and emancipating the poverty-stricken peasants can India's vast countryside be turned into a reliable base area on which the revolutionary forces could depend to grow from strength to strength and from which all-round victory could be seized eventually. Only by bringing about such a great change can the numerous peasants become an inexhaustible source of the people's armed forces and become the resolute participants in and supporters of the people's revolutionary war. The road of the Indian revolution to victory can only be the one pointed out by Mao Tse-tung, the one traversed by the Chinese revolution; that is, under the leadership of the proletariat, to boldly arouse the peasants, build revolutionary rural base areas, wage a protracted armed struggle, encircle the cities from the countryside and finally

No
mention
to
workers

seize them, and thus win ultimate nationwide victory. We witness today the development in the Indian people's advance on this road of victory.

The vigorous growth of the peasants' revolutionary struggle in India indicates a tremendous victory of the proletarian revolutionary line over the revisionist line within the Indian Communist Party. There has existed for a long time within the Indian C. P. a sharp struggle between the two lines which centres around whether the Indian revolution should follow the road of the Chinese revolution or the revisionist "parliamentary road". The renegade Dange group and the revisionists in the Indian C. P., while opposing and hating the peasants' revolutionary struggle in India, have been doing their utmost to advocate the formation of "non-Congress governments" by defeating the Congress Party in elections. When the peasants' armed struggle broke out in Naxalbari, the renegade Dange clique and the revisionists in the Indian C. P. revealed their ferocious features by serving as hawks and hounds of the Indian reactionaries in cracking down on the peasant revolution. The so-called "non-Congress government" road has gone completely bankrupt in India.

The revolutionary forces of the Indian C. P. who are determined to follow the road of the Chinese revolution have proclaimed that "the strategy employed by the great leader Mao Tse-tung is one which the Indian Marxists should adopt." They go among the peasants to propagate as widely as possible Chairman Mao's brilliant thesis that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." Once the great, invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung is grasped by the revolutionary peasants of India, the flames of their revolutionary armed struggle will surely spread with intensity. Facts have proved that the several hundred million peasants in India possess inexhaustible revolutionary potentialities and that once they become awakened, no power will be able to hold them back. They will smash all the trammels that bind them and rush forward along the road to liberation.

"A single spark can start a prairie fire." Let the Indian peasants' revolutionary storm rage more fiercely.

Rebellion Is Right !

[We publish below the following reply to the show-cause notice (dated 17. 1. 68) served by the so-called Bangalore District Committee of the CPI (M) on Comrades S. Ramkrishna and A. K. Dutt. —Editorial Board, Liberation.]

This reply is a repudiation of the revisionist political line pursued by the neo-revisionist clique in the leadership of the C.P.I. (M), and an exposure of the bureaucratic organizational methods adopted by them.

CHARGE 1. You are doing propoganda against Party Programme itself among party members and other sections of the people.

REPLY : The Party Programme framed by the neo-revisionist clique in the C. C. of the C. P. I. (M) contains numerous reformist formulations and analyses. We have been waging an inner-party ideological struggle to refute and repudiate revisionism.

The Party Programme is full of self-contradictions. It is confused on fundamental issues and the neo-revisionist chieftains have deliberately failed to analyse clearly the stage and character of the Indian revolution, in order to fool and deceive the rank and file.

For instance, the Party Programme maintains that India became an "independent" and "newly liberated" country after August 15, 1947, while at the same time, it characterizes this so-called "liberation" as a "transfer of power" (refer to paras 2, 3, 4 and 105).

The Programme also hints that this "independence" was only formal, while at the same time it attempts to cover up the comprador character of the Indian big bourgeoisie, the lackeys of the imperialists.

Para 9 states : "The big bourgeoisie compromised with imperialism and agreed that British finance capital would be

allowed to continue its plunder, besides its acceptance to become a member of the British Commonwealth." The colonial bureaucracy and state apparatus were "kept intact" to suppress the masses and an alliance was made with the feudal lords. This was "independence" and "liberation" !

The truth is that formal "independence" was a screen meant to disguise the real dependence on and rule of imperialism. After the "transfer of power" in 1947 India was transformed from a colonial country under the direct rule of imperialism into a *semi-colonial country in which imperialism continues its rule indirectly*, through its lackeys, the domestic reactionaries, i. e., the bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisie and the big landlords.

However, the Programme cunningly slurs over the above facts and states that "despite the transfer of power" in 1947 British imperialists "had *hoped* to make our independence formal" but "the course of historical development since then had been disappointing to the imperialists and their hopes were *belied*." (Para 4)

We ask the neo-revisionist chieftains, do they or do they not want to deliberately distort the facts of history by maintaining that "the course of historical development had been disappointing to the imperialists ?" Do they not want us to believe that the Indian big bourgeoisie is building up an independent national economy and following an anti-imperialist policy ?

Let us briefly survey the course of historical development since 1947 which has been so "disappointing to the imperialists." British imperialism not merely continues to exploit our country but has increased its investments three to four times since 1947. U. S. imperialism has taken its place as the new boss, in addition to its number one accomplice, the Soviet revisionist clique. The 2000 and odd collaboration agreements with the imperialists ; the neo-colonialist exploitation and control of our country's economy through U. S. imperialist "aid" and loans of over 7 billion dollars (over Rs. 5,000 crores), including the P. L. 480 agreement on foodgrains "aid" ; U.S.

imperialism's direct investments of \$ 200 million ; the anti-China policy followed by the Indian reactionaries in collusion with and at the dictates of U. S. imperialism and the Soviet revisionists ; these are the historical developments which, the Programme claims, have "belied the hopes of the imperialists" and "have been disappointing to the imperialists !"

Why are you, neo-revisionists, trying to screen U.S. imperialism's domination and exploitation of our country in alliance with the Soviet revisionist clique and cover up the comprador character of the Indian big bourgeoisie, when already on July 1st, 1950, on the occasion of the 29th Anniversary of the C. P. C., the C. C. of the C. P. I. had "pledged to unite the entire people of India against Anglo-American imperialism and its Indian stooges ?" (Refer to document entitled "Greetings to Communist Party of China on its 29th Anniversary, July 1st, 1950", as printed in *Liberation* No. 3, Jan. '68)

The counter-revolutionary Madurai resolution claims that the Indian big bourgeoisie, which heads the Indian state and government, is industrial, not comprador in character. If India is independent and "liberated", and the big bourgeoisie is the decisive force in regard to its conflicts and contradictions with imperialism (which it resolves "by pressure, bargain and compromise", refer to para 15, Progr.) as the Programme and the counter-revolutionary Madurai resolutions maintain, then how can the present stage of the revolution be characterized as the stage of People's Democracy ? Why do you, neo-revisionists, then not give the slogan for the socialist revolution ? A clear distinction must be made between the two revolutionary stages, i.e., the national-democratic and the socialist revolution. You cannot mix up the two revolutionary stages. The socialist revolution is only possible after the national-democratic revolution, which is the necessary preparation for it. The theory of "accomplishing both at one stroke" has been thoroughly repudiated both in theory and practice by Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the rich experience of the Great Chinese Revolution. You, neo-revisionists, are deliberately confusing the two distinct revolutionary stages in order to

divert the broad masses of the Indian people and the working-class from the struggle against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-comprador capitalism, and in order to sabotage the new-democratic revolution.

The neo-revisionist chieftains are repeating their criminal error of 1948-49, when under the leadership of B. T. Ranadive they followed the Trotskyite 'theory of a single revolution' and sabotaged the agrarian revolution in Telengana just as today they are attempting to sabotage the agrarian revolution in Naxalbari. Then, as today they slandered the C. P. C. and totally denied the validity of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's brilliant exposition of the character and stages of the revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries as expounded in his great masterpiece, *On New Democracy*. (Refer to *Liberation* 3, "Pages From Party History.")

You, neo-revisionists, are opposed to revolution and Mao Tse-tung's Thought and have no faith in the masses. You have become tools of the imperialists. You are hankering after ministerial posts and always looking for new ways of serving your masters. That is also why you have betrayed the revolutionary armed struggle of the Naxalbari peasants where, in the garb of the U. F. Ministry of West Bengal you have unleashed brutal massacres using the military machine of the reactionary classes, in the name of maintaining "law and order."

The stage and character of our revolution is similar to that of pre-liberated China. But the neo-revisionist chieftains deny today that India's road is China's road, even though, after their betrayal of the Telengana armed struggle, the C. C. of the CPI were forced to admit (*however hypocritically*) that "The brave fighters of Telengana, Andhra, Mymensingh, etc., have already shown that the Chinese path is the path for India also. The Central Committee is sure that following this path the Indian people can defeat the diabolical plans of Anglo-American imperialism to make India its base of aggression against the Soviet Union and China as well as of intervention against the peoples of South-East Asia, liberate their country

from the imperialist grip and establish People's Democracy." (Refer to the above "Greetings to the CPC", July '50).

We, the revolutionaries in the CPI (M), maintain that the Indian revolution must take the road of relying on the peasants, establishing rural base areas, persisting in protracted armed struggle and using the countryside to encircle and finally capture the cities. This is Mao Tse-tung's road and the road of Naxalbari.

Instead, you, neo-revisionists, preach "peaceful transition" and bourgeois parliamentarism. The notorious para 113 of the Programme has often been quoted by the neo-revisionist chieftains in defence of their opportunist tactics i.e., "the establishment of peoples democracy and socialist transformation by peaceful means." To preach the possibility of "peaceful transition" to socialism is nothing but creating illusions among the masses and ranks and ideologically disarming them, no matter how much is said about bearing in mind "that the ruling classes never relinquish their power voluntarily." History has no precedent of your counter-revolutionary road of "peaceful transition" to socialism. And yet you neo-revisionists, want the party to "strive to achieve the establishment of people's democracy and socialist transformation by peaceful means"!

Lenin said: "An oppressed class which does not *strive to learn to use arms*, to acquire arms, only deserves to be treated like slaves. We cannot, unless we have become bourgeois pacifists or opportunists, forget that we are living in a class society from which there is no way out, nor can there be, save through class struggle. In every class society, whether based on slavery, serfdom, or, as at present, on wage labour, the oppressor class is always armed. Our slogan must be arming of the proletariat to defeat, expropriate and disarm the bourgeoisie." (*Military Programme of Proletarian Revolution*)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung teaches us: "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-

Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries."

We, revolutionaries of the C. P. I. (M), firmly reject the possibility of "peaceful transition" as stated in the Programme and hold that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." Only through armed struggle can the proletariat seize power and establish a people's democracy, i.e., a new-democratic state under "the joint dictatorship of several anti-imperialist classes" (Mao Tse-tung), led by the proletariat.

The Programme revises the Marxist-Leninist concept of suffrage and parliamentary democracy as instruments of bourgeois rule and claims that they "can serve as *instruments of the people* in their struggle for democracy, for defence of their interests." (Para 71).

Lenin says in *State and Revolution*: "We must also note that Engels is most definite in calling universal suffrage an *instrument of bourgeois rule*. Universal suffrage, he says, 'is the gauge of the maturity of the working class. It cannot and never will be anything more in the present-day state.'"

What is parliament? How should revolutionaries make use of the bourgeois parliament? Lenin said:

"To decide once in every few years which member of the ruling class is to repress and crush the people through parliament—that is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism... the real business of "state" is performed behind the scenes and is carried on by the departments, chancelleries and General Staffs. Parliament itself is given up to talk for the special purpose of fooling the "common people".

(*State and Revolution*)

Our revolutionary task is to participate in parliament in order to expose the *real essence* of bourgeois parliamentarism to the masses, not to build further illusions by babbling trash about "parliamentary struggles" and the formation of parliamentary ministries which will give "great fillip to the revolutionary movement of the working people" (Para 112); nor to use parliament for the purpose of "bringing into existence governments pledged to carry out a modest programme of

giving immediate relief to the people." (Para 112). This reformist formulation has been often quoted to defend the neo-revisionists' participation in the "non-Congress coalition ministries" of Bengal and Kerala, which have served as screens to mask the rule of the imperialists and reactionaries.

Lenin said: "Revolution enlightens all classes with a rapidity and thoroughness unknown in normal peaceful times. The capitalists, better organized and more experienced than anybody else in the affairs of class struggle and politics, learnt their lesson faster than the others. Perceiving that the position of the government was untenable, they resorted to a method which for many decades, ever since 1848, has been practised by the capitalists of other countries in order to *fool, divide and weaken the workers*. This method is what is known as a coalition government, that is, a joint cabinet of members of the bourgeoisie and the renegades from socialism."

(*Lessons of the Revolution*)

Facts have shown that the Kerala and Bengal Coalition ministries set up within the framework of bourgeois parliamentary democracy have only held back the revolutionary movement, and served as tools to protect the interests of the exploiters. The betrayal of the Naxalbari peasant revolt is the outstanding example.

The central problem of every revolution is the seizure of state power and the smashing of the state machinery. The main components of state power are the army and the police. Without the seizure of power by armed struggle and the smashing of the state machine of the landlords and capitalists, there can be no people's power of any sort.

The programme slurs over the basic question of seizure of power by the proletariat and how it is to be achieved, *i.e.*, the tactical line, except vague and ambiguous terms like "parliamentary and extra-parliamentary struggles" and, the need "to face up to all contingencies, to any twist and turn in the political life", which is meant, on the one hand, to deceive the revolutionaries and the masses into believing that "extra-parliamentary struggle" includes armed struggle, while, on the

other, to assure the reactionaries that the neo-revisionist chieftains would limit the struggles of the working-class within the bourgeois constitution and legality

On the question of the right of nations to self-determination the Programme adopts the reformist slogan of "autonomy". It shows great keenness to defend the annexations of the Indian bourgeoisie and denies the oppressed nationalities and national minorities their right to self-determination. It claims that "widest autonomy" is sufficient. This is how the neo-revisionist chieftains defend the interests of their masters, the Indian reactionaries and the imperialists, and betray the liberation movements of the oppressed nationalities who are waging armed struggle against the reactionaries.

However, the Party Programme, which contains numerous revisionist formulations, also has a revolutionary aspect. Para 97 correctly analyses (and we fully concur with this analysis) the *agrarian revolution* as "the axis of the democratic revolution", and declares that "any failure to grasp its full significance and import is to miss the very essence of the democratic revolution." The neo-revisionist chieftains were forced to include this aspect in order to keep up the revolutionary pretence. When the revolutionaries put into practice this aspect of the programme the neo-revisionist chieftains were immediately unmasked. This revolutionary aspect of the Programme was clearly made to serve as a mask by the neo-revisionist chieftains to hide their renegade features. The revolutionary armed struggle of the Naxalbari peasants led by the revolutionaries of the C. P. I. (M) has heralded this very agrarian revolution. The neo-revisionist chieftains, who are the tools of the reactionaries and the imperialists, were forced to reveal their real renegade features when they treacherously betrayed the agrarian revolution at Naxalbari in order to save the class rule of the reactionaries and to save their own skin and ministerial jobs.

It is the neo-revisionist chieftains, who talk so piously of the "sanctity" of the Party Programme, who have in practice opposed and betrayed the basic revolutionary aspect of the

Programme while carrying out its numerous revisionist formulations to the letter. And these renegades charge us with carrying out propaganda against the Programme!

These are only some of the basic points which show conclusively that the neo-revisionist Programme adopted at the 7th Congress at Calcutta in '64, is the theoretical basis of the neo-revisionist chieftains' policy of class collaboration and betrayal of the proletariat.

The Programme was adopted without proper discussion among the ranks. It was therefore initially accepted by the unsuspecting ranks who were deceived by the revolutionary phrase-mongering and promises of the neo-revisionist chieftains. But today there is a great awakening among the ranks who are inspired and led by Mao Tse-tung's Thought. Nothing is accepted unconditionally without criticism. Modern revisionism will inevitably be swept away by the revolutionary ideology of Marxism-Leninism, which, in our era, is Mao Tse-tung's Thought.

For three years the neo-revisionist chieftains evaded discussion on the international ideological controversy with various excuses, such as "preparing for the general elections" and "forming the U. F. Ministries." But after the publication of the counter-revolutionary anti-China Madurai resolutions they were forced to come out as the defenders of Khrushchov revisionism, in spite of their "centrist" posture.

Charge 2. You are slandering the provincial leadership and thus trying to bring down the prestige among the ranks.

Reply : This provincial leadership and the neo-revisionist clique in the C. C. are birds of the same feather. The P. C. can only act as lackeys of the neo-revisionists in the C. C. and share the spoils with them. Their prestige among the ranks and people is so low that no amount of slander could make an appreciable difference.

This charge is frivolous.

Charge 3. You have gone to Shimoga without permission of the D. C. and have distributed some leaflets among the peasantry without the permission of the P. C. and D. C. in Shimoga.

Reply : We have distributed copies of the Declaration of the Revolutionaries of the C. P. I. (M) (in Kannada) among rank and file members without permission of the P. C. and D. C. in Shimoga District. We have called upon all the revolutionaries of the C.P.I. (M) in Karnataka to *openly* repudiate the neo-revisionist clique and *openly* to join hands with us who are striving to build a genuine communist party in our country.

We did not require the permission of the P. C. and Shimoga D.C. to do this for these committees are controlled by the neo-revisionists who are opposed to revolution.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung teaches us: "All erroneous leadership that endangers the revolution should not be accepted unconditionally but should be resisted resolutely."

A party leadership which has betrayed Marxism-Leninism and is following a counter-revolutionary political line cannot impose its discipline.

Marxism-Leninism holds that political correctness and correctness in principle are the prerequisites for organizational subordination. The proletariat's organizational line must be subordinated to its political line.

How is the iron discipline of the proletariat maintained? Lenin formulated three conditions: "(1) by the class consciousness of the proletarian vanguard (i.e., the Communist Party) and by its devotion to the proletariat; (2) by its close contact ... primarily with the proletariat, but also with the non-proletarian masses of working people; (3) by the correctness of the political leadership exercised

by this vanguard... provided the broad masses have seen, from their own experience that they are correct."

None of the above conditions are fulfilled by you, neo-revisionist "leaders". Therefore, you cannot impose discipline and any such attempts must end in grimacing, as Lenin observed.

The supreme principle for communists is revolution. The party leadership has betrayed revolution. We must resolutely rebel against those party committees and "leaders" who oppose revolution. We must never be slavish to the neo-revisionists. We must resolutely uphold the revolutionary line, Mao Tse-tung's Thought and the path of Naxalbari and expose and repudiate the treacherous political line of the neo-revisionist chieftains who talk of "organizational discipline" while sacrificing the political principles of the proletariat.

Charge 4. You have issued a statement to the press which has appeared in *Kannada Prabha* (6. 1. 68) in violation of all party norms and programme.

Reply : This is a lie. We have not issued the statement to the press which appeared in *Kannada Prabha* or any other daily. We are not after cheap advertisements in the bourgeois press like many of you, neo-revisionists.

Charge 5. You are not participating in any of the D. C. activities like collection of party funds, P. C. funds, attending branch meeting, party meeting, procession etc.

Reply : For a long time the party ranks in Bangalore have been rebelling against the revisionist political line and bureaucratic organizational forms followed by the Karnataka P. C.

The rebellion of the ranks against the P.C. came to a climax on the question of the selection of a candidate for the so-called "general elections" in

March/April '67. The ranks have no great fascination for the so-called "general elections" but the P. C. had selected an unworthy candidate, without taking into account the opinion of the ranks. The ranks and a section of the D.C. then openly revolted and refused to accept the P.C.'s candidate. The Polit Bureau was forced to intervene and tried to save the face of their lackeys. But finding that the ranks could not be tamed by threats the Polit Bureau endorsed the candidate supported by the ranks. Then the ranks and a section of the D.C. boldly exposed the bureaucratic methods and corrupt practices of the Provincial leadership and demanded the immediate implementation of inner-party democracy. At the same time the workers of the Hotel Workers Union also rebelled against the corrupt and bureaucratic leadership of the present 'ad-hoc' Organizing Committee secretary, and presented memorandums to that effect to the neo-revisionist chieftains Sundarayya and A.K. Gopalan. Fearing that the "leaders" would be overthrown, the P.C. dissolved the elected D.C. and installed in its place their docile tools, the present 'ad-hoc' Organizing Committee. This was done with the knowledge and approval of the Polit Bureau.

The various resolutions condemning this bureaucratic centralization were ignored. Sundarayya refused to meet both the party rank and file and the hotel workers. "Disciplinary actions" were taken, but at no stage were the concerned members allowed to be heard in person when "disciplinary action" was taken against them.

This was the kind of organizational slavery which the neo-revisionist "leaders" tried to enforce on the rank and file.

Ignoring the numerous resolutions of protest against this autocratic act, the 'ad-hoc' clique imme-

diately dissolved all the branches. Our branch, the Teachers' and Students' Branch submitted a resolution to the C. C. charging the P. C. with promoting factionalism in the name of enforcing "discipline." Many other branches also submitted resolutions protesting against the "disciplinary actions" and refusing to recognise the illegal 'ad-hoc' clique.

The P. C. had first appointed the 'ad-hoc' Organizing Committee for 6 months. But this clique is now continuing in office for about a year without holding the District Conference and are now calling themselves the "Bangalore D. C."

In this arbitrary manner, by crushing inner party democracy, the neo-revisionist clique in the P. C. had hoped to crush the revolt of the rank and file. But the rank and file in Bangalore have thoroughly exposed and repudiated both the P. C. and their tools, the 'ad-hoc' D. C.

You, neo-revisionists, have been using the threat of expulsion to blackmail revolutionary comrades who have rebelled against your revisionist political line and organizational slavery not only in Bangalore but all over India. And everywhere you have met with resolute resistance and were forced finally to admit defeat.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung teaches us that the many truths of Marxism-Leninism can be reduced to "the right to rebel." We, the revolutionary ranks in Bangalore, have learnt this profound truth from our own experience and struggles against you, neo-revisionists.

You, neo-revisionists, claim that you are practising democratic centralism. But when the ranks demand inner party democracy and the right to criticize, you say that this is anarchism. But how can there be correct centralization without democracy?

Comrade Mao Tse-tung teaches us:

"Within the ranks of the people, democracy is correlative with centralism and freedom with discipline. They are two opposites of a single entity, contradictory as well as united, and we should not one-sidedly emphasize one to the denial of the other. The unity of democracy and centralism, of freedom and discipline, constitutes our democratic centralism."

This is the correct relationship between democracy and centralism, but how can we expect revisionists to understand revolutionary dialectics? The neo-revisionist bureaucratic organizational methods are derived from their revisionist political line. Their organizational forms are meant to suit a legal bourgeois parliamentary party, not the party of the revolutionary proletariat.

Charge 6. You are cyclostyling some material and distributing among party members and others.

Reply: To propagate revolutionary ideology is the duty of all true communists.

Charge 7. You are having contact with expelled party members.

Reply: We have contact with the revolutionaries of the C. P. I. (M) and we also want to have more contact with all revolutionaries.

The International Communist Movement has expelled the neo-revisionist chieftains, whereas we, the revolutionaries of the C. P. I. (M) are a part of the International Communist Movement.

The Principal Contradiction In The World Today

A Refutation of the CPI (M) Central Committee's Madurai Draft Resolution on the Issue of Contradictions

Chairman Mao has said: "...in studying any complex method in which there are two or more contradictions, we must devote every effort to finding its principal contradiction. Once this principal contradiction is grasped, all problems can be readily resolved." And: "There are many contradictions in the process of development of a complex thing, and *one* of them is necessarily the principal contradiction whose existence and development determines the existence and development of the other contradictions."

The Madurai Draft betrays the C. C.'s revisionist understanding of the nature of contradictions.

The neo-revisionists have failed to understand the importance of grasping the principal contradiction in the world today. The neo-revisionists have also failed to understand that the principal contradiction is not fixed or permanent; in a different situation the contradictions can change position. In the solving of any problem where there are two or more contradictions the vital and primary task is to distinguish clearly the principal contradiction from the other non-principal contradictions, because it is "the principal contradiction whose existence and development determines the existence and development of other contradictions."

What is the principal contradiction in the world today? The neo-revisionists have no answer to this question. A flood of sophistry covers up their ignorance of dialectics. There are four fundamental contradictions in the world today: the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp; the contradiction between the proletariat and the

bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries; the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism; and the contradictions among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

Of the four fundamental contradictions in the world today, only one can be the principal contradiction which will *determine* the existence and development of the others, although these four fundamental contradictions are inter-related and influence each other. The Soviet revisionists hold that the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is the sharpest of all the contradictions and, hence, the principal contradiction in the world today. They also hold that the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp can be resolved by peaceful economic competition and peaceful co-existence. The other fundamental world contradictions will also automatically disappear with the disappearance of the contradiction between the camps of socialism and imperialism and a new "world without wars and all-round co-operation" will appear. They also maintain that through peaceful competition etc. imperialism will collapse of itself and hence there is neither necessity nor justification for the oppressed peoples to wage wars of liberation against imperialism.

The position of the neo-revisionists on the question of the principal contradiction in the world today is fundamentally the same and their sophistry and confused verbiage is only an attempt to disguise this position. They maintain that the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp remains the principal or "central contradiction of our time" and, that in our epoch the international socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in determining the course of world development." At the same time they try to deceive the revolutionaries in the party by asserting that, "Notwithstanding the fact that it *is* so (*i.e.*, the central contradiction is the one between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp), the one (contradiction) between the imperialists and oppressed nations has got accentuated and assumed the acutest

form,...and the intensification of this contradiction is, of course, *influencing* the course of all other contradictions, their growth and development."

What a momentous discovery! This is, indeed, "turning dialectics into the meanest and basest sophistry", as Lenin had described the weighty pronouncements of the revisionists of the Second International.

It is obvious to us all that the *intensification* of any one of the four fundamental contradictions will *influence* the course, development and growth of all other contradictions. If the neo-revisionists of the C.C. were really to refute the standpoint of the Soviet revisionists they would have to assert unequivocally that the contradiction between the imperialists and the oppressed nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America, does not merely *influence* the growth and development of the other fundamental contradictions in the world today, but that it is the existence and development of this contradiction which determines the growth and development of the other fundamental contradictions. In short, this contradiction between the imperialists led by the U.S. and the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America is the principal contradiction in the world today. And, hence, it is the development of this contradiction that is determining the development of the struggle of the world's peoples against U.S. imperialism and the reactionaries of all countries.

Why is the contradiction between the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the imperialists headed by the U.S. the principal contradiction in the world today?

The victory of the Great Chinese Revolution brought about a fundamental change in the world balance of forces, in the struggle between world imperialism and the oppressed peoples. This victory "breached imperialism in the East" and gave a great impetus "to the national liberation struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America which entered a new historical period."

After World War II, U. S. imperialism has become the biggest international exploiter. It is the main force of war

and aggression in the world today, and the most ferocious enemy of the peoples of all countries. The Soviet revisionists are U. S. imperialism's main ally in its scheme of domination and plunder of the world.

U. S. imperialism's main targets of exploitation and aggression are the colonial and semi-colonial countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Hence, the main arena of struggle against imperialism headed by the U. S. is in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the storm-centres of revolution today. The national liberation revolutions in these continents, whose focal point is the heroic war of liberation waged by the Vietnamese people against U. S. imperialist aggression, are the most important forces dealing direct and mortal blows at U. S. imperialism and its lackeys. Today the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who form the vast majority of the world's population, are undermining the foundations of the rule of imperialism and colonialism by waging people's war under the guidance of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Since World War II, advancing wave upon wave, the national liberation struggles of the peoples of China, Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Cuba, Indonesia, Philippines, Burma, Thailand, Algeria, Tanzania, South Yemen and other countries, have developed into an irresistible and invincible revolutionary force which is sweeping U. S.-led imperialism into the dustbin of history.

The contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The contradiction between the oppressed peoples and the imperialists, between the peasantry and feudalism, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the contradictions among the imperialists themselves and between the imperialists and the socialist countries are all concentrated here. Therefore, as Comrade Lin Piao says, "in the final analysis, the whole cause of the world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of Asian, African and Latin American countries who make up the overwhelming majority of the world's population." (*Long Live The Victory Of People's War*). Hence, it is the develop-

ment of the national liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America under the guidance of Mao Tse-tung's thought, which is determining the course of development of the world revolution today.

Materialist dialectics holds that, "The fundamental cause of development of a thing is not external but internal; it lies in the contradictoriness within the thing." (Mao Tse-tung, *On Contradiction*). Therefore, the fundamental cause of the collapse of imperialism must be found in the development of its internal contradictions. The development of the external contradiction i.e., the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, although it is very sharp, can only influence and bring about favourable conditions for the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples. It is the development and intensification of the principal contradiction with the imperialist camp, i.e., the contradiction between the oppressed nations and the imperialists led by the U. S., which is the fundamental cause for the collapse of imperialism and the further development of the socialist camp.

The superiority of the socialist system and its achievements in construction can inspire but never replace the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations. The oppressed peoples can win liberation only through their own revolutionary struggle. The liberation of the masses is achieved by the masses themselves. This is a fundamental truth of Marxism-Leninism.

That is why, the contradiction between the oppressed nations and the U. S. imperialists cannot be resolved through the peaceful economic competition between the socialist and imperialist countries. This contradiction can only be resolved by the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples, which must inevitably lead to the final collapse of imperialism.

Comrade Lin Piao has said :

"At present, the main battlefield of the fierce struggle between the people of the world on the one side and U. S. imperialism and its lackeys on the other is the vast area of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the world as a whole, this

is the area where the people suffer worst from imperialist oppression and where imperialist rule is most vulnerable. Since World War II, revolutionary storms have been rising in this area, and today they have become the most important force directly pounding U. S. imperialism. The contradiction between the revolutionary peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the imperialists headed by the United States is the principal contradiction in the contemporary world. The development of this contradiction is promoting the struggle of the people of the whole world against U. S. imperialism and its lackeys." (*Long Live The Victory of People's War*)

Why are the neo-revisionists deliberately confusing the issue of the principal contradiction in the world today? Why do they side with the Soviet revisionists and maintain that the contradictions between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp is the central or the principal one in the world today?

The reason is that the neo-revisionists are opposed to people's war and revolution. They have no faith in the masses and are afraid of U. S. imperialism. That is why, they maintain that India is an "independent" and "newly liberated" country and praise the Indian "bureaucrat-comprador" bourgeoisie, the lackeys of U. S. imperialism, in a sly attempt to cover up the neo-colonialist aggression of U. S. imperialism against our country.

Finally, with this Madurai document, they hope to succeed in continuing to deceive the revolutionaries in the party, by pretending to side with the general line of the C.P.C. on certain issues while on the basic, fundamental issues they support and follow the line of Khrushchov revisionists, as the neo-revisionist standpoint on the issue of the fundamental contradictions in the world today clearly demonstrates.

“Unity in Action” With Whom— Revolutionary People or the Revisionist Clique ?

—Partha Choudhury

“Disguised counter-revolutionaries”, said Mao Tse-tung, “conceal their true features by giving a false impression. But since they oppose the revolution, it is impossible for them to cover up their true features completely.” The desperate attempts Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Jyoti Basu and Co. are making to conceal their true features remind us of these words of Comrade Mao Tse-tung. The CPI (M) *Central Committee’s Draft for the Ideological Discussion* and the long series of articles in its defence represent a pitiful attempt on the part of their authors to conceal their true features by prostituting Marxism as they have ever been doing. This attempt to hoodwink Party comrades with Marxist catchwords is quite in keeping with their historic role as tools of the imperialist-feudal-comprador combine in opposing the tide of revolution that has set in.

The *Draft* seems to be an exercise in abstract theorising which, while criticising the revisionists’ stand on ideological issues as a sort of mistake or deviation, lashes out at the great Communist Party of China for its alleged anti-Marxist stand on the issue of “Unity in action” and for its “interference” in the affairs of the Indian Party. The lengthy articles in defence of the *Draft* are even more rabid in their attacks against the CPC (though they carefully refrain from mentioning the CPC) and other Marxist-Leninist Parties and Groups, which oppose the revisionist slogan. It is not accidental that neither the *Draft* nor the seemingly endless articles do anywhere mention that the thought of Mao Tse-tung is the Marxism-Leninism of our era—the era when imperia-

lism is heading towards collapse and proletarian revolution is on the eve of its final victory—just as Leninism was the Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Nor do they anywhere acknowledge the leading role of Mao Tse-tung’s Party in the World Communist movement of today. How can a bunch of opportunists declare unequivocally as Enver Hoxha did at the Fifth Congress of the Albanian Party of Labour in November, 1966 ?

“The PLA (Albanian Party of Labour) thinks that all the parties and Marxist-Leninist forces, as equal and independent, must closely unite with the Communist Party of China and the People’s Republic of China to form an iron block against which our enemies would break their heads. We do not care at all for the slanders of the revisionists and their imperialists that by joining China we became her ‘satellite’ and lost ‘independence’.”

It will be our purpose to show by analysing the arguments of this miserable bunch of counter-revolutionaries—the arguments in defence of the revisionists’ slogan of “unity in action”—that while pretending to accept Lenin’s teachings in the abstract, they actually repudiate them in the concrete. Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Basavapunniah and Co. have now joined in the world-wide revisionist chorus clamouring for “unity in action” between Marxist-Leninists and revisionists for the ostensible purpose of lending support to the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialism.

What are the arguments these neo-revisionists put forward to justify the revisionist slogan of ‘unity in action’ ?

“The stark reality, today,” these “Marxists” lament, “is that the small socialist republic of North Vietnam, together with its patriotic fighters in South Vietnam, is fighting *alone* against U.S. aggression and is making unheard of sacrifices, notwithstanding the fact that she is a member of the world socialist camp which has become a formidable force in the present era.” (Italics ours). Pointing out that the slogan of unity in action is not “an immediate and practicable one,” the *Draft* continues :

"But the freedom-lovers and proletarian revolutionaries of the whole world are extremely concerned and agitated over the brutal and fascist war on the Vietnamese people and *desire united action by the socialist States, particularly the Soviet Union and China*, so that the aggressors might be speedily driven out and peace restored in Vietnam. Our Party cannot but share this legitimate *urge of the people, all over the world*, and eagerly look for such a heartening development as soon as possible". (Italics ours).

Then the *Draft* mentions the conditions that must be fulfilled if "unity in action" is to be forged. First, there must exist minimum mutual confidence between the Chinese and Soviet leaders as "the unity in action proposed in this concrete case is nothing short of military action with its own serious consequences." Second, the Soviet leaders "will have to abandon the facile notion of maintaining world peace in collaboration with the most aggressive U. S. imperialists." Both these conditions, the *Draft* notes, are absent at present. Yet, the C.C. of the CPI (M) "cannot subscribe to the view that the slogan of unity in action *in principle* is wrong, since it advocates unity in action between the revisionist leaders of the CPSU and the Marxist-Leninist leaders of the CPC, since the contradiction between revisionism and Marxism-Leninism is by nature antagonistic, and such united action is impermissible." (Italics ours)

Then follows a homily on how to build up a united front and how to avoid the mistake of not distinguishing between the Soviet leaders and the masses behind them. These "Marxist-Leninist" warriors battling against revisionism, on the one hand, and dogmatism and left sectarianism, on the other, point out that "the very concepts of united front, united action, etc., advocated by communists presuppose action against a common enemy, at a particular stage of development, together with several other classes and parties with whom the proletariat has its contradictions, at times."

About thirty columns of the precious pages of *People's Democracy* have been devoted to answering critics who oppose

this slogan. Most of the space has been taken up in elaborating the sermon on the united front and on the necessity of rescuing the Soviet people from the clutches of the revisionists by developing the class struggle and waging a *real, not verbal*, struggle against U.S. imperialism. Not only Comrade Lenin but Comrade Dimitrov also has been invoked to defend the slogan of "unity in action." Quite a lengthy extract from Comrade Dimitrov's report to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International has been given.

At the same time *sly* attempts have been made in an article in defence of the *Draft* to represent the Soviet Union as playing today a genuine anti-imperialist role in Vietnam. The article says: "It should also be noted that our critics' estimate of the role which the Soviet Union is playing in Vietnam at present in distinction from the past, does not tally with the estimate of the leaders of Vietnam." (*People's Democracy*), February 18, 1968. After quoting from a message of Comrade Ho Chi Minh and other Vietnamese leaders to the Soviet Party and Government on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution to prove that the Soviet revisionist clique is rendering valuable assistance to Vietnam, it jumps to the conclusion: "they (the Vietnamese leaders) *clearly indicate* that a united action of the entire socialist camp will be of tremendous help to them." (Ibid) In the message itself there is not a single word about 'the socialist camp' or about 'united action.' This utterly dishonest conclusion which the Ranadives seek to force on unsuspecting comrades is part of the trickery they have played too long.

They have also invoked Kim Il Sung, who said: "Even those who once took to revisionism have found it hardly possible to hold out before the world public opinion without supporting the Vietnamese people. This is a good thing, by no means bad... There may be some who condemn the U.S. imperialist aggression and support Vietnamese people in order to make up for their past mistakes which they repent [who are those repentant sinners?], others may join in the anti-imperialist struggle, though reluctantly, under pressure from their own people and the peoples throughout the world, although their

fundamental position remains unchanged. But whatever their motives, it is necessary to enlist all these forces in the joint anti-imperialist struggle."

Does the "joint anti-imperialist struggle" proposed by Kim Il Sung mean joint "military action" which the *Draft* envisages. If so, what about the two minimum conditions which, according to the *Draft*, needed to be fulfilled before there was any practical possibility of such struggle—the minimum mutual confidence between the Chinese and the Soviet leaders, the basis of which, the *Draft* says, the Soviet leaders had destroyed, and the Soviet leaders' abandonment of the policy of collaboration with the U.S. imperialists? Did the Ranadives forget these conditions of theirs when they approvingly quoted Kim Il Sung?

But with 'deadly' sarcasm they wrote: "We hope our critics will not ascribe to the Korean leader a lack of desire to resist American imperialism or think that he has fallen victim to the cunning change of tactics of the revisionists."

In this connection we cannot but refer to the following formulation of Kim Il Sung's included in his report to the Korean Party in October, 1966:

"In our society (in North Korea) there exist no socio-economic and material sources for the emergence of outdated ideas... One may commit a leftist error if one emphasizes class struggle only... forgetting that the alliance of the working class, peasantry, and intellectuals constitutes the basis for social relations under socialism... this may cause unrest in society." It is an astounding statement from the leader of a country half of which is administered by stooges of U. S. imperialism and occupied by fifty thousand American troops and where the American way of life flourishes. "Consequently," *Progressive Labour* observed, "this point of view obliterates the dictatorship of the proletariat, and prevents class struggle against old and new bourgeois forces because of the fear of 'unrest'—a nice cozy estimate in which the stage is set for the restoration of capitalism." ("Road to Revolution—II", *Progressive Labour*, February-March, 1967).

We have digressed. Let us now return to Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Basavapunniah and Co. In the *Draft* they admit that the slogan of "unity in action" is not "an immediate and practicable one" but they put up a brave fight for 'a true Marxist-Leninist principle' which the CPC and other Marxist-Leninist Parties and Groups are supposed to oppose. But in the articles, the ideal seems capable of realization now and they convey the impression that what prevents it is "the sectarian and disruptive outlook," "the extra-Left stand", the anti-Leninist policy, the ignorance of the ABC of Marxism and the factional motives of those who oppose the slogan.

Let us first take up the question of building up a united front against U. S. imperialism. Our "Marxist" warriors maintain that the Soviet leaders, though revisionist, should be welcomed as a member of the front. Profuse quotations from Lenin and Dimitrov are offered in support of their view. The principle that they state is unquestionable but what is pernicious is the manner in which this Leninist principle is prostituted in the interests of the revisionists. The working class and its party should build up a united front against a common enemy with classes and parties with which it has at least a temporary identity of interests. In the thirties, when fascism was emerging, there was such a basis for a partial and temporary unity between the working class and other classes including a large section of the bourgeoisie—the classes which were all threatened by the rise of fascism.

"During World War II", to quote from "Road to Revolution-II", *Progressive Labour* of February-March, 1967, "the Soviet Union was in alliance with the U. S. Both wanted the defeat of Hitler but each for a different reason. Since the defeat of Hitler was critical for mankind's progress to socialism, there was a basis for partial and temporary unity. And the result was that the socialist revolution did advance.

"But in the case of Vietnam, things are quite the opposite. Both the Soviet Union and the U. S. want the revolution crushed now! Therefore, there is no basis for partial and temporary unity with the revisionists."

In its letter of March 22, 1966, the Central Committee of the CPC wrote to the Central Committee of the CPSU :

"Despite the tricks you have been playing to deceive people, you are pursuing U. S.-Soviet collaboration for the domination of the world with your whole heart and soul. In mouthing a few words against U. S. imperialism and in making a show of supporting anti-imperialist struggles, you are conducting only minor attacks on U. S. imperialism while rendering it major help. ...Your clamour for 'united action,' especially on the Vietnam question, is nothing but a trap for the purpose of deceiving the Soviet people and the revolutionary people of the world. You have all along been acting in co-ordination with the United States in its plot for peace talks, vainly attempting to sell out the struggle of the Vietnamese people against U. S. aggression and for national salvation and to drag the Vietnam question into the orbit of Soviet-U. S. collaboration. You have worked hand in glove with the United States in a whole series of dirty deals inside and outside the United Nations. In close co-ordination with the counter-revolutionary 'global strategy', you are now actively trying to build a ring of encirclement around socialist China. Not only have you excluded yourselves from the international united front of all the peoples against U. S. imperialism and its lackeys, you have even aligned yourselves with U. S. imperialism, the main enemy of the people of the world, and the reactionaries of all countries in a vain attempt to establish a Holy Alliance against China, against the people, against the national liberation movement and against the Marxist-Leninists."

Today, revisionism is the main ally of imperialism. What are its main goals? "The main goals of revisionism," to quote from *Road to Revolution-II*, "are to crush existing revolutionary movements, to prevent the development of new revolutionary movements, and to subvert socialism and restore capitalism where the revolution has triumphed." Under cover of the slogan of "a state of the whole people" the revisionists have already restored capitalism in the Soviet Union and

several other East European states. To quote again from *Road to Revolution-II*, "The Soviet Union has changed from being a country whose means of production were owned by the working people to one controlled and owned by a new exploiting class whose origins are in the former managerial-technical-professional strata. Profit—the private appropriation of the society's economic surplus—has replaced planning the economy for the benefit of the workers. Profit has been brought to the fore in all aspects of the Soviet economy."

Though *outwardly* the means of production are still socially owned, the economic processes and relations that have recently been introduced are more and more dominated by capitalist characteristics and, as a result, social wealth is turning into its opposite. "Within the Soviet Union the essence of capitalism has been restored. Everything from Liberman's plan to the ability to will complete personal fortunes to heirs gives the game away." (*Road to Revolution-II*)

The Soviet state apparatus and the leadership of the Soviet Party have no doubt been usurped by the representatives of the new capitalist forces though, as Mao Tse-tung has said, these forces will surely be overthrown by the Soviet workers. While restoring capitalism to the Soviet Union, its new rulers are trying their best to practise counter-revolution abroad. "Like any other nation which is developing an economy based on private profit," *Road to Revolution-II* points out, "The Soviet Union needs areas to exploit." Under the guise of "International Socialist Division of Labour," they have sought to stifle the industrial development of other socialist countries and turn them into the appendage of their economy. By extending economic and military aid they try to establish their neo-colonial domination over countries like India and Indonesia. It is the objective needs of the new ruling classes of the Soviet Union that force them to practise counter-revolution both at home and abroad and play the role of the junior partner of U.S. imperialism. Its foreign policy is inevitably a projection of its internal policy. It has built up close political and economic

relations with all reactionary governments on earth including the Sato Government of Japan, the C I A-led military clique of Indonesia, the U.S. satellites of Latin America. To put out the flame of national liberation struggle in different countries it actively colludes with U.S. imperialism and the worst reactionary regimes in different countries—the Congo, Iraq, Indonesia, India etc.—whom, while mouthing the slogan of a world without arms and war, it arms to the teeth. It was Khrushchev who declared in 1960: "Any local war might spark off the conflagration of a world war." On this false plea Khrushchev and his heirs have tried their best to sabotage all national liberation struggles, while, at the same time, they have placed all kinds of military hardware, besides economic aid, at the disposal of the reactionary ruling classes seeking to strangle the revolutionaries. Their policy of active hostility towards China and of close collaboration with U.S. imperialism is quite well-known. The Soviet policy towards Vietnam is not isolated from but part of their global strategy. Until 1964, Khrushchev and his men openly refused to support the Vietnamese revolutionaries. In the early months of 1965, when the U.S.-puppet regime in South Vietnam was on the verge of collapse, the Soviet revisionists came out with offers of help to the Vietnamese people. Why do the Soviet leaders help Vietnam against U.S. aggression? Because they are forced to. They are caught in the meshes of an insoluble contradiction. Though accomplices of U.S. imperialism, they are obliged to preserve the facade of being anti-imperialists in order to maintain their own rule and to deceive millions of people at home and abroad.

Explaining the significance of the informal talks Kosygin had with Vice-President Hubert Humphrey and Secretary of State Dean Rusk in New Delhi in January, 1966, the U.S. President's Adviser McGeorge Bundy said in a television interview on January 16, 1966:

"The public position of the Soviet Union is one of strong support for the specific objectives, for the conditions set down by the government of North Vietnam.

"...It has been made clear to us over a long period of time that the Soviet Government hopes there can be a peaceful settlement."

In another telecast on the same day Hubert Humphrey told his audience:

"It is a fact that the Soviets are trying to build a containment wall around China. This was part of the reason for Tashkent and that was well done.

"Its (the U.S.S.R.'s) main concern is Communist China rather than anything the U.S. may be doing."

In an article which appeared in the *New York Post* and other U.S. papers on May 14, 1966, Washington columnist Jack Anderson wrote:

"This column has obtained a copy of the intelligence report summarizing Kosygin's views. It shows that Russia is extremely anxious to keep the Vietnam war from exploding and would welcome a peace conference. Kosygin even said that he understood the American predicament in Vietnam...

"'In several recent interviews off the record', reports the secret intelligence dispatch, 'Kosygin said he understands the U. S. cannot cease its efforts in Viet Nam 'by itself' without 'other people doing something reciprocally'.

"'He described his country's relations with the U. S. as good and said that the U.S.S.R. intends to continue its policy of no conflict with the U. S.'"

This policy of 'no conflict' and active collaboration with the U.S. imperialists has yielded a large number of agreements and treaties between the U. S. and Soviet rulers, the latest of which is the Draft Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. While the revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union are offering much less aid to the revolutionary fighters of Vietnam than what they are pouring into India, they actively help the U.S. imperialists to shift thousands of soldiers and most of their guns from Europe to Vietnam.

What common interests, even temporary, form the basis of unity, even partial and unstable, between anti-imperialists and revolutionaries, on the one hand, and these counter-

revolutionaries of the basest type, on the other? It is by their policies and deeds that these counter-revolutionary rulers of the Soviet Union have excluded themselves from the Socialist camp and the international united front of revolutionary peoples fighting against U.S. imperialism.

No Marxist-Leninist confuses the Soviet leaders with the Soviet people, as our neo-revisionists accuse Marxist-Leninists of doing. At the Fifth Congress of the Albanian Party of Labour, Comrade Hoxha quoted the words of Lenin, "The struggle against imperialism, if not closely connected with the fight against opportunism becomes an empty talk and fraud", and declared:

"Our Party firmly rejects the idea that 'united actions' with the Khrushchevite revisionists against U. S. imperialism are a touchstone for a useful and effective struggle against revisionism. Actually, to co-operate with revisionists, to take united actions with them is to slip gradually into the revisionist positions, to accept their treacherous line."

Such unity with U. S. imperialism's ally will inevitably confuse the revolutionary peoples all the world over and disrupt their solidarity. The best way of unmasking the Soviet revisionists and isolating them from the people they confuse is to expose their policy of collaboration with U. S. imperialism and their policy of hostility towards China and the revolutionary movements everywhere.

Next, it is quite evident that the Madurai brand "Marxists" are deliberately subverting the principles of People's War and discarding Mao Tse-tung's strategy of defeating imperialism, the strategy Lin Piao explained in *Long Live the Victory of People's War*. To them 'unity of action' is "united military action" to defeat U. S. imperialism. "United military action" to hasten the downfall of U. S. imperialism can lead either to a surrender on the part of U. S. imperialism or to a world conflagration. As U. S. imperialism will certainly not willingly wither away, a world conflagration, a nuclear holocaust, will then be inevitable. Anybody who suggests this is an agent provocateur donning the garb of a Marxist.

Such a strategy is opposed to the principles of People's War which the Vietnamese people are waging victoriously today. The Vietnamese people have developed the art of People's War to unprecedentedly new heights and are raining smashing blows on the U. S. imperialists. More Vietnams are appearing in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; the grave of U. S. imperialism is being dug by the revolutionary peoples in Viet Nam, Burma, Thailand, the Congo, Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, etc. As Comrade Lin Piao said:

"Everything is divisible. And so is this colossus of U.S. imperialism. It can be split up and defeated. The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and other regions can destroy it piece by piece, some striking at its head and others at its feet. That is why, the greatest fear of U.S. imperialism is that people's wars will be launched in different parts of the world, and particularly in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and why it regards people's wars as a mortal danger."

The brave peasantry of Naxalbari, Sreekakulam and other places in our country have kindled the spark of People's War in India. The arch revisionists who are serving as tools of domestic and foreign reactionaries to snuff it out are naturally betrayers of People's War everywhere and oppose their knavish strategy of "united military action" by the 'Socialist camp' to People's War.

In *The Collapse of the Second International*, Lenin said: "Socialist parties are not debating clubs, but organisations of the fighting proletariat; when a number of battalions have gone over to the enemy, they must be named and branded as traitors." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 212). The CPC, the leader of the world communist movement, and Marxist-Leninists everywhere else have named and branded them as traitors: among them are the leaders of the CPSU and the Ranadive, Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Basavapunniah and Co.

[Continued from Page 16]

The Reserve Bank of India timed its announcement of lowering the Bank rate with the proposed withdrawal of certain types of corporate taxes for the reported purpose of simplification of the tax structure. Stock Exchanges in Calcutta and Bombay are evidently taking on a cheery note. A glow of satisfaction, however well disguised, is clearly discernible in the outlook of the business world. The President of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, which is well-known for its patronage of the foreign capital invested in India, even praised the budget as an 'imaginative' one.

There is a popular misconception that budgets are, up to a point at least, the handiwork of the concerned Finance Minister. This is far from the truth. Take, for instance, the present budget. It was preceded by the circulation among the M. P.s of an 'Economic survey,' prepared by the Government officials. It contained all the high lights of the budget proposals. The imperialist powers regard the bureaucracy as very trustworthy and, indeed, they have been trained to look after monopoly interests. That they performed their jobs well is evident from the certificates of the Chambers of Commerce.

Thus was staged the budgetary drama with the usual parliamentary fanfare, in which every one went through the motions of an annual ritual. Such performances often provide scope for exercise in nameology for our scholars. In Nehru's era, some budgets were termed 'Lame Duck' budget, 'Pedestrian' budget etc. This one has earned the epithet 'Revival' budget! It is a matter of conjecture, however, whether the economy will survive the heavy dose prescribed in the name of 'revival', or get caught in the fires of a runaway inflation like the one that engulfed China during the phase of the Chiang rule.