

# Agrarain Revolution and Elections

**Applying** the theory of Differentiation of the Three Worlds theory proposed by comrade Mao to both international and national situations, the latest Provisional Central Committee (PCC) *Our tasks in the present situation* of 30-1-80, has correctly characterised that "Soviet Union is a greater danger to our people, both internationally and nationally and therefore a greater enemy of the Indian people." The P.C.C. resolution has also correctly stated that :

Soviet Union and its allies, the present Indira Congress government, the leadership of the CPI and CPM, with their revisionism and support to Soviet Union and the pro-Soviet elements in other parties, should be taken as the greater danger. In the context of the present world situation, when the danger of a new world war from the Soviet Union is increasing, the presence of pro-Soviet Indira Congress govt. in the centre; and the CPM-CPI in the opposition faithfully serving the interests of the Soviet Union constitute the greater danger and are the greater enemies of the Indian people.

The Marxists-Leninists, all the revolutionary groups in India have rejected the path of parliamentarism and have adopted the path of People's War as the only path to achieve New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the working class. The latest P.C.C. resolution has clearly stated that "in our country, Protracted People's War has to be conducted mainly in the form of Armed Agrarian Revolution".

To achieve this strategic objective, the PCC resolution has asked the Party to mobilise all the sections of the people—the workers, peasants, students and govt. employees on their immediate economic and political issues combined with the propagation of revolutionary politics of Agrarian Revolution to intensify the people's struggles.

The PCC resolution has clearly stated that the main direction of the party work should be consciously oriented towards building the revolutionary peasant movement.

Selection of strategic areas, concentration of cadres, formulation of fighting and agitational slogans with extensive discussions of the people of the area, mobilising the peasants

for struggles on those issues, building the peasant organisations, arming of the people from the beginning, with the locally available weapons in the anti-feudal struggles, organising of the village volunteer organisations, organising people's resistance to landlord - goonda-police violence and repression and thus create, develop and defend areas of sustained resistance and thus advance to establishing the base areas in the countryside.

The PCC resolution has also clearly stated that :

In building the trade union movement, our main direction should be to build revolutionary Trade Union movement i.e., concentrating chiefly on politicizing the workers, ideological and political struggle against legalism and economism, building of worker-peasant unity, volunteer organisations to resist police—management goondaism and repression, building of the secret Party among the workers *and thus* unite the working class and make it the conscious leader of the New Democratic Revolution.

Thus building of *areas of sustained resistance* in the rural areas, and building *revolutionary Trade Union movement* in the industrial centres have been taken as the most important tasks of the party in the present phase of the struggles, with work in the rural areas as the priority task.

In conducting the immediate economic and political struggles of the people, the Party units have been asked to :

Consciously and constantly follow the mass line, drawing the masses at every phase of the struggle in all our mass activities.

The PCC resolution has also said that:

In conducting these struggles, we must utilise the various contradictions between the two super powers and their allies,

*that,*

"These contradictions should be utilised from issue to issue, both economic and political, consistent with the general political line of the party, of taking the Soviet Union as the greater danger, both nationally and internationally, and Soviet Union and its allies in India wherever they are, whether in power or in opposition, as the greater danger."

It has also stated that :

The main edge of these people's struggles, the struggle for United front should be directed against the economic, political, military domination of the Soviet Union in India since Soviet Social-Imperialism is the greater danger to our people both nationally and internationally and the Indira Congress Government, the CPI and CPM are the greater enemies of our people, since these forces are faithfully serving the interests of Soviet social-imperialism in India and the World.

These United front struggles should ultimately help the national bourgeoisie to break away from the big-bourgeois, big-landlord classes and should help in building the People's Democratic Front with the democratic sections under the leadership of the working class to lead the Armed Agrarian Revolution to success.

The PCC resolution has also noted that the possibilities of united front with pro-USA and pro-second world forces against Soviet domination have grown on such issue as civil liberties, on the immediate issues of the people—economic and political—and above all, against the predominance of the Soviet Union in India, against Soviet aggression wherever and whenever it raises its head, particularly now in Afghanistan, against all concessions to Soviet Union and the Soviet Union's efforts to convert our country into its neo-colony, and Indira Congress govt.'s connivance at these efforts and its plans for world war.

Thus one could see that the PCC resolution has laid emphasis that in conducting these struggles, the party units should firmly follow a policy of united front, uniting with all the forces that could be united on each issue—both economic and political, including the forces of the pro-USA and the pro-second world forces, even the forces of CPI and other mass organisations at the local level to defeat the main enemy on that particular issue.

In spite of this, the PCC resolution has clearly stated that it should participate in the elections on the basis of its own strength, not to support any other big-bourgeois big-landlord political party, the revisionists and the neo revisionists, not to have any election alliance or adjustment of seats with the opposition section of the big-bourgeois big-landlord parties or the CPI and CPM either at the national or at the regional level.

But some persons both inside and outside the Party are raising many questions on our attitude towards participation in elections and about election alliances. Some criticise our participation in the elections as revisionism while some others attack our policy of not having adjustment of seats or election alliances with other ruling class parties or revisionists and neo-revisionists as nothing but being 'neutral' between US imperialism

and Soviet Social-imperialism, between govt. and the opposition, between fascism and bourgeois democracy etc., which, in their opinion, is nothing but support to Soviet social-imperialism and the Indira Congress.

Let us discuss this subject a bit deeper.

### Participation in the elections

All the Marxists-Leninists, all the Communist Revolutionary groups in India, including our Party have rejected the path of parliamentarism as a path for Indian revolution, and have accepted People's War as the only path for Indian Revolution to achieve the complete liberation of our people, to achieve our New Democratic Revolution.

But as a result of intense hatred towards the policy of parliamentarism so far pursued by the revisionists and the neo-revisionists, our party leadership adopted the policy of *boycott of elections* for the whole period of New Democratic Revolution, as a matter of strategy and adopted the method of *annihilation of class enemies* as the main form of struggle to mobilise the people for People's War. In practice this policy has proved to be very disastrous for the cause of Indian revolution.

From the beginning, the slogan of *boycott of elections* has never proved successful. Experience has proved that vast millions of our people still have parliamentary illusions, are participating in the elections and are not yet prepared for higher forms of struggle. In such conditions, boycott of elections means nothing but leaving the political field free for the ruling class parties, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists to deceive the people with deceptive slogans and promises.

With this experience and considering the level of the movements, our Party has decided to participate in the elections on the basis of its own Agrarian Revolution Programme. Also it has been decided that the "participation in elections, where and when, and in what form should be decided in each election".

To the extent that our Party has participated in the elections on the basis of its own Agrarian Revolution Programme, we have been able to widely propagate our programme among the people, extend the movement and prepare the people for further struggles.

It is wrong to think that mere participation in the elections is parliamentarism. Participation in the elections to widely propagate among the people our full programme for revolution, and thus prepare the ground for further struggles is entirely different from the path of parliamentarism which takes the parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle for the salvation of our people.

While rejecting the path of parliamentarism, our Party also rejects the slogan of *boycott elections* as a negative and sectarian slogan which isolates our Party from the people.

Our participation in the elections, on the basis of our own strength, on the basis of our own Agrarian Revolution programme is entirely in keeping with the level of our movement at present, with the level of consciousness of our people at present.

It is entirely based on the teachings of Lenin on this subject. Lenin had taught us that we should participate in elections, as long as the people have parliamentary illusions, and boycott elections when the people have overcome their illusions about bourgeois parliamentary system and are prepared for higher forms of struggle.

Then the question arises: Having decided to participate in the elections, why does our Party refuse to have election adjustment of seats or election alliances with the CPI and CPM and with other opposition ruling class parties, national or regional? Why not unite with the lesser against the greater danger? Why do we refuse to support the present opposition parties in other constituencies, where our party does not contest?

There are fundamental reasons for such a refusal.

### Orientation

First of all, even while participating in the elections, we must stick to the general orientation of the Party.

Our general orientation of the Party should be to prepare the people for Protracted People's War, and convince the people that the present constitution is a big bourgeois-big landlord constitution meant only to preserve the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in our country, and elections under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution will not lead to any basic changes in our present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system.

Our participation in the elections should be in line with this general orientation of the Party. It should not increase the illusions of the people on the present bourgeois parliamentary institutions, but help the people disillusion themselves about these institutions, and thus prepare them step by step for higher forms of struggle. Having adjustment of seats, or election alliances or support to the opposition ruling class parties, and the revisionists and the neo-revisionists under one pretext or another is nothing but telling the people that something good can be achieved through the present big bourgeois - big landlord constitution, and that too in alliance with the very same parties who are wedded to preserve the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system in our country.

**That is why the PCC resolution has very clearly declared that the**

**Basic aim of our participation in elections should be to extensively propagate the politics of Agrarian Revolution and the political line of the Party among the people, to extend and consolidate our mass base among the people. If in this process of struggle, we win some seats in elections, we will utilise that position to achieve the same aims,**

*and that,*

**We must boldly tell the people that elections under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution will not lead to any basic changes in the present society and that only a Protracted People's War could lead to such basic changes in our society.**

### **Attitude towards ruling class parties, and CPI - CPM in the present parliamentary system**

**Comrade Lenin had taught us that bourgeois parliamentary democracy is nothing but a mockery of democracy, that it is a democracy for the ruling and exploiting classes, and oppression and suppression for the overwhelming majority of the oppressed classes, that elections are held periodically to decide which section of the ruling classes are to rule the people for a particular period, that "in Parliament, this is just chatter for the special purpose of fooling the common people" (State and Revolution). He has also declared that the most free of bourgeois parliamentary democracy is nothing but bourgeois dictatorship.**

**Lenin has told us that in a bourgeois parliamentary democracy, the opposition sections of the ruling classes make all sorts of deceptive promises to the people, which they betray the moment they come to power.**

**Our experience in India has also proved this. The Congress in India has led this country for more than 30 years in the garb of parliamentary democracy side by side with bloody repression of all genuine people's struggles. Then the Janata came to power in 1977 with many deceptive promises, but suppressed the people's struggles, without taking any steps to effect any basic changes in the society. The CPI and CPM governments have come to power without bringing about basic changes in society.**

**The opposition section of the big bourgeois-big landlord class parties, national or regional had come to power in various states, revisionists or neo-revisionists are still in power in states like Tripura, West Bengal and Kerala. Practice has proved that these governments are all big bourgeois-big landlord governments which will not bring about any basic changes in our semi-colonial and semi-feudal state. Practice has also proved that the revisionists or the neo-revisionists will not bring about any basic changes in the present day society, that they are only interested in the**

preservation of the present day semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, and that they also use bloody repression to suppress the genuine people's struggles.

Their opposition to the ruling class party—the Indira Congress is nothing but fictitious. Time and again they have declared that they are not for any confrontation with the centre.

It is in this situation that we are participating in the elections, to tell the people that all the ruling class parties, whether in power or in opposition, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists are all wedded to the preservation of the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, and their opposition to the ruling class party is nothing but fictitious.

Today our basic orientation is to mobilise the people for Protracted People's War, to mobilise people to build pockets of sustained resistance and build revolutionary trade union movement in the industrial centres as the most important task. We must expose the fictitious opposition of the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists and win the people behind them to participate in the Agrarian Revolutionary struggles. This can only be achieved by a ceaseless exposure of the fictitious opposition of the opposition section of the ruling classes, the CPI and CPM.

Our support to, or adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the CPI and CPM goes against this basic orientation of the Party towards these parties, that we should thoroughly expose their fictitious opposition, that they are only interested in the preservation of the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, and win the masses behind them for Agrarian Revolution.

Our support to, or adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the CPI and CPM will only increase the illusions of the people in these parties, will only create the impression in the people that these parties are better than the ruling class Party, that something good can be achieved through the present big bourgeois - big landlord constitution through these parties in power. This is against the basic orientation of our Party.

In any bourgeois parliamentary system there are bound to be opposition sections of the ruling class parties, since contradiction among the ruling class parties is one of the fundamental contradictions of the capitalist society. There are bound to be revisionists and neo-revisionists inside the working class movement creating illusions about the parliamentary system. These opposition parties, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists will always be mouthing some liberal sentiments, to demarcate themselves from the ruling class parties, deceive the public to get their votes, and betray these promises the moment they come to power. This is

**exactly what is happening with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the CPI and CPM.**

**Support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with any of these parties under some pretext or another, such as 'to defeat fascism', or 'to prevent fascism from coming to power', or 'to fight authoritarianism' or 'to break the monopoly of power' is nothing but permanently tying ourselves with these parties for election purposes, to get into the seats of power through their help.**

**Such an attitude should logically lead us to support these parties when they come to power. That means supporting these parties in their measures to preserve the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal society.**

**The representatives of these parties on many occasions change their labels, their parties, and even join the ruling class party.**

**The Shah Commission report and the Vaidyalingam report have thoroughly exposed how corrupt the leading figures are in all the big bourgeois big landlord ruling class parties.**

**Experience has proved that all the ruling class parties, CPI and CPM adopt bloody repression when in power to suppress all genuine people's struggles.**

**Our support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, the CPI and CPM is nothing but taking moral and political responsibility upon us for their corruption, for their bloody repression on our people.**

**There is another aspect to their question. As the PCC resolution has stated, the ruling classes in India, being comprador, are already split into pro-Soviet, pro-USA and the pro-second world countries' groups.**

**Support to, election alliances or adjustment of seats with some of the opposition parties, like the Janata, which is mainly pro-USA is nothing but telling the people that US imperialism is better than Soviet social imperialism. This goes against the basic orientation of the Party of mobilising the people for the destruction of both US imperialism and Soviet Social-imperialism in India at present, taking the latter as the greater danger, thus creating illusions in the people that social imperialism can be defeated through the parliamentary system by aligning ourselves with the pro-US lobby. This is an absurd idea of defeating any imperialism through the parliamentary system.**

**Support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with the CPI and CPM goes against the basic line of the Party of taking Soviet Union as a greater danger to our people both nationally and internationally. The CPI and CPM are the most faithful servants serving the interests of the Soviet Union both in India and abroad. Support to them in elections is**



nothing but direct service to Soviet Social imperialism in India, direct service to its efforts to convert our country into its neo-colony and its efforts to create war bases in India for its aggression in Asia.

The 'heroes' who have been shouting so much about taking Soviet Union as the 'only' danger to India, of concentrating the people's struggles against the predominance of the Soviet Union in India, and 'thundering' about defeating the 'A' team (the Indira Congress) and 'B' team (the Charan Singh group which included the CPI and CPM) have no shame to support the very same CPM in Sreerampur parliamentary bye-elections, which exposes their rank opportunism in elections.

Support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling classes, and CPI and CPM is nothing but conducting certain economic and legal struggles, political propaganda, and drawing the Party from one election to the other and permanently tying ourselves to certain big bourgeois-big landlord parties. This is nothing but wanting to come to power through the present parliamentary system. This goes against the basic orientation of the Party that the present system can be overthrown only through a Protracted People's War. That is why the PCC resolution has clearly stated that while participating in the elections, "we should not have any illusions that our Party could share power with any section of the ruling classes and their parties, regional or national, under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution".

The policy of support to, adjustment of seats and election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling class parties, CPI and CPM is nothing but following the parliamentary path of the CPI and CPM. Such a policy is nothing but abandoning the path of Agrarian Revolution, while the CPI and CPM, with their revisionism have made themselves the appendages of the big bourgeois-big landlord class in our country. Such an election policy is bound to make our Party the appendages of the CPI and CPM. The PCC is resolutely opposed to such a line of class collaboration.

### **General Political United Front**

This question has to be looked at from another angle also. It is true that we should always differentiate among our enemies, find out the chief enemy among them and defeat our enemies one by one.

Does this mean that we should always unite with lesser enemies against the greater enemy? This is an absurd idea. There are specific occasions when we should have general political united front with the lesser enemies against the greater enemies on the basis of a minimum political programme. On the other hand there are occasions when we should utilise their contradictions on specific issues to intensify the people's struggles against the greater enemy, some times to neutralise the lesser enemy.

Comrade Mao in his 'Introduction to the Communist' had clearly stated that "different groups within the big bourgeoisie are backed by different imperialist powers, so that when contradictions among these powers become sharper and when the edge of the revolution is mainly directed against a particular power, the big bourgeois groups dependant on the other powers may join the struggle against that particular power *to certain extent and for certain time*. At such times, in order to weaken the enemy and add to its own reserves, the Chinese proletariat may form a united front with these groups and should maintain it as far as possible, provided it is advantageous to the revolution." (emphasis mine)

From this it is clear that we cannot unite always with the lesser against the greater enemy and we can have united front with them only on certain specific occasions, and that too if it is advantageous to the revolution.

Support to, adjustment of seats or election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling classes or CPI and CPM, is nothing but having a general political united front with these parties on the basis of a minimum of political programme. Does such a situation exist in India today when we are in the phase of Agrarian Revolutionary struggle? No section of the ruling class parties, CPI and CPM will join us for Agrarian Revolution. When does such a situation arise?

The PCC resolution is very specific on this question. It says "For unity between the working class party and section of the ruling classes there should be a common basis. Such a common basis will come, when any super power makes aggression on our country, or in the period of fascist repression, supported by any super power, as it happened during the period of Indira's emergency, or if our country is converted into a neo-colony. During such period there will be a common basis for general political united front between the working class party and that section of the ruling classes opposed to that particular super power to a certain period to a certain extent".

Any of the above conditions do not exist today in India. In such conditions to have seat adjustments or election alliances with any section of the ruling classes, the CPI and CPM is nothing but tailing behind them.

All talk of uniting with the opposition section of the ruling classes, the CPI and CPM in the name of preventing our country from becoming a neo-colony of the Soviet Union or preventing the fascism of Indira Gandhi is nothing but political support for big bourgeois-big landlord policies of these parties or to the path of revisionism and parliamentarism of the CPI and CPM.

At the same time the policy of the PCC of utilising the contradictions of the ruling party with the opposition section of the ruling

classes or the CPI and CPM on specific immediate issues, both economic and political, intensifies the people's struggles and we can advance the revolutionary movement in the country.

The Party should be clear that fascism, neo-colonialism or Soviet Social-imperialism can not be defeated through the parliament, but only by mobilising the people for People's War. Only Agrarian Revolution could be an alternative either to fascism or Soviet neo-colonialism.

The PCC resolution on utilising the contradictions of the various sections of the ruling classes, CPI and CPM helps to unite with their cadres at the lower levels on the immediate issues of the people, while trying for united front with their leaderships on specific issues of common interest.

Such a policy also lays the ground for general political united front with these sections when Soviet neo-colonialism or fascist dictatorship materialises.

Our united front tactics should keep advancing the Agrarian Revolution; it cannot be a united front to win seats in elections.

So our policy towards elections is very clear at present. We are against the boycott of elections. But we should participate in the elections on the basis of our own strength, support progressive and revolutionary candidates in other seats; we should not have any seat adjustments or election alliances with any of the ruling class parties, national or regional, or the CPI and CPM, should not have any illusions of sharing power with these parties under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution but should persevere in the path of Agrarian Revolution.

At present we should keep the strength of the Party in mind. We are not yet strong enough to influence the political situation in our favour either at the national or regional level. In such a situation any thought of seat adjustments or election alliances with the opposition of the ruling classes, and the CPI and CPM will lead only to one-sided support to these parties by our Party, which will make our Party a tail of these parties.

All the ravings of certain persons that this is nothing but being 'Soviet Naxalites' or being 'neutral' between US imperialism and Soviet Social imperialism, or being 'fifth column of Kremlin' (Third World Unity, No 26, Feb. 1980) will not swerve the Party from the path of Agrarian Revolution. We will only consider them to be the mad ravings of certain persons who want to betray the Agrarian Revolution, who have taken Agrarian Revolution as a mere intellectual exercise. 26-3-80

*(This article was published in May, 1980 issue of New Democracy.)*