

Extracts From *Left Trend Among Indian Revolutionaries**

14. Mao's Thought and the Telangana armed struggle

During the period of 1946-51, armed struggle was carried on under the leadership of the Communist Party in Telangana. In the beginning it was carried on against the Nizam's military, and against the Congress military after September, 1948. The people of Telangana as well as the revolutionaries were very much influenced by the Chinese revolution. Also it was the first attempt to apply the experiences of the Chinese revolution to the Indian conditions. Basing on the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle, the then Andhra Communist Committee, which led the Telangana armed struggle, had made it clear that like the Chinese revolution the Indian revolution has to be a protracted war, that the political power could not be seized as in the case of Russia through insurrection in the semi-colonial and semi-feudal India and that as in China the New Democracy has to be established in India. This is anybody's knowledge (an important document connected with this was even published in *Liberation*). It was in Telangana itself that Mao's Thought was for the first time applied to the Indian conditions. Therefore it should be said that the Telengana armed struggle is the form of people's war in India.

The leadership of the CP (M.L.) who refuse to recognise this historical truth say that the Mao's Thought was for the first time applied in India in the Naxalbari armed struggle. This is what they say:

Naxalbari represents the first-ever application of Mao's Thought on the soil of India. It was in Naxalbari that the peasants, for the first time, launched their struggle for the seizure of state power. For this reason, Naxalbari symbolises the path of liberation for

*This is the title of a critique of the policies of CPI (ML) led by Charu Majumdar, written by D.V.Rao in 1970

exploited masses of the Indian people, thus ushering in a new era in the political history of India. (Charu Majumdar, *Liberation*, September, 1969).

It is indisputable that the Naxalbari armed struggle has got historical significance. The Naxalbari armed struggle has clearly proved that the parliamentary system has become outdated in India, that there is a revolutionary situation in the country, and that the conditions for armed struggle are mature in several parts of the country. It has also reiterated the fact that the Chinese path is the only path for the liberation of India and that it is the path of peoples war. This served as a warning for all the Indian revolutionaries and on this warning they started to prepare the masses for armed struggle in their respective areas. Thus the Naxalbari armed struggle has not only heralded the present Indian revolution, but also it has once again proved that the Mao's Thought is applicable to the Indian conditions. It was only after the Naxalbari armed struggle that the armed struggle was launched in Srikakulam and Telangana, and is being carried on now. While such is the significance of the Naxalbari armed struggle, the leadership of the CP (M.L.) don't view it from this angle. They say that what was followed by the revolutionaries and the masses during the Telangana armed struggle was not Mao's Thought, and that the pursuance of Mao's Thought began only with the Naxalbari armed struggle and thus refuse to recognise the historical truth. During that period, based upon Mao's Thought the armed struggle was carried on not only in Telangana but also in the princely state of Tripura which was closely linked with West Bengal.

In the course of this armed struggle, the people under the leadership of the revolutionaries established village Soviets (Grama Rajya) in 3000 villages of Telangana. They organised the people's armed forces. They distributed 10 lakh acres of land of the landlords among the poor and landless peasants and introduced many revolutionary reforms in the interest of the masses. They laid foundations for the People's Democracy. In Telangana it was proved in practice that the Indian revolution would be in the form of protracted war to achieve the People's Democracy (then known as New Democracy).

Just because the then leadership of the Communist Party of India betrayed the revolution in 1951 and took to the parliamentary path, the significance of the Telangana armed struggle does not become unimportant in any way. The valuable experiences gained by applying Mao's Thought in the armed struggle are also very essential for

the revolutionary struggles and the armed struggles going on today. To refuse to accept them is to refuse to learn the lessons of the Indian revolutionary struggles. This is a thing that no revolutionary should do.

The Naxalbari armed struggle which has so much of significance has not however continued as a protracted war. They have even accepted the mistakes that have led to the failure of this struggle as follows:

1. *Lack of strong party organisation.*
2. *Failure to rely whole-heartedly on the masses to build a powerful mass base*
3. *Ignorance of military affairs.*
4. *Thinking on old lines and a formal attitude toward the establishment of political power and the work of revolutionary land reform.*

(While we accepted the teachings of Mao in words, we persisted in revisionist methods in practice. Party organisation in every area actually remained inactive.)

5. *Party members were all active at the beginning of the struggle but they were swept away by the vast movement of the people.*

6. We did not politically assess, nor did we propagate among the people, the significance of the 10 great tasks performed by the heroic peasants. We now admit frankly that we had no faith in the heroic peasant masses who were swift as a storm, organised themselves, formed revolutionary peasant committees, completed the 10 great tasks and advanced the class struggle at a swift pace during the period from April to September 1967. (Sanyal Report on Terai)

At another place they wrote as follows:

"Our failure in establishing the revolutionary political power and in carrying out revolutionary land reforms blunted the edge of class struggle both during and after the struggle". (Ibid).

It is a good thing that they own their failures in Naxalbari at least to this extent. The sum and substance of their failures is that the struggle was spontaneous and that they could not give it

an organised form. The main points that they have accepted are as follows.

The leadership of CP (M.L.) accepted Mao's Thought in words and followed revisionism in practice. Even today this leadership is merely chanting Mao's quotations but they are not in actual fact applying Mao's Thought to the Indian conditions. (We have already explained as to how they are not taking the Indian conditions into consideration and working contrary to Mao's Thought.).

They themselves admit that they did not rely upon the masses. The position with them is same even today. The experiences of Naxalbari show that no leadership can successfully lead the people's struggles without fully relying upon the masses. In spite of their loud talk about relying upon the masses, they are not in actual fact still prepared to undertake the revolutionary mass mobilisation. Therefore this self-criticism of theirs has come to be nothing but formal. On the one hand, they admit that they did not realise the significance of revolutionary land reforms. But on the other hand, they are formulating that *the Naxalbari struggle is not a struggle for land but for political power*. They have gone back on this question which is one of the items of their own self-critical report and thus refuse to admit it.

The Naxalbari leadership could have in fact avoided these mistakes, had they studied and correctly grasped the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle. They could have redoubled the organised struggle of the Naxalbari peasants with the distribution of land, establishment of the village Soviets and building of people's armed forces and be in a position to carry on the protracted war. It was solely because of their failure in fulfilling these tasks that they have failed to provide leadership to the Naxalbari struggle. They fail to recognise this main defect. They are at the same time denying the historical truth that the Telangana armed struggle was based on Mao's Thought. When we say that the Telangana armed struggle was based on Mao's Thought, we do not however mean that no mistakes were committed during the armed struggle. Despite certain mistakes, the Telangana armed struggle could go on for 5 years, only because it had the organised might of the masses behind it, together with Mao's Thought as its guide.

It is clear that it is only for the purpose of refusing to take the experiences of Telangana armed struggle that they are refusing

to admit the fact that the Telangana armed struggle was guided by Mao's Thought. It is indisputable that the revolution today would also be guided by Mao's Thought. But for a revolutionary to reject the experiences of the armed struggle, especially the Telangana and Tripura armed struggles that went on during the period of 1946-51, under whatever pretext, is unpardonable. Similarly, drawing correct lessons from the experiences of the Naxalbari, Srikakulam and other armed struggles going on today, the revolutionaries should enrich their revolutionary experiences. Only then would they be able to provide correct leadership to the armed struggle going on in their respective areas.

Formulating and implementing our programme and policy based on the experience of the Telangana armed struggle, we could in a short time build a revolutionary movement, launch the armed struggle and even with some victories. We are able to defend our revolutionary gains and carry on the armed struggle. We would always strive to utilise the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle as well as the experiences of the struggles going on in other parts of the country.

The leadership of CP (M.L.) have failed to take correct lessons not only from the experiences of Telangana armed struggle but also from the experiences of struggles under their leadership. They have given up the task of building the revolutionary mass movements. They are portraying their "annihilation of the class enemy" as guerilla warfare, and thus depriving the armed struggle of its necessary mass base or at least weakening it.

15. Deviation from Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought

If we have to correctly understand this deviation in the Indian revolutionary movement, we should study what Mao has said about the "Roving Rebel Bands" during the armed struggle in China as well as what Lenin has said about "terrorism".

In saying that "*Some People want to increase our political influence only by means of roving guerilla actions but are unwilling to increase it by undertaking the arduous task of building up base areas and establishing the people's political power*", Mao explained one of the characteristics of the Roving Rebel Bands. In order to rectify this tendency, he says that we should, besides conducting propaganda about this deviation in the party and the revolutionary

peoples army, "Draw active workers and peasants experienced in struggle into the ranks of the Red Army so as to change its composition". (*Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party*).

We have explained that though the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) wish to build the base areas and to establish people's political power, the slogans that they advance are in no way useful for this purpose. On the basis of the momentary enthusiasm that their "actions of annihilation of the class enemy" create among the masses, they have claimed in unmistakable terms that such actions would rouse the masses and enhance the influence of the revolutionary forces. Thus the "actions of annihilation of the class enemy" that they carry on disregarding the building of revolutionary mass movements are similar to the actions of the Roving Rebel Bands that Mao pointed out. Mao says that the active worker and peasants with struggle experience should be drawn into the revolutionary people's army in order to rectify this tendency. For this reason Mao attaches great significance to the struggle of the peasantry and the working class.

Besides what Mao has said above about the Roving Rebel Bands, it is essential to study what Lenin had said about "terrorism".

On "terrorism", in one of the resolutions of the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, Lenin writes thus:

"The Congress decisively rejects terrorism, i.e., the system of individual political assassinations, as being a method of political struggle which is most inexpedient at the present time, diverting the best forces from the urgent and imperatively necessary work of organisation and agitation destroying contact between the revolutionaries and the masses of the revolutionary classes of the population and spreading, both among the revolutionaries themselves and the population in general, utterly distorted ideas of the aims and methods of struggle against the autocracy". (Collected Works. Vol.6. Page 474).

While writing about the struggle of the Bolshevism against the petty bourgeois semi-anarchical revolutionism, he explains the struggle within the Socialist Revolutionary Party on this question, as follows.

--This party considered itself particularly "revolutionary" or 'Left' because of its recognition of individual terrorism, assassination - something that we Marxists emphatically rejected. It was, of course, only on grounds of expediency that we rejected individual-

terrorism.....(Collected Works. Vol.31, Page 33)

"Without in the least denying violence and terrorism in principle, we demanded work for the preparation of such forms of violence as were calculated to bring about the direct participation of the masses and which guaranteed that participation". (Collected Works. Vol.6, Page 195)

This is what Lenin has said about the struggle against individual terrorism that stood in the way of preparations for the 1905 insurrection. Notwithstanding the fact that we are now following the path of people's war and not insurrection, the basic principle that there should be mass participation in the revolution and that we should prepare the masses to this end remains the same in both the cases. The insurrection is a form of struggle in which the working class seize the political power through an armed insurrection, while the people's war is the form of struggle in which the political power is seized through protracted (peasant) war. Viewing from this angle, and analysing our experience, we should find it inescapable to prepare the masses, the party and the armed forces in order to launch and carry on the armed struggle. It is on this that our victory solely depends.

Lenin did not merely reject violence and terrorism as a matter of principle. He directed that all Marxists should reject violence in the form of individual terrorism. He pointed out that while not being useful, it is extremely harmful to the revolution. Thus he denounced terrorism as unacceptable.

Like all the other revolutions, our people's war is also undoubtedly a violent revolution. All the people's armed struggles going on in different parts of our country today are also likewise violent struggles. Not only we accept violence in principle but also we actually practise the revolutionary violence. We have already explained this problem while discussing the problems of armed struggle. It is only the actions which are going on in the form of "actions of annihilation of the class enemy" that we are opposing. We oppose this form because, in our opinion, the indiscriminate actions without preparing the masses for armed struggle would be harmful for the armed struggle.

Not only the "actions of annihilation of the class enemy", carried out by the followers of the C.P. (M.L.) in the Circar, Rayala-seema and Telangana districts of Andhra Pradesh, possess the characteristics

of "Roving Rebel Bands" and terrorism, as pointed out by Mao and Lenin, but also they have yielded exactly the same results. These actions were carried and based upon the line of thinking of C.P. (M.L.) leadership on the programme of "annihilation of the class enemy". They have caused irreparable losses to the revolutionary movement as well as to the armed struggle in Andhra Pradesh. It cannot be said that this wrong line of thinking of the C.P. (M.L.) leadership has been implemented in Andhra alone. It is clear that the revolutionary movement in different parts of the country has suffered to the extent this programme was implemented by their cadres.

We have explained that the "programme of annihilation of the class enemy" does not reflect a correct understanding of the armed struggle and that it is opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought. We have also shown that it does not conform to whatever experiences of armed struggle we have. The experiences that have already been acquired clearly show as to how harmful is this deviation. There is no doubt whatsoever that this deviation of theirs is close to the concept of "Roving Rebel Bands" and the individual terrorism described by Mao and Lenin. If they fail to analyse their own experiences in the light of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought, and rectify this deviation, they would travel in the same wrong path and ultimately become divorced from Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

16. Common points between the revisionists and the leadership of C.P. (M.L.)

We have so far analysed the incorrect views as well as the incorrect practice of the C.P. (M.L.) on various questions concerning the armed struggle. Their failure in realising the need for the revolutionary mass movements as well as the struggles for the development of armed struggles has become evident. This has ultimately resulted in the annihilation of the land lords in the name of "annihilation of the class enemy" and claiming it as the armed struggle.

An interesting thing here is that the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) have got a main point in common with the old and new revisionists, the very same revisionists whom they are vehemently denouncing day in and day out. The old revisionists who support the ruling classes, who follow the parliamentary path, and who assert that the social changes could be brought about without a revolution, have

given up the revolution as well as the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants. Though the neo-revisionists sometimes appear to be hesitating in supporting the ruling classes, they are also following the parliamentary path on the plea that there is no revolutionary situation in the country and given up the peasant and working class struggles. Thus both the revisionists have given up the building up of revolutionary movement through revolutionary struggles as well as leading of the revolution.

The leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) who accept the necessity of armed struggle for the revolution and claim that the masses could be roused through their programme of "annihilation of the class enemy" has also given up the task of building the revolutionary movement through the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants.

Thus the old and new revisionists and the leadership of the CP (ML) completely agree on the question of giving up the task of building the revolutionary movement through the revolutionary struggles of the workers and peasants.

The leadership of the Communist Party of India followed a "Left" line during 1948. The theory which this leadership propounded was that since there was a revolutionary situation in the country, the political power could be seized through the "insurrection" by the working class without revolutionary struggles. Following this line of thinking they rejected the path of people's war. They vehemently denounced the Andhra Communist Committee as reformist for having proposed the path of people's war. Similarly the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) have also given up the peasant revolutionary struggles, but they have done so in the name of the very people's war itself. They are denouncing the Communist Revolutionaries of Andhra, who are organising people's war through people's revolutionary struggles as revisionists. Thus what they follow is nothing but the "Left" line. The difference between the Left deviation of 1948 and that of present day lies merely in their slogans of insurrection and people's war and not in their character. One was advanced in the name of Leninism while the other is being advanced in the name of the Mao's Thought.

There is nothing to wonder about the Left deviation of 1948 as well as the Left deviation of the present day. But what is really surprising is the glaring similarity between the present-day revisionism

and the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) on the fundamental question, on the question of rejecting the people's revolutionary struggles. Yet this is an objective reality. Both these deviations stem from one and the same source. The only difference is that while the revisionism is outside the revolutionary ranks, the Leftism is within the revolutionary ranks.

When there are no differences on the fundamental points between the old and new revisionists and the CP (M.L.) leadership, why should the old and neo-revisionists denounce the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.)?

For the old and new revisionists who defend the ruling classes, or follow the parliamentary path, the people's revolutionary struggles, the resistance in self-defence, the armed struggle -- all would appear as terrorism. It is exactly for this reason that the old and new revisionists are denouncing all the revolutionaries as terrorists. While the old and new revisionists are denouncing the left deviation of the leadership of C.P. (M.L.) from a revisionist stand-point, we are pointing out their "LEFT" deviation in the light of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought and on the basis of the experiences of peoples revolutionary struggles of India. We do so because, as Mao says we have to take the lessons from our past mistakes in order not to repeat them in future. The reason for this is to cure the disease in order to save the patient.

We should carry on a serious ideological struggle against the revisionism as well as the "LEFT" deviation and march forward taking all the aspects of armed struggle into consideration and properly co-ordinating them, if we have to take advantage of the existing revolutionary situation in the country and lead the Indian revolution to a victorious finish. We should mobilise the masses into peoples revolutionary struggles and simultaneously carry on the armed struggle.

.....

Is Mere Chanting of Mao's Name Internationalism?

They are trumpeting that they are internationalists and that Mao is their party's Chairman. This trumpeting of theirs has got nothing to do with the proletarian internationalism. Our proletarian internationalism should possess the following main characteristics:

(1) We should to a greater extent make use of the experiences of the Chinese revolution to successfully complete the Indian revolution. We would be able to fulfil this task only by applying Mao's Thought to the Indian conditions and conducting the revolution. We should examine the experiences of the revolutions that went on so far, as well as the revolutions still going on in various countries, and apply them to the extent they are applicable to us.

(2) We should defend Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought from the attacks of Revisionism and Left Sectarianism.

(3) We should face the attacks of the imperialists and the Social Imperialists and defend the policies of the Communist Party of China.

(4) We should expose the war preparations and the conspiracies of the Indian ruling classes against China and Pakistan with the overt and covert support of the imperialists and the social imperialists. We should mobilise the masses against these war preparations and conspiracies. If the Indian ruling classes launch a war of aggression against China, we should intensify the revolution, convert it into a Civil War and hasten the overthrow of the ruling classes.

(5) Successfully completing the people's democratic revolution, which smashes the imperialism and social-imperialism in India, by itself is the greatest of our international duties. This would not only liberate the Indian people from imperialism but also it would weaken the chief architect of imperialism as well as its ally, prevent the world war and pave the way for world peace.

This is what ought to be our proletarian internationalism. Distorting this revolutionary outlook, the leadership of this group has reduced it to the few words, "*the Chinese Chairman is our Chairman*". They thought that they need not in actual practice follow Mao's Thought if they keep repeating these few words. They are only saying this for the purpose of defending their own wrong theories.

As they have distorted the armed struggle and reduced it into their "programme of annihilation of the class enemy", they have also distorted the Mao's Thought and reduced it into the few words, that "*the Chinese Chairman is our Chairman*".

This and their claim that Mao himself is personally leading them only shows that they have no confidence in their own policies. Further, it is clear that in their own party, the ordinary cadre and

the party members are not prepared to accept them unless they are said to be Mao's policies. They should be prepared to bear the responsibility for their own incorrect policies. They should take lessons from their experience and rectify them. But it is unpardonable to cash on them in the name of Com. Mao.

This is nothing but a deliberate attempt of silencing the criticism of their wrong policies from the ordinary cadre and the fellow revolutionaries or at evading the responsibility of answering the criticism of their own ranks if any. Just because of this the revolutionaries would not go back to criticise them. They are fast realising, through their own revolutionary experiences, as to how utterly wrong are the policies of the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) and criticising them. We believe that this criticism of ours would help them in their endeavour.

In the name of suggestions and directives from International leadership, the All India leadership had, on many occasions in the past, forced their wrong policies, especially their reformist and revisionist policies on the party and betrayed the Indian revolution. The leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) is now travelling in the same path. They are forcing their wrong policies on their cadres and party members in the name of Com. Mao.

.....

4. It is only when correct leadership is provided to the revolution that revolutionary authority is established:

We have already shown as to how the C.P. (M.L.) has failed in the field of ideology, armed struggle as well as achieving the unity among the revolutionaries. Unmindful of such a serious mistake at the very outset, they are now going to establish their "Revolutionary Authority". They are openly declaring that the recognition of their "revolutionary authority" is the pre-requisite for the revolutionary unity.

See what they are saying:

"Today, the situation is such that if we are to advance the revolution in the face of the attacks of revisionism and the reactionaries we must conscientiously and seriously wage a struggle

to establish the revolutionary authority of comrade of Charu Mazumdar. Our slogan is, internationally, we must follow Chairman Mao, Vice-Chairman Lin Piao and the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China as well as world lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Nationally, we must be loyal to Chairman Mao, vice-Chairman Lin Piao, and the Communist Party of China, and must fully accept the revolutionary authority of the leadership of Comrade Charu Mazumdar. Only thus can the revolutionary "unity be built and the revolution win victory" (Liberation, February 1970. Pages 49-50).

We, the communist revolutionaries, accept Mao's Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of this era. We accept it as a guide for our revolutionary practice. We firmly believe that only by correctly applying Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India and leading the revolution would the Indian revolution become victorious. The kernel of Mao's Teachings. Lin Piao's writings, the revolutionary experiences of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution itself is the Mao's Thought.

Contrary to this, the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) are merely chanting the names of Mao, Lin Piao and the Chinese Communist Party. They have totally failed in applying Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India. While this is the truth, they are making use of these names to make their wrong policies attractive to their cadre as well as to escape the responsibility of answering their criticisms.

This leadership has failed in leading the Naxalbari armed struggle. The recent experiences show that they have also failed in leading the Srikakulam armed struggle. In Bengal, when ruling classes are enmeshed in a serious crisis and when the revolutionary situation is ripe, this leadership has confined itself to "the actions of annihilation of the class enemy", instead of mobilising the masses of armed struggle through revolutionary mass programme and revolutionary mass movement. This leadership has completely failed in leading the armed struggles, in the very primary stage. It is clear that they are chanting the names of Mao and others solely for the purpose of hiding this utter failure of theirs.

The revolutionary authority of the leadership could be established only in the course of revolution and by providing correct leadership to the revolution. Similarly the revolutionary unity also could only

be achieved in the course of the revolution. By providing correct leadership, the revolutionaries should successfully complete the revolution. For a leadership which has failed to fulfill all these tasks, it would be ridiculous to bring up the question of establishing their "revolutionary authority".

We might, in the beginning, commit mistakes owing to our limited or lack of experience in conducting the revolutionary struggles. Drawing correct lessons from these mistakes, we should strive to provide correct leadership. This is what a humble leadership should do.

There are no leaders in India who can even sit alongside Mao and Lin Piao. The Indian revolution has yet to produce such leaders. The sooner the leadership of C.P. (M.L.) realises this, the better for them.

They are denouncing us as revisionists. But they have failed to point out even a single formulation either in our thinking or in our practice, which revises Mao's Thought. It is clear that they are adopting this method for the purpose of misleading their followers.

From this it is evident that the unity of the revolutionaries is possible only through serious ideological struggle. The experiences show that the unity of the revolutionaries would become possible only when the revolutionaries within the C.P. (M.L.) carry on an uncompromising struggle against the erroneous "Left" policies of this leadership and unite with the revolutionaries outside the C.P. (M.L.) on the basis of Mao's Thought.

We have discussed here the main differences between us and the leadership the C.P. (M.L.), shown where they are making mistakes, and put forward our stand. The following is the sum total of these discussions:

1. The principal contradiction in the present Indian society is the contradiction between feudalism on the one hand and the vast masses of the people on the other. It is wrong to show this as a contradiction between feudalism and the poor peasantry. Due to this, the revolutionary nature of the struggle against feudalism would degenerate to the nature of economic struggle and narrow down. While carrying on the armed struggle for the seizure of political power and abolition of feudalism, the masses would also carry on revolutionary struggle to resolve the contradiction between them and the imperialism.

2. There is a revolutionary situation in the country. But at the same time, the development of the revolutionary movement is uneven in the country. Basing on this, we should mobilise the masses into the revolutionary struggle and prepare them for armed struggle. Just because there is a revolutionary situation, it would be wrong to abandon the revolutionary struggle and take up the "programme of the annihilation of the class enemy" in the name of armed struggle.

3. As it is wrong to confine the masses to economic struggles, (which is known as economism), it is also wrong to refuse to mobilise the masses on political and economic demands, especially on political demands in the name of shunning economism. Through these struggles the masses would, out of their own experience, realise the need for armed struggle. In the present revolutionary situation, the masses in different parts of the country would quickly realise the need for armed struggle depending upon the level of the mass movement of the respective areas.

4. The armed struggle which has got the base of the revolutionary mass movement would alone become successful. For this, the building of revolutionary mass organisations, the implementation to the extent the masses are ready of the agrarian revolutionary programme, which is a peoples' revolutionary programme, is essential. When we say that the armed struggle is the main form of struggle in the present revolutionary situation, it would be wrong to say that the armed struggle is the only form of struggle and to reject all the other necessary forms of struggles. Likewise it is also wrong to equate the "programme of the annihilation of the class enemy" with the armed struggle. Based upon the people's democratic revolutionary programme, the masses would take up the armed struggle as the main form of struggle to overthrow the ruling classes, would defeat the armed forces of the ruling classes and seize the political power into their own hands. In any stage of the armed struggle -- even in the primary stage -- the programme of annihilation of the class enemy could not be a programme of the armed struggle. Similarly it is also wrong to say that we should rouse the masses through "the programme of annihilation of the class enemy". Like "economism" this trend also gives up the task of building the revolutionary movement through revolutionary mass movements. There is similarity in them in this respect. This wrong trend is contained in the armed struggle outlook of the leadership of the

C.P. (M.L.).

5. The support of the leadership of the C.P. (M.L.) to the separate Telangana movement is incorrect. They tailed one of the groups of the ruling classes. The people of Telangana do not form a separate nationality. The separate Telangana movement was not a struggle for the right of self-determination. This is not a national struggle for the unification of the nationality of Andhra. Further the very slogan of "People's Raj" in India, and in Andhra as a part of India, could be established only when the ruling classes are defeated through people's war. But to advance a slogan of "People's-Raj" in Telangana alone would be a fraud on the masses. When the ruling classes are fighting among themselves, we should make use of these contradictions and advance the revolution but should not tail behind one of these groups of the reactionary ruling classes. This is nothing but opportunism.

6. We do not recognise the revolutionary authority of the leadership of the CPI (M.L.). They have failed in fulfilling the main tasks -- the task of leading the revolutionary struggles as well as the task of unifying the revolutionaries. The leadership that could fulfil these tasks would alone have the revolutionary authority. This would be possible only in the course of the revolution. We would be able to fulfil this task only when we apply Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought to the concrete conditions of India, unite the revolutionaries on the basis of the armed struggle and leading the revolution. It is essential to do this as early as possible.

These are the differences on the fundamental questions Based on our limited experiences, we have endeavoured to analyse them in the light of Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought. The essence of this wrong trend of the leadership of C.P. (M.L.) is "Left opportunism". It is due to this deviation that they refuse to recognise the decisive role of the revolutionary mass movement for the overthrow of the ruling classes through armed struggle. In the organisational field, they are adopting groupism and thus obstructing the revolutionary unity of the revolutionaries on the basis of Mao's Thought.

"Left" opportunism is not new in the Indian revolutionary movement. The Communist Party fell into the hands of the "Left" opportunist leadership in 1948. Through its "Left" policies this leadership did irreparable damage to the party. On some of the

main issues, there is a similarity between the policies of the two. With the slogan of insurrection, in the name of Marx, Engles, Lenin and Stalin, the then "Left" leadership rejected the protracted war based on the Mao's Thought and agrarian revolution. The present "Left" leadership refuses to apply Mao's Thought to the Indian concrete conditions in the very name of Mao, Lin Piao and the Chinese Communist Party. In the name of "annihilation of the class enemy", they are taking the armed struggle on a wrong path. Both of them reject the decisive role of the revolutionary mass movement in the seizure of political power by the people. Both refuse to take the experiences of the Telangana armed struggle for formulating the path of armed struggle in India. In the name of the suggestions from the international leadership, both forced their "Left" policies on the party. Though these two "Left" policies belong to two different historical periods, it is interesting to note the similarities between the two.

When the Chinese Communist Party was under the influence of the "Left" opportunism, Com. Mao waged a serious struggle and defeated it and carried forward the Chinese revolution creating a glorious history. Today in India also, it is essential to carry on a serious struggle against both revisionism and "Left" opportunism. Only then would the Indian revolution march forward.

The Indian revolution that has begun very late and facing many ups and downs is going on under a very favourable national and international situation. The victory of the proletarian cultural revolution in China, the advance of the revolution in Indo-China, Africa, Latin America and Arab countries, the imperialism caught in the crisis and leading towards its end, and the exposure of the anti-people, pro-imperialist policies of the Soviet Social imperialists -- all these offer us internationally favourable conditions. The remarkable role of People's China as the centre of the world revolution stands as a powerful safeguard for these favourable conditions. Due to the divisions and controversies growing among the ruling classes of the country, they are enmeshed in a serious crisis. There is not only a revolutionary situation, but also there are revolutionary struggles raging throughout the country. The experiences of the Chinese revolution as well as the experiences of various revolutions are available for the revolutionaries in the country. The bankruptcy of the parliamentary path of the social democratic parties is getting exposed. Nationally these are the favourable conditions. Yet the

disunity among the Indian Revolutionaries stands as an impediment to the progress of the Indian revolution. Though the revolution had suffered losses due to the fascist repression unleashed by the ruling classes, and as a result, the advance of revolutions has to some extent suffered a temporary setback, the revolutionary forces would undoubtedly overcome these setbacks and march forward.

We hope that our criticism would prove useful to the Indian revolutionaries to conduct a healthy discussion on all the problems facing the Indian revolution today.

Let us unite on the basis of

Marxism-Leninism and Mao's Thought.

Andhra Pradesh
Revolutionary Communist Committee.

Date: 1-10-1970

(Translated from Telugu Original)