

## 'ONE DIVIDES INTO TWO'

(February 1, 1974)

SUBROTO DATTA (*Jahar*)

[ The author of this article was reportedly killed in a clash with the police in Bihar. As the article was received late, it is being published as an Appendix.—*Ed.* ]

Class struggle will continue in class-divided society. This class struggle has its reflection within the Party. As a result, the dialectics of two thoughts operates both inside and outside the Party. One is the correct line, another, the wrong line, i. e., one is the revolutionary line, and the other, the counter-revolutionary and revisionist line. Any two-lines struggle ultimately is the struggle of two world outlooks: one is the proletarian outlook, and the other, the bourgeois outlook. In other words, one is the outlook of dialectical materialism, and the other, the outlook of idealism and metaphysics. The outlook of each and every reactionary power and revisionists is idealism and metaphysics. Dialectical materialism is the outlook of the proletariat.

Within the Communist movement of our country, a struggle between two outlooks was going on. At that time, the revolutionary peasant upsurge of Naxalbari took place under the leadership of Comrade Charu Majumdar. It was because of the revolutionary peasant upsurge at Naxalbari that dialectical materialism won in theory and practice, the developed role of the proletariat guiding it. The victory of the dialectical materialistic outlook was possible by struggling against and completely defeating the outlook of idealism.

After Naxalbari, the struggle between the two lines and the two outlooks has reached a developed stage. The correct revolutionary line of our respected and dear leader, Charu,

Majumdar, has been established within the Party and among the people through revolutionary practice in recent years. From 1962, he was the representative of a correct revolutionary line. He was the first person who boldly declared in 1962, "The Indian Government has attacked China and so we should oppose this war." From 1962, particularly from 1965 to 1967, he wrote the historic *eight documents*. These are documents of uncompromising struggle against the revisionists and set forth the revolutionary theory of New Democratic Revolution of India. Comrade Charu Majumdar integrated the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought with the concrete realities of Indian revolution, upheld a revolutionary theory and formulated a correct revolutionary line for Indian revolution.

The representatives of the wrong line within the Party opposed the revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar from the beginning. Ashim—in his document on the national question—completely failed to distinguish between 'wrong' and 'right', in criticising the Party line, i. e., the revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar. After that, 'Soumya' opposed (the line) from inside and then, going outside the Party, circulated a big document in the name of 'Ajoy'. The main thing in that document was the philosophical theory of China's Khrushchev, Liu shao-chi. 'Soumya' propagated that bourgeois revisionist philosophical theory in the name of dialectical materialism. That was his little difference with Ashim. Then, what was the philosophical theory which he propounded in the name of dialectical materialism? That was the theory of China's Khrushchev, Liu shao-chi—"combine two into one". In other words, 'Soumya' saw two aspects, 'wrong' and 'right', in the correct revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar. In reality, the two lines in the Party are : one, the correct revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar, and the other, the wrong line which is the reactionary, revisionist line. This is the correct philosophical theory of dialectical materialism, i. e., 'one divides into two'.

‘Soumya’, with his revisionist philosophical theory searched for and failed in finding ‘wrong’ on all the questions in our Party line, the line which was the correct revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar. The revisionists, modern revisionists and then Nagi-Pulla-Asit-Parimal-Satyanarain-Ashim-Souren etc.—all the revisionists of various hues—attacked the Party line on this particular question.

The pedlar of the revisionist line that came next, ‘Sharma’, hiding his own bourgeois outlook, searched for and failed in finding ‘wrong’ in the revolutionary line of Comrade Charu Majumdar—all this in the name of ‘self-criticism’ and ‘withdrawal’ (of slogans). This was also nothing but the outlook of ‘combine two into one’.

“One trend covers another trend.” After the Tenth Congress of the great Chinese Communist Party, the anti-Party clique, the supporters of Lin, Mahadeb (*Chotda*) and company, took an anti-Chinese revisionist line from the moderate point of view. They also—with an outlook of idealistic philosophical theory ‘combine two into one’—are searching for ‘wrong’ in the correct Chinese Party line after saying ‘Red salute to the Tenth Congress’ and ‘The Great, Glorious and Correct Chinese Communist Party’. It is nothing but a vain search for ‘wrong’ in the proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman.

‘One divides into two’ and ‘combine two into one’ constitute the struggle of two lines and two outlooks. Everyone is speaking of ‘one’ and ‘two’, but from two outlooks.

Then, what is ‘one divides into two’? Feudal society divides into two—peasants and landlord class—whereas dialectics is permanent. Feudal rule would be repudiated and then peasant rule would be established. The peasant class divides into two—on the one hand, the poor and illiterate, and on the other, the most daring, kind and bold in their spirit of sacrifice. The landlord class divides into two—on the one hand, the living tiger to murder and exploit the peasants, and on the other, the paper tiger. The proof is that the

peasants are annihilating them and their destruction is certain. The world situation is also 'one divides into two'—the danger of war, and revolution, the main trend.

Then, what is 'combine two into one'? To search for 'good' with the 'bad' within the feudal society; to search for 'bad' with the 'good' within the peasant class; to search for 'good' with the 'bad' within the landlord class. Today, the pedlars of this idealistic philosophical theory are searching for 'wrong' even within the correct revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar. Then, tomorrow they would search for 'wrong' within the Thoughts of Chairman. But today, in the violent revolutionary conditions, the consciousness of the Party comrades and the people has developed. So tomorrow is far away, they are being flushed out today.

Today, we have to annihilate this idealistic philosophical theory: 'combine two into one' and establish the dialectical materialistic theory of 'one divides into two'.

Today we have to understand what it would be if we apply 'one divides into two' in the revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar. Not 'wrong' and 'right'. Then what? It is the dialectics between two 'right' (aspects), the dialectics between the 'basic' truth and the 'developed' truth, the dialectics between the truth of today and the truth of tomorrow. In this way we proceed, society proceeds, revolution and the revolutionary line develop. Comrade Saroj Datta said: The task to be done at twelve must be done by twelve, the task to be done at one o'clock must be done by one o'clock, task to be done at two o'clock by two. The revisionists can cry out that the line is changing; the reason is that they see everything from the dogmatic outlook. They do not understand the development.

In the field of class-struggle also we have to understand 'one divides into two'. Our basic line is the great line of 'annihilation of the class-enemies'. After Magurjan, annihilation is one kind of economism, so we have to snatch the rifle. After rifle-snatching, it is not only mere snatching, we have to use it: that is, annihilation, rifle snatching and shooting. To-

day we should attack not only the enemy's standing force but the mobile enemy also : that is, annihilation, rifle snatching, shooting and attack on the mobile enemy. This is development, this is the dialectics between one 'right' and another 'right'. Revolutionary line is not a static thing. It is a science which proceeds towards dialectics, and develops. We all should understand this.

The experience of our practice is also 'one divides into two' : the experience of victory or moving forward, and the experience of defeat. If we isolate ourselves from the revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar we will be defeated. And if we follow the revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar wholeheartedly we can move forward and would gain victory.

That is why Charu Majumdar has directed us to grasp the outlook of dialectical materialism and to refute the outlook of dogmatism and metaphysics. We should grasp 'one divides into two' and refute 'combine two into one'.

The future of the revolutionary line of Charu Majumdar is also 'one divides into two'. The victory of the revolutionary line is certain. But it should proceed by destroying the revisionist line of various hues.

Our future is also 'one divides into two'. "Future is bright but the way is tortuous."

[Received through Post—sent by *The Red Guards*]