

ON THE STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL ORGANISING COMMITTEE OF THE CPI(ML) BY A MEMBER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

(Frontier July 20, 1974)

The Central Organising Committee prepared a statement in February which was published later in 'Frontier' 'Pilupu' and some other papers. Opinions expressed by some friends on the statement have given rise to these comments. All those I met unanimously asked me: why was there no mention at all of annihilation of class enemies in the statement? Has the Party given up this policy?

After the death of Comrade Charu Mazumdar, it took the Party committees in different States a long time to establish contact with one another. Therefore, despite a considerable lapse of time, the Central Committee could not be organised afresh. Another factor which caused the delay was the ideological, political and organisational confusion in the Party following the momentary setbacks to the armed peasant struggles led by the CPI(ML) in different parts of the country. During this period of difficulties, the party had to face the attacks of the Government and the revisionists on the one hand, and on the other, ideological confusion. It was very hard indeed for the party to reunite under such difficult circumstances. The party is facing two major tasks in the course of its efforts to organise and lead the armed struggles further ahead. The first, to draw lessons from the victories achieved and mistakes committed during the last six years either on account of lack of experience or lack of depth ill ideological understanding. The second, to lead the armed peasant revolution by taking necessary steps to bring the Party nearer to the people. The first task is related to self-criticism and the second to practice. Any individual or the party can foresee the future clearly only through self-criticism based on Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung Thought.

After analysing the past experience, the COC held that the general line of the party was correct. It once again clarified the line accepted by the Party Congress and set before the party four immediate tasks with the aim of snatching power by the people under the leadership of the working class. This, in brief is the essence of the statement. The statement has a limited purpose and is confined only to the aspects mentioned above. Therefore, the statement has no analysis of the victories achieved or reverses suffered by the party during the past six years nor does it contain any self-criticism regarding the usefulness or otherwise of different forms of struggle. These issues were out of the scope of the statement. The COC decided to prepare soon a detailed report on self-criticism to be presented to party members for discussion. The present document limits itself to the aim of mobilising the party on the line accepted until the death of Comrade Charu Mazumdar.

ANNIHILATION

Why then, is there no mention of annihilation of class enemies in the statement? The question is natural because during the last five or six years annihilation of class enemies remained the main form of struggle and a major aspect. In view of the present ideological confusion it would not be surprising if this lack of mention is

exploited to make contradictory interpretations. In fact, the COC in the present statement reiterated only the main revolutionary line. There is no specific mention of various forms of struggle. Similarly, there is no mention of annihilation of class enemies. The COC thinks that no form of struggle which helps the armed peasant revolution to some extent or other and enjoys people's confidence should be rejected. The COC holds that such forms of struggle should be mobilised and led by the Party.

It was during the lifetime of Comrade Charu Mazumdar that the long neglect of partial forms of struggle which enjoyed people's confidence was accepted as a mistake. This was also mentioned in his last article. While condemning the views of some revisionists that armed struggles should start only when the people were steered through economic struggles, the party, for a long time, held the wrong view that all economic struggles were revisionist and hence the party neither supported nor participated in such struggles. Comrade Charu Mazumdar referred to this aspect in his last article. Therefore, the COC made a reference to this aspect and it was included in the third task. Specific reference to this aspect was made only because the party had neglected it for a long time. This does not mean that all other forms of struggle are given up, or their importance undermined. For example, there is no mention in the statement of "snatching of arms" which had assumed a form of widespread struggle in West Bengal. The lack of reference to this form of struggle does not mean that it has been given up by the party altogether. Similarly it is also meaningless to say that the party has given up annihilation of class enemies during the long and protracted civil war and developed stage of class war as well. In this regard I consider it my duty to say that any other interpretation of the statement would be nothing but wishful thinking on the part of people with different motivations. The essence of the COC statement is that the party should take up all other forms of struggle along with economic struggles that might arise in future. Such struggles should be taken up on the basis of their usefulness, as far as possible, in further strengthening the peasant revolutionary bases in the country to further strengthen armed struggle.

Then the question arises whether the party correctly assessed the peculiarities and usefulness or otherwise of the forms of struggle followed by the party during the last six years. Has the party developed the necessary competence to take up such forms of struggle? Did the party commit any mistake? If so what were these mistakes and what was the ideological weakness which led to such mistakes? Such questions arise while analysing the past experiences. These issues will be taken up in the report on self-criticism. It will be incorrect to strive for different interpretations of issues which have not been raised in the statement.

THIRD TASK

Some doubts have been expressed about the third task which says the party should assume leadership of mass organisations through participating in all struggles. We had neglected mass organisations as well as economic struggles until the last article of Comrade Charu Mazumdar was published. Such neglect was strong among the Party members. It is not surprising if such attitude persists even today, and

therefore, the doubts expressed are natural. Since almost all organizations in our country are under the leadership of either revisionists or reactionaries, we had been under the impression that mass organizations would only remain as they were, and instead of helping would become hurdles in the path of revolution. As a substitute we resolved to organise tile masses in every village by forming revolutionary councils as the main forms to organize the people, we forget the need to continue other organizational forms simultaneously. Actually, revolutionary councils were formed only in those areas where struggle had reached higher stages. Since we failed to recognise the fact that a strong enemy could not be defeated by disorganised masses, we failed to achieve our objective even when such committees were formed. In fact in different places, such committees remained only for name's sake. While repeating superficially the principle that forms of organisation and struggle are evolved by the people themselves, we mostly followed the forms which suited us, without taking into consideration their implications. Organisations which are tools in the hands of the Government cannot help the revolution. Similarly our past experience shows that mass organizations, imposed from above without taking into consideration the preparedness of the masses, only remain on paper and prove to be ineffective.

Therefore, along with the formation of revolutionary councils with the understanding that they are the main form of organization, other forms of organization, should also be taken up according to the preparedness of the masses. Some of these organizations may exist for a long period while others may be useful for the time being depending on the nature of the problems. For example, student unions and trade unions exist for longer periods while committees formed to lead the struggle on the food problem against price rise exist for a shorter period. It is to be understood that through such struggles people develop their consciousness and realise that they will have to fight for their rights. Through such struggles they also realise the need for organization. Only after this realisation, as Lenin said, such organizations can become powerful weapons in revolutionary struggles. As on all other issues, there is complete or total difference between revisionists and revolutionaries regarding the formation of mass organization. Revisionists give importance to content. That is why revisionists need pocket organizations. For revolutionaries even a small issue is important enough to organize people and lead their revolutionary consciousness a step ahead. That is why they make use of every form of struggle in accordance with the preparedness of the people. At a time when this Government is practising fascist policies, it would be an illusion to believe that mass organization can always function smoothly. With the sharpening of struggles between the people and the Government it will be inevitable for mass organizations to exist only secretly. In practice they gradually take the form of revolutionary committees. Considering the above aspects, the COC holds that organizing of the masses should be given due importance and depending on the situation any form of organization may be taken up.

On the question of leading the people, there is no difference between leading mass organizations and leading the people. No revolution will succeed without the leadership of the vanguard of the proletariat, the communist party. This is the main

point in our political resolution. Therefore it would be wrong to say that assuming the leadership of mass organizations would be incorrect.

There is another view which says that working in mass organizations would expose the party organization. This is very much true. But it is not concerning the organization only. This problem confronts whenever we try to combine legal work with illegal work. Then, what is the solution? The solution lies not in abandoning the task of organising the masses but in acquiring efficiency in organization. There is no other way than to follow the line of organizing the masses without exposing the organization. Such a line should be evolved by ourselves through practice.

It is hoped that comrades will understand the COC statement in the light of this explanation, and will take up the tasks given in the statement in a Bolshevik spirit