

## Fight Against Revisionism

[Following is the English version of a Party Letter addressed by the Andhra State Committee of the CPI(M-L) to all Comrades in Andhra. In this important document the Andhra State Committee sums up the experience of the armed peasant struggle in that State for the last three years, analyses the causes of the setback, firmly upholds Comrade Charu Mazumdar's revolutionary line and issues a call for fighting revisionism within the Party and outside].

After severe setbacks, our Party in Andhra is moving ahead with firm confidence in the victory of our struggle, disappointing the expectations of the enemy.

The state-wide revolutionary struggle during the past three years is significant for its victories as well as a matter of sadness for the setbacks.

Our losses can be summed up in a word. In Andhra we lost almost the entire leadership of the Party. It is common in the history of revolutionary struggles that

whenever there are serious setbacks, ideological confusion sets in, giving birth to doubts regarding the Party's general line and its tactics.

Such is the situation the Party is facing today in our state and throughout the country.

In our state, the ideological confusion, besides the loss of leadership, has become a big obstacle to the advancement of our revolutionary struggle.

Unless we successfully overcome this ideological confusion (that is, unless we achieve ideological unification in the Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought), we can neither find out the real causes of our past setbacks nor carry forward the struggle with correct understanding. Concerning our mistakes both in theory and in practice in the course of our struggle for the last three years and our mistakes in understanding which persist even today, it is necessary to come to clear-cut decisions on the basis of resolutions adopted in our Party Congress, so as to play successfully our proper rôle in the Indian revolution which is a part of world revolution.

Only then can we overcome the present ideological confusion that has become an obstacle to our revolutionary practice. Only then can our struggle advance irresistibly.

With this aim in view the Andhra State Committee is addressing this Party letter to all comrades in Andhra.

It is our Party that waged a real struggle against revisionism that has its roots deep in the communist movement of the past three decades. The Naxalbari struggle which is the harbinger of the consciously-led revolutionary armed struggle in India dealt a very powerful blow at revisionism in India. The truth that should never be forgotten is that from the time of the Naxalbari struggle to the present day, the history of the communist Party (M-L) is the history of struggle between various forms of revisionism on the one hand and Mao Tsetung Thought on the other. This has

been the history of the Party in the past and the present and will continue to be so in the future.

In a semi-colonial and semi-feudal backward country like India, where small commodity economy is predominant, the necessary material basis is there for the repeated rise of revisionism in the course of our struggle for a very long time. Our struggle can advance towards victory only when we are also able to fight battles in future against new forms of revisionism. This is the first lesson we have to learn from the history of the world revolutionary movement.

### REVISIONIST LINE

Following are the arguments that have arisen out of the ideological confusion, nourished under the influence of the severe setbacks suffered during our three year-old struggle :

- 1) We took the enemy lightly not only strategically but also tactically. This resulted in severe setbacks.
- 2) Though our understanding was correct to a certain extent, we suffered setbacks because of the centre's line of adventurism.
- 3) Because of the wrong policy of annihilating all class enemies and because we failed to exploit the contradictions among the class enemies, we suffered many losses.
- 4) As we did not consider the fact that a section of landlords would certainly join the democratic revolution, we resorted to an adventurist line in practice and courted setbacks.
- 5) Squad actions are not permissible. We can annihilate the class enemy or confiscate his property only when there is people's participation. We suffered setbacks because of our squad actions.
- 6) As we did not wage economic struggles in the past in certain areas, the people did not participate in the actions in those areas. In those areas we must train the people for revolution through economic struggles. We suffered

✓ setbacks because we started our armed struggle by relying on guerrilla squads.

7) It was wrong to start armed struggle in the plain areas as the people were not prepared to participate in the actions. Hence we suffered setbacks.

8) It is wrong to launch armed struggle before securing modern weapons. We suffered setbacks because of a paucity of weapons.

9) As we faced setbacks in Srikakulam, it is better to move one step backward and start mobilising people through economic struggles.

✓ It is not correct to think that only a few of our comrades are entertaining such ideas. These ideas are prevalent in the Party from top to bottom, of course, in different degrees and in different shades.

If we arrange all these ideas into a comprehensive thought, we can arrive at the following conclusions regarding our liberation struggle :

✓ "Through economic struggles, people get the necessary primary consciousness for waging armed struggle. The direct participation of the people in a considerable number is a correct indication that the people have acquired such primary consciousness for carrying on armed struggle. We must launch armed struggle only when people are ready to participate directly in the armed struggle. In the absence of such people's participation, we must concentrate on mobilising the people through economic struggles with the aim of giving them primary consciousness to wage armed struggle. After launching armed struggle we have to annihilate only the wicked class enemies. Regarding other class enemies we can teach them revolutionary politics and leave them off. A section of the landlord class either joins the democratic revolution or supports us indirectly. We must secure modern weapons before launching such armed

(Continued on page 177)

(Continued from page 128)

struggle. It is impossible to launch armed struggle without securing a minimum number of modern weapons. We must give preference to terrain along with weapons. It is not possible to wage guerrilla struggle in the plains. We must select a convenient terrain of mountains and forests and systematically work to launch guerrilla actions in these areas. As the guerrilla struggle advances and as we gain initiative, then alone we can extend our struggle first to the plains and then to towns. Until we reach that stage we cannot fight in the plains or in the towns, for such fighting can provoke the enemy. Self-defence is important. If we can save the revolution from the attacks of the enemy, the future is definitely ours".

No doubt, this understanding is another variant of the wrong understanding advocated by the Nagi Reddy clique in Andhra for the last three years. This understanding runs quite contrary to the policies advocated by our Central Committee from the very beginning. From the beginning we opposed this wrong understanding and broke away from the Nagi Reddy clique, which is a revisionist clique parading its revisionist counter-revolutionary ideas under the guise of Chairman Mao's Thought.

### REVOLUTIONARY LINE

Let us consider the understanding of our party in regard to our liberation struggle. It can be summed up briefly as follows:

"We are living in a glorious era—the era of the total collapse of imperialism and its lackeys and the world-wide final victory of socialism. This decade is a decade of liberation. Victory is not far off. The revolutionary situation is excellent throughout the country. The Indian revolutionaries must be prepared to make daring sacrifices to play their key-role in the world revolution that is advancing

by leaps and bounds and delivering death-blows to imperialism. It is suicidal to think that self-defence is important.

When the imperialist monster is being attacked by the revolutionaries of different countries—one attacking the head, the other feet and so on—the Indian revolutionaries have to play their part successfully. It is our immediate revolutionary task to mobilise and prepare the exploited of our country to make boundless sacrifices. It is an illusion to think that economic struggle gives people necessary primary consciousness to wage armed struggle. This understanding is the royal road to revisionism. It is also suicidal to think that the direct participation of people in the armed struggle

is an indication of the revolutionary situation in a country. This is another wicked weapon in the hands of revisionists to injure revolution. The direct participation of people in the struggle is an indication of spontaneity among the people and not a sign of revolutionary consciousness. It is our revolutionary task to create consciousness among the people—to help them understand that without the people's army the people have nothing—and it is our revolutionary task to build the Red Army. It is only through guerrilla warfare that we can mobilise the people and develop their initiative. We must discard all methods that encourage open battles against the enemy. We must adopt guerrilla tactics. From mobilising people to fighting the enemy—we must employ guerrilla tactics.

People's armies were found in different countries in different ways and in different historical conditions. The urgent problem before Indian revolution is not the problem of what military tactics to be adopted in the revolutionary war with an already found Red Army. Our problem is the problem of building the Red Army from grass roots. The immediate revolutionary task is to rely honestly and completely on workers, poor and landless peasants, mould their inherent class hatred to the revolutionary purpose, develop their

initiative, advance the class struggle to the highest stage and build the Red Army with the militants coming from the struggle.

The battle of annihilation of class enemies, the political line formulated by Comrade Charu Mazumdar, is the successful practical method of fulfilling this revolutionary task of building the Red Army. This method is creatively developed from Indian revolutionary practice to solve the problem of building the Red Army.

There are two aspects of the battle of annihilation. The first aspect is that it is the higher stage of class struggle that prepares the people to take revenge on the class enemy. The second aspect is that it creates red terror that forces the class enemy to flee from the villages and paves the way for the seizure of political power by the basic classes under the leadership of the Communist Party. We can build the Red Army quickly and efficiently only when we implement this policy with the death-defying spirit of sacrifice. This is the only guarantee for the victory of Indian revolution. If we forget the second aspect of the battle of annihilation, then we invariably land on economism. As a matter of fact this was what happened in Andhra.

In the era when we are leading our revolution, when world reaction is afraid of the people of the world, we need not follow from A to Z all the methods adopted by the Chinese comrades in 1936 in building liberated areas. The revolutionary situation is excellent throughout India. Throughout the world the revolutionary forces are advancing victoriously. There is the leadership of Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party—the guarantee for the victory of world revolution. It is possible to build many liberated areas in different parts of our country. By waging the battle of annihilation in vast areas in a big way, we can pave the way for the building of the Red Army and liberated areas. In the course of our advance,

history will place before us the problem of the definite location of liberated areas. It is suicidal to think of concentrating all our forces in a 'convenient terrain, waiting for the glorious future'.

The battle of annihilation can be successful only when we rely completely on poor and landless peasants. Squads should be formed of basic classes. The petty bourgeois comrades must work only as political commissars. All problems concerning the battle of annihilation are to be decided by the members of the squads in a democratic way. The problems such as the targets of annihilation and the practical problems concerning it are to be left to the squad members. The Party need not interfere unless the squads go against the aims of our revolution.

In brief this is the view of our Party on the practical implementation of our immediate tasks.

Comrades! Now it is clear that there are two understandings on the question of the war of liberation—one opposing the other.

While economism is the basis of one understanding, Marxism is the basis of another. While new-type revisionism under the mask of Chairman Mao's Thought is the basis of one understanding, the creative application of Mao's thought to the concrete conditions of India is the basis of the other. The first understanding damages the cause of revolution by throwing the revolutionary situation into the cess-pool of revisionism; the second understanding demands the spirit of sacrifice to build the Red Army and liberated areas by developing and extending the battle of annihilation basing firmly on the excellent revolutionary situation in the country. The first understanding is the last breath of revisionism on its death-bed, the second understanding is the living expression of Mao's thought.

Hence our comrades must firmly fight against revisionism of the first understanding. We must sweep away

all such counter-revolutionary trash from our understanding. Revisionism under the guise of Chairman Mao's thought is more dangerous because it can create considerable confusion among the revolutionary ranks. Hence our conference has correctly defined this type of revisionism as the last reserve of imperialism.

We can go ahead only by defeating this new-type revisionism.

#### Revisionist understanding is the only cause of our setbacks

Let us consider in detail "certain causes" advanced by some of our comrades for our setbacks in the struggle. The essence of their arguments (as already explained) is that we suffered because of left adventurism.

Some comrades say that "our understanding is correct in general. But we suffered setbacks because of the left adventurist directives imposed on us by the Central Committee or Comrade Charu Mazumdar. The State Committee firmly maintains that this view is not correct. It is necessary to understand that remnants of revisionism have been rampant in our understanding and practice right from the beginning of the Srikakulam struggle to the present day. To be more clear, in the past as well as in the present, it is not the understanding of Comrade Charu Mazumdar that was implemented. As a matter of fact something that was contrary to his understanding was implemented. In the name of Comrade Charu Mazumdar's understanding something different or alien to it was implemented in the past as well as in the present. Unless we understand this naked truth clearly, we cannot find out the real causes for our failures and there is the danger of landing on economism, confinement of armed struggle to forests and thereby damaging the cause of revolution—all in the name of "leading the struggle across smooth waters with no more losses in future". This self-complacent attitude cannot help us to understand the depths of revisionism.

To understand the above argument, it is necessary to understand the significance of the Srikakulam struggle.

The flames of the Naxalbari peasant armed struggle led by Comrade Charu Mazumdar set ablaze Srikakulam. Led by the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) the Srikakulam peasant struggle reached a new stage of guerrilla warfare, higher than the Naxalbari struggle, and has become an example and source of inspiration to the other parts of the country. The flames of the Srikakulam guerrilla struggle spread to all parts of Andhra and many other parts of the country. Guerrilla struggle reached a new stage in Bihar and Bengal. Our Bengal comrades have taken the struggle to the next stage of laying the foundation for the building of the Red army. The first People's Army in the history of Indian revolution is fighting valiantly against reactionary Indian troops and police in West Bengal.

For the past three years, by carrying on armed struggle in various parts of the country, we delivered powerful blows at age-old revisionism. We created an atmosphere of armed struggle throughout the country. Everyone in this country is discussing our armed struggle. Everyone is deciding what should be his attitude towards revolution. In a big way Mao Tsetung Thought has reached the exploited people and petty bourgeois intellectuals with low incomes. At least in some states we have created guerrilla areas. At least in one state we have laid the foundation of the Red Army. Thus we have advanced farther on the road to the protracted armed peasant revolution.

This in brief is the influence of the Srikakulam struggle on the Indian Revolution.

The achievements of our struggle for the past three years are not ordinary. It is no exaggeration to say that our struggle has written a new chapter in the history of the Indian revolution.

This is only one aspect of the Srikakulam struggle. As revolutionaries we have to consider also the other aspect of the Srikakulam struggle. Why did our squads fail to snatch fire-arms from the enemy in time? Why did we not seriously attempt to build the Red Army? Why did we not organize small squads and extend our activity to vast areas as the concentration of the enemy increased? Why did we fail to create red terror in the vast rural areas of Andhra making it impossible for the landlords to lead their lives peacefully and why did we fail to pave the way for the seizure of political power by poor and landless peasants? All these questions point to the second aspect of the Srikakulam struggle. All these questions have arisen not out of utopian thinking but in the course of the actual development of the struggle. They have emerged as urgent tasks before us. These problems are to be solved for the further development of our struggle. All these problems indicate our failure in the Srikakulam struggle. As we failed in solving these problems, the struggle failed to reach a higher stage. As a result of this failure, we lost initiative, suffered from many limitations and were exposed to many defeats. From the revolutionary point of view, the above are the real causes of our "setbacks in Srikakulam" and of "our temporary retreat in Srikakulam". Free from such deviations, Bengal comrades under the direct leadership of Comrade Charu Mazumdar opened a new chapter in the history of the Indian Revolution.

While the Naxalbari struggle convinced the people of India that protracted armed struggle is the only way for the liberation of India, it is Srikakulam that discarded open battles and laid the basis for guerrilla struggle. It is West Bengal that went one step forward, snatched rifles from the enemy and built the Red Army.

Unfortunately, those comrades who maintain that the setbacks are due to left-adventurism mention different causes for our failure. According to them, the arrest of

many comrades and the death of many comrades are the causes of our setback. According to them, we would certainly have courted much more loss if we persisted in following the same adventurist line. Hence they come to the wrong conclusion that we suffered because "we belittled the enemy tactically and pursued an adventurist line". So they came to the counter-revolutionary conclusion that "we must retreat a step backward and mobilize people on economic issues". The sixteen page-pamphlet distributed in the name of the Srikakulam District Committee of the Party is nothing but the expression of such suicidal understanding. The State Committee unequivocally repudiates this sixteen-page pamphlet. It congratulates those comrades who fought against this pamphlet throughout the state. The Committee thinks that all this counter-revolutionary thinking is the climax of the revisionist thinking prevalent among us.

The State Committee firmly maintains that we can advance the cause of revolution only by discarding wrong thinking and by carrying on the battle of annihilation on a wide scale relying firmly on the landless and poor peasants. Revisionism among us is not an accident; the seeds of revisionism have been there in our understanding from the beginning of the Srikakulam struggle

Though it is our Party that waged real struggle against revisionism that developed during the past thirty years, it is nevertheless a fact that revisionist remnants are haunting us. We played a praiseworthy role in fighting against the Nagi Reddy clique and demarcating ourselves from them. Yet on many issues our practice is within the orbit of Nagi Reddy politics.

Even though we—Andhra comrades—have the firm belief that we can establish a Peoples' democratic State under the guidance of Chairman Mao's Thought through protracted struggle by liberating villages first and encircling

and liberating cities later, still we have fantastic ideas on many issues. Our thinking is opposed to Chairman Mao's Thought in matters of revolutionary practice and in creatively applying the principles of protracted struggle to the concrete conditions of our country. Even though we find stray incidents of adventurism here and there, the remnants of revisionism have been predominant in our practice for the past three years. This revisionist understanding has become an obstacle to the progress of the Srikakulam struggle.

Though we demarcated ourselves organizationally from the Nagi Reddy clique, we failed to expose its politics clearly because of remnants of revisionism within us. We have sufficiently exposed them in matters such as their refusal to lead the Srikakulam struggle and their refusal at least to support the struggle. But we failed to hate economism, the basis of their politics. We did not effectively explain to our Party members that economism is counter-revolutionary. Rather, when our struggle was in full swing, we issued a circular named "Extend our Struggle to New Areas", which is another variation of economism under the mask of a call for armed revolutionary struggle. Though this circular did not come to lime-light because of the staunch resistance of fighting comrades, the same understanding dominated the leadership throughout. Because of the continuation of this wrong understanding, we faced setbacks and on facing setbacks, a call was given in the name of the Srikakulam District Committee once again: "Mobilize people on economic issues!"

There is general agreement in respect of what Chairman Mao said: "WITHOUT A PEOPLE'S ARMY THE PEOPLE HAVE NOTHING". But at first we had no clear understanding on the question of how to build the Red Army and liberated areas in the present Indian conditions. Rather, we had many utopian ideas. Though we

By this time Charn Babu had dropped of claim enemies as a tactic

demarcated ourselves from Nagi Reddy, we still had faith in spontaneity. We had no clear understanding of the cause of development of the movement and failed to have initiative at every critical turn of the movement. We suffered from the wrong understanding that hills and forests were enough for building liberated areas. We also suffered from the utopian notion that a liberated zone would be created at a point from where revolutionary activity extended. That is the reason why—and no other reason can be attributed—we have sent many comrades from the plains to Srikakulam. It is one thing to send comrades from other areas to Srikakulam only after assessing the number of comrades required and the qualities necessary for them to meet the revolutionary demands of Srikakulam, the heart of the revolutionary struggle of our state and it is another thing to send all and sundry who express their mere enthusiasm to participate in the struggle. We concentrated all available comrades in one area because the leadership suffered from the utopian idea that a liberated area could be created in the near future. Hence we failed to mobilize and organize revolutionaries effectively throughout the state to lay the foundation for building many liberated areas by creating red terror throughout the state and by creating adverse conditions for landlords to continue to live in the villages, by paving the way for building the Red Army and seizing political power. Let us consider the struggle we waged in the plain areas. Even after taking the decision to launch struggle in the plain areas, we did not, in practice, attach importance to the instructions of Comrade Charu Mazumdar. As a matter of fact, we continued to follow something contrary to his instructions. We mobilized a big number in each actions. (In many actions in plain areas the number of squad members varied between 25 and 75). We did not organize small squads. The life and the activity of the squad was placed under the direct

supervision of the Regional Committees that curbed the initiative of the squads. The leadership at different levels advocated the limited aim of annihilating only wicked enemies instead of carrying the battle of annihilation to terrorise the landlord class in a big way. In all these matters we went against the instructions of the central leadership. We did annihilate class enemies in the plain areas. But the point is that we carried out such actions with a wrong political and a wrong organizational understanding that imposed on us so many limitations.

Comrades! Annihilating the enemy alone is not the sufficient sign of revolutionary activity. We have to build the Red Army. People must seize political power at the local level. The annihilation programme is revolutionary only when it is carried out with the aim of laying the basis for establishing liberated areas. Otherwise, the annihilation programme becomes another form of economism. Hence Comrade Charu Mazumdar criticised Andhra Comrades that in practice they implemented one aspect of the annihilation programme and did not realize the proper significance of the second aspect of the programme.

Comrade Charu Mazumdar defined the battle of annihilation of the class enemy as "the higher stage of class struggle and the beginning of guerrilla warfare". If we confine the struggle to the first aspect of annihilation programme—whatever our intentions may be—we slip into the mire of economism. Only when we successfully coordinate the two aspects of the annihilation programme, then only we can build the Red army, seize political power and lay the basis for the building of liberated areas. Then only the annihilation programme helps the advance of revolution.

It is clear now that we suffered setbacks in the plain areas because of our revisionist understanding. But some comrades argue that "it is impossible to conduct guerrilla

struggle in the plain areas". Some others argue that "squad actions without the participation of the people are adventurism". As it is not easy now to say that it is impossible to fight in the plains while the Red army is being formed in the plains of West Bengal before our very eyes, some comrades raise some other objections regarding our struggle in the plains. They say that it is impossible to carry on struggle without modern weapons and that "we can carry on struggle in the plain areas only by depending on the forests nearby" and that "it leads to losses if we fight in the plains without close links with the forest areas". This is a new variation of the old theory that it is not possible to fight in the plain areas.

As we were not clear about the aims of our struggle in the plain areas, we followed wrong method of struggle. We did not rely completely on the basic classes. These are the causes of our failure to extend our struggle to the plain areas and of the loss of leadership at all levels.

Let us consider the question of the role of different classes in our revolution. This is a question of strategy. Chairman Mao teaches us: "WHO ARE OUR ENEMIES? WHO ARE OUR FRIENDS? THIS IS A QUESTION OF THE FIRST IMPORTANCE FOR THE REVOLUTION"; Ours is the New Democratic Revolution. Agrarian Revolution is the axis of New Democratic Revolution. Under the leadership of the working class and basing itself on the firm unity of the working class and the peasantry the united front is formed of the working class, the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. This united front seizes political power by fighting against the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudal class. Though there is general argument as regards the role of the rich peasants (a section of them will come over to us and most others will remain neutral while a tiny section may join the enemy camp) as the struggle advances, a discussion is going on in the Party

about the role of the rich peasant in the initial stages of the struggle. In the backward countries like India, the rich peasant also carries on feudal exploitation. So in the initial stages of the revolution, before our revolutionary forces assume a dominant position, the rich peasant opposes the revolution. So it is argued that we can win over middle peasants only by waging sharp political struggle against the rich peasant. But it will be wrong to think that a section of the landlords will either support our revolution or remain neutral. Unfortunately, our state leadership entertained such ideas. It is not accidental that the leadership declared in a pamphlet, "A section of landlords will join the Democratic Revolution and no force on earth can prevent them from joining our revolution". It is the reflection of our wrong understanding regarding the role of different classes in our revolution. As a result of this understanding strange slogans such as "Safely leave off some landlords after teaching them our politics" and "Exploit the contradictions among the landlords" raised their ugly heads. Is it not a fact that this attitude causes harm to our struggle to create red terror in the villages and liberate the villages from the landlords?

Though we repeatedly chanted the resolutions of the Party Congress, in practice the leadership including comrades at different levels in the Party suffered from this wrong understanding, which was at the root of many revisionist errors made in the course of our struggle.

The hegemony of the proletariat is another important aspect of the question of the role of different classes in the revolution. Great Lenin successfully buried the corpse of the Second Communist International's disruptive stand that "the proletariat need not be the leaders of the democratic revolution" and that "it is not the political task of the proletariat to be the leaders of the democratic revolution". Yet, during the period of modern revisionism, the prole-

tarian hegemony was negated in practice even though it was upheld in words. It so happened also in our country.

Revisionism weakens proletarian dictatorship where we are in power and negates Proletarian hegemony where we are still in the struggle.

In the past thirty years of revisionist practice we led many peasant struggles. In many villages the Communist Party became a "considerable force" and a "majority Party". We gave pet names to those villages as "red villages". But as class struggle intensified, the hollowness of these "red villages" and "majority parties" was exposed. They collapsed like houses of cards. Why? Those "red villages" were not born of class struggle. They were the products of the policy of class-collaboration. The united front under the leadership of the working class with basic classes as chief allies and with the aim of accomplishing agrarian revolution is not the basis of those "red villages". They are the "red villages" under the leadership of landlords on the basis of class collaboration with the aim of preserving feudal exploitation—all in the name of the Communist Party. This is the result of modern revisionism. From top to bottom, at all levels, landlords became the leaders of the Communist Party. It is not accidental. It is the result of modern revisionism.

Then, what is our position after discarding revisionism? We are not cured of this disease. Even today our Party is dominated by the petty bourgeoisie. Our cadres are predominantly petty bourgeois. Even today the villages of poor and landless peasants are not the centres of our activity. Leadership is not from the basic classes. In the villages we still take shelters in the petty bourgeois and rich peasant houses and enquire whether any poor peasant is prepared "to co-operate" with us. Still we do not have such strong and living contacts with the basic classes that we can take shelter in the huts of poor peasants and enquire

whether any petty bourgeois is ready to co-operate with us. This is our fundamental weakness. We can overcome this weakness by intensifying the programme of annihilation of the class enemies. By this alone we can develop the fighting initiative of the basic classes. We can mobilize militants who participated in these actions, give them political consciousness and promote them to leadership. In this way we can lay strong foundations for building up the struggle. Revisionism within us has become an obstacle even in practising proletarian hegemony. Recently a strong argument was put forward that "we have to wait for a long time—for years—to organize squads based on poor and landless peasants". It is unrealistic to think in the context of the nature of the present revolutionary era that one has to wait for a long time to win over the basic classes. Moreover, it is better for those comrades to realize that there are no short-cuts for the victory of revolution.

Let us consider the question of Party organization. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that once a correct political policy is decided upon, it is the strength of the Party organisation that decides the victory of our class struggle. Great Lenin denounced the Second Communist International that negated the necessity of a disciplined Party organized on the principle of democratic centralism. But in the period of modern revisionism the leading role of the Communist Party is minimized. In the past three years we also suffered from revisionist practice in the matter of Party organization. For example, many comrades were sent to Srikakulam from plain areas. But the Party had no control on the arrival and sudden departure of those comrades. The Party had no assessment regarding the nature and amount of help needed by Srikakulam from the outside and it did not have clear ideas about what sort of cadres could exactly meet the demands of the Srikakulam struggle. The principle was: "Those who can come to

Srikakulam, let them come. Those who want to leave Srikakulam, let them leave. The movement loses nothing as a result of this coming in and going out". This thinking shows spontaneity in organizational matters. It shows our failure to recognize the necessity of planning and foresight. As a result, we trailed behind the events. In practice, we suffered from this sort of spontaneity.

In the course of struggle, there arose contradictions between the local comrades and comrades from other areas. There arose contradictions between the Party leadership and the leadership of the agency area, which is the heart of our movement. It resulted in the worst type of factionalism that did great harm to the Party. We also faced many organizational problems in the course of the movement. But the leadership relied on spontaneity. It did not try to mould the situation. We minimized the subjective factor—the role of the Party—and suffered from the un-Marxist understanding that if objective conditions were favourable, these were enough for the revolution to succeed. The same understanding could be noticed in the formation and functioning of the State Committee. The State Committee did not become the real Committee with grip on the total movement. Sufficient attempt was not made to make it a real Committee. No doubt, it takes some time for a Committee to develop into a real Committee. Here the problem is not the problem of time, it is the problem of correct understanding. In practice the State Committee became a general body and the Srikakulam District Committee became the real State Committee. For example, the members of the State Committee did not know of the contradictions within the leadership of Srikakulam, even though the news of these differences were appearing in the bourgeois papers in a big way. The causes for this sad state of affairs in Party organisation cannot be simply attributed to one or two individuals. This will

not help us to learn correct lessons. The main reason for this state of affairs is our revisionist understanding that refuses to recognize that the subjective factor (a disciplined party), besides the objective conditions, is essential for the victory of revolution. It is clear that remnants of revisionist understanding, that are prevalent in our Party from top to bottom, at different levels and in different degrees, are the main cause of our setbacks and not left adventurism, as some comrades are advocating.

To sum up, the following are the concrete manifestations of revisionism both in our theory and in our practice:

The idea that it is not possible to fight in the plain areas, our failure to organize small squads by conspiratorial methods, our failure to mobilize in large numbers poor and landless peasants within the squads and make them the commanders of the squads, our hesitation to allot specific areas to squads and give democratic rights to them, our counter-revolutionary estimate that a section of landlords would join our revolution at a time when a call was to be given for creating red terror to make it impossible for the landlords to live in the villages, our attitude that only the wicked ones could be annihilated and other landlords should be left untouched after they were taught our politics, our economism in the circular "Extend the struggle to new areas", our failure to concentrate on the next stage of the movement—that of building the Red army and seizure of political power that lead to the creation of liberated areas, the role of the State Committee (except for the members from Srikakulam) as mere spectators and the Srikakulam District Committee turning out to be the real State Committee in practice, and our failure to solve in the interest of revolution the organizational problems which developed in the course of the struggle—these are the concrete manifestations of revisionism in our theory and practice, that were prevalent at all levels and in different degrees.

See  
p.  
185.

Even though the leadership stood in the forefront in fighting firmly against revisionism, we have not been free from the dirt of revisionism prevalent in our thinking for the last many years. We are not free from the influence of the traditions created by revisionism in matters of organization and methods of struggle. We have to wage a determined inner-Party struggle against these revisionist remnants and revisionist methods of work. Then alone we can advance the cause of revolution and successfully fulfil the historic tasks. In our inner-Party struggle against revisionism, we must not forget one important thing. It is a big mistake to think that a few individuals are responsible for this revisionist understanding that hindered our struggle. If we cannot understand the reality that this revisionist understanding is prevalent from top to bottom, at different levels and in different degrees, we cannot understand the necessity of the entire Party waging a determined inner-party struggle to purge revisionism. Moreover, it is an illusion to think that revisionism can be uprooted from the Party by taking action against a few individuals. The State Committee opposes all such thinking. It maintains that revisionism is a trend inherent in the whole Party and not with a few individuals in Andhra. The following extract from the "Resolution on certain questions in the History of our Party", adopted by the Enlarged Seventh Plenary Session of the Sixth Central Committee of the great Communist Party of China, will be helpful in understanding this problem and in conducting the inner-party struggle correctly: "The Enlarged Seventh Plenary Session points out that the struggles which the Party waged in the course of its history against Chen-Tu-hsiuism and Li-Li-sanism were absolutely necessary. The defect in these struggles was that they were not undertaken consciously as serious steps for correcting the petty-bourgeois ideology which existed on a serious scale in the Party; consequently they neither

clarified the ideological essence and roots of the errors thoroughly nor properly indicated the methods of correcting them, and so it was easy for these errors to recur. Moreover, undue stress was placed on personal responsibility in the belief that once an erring comrade was attacked, the problem was solved". The Enlarged Seventh Plenary Session pointed out: "The policy Comrade Mao Tsetung has adopted for the present rectification movement throughout the Party and for the study of Party history, namely, 'learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones and cure the sickness to save the patient', and achieve 'clarity in ideology and unity among comrades', is a model of the correct attitude for Marxist-Leninists in overcoming errors within the Party".

Comrades! We have noticed how for the past three years, revisionism, in different concrete manifestations, has become an obstacle to the development of our revolutionary struggle. Unless we fight against revisionism, we cannot go ahead.

There are five points which we should not forget in the course of our revolutionary practice. We must completely and solely rely upon poor and landless peasants. We must form guerrilla squads with poor and landless peasants. We must give democratic rights to those squads as regards all aspects of the battle of annihilation. In plain areas we should form small squads and carry out actions in the conspiratorial way as instructed by our respected leader Comrade Charu Mazumdar. We must carry onward the battle of annihilation throughout the State as far as possible, creating such red terror that will make it impossible for the landlords to live in the villages peacefully. Pay serious attention to these points, defeat revisionism and march onward!

*'Long live the Peasant Armed Struggle*

*Long live the C.P.I. (M-L)*

*A Long, long Life to Chairman Mao'*

—March, 1971