

## 'THE MAIN DANGER'

ARUN GOSWAMI

Mr Jana has made helpful observations about class struggle. But his remarks about the 'guerilla actions' conducted by the CPI(ML) are one-sided. Although the collective activities of a class are of greater importance, the individual

activities also constitute a part of the entire class struggle. Workers unnecessarily move to and fro to reduce working time ; land labourers slow down work in the absence of land-owners ; debtors play many tricks with usurers. There are many such examples. All these are done individually. Yet these are nothing but class struggle against exploitation. Undoubtedly, class struggle gains proper momentum when the individual activities are organised into collective activities of the class to the proper degree. It may also be mentioned that at a point when class struggle takes a qualitative leap instead of gradual quantitative transformation, only a handful of individuals actively participate at the very initial stages. Charu Majumdar never asked for the entire affair of 'action' to be kept a secret. He instructed that propaganda should be launched among the peasants in favour of 'action', one should be familiar with their opinions ; but he wanted to keep the actual programme a secret because the enemy was tactically strong. The aims of actions should be well explained to the people and they should be organised up to a degree required for the initiation of struggle and for facing immediate consequences. To demand organisation up to the highest degree before 'action' is mechanical, because only through protracted guerilla warfare can the people be organised strong enough to win final victory. It is also childish to demand that the programme of action should be known to all beforehand. That denies the very conception of 'guerilla' war.

Whether the 'secret assassinations' are justified or not is not a matter to be worked out without any knowledge of the concrete conditions. If these are executed to carry forward the main class struggle of the peasantry and are matched with the level of consciousness of the people involved, then they are justified ; otherwise not. The line of killing of the jotedars produced some bad effects only because it was taken as the central form, and not as a part of the entire class struggle.

There is a lot being said about mass organisations and mass-movements. But how to translate these principles into work ?

How can a party which is carrying on armed activities against the Government and whose members and cadres are being killed or jailed if exposed, combine open and legal activities with its basic illegal activities? This problem, I think, is yet to be solved and Pravat Babu sheds no light on it. At the time of Naxalbari white terror was not so fierce. In those days it was possible even to maintain an almost legal organisation like the CCCR which, in essence, was the party. Now the picture is different. So while criticising the CPI(ML)'s policy regarding mass line, one must state how to combine open, legal and mass activities (in an area which is not liberated, i.e. under white repression) with illegal and vanguard activities. Otherwise, it will lead us straight to economism and legalism. Armed struggle will be opposed in the name of maintaining open fronts. Any armed revolt against the present regime will be termed as the acts of "agents provocateur" to suppress "movements for democratic rights etc." There is yet another possibility. Underground cadres may be exposed to the enemy in the name of performing open activities. May I request Pravat Babu to say something about the actual procedure by which the illegal party, CPI(ML), can take part in mass organisations, mass movements, and lead them?

Another thing. The CPI(ML) never said that no mass movement is possible before the formation of red areas. What they said was that through the vast mass movements of the past the Indian people have been educated to a degree from where the only logical conclusion of mass struggle is guerilla war. So now the task of revolutionaries is to develop guerilla war and there is no need to repeat the lower forms of struggles. That new form of class struggle i.e. guerilla war, will draw a few people at first. But through gradual advance, broad sections of the people will gather around it and only then there is need to conduct mass movements again. One may or may not agree with this view. But it is not honest to distort a party's views.

Mr Jana does not agree with Mr Baburaj that the reason

for the setback is the mistakes not of the party line, but of the party cadres. It is doubtful whether a total setback throughout the country can result only from the mistakes of the cadres. But it is equally doubtful whether a party can be made so rigid that the cadres can translate its central directives into work absolutely without any distortion. The central authority usually maintains its contacts with low levels through intermediate chain which, in the case of an underground party in a vast country like India, is very long. So, distortions are bound to occur as a natural law. There may be even political swindlers in intermediate positions who distort the party's directives willingly and submit false reports to the centre. A party requires some time to recover from these difficulties. Not to realise this is idealism. Even in a strong party like the CPC, Liu Shao Chi and other swindlers did great harm to the party and the people in the name of the party before they were kicked out. What, according to Mr Jana, should be the view of a revolutionary about these? Should he hate Liu & Co. for the misdeeds, or should he blame Chairman Mao for his 'overall responsibility'? Whether there are mistakes committed by the central leadership of the CPI (ML) is another question. But how can one rule out the possibility that there may be evils and errors committed at intermediate and lower levels even if the central line is absolutely correct?

*August 11, 1973*