

## THE "MARXIST" LEADERSHIP IN ITS TRUE COLOURS

### SHAM CRITICS OF SOVIET REVISIONISM, BUT GENUINE ANTI-CHINA COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES

An Indian Communist

For once, after the 7th Congress held in Calcutta in 1964, this gang of despicable double-dealers have come out in their true colours as the most modern of revisionists amongst the whole lot. The Madurai Central Committee meeting held recently has adopted a draft on ideological controversies in the International Communist Movement and a resolution on Divergent views between the Marxist Party and the Communist Party of China on certain fundamental issues. An explanatory article on the above has appeared in the Onam special of the Malayalam Party organ *Deshabhimani* by the 'veteran' revisionist E. M. S. Namboodiripad. Sri Ranadive has, in the September 24 issue of the *People's Democracy*, come out with another lengthy article on India-China relations. All these four documents run into hundreds of printed pages and it is not my intention here to waste time on a detailed criticism of each one of them. For if I do so, I too will run the risk of being ignored by the bulk of party members as these documents themselves usually are.

### SHAM CRITICS OF MODERN REVISIONISM

One thing is very clear. The Communist Party of China has forced this gang to unmask themselves. But for the recent exposure by the C. P. C., these people heading the Indian Party would have continued to delude the ranks by their subtle pro-China posture. Look, what they say after the C. P. C. denounced them as revisionist

chieftains: "But there is no escape from this unpleasant reality and it would be grievously wrong on the part of our party either to gloss over these differences or to hush them up." Yes, far too long have you glossed over and hushed up things, gentlemen. Now the C. P. C. has made your escape impossible. Don't you try to be good boys by giving a clean certificate to the C. P. C. for their fight against modern revisionism headed by the Soviet leaders. Who wants your certificate now when the battle is virtually over? What were you, gentlemen, doing when the great life and death struggle for the mere survival of Marxism-Leninism was being waged on a world scale? At that crucial period one of you was undergoing free treatment at the citadel of Revisionism and in the bargain making secret deals with the Soviet chieftains in an effort to unite with the Dange clique. Another was engaged in the production of a "classical" treatise on Indian economy in collaboration with the very same revisionist academicians. A third one was operated upon in an East German hospital and tried his hand on further dirty deals. And now, when Soviet revisionism is completely exposed, you are coming out with a clean certificate to the C. P. C.: "Above all, the yeoman's service the C. P. C. has rendered to the world working class and the communist movement in fighting against and exposing the menace of modern revisionism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism cannot but be gratefully acknowledged by every Communist in the world." Will you kindly explain to the ranks when exactly you came to the realisation that modern revisionism was a menace? Surely you did not realise this even as late as May-June 1967, when you allowed one of your P. B. members to lend his name to the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society's State Special Conference in Kerala. How can we say you have realised this even today when you are planning to send several of your P. B. members one after another to the capitals of East European revisionist vassals? Even now

haven't you continued to impose a ban on advertising in your Party journals of literature against revisionism by C. P. C. ? Menace of modern revisionism, indeed ! And all the while sharing seats on the cabinet and *T. U.* and *Kisan committees* with the revisionist Dange clique ! Who wants the "grateful acknowledgement" from such double-dealers as you ?

The fact is that your revisionism has landed you into a miserable jam. You cannot openly side with the Soviets—they are so thoroughly discredited. Besides, the Dange clique has already occupied that position. You cannot accept the C. P. C's leading role in the International Communist movement today—because you had always been anti-China to the core. Yet you see all around you the tremendous impact of the C. P. C's irreconcilable struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism ! So you are trying to continue your double-dealing by hoodwinking that section of your ranks which is stirred by this impact and to capitalise on this sentiment among the broad sections of our people. But it is too late now. Your game is up. You are caught in an avalanche from which there is no escape. Very soon you will be another clique. The following admission of yours only justifies this forecast : "Special note is taken of the fact how the Communist Party is very weak and even non-existent in the greater part of the country and how it is menaced with the onslaught of revisionism organised in the shape of the Right Communist Party."

#### CODE OF CONDUCT DOES NOT APPLY TO REVISIONISTS

You declare that in 1964, you made a "decisive break" with Indian revisionism by adopting a Programme, a Report, a Declaration and a Resolution. These may all be very fine things you have done. But you never broke with the citadel of World Revisionism, i. e., the Soviet

leading clique. Even today you are insincere in your convictions about the real role of the C. P. S. U. leaders. At one place in the ideological Draft you say : "Modern revisionism led by Khrushchov and pursued by the present C. P. S. U. leaders, has done the greatest damage to the cause of the working class and the communist movement in the world." Just a few lines in advance you have this to say about the Soviet Union : "However our criticism of the compromising and collaborationist policies pursued by the revisionist leadership of the C. P. S. U. and the Soviet state does in no way imply the totally erroneous idea (!) that the Soviet Union has become an ally of U. S. imperialism or is working for sharing world hegemony with American imperialism and for the division of spheres of influence in the world, as this is tantamount to nothing short of placing the Soviet Union outside the Socialist camp." At another place in the same document you have let the cat out of the bag by stating, "the Soviet leaders whom we, too, consider as advocates of modern revisionism." So, according to you, modern revisionism was led by Khrushchov. The present C. P. S. U. leaders are only pursuing it. You admit it has done the greatest damage. Yet you want the Soviet Union to be still inside the socialist camp. And finally you expose yourselves, when you state that the Soviet leaders are just ordinary "advocates of modern revisionism." Lenin says, "The inevitability of revisionism is determined by its class roots in modern society. Revisionism is an international phenomenon." You cannot fight revisionism in just your own country without striking at its international roots. You say you made a decisive break with Indian revisionism in 1964. But all these years it is an established fact that you were flirting with Soviet revisionism, your journals were giving publicity to Soviet writers, your book-shops were (and are even now) doing very brisk trade in revisionist books and journals, your central organ praised

Khrushchov for his far-sightedness, you equated the Soviet Union with PRC by giving the slogan that you are neither "anti-Soviet nor anti-China" and by indulging in a host of similar other activities. It was not a fight against revisionism that you were conducting all these years inside the country but a mere faction fight—one clique against another, a sham fight to delude the ranks. Since revisionism is an international phenomenon, it is futile to fight it in isolation in a single country. And since you did not conduct a genuine fight against international revisionism, your frequent outbursts against the so-called Indian revisionists could only be taken as a cover to hide your own revisionism, which has got hardened with the years. And being revisionists, you have no right to seek protection under the code of conduct governing fraternal relations between Communist parties. This code applies only to parties based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and not to parties based on revisionism and narrow nationalism.

How can the Soviet leaders or for that matter the Tito clique seek shelter under this code of conduct? Revisionism and Marxism-Leninism are antagonistic contradictions and not non-antagonistic, as you try to make out. One or the other has to survive. There is no third course. Remember, revisionism is a menace. One cannot afford to be tender and friendly towards a menace. One just wipes it out, lock, stock and barrel, if one sincerely wants Marxism-Leninism to survive.

#### YOU ARE BASICALLY ANTI-CHINA AND ANTI-WORKING CLASS

Now about your so-called pro-China sentiments. After the Madurai C. C. meeting, the reactionary press and political leaders of all hues came out with loud statements like "Look, didn't we say so! The Marxist party is toeing the China line. Madurai resolutions confirm our early

warnings." You kept mum about these statements. These were to your liking. You wanted the ranks to believe this lie. This was the only way left for you to stop the revolt that was in the offing inside the party. Look, what your scare-crow dialectician B. T. Ranadive writes in *People's Democracy* (Sept. 24th): "The working class must fight this danger (the danger of American War against China), warn the people and hold high the banner of friendship between the two countries and the two peoples. Whatever may be the difficulties (sic) created by the border clashes, and other events, the basic fight for settlement and for friendship between the two countries must go on." What lofty sentiments! What braggadocio! What cheek on the part of a leader to shout out that the basic fight for friendship must go on, when at every crucial turn in the history of India-China relations, he and his colleagues in top party positions were as virulent in their anti-China activities as the pro-American lobby itself or were giving the green signal to these very reactionaries by their calculated silence. We know what fight you put up during 1962 and 1965 crises. We know what your P. B. stated during the recent embassy crisis. Besides, we also know what one of your veteran revisionist leaders in Kerala said about China in 1962 and 1965 and again in 1967 at the time of the embassy crisis. Did any one of you contradict these virulently anti-China statements of this Soviet agent and did you expel him from the party for such open anti-China activities? Yes, messieurs, the Revisionists, your call for a basic fight for friendship with China is, in Comrade Mao Tse-tung's words, very much like that of those false friends and double-dealers who have "honey in their lips and murder in their hearts."

It is well-known that you made short shrift of those comrades in the ranks who sincerely advocated the C. P. C. line on international issues; you branded them as American agents, agent-provocateurs, extremists etc. It was they

who held high not only the banner of "friendship between the two countries and the two peoples," as you declare, but also held high the banner of friendship between the two parties, which, to a communist, is the precondition for basic friendship at all other levels. You talk of the anti-China tirade of the Soviet leaders "as strengthening the hands of the extreme reactionaries in India" (B. T. R.). But gentlemen, what is your Madurai resolution on "Divergent views between our party and the C. P. C." but a crude piece of anti-China tirade? Listen to what you yourselves say: "It is at this very critical juncture that a dangerous attack comes against it, [the Marxist party] from the CPC." (Madurai resolution). Perhaps, according to your dialectics, this is how you propose to conduct your basic fight for friendship with China. Again, to quote your Namboodiripad from his latest article in the Onam Special of Deshabhimani, "Just as the CPSU did in the past so now the CPC also started interfering in the internal affairs of our party and started advocating a political line which did not correspond to the realities of the Indian situation." (Translation mine).

Just four years ago, in 1963, Dange in his reply to a *People's Daily* article entitled "Mirror for Revisionism" had this to say: "But why should they [the CPC] arrogate the right to interfere in our inner-party affairs, tell us what to do or not to do with our bourgeoisie, and also who among us 'is true Marxist revolutionary' or not or who is 'splitting the party'." (Quoted from *Questions of Ideology in the International Communist Movement* No. 7, Page 82)

This cannot be fortuitous. What Sripad Dange said just four years ago, Sri Namboodiripad and the other "Marxist" leaders are saying today. Criticism to them means only crass interference in their internal affairs. All they want other brother parties to do is to leave them alone. They may continue to commit hundreds of mistakes, and cause immense damage to the Communist

movement as a whole, yet these "Marxist" leaders want all these mistakes of theirs to be glossed over by brother parties. As for criticism from within the party, they know how well to deal with it with an iron hand. At such times, no codes of conduct for inner-party criticism are assiduously upheld and the constitution of the party itself is just so much scrap of paper for them. When the C.P.C. criticised Dange in 1963, perhaps you, breakaway Revisionist chieftains, took it as a good riddance. But now when it is your turn to be criticised, you are agitated and call it crass interference.

Gentlemen, nobody is going to be deluded by the honey on your lips. The murder in your hearts stands out fully exposed today. The Naxalbari peasant revolutionaries have done the job. The great betrayal of the Naxalbari peasants' action and expulsion of thousands of party members from the party is evidence enough of the wrecking activities you have undertaken. The CPC is only doing its internationalist duty when it starts exposing you. When they did it before, it was Dange who barked. Earlier still it was Khrushchov's turn to get the beatings from them. Now it is yours. You cannot escape from the inevitable doom that awaits all revisionists. Today the international communist movement is stronger than ever. It has overthrown the Soviet revisionist leadership from its leading position in the movement and replaced it with the CPC. What is more, it has placed the CPSU leading clique in its rightful place i. e., outside the pale of the international Communist movement. Things are going to be different from now on for all types of revisionists wherever they hide in any part of the world. The world working class of which the Indian working class is a national contingent will see to it that they are smoked out and exterminated from each country as inevitably as the C.P.S.U. leaders were smoked out and exterminated from the international Communist movement.

The murder in your hearts can be clearly seen from just some deliberate omissions in your C. C. document. While talking eloquently about "the tremendous victories scored by the Chinese Republic," you have not a word to say about the earth-shaking Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution or the invincible Thought of Mao Tse-tung. You say the C.P.C. rendered "yeoman's service to the world working class and the Communist movement in fighting and exposing the menace of modern revisionism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism", and you demonstrate the honey on your lips by "gratefully acknowledging" this yeoman's service. But the murder in your heart stands out exposed when you try to cover up the fact that it was with Mao Tse-tung's Thought that the CPC armed itself and the Chinese people and together with them fought and isolated modern revisionism both internally and externally on a world scale. You, pigmies of the Marxist Party, do you or do you not accept the fact that Mao Tse-tung's Thought is Marxism-Leninism of the era in which imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing towards worldwide victory? All your tall talk about the PRC being a shining example and the "grateful acknowledgement" of the yeoman's service rendered by the C.P.C. etc., is just so much honey on your lips to cover up the murder in your heart, if you do not answer this all important question. You can answer either way, but if, instead, you are proposing to remain silent, that too will be properly understood for what it is really worth, by the revolutionary ranks inside the country, i.e., your basic anti-China stand.

Lenin says, "Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action." Action in turn enriches Marxism. It does not stand still at any time. Marxism developed into Marxism-Leninism through the action of the world working-class and especially the Russian Bolsheviks led by the Great Lenin in the fight against the renegades of the Second International on the eve of and during the Great October

Revolution in Russia. It got consolidated through the post-Revolution practice of the world working class and especially by the Soviet working class headed by the C.P.S.U. (B) and Stalin. Marxism-Leninism developed into Mao Tse-tung's Thought by the action of the world working class and, especially, the Chinese working class, during the anti-fascist world war period and the practice of the C.P.C. led by Com. Mao Tse-tung, which led to the victory of the Great Chinese Revolution. It got consolidated in the struggle of the world working class and especially of the Chinese working class, in the life and death struggle against modern revisionism and the subsequent Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China. If you, drafting long, voluminous drafts and resolutions in the latter part of 1967, cannot have a word in these documents about the Thought of Mao Tse-tung or the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, you are only stepping into the shoes of the old-time revisionists, Bernstein and Kautsky and will only meet with the same fate as did those "worthies" of the Second International. What more evidence is required to prove that you are basically anti-China, anti-working class and utterly revisionist?

To you, only Marx, Engels, Lenin and, sometimes, Stalin exist—Mao Tse-tung does not exist at all—in the great galaxy of builders of the proletarian world outlook. Perhaps one of you, say Namboodiripad, covet the fifth place. Well, gentlemen, go ahead, all luck to you, but don't let it be said that a timely warning was not sounded before your inevitable fall into the little filthy dust-bin of history.

#### ACCADEMIC DISCUSSION, A MEANS OF HOOD-WINKING THE RANKS

Your academic discussion of programme issues, the character of the Indian state and your 'great' discovery of the difference between present-day Indian capitalism and

the Indian bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the pre-liberation capitalist development of China and the Chinese bourgeoisie, on the other, and your characterisation of this difference as a very important factor which the C.P.C. (which, you insinuate, is non-Maxist-Leninist) has not taken into account and has ignored, your antics at defining the Indian big bourgeoisie, and compartmentalising them into various categories as commercial or comprador, trading-bureaucratic, industrial, middle and non-big etc. are all part of the old game of trying to be profound theoreticians and dialecticians—in short, great guys—before the ranks, greater than even those simple folk who have conducted mighty revolutions in bigger chunks of this good earth and that too very successfully. In the past your bluster did only one thing and that is, it successfully kept away the great bulk of the Indian revolutionary-minded workers and peasants from the party. As you yourselves admit, "Ours is a very small party compared to the bigness of the country in which it is operating and the tasks it is confronted with," and the fact that the C. P. "is very weak and even non-existent in the greater part of the country"—in this 46th year of the establishment of the party—only go to confirm this. Thanks to the C. P. C. and the revolutionaries in the Indian Communist Party, this is not going to be the case in the future. Your bluster is no more going to trick the ranks. That is why, you are now hitting out in desperation at criticism from any quarter.

Behind all this hullabaloo about the difference between our big bourgeoisie and the Chinese big bourgeoisie is the refusal to learn the lessons of the Chinese revolution and an obsession to stick to formulations made by the world Communist movement before the Chinese Revolution. According to you, even in this third stage of the general crisis of capitalism, "Capitalism has developed in India and its class position in society is getting strengthened." "The economic crisis in the country is" only

"deepening and fast enveloping one sector after another of the nation's economy. Further it has also extended to the political sphere and a political crisis has set in and is likely to mature with speed." "The crisis is causing growing mass discontent among the people." "It offers tremendous opportunity to the working class and its Communist party to take big strides." But you bemoan that the political "level of the proletariat is in a deplorable state." So what to do? Just shunt along, hoodwink the ranks, cling to your positions and pass long resolutions and in the final analysis become appendages of the reactionary ruling classes.

You do not see that people in several parts of the country, in step with the general pattern of struggle in the whole of the Asian continent, have taken up arms and established armed bases inside the country. The Naga base is there right on our soil for the last ten years and more. The Mizo base is there for over two years. Now the Naxalbari base has sprung up since March this year. Are these not on the Indian soil? Your documents have not a word about these developments. Besides these, all over India, people are taking to stones, brick-bats and sticks to beat down the reactionary police every other day. This is a growing process inside the country. And here you are talking about a "deepening" economic crisis, sitting in your comfortable offices, dreaming of capturing the central cabinet during next general elections, and discussing the "special" features of the Indian big bourgeoisie. Gentlemen, you are counter-revolutionary revisionists. You forget the simple Marxist truth that without the Indian Communist Party incorporating the lessons of the Chinese Revolution into the practice of the Indian Revolution, no revolution in India will ever succeed, just as the Chinese Revolution would never have succeeded if the C.P.C. had not incorporated the lessons of the Great October Revolution into the practice of the revolution in China. You

assiduously work to cover up the lessons of the Chinese Revolution from the Indian working class and Indian peasants and then bewail that the political level of the proletariat is deplorable. Gentlemen, who can possibly be responsible for such a "deplorable" level of the proletariat excepting you who had been working overtime to shut off the East Wind from the Indian working class and the Indian peasantry? But now your game is up.

Instead of trying to be modest and learn the lessons of the Great Chinese Revolution, you are attempting to pit the formulations of the Communist International against the formulations of the C.P.C., which, in addition, you completely distort to suit your own requirements. Yes, the C.P.C.'s reading is that "the Congress government represents the interests of the Indian feudal princes, big landlords and bureaucrat-comprador capitalists." (*People's Daily* editorial, July 5th, 1967). Comrade Mao Tse-tung has this to say about the Chinese bourgeoisie:

"There is a distinction between the comprador big bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

"The comprador big bourgeoisie is a class which directly serves the capitalists of the imperialist countries and is nurtured by them; countless ties link it closely with the feudal forces in the countryside. Therefore it is a target of the Chinese Revolution and never in the history of the revolution has it been a motive force."

... ..

"The national bourgeoisie is a class with a dual character.

"On the one hand, it is oppressed by imperialism and fettered by feudalism and consequently is in contradiction with both of them. In this respect it constitutes one of the revolutionary forces. In the course of the Chinese Revolution it has displayed a certain enthusiasm for fighting imperialism and the government of bureaucrats and warlords.

"But on other hand, it lacks the courage to oppose imperialism and feudalism thoroughly because it is economically and politically flabby and still has economic ties with imperialism and feudalism. This emerges very clearly when people's revolutionary forces grow powerful.

"It follows from the dual character of the national bourgeoisie that at certain times and to a certain extent, it can take part in the revolution against imperialism and the governments of the bureaucrats and warlords and can become a revolutionary force, but that at other times there is the danger of its following the comprador, big bourgeoisie and acting as its accomplice in counter-revolution."

[ *Chinese Revolution & Chinese Communist Party* :  
Selected Works, vol. 2, pp. 320-21. ]

In addition to the comprador character a section of our big bourgeoisie has also the bureaucratic character. It uses the state bureaucratic apparatus to derive super-profits. Just as in China, amongst the bourgeoisie, it was the comprador capitalists who were the targets of the revolution, so also in India it has to be the comprador-bureaucratic capitalists. There is just no question of their being the motive force of the revolution.

It is true that the Indian bourgeoisie was and is the most developed bourgeoisie among the colonial and semi-colonial countries. But does this bourgeoisie, which developed as a direct result of the imperialist wars and as an appendage of the imperialist world economy, change its essential character from being a comprador-bureaucratic capitalist to that of an independent industrial capitalist? To characterise the mas industrial big bourgeoisie is to characterise India not as a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country, but to place India on a par with the imperialist countries like Britain, France, Japan or Italy. There is no other possible classification for such a bourgeois state. Either a country is a colony or a semi-colony or it is an independent country. You

define the position as follows: "The fact to be noted here is that it is the industrial big bourgeoisie which, today, has emerged as a powerful force holding the leading position in the new state and government and not the comprador-element." And again, "though certain tendencies of the nature (comprador) are present in the Indian situation too, it is by no means the principal characteristic of the Indian big bourgeoisie which is heading the state and government." By an indirect reference you attribute the principal characteristic of the Indian big bourgeoisie as "interesting itself in the expansion of industries and the development of the national economy." (Madurai Resolution, p. 5.). To have the cheek to attribute such qualities to the Indian big bourgeoisie during this third stage of the general crisis of capitalism is nothing but counter-revolutionary. The Appendix to para 33 (page 64) of your Party Programme has this foot-note below the figures: "The proportion of industrial production and commerce is not materially changed during the entire period (1948-63), despite rise in new industries," and still you have the cheek to say (indirectly of course) that: "expansion of industries and development of national economy" is the principal characteristic of the Indian big bourgeoisie. How then are you different from the Dange clique?

Again, from the Appendix given to para 29 of the programme (page 60), can't you see that from 1959 onwards there was a tremendous spurt in foreign collaborationist agreements which rose from 150 in 1959 to 302 in 1964, and again from the Appendix to para 24 (page 58) India's foreign liabilities rose from 493 crores to 761 crores in the private sector and from 225 crores to 1470 crores in the official or public sector. In the Appendix to para 30 (page 62) dealing with the utilization of external Assistance upto 31st Dec., 1963, the respective figures for the U. S. A., the U.K., West Germany etc., and the U. S. S. R. and other Socialist countries are 2034.9 crores, 194.5 crores, 245.5

crores and 166.2 crores. Do these figures show that the Indian big bourgeoisie is an industrial big bourgeoisie "interested in the expansion of industries and development of national economy" or that they are a comprador-bureaucratic bourgeoisie who have sold out the nation's interest to the imperialists, primarily U. S. imperialists for their crumbs in the super-profits. Do not these figures (and mind you, these are not the C. P. C's) indicate that there was a definite shift around 1959 from leaning on British imperialism as of old to selling out to American imperialism?

Your new analysis of the Indian big bourgeoisie and the character of the Indian state is so ridiculous that it is no wonder that it does not fit into any of the categories so far defined about the bourgeoisie in the world's hinterland. Hence your slogan of an independent path for India's Revolution. In effect it is meant only to isolate the Indian Revolution from its Asian, African and Latin American context and hand it over to counter-revolution, lock, stock and barrel.

### STABBING VIETNAM IN THE BACK

There is just one sector where you feel you can still play havoc: that is on the Vietnam question. But there again you are thoroughly mistaken. It is indeed surprising to find a group of people today who call themselves communists, championing, even after the West Asia crisis, the slogan of unity in action with the revisionists. You say, "A serious debate is on in the world communist movement as to the correctness or otherwise of the stand taken by the C. P. C. on this issue of proposed united action." Gentlemen, you will be right if you had said that the serious debate was taking place in the world Revisionist movement. The world communist movement with China as its leading centre has nothing to debate on

this issue. Their stand is unambiguous. They are out to wipe out revisionism and not to unite with it in action. As for Vietnam, don't you, revisionists, shed crocodile tears over their so-called suffering. You see only "the small socialist republic of North Vietnam together with its patriotic fighters in South Vietnam fighting alone against U. S. aggression" and "making unheard of sacrifices." This according to you is the stark reality. Quite a dismal, depressing picture indeed—looks like you are in the pay of Johnson, MacNamara & Co. For it can only be the American imperialists who would like the people of the world to see in Vietnam such a dismal "stark reality." You too want to stab Vietnam in the back by advocating induction of revisionism into their fighting ranks.

Gentlemen Revisionists, do you accept that the Vietnamese people are fighting a People's War and that in this era, imperialism can only be fought and defeated by waging a protracted People's War? The Vietnamese people learned the great lessons of the Chinese Revolution and took the tortuous path of People's War for their liberation, the only path by which peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America can defeat imperialism and their running dogs. You shed so much tears for Vietnam but have you ever tried to learn about the essential difference between a People's War waged by relying on highly conscious revolutionary people and an imperialist war, which can only be waged by relying on modern weapons and hired soldiers. In the words of Com. Lin Piao :

"Comrade Mao Tse-tung has provided a masterly summary of the strategy and tactics of People's War. You fight in your way and we fight in ours : we fight when we can and move away when we can't.

"In other words, you rely on modern weapons and we rely on highly conscious revolutionary people : you give full play to your superiority and we give full play to ours ;

you have your way of fighting and we have ours..... This strategy and these tactics can be applied only when one relies on the broad masses of the people, and such application brings the superiority of People's War into full play."

Since you refuse to understand this essential difference between the two wars, and the specific nature of the People's War waged by the Vietnamese people, you are not able to render any effective help to the valiant Vietnamese people, except by passing some resolutions, and once a while calling a public meeting. The job of an honest communist is not to bemoan the fate that has overtaken the Vietnamese people but drawing inspiration from the way the brave Vietnamese people are fighting the U. S. imperialists and winning victory after victory, to rouse the revolutionary consciousness of the broad masses of our own people against the common enemy and engage him in battles wherever possible. This cannot be done in 'unity' with revisionism, because the revisionists "try to exorcise the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principles of proletarian internationalism and call for rejection of the Leninist principles of party organisation and above all, of democratic centralism for transforming the communist party from a militant revolutionary organisation into some kind of debating society."

(The Twelve Parties' Declaration, 1957)

It is an every day experience for our working class and our communists that wherever revisionism penetrates, the first casualty is the revolutionary spirit. One can understand the Soviet revisionist leaders and their henchmen

all over the world clamouring for 'unity in action' in Vietnam. But you are advocating it in a new guise for the so-called purpose of "singling out and isolating the most immediate and hated enemy." Here you are advocating only your own rotten idea of a united front against the Congress in Kerala and in W. Bengal, which has in effect only rejuvenated revisionism on our soil to an alarming scale. Very rightly the C. P. C. believes that unity in action with revisionists will only bring disaster to the Vietnamese people. To talk about unity in action even after the West Asian crisis where the Arabs were betrayed so blatantly by the C. P. S. U. leaders only exposes your real face—the ugly face of modern revisionism with the C. P. S. U. as its world Centre.

#### THE INDIAN PEOPLE AND THE CHINESE PEOPLE ARE ONE

Our country is a great country. Its 510 million people are a great people. Being the world's second in terms of population its responsibilities to the world and to itself are tremendous. China, only a slumbering giant in the beginning of the century, with a population of 750 million, has shaken itself up from the age-old stupor and swept away all imperialist and feudal vermin from its sacred soil. And today it is wiping away capitalism too. There it is standing by our side shedding the brilliance of her achievements. The Indian people too are as inevitably rising up against their age-old enemies, feudalism and imperialism. Imperialism is now in its death-throes. As always it is relying, as a last resort, more and more on its agents within the camp of the working class and its party to come to its succour. The ruling circles of the Indian reactionaries who are its open agents are more hopeful of the modern revisionists, whether of the Dange clique or the Namboodiripad-Ranadive gang of double-dealers to hoodwink the

people and continue their inhuman exploitation. The Indian communists will always be on the side of the people fighting the age-old evils of feudalism and imperialism represented by Indian reactionary ruling circles and modern revisionists. Armed with Mao Tse-tung's Thought, the most advanced world outlook of the proletariat, they are certain to win, though the path will be tortuous and long. The day is not far off when we, the Indian people and our neighbour, the Great Chinese people will both stand up arm in arm and together with the other anti-imperialist peoples of the world will bury imperialism and feudalism and all other forms of exploitation, once and for all.