

WHAT'S TO BE DONE ?

K. G.

The statement by Mr Jana that in Naxalbari the legal struggle was combined with illegal struggle is not accurate. In any zone once armed struggle started, there was no scope for legal struggle against the enemy. The enemy will never allow such

action. Besides, to quote Chairman Mao, "it is necessary to create terror for a while in every rural area, or otherwise it would be impossible to suppress the activities of the counter-revolutionaries in the countryside or overthrow the authority of the gentry."

Jana criticised "the weakness of the Party's line that is to blame for the present defeat and disarray of the revolutionary forces" without examining the non-communist process of the formation of the CPI(ML) which was the root cause of basic weakness of the Party's line. During the process of formation of the CPI(ML), the ideological and political line was not thrashed out, the strategy and tactical line was not drawn up and communist organisational principles were not followed. The result was non-functioning of the party-committee system, and the writing in instalments of policy and tactical line of the Party by Comrade Charu Majumdar, and this led to "the present defeat and disarray of the revolutionary forces". Comrade Charu Majumdar formed the Party with groups and individuals who had no clear conception of Mao Tsetung Thought, as most of them did not integrate themselves with the peasants and workers. In this connection it should be mentioned that Comrade Ashim Chatterjee's group which was vehemently opposed to the *Deshabrati* group and later on to the CPI(ML), joined the CPI(ML) *unconditionally* as soon as Peking supported the formation of the CPI (ML).

I do not agree with the contention that "to withdraw from mass organisations and mass movements is to be guilty of left opportunism". Neither do I agree with the simplification that "it actually means abandoning the patient and painstaking political struggle and arousing the masses and winning them over.....and ends in a fatal divorce between the underground Party and the people". First, even after withdrawal from "mass organisations" and so-called "mass movements", patient and painstaking ideological and political struggle can be continued and the masses can be aroused. The vital.

question is whether the Communist Revolutionaries are among the masses and with the masses on the basis of "class-line" and mass line. The present situation demands that Communist Revolutionaries must remain underground among the masses and imbue them with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. They must take the leadership of the so-called mass organisations, that is, open and legal trade unions and peasant associations. But they should organise the masses and organise resistance struggle with the help of armed guerrilla squads, when necessary, against all sorts of tyranny, repression and exploitation—things which the so-called mass movements have never done for the last 50 years.

At Kanksha (near Durgapur) the Revolutionary Communist workers *never joined* the so-called peasant association and mass movement. Remaining underground, they propagated Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and then tried to organise resistance struggles against oppression, tyranny and exploitation. Of course, a revolutionary peasant organisation has evolved in the process of armed struggle, an organisation fundamentally different from the mass organisation envisaged by Comrade Jana.

It is also incorrect to say that "it was wrong on the part of the CPI(ML) leadership to characterise all other parties as parties of the ruling class". Since these parties serve the interests of the ruling classes and suppress and resist revolutionary armed struggle, they certainly represent the ruling classes. The argument that these parties are not the parties of the ruling classes as "there are also contradictions between them and the ruling classes" is not at all tenable. Will one refuse to call the Congress (O) a party of the ruling classes just because it has some contradiction with the latter? Contradiction with the ruling classes does not make a party anti-ruling class, because this contradiction is not the basic contradiction, not to speak of the principal contradiction. The policy and tactical line pursued by the CPI(M) and the cooperation it gave the Government for the past few years also

confirm the contention that there is no basic contradiction between the CPI(M) and the ruling classes. G. D. Birla's comment that "we have plenty of choices" on the election results of 1967 should remove any illusion about these parties.

As for economic struggle, to imbue the workers and peasants with revolutionary politics and prepare them for seizure of power, Lenin said : "The conception of economic struggle as the most widely applicable means of drawing the masses into the political movement, which our economists preach, is so extremely harmful and reactionary in its political sense" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 5, P. 413). For rousing the masses with political consciousness, Lenin prescribes that "class political consciousness can be brought to the workers only from *without*, that is only from outside the economic struggle, from outside the sphere of relations between workers and employers" (P. 422, *Ibid*).

This does not mean that the Communist Revolutionaries will not participate in the economic struggle of workers and peasants.

Comrade Jana's emphasis on mass organisation and mass movement and all kinds of cultural media to arouse the people will only retard the progress of building of rural revolutionary base areas. His very conception of mass movement is erroneous. He calls the Hunan peasant movement as a spectacular mass movement and on the same breath mentions big mass movements of India. What Chairman Mao said about the Hunan peasant movement was : "The second period, from last October to January of this year, was one of *revolutionary action* (emphasis mine). Within four months (it) brought about a great revolution in the countryside, a revolution without parallel in history". Can Comrade Jana tell us what "revolution without parallel in history" was achieved by the big mass movements in India ?

Mao never calls the peasant movement of Hunan a mass movement, he always calls it a "revolution", "revolutionary action". The "revolutionary action" of Hunan must not be

confused with the mass movements for economic gains in India.

The building of rural revolutionary base areas is the primary, principal and central task of the hour.

August 18, 1973