

STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL BOARD OF COMMUNIST ON ANTI-LENINIST CRITICISM OF COMRADE MAO TSE-TUNG

Made in the article "Struggle for People's Democracy and Socialism", *COMMUNIST*, Vol. II, No. 4.

THE Editorial Board of *Communist* unreservedly withdraws the entire criticism of Comrade Mao Tse-tung made in the course of an article entitled "Struggle for People's Democracy and Socialism—Some Questions of Strategy and Tactics" published in *Communist*, Vol. II, No. 4, June-July, 1949.

The Editorial Board tenders its deeply felt apologies to Comrade Mao Tse-tung and to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. The Editorial Board is fully conscious of the fact that the unworthy attacks against Comrade Mao Tse-tung made in the *Communist* was wrong not only against the Communist Party of China but against the solidarity of the international Communist front, a criminal violation of the principle of fraternal cooperation among Communists of all countries.

This criticism was not only wrong and anti-Leninist, but also a base slander against the leader of the victorious Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China. Objectively it only brought grist to the mill of the vilification campaign started by the Anglo-American imperialists with the sole object of maligning Comrade Mao and the Chinese Communist Party in the eyes of the peoples of the colonial countries and of disrupting the solidarity of the anti-imperialist democratic front.

The making and acceptance of such criticism and its publication in the theoretical journals like *Communist* (English), in Bengali, Marathi and Hindi publications is one of the most serious of the many mistakes committed by the Editorial Board.

If the Editorial Board had doubts about certain formulations in the writings of Com. Mao Tse-tung (if it was unable to understand the meaning of the policies pursued by the Chinese Communist Party, it was its elementary duty to have got into touch with the leadership of the Chinese Com-

munist Party to get its doubts solved by mutual discussions. This is what the solidarity of the international Communist front and the loyalty to the principle of the fraternal co-operation among Communists of all countries, demands of Communists of every country if they are to remain loyal to the cause of revolution.

• But the Editorial Board took the harmful course of making an open, abusive and uncomradely attack upon Comrade Mao Tse-tung. It was not an isolated mistake. It was a necessary part of the Trotskyite-Titoite conceptions which dominated the mind of the Editorial Board, of its effort to pursue Left-opportunist policies. The Editorial Board imagined that its Left-opportunist conceptions of the nature of the People's Democratic revolution in India, of its class alliance and strategy, which it had acquired under the influence of Titoist literature, was the last word in the application of Marxist-Leninist theory to the problems of the new stage of the colonial liberation movement.

Comrades from Andhra had submitted a document to the Editorial Board soon after the Second Party Congress (in June 1948) in which they very correctly proposed that the concrete formulation of the strategy and tactics to be pursued by the Party in its struggle to realise the programme and objective set forth by the Second Congress, should be made on the basis of the ideas developed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung in his classical work *New Democracy*.

The comrades from Andhra, who were pioneers in unleashing the agrarian revolution and in leading militant struggles of the peasants and people of Telengana, correctly pointed out that Mao's work was a brilliant contribution to the Lenin-Stalin teaching on the national liberation revolution in the colonies. They insisted that the path followed by the Chinese Communist Party in unleashing the national liberation struggle in the face of Kuomintang reaction and its white terror is the path which Indian Communists must adopt in the present phase.

The Editorial Board bent upon pushing forward its Trotskyist conception of the present stage of the Indian revolution, which denied its national liberationist and colonial character, and its Left-opportunist policies, rejected the proposal of the Andhra comrades and made a malicious attack upon Com. Mao Tse-tung.

The Editorial Board hypocritically stated that it "accepted Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin as the authoritative sources of Marxism", and that it has "not discovered new sources of Marxism beyond these".

After having declared itself the only authoritative in-

terpreter of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the Editorial Board then pronounces the following judgement on the leader of the victorious Chinese Revolution :

"Nor for that matter is there any Communist Party which declares adherence to the so-called theory of New Democracy alleged to be propounded by Mao and declares it to be a new addition to Marxism. Singularly enough there was no reference to this new addition to Marxism in the Conference of Nine Parties in Europe, i.e., Communist Information Bureau—E.B.). Under these circumstances it is very wrong for a section of the leadership of the Central Committee to take upon itself the task of recommending new discoveries which one of the most authoritative conferences of Marxists has not thought fit to recommend. The Andhra Secretariat should have thought ten times before making such a formulation and taking an original stand on the question of this contribution. It is impermissible for Communists to talk lightly about new discoveries, enrichment, because such claims have proved too often to be a thin cloak for revisionism (Tito, Browder, etc.). (Communist, Vol. II, No. 4, p. 77)

Proclaiming itself as the pontiff of Marxism-Leninism, the Editorial Board has here pronounced the classic work on *China's New Democracy* as revisionist and has shown the amazing brazen-facedness to suggestively mention Tito and Browder in that connection.

The Editorial Board knew very well that it could not brush aside the important questions raised by the Andhra comrades and put across its Trotskyite Left-sectarian policies, as long as the Party ranks continued to regard Com. Mao Tse-tung as one of the outstanding leaders of the international Communist movement—a creative Marxist and a continuator of the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the national liberation revolution of the colonies.

That is why the Editorial Board dishonestly pitted the authority of the Nine Communist Parties' Conference against Comrade Mao in order to declare his great work as revisionist. That is why the Editorial Board went to the length of suggestively mentioning the names of Tito and Browder in the same breath as that of Com. Mao—and that at a time when the entire imperialist press was slandering him as being an "Eastern Tito".

The Andhra comrades in their document of June 1948 correctly pointed out that only the Indian big bourgeoisie had struck a deal with imperialism and had passed over to the camp of reaction and counter-revolution. Basing them-

selves on the teachings of Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, the Andhra comrades argued that the middle bourgeoisie continued to be oppressed by foreign imperialists and Indian monopoly capitalists and that the Communists, in forging the Democratic Front against Anglo-American imperialists and their Indian servitors, the Indian big bourgeoisie, will have to adopt a correct attitude towards this middle bourgeoisie. The Editorial Board, in order to bolster up its anti-Leninist, Left-sectarian and disruptive thesis that the entire bourgeoisie had lined up in the camp of reaction, that the entire bourgeoisie had to be fought, made this unworthy and slanderous attack on Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

The Editorial Board dishonestly and without any proof, suggested that Mao's programme of New Democracy was based on the reformist conception of collaboration with sections of the bourgeoisie. Comrade Mao Tse-tung was falsely accused of propounding that the New Democratic regime to be created by the victorious revolution would be promoting "capitalism" and that he was completely negating "the transitional anti-capitalist character of the economic order under People's Democracy" and denying the perspective of advance to the construction of Socialism.

The Editorial Board picked up isolated phrases and paragraphs out of context from the writings of Mao to "prove" this lie and proclaimed arrogantly that:

"Some of Mao's formulations are such that no Communist Party can accept them; they are in contradiction to the world understanding of the Communist Parties." (Communist, Vol. II, No. 4, p 78)

Once again the international Communist movement is pitted against Com. Mao. It is slyly suggested that Mao's Marxism is of a doubtful brand and has little in common with that of the international Communist movement, thus once again lending a hand to the slander campaign of the imperialists.

The Andhra comrades in their document of June 1948 had drawn pointed attention to the fact that the Anglo-American imperialists had launched since March 1948 a furious and armed offensive against the rising national liberation movement in the countries of South-east Asia, and that the brutal repression and white terror launched by the Nehru-Patel Government against the democratic forces headed by the Communist Party of India was a part of this imperialist offensive.

The Andhra comrades quite correctly proposed that the Indian proletariat and Communists must in this situation

follow the path taken by the Chinese Communist Party in leading the liberation struggle of the Chinese people against imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionaries. They proposed that the Communists must concentrate on the task of unleashing the militant struggles of the peasants for urgently needed agrarian reforms in the rural areas of Bengal, Andhra and North Malabar. They unfolded the perspective of a protracted struggle and dogged resistance.

But the Editorial Board had already adopted an anti-Leninist analysis of the agrarian question in India. This analysis denied the dominance of feudal relations in India and negated the task of rallying all the peasantry in the struggle to wipe out feudal and semi-feudal landlordism. The Editorial Board, therefore, not only rejected the proposal to adopt the path followed by the Chinese people, but went one step further to give a falsified and slanderous interpretation of the history of the Communist Party of China.

The Editorial Board quoted a long passage from the Colonial Thesis of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International (July-August, 1928), which drew lessons from some of the mistakes committed by the former leadership of the Communist Party of China. From this passage, the Editorial Board drew the utterly false Trotskyist conclusion:

"Why had the Chinese to go through the protracted civil war? Just because the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party at times failed to fight for the hegemony of the proletariat, for bringing the majority of the masses in alliance and under the leadership of the proletariat, because it followed tactical policies which led to disaster." (*Ibid*, p. 84)

How utterly bankrupt and dishonest is this effort of the Editorial Board to undermine the prestige of the Chinese Communist Party and its leadership in the eyes of the Party ranks, can be seen from the following facts:

a) Already in August 1927, Comrade Stalin had replied to the Trotskyist opposition which had sought to slander the Chinese Communist Party in a similar way. Stalin said :

"The fact that the Communist Party in China grew in a very short period from a small group of 2,000 into a mass Party of 60,000 members...the fact that the Chinese Communist Party has succeeded in arousing millions of peasants from their torpor...the fact that the Chinese Communist Party has succeeded in so brief a period in gaining all these achievements is due incidentally to the fact that it followed the path outlined by Lenin—the path indicated by the Communist International...only ultra-Left renegades and ad-

venturists can doubt this." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1947, pp. 251-2)

The Editorial Board suppressed this fact from its readers.

• b) The present leadership of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Comrades Mao Tse-tung, Chu Teh and others came to the helm of affairs some twenty years ago. It did so by waging a determined struggle against both Right and Left deviations from Marxism-Leninism, by fighting for the correct Lenin-Stalin strategy and tactics of leading national liberation struggles. Under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Communist Party mastered the tactics of realising proletarian hegemony in the liberation struggle and became a mighty force, rallying the vast masses of the peasantry capable of achieving its final historic victory. The Editorial Board said nothing about this.

c) Already in 1935, when the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung had waged the "protracted civil war" against Chiang Kai-shek for eight long years the Communist International at its Seventh Congress paid a warm and glowing tribute to the Communist Party of China and characterised it as a model for all colonial countries. Comrade Mao Tse-tung was elected to the Executive Committee of the Communist International. The Editorial Board suppressed this fact from its readers.

This villification of the Communist Party of China and the slander of its great leader, Mao Tse-tung, indulged in by the Editorial Board is a serious crime against the Communist movement, against proletarian internationalism.

It arose not merely out of the political ignorance and petty bourgeois arrogance of the Editorial Board. It was a necessary part of the Editorial Board's Titoist Left-opportunist policy.

It was the outcome of the anti-international trend in the Editorial Board which manifested itself in the slanderous criticism of the brother Communist Parties made in the article on Revisionism (*Communist*, Vol. II, No. 2, February 1949) and in the publication of the correspondence of the Australian and British Parties. It expressed itself in the failure to publish articles of the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party in the *Communist*. It finally expressed itself in the suppression of the Peking Manifesto and the delay in the publication of the editorial of the organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

In making and publishing this criticism of Mao Tse-tung,

the Editorial Board is guilty of lending indirect support to the vicious slander initiated by the Anglo-American imperialists. It is guilty of the attempt to create a barrier between the leader of the victorious Chinese revolution and the masses and the people of India, preventing them from learning from the invaluable theoretical and practical experience of the great Chinese Party. The Editorial Board is guilty of a serious breach of the discipline and solidarity of the international Communist movement, of violating the principle of fraternal cooperation between the Communists of all countries.

In its recent meeting, the Editorial Board, after thorough discussion and on the basis of the criticism of its readers and the self-criticism of its own members, condemned the Trotskyite, Left-sectarian line, initiated and propounded by it in a series of articles and authoritative statements. The meeting condemned the serious anti-international trend manifested in these articles. The making and publishing of the slanderous criticism of Comrade Mao and the Chinese Communist Party was one of the worst manifestations of this trend. The meeting of the Editorial Board therefore took the decision to reconstitute itself.

II

It is necessary to refute in detail the criticism of Comrade Mao Tse-tung made by the Editorial Board in the course of its statement on Strategy and Tactics and to draw the lessons on the significance of the invaluable teaching and experience of the great Chinese Revolution for the Indian Communists and for the Indian people, to wage a persistent struggle against bourgeois nationalism which is the source of Left-opportunist deviation and of the "anti-international" trend in the old Editorial Board; to educate the vanguard of the working class in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

The statements on People's Democracy and on Strategy and Tactics adopted by the Editorial Board denied as the Trotskyists did on the Chinese question, the anti-imperialist character of the Indian revolution and the colonial character of India's economy, after the imposition of the Mountbatten Award. As a result of this Left-opportunist understanding, the Editorial Board negated the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and national liberationist character of the present stage of the revolution in India.

In its statement on Strategy and Tactics in the course

of Section III, the Editorial Board has made an utterly wrong criticism of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's important work *New Democracy*. The Editorial Board has not only ridiculed the idea that this book contained a valuable contribution to the Lenin-Stalin theory of national liberation revolutions in the colonies and semi-colonies, but has gone to the length of condemning this great work as "revisionist" and placing it on a par with Browder's reformism and Tito's Trotskyism. This impudent and bankrupt criticism of Comrade Mao's great work is the best exposure of the 'Left'-opportunist understanding and line of the Editorial Board.

Comrade Mao's *New Democracy* was the product of the integration of Marxist-Leninist theory with the revolutionary practice of the Chinese people's liberation struggle led by the proletariat. That is why it has the most valuable lessons for the proletariat and the Communist Parties in India and the other colonial countries.

In his *New Democracy* Comrade Mao Tse-tung defined the New Democratic revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies as an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party. The central slogan of this revolution was the New Democratic republic of all *anti-imperialist classes*, in which the leading role belonged to the working class. This revolution was a part of the proletarian Socialist world revolution. The accomplishment of the first stage of the revolution culminating in the setting up of the People's Democratic Republic and the People's Democratic dictatorship of the anti-imperialist classes led by the working class opens the way to the second stage, the building of Socialist society.

In propounding these great ideas which have been brilliantly confirmed by the historic victory of the revolution in China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung uttered a sharp warning against mixing the two stages. Condemning the theory of "a single revolution" which the Chinese Trotskyists were putting forward, Comrade Mao said that it was an "entirely subjective thought" which purports to "accomplish both the political revolution and the social revolution in one stroke" in utter disregard of the development of the revolution, i.e., the necessity of a period of transition between one revolution and another. Such talk by confusing the two stages of the revolution tends to injure the cause of revolution by diminishing the importance of the democratic tasks to be carried out at the present juncture. (*New Democracy*, PPH, 1950, p. 20)

The Editorial Board in its statements on People's Democracy and on Strategy and Tactics has committed this very

Trotskyist mistake against which Comrade Mao warned. This is exactly the reason why the Editorial Board belittled the importance of Mao's great work on *New Democracy* and had the conceit to suggest that it was not applicable to the present stage of our revolution in India and to suggest in so many words that it was no new contribution to the Lenin-Stalin teaching on the strategy and tactics of colonial revolutions. (ref. *Communist*, Vol. II, No. 4, p. 77)

Comrade Mao Tse-tung's *New Democracy*, first published in China ten years ago in January 1940, is a brilliant application of the Lenin-Stalin teachings of the strategy and tactics of the national revolution in the colonies, to the tasks and problems of the Chinese revolution. That book inspired hundreds and thousands of Chinese Communists to give correct leadership to the progressive forces of the Chinese people, who at that time were passing through difficult times, fighting on the one hand the war of resistance against Japanese aggression, while at the same time they were being subjected to a treacherous assault by the Kuomintang reactionaries.

The basic ideas about the New Democratic revolution in China developed in this book have not only stood the test of time but have been fully confirmed by the subsequent development and the victorious outcome of the revolution in China.

The ideas developed by Comrade Mao in his *New Democracy* have been further developed and concretised by him in his later articles especially in the article "Dictatorship of People's Democracy" (*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy*, No. 14 (41), July 15, 1949). He sums up the lessons and experience of the Chinese revolution in the following words.

"We have acquired invaluable experience and the essence of this experience consists of the following three factors: a disciplined Party equipped with the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, using the method of self-criticism and closely linked with the masses; an army led by this Party; a united front of different revolutionary sections of society and groups led by this Party. Basing ourselves on these three factors we won the main victory." (*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy*, No. 14 (41), July 15, 1949)

The editorial article of the organ of the Information Bureau which outlined the tasks of the Indian Communists and thus threw a sharp light on our Left-sectarian mistakes, has emphasised exactly these main lessons of the rich experience of the Chinese revolution.

III

Comrade Mao Tse-tung diligently assimilated the teachings of the great Stalin on the perspectives of the Chinese Revolution and correctly expounded them in his *New Democracy* written ten years ago. Basing himself on Stalin's article "International Significance of the October Revolution" written in 1918, Comrade Mao wrote:

"Since the publication of the article, Stalin has again and again developed the theory regarding the colonial and semi-colonial revolution, its separation from the old type, and its transformation into a part of the proletarian Socialist revolution." (*China's New Democracy*, PPH, Bombay, 1950, p. 7)

In this book written in the beginning of the Second World War, Comrade Mao emphasised the fact that with all imperialist countries as her enemies China cannot attain her independence without the aid of the one Socialist country (USSR) and the international proletariat. China must join the anti-imperialist front and take part in the world revolution. He very correctly characterised the People's Democratic revolution in China as

"a new type of revolution, wholly or partly led by the proletariat, the first stage of which aims at setting up a New Democratic society, a new state of the combined dictatorship of all revolutionary classes." (*Ibid*, p. 6)

Already ten years ago he foresaw the perspective of the Chinese revolution—a People's Democratic revolution led by the proletariat directly passing over into Socialist revolution, without having to pass through a capitalist development, in alliance with and with the fraternal assistance of the Socialist Soviet Union—a perspective which is today not a distant goal but an objective of practicable achievement especially with the signing of the treaty of friendship and mutual assistance between the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union.

In his *New Democracy*, Comrade Mao wrote:

"The first stage of China's revolution (which again is divided into many sub-stages according to its social character, is a new bourgeois democratic revolution, not the newest proletarian Socialist revolution, though it long ago in the past became a part of the latter, and is a magnificent part, a magnificent ally of it at the present. The first step or stage of

this revolution is certainly not to, and certainly cannot, establish a capitalist society dictated by the bourgeoisie, but to establish a New Democracy ruled by the alliance of several revolutionary classes. After the accomplishment of this first stage, it will be developed into the second stage—to establish the Socialist society of China.” (Ibid, p. 9)

In his article on “The Dictatorship of People’s Democracy” written on the eve of the formation of the People’s Democratic Government of China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung further concretised these ideas. He emphasised the fact that the victory of the Chinese revolution would not have been possible nor would it have been possible to consolidate victory after it had been achieved, had it not been for the Soviet Union, for its epoch-making victory over German and Japanese fascism, for the emergence of the People’s Democracies in Europe and for the growing struggle of the proletariat in the capitalist countries, and for the growing struggle of the oppressed peoples in the East. He summed up:

“Internationally we belong to the anti-imperialist front, headed by the Soviet Union and for genuine friendly aid we must look to this front and not to the imperialist front.”

Internationally, it is the alliance with the Soviet Union and the People’s Democracies — the fact that China is now an integral part of the anti-imperialist democratic front headed by the Socialist Soviet Union—that secures and consolidates China’s national independence and facilitates her transition towards Socialism.

Internally, it is the leadership of the working class headed by the Communist Party which follows the course indicated in the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, and the alliance with the peasantry, which forms the basic condition for the successful development of the dictatorship of the People’s Democracy in China and for its transition through People’s Democracy to Socialism and Communism.

Comrade Mao has laid the greatest stress on this in the article mentioned above:

“Alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie, and chiefly the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, for it comprises 80 to 90 per cent of China’s population, constitutes the basis of the dictatorship of the People’s Democracy. Imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionary clique were overthrown primarily by the force of the working class and the peasantry. The transition from the New Democracy to Socialism depends, in

the main, on the alliance of these two classes. The working class must lead the dictatorship of the People’s Democracy, for only the working class is the most far-sighted, just, unselfish and consistently revolutionary class. The history of all revolutions shows that without the leadership of the working class the revolution is doomed to failure. But under the leadership of the working class the revolution will be victorious.” (For A Lasting Peace, For A People’s Democracy, No. 14 (41), July 15, 1949)

All this shows how Comrade Mao has developed and concretised in the true spirit of Lenin-Stalin teachings the ideas about the transition of People’s Democracy to Socialism in China, which he formulated ten years ago in his *New Democracy*.

IV

The Editorial Board completely ignored this brilliant exposition given by Comrade Mao of the perspective of the People’s Democratic revolution in China, and of the course of its transition to Socialism under the leadership of the working class. In the course of the article “Struggle for People’s Democracy and Socialism”, the Editorial Board has made an utterly dishonest criticism of the exposition given by Comrade Mao Tse-tung of the transitional measures which the People’s Democratic state will have to take to consolidate its victory and to prepare the pre-requisites for the transition to building of Socialism (ref. *Communist*, Vol. II, No. 4, p. 78).

The Editorial Board, wrongly attributed to Comrade Mao the view that he stood for the promotion of capitalism as the dominant economy in the period immediately following the victory of the People’s Democratic revolution.

A distorted interpretation was given of the following quotation from Mao Tse-tung’s Political Report to the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of China (April 24, 1945) which the Andhra Secretariat had quoted in their document to refute the argument of those who said that at this stage of the revolution itself we have to fight against the entire bourgeoisie, against the entire capital:

“Some people cannot understand why the Communists, far from being anti-pathetic to capitalism, actually promote its development... What China does not want is foreign capitalism and native feudalism, it does not oppose native

capitalism." (Mao Tse-tung, *The Fight For A New China*, New Century Publishers, New York, 1945, p. 38)

The Editorial Board, without bothering to see what this formulation of Comrade Mao actually meant, and in which context it was made and quoted by the Andhra Secretariat, at once proceeded to deliver the following tirade:

"Is it not elementary Marxism that if you undertake to promote capitalism you will be inevitably promoting the dictatorship of the capitalist class... It is obvious that this promoting capitalism would mean promoting the rule of a fascist clique like Chiang's clique, for capitalism can only exist as fascism in China in present-day conditions." (*Communist*, Vol. II, No. 4, p. 79)

This is not honest criticism, but the cheapest demagoguery and slander, which only proves that the Editorial Board consists of complete ignoramuses who know nothing of the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the transitional measures which the proletariat, having come to power, must take in order to create conditions for the transition from capitalism to Socialism.

Comrade Mao had nowhere spoken of the necessity of absolute development of capitalism in China. He spoke of the development of capitalism in the same restricted sense in which Lenin also speaks of in the following passage for instance:

"Without changing its essence, the proletarian state may permit free trade and the development of capitalism only within certain bounds and only on the condition that the state regulates (supervises, controls, determines the forms and methods of, etc.) private trade and private capitalism." (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Two-Vol. Ed., Vol. 2, p. 761)

The Editorial Board by making this bankrupt criticism only proved its complete ignorance and repudiation of Lenin's and Stalin's teaching on the NEP, on the transitional economic measures which the proletariat in power must take in order to create conditions for the transition from capitalism to Socialism. Stalin has pointed out that Lenin's teachings on the New Economic Policy are universally applicable and "will be absolutely indispensable for every capitalist country in the period of dictatorship of the proletariat". This prophecy is today being fulfilled in the countries of People's Democracy, where the economic policy pursued today conforms to all the basic principles of NEP. Comrade Mao Tse-tung was making a brilliant application

of these teachings of Lenin and Stalin when he was defining how the People's Democratic state will have to adopt a correct policy towards middle industrial and trading bourgeoisie, in order to consolidate its power against the forces of foreign and native reaction and create the pre-requisites for the transition towards the building of Socialism. Not to see this but to talk of "horrifying" and "loose formulations" of Comrade Mao is nothing but the blind arrogance of dogmatists who refuse to learn from creative Marxism of the great leaders of international Communism.

The Editorial Board had before it the whole report in the course of which Comrade Mao had explained how the stage of the New Democratic revolution is distinct from the stage of the Socialist revolution and how the tasks of the former which are in the main anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and national liberationist, cannot be mixed with those of the latter which are the final liquidation of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism and Communism. In the same report Comrade Mao had also explained how the successful People's Democratic revolution would prepare the pre-requisites for the establishment of Socialism by "restricting capital"—by ensuring that "all native or foreign enterprises that are either of the nature of monopolies... for instance, banking, railways, shipping, etc.... should be managed by the state (i.e., People's Democratic state) so that private capital may not control the livelihood of the people."

Predicting the future course of the Chinese revolution, J. V. Stalin had pointed out years ago that

"when the working class wins hegemony in the Chinese revolution and consolidates its alliance with the peasantry and with the working people of town and country, it will be able to overcome resistance of the national bourgeoisie to achieve the complete victory of the bourgeois democratic revolution and later to shift it gradually to the course of Socialist revolution with all the consequences arising therefrom." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. IX, p. 222)

The revolutionary regime formed under the leadership of the proletariat, pointed out J. V. Stalin, will be

"a regime of transition to the non-capitalist or to be more precise, Socialist development of China." (J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. VIII, p. 366)

Comrade Mao not only asserted in general terms this Stalinist teaching about the 'non-capitalist' development of China after the victory of the People's Democratic revolu-

tion, but he also posed and solved the concrete problems of such a development. Comrade Mao, of course, knew that

"in a country dominated by small production in agriculture, you cannot decree Socialism and large-scale agriculture the next day—for the simple reason that the means of production for large-scale agriculture are not there and the majority of the small producers must be won over and convinced." (Communist, Vol. II, No. 4, pp. 79-80)

There was no justification whatsoever for the patronising criticism made by the Editorial Board:

"Mao confuses the toleration of commodity production, small-scale production, private production under conditions of people's rule and nationalisation of big industries and banks with promoting capitalism and completely eliminates the transitional anti-capitalist character of the economic order under People's Democracy." (Ibid, p. 80)

But in its unseemly effort to discredit Comrade Mao, the Editorial Board has failed to take note of the glaring fact that Comrade Mao has based his policy on just this anti-capitalist character of the economic order under People's Democracy—a policy which is of the utmost importance for the consolidation of the victory of the People's Democratic revolution, for the complete smashing up of the aggressive plans of American imperialism and its agents, which are by no means ended.

This is what Comrade Mao said in his report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on December 25, 1947:

"The New Democratic revolution is to eliminate only feudalism and monopoly capitalism, only the landlord class and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie (big bourgeoisie)—not capitalism in general and not the petty and middle bourgeoisie. Owing to the backwardness of China's economy it will still be necessary to permit the existence, for a long period, of the capitalist economy represented by the broad petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie even after the nationwide victory of the revolution.

"Furthermore in accordance with the division of labour in the national economy, the development of all sections among them beneficial to the national economy will still be necessary; they will still be an indispensable part of the entire national economy.

"The petty bourgeoisie includes small-scale industrial and commercial capitalists who hire workers and employees.

But besides these, there are the broad, independent, small industrial and commercial businessmen who do not hire workers or employees. With regard to these small industrial and commercial businessmen, it goes without saying that they should be firmly protected. After the nationwide victory of the revolution the New Democratic state will have in its hands enormous state capital which controls the economic pulse of the entire country, taken over from the bureaucratic bourgeoisie. It will also have the agricultural economy emancipated from the feudal system. Although for quite a long time the agricultural economy will still be basically scattered and individual, it can be guided step by step in the direction of cooperatives in the future. Under these conditions the existence and development of small and middle capitalist elements are not at all dangerous.

"The same applies to the new rich peasant economy which will necessarily come into being in the rural areas after the agrarian revolution.

"Adopting the ultra-Left, erroneous policies toward petty bourgeois and middle bourgeois economic elements as our Party did in the period from 1931 to 1934 must absolutely not be permitted to recur." (Turning Point in China, New Century Publishers, New York, 1948, pp. 16-17)

These profound conclusions of Comrade Mao Tse-tung have now been incorporated in the Common Programme of the victorious People's Republic of China. Article 30, Chapter 4 of the Common Programme lays down:

"The people's government shall encourage the active operation of all private economic enterprises beneficial to the national welfare and people's livelihood and foster their long-term development."

But this is not promotion of capitalism as a dominant economy. This is guaranteed by the fact that:

"State-owned economy is of a Socialist nature. All enterprises vital to the economic life of the country and to the people's livelihood shall come under the unified operation of the state. All state-owned resources and enterprises are the common property of all the people. They are the main material basis of the People's Republic for the development of production and the creation of a prosperous economy and are the leading forces of the entire social economy." (Article 28, Chapter 4 of the Common Programme)

It is guaranteed by the fact that the People's Democratic state led by the working class ensures the workers employed

in the private-owned enterprises, proper living conditions and the protection of their rights of trade union organisation and collective bargaining as against the employers.

Under these conditions the relative expansion of the small capitalist sector of economy only enables the People's Democratic state to consolidate the gains of the revolution, strengthens the power of the working class and creates the conditions for the march towards Socialist development, for the struggle to eliminate private-owned capitalist economy, for the complete squeezing out of the capitalist elements.

Thus we see that the Editorial Board has utterly refused to understand the rich content of the Lenin-Stalin policy of consolidating the regime of People's Democracy in China, pursued by the Chinese Communist Party and its leader Comrade Mao. Its conceited and ignorant criticism of Comrade Mao follows from its 'Left'-opportunist and anti-Leninist understanding of the stage of the revolution, and the new class alignment in India, after the crossing over of the big bourgeoisie to the side of imperialism and counter-revolution. The Editorial Board dogmatically stuck to its 'Left'-opportunist conception that the *entire bourgeoisie* had gone over to the camp of imperialism and reaction. It refused to understand that it was the Indian big capital (Birla-Tata-Dalmia), like the Chinese big capital (Four Families), that was interlocked with British colonial capital, and now with American monopoly, and was acting as their agent in maintaining India under foreign imperialist domination and as their colonial base. It refused to see that this imperialist-big bourgeois-landlord combine was not only oppressing workers, peasants and the petty bourgeoisie but also injuring the interests of sections of the middle bourgeoisie as well. The Editorial Board did not distinguish between the Indian big bourgeoisie and the other sections of the bourgeoisie and failed to see that it is the former that is placed in the seat of power and is collaborating with imperialists as their agents.

Thus it is not Mao's formulations on the development of capitalism that run counter-revolutionary, but it is the views of the Editorial Board which repudiated the Lenin-Stalin teachings on NEP and on the restricted development of capitalism which they imply, which advance the slogans of fighting straightaway against the entire bourgeoisie, without reckoning with realities, which are counter-revolutionary. That is why the Editorial Board refused to see the necessity of adopting a correct attitude towards the middle bourgeoisie and towards the rich peasants. That is why it

refused to learn anything from the great success the Chinese Communist Party achieved in forging a single united front of unprecedented breadth and depth, and which ensured their historic victory over the treacherous Chiang Kai-shek and his imperialist supporters. The significance of this experience is summed up thus:

• "The Communist Party of China and the People's Liberation Army of China earned the respect, recognition and love of all the people. A single united front, unprecedented in breadth and depth and unifying the workers, the peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the national minorities and certain sections of the middle industrial and trading bourgeoisie was created inside the country. The petty and the middle bourgeoisie in China suffered oppression and persecution at the hands of the reactionary big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the Kuomintang power (which was in the hands of monopoly capital). The petty and middle bourgeoisie is not or very little connected with imperialism. That is why this bourgeoisie, according to the definition of Mao Tse-tung 'a real national bourgeoisie', enters into a united front of struggle against internal reaction and foreign imperialism. **The basis of this united national front is the alliance of the working class and the labouring peasantry under the leading role of the working class.**" (V. M. Maslennikov, "On Leading Role of the Working Class in the National Liberation Movement of the Colonial Peoples", **Colonial Peoples' Struggle for Liberation**, PPH, Bombay, 1950, p. 28)

At the same time it is necessary to remember that the bringing of the middle bourgeoisie into such a united front cannot be achieved without conducting a correct struggle against this section of the bourgeoisie, which wavers during the course of the revolution between the reactionary bloc of the big bourgeoisie and imperialism on the one hand and the camp of democratic revolution on the other, supporting at one time the former and joining at others the latter. This is what Comrade Mao Tse-tung said about a section of this bourgeoisie in his report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in December 1947:

"In areas ruled by Chiang Kai-shek there is a section of the upper petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie (i.e., the national bourgeoisie — Y.H.) who, though small in number have reactionary political tendencies — these are the Rightist elements among these classes. They disseminate illusions about American imperialism and Chiang Kai-shek's reactionary bloc. They oppose the People's Democratic

revolution. As long as their reactionary tendencies can still influence the masses we should carry on the work of exposing such tendencies among the masses who have been under their influence. Blows should be delivered at their political influence among the masses, so as to liberate the masses from their influence." (Mao Tse-tung, "Present Situation and Our Tasks", quoted by Yu Huai in *People's China*, Vol. I, No. 1, Jan. 1, 1950, pp. 9-10)

The experience of the Chinese Communist Party shows that the task of bringing this section of the bourgeoisie, the middle bourgeoisie, into the common front against internal reaction and foreign imperialism, was very important for the final victory of the People's Democratic revolution in China and for its further consolidation against imperialist intervention.

But to carry out this task correctly it is necessary to take into account the dual nature of this section of the bourgeoisie:

"Blows at the reactionary political tendencies on the part of the Rightist elements of the national bourgeoisie and adequate educational and reforming work among the national bourgeoisie—all these compose the content of the struggle against the national bourgeoisie at various stages and in various periods of the revolution." "It is exactly because of this fact (dual nature of the national bourgeoisie) that struggle must necessarily be conducted in an appropriate manner against the national bourgeoisie while uniting with it." (Yu Huai, "On the Role of the National Bourgeoisie in the Chinese Revolution", *People's China*, Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 10 and 9)

This aspect of the Chinese experience and of the teaching of Comrade Mao Tse-tung is a concrete application of the historic analysis given by Comrade Stalin, of the role of the national bourgeoisie, of its compromising and revolutionary sections in the anti-imperialist liberation struggles of the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies, particularly of India and China, (Speech to the Students of the University of the Toilers of the East, 1925). The Editorial Board has dogmatically ignored and repudiated this teaching of Comrade Stalin on the role of the two sections of the national bourgeoisie and on the strategy and tactics of the proletariat in the struggle for consolidating its hegemony in the national liberation struggle.

It is of the utmost importance for the Indian Communists to diligently study this experience garnered by the Chinese Communist Party in the course of its historic revolutionary struggle. This is all the more important today when the national liberation struggle of the Indian people, which is now being led by the Indian working class, has entered into a new phase, when the resolute struggle of working class, peasantry and other progressive forces for a living wage, land and democracy, are rising to a higher form of struggle for land and for national liberation.

It would be impossible for us to raise the countrywide people's liberation struggle to a higher level and to lead it to victory unless we learn to bring the great masses of the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat, unless we learn to draw them into the revolutionary struggle against feudal landlordism and for land.

The vast experience of the Chinese Communist Party in unleashing the agrarian revolution, in combining the peasants' struggle for land with the people's liberation struggle against the imperialists and other bourgeois collaborators, in consolidating workers'-peasants' alliance under proletarian hegemony through the different stages of this struggle, is of immense importance to the Indian Communists.

The Andhra comrades, who have the experience of leading the great Telengana struggle, had very correctly raised a pertinent point:

"Our revolution in many respects differs from the classical Russian revolution, and is to a great extent similar to the Chinese revolution. The perspective is likely not that of general strikes and general rising leading to the liberation of the rural side, but the dogged resistance and prolonged struggle in the form of an agrarian revolution culminating in the coming into power of the democratic front."

But the Editorial Board instead of giving a straight answer to this question rejected the Chinese path outright. They accused the Andhra comrades of reformism, of counterposing the Russian way to the Chinese way and of ignoring the hegemony of the proletariat. Actually it was the Editorial Board itself which was guilty of reformist sabotage and disruption of the struggle for unleashing the agrarian revolution. Holding fast to its 'Left'-opportunist analysis of the agrarian question and talking loud of fighting

revolution. As long as their reactionary tendencies can still influence the masses we should carry on the work of exposing such tendencies among the masses who have been under their influence. Blows should be delivered at their political influence among the masses, so as to liberate the masses from their influence." (Mao Tse-tung, "Present Situation and Our Tasks", quoted by Yu Huai in *People's China*, Vol. I, No. 1, Jan. 1, 1950, pp. 9-10)

The experience of the Chinese Communist Party shows that the task of bringing this section of the bourgeoisie, the middle bourgeoisie, into the common front against internal reaction and foreign imperialism, was very important for the final victory of the People's Democratic revolution in China and for its further consolidation against imperialist intervention.

But to carry out this task correctly it is necessary to take into account the dual nature of this section of the bourgeoisie:

"Blows at the reactionary political tendencies on the part of the Rightist elements of the national bourgeoisie and adequate educational and reforming work among the national bourgeoisie—all these compose the content of the struggle against the national bourgeoisie at various stages and in various periods of the revolution." "It is exactly because of this fact (dual nature of the national bourgeoisie) that struggle must necessarily be conducted in an appropriate manner against the national bourgeoisie while uniting with it." (Yu Huai, "On the Role of the National Bourgeoisie in the Chinese Revolution", *People's China*, Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 10 and 9)

This aspect of the Chinese experience and of the teaching of Comrade Mao Tse-tung is a concrete application of the historic analysis given by Comrade Stalin, of the role of the national bourgeoisie, of its compromising and revolutionary sections in the anti-imperialist liberation struggles of the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies, particularly of India and China, (Speech to the Students of the University of the Toilers of the East, 1925). The Editorial Board has dogmatically ignored and repudiated this teaching of Comrade Stalin on the role of the two sections of the national bourgeoisie and on the strategy and tactics of the proletariat in the struggle for consolidating its hegemony in the national liberation struggle.

It is of the utmost importance for the Indian Communists to diligently study this experience garnered by the Chinese Communist Party in the course of its historic revolutionary struggle. This is all the more important today when the national liberation struggle of the Indian people, which is now being led by the Indian working class, has entered into a new phase, when the resolute struggle of working class, peasantry and other progressive forces for a living wage, land and democracy, are rising to a higher form of struggle for land and for national liberation.

It would be impossible for us to raise the countrywide people's liberation struggle to a higher level and to lead it to victory unless we learn to bring the great masses of the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat, unless we learn to draw them into the revolutionary struggle against feudal landlordism and for land.

The vast experience of the Chinese Communist Party in unleashing the agrarian revolution, in combining the peasants' struggle for land with the people's liberation struggle against the imperialists and other bourgeois collaborators, in consolidating workers'-peasants' alliance under proletarian hegemony through the different stages of this struggle, is of immense importance to the Indian Communists.

The Andhra comrades, who have the experience of leading the great Telengana struggle, had very correctly raised a pertinent point:

"Our revolution in many respects differs from the classical Russian revolution, and is to a great extent similar to the Chinese revolution. The perspective is likely not that of general strikes and general rising leading to the liberation of the rural side, but the dogged resistance and prolonged struggle in the form of an agrarian revolution culminating in the coming into power of the democratic front."

But the Editorial Board instead of giving a straight answer to this question rejected the Chinese path outright. They accused the Andhra comrades of reformism, of counterposing the Russian way to the Chinese way and of ignoring the hegemony of the proletariat. Actually it was the Editorial Board itself which was guilty of reformist sabotage and disruption of the struggle for unleashing the agrarian revolution. Holding fast to its 'Left'-opportunist analysis of the agrarian question and talking loud of fighting

capitalist elements in the countryside, pursuing Left-adventurist tactics in the cities, the Editorial Board systematically neglected and disrupted the developing of the anti-feudal struggle of the peasantry in certain areas. It completely ignored the central lesson of the revolutionary experience of the Chinese Communist Party and remained deaf to the clarion call of the Peking Conference of Trade Unions of Asian and Australasian Countries until the editorial article of the Information Bureau's organ roused it.

The enormous significance of the Chinese revolutionary experience to the working class of all colonial countries was specially emphasised in the Manifesto of the Peking Conference of Trade Unions of Asian and Australasian Countries and in the editorial article in the organ of the Information Bureau. The latter had drawn pointed attention of the Indian Communists to the important formulation made by Comrade Liu Shao-chi in the course of his inaugural address to the Peking Conference of the Trade Unions of Asia and Australasia:

"The path taken by the Chinese people... is the path that should be taken by the people of many colonial and dependent countries in their struggle for national liberation."

The path taken by the Chinese people is the correct application of the Lenin-Stalin teaching of securing the hegemony of the proletariat in the national liberationist and anti-feudal revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies, to the concrete conditions of the Chinese revolution. The final victory of the Chinese revolution, and the experience of the postwar phase of the national liberation struggles in the countries of South-East Asia—Viet Nam, Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, Philippines, etc., has completely proved the general applicability of the path taken by the Chinese people.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has brilliantly summed up the essence of this Chinese experience. Basing themselves on the well-known generalisation of Com. Stalin namely, that "*the characteristic and the advantage of the Chinese revolution is the armed people against the armed counter-revolution*", the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung came to the correct conclusion that "in China without armed struggle there will be no place for the proletariat, no place for the people, no place for the Communist Party and no victory of the revolution." In the early months of 1928, in conditions of nationwide Kuomintang white terror, the Chinese people, led by the Communist Party of China, established a number of small revolution-

ary bases as the starting point of the strategy to safeguard the revolutionary forces and to combat the counter-revolutionary forces.

Comrade Mao has summed up the essence of the path taken by the Chinese people in the following terms:

"It is erratic to ignore the principles of armed struggles, the revolutionary wars, guerilla warfares and political work in the army.

"Faced with such enemies, questions arise concerning the special revolutionary bases. The great imperialist powers and their reactionary allied armies in China have always indefinitely occupied the important Chinese cities. If the revolutionary force refuses to compromise with foreign imperialism and its servile underlings, but contrarily, to struggle to the very end, and if the revolutionary force is to accumulate and nurture its own strength and avoid fighting decisive battles with the powerful enemies when its own strength is not yet ascertained, then it must turn the backward remote rural areas into progressive strong bases, turning them into great military, political, economic and cultural revolutionary strongholds. Then from these strongholds, the revolutionary force can start to drive out the malicious enemies based on the large cities encroaching upon the villages; also from these strongholds, the revolutionary forces may, through prolonged struggles, gradually achieve total success. Under such conditions, and because of the unbalanced condition of the Chinese economic development (the rural economy is not entirely dependent on urban economy), and of the vastness of China's territories (there is immense space for the revolutionary forces to fall back to), and of the disunity and conflicts existing in the Chinese anti-revolutionary camp and of the fact that the main force of the Chinese revolution, the Chinese peasantry, is under the leadership of the Communist Party, thus, on the one hand, there is a great possibility for the Chinese revolution to succeed, first and foremost, in the countryside... Thus we can understand why these prolonged revolutionary struggles, starting out from such special strongholds, are composed chiefly of peasant guerilla warfares under the leadership of the Communist Party of China. It is erratic to ignore the principles of rural districts as revolutionary bases, the strenuous work amongst the peasantry and guerilla warfare.

"But in stressing upon the importance of armed struggle, we must not overlook the other form which revolutionary struggles must take, for without the other form of revolutionary struggles, armed struggles alone cannot be victorious. In

stressing upon the importance of the work in the rural bases, we do not mean to give up the work in cities and towns or in other rural districts which have not yet become bases, for without these, the revolutionary strongholds would become isolated, and the revolution would be a failure. Because the ultimate aim of the revolution is to secure the town strongholds from the enemies, and without sufficient work done in the cities and towns, this aim can never be achieved." ("The Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China", *China Digest*, Vol. V, No. 10, p. 16)

Summing up the experience of the 22 years of armed struggle of the Chinese Revolution, Comrade Chu Teh writes:

"This armed struggle of the Chinese people is not an isolated purely military struggle. It is an armed struggle based on the firm alliance of the workers and peasants, uniting, at the same time, with other people among the broad masses.

"This armed struggle is closely linked up with, and is inseparable from, the peasants' agrarian revolution. Had there been no support for the peasants' agrarian revolution, it would have been impossible to organise such an armed struggle. If the proletariat had not united with the peasants and with the other forces in the countryside capable of being won for a broad united front, had it adopted 'Leftist' adventurism in its policies, it would not have been possible to direct the armed struggle to victory...." (*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy*, No. 17, (44), Sept. 1, 1949)

The Editorial Board's rejection of the path taken by the Chinese people led to the advocacy of the reformist sabotage and disruption of the developing anti-feudal struggles of the peasantry. It led in practice to refusal to struggle to realise proletarian hegemony, to forge alliance with the vast masses of the peasantry and to lead them in the revolutionary struggle for land, merging the same with the struggle for national liberation against imperialism and its lackeys.

Chinese experience teaches important lessons as to how the proletariat and its Party coordinate the struggle for the agrarian revolution in the rural areas, with the struggle of the working class and other democratic forces in the cities, how it secures proletarian hegemony in the struggle for national liberation, and how it gathers together and strengthens the revolutionary force with which it delivers crushing blows against the imperialist oppressor and its agents till final victory is won.

In this connection it is of the utmost importance to ponder deeply over the following very important formulations made by Comrade Liu Shao-chi in his report to the Peking Conference of Trade Unions of Asia and Australasia:

"The rule of the imperialists and their lackeys in the colonies and semi-colonies deprives the people of all democratic rights as it had done in China in the past. Persecuted and hounded by the imperialists and their lackeys in the cities where white terror reigned, our revolutionaries were compelled to seek refuge in the countryside and mountains and to defend their lives with armed force. However, had such armed struggle been confined to defence alone, it would inevitably have been crushed by imperialism and its hirelings. Thus, the revolutionaries had to be closely linked with the peasants as well as with all other people who opposed imperialism, to use all ways and means to smash repeated offensives and break through the encirclement organised by imperialism and its hirelings; they could not but organise regular revolutionary armies to smash the armies of the imperialists and their lackeys. However, it was precisely because of this that it was possible to build up a strong revolutionary army and ultimately drive out the forces of imperialism and its lackeys and win victory in the national liberation struggle. It is quite clear that without such armed forces to defend themselves, the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies will not be able to achieve anything for themselves. The existence and development of working class organisation and the existence and development of a national united front are closely connected with the existence and development of such an armed struggle. This is the inevitable path of many colonial and semi-colonial peoples in the struggle for their independence and national liberation."

VI

The Editorial Board not only rejected the path taken by the Chinese people but sought to give the same dishonest interpretation of the course of the Chinese revolution which the Trotskyites gave and which Stalin sternly refuted (ref.: Section I). The Editorial Board quoted a long extract from the Colonial Thesis of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International (1928), distorted its meaning and drew from it the false conclusion that the Chinese people had to go through a protracted civil war because the Chi-

nese Communist Party committed reformist mistakes, because it was unable to fight correctly for the hegemony of the proletariat.

But the Editorial Board hid from the Party ranks how the Seventh Congress of the Communist International which met in 1935 evaluated the achievements of the Chinese Communist Party during the seven long years of civil war. Comrade Wilhelm Pieck in his report on the activities of the Communist International said:

"The Chinese Revolution provides the first model of a colonial revolution in which the ideological and also, in its initial form, the state hegemony of the proletariat is realised. In the Chinese working class the colonial proletariat has proved in practice its ability to settle great historical problems, to maintain the complete economic and political independence of the country, to completely abolish feudal survivals, to put an end to large landed proprietorship, to excise the cancer of usury, and to undertake revolutionary changes that clear the way for Socialism." (W. Pieck, "The Activities of the ECCI" **Reports of the World Congress of the Communist International**, Workers' Library Publishers, New York, 1935 p. 60)

Thus the protracted civil war was a model example and a source of inspiration to the proletariat and the peoples of the colonies:

"The Communist Party of China sets an example for all Communists of the colonies and dependent countries." (*Ibid*, p. 96)

Comrade Pieck summed up the achievements of the eight years of civil war which the Chinese Communist Party fought between the years of the Sixth and Seventh World Congresses of the Communist International:

"...the great road which the Communist Party of China has traversed in the interval between the Sixth Congress and the Seventh, a road that fills the hearts of the Communists of all the world with pride and joy (Warm applause). The comrades showed us how the Party has grown into a mighty mass organisation, how a Red Army was created and how the new Soviet state was established. They showed us how former workers, peasants, artisans and students have developed into military commanders and statesmen and how under the leadership of the Party, a people of 450,000,000, downtrodden and martyred by the imperialists, is waging a fight for its emancipation." (*Ibid*, p. 96)

The great experience of these early years of the civil war during which the Chinese Communists, in the face of

Kuomintang's armed might and white terror, created their People's Liberation Army and established people's power in the first liberated areas, has great lessons for the peoples of the colonial countries, particularly in the present period. It is particularly important for us to know and understand the source of their strength and the secret of these achievements of theirs. Comrade Wang Ming has explained it thus in his report:

"Our Party is true to the teachings of one who, after the death of Lenin, continued to develop further the theory and tactics of Marxism-Leninism in general, and the theory and tactics of Marxism-Leninism as applied to colonial revolutions in particular, who developed the theoretical foundations of the strategy and tactics of the Chinese Revolution—to the teachings of the great Stalin!

"The Communist Party of China has grown and become strong on the basis of an irreconcilable struggle against counter-revolutionary Trotskyism and liquidationist Chen Tu-hsiuism, against the semi-Trotskyist Li Li-hsianist line and counter-revolutionary Lo Chang-lunism. It has grown and become strong on the basis of an active participation in and leadership of various forms of mass struggle in the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. It is precisely this growth of the forces of the Communist Party of China that permits it boldly and decisively to raise in a new manner the question of the anti-imperialist united front." (Wang Ming, "The Revolutionary Movement in the Colonial Countries", **Reports of the World Congress of the Communist International** Workers' Library Publishers, New York, 1935, p. 33)

The relentless struggle against Right-reformist opportunism, as well as against "Left"-sectarian opportunism, which Comrade Mao Tse-tung carried on, while guiding the course of the Chinese revolution through its various stages and zig-zags during two decades and more, has extremely valuable lessons for Indian Communists.

During the first stage of the Chinese revolution (1925-27) Comrade Mao fought the Right-reformist opportunism of those who adopting a conciliatory attitude towards Kuomintang reactionaries like Chiang Kai-shek or Wang Ching-wei, advocated liquidation of the peasants' revolutionary struggle for land. Comrade Mao firmly upheld the Stalinist line that the proletariat must lead peasants' revolutionary struggle against feudalism and for land, in order to support the national liberation struggle against imperialism, in order to defeat the treachery of the Kuomintang reactionaries.

During the period of anti-Japanese war (1937-45) Com-

rade Mao again severely condemned the opportunism of those who, adopting a conciliatory attitude towards Kuomintang reactionaries headed by Chiang Kai-shek, wanted to liquidate the peasants' struggle for land by saying that it would break the anti-Japanese united front with Kuomintang. Comrade Mao firmly upheld the Stalinist teaching on the Chinese revolution that the proletariat must lead the peasant war, must develop the armed struggle of the peasantry for land. Comrade Mao kept Stalin's warning given in 1927 firmly in view:

"The anti-imperialist united front in China will be all the stronger and more powerful, the sooner and more thoroughly the Chinese peasant is drawn into revolution."

During the ten-year period of the civil war (1927-37), when the Chinese proletariat was leading the agrarian revolutionary movement, Comrade Mao sternly opposed the Left-sectarian opportunism of those who tended to forget the extremely important political factors of anti-imperialism, who ignored the fact that China's revolution, even after Chiang Kai-shek's betrayal, remained basically national liberationist in character and directed towards the overthrow of imperialist domination. He firmly kept in view Stalin's warning uttered in 1927:

"The bourgeois democratic revolution in China is directed not only against feudal remnants. It is at the same time directed against imperialism."

This basic fact created favourable conditions for the Chinese proletariat and its Party to create a broad united people's front, embracing workers, peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, revolutionary intelligentsia and sections of the bourgeoisie which were prepared to support the struggle against imperialism and its Kuomintang lackeys. Comrade Mao correctly and persistently guided the Party in building such a front under the leadership of the working class and its Communist Party.

It was this fight against Right-reformist opportunism as well as against "Left"-sectarian opportunism conducted by Comrade Mao which enabled the Chinese Communist Party to correctly wield the weapon of Stalinist revolutionary strategy and tactics and lead the revolution to victory. It enabled the Chinese Communist Party to go on developing the armed struggle on the one hand, while at the same time carrying out the mobilisation of the broad masses in the cities and areas which were under the domination of imperialism and Kuomintang reaction on the other, by skilfully

combining revolutionary activities and organisation with open legal struggle of the masses in these latter areas and thus muster powerful revolutionary forces to launch an offensive on the reactionary rule of imperialism and its stooges at the ripe moment.

VII

Such are the lessons which arise out of Comrade Mao's struggle against Right and Left deviations from Marxism—Leninism. These are of particular importance to the ranks of Indian Communists at the present time, when they have to conduct a ruthless struggle against all trends of bourgeois national reformism and for the complete liquidation of Left-sectarianism, when they have to wield the weapon of criticism and self-criticism in order to reunify the movement on the basis of the correct Lenin-Stalin strategy and tactics, so that it can place itself at the head of the rising upheaval of national liberation struggle.

The criminal attack on Com. Mao Tse-tung was published just at the time when the great People's Liberation Army of China, led by the Communist Party and its leaders Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh, had begun its final victorious march for the liberation of the entire Chinese soil from the grip of the Kuomintang clique and its American protectors. It did incalculable harm to our movement. It prevented Communist cadres from leading a powerful mass movement of solidarity with the victorious Chinese revolution, from explaining to the masses of our people the significance of the triumph of the popular revolution in China which was one of the most devastating blows delivered against the imperialist system since the Great October Revolution. It prevented them from assimilating and applying to our conditions the teachings of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the rich revolutionary experience of the great Chinese Communist Party.

All this shows very clearly how strong is the influence of bourgeois nationalism in the leadership of our movement, and in the leading Communist cadres and how weakly developed is our loyalty to the principle of proletarian internationalism.

The warning voice of the editorial of the organ of the Information Bureau, and the clarion call of the Peking Conference of Trade Unions of Asia and Australasia have awakened us. The leadership and the ranks of our movement

are now engaged in a mighty collective effort to correct the past Left-opportunist mistakes, to sharpen and finalise our understanding of the new political line in the light of self-criticism, of the past experience of mass struggle, to regroup our forces and to unify them solidly for the practical execution of the new tactical line.

It is the duty of the Editorial Board to wage a consistent ideological struggle against bourgeois nationalism, which is the common root of our Right-reformist as well as Left-opportunist deviations.

It is necessary for the Editorial Board to initiate a systematic campaign to educate the vanguard of the working class in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

The Editorial Board, therefore, resolves as follows:

(a) Correct Marxist-Leninist exposure of bourgeois nationalist ideologies such as liberalism, petty bourgeois anarchism and Gandhism, especially the latter, must form part of the education syllabus for Communist cadres. The Editorial Board must concentrate on systematic ideological exposure of Gandhism as practised by the Congress leaders through propaganda articles.

(b) The Editorial Board must devote special attention to the exposure of the ideological propaganda and policies of the leaders of the Socialist Party. Exposure of the Gandhian propaganda which these leaders carry on among the masses to emasculate them and sabotage their struggle is an important part of the struggle against bourgeois nationalism. It is equally important to expose the cosmopolitanism and "neutrality" of these leaders showing them up as the agents of reactionary British Labour leaders, as the anti-Soviet propagandists of the American warmongers.

(c) The Editorial Board must take steps to acquaint the Communist ranks with the most important authoritative documents of the struggle against bourgeois nationalism and for proletarian internationalism started by the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties with its historic resolution on the "Situation in Yugoslavia".

(d) To organise and facilitate the systematic study of the authoritative documents and reports of the Chinese Communist Party, its history and the writings of its leaders, the Editorial Board must publish all these and make them available to Communist ranks and enable them to assimilate the experience and lessons of the Chinese revolution.

In conclusion, the Editorial Board gives its solemn pledge to the Communist Party of China, to its leader Mao Tse-tung and to the international Communist movement,

that it will wage a tireless ideological struggle against bourgeois nationalism and to steel the vanguard of the Indian working class in the spirit of Stalinist proletarian internationalism, so that it may be capable of unleashing and heading the mighty national liberation struggle of our people and enable them to take their rightful place in the great anti-imperialist and democratic camp led by the Soviet Union, in the fight for lasting peace, People's Democracy and Socialism.