

**AN OPEN LETTER TO  
THE PARTY MEMBERS  
DEFEAT NEO-REVISIONIST POLICIES  
OF THE POLIT BUREAU !  
FORWARD TO BUILD A REVOLUTIONARY  
COMMUNIST PARTY !!**

*[Released by four leading Comrades in AP in reply to  
the "OPEN LETTER" by the Polit Bureau of CPI(M) to  
"ANDHRA COMRADES" in later part of 1968-EC]*

Comrades ;

The Central Committee leadership has refused to implement the decisions of the Calcutta Congress on the ideological issues; it has adopted a complete neo-revisionist line; it has destroyed internal democracy of the communist party, and has taken to dictatorial organisational methods; in consonant with these steps, they have expelled four of us from the party.

Already the Communist Revolutionaries of Bengal, Kashmir, U.P., Bihar, Orissa, Kerala and other provinces are fighting the neo-revisionist policies of the central leadership.

In Andhra Pradesh, overwhelming majority of party members, district and taluq committees are valiantly fighting the neo-revisionist policies of the central leadership. Recently provincial committee members, secretaries and important functionaries of district committees met at Vijayawada and have called for the rebuilding of the communist party on revolutionary lines.

We declare that the neo-revisionist central committee leadership and its disruptive policies alone are responsible for such a development inside the communist party.

**The Origin of the party :**

Our party was born in the ideological struggle against the revisionist policies of the Dange group. We thought that it was born with the aim of working on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The Calcutta party congress declared the establishment of people's democratic state through agrarian revolution as its aim.

But today the central committee leadership has betrayed the aspirations of the party members, has betrayed the party programme and has betrayed the aims

of the party congress; it has adopted the policy of class collaboration in the place of the policy of class struggle; it has renounced Marxism-Leninism and has adopted a complete neo-revisionist policy.

In our ideological struggle against revisionism of Dange group, the ideological battle of the Chinese Communist party against the revisionist policies of the CPSU leadership, roused the consciousness of our party members and inspired them for an irrevocable ideological battle against revisionism; it gave them confidence about the future of communism and Marxism-Leninism. It greatly helped us to rally majority of the party members in the struggle against revisionism of the Dange group.

But immediately after the party congress was over, immediately after the rebirth of our party, the central committee leadership has taken up the despicable method of rousing anti-China sentiments inside our party.

The central committee leaders held classes inside the jails on Kutch issue, Kashmir issue, on the issue of Indo-Pak conflict. They initiated disputes on the attitude of the CPC towards these issues. The then acting secretary of the All India party EMS Namboodripad openly condemned the attitude of the CPC towards Indo-Pak dispute. The leaders of the central committee joined the reactionaries in rousing anti-China chauvanism in the country.

Sri P.Sundarayya, who had gone to Russia for medical treatment took cudgels against the CPC even from there. He, by himself, laid the basis for the ideological line of the party, in the letters he wrote from Moscow. He sharply condemned the attitude of the CPC towards CPSU leadership and Vietnam. He certified that the CPSU leadership, inspite of certain mistakes, was greatly helping the national liberation struggles. He declared that the CPSU leadership must be treated as a friend and not as a foe, that efforts must be made to correct the CPSU leadership, and that points of common agreement between our party and CPSU were greater than points of disagreement.

Are not these letters a result of an agreement with the CPSU leadership?

These letters were written from Moscow, the source and centre of modern revisionism; they were sent through Sri Bhupesh Gupta, revisionist leader; who ever might be responsible, the letters were leaked to the press; they were given world-wide publicity. The world and our government made to understand that our party leadership was against the CPC line.

After the recent general elections, in "New situation and party's Tasks", the CC criticised all those meaning the CPC, for the "mistake of equating every concession and each step of surrender with final surrender and final going over to imperialism", for their "infantile exercise to substitute tactics for strategy and vice-versa".

The central leadership condemned the struggle of Naxalbari peasants for land and existence; it supported the repressive measures that the central and provincial governments adopted against that struggle. The CPC welcomed the Naxalbari peasant struggle. It gave its whole-hearted support to that struggle. Our party leadership publicly denounced the CPC for its support to the Naxalbari peasant

struggle. The CC leadership braved this support as an interference in the internal affairs of our party and thus find to rouse national chauvanism in our party ranks.

Thus, after the Calcutta party congress, the CC leadership has tried to rouse anti-China sentiments both inside our party and among the public on every important issue.

The ideological resolution of the Bardwan plenum was the culmination of the anti-China activities that the CC leadership has been continuously following.

#### **PB. Open letter - the Neo-revisionist line:**

The PB open letter is an open expression of the neo-revisionist policies of the PB.

The PB leadership, in its open letter, has claimed that it is fighting both against the revisionist policies of the CPSU leadership and the "adventurism" of the CPC. They have certified themselves that they alone are the sole guardians of Marxism-Leninism, that their creative line is a result of their independent thinking. They are uplending themselves for this "independent" thinking.

But there is not a particle of truth in these false claims; the PB line is nothing but a neo-revisionist line covered with deceptive revolutionary phraseology; it is nothing but a replica of the revisionist line of the CPSU leadership. Any person with little common sense could clearly see that the line of the PB is nothing but an anti-China line in its concentrated form.

The PB pretends to be criticising the CPSU revisionist leadership on every issue; but, in practice, implements that very same line with a deceptive coverage of revolutionary phraseology. This is the line of the PB.

#### **New Deception in the Name of the New Epoch:**

With the victory of the Chinese revolution, the socialist camp came into existence. This is a new epoch of world wise peoples struggles against decaying imperialism. This is a new epoch of transition to socialism from capitalism. This is a new epoch when the colonial system is crumbling. This is new epoch of national liberation struggles and socialist revolutions.

This is a new epoch which has brought the completes destruction of the world imperialist system on the agenda. This is a new epoch which heralds the success of the world socialist revolution.

But American imperialism, armed with deadly weapons, is fighting its last ditch battles for the preservation of the crumbling world imperialist system.

The consciousness of the people of the backward countries has been roused; they are united; and adopting the methods of peoples war; they are dealing death blows to the imperialist system for their national liberation; They are marching forward despite all odds.

It is the duty of the socialist countries, the world working class and communist movement to give all kinds of help-ideological, political, diplomatic, military-to these national liberation struggles who dealing a death blows to the colonial system. This is the line that the CPC is advocating. This is the line that Marxist-Leninists are everywhere implementing.

At a time when the national liberation struggles are advancing like a hurricane, the CPSU leadership betrayed the world revolutionary movement, and the national liberation movements. It threatened the revolutionaries that even small armed struggles any where in the world, will lead to world conflagration; it threatened them by saying that American imperialism was not a paper tiger, but a tiger with "nuclear" teeth, that any underestimation of American imperialism will lead to disastrous results, that armed struggles, in these circumstances, will lead to unnecessary heavy sacrifices. Thus the CPSU revisionist leadership weakened the national liberation struggles and helped imperialism.

Today the PB leadership is again repeating the very same theories of the CPSU revisionist leadership on national liberation struggles. The PB makes fun of the revolutionaries by saying "on one hand, they grossly exaggerate the world revolutionary situation depicting the world capitalism to be 'on the verge of final collapse' and advocate aggressive tactics of world revolution" (PB's open letter to the Andhra comrades, pp. 6)

Comrade Mao described American imperialism as a mere paper tiger. The events after the second world war have amply proved the correctness of this evaluation. Armed national liberation struggles have erupted and are advancing throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America inspite of armed suppression of the imperialists and the betrayal of the CPSU revisionist leadership. As an outstanding example of the anti-imperialist struggles, the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese peoples is striking blow after blow on the American imperialism spelling its death-hell. American imperialism has been thrown into a serious economic and political crisis. The negro and other working class struggle in America itself, student and working class struggles throughout western Europe are advancing. That imperialism is waging its last ditch battles from its death bed.

But the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB does not see this development. It sees only over estimation of the revolutionary situation in all this objective description.

While the CPSU revisionist leadership threatened the revolutionaries with its description that American imperialist 'paper tiger' was armed with nuclear teeth, the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB speaks of the overestimation of the world revolutionary situation. The arguments of both are the same; their aims are one-to weaken the revolutionary struggles.

### **The Decisive Role of the National Liberation Movements:**

Because of the intensification of the basic contradiction between the imperialist and socialist camps, and under the influence of this basic contradiction itself, national liberation movements have erupted in this new epoch. They have shaken the very foundation of imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The growth of the national liberation movements will intensify the contradictions between the various imperialist powers, resulting in the further weakening of imperialism; the war plans of the imperialists will be thwarted; the socialist countries will get a breathing space to advance in all fields without the fear of world war. The growth of the national liberation movements will lay the

basis for the working class revolutions in the capitalist countries. In a way, the fate of the world humanity depend on the victory of national liberation movements. This is the estimation of the Marxist-Leninists throughout the world; this is the estimation of the Chinese communist party.

That is why, Marxist-Leninists throughout the world hold that today the national liberation movements play a decisive role in the destruction of imperialism in colonial and semi-colonial countries in the destruction of imperialism; they hold that the socialist camp and the world communist movement should help the national liberation movements in all possible ways.

The CPSU revisionist leadership refused to see this reality. They propagated the pervicious view that colonial and semi-colonial countries will be liberated by the successful building of communism in the Soviet Union and its economic help to the backward countries.

In other words, the neo-revisionist PB leadership has begun to propagate this very pervicious view; they are preaching that the national liberation movements in colonial and semi-colonial countries could not stand upon their own legs and achieve help from outside.

Look at the following statements from articles in *Peoples Democracy*: "The armed intervention of the Chinese volunteers defeated American attempts to export counter-revolution to Korea and in collaboration with the people and working class of North Korea, saved North Korea for democracy and socialism". (No. 3 PD articles) "The experience of the South Vietnam struggle itself shows that without the active help of the socialist countries, freedom struggle itself becomes extremely difficult". "The experience of Korea and Vietnam shows that armed help is essential for the success of the struggle". (from PD articles).

The meaning of these statements is very clear. The national liberation movements in colonial and semi-colonial countries cannot play a decisive role in winning their liberation; they cannot achieve victory without outside help.

If anybody opposes above statements, he is dubbed as a counter-revolutionary. According to PB to say that the national liberation movements will play the decisive role in destroying imperialism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is a counter-revolutionary proposal; to wait with folded hands for outside help is a revolutionary act; to say that the national liberation movements have stand on their own legs to achieve victory in their struggles is a counter-revolutionary act.

Lenin had seen the decisive role of the people of the backward countries in destroying imperialism. He had said in 1919:

*"The period of the awakening of the East in the contemporary revolution is being succeeded by a period in which all the Eastern peoples will participate in deciding the destiny of the whole world, so as not to be simply an object of enrichment of others. The peoples of the East are becoming alive to the need for practical action, for every nation to take part in shaping the destiny of all mankind" (from the address to the Second conference of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East).*

This is the very same idea that the CPC is propagating today. It says: "*A fundamental task is thus set before the international communist movement in the contemporary world, namely, to support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations, and people of Asia, Africa and Latin America, because these struggles are decisive for the cause of the international proletariat as a whole*" (More on Togliatti, pp.45).

Lenin could foresee the decisive role of the national liberation movements in the destruction of imperialism; the CPC has brought this idea to the forefront.

But the neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to see the correctness of this estimation; not only that it castigates the very idea itself as counter-revolutionary.

The theory of the CPSU leadership that the colonial and semi-colonial countries will win their liberation through the economic aid of the socialist countries and the theory of neo-revisionist leadership of the PB that socialist diplomacy and armen help of the socialist countries is essential for the liberation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries are one and the same; their aim is same-both aim at weakening the key role of the national liberation movements at the present times; both aim at weakening the national liberation movements.

### **Peoples War:**

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has not only refused to recognise the keyrole of the national liberation movements in the destruction of the imperialism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, it refuses to recognise the universal method of the peoples war that the national liberation movements have adopted after the second world war.

The Chinese revolution developed in a way different from that of the Russian revolution. The Chinese revolution achieved its victory through a protracted armed struggle, through the method of liberating the countryside first and liberating the towns in the end. This was their peoples war. The tactics of peoples war, the experience of the Chinese revolution, is showing the way for the liberation of the backward countries. After the Second world war, the peoples, the Marxists-Leninists of all the backward countries could advance their national liberation struggles by applying the experience of the Chinese revolution, by applying the tactics of the peoples war to the conditions of their own countries. The neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to apply the experience of this peoples war to the conditions of their own countries. The neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to apply the experience of this peoples war to our own conditions and evolve our own forms of struggle.

The neo-revisionist PB leadership, while saying that victory of social revolutions cannot be achieved through peaceful parliamentary methods in the conditions of our country, at the same time stresses, time and again that the possibility of peaceful methods should always be kept in mind, thus instilling illusions about the possibility of peaceful transition.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has clearly stated that the methods of the peoples war are not applicable to the Indian conditions. They refuse to

apply the universal tactics of peoples war, that are being adopted in all the colonial and semi-colonial countries, to the Indian conditions, by showing the differences between the geographical conditions of India and China.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is declaring its fidelity to the 1951 tactical programme, only to cover up its parliamentary path.

Though the 1951 tactical programme has been accepted, it had never been properly discussed during all these seventeen years. We have never discussed the steps to implement this programme, the political line to be adopted for the implementation of this programme, the areas suitable for the implementation of this programme.

But all these years, the peoples of various areas of the country have been fighting for land, food and liberation; those struggles are still continuing. The party has never discussed the lessons of these struggles.

Last year, the Naxalbari peasants have started the struggle for land; it is closely related to their liberation from landlord oppression. The Naxalbari peasant struggle showed the proper way for the people who were waiting for an alternative path of struggle. It was the minimum duty of the communists to support this struggle through all possible means; we should try our utmost to advance that struggle.

But the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has betrayed that struggle. It stabbed the struggle of the sons of peasants in the back, by describing the whole struggle as a struggle for disruption. It tried its utmost to isolate that struggle from the other democratic movements in the country with falsehoods and lies.

The PB stooped to the low level of supporting the repressive measures of both central and provincial governments against that movements. The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB was a party to the repressive measures that the Bengal provincial government adopted against that struggle.

Today it is taking the same disruptive methods towards the movements of Srikakulam and Telangana. The people of these areas are fighting for land and food. The Andhra provincial government is suppressing that movement. Police, landlords and goondas are unitedly and viciously attacking the people, and the party cadres; in false hundred are being arrested; thousands are being involved cases; they are burning villages one by one; party cadres are being subjected to inhuman torture, women are being raped; party cadres are being murdered.

How are we to defend the movement in these areas? How are we to resist these inhuman raids? How are we to extend this movements? This is the serious problem that the party in Andhra facing. What is the solution that the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB to this movement? Satyagraha, demonstration, petitions-this is thier solution to stop these raids.

The PB leadership is viciously attacking all those who want to organise resistance to these repressive measures in defence of the movement. They are publicly declaring in the press that all such attempts are nothing but a call for an immediate armed revolt. But everybody knows that this is a lie. The PB leadership itself is supplying the political arguments in justification of government repression.

Not only that, they are belittling the Srikakulam and Telangana movements which are the strongest bases for the party movement in Andhra, they say that we 'pick out stray, scattered and tiny islands of militant peasant and tribal peoples struggles in the vast ocean of our country's peasantry' (*PB open letter*, pp.27)

Our is a vast country with uneven development: peoples movements are also developing unevenly. In these conditions, in today's economic and political crisis, militant struggles are bound to break in various parts of the country. The communist party must boldly lead those struggles; we must resist the repressive measures against those movements; we must develop the anti-landlord struggles in other parts, that we must coordinate all these struggles and according to a plan, develop these struggles towards a peoples war.

But this is not the line of the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB. It says that revolutionary conditions have not yet matured; that party organisations are weak; that we are not yet in a position to beat back repression: with those arguments the neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to lead these struggles and thus weakens them.

They are counter-posing the resistance movement to that of the party and mass organisations.

But in all backward countries, the mass movements, after reaching a particular stage, have to face severe repression from the government. After this stage has been reached, the peoples movements could make further advance only by beating back the repressive measures, only by combining the mass movements with armed struggle. The neo-revisionist leadership refuses to recognise this hard truth.

### **Naked Parliamentary Path:**

Why is the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB opposed to the tactics of peoples war? Why is it falsely swearing by the 1951 tactical programme? Why is it opposed to any resistance programme to any militant struggle?

The basic reason is that the neo-revisionist PB leadership has taken to a complete parliamentary path.

It has given up the aim of achieving peoples democratic revolution and instead has adopted the aim of establishing non-congress government.

At one time, all the exploiting classes were behind the congress. Today anti-congress sentiment is growing among the masses. Because of this, the exploiting classes themselves are coming forward in the garb of opposition.

They want to mobilise the anti-congress sentiment of masses behind themselves, win power for themselves and thus save their exploitation. It is with this aim that the swatantra party, Bangla congress, Bharatiya Krantidal, DMK, Muslim League etc. are born.

Now the revisionist leadership of the PB wants to build united front with these bourgeois parties. It wants to establish non-congress governments in the provinces in partnership with these parties. It wants to establish a non-government at the centre. Thus, It says, it wants to break the monopoly power of the congress and thus to think if achieving peoples democratic revolution. This is the "revolutionary" line that they are following today.

Partnership in the non-congress government with the bourgeois parties not will basically change class exploitation. Such a change has not come. Still the neo revisionist leadership of the PB loudly claims that it has broken the monopoly power of the congress.

It is sheer deception of the masses to say that today's non-congress governments are breaking the monopoly power of the congress when the whole power at the centre is still in the hands of the congress, when the President, Governors and the military are still in the hands of the congress.

Communist must have the basic aim of developing the anti-congress sentiments of the masses into class consciousness and of leading the anti-congress masses towards class struggles.

Having united front with bourgeois parties for elections in the name of votes and seats is nothing but creating illusions among the masses about bourgeois parties. This is nothing but renunciation of the theory of class struggle and adopting a class collaboration policy.

Participation in ministries without real power along with bourgeois parties is nothing but creating illusions among the people about the parliamentary path.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is following exactly the same path. United front with bourgeois parties in elections; participation in ministries without real power in partnership with bourgeois parties-this will only create illusions among the masses that they could achieve their liberation without class struggles, without revolution. This is a betrayal of the revolutionary movement.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has taken to a complete parliamentary path. This is why it is opposed to peoples war, to the resistance movement against landlord goonda attacks. It has renounced all mass struggles in order to save its ministries. That is why it is preaching that the rural poor and the peasants could not advance in the face of armed might of the reactionary forces.

#### **United Front with CPSU Revisionist Leadership:**

After the Second world war, after the victory of the Chinese revolution, when the revolutionary forces were advancing throughout the world like a hurricane, revisionism raised its head to destroy the revolutionary movements. Soviet Union has become the centre of modern revisionism and CPSU has become its leader.

The policies of modern revisionism, led by CPSU leadership, adopted in the name of new epoch towards world contradictions, transition to socialism, war and peace; building up of communism in Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the proletariat in the soviet Union, have betrayed the world revolutionary movement. It is joining hands with the reactionaries of various countries to suppress revolutionary movements; it has weakened the world revolutionary movements; it has opposed and obstructed the revolutionary struggles of the Vietnamese people; it has disrupted the unity of the socialist camp and the world communist movement; it has joined hands with American imperialists and reactionaries throughout the world to build an anti-China axis; it has joined hands with US imperialists for world domination; it is weakening socialism in the USSR and is trying to restore capitalism in the USSR.

In short, the essence of the policies of the CPSU revisionist leadership is preservation of capitalism in the capitalist countries and restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries.

Today the revisionist leadership of the CPSU is acting as a counter-revolutionary force, as an agent and friend of imperialism inside the socialist camp and the world communist movement. It is a class enemy of the working class.

But the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB while pretending to be criticising the policies of the CPSU leadership as revisionist, refuses to see the counter-revolutionary nature of the CPSU revisionist leadership, refuses to see that the CPSU leadership is acting as an agent and friend of imperialism inside the socialist camp and world communist movement. The PB is saying that such a characterisation is against the very character of the New epoch.

Not only that the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has declared that the CPSU revisionist leadership is not collaborating with American imperialism for world domination. It appears, according to PB, that the CPSU leadership is collaborating with American imperialism because it thinks that friendship with US is a greater guarantee for the world peace than friendship with China. Can there be a greater deception than this?

Revisionism is a child of capitalism. But, the PB claims that social conditions of a capitalist nature in the Soviet Union are not the basis for revisionism in the Soviet Union, that the soviet revisionism does not have capitalist nature, that new capitalistic elements are not growing inside the Soviet Union, that the CPSU revisionist leadership does not represent the new capitalistic elements, but on the other hand represent the whole soviet people. Thus the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is revising the basic lessons of Lenin on revisionism.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB in its open letter to the Andhra comrades has gone one step further from the resolution of the Burdwan plenum. In the open letter to the Andhra comrades, it has declared USA and USSR are not trying to build an anti-China axis but everybody could see that both America and Russia are developing their relations with the reactionary government of India, Japan and Indonesia against China. While American imperialism has established war bases to the south of China, the USSR is building such bases to the north of China. Both USA and USSR have concluded number of nuclear agreements against China. Everybody could see that both USA and USSR are united in a conspiracy to isolate China economically, politically and militarily. The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB refuses to see even this fact. This only shows the degeneration of the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB in its anti-China hatred.

They are even propagating the view that even parties with revisionist leadership should be recognised as communist parties. If so why not the Dange party a communist party? Then why did we separate ourselves from the Dange party?

The meaning of all these arguments is only one. The criticism of the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB against the CPSU revisionist leadership is only a pretence. In practice, it is following exactly the policies of the CPSU revisionist

leadership. All the efforts of the PB leadership are directed towards building a united front with the CPSU leadership.

### **Enmity towards the Chinese Communist Party:**

The neo-revisionist leadership of the central committee, which is striving its best to build united front with the CPSU leadership, has naturally developed enmity towards the Chinese communist party.

Within the socialist camp with 100 crores of population China has alone got 70 crores of population. Today Peoples Republic of China is in the forefront of the struggle against American imperialism; it is helping the national liberation movements to the best of its capacity. Peoples Republic of China and the Chinese communist party are in the forefront of the struggle against modern revisionism.

China is fighting for the completion of the socialist revolution through the great cultural revolution. The neo-revisionist leaders of the PB refuses to see this fact.

The Chinese communist party has developed Marxism-Leninism, applicable to the present-day world situation, in order to achieve the tasks of the new epoch. The Chinese communist party has developed Marxism-Leninism Mao's thought for the accomplishment of the tasks of new epoch-the complete destruction of world imperialism and winning world socialist revolution.

Marx and Engles developed their theories of scientific socialism in a period of growing industrial capitalism.

Lenin further developed Marxism as applicable to the period of imperialism.

Stalin developed Marxism-Leninism in building socialism in a single country encircled by capitalist states and in his struggle for creating mass communist parties throughout the world.

The thought of Mao is a further development of Marxism-Leninism applicable to the present era, when imperialism is fast disintegrating and the national liberation struggles have come to occupy a central place for completion of the world socialist revolution.

Peoples democracy, Peoples war, Completion of the Socialist revolution through the great cultural revolution, an irreconcilable ideological battle against modern revisionism -this is the quintessence of Mao's thought.

Already, present world history has amply proved that wherever the people have assimilated the experience of the Chinese revolution, and applied it to the concrete conditions of their countries, there the revolutionary movements have won complete victory or have made significant advances. And where ever the people have not assimilated the experiences of the Chinese revolution, there the revolutionary movements have failed to make any significant advance or even counter-revolution has succeeded.

The neo-revisionist PB leadership refuses to see this fact, refuses to accept Mao's thought.

The neo-revisionist PB leadership has replaced peoples democracy with non-congress democracy, agrarian revolution with the establishment non-congress

governments both at the centre and the provinces. It is belittling the great cultural revolution of the CPC. That is why they have refused to accept Mao's thought.

The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB wants to cover up these ugly truths. Under the pretence of praising the service of CPC to the cause of Marxism-Leninism, it tries to cover up its anti-China hatred.

But soon they have to come out in their true colours.

At Palakollu provincial plenum meeting the central committee leaders have to come out openly in their anti-China colours. They declared that while the CPSU leadership was revising Marxism-Leninism from the right, the Chinese communist party was revising Marxism-Leninism from the left. They declared that the CPC was following an anti-Marxist-Leninist policy in treating the CPSU as a friend of American imperialism, in refusing united action with CPSU leadership on the question of Vietnam and in its criticism of our own party.

The degradation of neo-revisionist PB leadership has reached such low levels as to say that CPC is responsible for the murder and torture of lakhs of communists in Indonesia. They have not stopped with that. The following are the certificates that the neo-revisionist PB leadership has bestowed on the CPC for its refusing united action with CPSU leadership in Vietnam.

- Anyone who opposes it under whatever pretext only aids the game of imperialism as the revisionism policies do.
- This is how a fake fight against revisionism works and coincides in action with it.
- This opposition to the very proposal of united action in relation to Vietnam, is disruptive of international unity.
- The utterly reactionary character of this line stands unmarked when it is realised that it obstructs and hinders the united action of the socialist camp for Vietnam.
- This is where departure from Marxism-Leninism leads.
- One who confuses ideological unity, unity between parties, with proposal for united action on a specific issue, has no right to be considered a Marxist-Leninist.
- Abandonment of this attempt is on par with the revisionist betrayal of Vietnam and our critics are guilty of it.
- The picture they present, the arguments they advance, the positions they take have nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism.
- Thus they dare not say openly that they really do not recognise the existence of socialist camp- a counter-revolutionary conclusion.

All these certificates have been taken from the articles of Peoples Democracy. It is the CPSU leadership that had given the call for united action in Vietnam. It is the CPC that has refused to accept this call. Even a fool could see that all these certificates of the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB really refer to the CPC.

That means, according to the PB leadership, CPC has no Marxism-Leninism, that it has taken to a counter-revolutionary ideology. This is their estimation of the

CPC. Thus they have joined the anti of their-China chorus of the reactionaries. This is the low level anti-China hatred; this is the measure of their degradation.

### **Dange Revisionism in New Form:**

Just as they have adopted the policies of the CPSU leadership on the international issues, neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has adopted the policies of the Dange group with regard to the internal issues.

Our country has become bankrupt because of the economic and political policies of the congress government. Our rupee is tied to the American dollar. Our exports and imports are dependent upon the wishes of the world bank and the US imperialists. Our budget and the five year plans are dependent upon the loans from world bank and US imperialism. Our industries depend on foreign supplies of machinery, spare parts, raw materials and technical know-how. Our military hardware is dependent on foreign imperialist supplies. Our rationing is dependent upon the food supplies from America. Today American domination is to be seen in every sphere of economic life. It is able to force the congress government to change its political policies according to the wishes of US imperialists. The foreign policy of the Congress government has become a part of the foreign policy of US imperialism.

Today our country is subjected more and more to the economic and political exploitation of US imperialism. The independence has become nominal. The country has become a neo-colonial country for American imperialism. Slavery to US imperialism has become real.

The Dange revisionists tied their best to cover up this reality. They praised the congress government that it achieved full independence for the country, that the country was advancing on independent lines.

Today the neo-revisionist PB leadership is seeing independence in the government of Indira Gandhi still to some extent, and that this has been possible because of the political power in the hands of the congress government, that it is wrong to speak of American slavery seeing only American domination over our economy. Is there any difference between the arguments of the Dange group and the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB? Is this not a new deception of the masses?

Due to the economic policies of the congress government the whole economic life of the country is in a great crisis.

Instead of seeing this reality the revisionists of the Dange group expected the congress government itself to achieve industrial revolution. Today the neo-revisionist PB leadership is seeing economic 'development' and industrial 'development' under the congress regime. (PB open letter to the Andhra comrades, pp. 16)

While the Dange revisionists expected the Congress government to build an independent economy and achieve industrial revolution through the economic aid of the Soviet Union, the neo-revisionist PB leadership is saying that the congress government is able to save the independence of the country to some extent through Soviet economic aid.

Not only that; they have begun to see the so-called “planned” industrial development with the ‘aid’ of both the socialist and imperialist states” (PB open letter pp. 9) This only means that the neo-revisionist PB leadership is dreaming of planned industrial development through the aid of American imperialist capital.

Because of American domination over the economic life of the country, the foreign policy of the government is subservient to the foreign policy of the US government; it is occupying a key place in the world strategy of US imperialists to suppress national liberation struggles and Anti-China conspiracies. The attitude of the Indian government towards North Vietnam, Cuba, Middle East clearly proves this. In the recent period, with the expected withdrawal of British imperialism from Asia, the Indian government, with the support US imperialism and Soviet Union, is aspiring to fulfil the part of the British imperialism in these parts. The recent tour of the Prime Minister in the South-eastern countries only confirms this. The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB wants to be blind to these developments.

The Dange revisionists praised the foreign policy of the congress government as a policy of full non-alignment, as an anti-imperialist foreign policy. The neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is loudly declaring that it is wrong to say that *“the non-alignment policy of the Indian government is given up for good, substituting it with a policy of total surrender and subservience to imperialists”* (PB open letter- pp 20)

While the Dange revisionists dreamt of achieving national democracy through an united front with ‘progressive’ congressmen and other ‘progressives’, the neo-revisionist PB leadership wants to achieve its revolution through an united front with congressmen who have come out of the congress or other bourgeois parties and establishing non-congress governments.

Instead of leading the anti-congress masses into class struggles, the neo-revisionist PB leaders are creating illusions among the masses about the bourgeois parties by its united front with bourgeois parties like the Bangla Congress.

While the party programme placed the aim of peoples democracy through an agrarian revolution, the neorevisionist PB leadership is working to achieve non-congress governments through its election fronts with bourgeois parties.

Hiding this fact, the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB is finding fault with the Dange revisionists for trying “to topple the central congress government” (PB Letter, p 24)

But the neo-revisionist leadership of the CC itself has placed this aim of establishing a non-congress government at the Centre. In the New Situation and party's tasks, the CC has declared:

*“It is this struggle of the democratic parties and groups in different legislatures and among the people, in parliament and in states with non-congress democratic governments that alone can pave the way for consolidating and widening the unity achieved by the democratic forces and open prospects of realising the slogan of non-congress democratic government at the centre”* (New Situation and Party's Tasks, p. 29)

Thus we see that the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB has copied the slogan of non-congress government at the centre from the Dange revisionists. Now in the open letter they pretend as though they are opposed to such an idea.

An analysis of the above facts clearly show that the fight of the neo-revisionist leadership of which the revisionism of the Dange group is merely a paper fight, while the truth is they have adopted all the policies if the Dange group with regard to the internal situation. That is why the Dange revisionists and the neo-revisionists could unite on every issue- one-congress governments, Naxalbari peasant struggle and anti-China campaign.

If the CPC criticises their policies, the neo-revisionists PB leadership condemns such a criticism as interference in the internal affairs of brother parties and tries to rouse national chauvanism against the CPC in the country.

If our party comrades question the correctness of such a policy, the neo-revisionist leadership of the PB decries that such comrades, having adopted the party programme are opposing the same because of the CPC criticism that they do not have independent thinking, that they are agents of the CPC.

But what is the truth? Even at the time of Calcutta Congress, when the party programme was being adopted, the Naxalbari comrades put forth many amendments on the subjects mentioned above.

In the Andhra party conference at that time, an amendment was carried which declared that the foreign policy of the Indian government was a fake non-alignment policy, that its foreign policy was subservient to that of US imperialism; but it was defeated at the Calcutta congress.

An amendment to the party programme, demanding self determination to the nationalities was proposed before the party congress. But the leadership prevailed on the Congress to post-pone admission on the subject.

Some of the Guntur comrades brought an amendment to the party programme in the district and provincial conferences that "it was wrong to fight that section of the bourgeois which was not tied to the imperialism and feudalism" that such a step "will interlink democratic stage of the revolution with that of the socialist revolution".

Even in 1964, at the time of Tenali convention, comrades pointed out that it was wrong to decide the party programme without deciding our stand on the international ideological debate.

In 1965, during our detentions in jails, there were very serious discussions about the anti-China attitude of the CC leaders. There were serious discussions with the PB leaders face to face.

Thus we see that even at the time of Calcutta congress, many comrades raised objections to certain aspects of the party programme.

At that time, each comrades raised a point of discussions based on his own experience. Now when the experienced CPC is criticising our party programme and policy on a clear cut ideological basis comrades are opposing the neo-revisionist theories and policies with self-confidence.

It is for this that the neo-revisionist PB leadership is accusing us as Chinese agents, that we have mortgaged our brains to China. They have stooped to the low level of telling lies when they say that none opposed its programme previously.

### **What does All This Show?**

The claim of the neo-revisionist PB leadership that it is fighting against the revisionist policies of the CPSU leadership and the adventurist and dogmatic policies of the CPC at the same time, is a false claim.

This middle course is merely a myth. It is only a cover for their neo-revisionist line:

- United front with the CPSU revisionist leadership and enmity towards CPC;
- United front with the Dange revisionists and enmity towards Marxists-Leninists; love for parliamentary path and opposition to militant struggles;
- This is the meaning of the PB's letter to the Andhra comrades. This is the neo-revisionist line.

It is the duty of every communist to expose this neo-revisionist line before the people and the party members. It is the duty of all to carry on an irreconcilable, ideological, political and organisational battle against this neo-revisionist line.

The central committee leadership is spreading lies and adopting dictatorial methods against these comrades who have opposed its neo-revisionist line. They are denouncing us throughout India saying that we are going against the seventh congress decisions and the party constitution.

Who has gone against the decisions of the Seventh congress? The party congress had asked the CC to organise ideological discussions in the dispassionate atmosphere. The party congress had asked the members to enrich Marxism-Leninism to the end their own experience. It is the central committee that has really gone against the decisions of the seventh congress, as proved by the following facts:

Even before the party has taken decision the ideological issue, as against the decision of the seventh congress, the PB leaders and the CC have carried a right opportunist anti-China line.

In 1965, during Indo-Pak dispute, the PB leaders, both inside and outside jails, have carried on an anti-China campaign, against the spirit of proletarian internationalism leading to serious inner-party disputes.

The General Secretary of the party, while in Moscow, having come to an agreement with the CPSU revisionist leadership on national and international issues, wrote letters from Moscow, which got publicity in the press.

One PB member wrote to Nanda, in contradiction to the party programme, saying that our programme does not differ from that of Dange revisionists on peaceful transition (M. B. letter).

In the course of internal discussion the leadership utilised the party press against those comrades who opposed its opportunist line.

In 'New situation and party's tasks', the CC leadership tried to cover up the betrayal of the CPSU revisionist leadership on the dependency of the Indian government raising a serious discussion inside the party.

Having started such internal disputes inside the party, even before the ideological discussions started inside the party, the CC leadership expelled the Naxalbari comrades who are leading the peasant struggle, disrupting the party and rousing passions in the party.

in contradiction to the rights of the party members conferred by the party congress, the CC leadership declared the Madurai ideological draft as a policy statement; refused to distribute the alternative draft to the party ranks, put certain restrictions on free and full discussions on the ideological draft.

All these facts clearly show that it is the PB and CC who violated democratic centralism inside the party, who went against the decisions of the Seventh congress.

Who went against the Party Constitution?

According to the constitution, every party member, whatever may be his position inside the party, should abide by party discipline (clause 19 (4)). The CC must represent the whole party (clause 16 (14)).

The CC did not discharge its tasks towards the decisions of the party congress, behaved in a sectariat way, did not control the activities of the PB. In the end, the PB itself has acted against the decisions of the party congress.

In the name of majority for the so-called official line, the PB nominated its followers to the provincial secretariat and the provincial committee.

In spite of this nomination, when the PC by one vote majority decided to include the issue of Srikakulam and Nalgonda mass movements, the PB members who have lost confidence in internal democracy of the party have got a ruling from the president, its follower, keeping this to the end.

Two PB members took that whole authority into their own hands to expel four secretariat members including a CC member.

The CC leadership have gone against the party constitution itself : they have reduced communist committees into bourgeois organisations. Now their efforts to spread the lie that we have gone against the party constitution is only a part of their disruptive neo-revisionist line. Having refused to decide the ideological issue democratically through a party congress, they can only take to disruption.

### **Disruption by the Neo-revisionist Leadership :**

While we were all uniting and gathering strength with the help of international literature, to fight modern revisionism, to fight against the Dange group, its anti-proletarian internationalism, the present CC leadership pretended to be supporting us. At that time we did not see through the disruption game of this leadership in making the Dange letters the main point of discussion, in post-poning the discussion on the ideological issue, in pursuing for the party programme in the name of fighting Dange group; we could not see that it was a planned disruption. We could see the conspiracy of this leadership when it declares in the Burdwan resolution that the party congress has decided its Marxism-Leninism through the party programme,

and that they are only projecting that experience of the international experience to the international issues. As its neo-revisionist policy is exposed, the CC leadership has resorted to disciplinary actions and party disruption. They have no need to look back on their activities. They are disrupting the party in province after province. Having renounced the aims of the Seventh congress, and now they are calling for the Eighth party congress.

A party congress without communist revolutionaries in the various provinces it will only be a congress of the neo-revisionist group.

We should have no illusions about this neo-revisionist leadership. Let all the communist revolutionaries concentrate on the following immediate tasks:

- We should propagate Mao's thought, Marxism-Leninism of the present era, against modern revisionism.
- We should defend our mass movements against all inhuman repression: we must struggle to expand those movements.
- Organise and lead class struggle of the exploited classes of the countryside against landlord exploitation.
- Organise the trade union movement on revolutionary lines.
- We should organise student and youth organisations so as to attract large number of youth and students towards scientific socialism.
- We must build a strong and disciplined communist party through struggles, based on Marxism-Leninism. This is our aim. We earnestly hope that every party member will participate in this struggle. Let us all together march forward.

1968

With revolutionary greetings

**Tarimela Nagi Reddy**  
**Devulapalli Venkateswara Rao**  
**Kolla Venkayya**  
**Chandra Pulla Reddy**

