

Peking And CP(ML)

The following letter was reported to have been circulated by a number of CP(ML) leaders—in jail now—quite some time before Charu Mazumdar's arrest, and death in jail custody.

Comrades,

WE convey our revolutionary greetings to all. We feel that we are not competent to send you these suggestions, but owing to abnormal situation inside the Party now, we are compelled to take this course.

By this time, we hope, you all know that the great glorious and correct Chinese Communist Party has sent us most valuable fraternal suggestions in respect of our liberation struggle in India in the month of November, 1970.

We are citing certain excerpts of the valuable suggestions for our convenience. The suggestions are:

(1) The Chinese Party grew and developed by fighting alien trends—both left adventurism and right deviation.

(2) The Chinese Revolution became successful with three magic weapons: (a) the Party (b) the people's Army (c) the United Front.

(3) To call a Chairman of one Party as the Chairman of another Party is wrong, and... it will wound the national sentiment of the working class of this country.

(4) Your idea of United Front is wrong. You have said that the United Front will come into being only after the formation of some base areas. This is a mechanical understanding. The United Front is a process. The United Front comes into being at every stage of struggle, and again it breaks down. This is not a permanent organisation. There is no doubt that the worker-peasant unity is its main basis. But the main understanding behind the Unit-

ed Front is the unity between the exploiter and the exploited (those exploiters who are not the main target of the revolution). The characterisation of the bourgeoisie as a whole comprador is wrong.

(5) Regarding the formulation that the open trade union, open mass organisations and mass movements are out of date, and taking to secret assassination as the only way: This idea needs rethinking. Formerly we misunderstood your word 'Annihilation'. We used to think that the idea is taken from our Chairman's war of annihilation. But in July 1970, issue of *Liberation* (the organ of CPI-ML) we came to understand that this annihilation means secret assassination.

(6) You have applied Lin Piao's People's War Theory in a mechanical way. Lin's Guerilla War theory is a military affair. During the anti-Japanese resistance war when we had an army of 10 lakhs, at that time some comrades in the army raised a slogan that positional warfare and mobile warfare are the way to mobilise the people. In reply to this wrong theory, Comrade Lin said that guerilla war is the only way to mobilise the people. This military theory has no relation with political and organisational question.

(7) Regarding the formulation that if a revolutionary does not make his hand red with the blood of class enemies, then he is not a communist. If this be the yardstick of a Communist then that Communist Party cannot remain a Communist Party.

(8) No stress has been given on agrarian revolution and the slogan for the seizure of the State power is counterposed to the land problem. There is no agrarian programme.

(9) Without mass struggle and mass organisation, the peasants' armed struggle cannot be sustained. The Communist Party of China supported Naxalbari struggle not merely as a struggle for the seizure of state power. The article 'Spring Thunder' published in China in support of

Naxalbari and published in *Liberation* will clarify it.

(10) The authority and prestige of a leader cannot be created but grows and develops.

(11) The general orientation of (CP-ML) is correct but its policy is wrong.

We firmly accept these valuable suggestions and criticism from the fraternal party. We deeply feel that the Central Committee of our Party led by Comrade Charu Mazumdar should have accepted the above suggestions and criticism at once and made self-criticism and rectify the mistakes, as suggested, in the interest of the agrarian revolution of our country.

But to our great disappointment, regret and disgust, we found that Comrade Charu Mazumdar and the Central Committee led by him, has refused to take lessons from the above valuable suggestions. In our opinion, if he had any reservations in respect of the suggestions, from the fraternal party, then he could have readily circulated the fraternal party's suggestions to all the party units for discussion. But he failed to take this course, as a result of which discussion and discord cropped up inside the Party. This is the bad old method and practice followed inside the Indian Communist movement.

We firmly believe that the Central Committee and the Central Party line have deviated from the path of the glorious Naxalbari peasant uprising. That is, the path shown in their Report on Peasant Movement in the main has completely departed from the path enunciated in the famous article "Spring Thunder" in respect of our armed agrarian revolution. We deeply feel that our policy suffered Left adventurist deviations as a result of which a wrong left adventurist method was adopted for which at present the Party in fact has split into groups and factions, and Com. Sushital Ray Chowdhury was the victim of this method and for this the cause of the armed agrarian revolution of our country is hindered and jeopardised.

We firmly declare that we do not owe any allegiance to any group or faction. Our relation with the groups which believed in the Thoughts of Mao, both inside and outside the CPI (ML) is not antagonistic. We firmly believe that as General Secretary of the Party Comrade Charu Mazumdar is mainly responsible for the Left adventurist deviations and at the same time, we firmly believe that all the members of the former first Central Committee elected by the first Congress of the Party and all the members co-opted in the present Central Committee cannot also shirk their responsibilities, because they are also more or less directly or indirectly responsible for the Left adventurist deviations.

We, the undersigned, with utmost devotion and frankness accept our guilt and we emphatically declare that we will boldly accept the criticisms of our comrades in this connection, and we are also doing our self-criticism with full honesty. We call upon all the members of the former and present Central Committee to accept their guilt and make self-criticism in the interest of our armed agrarian revolution.

We earnestly request all the members of our Party and the sympathisers to be bold enough and come forward unhesitatingly to repudiate the Left adventurist deviationist line advocated by Comrade Charu Mazumdar and ask him to make honest self-criticism and to accept his guilt in respect of our armed agrarian revolution. We also appeal to our comrades and sympathisers to criticise the Central Committee members and ask them to accept their guilt and make self-criticism honestly. We must be very careful against revisionism, while fighting against Left deviations, which have become the main danger inside the Party for the present.

We appeal earnestly to all the members of our Party to prepare a review of the struggle in their respective areas; start discussions throughout the Party; and try to

rectify the mistakes in the light of the Naxalbari path as laid down in the article 'Spring Thunder', and by accepting the suggestions from the great glorious, and correct Chinese Communist Party as the basis, without any reservations; and create a new unity to carry forward the armed agrarian struggle.

Kanu Sanyal

Chowdhary Tejeswara Rao

Souren Bose

D. Nagabhushanam Patnaik

Kolla Venkaiah

D. Bhuvan Mohan Patnaik.

Gandharva's New Play

HITEN GHOSH

GANDHARVA's latest, *Majār Majā* (Fun of Funs)—a collection of skits—is the group's offering on the occasion of the Bengali theatre centenary which is almost entirely taken up with revivals and memorial services. Gandharva brings a professedly anti-play or anti-theatre. Not for it the drama with plot, characterisation or development. So away with climax, anti-climax and all such useless heirlooms. Only a paroxysm of rage here—no theatre of protest though, no blue-print for struggle, no diatribe against anything or anyone, and still less a burst of irresponsibility.

Gandharva calls its new play an amalgam of sketches to glance through in idle curiosity for an odd glimpse of events in the past years. And yet here is, the programme assures us, the 'real drama' for you and me. A curious, though candid, apologia this.

The group seems a little split in its purpose. From all one could gather from the present showing, it believes in theatre of commitment and is not ashamed of being propagandist. Propaganda and protest are writ plain all over the play under review. Which cannot be a vice in itself, but the play suffers from a contradiction in the group's aim as set forth in the handbill,