

# THE SUCCESS OF THE REVOLUTION IS ASSURED

In the "Immediate Programme" we had stated :

"India is a neo-colony. The people of this country are suffering from the exploitation of US imperialism, British imperialism, Soviet revisionist neo-colonialism. Along with imperialism, feudalism is also an important exploitation force. 70 per cent to 80 per cent of the people living in rural areas are suffering from various forms of feudal exploitation. In these circumstances, Indian revolution will be completed in two stages. Today we are in the stage of New-Democratic Revolution."

In the course of my statement, I have explained as to how the Indian big bourgeoisie betrayed the revolution and how it has allowed foreign finance capital to exploit the country in various forms much more intensively than even in the colonial period. I have also explained how the Indian big bourgeoisie allied itself with feudal landlords and princes and helped them to intensify even feudal exploitation along with growing capitalist relations.

Therefore, it is clear that the Indian democratic revolution can succeed only under the leadership of the proletariat.

## **Liberation Can Succeed Only Under the Leadership of the Proletariat**

In 1925, addressing the students of the university of the peoples of the East, Stalin had warned the national liberation movements of colonial countries about the role of the colonial big bourgeoisie such as in India :

"In certain countries (India, for instance) capitalism is growing rapidly and is giving birth to and crystallising a more or less numerous class of proletarians."

"As the revolutionary movement progresses, the national bourgeoisie in such countries divides into two sections, a revolutionary section ( the petty bourgeoisie) and a compromising section (the big bourgeoisie). The former continues the revolutionary struggle; the latter enters into a block with imperialism."

How true this objective analysis is in the case of India, is evident without any further explanation. This process of compromise by the leading representatives of the colonial big bourgeoisie with imperialism reached its final completion in India with the transfer of power. This classical process of compromise exposes the true character of the Indian State, as the biggest dependent semi-colonial country. It has clearly exposed that national liberation revolution cannot succeed under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. Stalin had warned that "**Independence does not come as a gift**" - in the form of transfer of power from Lord Mountbatten to Pandit Nehru - but is possible only "**by victorious revolution**". and that this victorious revolution can be advanced only under the hegemony of the proletariat.

He had categorically stated that, "the revolution cannot be advanced and the complete independence of capitalistically developed colonies and dependencies cannot be achieved unless the compromising section of the national bourgeoisie is isolated, unless the petty bourgeoisie revolutionary masses are freed from the influence of this bourgeoisie, unless the hegemony of the proletariat is established, unless the advanced elements of the working class are organised in an independent communist party."

The conditions for the success of the revolution are laid down firmly. They are as important today as they were in 1925.

In India today the fight for national liberation is intertwined with the struggle for democratic, anti-feudal revolution. Only after completing these two tasks can one talk of the completion of Socialist task.

As Mao Tse-tung has explained: "*These two great tasks are interrelated. Unless imperialist rule is overthrown, the rule of the feudal landlord class cannot be terminated, because imperialism is its main support. Conversely, unless, help is given to the peasants in their struggle to overthrow the feudal landlord class, it will be impossible to build powerful revolutionary contingents to overthrow imperialist rule, because the feudal landlord class is the main social base of imperialist rule in China and the peasantry is the main force in the Chinese revolution. Therefore, the two fundamental tasks, the national revolution and the democratic revolution are at once distinct and united.*

*In fact, the two revolutionary tasks are already linked ..... It*

*is wrong to regard the national revolution and the democratic revolution as two entirely different stages."*

("Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party").

I have explained how the main task of the anti-imperialist revolution still continues in India, since imperialist exploitation is no whit less than it was under direct colonial rule and hence national liberation is yet to be achieved along with anti-feudal democratic tasks.

Thus the people's democratic revolution is an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution of the broad masses of the people under the leadership of the proletariat. This revolution is a new type of democratic revolution.

### The Question of State Power

When we say that the democratic tasks of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution can be accomplished only under the leadership of the proletariat, the question of State power is posed directly. Which class holds power decides everything; upto now, the State power is held by the big bourgeoisie in alliance with imperialism and feudalism. We have found that it cannot in any circumstances fulfil the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks. This bourgeoisie adopts all kinds of deceptive practices to hoodwink the people. When it is compelled to make any particular concession, it does so only to begin withdrawing them the following day. It hands out promises left and right - the latest election promise of land ceiling of 12 to 18 acres of wet land per family-only to fail to carry them out later. Finally, it enters into a coalition, to cover its domination, even with revisionist progressives - "*only to fool the people by a show of honest coalition*". "*In words it claims to be a popular, democratic revolutionary government, but indeed it is anti-popular, undemocratic, counter revolutionary, bourgeois government.*" (Lenin: "One of the Fundamental Questions of Revolution.")

Indian bourgeoisie is adept in fooling the people by loud proclamations of revolutionary slogans, like '*curb the monopolies*', plans for '*ceiling on urban properties*', and legislation on '*land ceilings*' and implementation of '*crash programme for the distribution of banzer land*'.

Paul A. Baran, Professor of Economics of Stanford University, in his book. "The Political Economy of Growth", characterises the

Indian Bourgeoisie thus :

"Anti-imperialist by background, it is courting favours from foreign capital. Espousing the principles of private property, it promises the nation a 'socialist pattern of society' ..... anxious to reconcile the irreconcilable needs, to compose radical differences, to find compromises where decisions are inevitable, losing much valuable time and energy in bridging current conflicts within its own fold, the government substitutes minor reforms for radical changes, revolutionary words for revolutionary deeds, and thus endangers not only the possibility of realising its hopes and aspirations but even the very tenure of office'.... it is incapable of providing genuine leadership for the battle for industrialisation ... (Pages 246,247).

Thus the proud declarations of anti-imperialism, the insistent talk of '*remove poverty*' and all such revolutionary words are a psychological bait to the masses. And the bourgeoisie knows it.

As Gunnar Myrdal in his "Asian Drama" says : "The Indian political pattern of bold radicalism in principle and extreme conservatism in practice, was already well-established before Independence," and that "this co-mingling of revolutionary views on economic and social questions with a solicitude for the vested interests of the Indian upper classes - including even those of the feudal princes and absentee landlords was among Gandhi's more subtle ideological achievements." (Page 260-261). Therefore, the Indian vested interests were not much perturbed or bothered about radical pronouncements. Lenin's characterisation that all these deceptive slogans, declarations, and promises, are only to fool the people have proved in practice to be hundred per cent correct, whatever be the prettification of the revisionists and their coalition with the Congress party to form united front governments.

Therefore, the question of power is the fundamental question. The theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao's Thought- the quiescence of historical experience, is clear that the question of power is not resolved even "*under all sorts of 'coalition' cabinets that include 'socialists', that these socialists, even when individuals among them are perfectly honest, in reality turnout to be either a useless ornament of or a screen for bourgeois government, a sort of lightning conductor to divert the indignation from the government, a tool for the government to deceive the people.*" (Lenin, Ibid).

It is the experience not only of our country but all over the world - such as in Italy and France, Indonesia and Ceylon - that such coalition governments where the Communists have participated are not only a tool, ornament, or a screen to deceive the people, but a counter revolutionary force to suppress the revolutionary forces.

### The Question of Violent Overthrow and Capture of Power

I can do no better than to quote the historic statement of the Communists accused of Meerut conspiracy case on this issue. They proclaimed that "democracy in fact is held to be unreliable in capitalist society because of the fundamental helplessness of the propertyless man, the parliamentary forms only serve to veil the reality of the bourgeois dictatorship by an appearance of popular consent, which is rendered unreal by the capitalist control of the social structure; and even this veil is set aside in moments of any stress by open assumption of emergency dictatorial powers" ..... We "believe that the ruling class will use every means, political, economic and military, to defend its privileges and that the final decision will not be reached without open civil war. In support of this, they (the communists) quote evidence to show the readiness of the ruling class in many countries to fling constitutional considerations to the winds when their privileges are in danger." (Page 271-72).

This statement which was true then, is truer today in Indian conditions. We have, during these 20 years and more of Indian democracy, witnessed emergencies declared all over the country and in various parts to openly and uninhibitedly use savage force against the workers and peasants to drown their just struggles in blood. We have noted how, in every province the landlord class and the government have thrown "**democratic law**" overboard, massacred thousands, and use every method of savage brutality against millions. The ruling class in its own interests become a moralist of vehement democracy in the name of the people. The Indian ruling class paraded 'democracy' in the case of East Bengal where Yahya Khan used the crudest fascist methods to suppress the people. The '*democratic*' Indian government which has unleashed Baranagars and Howrahs in West Bengal and innumerable police camps in Srikakulam to torture, butcher

hundreds of people is capable of deceiving the people by shedding democratic tears.

It is my firm opinion that the entry of Indian troops into East Bengal is not only to safeguard the Indian and British bourgeoisie's economic interests but also to counter the growing influence of anti-imperialist and anti-feudal forces in the armed struggle. Already, news has begun to appear of the arrests of Left forces in East Bengal. Therefore, to fling the '*constitutional and democratic facade*' to the winds is not Yahya Khan's privilege alone. It is as much the privilege of the Indian bourgeoisie. The Indian bourgeoisie which intervened in East Bengal supposed by, according to revisionists of all the branches, on behalf of the people fighting against brutal force of Pakistani savage dictatorship - had the temerity, in the name of democracy, to intervene in Ceylon to suppress the people's upsurge and help Sreemathi Bandarenaike to establish herself through democratic genocide. The bourgeoisie thinks that use of violence is the privilege of the bourgeoisie alone. We, the representatives of the working class, believe that to establish real democracy - democracy of the people on the basis of extermination of feudal and imperialist - cum - comprador bourgeoisie exploitation - the people have as much right and are as much privileged to use violence against the counter revolutionary violence of the bourgeoisie.

Therefore, "it is the conditions of society that are producing chaos and revolution; it is the object of the Communists to end those conditions by giving conscious direction to the instinctive force of revolt instead of seeking to stem them." (Ibid, Page 281).

"**Revolutions are locomotives of history**" said Marx. It has been so from the earliest period of history, starting with the revolt of the slaves against slavery, the revolt of peasants and middle classes against feudalism, the revolt of oppressed nations against imperialism, and the revolt of workers against capitalism. "The right to revolution is, after all, the only real '*historical*' right, the only right on which all modern States without exception rest." (Marx, "Introduction to the Class Struggle in France"). The American and French revolutions, the Russian and Chinese revolutions, the Viet Nam and Cuban revolutions are only a few in modern history. No State of importance was ever established without a violent fermentation of revolutionary struggle. Therefore, it was that Lenin proclaimed :

"Whoever recognises class struggle cannot fail to recognise civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and under certain circumstances inevitable, continuation, development, and intensification of class struggle. All the great revolutions prove this. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it, would mean sinking into extreme opportunism and renouncing the socialist revolutions."

As Lenin said of such revolutionary wars : "Of all the wars known in history it is the only **lawful, rightful, just, and truly great war.**"

To reiterate this great historic truth, and to explain to the people of the world the immense and immediate absolute necessity of revolutions to change the face of the earth from a world of exploitation to a world of socialist reconstruction Mao Tsetung proclaimed the truth that "**Power grows out of the barrel of the gun**".

Our own experience has proved the truth of this maxim.

### **Do Revolutionary Conditions Exist in India**

We are absolutely of the opinion '*yes*'. The objective conditions in our country are excellent. The economic and political crisis is growing day by day, for the past four years even though, off and on, temporary stability seems to have set in. The production front is in the doldrums. Mass misery and unemployment are a growing feature. The prices are rising. The convulsions in the countryside are on the increase. The dissensions in the ruling class are growing, even if to outer appearance Indira Gandhi seems to hold the reins firmly. The growing inter-imperialist contradictions are having, and will be having, greater and greater impact to increase the growing instability. The crisis of the budgets of the states, the crisis of international aid, the crisis of the balance of payments, the crisis of rising prices, the crisis on the agricultural and industrial front, the growth in working class struggles - never has India been in the midst of such a grave situation. On the political front, every bourgeois party and their collaborators are in the midst of cracking the internal crisis. The oncoming period will only increase the cracks. Every united front government is faced with internal dissensions. The factional dissensions in the ruling party too - with all the built in popularity of Indira Gandhi - are widening.

This is a period of growth of the objective conditions necessary

for revolution.

But then the question is posed : Are the subjective factors, too, as mature as the objective factors? And, then, a gloomy picture of the weakness of the Communist movement is presented to the world.

Lenin had said : *"It would be erroneous to believe that revolutionary classes always have sufficient strength for the accomplishment of the overturn at the time at which the conditions of the socio-economic development have rendered the need for that overturn entirely ripe. No, human society is not arranged so rationally and so 'conveniently' for its progressive elements. The need for the overturn may be ripe, but the strength of the revolutionary creators of that overturn may turn out to be inadequate for carrying it out. Under such conditions society rots and this rotting sometimes lasts entire decades."*

Ever maturing crisis of a society does not by itself bring about a revolution. There might be sporadic outbursts of anger. There might even be rebellions as in the case of the Indigo revolts, or the Mopla rebellion, or the Manyam revolt of the girijans; but they will all be expressions of discontent - they cannot be vehicles of change of society from one into the other. Objective conditions for change are created from out of the functioning of the society itself. No special effort is necessary for the creation of objective conditions necessary for a successful revolution.

But the subjective conditions necessary for a successful revolution do not arise automatically. Socialist consciousness does not arise automatically from working class struggles for their demands; it has to be imparted from outside by the party of the working class. That is what is meant by *'political consciousness'*. So long as the Communist Party fails to educate consistently and consciously the need for a revolution, the need for an armed struggle for the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, the people's democratic dictatorship; so long as the Communist Party does not *"spread among the working class a concrete idea of the most probable course of the revolution"* (Lenin); the subjective conditions necessary for an armed revolution to be led by the working class will never be created.

Therefore, Lenin insisted that it is necessary to *"spread among the working class a concrete idea of the most probable*

**course of the revolution"** and that we must propagate amongst broad sections of the proletariat the idea of armed people fighting for the capture of power.

We, the Communist revolutionaries, believe in the theory of people's war. We have declared in the immediate programme our path. *"Our revolutionary line - completely different from the revisionist parliamentary path". "The vital aspect of this programme is to liberate the villages, encircle the towns and gradually liberate the urban areas"*. In the successful implementation of this programme, *'agrarian revolution plays the vital role'*. Hence the need for revolutionaries to propagate the importance of land distribution and organise the masses for action on the question of land.

But Communist revolutionaries always remember that the demand for land to the tiller, the demand for land reform **in the abstract**, is one of the means of duping the masses of agricultural labour and poor peasants. It is the slogan that is successfully being adopted as its own by the party in power. At the present time, the mere propaganda of the slogan, without releasing the initiative of the revolutionary energy of the people, can only show illusions and demoralise the masses; for it makes them believe that the bourgeoisie is humane and turns the masses into a plaything in the hands of the bourgeoisie. At the same time, to create an illusion that, through coalition governments which include Communists the question of land reforms can be tackled, is greater deception, to pretend to do this is to become the tool of the bourgeoisie to deceive the people. As Lenin says, *"it is the greatest delusions, the greatest self-deception, and a deception of the people, to attempt, by means of this State apparatus, to carry out such reforms as abolition of landed estates without compensation."*

Therefore, to assume and thereby create an impression that land reforms for the abolition of landlordism may emerge from bourgeois-land-lord government is, in theory, to substitute vulgar phrases for a historical study of the policies of this government during the course of the 20 years of its existence. In practice, it is to deceive the masses of the people by beclouding their political consciousness, by covering up and prettifying the real policies pursued by the ruling classes, by concealing from the masses the main thing - namely, that democratic land reforms are impossible without a series of armed struggles.

The objective situation in our country is such that, among the masses, disappointment, dissatisfaction, protest, indignation, and revolutionary temper are mounting - which at a stage of that temper's development may turn into action with incredible speed in quite a number of places. Either aid the growth and development of revolutionary action against landlordism and the government, or also hamper, soothe, and extinguish the revolutionary tempo. There is no third path. This is the only practical way in which the issue now stands posed. The bourgeoisie and their agents in power will agree - and from the standpoint of **their** interests sometimes must agree - to any verbal concession to the Left such as the announcement of a ceiling of 12 to 18 acres of wet land in the Congress (R) manifesto or even the abolition of landlordism, the implementation of land reforms, so that a rupture, at a particular critical moment, between the masses and the opportunist leaders is averted and resumption of more and more serious revolutionary actions thus avoided. That is how the bourgeoisie makes use of the alliance, unity, or even coalition governments with the Left block of parliamentarians, to deceive and disrupt the mass upsurge.

We say to the masses : "Do not trust any high sounding programmes. Do not have faith in any land reform legislations and their implementation by the bourgeois landlord leaders and their government. Rely on your own mass revolutionary action against landlords and their governments". We explain to them and help them to build up such action. There is no escape from landlordism, no possibility of progress without a civil war.

These are the two alternative stances that ought to be placed before the people, consistently and consciously, along with the concrete idea of the probable course of the revolution - so that the tactics of delusion and deception may be exposed and alternatively by organising the people for revolutionary actions subjective conditions for the success of the revolution may be hastened. Towards this end, "the revolutionary party and the revolutionary people must learn to master all forms of struggle, including armed struggle. They must defeat counter revolutionary armed force with revolutionary armed force wherever imperialism and its lackeys resort to armed suppression." This is the revolutionary guideline, to be followed with revolutionary fervour.

Therefore, the demand of the masses for 'land to the tiller' and 'abolition of landlordism' are not the same as the slogans of

the class-conscious vanguard. The spontaneous demands of the masses for land is one of the most important symptoms revealing the beginnings of disappointments in the bourgeois lie about land reforms. All efforts must be bent towards utilising this mass urge for land, to politicise this upsurge of economic consciousness. But how is it to be done, to complete the disenchantment of the masses from the spell of bourgeois influence and make them conscious of the necessity of agrarian revolution? To recognise the slogan for land to the tiller and repeat it *ad nauseam* would mean deceiving the people with the illusion that through agitation and limited struggles the existing government and the present-day master classes are capable of granting land to the tiller, that they can be made to abolish landlordism in a way satisfactory to the masses of agricultural labourers and poor peasants. Nothing is more harmful than such deception. It is the duty of the revolutionaries, to make use of this urge to rouse them into revolutionary actions of distribution of land - to rouse their initiative and revolutionary energy. "*If the words of our programme about supporting the revolutionary actions of the peasantry, including the confiscation of the landlords' lands is not a mere phrase - mongering, then we must think about organising the masses for those actions.*" (Lenin).

Such is the path of real Communists. The subjective factor for the success of the revolution is not created by waiting for such a good day to dawn of its own accord. Such a good day would not dawn for ages to come. Political consciousness, can only be created on the basis of agrarian armed revolution as the main plank of the programme. The concrete idea of the probable course of the revolution is the people's war.

Lenin has declared that, "*in the final analysis, force alone settles the great problems of political liberty and the class struggle, and it is our business to prepare and organise this force.*"

### The Question of Law

Our conception of law is clear. As Marx said, "*I was led by my studies to the conclusion that legal relations as well as forms of State could neither be understood by themselves, nor explained by the so-called general progress of human mind, but they are rooted in the material conditions of life, which are summed up by Hegel after the fashion of the English and French of the eighteenth century*

*under the name 'civil society' the anatomy of civic society is to be sought in political economy."* (A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", Page 11). It is clear that such civic society has a particular legal system of its own based on the economic relations existing in that period. The system of slave society, the feudal economy, and capitalist relations of production, were the base on which legal superstructure was created. As Marx further explains :

The general conclusion at which I arrived and, which once reached, continue to serve as the leading thread in my studies, may be briefly summed up as follows :

*In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society - the real foundation on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness.* (Ibid, Pages 11-12).

The political and social superstructure, built on the basis of mode of production, in any particular period, comprises the armed forces, the police, the administrative system, the educational system, and so on. The legal and judicial system forms part and parcel of the repressive machinery in the maintenance of the acquisitive society.

For a particular time the bourgeoisie succeeds in maintaining the appearance of justice and equality between the classes. This, for a certain period, works as a cover in the defence of its class interests. But this facade cannot last long. H. J. Laski, the intellectual mentor of many of our liberal politicians during the first half of this century, summarises the machinery of justice thus :

*All men are equal before the courts : but they*

*cannot enforce this equality save by the possession of wealth they do not possess. The humble tenant who seeks redress against the landlord, the servant girl who is dismissed without wages by her mistress, the workman injured in the course of employment and refused compensation by an employer who argue negligence on his part all these are but instances of an inequality before the law which gives the lie to the democratic thesis of equality. The hierarchy of courts, moreover, may well swallow up in the costs of appeal even the pitiful redress the worker has been able to secure .... the very fact that special legal institutions have been created which seek to alter the balance the present order maintains, is itself proof that the democratic claims is inadequate.* (Quoted by the Communists in their statement to the court in Meerut conspiracy case).

*The same view of the class nature of the legal machinery was taken by no less considerable authorities than the Webbs ("History of Trade Unionism", Page 625-626) in their account of the Osborne judgement. They refer to 'the bias and prejudice, the animus and partiality - doubtless unconscious - of the judges themselves ..... the undisguised glee with which this grave miscarriage of justice was received by the governing class ..... and state : 'what lay behind the Osborne judgement was a determination to exclude the influence of the workmen's combinations from the political field'. Thus these authorities admit the class character of the law and judiciary.* (Ibid : Page 296).

In our own country, the conditions are certainly no better, if not worse. For all practical purposes, the law of the jungle prevails as narrated in my statement.

Never probably in the history of our country have so many conspiracy cases been instituted against revolutionaries as today. How constitutionally and legally the established government functions and how the so-called democratic governments throw overboard their own constitutional principles and law was the running thread of most of my statement. Even in regard to this

case, in which we are all charged, every constitutional injunction has been burried deep by these who swear by sanctity by the constitution. For example, Article 22 (2) of the constitution lays down that the arrested persons should be produced before a magistrate within 24 hours of arrest. We have seen in the course of my statement how, in thousands of cases, this was not implemented. In the course of this case itself it has been brought to the notice of the court that quite a number of comrades Ramalinga Chari, Simhadri Subba Reddy, Mohan Reddy, Kolli Lakshmana Swamy, Meesala Venkata Rao, Manam Rama Rao, Veera Venkayya, Sundaraiah, Santhi Raju, Burada Appa Rao, Tirupathi Venkateswarlu, and Mandla Subba Reddy - were kept in illegal custody, for months together in the case of a few of them, and tortured before producing them in the court. And we have brought to the notice of the court the illegal and unscrupulous methods adopted to obtain 164 statements even though Article 20 (3) categorically states that no person accused of any offence shall be compelled to be a witness against himself. The instances, of Vemuri Subba Rao, Appanna, and Meesala Venkata Rao, are glaring examples, other than those of immoral inducements to Mrs. Jhansi and Mohan Rao. The instances of Panduranga Rao became clear when he himself cross-examined the witness in the court. Could there be a better example than those of the necessity of revolution and the communist policy? The experience of this case confirms the correctness of our policy - the policy of uncompromising struggle for the establishment of a people's democratic State.

### **Revolutionaries Must and Will Unite**

We are in the period of revolutionary upheavals in India. On the basis of Mao Tsetung Thought, on the guidelines of the '**people's war**', the revolutionary spark from Naxalbari spread fast and wide and engulfed vast areas of Srikakulam, Khammam, Warangal and East Godavary. The masses were roused for land in Anantapur and Kurnool. Apart from the vast armed struggle areas of Parvathipuram, and parts of Khammam and Warangal in Andhra, there have been peasant armed struggles in areas in Bihar and Bengal. Vast revolutionary experience has been gathered. Brilliant successes have been achieved. Vast defeats have been encountered.

Taking advantage of serious discussions amongst

revolutionaries of all shades in the country, in the evaluation of the experiences gained, sometimes leading to serious splits, the revisionist and reactionary forces in the country are all jubilant. They confidently assert that their senile programme of parliamentary path and their tie-up with the ruling party have proved a great success. They blinded by the success of temporary alliance with the ruling party, fail to note that their programme is already emasculated and is well on the way to final extinction. A day is fast approaching when their usefulness to the ruling party will be nil and they will find a place in the dust-bin of history.

This purposeful great debate amongst the revolutionaries for the principled evaluation of successes and failures, on the basis of experiences of revolutions the world over, and on the basis of our own struggles, will certainly unite the revolutionary forces in the country in the long run. This long drawn out 'people's war' can never be a series of successes alone. No revolution has ever been so.

India is a vast continent of various nationalities. Objective and subjective conditions are not the same all over the country.

With flexible tactics and adoption of various forms of struggles, with armed peasant revolution as the main struggle, I am confident that the Indian people's democratic revolution is on the march to success.

### **VICTORY OF THE REVOLUTION IS ASSURED**

★ ★ ★