



*By the Same Author*

COMMUNISM & PEASANTRY : IMPLICATIONS OF  
COLLECTIVIST AGRICULTURE FOR ASIAN  
COUNTRIES

GANDHISM AND COMMUNISM

Distributed by Impex India, 5/1, Deshbandhu  
Gupta Road, New Delhi-1.



FOUNDATIONS OF MAOISM

by

RAM SWARUP

# FOUNDATIONS OF MAOISM

by

RAM SWARUP

Jyotsna Prakashan



First Published in India in December, 1966

All Rights Reserved

Publishers : Ashok Kaushik, Jyotsna Prakashan,  
7F, Kamla Nagar, Delhi-7

Distributors : Impex India, 5/1, Deshbandhu Gupta  
Road, New Delhi-1

Printers : Navchetan Press (Private) Ltd.,  
(Lessees of Arjun Press)  
Naya Bazar, Delhi-6

## FOUNDATIONS OF MAOISM

*By the Same Author*

COMMUNISM & PEASANTRY: IMPLICATIONS OF  
COLLECTIVIST AGRICULTURE FOR ASIAN  
COUNTRIES

GANDHISM AND COMMUNISM

Distributed by Impex India, 5/1, Deshbandhu  
Gupta Road, New Delhi-1.

FOUNDATIONS OF MAOISM

RAM SWARUP

VOICE OF INDIA

New Delhi



First Published in India in December, 1966  
Pdf: 2015.

© All Rights Reserved

Publishers: Ashok Kaushik, Jyotsna Prakashan,  
7F, Kamla Nagar, Delhi-7

## FOREWORD

During the Chinese aggression of India in 1962, the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, our then Prime Minister, said in one of his public addresses: “The Chinese threat to us is there for the next 10 or 20 or 40 years.” This was not a light-hearted warning to the nation. He knew what he was talking about.

This book “Foundations of Maoism” by Shri Ram Swarup adds effective and convincing substance to corroborate Panditji’s warning of 1962. The author has in his Preface given us, in lucid language, a clear picture of what Maoist China’s doctrine is, in her attitude and conception of a Communist world order and how she plans to achieve her aims.

As the author rightly says, “According to Leninist-Maoist thinking, communism in a country does not come about *spontaneously* as a result of the sufferings of the people. On the other hand, communist revolution has to be *pushed through consciously* by a cadre of *professional revolutionists* indoctrinated in the thoughts of *Marxism-Leninism* and *trained* in the art of *subversion*. Poverty and sufferings provide the *objective* conditions—*subjective* conditions are provided by an *organised elite*.” The economic distress and frustration provide the fertile soil for Communism to thrive in—and we have, alas, amongst us some traitors who are the *organised elite* to exploit the illiterate masses in our present temporary economic problems.

This is all indeed alarming truth—alarming because of the manner in which communist tentacles seem to be entwining, apparently innocuously but quite effectively, the innocent minds of frustrated elements in our society who are led to imagine that a land of milk and honey emerge when

Mao's much advertised "New Democracy" gets into full play in due course in their own homeland. I well remember how this organised elite used to tell the thousands of innocent and illiterate tea plantation labourers in North Bengal during the 1962 Chinese invasion: "*Daro mat, Cbeenka mukti fauj a raba hai. Jab aega woh tumko bahut khurak, kapra or sub cheez dega*" so on, meaning, "Do not be frightened. The Liberation Army from China is coming. When it comes, it will give you a lot of food, clothes every thing else," or words to that effect.

The author, Shri Ram Swarup, by his exhaustive and such thorough study and survey of China's imperialistic ambitions of communist pattern, of her methods to create internal unrest and disorder, by sabotaging railway lines, by inciting the labour and students to go on strikes and to show no respect for law and order, has given us a warning of the things to come to us, if we refuse to see the writing on the wall simply because we are a democracy where every one can say or do what he likes. If the authorities concerned and the people ignore all that has been said in this book so clearly with arguments based on irrefutable facts and do not take immediate measures to stave off the real danger to our principles of democracy, as enshrined in our constitution, by firm, practical and positive measures to nip things in the bud, we will all—those loyal to our heritage and to our sacred soil—be committing a national crime of depriving our future generations of the glories and the grandeur of our present democratic ways of life which we of to-day enjoy.

The military might of China of which the author has told us in this book is really frightening during this early stage of our planned big defence build-up. Added to her very formidable land, sea and air striking power and her nuclear threat, her detonating a nuclear device with a guided missile as recently as 27th October 1966, cannot be taken light-heartedly. Our defence problems are further increased by China finding a new close ally, who is our immediate



neighbour and who may be used as China's tool to create for us some real defence anxieties and concern which we with our existing resources may find it not too easy to deal with on our own. Such use of her ally will certainly be in her own interests and definitely not of her ally's.

As I see it, I do not think Shri Ram Swarup has written this book with any passion or prejudice. He has only portrayed to us—in order to focus our attention to the threat to our security—Maoism and its dangers to democracies. His is a warning which cannot be ignored by us if we want to live as a free and independent people. Shri Ram Swarup has done our country a yeoman's service in writing this book. We must thank him. I congratulate him.

I hope this book will be widely read by the old and young, men and women who are loyal to our Motherland. I particularly hope that every single college student and other youth of our country will read this book from cover to cover; for, our youth are our hopes and leaders of tomorrow and they must be warned now not to sleep but to keep awake to ensure that we will say till eternity "Jai-Bharat" only under our National flag—the Tri-colour with the Ashoka Chakra on it.

19th December, 1966.  
Roshanara,  
Mercara,  
Coorg.

K.M CARIAPPA  
General (Retired)

# CONTENTS

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| Foreword | v  |
| Preface  | xi |

## Part I

|  |    |
|--|----|
| I. New Democracy in New China          | 3  |
| II. New Economy of New China           | 10 |
| III. New Culture of New China          | 17 |
| IV. The Myth of Socialist Food Surplus | 25 |
| V. Change-Brain Campaign               | 31 |

## Part II

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| VI. The Chinese Menace to India & Asia   | 49  |
| VII. Foundations of Maoism   | 67  |
| VIII. Mao's Two Pronged Attack: Internal<br>Subversion Joins External Aggression | 100 |
| 1. Peking Army in Calcutta Streets   | 100 |
| 2. Police "Excesses" and Vested Interests  | 102 |
| 3. Lessons of the West Bengal Bundh  | 105 |

## PREFACE

The present selection consists of two sets of articles. The first set belongs to the early days of Chinese communism. In fact, four out of the five articles which constitute Part I of this book were written and published in 1952. They deal with internal developments in China.

The second set of articles, which constitute Part II, were written during the last 12 months. They discuss communist China in her external aspect. The two aspects cannot be separated. They interpenetrate each other.

In both the aspects, an attempt has been made to discuss Maoist practice in terms of Maoist theory and vice versa. This may have made the discussion somewhat dry at many points. But this is unavoidable. In communism, theory and practice go together. Theory enlightens practice; and practice tests, embodies and illustrates theory. Theory provides a background, a perspective, a frame of reference. Without understanding communist ideology, isolated communist slogans and tactics appear to be discrete, discontinuous and devious. But with a knowledge of communist theory, all communist zigzags, detours, contradictory slogans and programmes acquire a new significance and become part of a developing offensive. In fact, if we understood communism as a whole, dialectically, then we would not have made the mistake we did in interpreting Maoist China, in understanding its motive-force, direction and aims. For example, if we knew communism then it was easy to see even in 1950, as these articles show, that 'New Democracy' was only another name for a ruthless party dictatorship; that initial land distribution was only a step to eventual land confiscation; that 'New



Culture' was only euphemism for brain-washing and was to lead to unprecedented regimentation; that the Chinese slogan of peace was only a facade for a new ruthless imperialism.

The first three articles are a trilogy and have to be read together. They discuss Chinese politics, economics and culture which according to Ma Tse-tung were the three inseparable constituents of China's "New Democracy". The succeeding two articles discuss the same subjects with a different emphasis.

These articles were written at a time when not many voices of their kind were heard. They appeared in relatively smaller papers like Thought, Janata, Organiser, Swatantra and People. They were not acceptable to the big papers owned by "capitalists", partly because the views expressed were unpopular, and partly because the points of view went beyond the ideas of the learned editors. This raises an important question: how far does the big press bring to the fore neglected facets of important problems and helps informed judgment, and how far does it merely deepen and universalise a prevailing prejudice?

The second part deals with the dynamics of China's outward expansion and the nature of the danger she poses for India and other countries of Asia. The sixth article develops the point that Chinese threat is partly military, and partly ideological-subversive and political-organisational. The vehicle of the latter threat is not the People's Army, but the fifth columns recruited locally. There are no orthodox style of armies marching along traditional invasion routes, but the threat develops along subtle, unidentifiable, ideological channels.

For example, in the Indo-Chinese confrontation, the locale of the engagement is not limited to certain mountain passes in the North; on the other hand, the theatre of war is far-flung and the frontiers are invisible. China is fighting us not only in the North; she is fighting us in South-East Asia, in Pakistan, in New Delhi and Calcutta, in our Universities and

trade unions. We can neglect this most important aspect of the Chinese threat only at our own peril.

The seventh article is the longest and perhaps the most important. It discusses Maoism as a whole, its doctrines and principles of organisation, its theory and practice, its strategy and tactics, its ethics, its theory of war and revolution, its internal and external expressions. For a proper defence of India and Asia, we shall have to make ourselves familiar with the ideological motivations and organisational weapons of Maoism.

One important thesis of this article is that according to Leninist-Maoist thinking, communism in a country does not come about *spontaneously* as a result of the sufferings of the people. On the other hand, a communist revolution has to be *pushed through consciously* by a cadre of *professional revolutionaries* indoctrinated in the thoughts of *Marxism-Leninism* and *trained* in the art of *subversion*. Poverty and sufferings provide the *objective* conditions; *subjective* conditions are provided by *organised elite*.

Understood concretely in the Indian context, it means that there are already about 200,000 communist party members, a hard core of professional and indoctrinated revolutionaries and full-time agitators. They are surrounded by activists, allies, frontmen, fellow-travellers and dupes. They own the biggest chain of newspapers and support the most widespread publishing programme. They have at their disposal the resources for organising a vast agitational and conspiratorial programme. They have been collecting arms and they have been training their workers in sabotage and guerilla warfare. They have infiltrated into the sensitive areas of our economy, education and administration. They are trying to create a “Yenan” in West Bengal Assam with a “safe rear” in China and East Pakistan. Only recently, on the 10th August, the Statesman reported about a “strategy of sabotage” and “disintegration” which the Left communist leaders decided upon in their Tenali meeting in June. The

meeting was held in utmost secrecy. It is believed that recent train mishaps were the results of Tenali Plan. The Plan included sabotage of defence establishments, burning of crops and aid to separatist movements in Nagaland and Mizo hills. Indian patriots and strategists will have to take into account this front of the Chinese invasion.

Two small pieces at the end were contributed to the press at the time of March-April happenings in Calcutta. These writings try to bring out the inner significance of those events and link them up with happenings in South-East Asia. The author was at Calcutta at that time and he saw Maoism in action in the streets of that city. He saw how persons in power who thought their position was impregnable and who felt at the top of the world were humbled overnight and were constrained to think that the country was “sitting on a volcano”, to use Chief Minister P.C. Sen’s expression. He saw that though eventually law and order were restored but things were never the same again, psychologically speaking.

During the tragic happenings of West Bengal, Shri P.C. Sen was forced to admit that communism was following a “global policy”. We hope he is aware of the implications of his statement. A communist global policy is not merely a geographic concept. It is related to space as well as time. This strategy is far flung as well as long range. It is military as well as ideological. It functions openly as well as secretly. It conquers stage by stage, country by country, sector by sector. In short, a communist global policy means that it is multi-dimensional, related to space, time, culture, doctrine, organisation, etc.

It means that communism never goes to sleep or relaxes; it continues to act through all ups and downs, through thick and thin. It is always planning, preparing, organising, infiltrating. It means that communism never acts under a temporary provocation, seeking redress against an immediate injustice; on the other hand, it is a full time occupation calculated to capture total power.



If such is the foe and such is the nature of this aggression, then what should be the strategy of our own defence? It is not possible to discuss this question adequately here. But if the nature of defence derives from the nature of the enemy threat, then the above discussion should help to indicate at least some of the principles of this strategy.

The first principle of an adequate strategy of defence is that it should be larger in conception. The sorry fact is that hitherto free India had given no thought to problems of defence and when it did under the pressure of Chinese invasion in 1962 and and Pakistan invasion in 1965, it thought of the problem only in terms of border security. Even the British conception of Indian defence was larger. It included great bastions of Hong Kong and Singapore in the East and Aden and the Suez Canal area in the West. Around India it maintained buffer states and by a balance-of-power diplomacy prevented peripheral areas from falling into the hands of strong neighbouring powers that might menace India's security. As Lord Curzon said, that was "the secret of (our) whole position in Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan, Tibet, and as far eastwards as Siam. He would be a shortsighted commander who merely manned his ramparts in India and did not look beyond."

But, today, India is behaving like Lord Curzon's shortsighted commander. Under pressure of events, she is beginning to man her ramparts in the country, but she still refuses to look beyond. True, world conditions are not the same as they were under the British dominance but the fact remains that to quite an extent the centre of our defence lies beyond our borders. We have to find a modified version of the old balance of power in some collective security measures which could ensure safety to the newly-independent countries of the area under changed realities of power equation. But the policies that the Indian Government is following in relation to Viet Nam shows that she is quite unaware of this dimension and requirement of our defence.

She is still possessed of a mind which kept India disarmed and defenceless during all these years of independence.\*

Our strategy should also be multi-dimensional. It should be military as well as ideological. We should take note of the Chinese weapon of ideological-subversive warfare. One of the best ways of fighting Mao's threat to India is to fight Maoist fifth columns in India. If his fifth columns are eliminated from the Indian scene, the Chinese would also be less tempted to try a military adventure. Thus, elimination of the Chinese party from India will work for Indo-Chinese amity in the long run.

Similarly we should fight Chinese subversion in South Asia. We should strengthen concepts and forces of regional defence in this area, particularly those based on the lines of cultural self-articulation. For thousands of years there has been a great cultural affinity between the peoples of this region. Those links should be restored and strengthened. During the days of European domination, economic and political impoverishment had gone hand-in-hand with

---

\* While the British defended India in Singapore and Aden, Indians themselves in their days of decline have fought the enemy at Panipat! That the strategy of the modern rulers is no better than that of the medieval rulers will be clear from a despatch sent by a U.S. correspondent, Mr. Henry S. Bradsher, to his newspaper in Washington. This despatch says: "Indian army has abandoned any hope of defending large areas of India's Himalayan frontier against Communist China, it was authoritatively learnt here. If the Chinese forces based in Tibet try next spring to occupy more of the Indian border areas they claim, 6th Indian army strategy will be to concede large areas, virtually without a fight. The Indians will be prepared to resist only points deep in their own territory. Indian army of between 400,000 to 500,000 men, it was reported, is thinking of making its stand in the Himalayan foothills or down on the plains if the Chinese attack. Since the Chinese claim only mountain areas this plan could concede to Peking most of the disputed territory," (Washington Post, Jan. 1, 1960)

Instead of contradicting this report, the Government of India circulated it in India! It is obvious that this news was inspired and it was meant to prepare Indian public opinion for the Government's bankrupt *Panipat strategy* of defence. Events in late 1962 amply bore out the correctness of this report.

cultural impoverishment. Because we are cut off from our roots, our life-springs have dried and nothing grows except thistles and darnels. Exotic intellectual fashions and imported cults of easy living and violence tend to fill emptied hearts and minds. Root values of the cultures of this area are derived from the religions originating in India. Those values can fulfil the deepest aspirations of man. If those are revived, Maoism will lose its appeal.

Whether one likes it or not, America and Russia too are participants in the struggle raging in this area. Their interests are ideological as well as national. Those interests conflict and complement. Russia is opposed to America but also finds herself opposed by China. China opposes America but America is restrained by the fear that the present conflict may escalate into a bigger war. China would like to involve America and Russia in a war of mutual destruction with the rest of the world left to her sweet mercies. America and Russia each would like the other to fight China and herself stay out and even pretend friendship with China. Also no one of the two would like a vacuum in Central Asia which could be filled by the other. So both of them are interested in having a strong and weak China at the same time. Thus their aims are inconsistent, motives are mixed, actions are equivocal and the situation is confused. But we should make as much meaning as is possible out of this puzzle.

Faced with an implacable enemy like China, the small weak neighbouring countries are forced to turn to America for help. American aid does save them from an immediate and direct military take-over but it is no great help in the long protracted subversive war that these countries face. The presence of the American soldiers for a long time creates its own problems like inflation and moral and political disintegration of those countries. For example, because of this fact, Viet Nam has tended to become a big brothel as Senator Fulbright points out, and as anyone can see from special articles on the subject in magazines like the Time and the Newsweek.

American help also tends to be capricious. It may be volunteered in one case and denied in another; it may be rushed at one time and altogether withdrawn at another. American posture is also not consistent. The American defence establishment may support anti-communist struggles here and there for reasons of national power, but by and large the sympathies of the American intellectuals and liberals are with pro-communist causes. The American mind and loyalty have been divided in fighting Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh; but there has been near unanimity in the American press in maligning and denigrating Chiang Kai-shek and President Diem. India is also likely to miss loyalty and consistency in this pattern of American help.

Russia is breaking away from its Stalinist nightmare. Her relations with China are also cooling off. If the two trends continue and Russia reaches a point of no return (the two trends are not irreversible yet), Russia could play a constructive role in the affairs of South Asia vis-a-vis China.

We have to remember that in this struggle against Maoism, Chinese people, whether on the mainland or overseas, are the best allies. Only they must feel that the struggle is not directed against China but against Maoism.

Without relaxing our vigilance and our preparation, we should also not let go any opportunity for a realistic solution of our dispute if that is possible without surrendering our principles. It is enough for the time being if China could be kept to her present limits. Time may do the rest. Mao is mortal and after he dies things may relax and a less imperialistic China may emerge.

Meanwhile, let us remember that the best guarantee of our freedom is in our internal strength and national unity, in the skills, determination, will and vision of our men. Let us rediscover our self-identity. Let us remember that we are a mighty nation and aggressors could not trifle with us and get away easily. Let our people cultivate justice, truth, fairness and helpfulness among themselves; let them learn to look

danger in the face; let them develop an objective and dedicated intelligence; let them develop habits of selfless and devoted work; let them rediscover the vision of unity and larger life. These are difficult qualities to cultivate, but they lead to the path of invincibility and that sure strength which overcomes all obstacles.

# **PART ONE**





## Chapter I

# “New Democracy” in New China\*

### Dictatorship in Democracy

Recently, a wave of enthusiasm has swept over India about China. Different people admire the new regime for different reasons. Some admire it because it is communist; others, because it is essentially capitalist; and, still others, because it offers a new synthesis, a veritable Third Force between the anarchy of capitalism and the regimentation of communism. Some admire New China because it is new, others because it is after all not very new and because old China would reassert itself and absorb the new one. All these differing and even opposing elements combine to create among certain sections an amount of enthusiasm which could be described as hysterical.

While official India is seized in a panic of admiration, it cannot be said that information has kept pace with admiration. One correspondent reporting her interview with one of India's highest ranking cabinet ministers says that the Hon. Minister showed great concern for the Negroes of America. The reporter joined with him in the belief that lynching is a national disgrace, but pointed out that it had been on the decline, at present averaging one a year. Then,

---

\* Mao Tse-tung says, “The combination of New Democratic Politics, New Democratic Economy and New Democratic Culture is the Republic of New Democracy.” These three constituents of New China have been discussed in the first three articles of this book. These articles were written and published in 1952. They appeared in *Organiser*, *Thought People*, *Swatantra* and other papers.

she asked his opinion on mass executions in China. "Oh, we don't know anything about that," the minister replied.

It is his business to know.

It is claimed by non-communist admirers of China that leaders of New China have not nationalised and collectivised like Russia; that the country is governed by a coalition of parties; that these two facts are opposed to communism; that what has emerged is a new experiment in political and economic organisation, more suited to the genius of the Chinese people. In short, they claim that China is a co-operative socialism ruled by the masses of people, not necessarily through parliamentarian agencies; and the less creditable reports of mass executions and the like which are often heard, are either not true or quite understandable as a necessary concomitant of the vast revolution that has taken place and that is being consolidated.

### **Two Stages**

This understanding of China is a misunderstanding. Most of the fallacies arise because people are not conversant with the theory and practice of communism which divides its task into, at least, two stages. Both these stages are geared to the question of power which according to Lenin is the fundamental issue of a communist revolution. The first stage is the stage of New Economic Policy in Soviet Russia, People's Democracy in East European countries and New Democracy in China. This stage is to precede the next stage of socialism which is inevitable. Mao Tse-tung is quite clear on this point. He says; "China's revolution must be divided into two steps, the first being that of New Democracy, the second that of socialism." It seems many people including our ex-ambassador Panikkar confuse the two stages and praise the Chinese leaders for the first stage when their ultimate aim and effort is for the next stage. Mao Tse-tung calls such persons "ill-minded propagandists" who

“purposely mix up the two stages.” According to him, “the theory of a single revolution is the theory of no revolution.”

According to the Chinese communist leaders, New Democracy has nothing to do with the democracy that we know. According to Mao Tse-tung, New Democracy “is a part of the world proletarian revolution.” This is an important difference, for it explains two other differences in the origin and direction of the New Democracy. New Democracy could only be brought about by communist methods, communist tactics, slogans and strategy, under the leadership of Soviet Russia and can move only in one direction towards communism, under the same leadership, under the same principles of communist organisation of power.

The communist way of bringing about a revolution means that the revolution has to be violent, that during each stage it seeks ‘alliances which are broken later on, that opportunist slogans are raised which have nothing to do with the communist beliefs, that demands like individual civil liberty and free elections are put forward which have nothing to do with the communist programme of action when they have captured power. For example, in China an elected parliament and free elections were demanded in the thirties and denied at the end of the forties. For confirmation, refer to the speech of vice-chairman Liu Shao-chi in February, 1951 to the All Circles Peoples Representatives Conference. It says: “The mention of elections usually makes some people think of the old slogan of universal, equal, direct and secret balloting. In the past, under the reactionary regime of Chiang Kai-shek, the raising of this slogan, in order to oppose the dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek, undoubtedly had a progressive significance. But the demand for the immediate realisation of this slogan under the state power of the New Democracy today, is not quite suitable to actual conditions . . . and, therefore, at this stage cannot be fully adopted.” In this

speech of 3000 words, the word 'people' occurred 120 times!

Consolidation of revolution with the help of communist methods means that no necessary stage is skipped over, that the revolution passes through an intermediary, preparatory stage of New Democracy or People's Democracy.

But whatever the stage, communist revolution is a proletarian affair. Chinese communism "is a proletarian system of thought," says Mao Tse-tung. According to the constitution of the Chinese Communist Party, the Party "is the organised vanguard of the Chinese working class and the highest form of its organisation." And though it is essentially a proletarian party, it "represents the interest of the Chinese nation and the Chinese people."

Proletarian in its aims and organisation, nevertheless, the party is not exclusive. According to Lenin's advice, it goes to the masses wherever they are and mobilises them by airing and intensifying their grievances and putting forward their demand, though they may not be the demands of the Party.

The power and purpose of the Party are perfected through a system of 'alliances'. These alliances are entered into in order to isolate the enemy, neutralise the vacillating groups and mobilise the supporters. The enemies, the vacillating groups, the supporters change from stage to stage. Mao Tse-tung and his party fully accept this theory of alignment. At present at the stage of New Democracy, the allies are the poor peasants, the handicraftsmen, paupers, employees, etc. In his *Chinese Revolution and The Communist Party of China*, Mao Tse-tung minutely goes into the question of classes and their revolutionary or reactionary role at different stages of revolution. Their roles change according to the change in the stage of the revolution; and, so, allies, enemies, vacillating groups that are to be neutralised, slogans and strategy also change.

### **Hegemony**

Besides the concept 'stages of revolution', there is

another concept 'hegemony', equally basic in communist thought. Whatever the stage of revolution the 'hegemony' or 'leadership' of the proletariat must be assured within any alliance. As Stalin says, an alliance is permissible "on the condition that the guiding force of all this alliance is the proletariat." The hegemony in the struggle for the proletarian revolution ripens into the hegemony of the state. Stalin explains the link between hegemony at various stages of the revolution with the dictatorship of the proletariat which is the final aim. According to him the dictatorship of the proletariat in the bourgeois revolution, the proletariat being in alliance with the peasantry, would grow into the hegemony of the proletariat in the socialist revolution, while the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry would prepare the ground for the socialist dictatorship of the proletariat (that is, without the peasantry). In other words, from the proletarian hegemony in the alliance during the revolutionary struggle to the hegemony in the coalition during the New Democracy. This coalition is also called the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry which, it is claimed, is the present Chinese stage. In due course, the 'democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants' would be replaced by the 'socialist dictatorship of the proletariat'. To express the idea in trenchant communist terminology, the 'toiler' would increasingly come under the 'hegemony' of the 'worker'.

The Chinese Communist Party fully subscribes to this concept. According to Mao Tse-tung, "the foundation of the people's democratic dictatorship is the alliance of the working class, peasants and urban petty-bourgeoisie." But, he adds, the "democratic dictatorship must have the leadership of the working class." For according to him, "in the era of imperialism no other class in any country can lead any genuine revolution to victory. Proof lies in the fact that China's petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie led revolution on many occasions, but all ended in failure." Believing as they do, the essence of New Democracy has



been summed up by Mao Tse-tung himself in three factors; “One is a disciplined party armed with the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin . . . ; another is an army led by such a party; and the third is a united front of all revolutionary strata and all revolutionary parties and groups, led by such a party.” So, Party first, Party last.

In the light of the above, the coalition character claimed for the present Government of China is spurious. It is not a genuine coalition between equal and independent partners with their own programmes and leaders, but a collection of reliable tools for presenting a facade of coalition. The criterion of a genuine coalition is whether any class or party or individual could stay out of this coalition and canvass for its own point of view which is patently impossible. The persons who make the coalition have no face, character, idea or ideal of their own: they faithfully serve the interests of the communist leadership till the next stage is launched and they are heard no more.

### **Dictatorship**

Distinguishing between a capitalist democracy and a socialist democracy, Lenin had said that in the former, capitalists hunt down the socialists, while, in the latter, socialists hunt down the capitalists. Mao Tse-tung believes in this thesis. “You say we are dictatorial. My dear sirs, what you say is correct. That is just what we are,” he says. But, he claims, in this dictatorship, while the reactionaries are deprived of the right to voice their opinion, the people are given this right. Who are the people? According to Mao Tse-tung, “at the present stage in China, they are the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie”. In this statement, the phrase “at the present stage” is very important. In the next stage when the present reactionaries consisting of “the landlord class, the bureaucratic capitalist class, reactionary clique of the Kuomintang and their accomplices” (the accomplices can mean anybody) are no more, other reactionary classes and

groups would come into being. Of these classes, Kulaks consisting of 6 million families have already been named though they are being “preserved” for the time being.

The class status of an individual also determines the kind of ‘law’ administered to him. According to Mao Tse-tung if ‘people’ break the law, “they would be punished, imprisoned or even sentenced to death. But these would be individual cases, differing in principle from the dictatorship imposed against the reactionaries as a class.”

Summarising our conclusions, the New Democracy of New China which is also designed as the People’s Democratic Dictatorship is the dictatorship of the communist party, ruling in the name of the dictatorship of the working class. The coalition character claimed for its present government is a farce. In its origination, the New Democracy was brought about by ruthless communist methods and means; at present, it is being implemented and consolidated by mass terror and killings;\* in its direction, it aims at establishing a “system of communism”. Internally, it is dictatorial in its power organisation; externally, it belongs to the world communist front. All these features are claimed for it by its leaders and students; but these are denied or explained away by its enthusiast and propagandists.

---

\* Frank Moraes says that since the Communist Party of China took power, 2,000,000 persons were killed (by 1952) whom the CPC identified as KMT guerillas. He also notes that 15,000,000 were classed as landlords and rich peasants in the provinces of North China and Manchuria (probable population 100,000,000), scheduled for liquidation. R.L. Walker says that in the mass trials of “counter revolutionaries” from November 1950 to November, 1951, 1,500,000 persons were killed. According to W.S. Robertson of the American State Department, in the first four years of the Communist regime, 15,000,000 people were killed.

But of these terror-filled days, Dr. V.K.R.V. Rao of the Delhi University and now of the Planning Commission brings this report: “The hold of the Communist Party is based on the same sort of considerations which gave Mahatma Gandhi and his colleagues leadership of the Indian masses.” It shows that Dr. Rao neither understands Maoism nor Gandhism.

## Chapter II

# **“New Economy” of New China**

### Land Reform as a Prelude to Collectivization

Of the constituents of the New Republic of China, New Economy is the most important. It directly determines the New Politics which according to Mao Tse-tung “is the concentrated” and “centralised expression of this economy.” Of the New Economy, land reform is the central feature. We are told that China was a feudal country, owned by a small number of landlords who kept the people in economic and political vassalage and the economy in a stagnant, moribund state. But with the land redistribution programme more or less completed, the citadel of feudalism has been stormed. Not only a new social justice has been established in the affairs of men, but the whole economy has been put on high road to prosperity. As a result, the country which had only famines to boast of till yesterday is, today, in a position to spare rice out of her ‘socialist surplus’ to a starving India.

### **The Nature of Agrarian Reform**

In many countries of the East, land reform is overdue. The only correct basis of land tenure is that those who till the soil should also own it. But nothing could be more detrimental to the spiritual and economic interests of the common people than to leave the agrarian reform to the communists to achieve. For, to them land distribution is not a worthy object, a measure of social justice, but is a tactical move, a “transitional measure” to be abrogated as soon as conditions permit. On the basis of ‘land to the peasant’ slogan, they mobilise the support of the peasantry; and after

they have come to power and consolidated that power with the help of that support, they take away the land again. According to the Communist International: "in the colonial countries, the principal task is to develop systematically the peasant agrarian revolution and to champion national independence advancing through a series of preparatory stages, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat." The strategy is to utilize nationalist and agrarian movements for eventual communist dictatorship.

A deep-seated hostility towards the small producer in general and the peasant in particular has informed communism from the start. Kautsky, when he was a good Marxist, said: "Our policy must favour the peasant as little as the Junker." But here was the rub. Although communists had no use for the peasant, they could not succeed without him. In order to bridge this gulf, Lenin developed the tactical side of Marxism. As applied to the countryside, the communists divide their task in two stages. In the first stage, they "support the peasantry in general against the landlords" and, in the second stage, they "support the proletariat against the peasantry in general." The two steps are part of the same process which is called the "offensive of socialism."

The communist leadership of China fully accepts and follows this thesis. Why was the 'surplus' land of the landlords and the rich peasants distributed? The reason was politico-tactical. In the words of Liu Shao-chi, it was done in order to "raise the peasants' high revolutionary enthusiasm to participate in and support the People's Revolutionary War and strike down Chiang Kai-shek's Regime . . ." When this exigency is over, when the party has consolidated its power, the second stage would begin, the stage of collectivisation. In the words of the Party Constitution and Programme: "At a future date, when the Chinese national-democratic revolution has won a complete victory, the task of the Communist Party of China will be to take necessary steps for the realisation of a system of a Socialism and Communism."

### **The Pattern of Agrarian Reform**

That the land reform undertaken today would be abrogated at a later stage is certain. It is equally certain,\* that the ‘October of the peasants’ as this stage is called would be more bloody than anything before. Meanwhile, it would be instructive to discuss how the land reform has been carried out and what it has meant to the peasants.

Chou En-lai says that the “agrarian reform is a systematic and fierce struggle.” So fierce that it is difficult to imagine it. The usual pattern was that the communists would go to a village, seize the village granary and declare it communist property. Then they would confiscate the granaries of those who had any grain with the help of those who had no grain. The former were called landlords and rich peasants; the latter poor peasants. Of this confiscated grain, the communists kept 80%, and gave away 20% to the poor peasants.† This was the ‘popular’ basis of the land reform programmes. After some time, the poor peasants were organised into a Poor Peasants League.

The young element was separated from the old and indoctrinated. During this time, simultaneously, the party leader went on collecting information about every family, making an inventory of all their belongings, classifying them into such categories as landlords, rich peasant, middle peasants. When the records were complete, peasant

---

\* An embryonic collectivization in China was already emerging in 1952. Very soon, the process was greatly expedited. By the spring of 1957, 500,000,000 peasants were organised into 750,000 collective farms. In 1958 it was decided to change over from “collective ownership system” to “all-people ownership system.” Thus came the notorious communes. Under this system peasants were turned into worse than chattels. All their land, trees, houses, cattle and implements were confiscated.

† During the “Land Reform” movement, an estimated 700,000,000 mou of land, 700,000,000 farm implements, 140,000,000,000 catties of food, 7,000,000 houses and 49,000,000 heads of cattle were confiscated. Only a part of these assets were redistributed. The rest went to the communist government.

meetings were converted into liquidation meetings. Land was taken away from landlords and distributed among the poor peasants. The poor peasants did not like denouncing their neighbours, but they were glad they had more than before. But very soon, their dreams were shattered. The communist tax-collector came and took away a large part of the produce, sometimes three to five times the Kuomintang tax. In the political language of communism, the fierceness of the whole process was summed up in 1947 by Mao-Tse-tung himself in these words: "to rely upon the poor peasants, to unite staunchly with the middle peasants, and to abolish the feudal and semi-feudal exploitation of the old type rich peasant and landlord classes."

The policy of expropriating the 'rich peasant' adversely affected the food position of the country, so the policy has been changed temporarily. The 'rich' peasant is being preserved for the time being. Though he is being retained economically, he has been politically disfranchised. He is a second-grade citizen.

### **Landlords and Rich Peasants**

The words 'landlords' and 'rich' peasants are very misleading. These are used in order to mobilise the socialistic hatred built up against them in the last century. The Chinese landlord was more of a myth than a fact. We do not suggest that China had no landlords and not even cruel ones. But the indignation mobilised against them was directed against an entirely different people, against people who were just well off. The Chinese 'landlord' had, on an average, only 30 acres of land unlike his counterpart in Russia who had on an average 5000 to 6000 acres. The Chinese landlords numbered 4,000,000 families or 20,000,000 men, women and children.

The Chinese 'rich peasant' is still more mythical. He was a starving fellow, a needy, poverty-stricken sort. According to the Great Soviet Encyclopedia Vol.32, the Chinese 'kulaks' numbered 3,600,000 families, owning between them



38,900,000 acres of land; or, about 10 acres per family. In 1950, their number was estimated at 6,003,000 families which gives 6 acres per family. *The truth is that the Chinese countryside presents a drab picture of poverty, but communists must divide and differentiate so that they can mobilise one class against another and consolidate their power. Divisions are indispensable for communist tactics.*

### **Production**

From the technique and scope of land distribution, we turn to its achievements. When collectivisation comes, we shall have a concert of eyewitness accounts of persons who will have been on a goodwill or fact-finding mission to China (very much like the events in Soviet Russia), making out one thing: how dismal a failure, how inefficient the land reform programme has been. But meanwhile, all kinds of claims are being made for this economy. Stripped of all exaggeration, the fact remains that the present agricultural production has not reached the pre-war level. According to figures in *People's China* of Feb. 1, 1950 and May 16, 1950:

#### **Grain Output**

|         |            |                  |          |
|---------|------------|------------------|----------|
| 1931-36 | (average)  | 284,500,000,000  | catties. |
| 1941-46 | (do)       | 239,000,00,000   | "        |
| 1949    | (Estimate) | 212,500,000,000  | "        |
| 1950    | (Plan)     | 222,5000,000,000 | "        |

#### **Cotton Output**

|                 |            |               |          |
|-----------------|------------|---------------|----------|
| Pre-war maximum |            | 1,697,000,000 | catties. |
| 1949            | (Estimate) | 850,000,000   | "        |
| 1950            | (Plan)     | 1,300,000,000 | "        |

The figures speak for themselves. Grain production in 1949 was 21% less than in Chiang's China of the thirties. In 1950, it was 6% less. According to *China Reconstructs* of May-June 1952, a bi-monthly official Chinese magazine,

selling in all towns of India, grain production in 1951 was only 92.8% of the 1936 production.

In spite of these facts, all kinds of claims have been made for communist China. It seems that intellectual integrity is not a strong point of these Chinese enthusiasts.

We do not say that the pre-war level will not be reached, but it was reached in all war-torn countries of Europe; and it reached very much earlier in agriculture than in industry. Meanwhile, China has to support an increased population on a reduced supply of food. No wonder, there was widespread famine last year, the rigours of which were increased due to the political grain export of the authorities. Of course, we are sincerely grateful for the grain we received,† but I was only arguing with those who see ‘socialism’ and ‘surplus’ in this export.

### **Grain Deliveries**

During the period of New Democracy, land belongs to the peasant and the produce belongs to the Government. No information is available as to the exact amount of grain collection, but if Soviet experiment is any guide, these collections tend to increase several-fold. Available information confirms this conclusion. We are told that the peasants compete with each other in over-paying their taxes, the same as Russian peasants compete in over-fulfilling their grain-deliveries to the state. According to *People's China* of June 16, 1950, “the peasants of Inner Mongolia handed in 5% more than their allocation. And in North West China the peasants surpassed their tax target by 13%.” According to the same authority, “the collection of public grain assumes the character of a great mass movement when the taxes fall due. The grain for the government is winnowed and sunned before it is sent to the public granaries . . . Families, mutual

---

† In 1950, India had bought a small quantity of rice from China.

aid groups, villages and districts . . . eagerly compete for the title of Model in Public-grain Deliveries.”\*

A good deal is made of communist China’s solicitude for people’s education and people’s health. But according to *People’s China* of Feb. 1, 1950, only 4.1% was spent on cultural, educational and public health expense. In a communist country, the cultural and educational mean the indoctrinational. The chief expenditure is military, which is 41.4% on an army which is mainly ‘voluntary’. Administrative expenses are 21.4%. Fact is that communist China is an imitation of Soviet Russia. In due course, the likeness would be complete: dictatorship, taxes, increasing poverty of the masses and increasing opulence of the bureaucracy, a war economy, a political budget and the rest.

---

\* During the course of the first decade under communism, the Chinese peasant, according to certain estimates, produced about 3,100,000,000,000 catties of food grains and 250,000,000 bushels of cotton. But their share has been less than half. The rest has been taken away from them under various pretexts.

### Chapter III

## **“New Culture” of New China**

Confessions of a Professor

Many persons praise New China because, they claim, she is not a Soviet satellite, because she has instituted ‘land reforms’, because she has mobilised great ‘enthusiasm’ for ‘transforming’ the country. In this paeon of praise, the questions of individual freedom, of the sacredness of individual thought and inspiration have been overlooked. In fact, those who raise such questions are looked upon with suspicion as persons suffering from some perverse scale of values with rather a developed capacity for putting the cart before the horse.

In New China, free speech has been completely abolished. Today, there is no such thing as feeling strongly and sincerely about a thing and writing or speaking about it. There are no more columnists writing from different angles according to their light or temptation on the basis of information derived from diverse sources. Now all news is state-owned and state-controlled. For example, within nine months of the ‘liberation’ of the Canton city, fourteen papers were ordered to stop publication. Finally out of eighteen newspapers, eight were taken over by the People’s Government, three took to the People’s Government, six were altogether suspended, one ‘voluntarily’ closed down.

Communism believes that thought, theory and culture in general are a reflex of the prevailing mode of production. In the well-known words of Karl Marx, “it is not consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.”

The leadership of communist China fully subscribes to this view. Mao Tse-tung says: "A given culture is the ideological reflection of the politics and economy of a given society." Accordingly, he divides Chinese culture in several epochs and stages in terms of several stages of Chinese politics and economy. Corresponding to the colonial and feudal economy of the country, China was ruled till recently by an imperialist culture and a feudal culture which were "great friends." To this combination is opposed the New Culture, the "proletarian culture", of New China, the New Culture that reflects the new Politics and New Economy of the period of New Democracy. The two cultures are antagonistic. According to Mao Tse-tung, the one cannot be extended if the other is not stopped or crushed. "The struggle between the two is a struggle of life and death." The New Culture is of a very recent origin. In fact, its exact date has been indicated, the 4th May, 1919. On this date, the May 4th Movement in culture was started. According to Mao Tse-tung, Lu Hsiang-shan was the "commander-in-chief" of this culture, who, representing the majority of the people, "dashed forward at the enemy on the cultural front."

According to Mao Tse-tung, the fundamental character of the present national culture is not of socialism, but that of New Democracy, that being the Politics and Economy of the present stage of revolution. It means that this culture must oppose "bourgeois cosmism", resist "all those kinds of thought that are contrary to resistance, to unity, or to progress." It must also "expand the propaganda of communist thought and intensify the study of Marxism-Leninism."

The New Culture is also opposed to the old culture for which China is admired throughout the world including India. According to Mao Tse-tung, "worship of Confucius, study of ancient classics, the practice of old rules of propriety and old thoughts represent old culture," represent "slave ideology," and therefore must be crushed. According to Kuo Mo-jo, chief

official of New Culture, the legacy of culture from old China cannot satisfy the demands of New China and hence must be “eradicated.” Maoism is fast replacing Taosim.\*

The Chinese religion was highly individual, but even that is being tamed. There were reports published in Hongkong recently that Marx, Lenin and Mao Tse-tung are replacing the Bible in churches at Fushan near Canton. According to these reports, Bible study classes were abolished and were replaced by classes for the study of communist doctrines. Priests, clergymen, monks are being removed on one charge or another. Recently some nuns were tried for “poisoning” the children.

The radio, film, literature, drama are being harnessed to propagate the party line. The Government does most of the printing and publishing and runs half the bookstalls in the country. Soviet literature is flooding the market. Text books are being written from the communist angle. The Chinese books, radio, posters, films, all depict and sky-praise Stalin and Mao Tse-tung and those who stand for them. For a specimen, we quote the following lines from a poem written by Kuo Mo-jo with whom we have already made our acquaintance. He writes:

Great Stalin, beloved steel, eternal sun,  
Because humanity has you,  
Marxism-Leninism can exert its might today.

The poem goes on in the same strain. Incidentally the above lines illustrate what a ‘progressive’ poem means. It means writing a poem which extols communists and damns the rest.

---

\* The so-called current Chinese cultural revolution under Red Guards is only a continuing war against China’s ancient culture. It claims to be directed against four “olds” — old thoughts, old culture, old customs, and old ways of life. It is headed by Marshal Lin Piao, Defence Minister, described as Mao Tse-tung’s ‘close comrade-in-arms’.

Among the targets of their 'damning' literature, the place of honour is occupied by America. The New Culture being anti-imperialist and America being the arch-imperialist of the day as labelled by communists, who have a more than average insight for these things, the communist Chinese solicitude for America is understandable. 'Hate weeks' and 'indignation meetings' are organised against imperialism in general and America in particular. Even sports depict the same theme. According to an eye-witness, year before last, the annual olympics showed a game which depicted the struggle between the imperialist camp and the socialist camp, fought on both sides by persons wearing animal masks. The imperialist camp was represented by cunning, hoofy, ugly looking animals; the socialist camp was represented by powerful animals. In this unequal combat, a running dog could also be seen. The resemblance was unmistakable.\*

A common Marxist terminology is replacing the old babel of tongues and anarchy of opinions. It is hoped that identity in slangs will lead to an identity in thought, beliefs and action. This verbal conditioning may lead to a deepening gulf between China and the rest of the world which may be harder to cross.

### **Change Brain Campaign**

But the most instructive thing is not the communist theory and practice of culture, but the contents that are being put into this culture, the shape it is taking in the daily affairs of millions of people and the demand it makes on them as individuals. Along with other efforts of communists on the literary or cinematographic fronts, there is going on a still vaster phenomenon, the phenomenon of what is called 're-

---

\* The dog represented Jawaharlal Nehru.

education' of millions of people, particularly the teachers and the students. The re-education is also called the 'Change-Brain' campaign or 'brain-washing' drive, which involves literally millions of people. According to a PTI report of 29th November, 1951, prominent Chinese professors in Peking and Tientsin were confessing their "fallacies and foolishness in thinking" in a series of self-critical articles in the Communist official newspaper *Peking People's Daily*. The drive is undertaken with a view to bring the way of thought of an individual into line with Communist Party policy and to destroy his individual self-pride and self-reliance. Because of the importance of the subject, we would quote extensively from a 'self-critical' article of Professor Fung Yu-lan, who was only recently with us as a member of the Chinese Cultural Mission. His main thesis is that in olden days he thought he was non-political, but by being so he was objectively with the Kuomintang; that now he realises his old backwardness and that ever since the coming-in of New Democracy, he has 'developed' a good deal. His 'self-criticism' also throws a flood of light on the nature of self-criticism and the way it is undertaken. He says:

"I have begun to realise my former backwardness . . . I liked to think that I was engaged in academic work for academic work's sake, and in education for education's sake. Now looking back at these ideas I see that they were indeed rationalisations designed to deceive myself as well as others... In fact, not to reject the K.M.T. approaches was tantamount to maintaining relations with them...

"I made up my mind to remain in Peking and wait for the changes to be brought about by the liberation of the city. But I did not prepare myself mentally to meet the change by reading more communist books. I think this again was due to my reluctance to see the change. . . ."

How the students 'help' the teachers in self-criticism is made clear in these lines. Fung Yu-lan adds:



“Before the summer vacation last year, two Tsingha University philosophy students were glad to learn that I was interested in self-criticism. They spent a sleepless night discussing what suggestions and recommendations they were going to offer me. The next morning, they found out that what I actually intended to do was to write an essay on self-criticism but not practise it myself. They were naturally disappointed..... The instance cited above reveals that my unconscious attitude kept others away from me. I thought I was modest, but in actuality I was arrogant. . . Turning to myself and looking back over all my past behaviour, I shall not here speak of those deeds that were obviously wrong. But even some of those not considered wrong were still motivated by a great deal of individual heroism. Therefore, in the light of the moral standards of the new society, they must be criticised. . . In brief, I feel that the new society, under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, is raising itself to new heights. I feel that I myself am also developing. Although I cannot say precisely how much progress I have made in the past year, I do realise my past backwardness, and this, of course, in itself may be regarded as progress.”

How the confession is carried and what is its scope are also made clear by the professor. He says: “As far as the method of criticism and self-criticism goes, the modern form is a mass affair vastly different from that practised by the old Chinese philosophers. The latter shut themselves up in rooms for the purpose of introspection, imagining that ‘ten fingers were pointed at them and that ten eyes were fixed upon them’. . . .But now the ten fingers and ten eyes are no longer imaginary, but real. In the old days, it was a rare occasion when a few friends gathered together to exchange criticism. But millions of Chinese communists are to-day practising criticism and self-criticism....”

“Professor Fung Yun-Ian is an author and was awarded an honorary doctorate by the Delhi University for his

scholarly works. But it should be known that he has disowned those scholarly works. Speaking about his books he says: "They provided a refuge for those who were unwilling to change. Therefore my writings had a detrimental social effect upon the revolutionary cause....my writings hindered not only my own progress but the progress of all others." One wonders whether the degree conferred on him by the Delhi University was for his old 'backwardness' which he now disowns or his 'new scholarship' for which he has not yet qualified. The fact is the degree was political, given to him at the instance of the External Affairs Ministry. In honouring the professor, the university honoured the system of forced confessions and recantations which is what constitutes communist education.

We do not blame the professor, for he had no choice.\* But we are pained at the spectacle of those academicians in free India who are engaged in the task of selling the system of confessions and conformity under all sorts of labels and catch-words. Recently we had an opportunity of attending a lecture by one of the professors,† who had been on a goodwill mission to China, in one of the local colleges of Delhi. He quoted without blinking from Mao Tse-tung that education in China is political. He recommended this system of education to his audience in terms of a juicy slogan: 'Chinese education is not divorced from life'. He did not realise the enormity of what he was advocating. *He forgot that in a communist country, politics does not mean any politics but a defined, obedient practice which changes from*

---

\* In fact, we should have sympathy and praise for him. Under very difficult circumstances, he has shown great resourcefulness and mental toughness. Between 1949 and 1958, he made confessions 136 times. And yet in another confession in 1960, he said: "I am completely under the influence of my thoughts. Having gone through a number of reforms I am slightly improved. But recently the failing reappeared in its original form."

† Prof. Mohammad Mujeeb of Jamia Millia Islamia, Delhi. He spoke to students and teachers of Delhi College.

*stage to stage. Education in a communist country is not merely political, but Marxist. Not only Marxist in the sense of believing and preaching Historical Materialism and Class War, but communist. Not only communist, but politbureaucratic. It must follow the zigzags of communist slogans and tactics.* At every turn, it must change its purpose and its definition, must blacken or admire according to the decisions of the party leadership. For example, in Russia when the Kulak was to be liquidated, education joined with politics in demanding it. A teacher was defined as “the nerve centre at the intersection of the class war between the past and the present, between the machinations of the Kulaks and proletarian socialist activity.” In this zigzag, many heads must fall. We shall not burden this article with the names of those who have so fallen.

We believe that the New Culture may be sufficient for persons like V.K.R.V. Rao, Mohammed Habib, Nirmal Bhattacharya and Tripurari Chakravorty and they may be qualified for fulfilling its demands, but the majority of teachers and students in free countries will resist its encroachment once they know the truth.

## Chapter IV

# The Myth of Socialist Food 'Surplus'

A great enthusiasm for China prevails in India today. More particularly, this enthusiasm relates to great economic strides supposed to have been made by China under the new communist regime. According to Mr. Shibbanlal Saxena, grain production in China has, as a result of communist land reform, doubled and even trebled. Scientist Meghnad Saha found that the new Chinese was eating three meals a day. Apparently this is meant to establish a contrast with the Old Chinese and the present-day Indians who supposedly do not get even one square meal a day. Dr Kumarappa was simply swept off his feet at the spectacle of the new Chinese opulence. Ex-Ambassador Panikkar lectured to the Congress M.P.s on how Chinese communists solved their food problem. Mrs. Vijya Laxmi Pandit told the U.P. Congress legislators that within a short time China had increased her food production so much that from a deficit country she had become an exporter of food.

In all such utterances, the claim to speak and write and propagate for China is based not on a study of communism in general and of Chinese agricultural developments in particular, but on short trips to that country organized by her rulers and so filled with *fete* and receptions that there was

---

\* Published in 1952 in *Nagpur Times*, *Current*, *Organiser*, *Thought*, *Mysindia* and *Swatantra*. The *Modern Review* also published it without the author's name, which was somewhat unpopular for bringing about unpalatable facts about China which had become the new beloved of many intellectuals, writer and politicians.

hardly any time or taste left for independent studies. We believe that physical locomotion can never replace painstaking study of facts and sifting, comparing and evaluating of evidence. Glob-trotters are not the best judges of a country's affairs.

Increased food production in China is a myth, but it is one of those myths which overtake the world from time to time and which are believed in spite of all facts to the contrary. A study of Chinese economic literature reveals a deficit instead of a surplus. The following table gives the production in successive years:

*Index Numbers of Food Production in China*

|                         |       |
|-------------------------|-------|
| Pre-war average 1931-37 | : 100 |
| 1946                    | : 91  |
| 1947                    | : 92  |
| 1948                    | : 94  |
| 1949                    | : 89  |
| 1950                    | : 87  |
| 1951                    | : 93  |

The figures are quoted in the U.N. publications, *Statistical Yearbook 1951*, and *World Economic Report 1950-51*, but are also confirmed by the Chinese communist sources. According to the May-June, 1952 issue of *China Reconstructs*, a propaganda publication, the Chinese production figures are:

|            | 1936 | 1950 | 1951 |
|------------|------|------|------|
| Foodstuffs | 100  | 87   | 92.8 |
| Rice       | 100  | 96.5 | 99.4 |
| Wheat      | 100  | 80.4 | 88.5 |
| Soya bean  | 100  | 58.9 | 63.3 |

The above figures speak for themselves. Food production in 1950 and 1951 was lower than in the 1930s

under Chiang when the Sino-Japanese war had not broken out and the country still enjoyed a measure of peace. If production is again rising though not reaching the pre-war level yet, the reason is not Chinese communism, but conditions of peace that have returned as a result of the Japanese defeat in the war.

In fact, the above figures do not reveal the full deficit. The figures for 1950 and 1951 are unverified communist claims. They also include figures for Manchuria which is now called the North East. Pre-war figures exclude Manchuria, Jehol and certain other areas. It is significant that the main increases claimed have taken place in the North. According to *China Reconstructs*, production in Manchuria was 7.6 per cent higher than in the local all time peak year of 1943. In Shantung province, food crops were 9 per cent above pre-war, and in Shanshi 10 per cent higher. Since the over-all figure is considerably below pre-war, this would make the other provinces of China produce considerably less than the general index figures indicate.

### **Per capita Consumption is Lower**

No wonder with a larger population to support on a lower level of production, consumption standards have fallen below pre-war. According to the *Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East 1950*, the average food supplies available for human consumption and the energy-value that food represents are as follows:

#### *Per capita Food consumption*

|         | China (22 provinces) Cereals<br>kilograms<br>(Annual Supplies) | calories<br>(Daily Intake) |
|---------|--|----------------------------|
| 1934-38 | 171.6  | 2226                       |
| 1948-49 | 165.1  | 2172                       |
| 1949-50 | 153.0  | 2020                       |

These figures reveal that the average consumption has been declining. The figure do not say that these quantities are availed by the consumers, but are computed on the basis of available supply of food and equitable distribution. Inequality which is prevalent even under communism depresses these figures still more so far as the masses of people are concerned.

The above facts did not fundamentally change in the year 1951, except that in this year population was larger and taxes were higher. If we make allowance for seeds (about 12 per cent of the produce) and divide the country's total rice production by her total population, we get for each individual an amount lower than what it was in 1936 and lower than any scientifically established norm. We may divide this quantity in as many meals as would satisfy Dr. Meghnad Saha, but it will not change the total quantity by one iota as long as the total production and population remain what they are. To provide some thing like adequacy in food—even in quantity—would need very much more than the present level of production.\*

When it is claimed that China has solved its food problem, it only means that due to the police character of their state,

---

\* Increasing food shortage seems to characterize increasing success of communism. Per capita food-rations have been falling ever since communists took over the country. Before 1949, monthly per-capita food rations was 50 catties; during 1940 to 1952 only 35 catties. From 30 catties in 1953-55, it fell to only 18 catties in 1958. In 1960 it touched 11.5 catties.

Consumption was declining while all the time increased food production was being claimed. For example, when communes were introduced in 1958, the government soon announced that its output of food and cotton had more than doubled since 1957. But simultaneously, it officially ordered the eating of rice husk, potato leaves, wild plants and bean waste. By mid-1962, overseas Chinese were sending 200,000 food parcels to their hungry relatives and friends in mainland China. One thousand firms in Hongkong alone were specializing in sending food parcels to China

the Chinese people are no longer able to complain of their hunger. In fact, they have to sing paens of praise for their prosperity! On the other hand, in India where people are free to speak, organize and agitate, political parties compete with each other in flaming the consciousness of hunger. Thanks to this propaganda, the best paid and the best fed classes in India often regard themselves as the worst starved. It is a real dilemma. Freedom leads to slogan-mongering and to even the propagation of non-existent or imaginary grievances, while regimentation leads to suppression of all venues of expression of even legitimate grievances.

The communist surplus export is as spurious as its food self-sufficiency. The fact is that in a dictatorial country, where the rulers do not give a damn to their subjects, it is possible for grain production to fall and grain export to rise. We have the example of Soviet Russia. From 1929 to 1933, while grain production was falling catastrophically, causing a widespread famine, Soviet authorities continued to export grain in ever larger quantities. In fact, on the eve of the new harvest in 1928, when the peasants were not yet collectivized and communist control over them was not complete, the Soviet Government was forced to import 12 million poods of food-grains from abroad. But all this changed as soon as the collectives were instituted. Grain began flowing in in the coffers of the government.

Because China is a police state, she has been able to 'solve' her food problem, while we have failed.

Now, what is the nature of the food problem? It is a city problem. Enough does not come forth from the rural side to feed the urban areas. In India, the communists preach rationing in the towns and abandoning of procurement in the villages. They agitate for low selling price in towns and high price for the farmer. In this vote-catching campaign, other political parties also join. In a communist country, where all opposition has been silenced, no such difficulties arise. There it is possible to organize forced deliveries out of the



peasants at confiscatory prices to any amount. We have the example of Soviet Russia. Between 1928 and 1938, production of grain was about the same (if we make allowance for the change in the method of computation introduced in 1932), that is about 74 million tons; while the government's share during this period increased from 630 million poods to 2300 million poods or 375 per cent.

A similar thing is happening in China.\* Farmers are competing with each other in over-paying their tax-grains to the government in the same manner as the Russian peasants "competed" in over-fulfilling their grain-deliveries to the state.

---

\* For example, according to People's Daily Commune Yang Chuang, Ting Hsein, Shantung, "sold" 850,000 catties of "surplus" food to the Government, a quantity which was 3 million more than its quota. In 1962, the Government got 70,310,000 catties from the Chi Li Mu League of Tung Liao, 9.42% more than the expected quota. Some other figures for 1961 alone are: Hsiao Hsi Commune, Hunan sold 370,000 catties; Pao An Hsien, Kwangtung sold 7,700,000 catties; Fan Ho Commune, Mukden sold 150,000; and so on.

## Chapter V

# **Change-Brain Campaign\***

While official India is seized with admiration for the communist rulers of China, the Chinese people themselves are in the grip of a new phenomenon: Brainwashing. In China, this is known as Kai Chou, which means 're-casting of the personage'. Yes, recasting of the personage! The change must not be merely outward: sartorial or economic or political. Mind itself must change and yield to communist engineering.

Through brain-washing old China is being destroyed and a fundamentally new China is emerging. Stalinism-Maoism is fast replacing Buddhism and Confucianism. This fact is not sufficiently recognised in India. Communists and their fellow-travellers are utilising the fact of ancient Indo-Chinese cultural ties based on spiritual Buddhism to spread the cult of materialistic Maoism in India.

Kai Chou utilises several methods and techniques. But the most important method is that of "self-criticism" or public confession. Every other method subserves and eventually leads to self-criticism.

The basic feature of self-criticism is not indoctrination, but *disintegration*. Indoctrination is bad enough; it organises human personality around a narrow range of ideas and breeds intolerance. Nevertheless it still has some organising

---

\* First written & published in 1954-55.

or unity principle. But what the communist regime seeks is disintegration of the human personality. The intellectual must be brought to his knees, shown his place, deflated, vanquished and reduced to ignominy and self-abasement.

Self-criticism demands a totalitarian regime. It must be clear to the victim that he is completely helpless; that even martyrdom is not possible; that if he dies he dies a dog's death; that the security of those he loves depends on how he behaves. In a country where democracy prevails, where individuals and groups have legal rights, and have publicmen to speak on their behalf, self-criticism on any large-scale is not possible.

The method of self-criticism is scientific, though not of the laboratory. To be effective, confessions must be organised openly, in the full glare of publicity, with the masses of people participating. Terror perpetrated in the privacy of a cell has no public utility or example. Hatred, fear, reward and punishment should be so organised that people themselves engage in plucking thoughts out of each other's minds.

The purpose of a confession is to humiliate a person in the public, to kill his pride and self-confidence. By being compelled to attack his own convictions and ideas, the confessor develops self-ridicule and self-contempt. Confessions destroy a man's self-respect. A person who 'confesses' under duress to opinions contrary to his beliefs loses not only in the eyes of the public but most heavily in his own. He knows he is a sham and a weakling. When compulsion makes for conviction and one set of ideas is changed for another, people lose respect for ideas themselves. An independent, courageous, self-respecting intelligentsia is the life-breath of freedom. Therefore to bring this freedom and autonomy of mind into ridicule, into kow-towing docility and unseemly breast-beating becomes the most important task of a dictatorial regime.

Confessions are organised in factories, trade-shops, farms, schools and colleges. But how is it that these massive and significant facts are not known outside? How is it that the ever-increasing cultural delegations fail to see these facts supremely important to culture? How is it that these facts fail to appear in the Indian Press? Is it due to the Government control or communist infiltration of the press or the self-discipline of our editors and correspondents? To my mind, all these factors cooperate in giving rise to a phenomenon that amounts to a very rigid censorship. Facts unfavourable to the totalitarian regimes of China and Russia are kept out of the press. Favourable facts are propagated and repeatedly published.

In a communist country, a person of any worth must confess. But here we shall restrict ourselves to the university circles alone. There are many categories of crimes to which they confess, but generally confessions relate to the crimes of individualism, liberalism, subjectivism and personal interest. Yang Shih-hsien, Chairman, Administration Committee, Nanking University, criticised himself for his 'non-political-mindedness', "classless-mindedness", "aloofness" and "being wise to preserve himself". Li Tsung-en, Physician and President of the Peking Union Medical College, confessed to "idealism", "reformism", "technicalism", and "non-political-mindedness".

Here in India, for example, it will be difficult for their students to correct professors like Dr. V.K.R.V. Rao of the Delhi university, but in communist China their counterparts see their mistakes rather readily once the students demand it. Yen Jen-keng, professor of Economics at Chekiang and Peking universities, wrote his piece: "Criticising My Reactionary Reformism". Chu Ch'i, head of the Economics Department, Nanking University, and author of several books (Introduction to New Finances; A New Theory of Expenditure; A New Theory of Revenue), confessed to the

charges of “reformism” and “ambition” in an article “Criticizing My Capitalist Thought”. Fung Yu-lan, a well-known Chinese philosopher, confessed to “idealism” and “decadence”. He disowned his scholarly works for which, however, he was awarded an honorary doctorate by the Delhi University at the instance of our Foreign Affairs Ministry! Chin Yo-lin, Professor, Philosophy Department, Ts’ing hwa university, analysed his “pre-liberation thought”, and criticised his “Capitalist, Idealistic Philosophy of Education”. He concluded “ I am almost 50. I feel very sinful. I want to become a new man”.

They have also to confess to “worship-America” attitude. Ch’en Yuan, a well-known historian, wrote: “I was a mean accomplice of imperialism, and a dirty and despicable compradore”. Ko T’ing-sui, physicist, confessed to having been “a cultural slave of American imperialism”. Huan Chia-te, Professor of Foreign Literature, Shantung university, wrote an article, “Criticism of My Motive for Publishing the West Wind Magazine. . .A Tool for American Imperialistic Propaganda”. Ch’in Kuang-yu, professor of Pathology, Lingnan Medical College, wrote a confession under a microbicidal title, “Annihilating My Deadly Enemy. . . . Pro-America Thought.”

Similarly while America is being damned, the Russian cult is propagated. T’eng Ta-ch’un, Professor of Education, Hopei Teachers College, said, “As I have now begun to hate the United States, I have naturally come to think that the Soviet Union is lovable, respectable and worthy of our worship.”

At the end of the confession, the confessor promises to behave better. Chin Tsu-chung wrote, “I hate my ugly conduct of the past.....I urgently demand ideological reform”. Wu Mi, Professor of Foreign Literature, Southwestern Teacher’ College, promised to “learn more about Marxism-Leninism and Maoism . . . look at things from

the proletarian standpoint. . . stick to communism without fence-riding, without compromise and without recourse to a middle-of-the-road policy". Yen Shu-t'ang, a law student of Yale, Peking and Wuhan universities, said 'I hate myself . . . However, I have to lift my head to face you, to see the light, the light of New Democracy, Socialism and Communism."

We briefly discussed above the nature and purpose of "self-criticism" and quoted representative passages to bring home its nature. We now list 156 names of professors, scientists, etc., who had to make public confessions, many of them more than once. Only the names of the top-most scholars have been included. With a few exceptions we owe this list to the learned Dr. Tsui Shu-chin, once professor of International Law and Relations at the National Peking University.\*

### **Biologists**

1. Chang Ching-yueh      Dean, Peking University,  
concurrently Dean, School of  
science.

---

\* This article belongs to the very early period of communist regime. But starting from "Thought Reform Movement" of 1951 and the "3-antis and 5-antis campaigns" of 1952, the struggle against intellectuals has in fact never ceased. In the later part of 1955, another movement was launched for the purge of so-called hidden counter-revolutionary elements. In this campaign 1,300,000 intellectuals were subjected to political screening and 80,000 received legal punishment. In 1957, after hundred flowers had bloomed, 100,000 people, mostly intellectuals, were accused of being "right-reactionaries". They were despatched to factories and far-away villages for "reform through labour".

In 1958, "Reform Through Labour" was followed by "Heart-Offering" and "Red and Expert" movements. For example, on March 23, 1958, 457 members of a newly-formed "Heart-Offering League", offered their hearts to the Communist Party and on the next day confessed 50,259 examples of wrong thoughts and wrong activities. They also shouted a promise: "We must be faster, wider, truer, and deeper."

Currently the press has been reporting a new terror campaign against intellectuals suspected of "revisionism".

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 2. Ts'ui Chih-lan<br>(Mrs. Chang Ching,<br>yueh) | not available  |
| 3. Li Liang-ch'ing                               | Head, Botany Department,<br>Shantung University.             |
| 4. Lu Yen-hao                                    | not available  |
| 5. Chang Tsung-ping                              | ditto  |
| 6. Liu I-jan                                     | ditto  |
| 7. Wu Chao-fa                                    | Prof. of Biology, Catholic<br>University.                    |
| 8. Wang Chia-chieh                               | Dean, Aquaculture Research<br>Institute, Academy of Science. |

#### **Physicists**

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| 9. Chou P'ei-yuan   | Dean, Ts'inghua University.  |
| 10. Ko T'ing-sui    | Prof. of Physics, Tsinghwa<br>University.  |
| 11. Li Fang-hsun    | Chairman of Administrative<br>Committee (equivalent to<br>president) Chinling University<br>(the former Nanking University). |
| 12. Lu Hsueh-shan   | not available  |
| 13. Huang Hsi-t'ang | ditto  |

#### **Chemists**

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 14. Yang Shih-hsien | Chairman of Administrative<br>Committee, Nankai University. |
| 15. Sun Cheng-ngo   | Chairman, Chemistry Dept.,<br>Peking University.            |

#### **Mathematicians**

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| 16. Hua Lo-keng | Dean, Mathematics Research<br>Institute, Academy of Science,<br>concurrently Prof. of |
|-----------------|---|

- Mathematics, Tsinghwa and Peking Universities.
17. Li Hsien-cheng not available
18. Ko Chao Prof. Szechuan University.

### **Geologists**

19. Li Szu-kuang Vice President, Academy of Science.
20. Yu Te-yuan Vice President, North-east College of Geology.

### **Medicine**

21. Li Tsung-en President, Peking Union Medical College.
22. Teng Chia-tung Chief Doctor, Medical Dept., P.U.M.C.
23. P.E. King President, Nanking Medical College.
24. Hsu Ying-k'uei Chairman, Dept. of Psychophysiology, P.U.M.C.
25. Ts'ai Ch'iao Dean, Medical College, Nanking University (the former Central University).
26. Ch'in Kuang-yu Prof., Pathology Lingnan Medical College.
27. Huang Chia-szu Vice President, Shanghai College of Medicine.
28. Chou Chin-huang Chairman, Dept. of Materia Medica, P.U.M.C.

### **Veterinarians**

29. Huang Chu-feng Chairman, Veterinary Dept., Northeast College of Agriculture.



**Engineers**

- |     |                   |  |
|-----|-------------------|--|
| 30. | Liang Szu-ch'eng  | Chairman, Dept. of Architecture, Ts'inghua University.                               |
| 31. | Ma Ta-yu          | Dean, Engineering School, Peking University.   |
| 32. | Chao Keh-tung     | Assist. Prof., Dept. of Architecture, Northeast Engineering College.                 |
| 33. | Hsieh Kuang-hua   | Prof., Civil Engineering, Chiaot'ung.  |
| 34. | Hu Wei-po         | Prof., Engineering School, North China University.                                   |
| 35. | Mao I-sheng       | Former Dean, Engineering Carnegie Institute of Technology and M.C.E., Cornell.       |
| 36. | Chou Fa-ch'i      | not available  |
| 37. | Chang Han-ying    | Former President, Peiyang University. Vice Minister, Ministry of Water Conservancy.  |
| 38. | Chang Wei         | Chairman, Department of Civil Engineering, Tsinghua University.                      |
| 39. | Hsu Ch'inu-ch'un  | not available.   |
| 40. | Ch'ien Chung-han  | ditto  |
| 41. | Ch'ien Wei-ch'ang | Vice Dean, Tsinghua University, concurrently Prof., Dept. of Mechanical Engineering. |
| 42. | Huang Yu-shan     | Prof., Dept. of Aeronautic Engineering, Nanking                                      |

- University (the former Central Univ.)
43. Ch'en Shih-hua Vice Dean, Tsinghwa University.
44. Shih Chia-yang Dean, Engineering School, Tsinghwa University.
45. Ch'en Shu-t'ao Prof., Dept. of Civil Engineering, Northwest Engineering College.
46. Chin Hsi-wu Prof., Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, Tsinghwa University.
47. Hsu Hsin-fu not available.
48. Tseng Chia-tien ditto
49. Ch'en Yung-ling Dean, Engineering College, Lingnan University.
50. Shih Pin Prof., Electrical Engineering, Aurlona Univ.
51. Tu Cheng-fu not available.
52. Yao Ch'eng-san ditto
53. Ting Hsu-huai Prof., Dept. of Chemical Engineering, Nankai University.
54. Fu Ying Instructor, University of Michigan, now head of the Department of Chemical Engineering at Peking University.

### **Agriculture**

55. Tai Fang-lan Prof., Peking University of Agriculture.
56. Sun Hua Chairman, Deptt. of Horticulture, Northwest College of Agriculture.
57. Chin Tzu-chung Dean, School of Agriculture, Nanking University.

- |                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| 58. Sun En-lin        | not available  |
| 59. Chang Wen-ts'ai   | ditto  |
| 60. Chao Shan Huan    | ditto  |
| 61. Hua Shan          | Vice President, Shantung<br>College of Agriculture.  |
| 62. Chung Hsing-cheng | Prof., Dept. of Agriculture,<br>Shantung University. |

### **Specialists in Chinese Language and Literature**

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| 63. Lo Ch'ang-p'ei   | Dean, Language Research<br>Institute, Academy of Science,<br>concurrently Dean, Literature<br>Research Institute, Peking<br>University. |
| 64. Yu Kuo-en        | Prof., Dept. of Chinese<br>Literature, Peking University.   |
| 65. Yang Chen-sheng  | not available.  |
| 66. Li-Chin-hsi      | Chairman, Dept. of Chinese<br>Literature, Peking Teachers'<br>University.   |
| 67. Wen Kung-yi      | Chairman, Dept. of Chinese<br>Language, Hopei Teachers'<br>College.   |
| 68. Huang Nien-t'ien | Assist. Prof., Dept. of Chinese<br>Literature, Szechuan University  |
| 69. Wei Chien-kung   | Prof., Dept. of Chinese<br>Literature, Peking University.   |
| 70. Chung I-wen      | not available.  |
| 71. T'an P'en-mo     | ditto   |
| 72. Lu K'an-ju       | Vice President, Shantung<br>University.   |
| 73. Li Chia-yen      | not available.  |
| 74. Ts'ai Ch'iu-nung | Prof., Dept. of Chinese<br>Literature, Sun Yat-sen<br>University.   |

75. Ch'eng Ch'ien-fan      not available.  
 76. Fang Ling-ju          Prof., Chinese Literature,  
    Fudan University.

### **Specialists in Foreign Languages & Literature**

77. Wu Ta-yuan            Prof.,  
 78. Chu Kuang-ch'ien    Prof., Dept. of Western  
    Language, Peking University.  
 79. Wu Mi                 Prof., Dept. of Foreign  
    Literature,                 Southwest  
    Teachers' College.  
 80. Huang Chia-te        Prof., Dept. of Foreign  
    Languages, Shantung University.  
 81. Li Chih-yeh            Chairman, Dept. of Foreign  
    Language, Nankai University.  
 82. Lu Shu-yu             Tutor, Foreign Languages  
    School.

### **History or Geography**

83. Ku Chieh-kang        not available.  
 84. Yang Jen-pien        Prof., Dept. of History, Peking  
    University.  
 85. Nieh Ch'ung-ch'i     not available.  
 86. Ch'en Yuan            President, Catholic University  
    and Peking Teachers'  
    University.  
 87. Chou I-liang         Chairman, Ancient Chinese  
    History Research Section,  
    Dept. of History, Peking  
    University.  
 88. Liang Szu-yung        not available.  
 89. Hou Jen-chih         Prof., Dept. of History,  
    Yenching University.  
 90. Pai Shou-i             Chairman, Chinese History,

- Research Section, Peking Teachers' University.
91. Wu Tyu-chin      Chairman, Dept. of History, Wuhan University.
92. Sheng Hsu-kung      Prof., Dept. of Geography, Peking Teachers' University.
93. Hsia K'ai-ju      Prof., Dept. of Geography, Northwest University.

### **Education or Psychology**

94. Ou Yuan-huai      President, Great China University, and Prof., East China Teachers' College.
95. Tung Wei-chuan      Chairman, Dept. of Education, Peking Teachers' University.
96. Chang Hsian-lan      not available.
97. Hu Chih-ping      Prof., Dept. of Chemistry, Peking Teachers' University.
98. Ch'en Ho-ch'in      President, Nanking Teachers' College.
99. T'eng Ta-ch'un      Prof., Hopei Teachers' College.
100. Sun Kuo-hua      not available.

### **Philosophy**

101. Fung Yu-lan      Chairman, History of Chinese Philosophy Research Section, Peking University.
102. Chin-Yo-lin      Dean, School of Literature and Art, Tsinghua University.
103. Liang Sou-ming      not available.
104. Tang Yung-t'ung      Vice President, Peking University.
105. Chi Wen-fu      President, Honan University.

**Musicians, Artists or Dramatists**

- |                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| 106. Chang Jen-hsia   | Prof., Central Academy of Art.   |
| 107. Chan Hung-tao    | not available.   |
| 108. Feng Tzu-k'ai    | ditto  |
| 109. Ouyang Yu-ch'ien | Central College of Drama and Theatrical Art, President.                          |
| 110. Lao She          | A vigorous Literary figure of modern China. Author of well-known "Rickshaw Boy." |
| 111. T'sao Yu         | Playwriter.  |
| 112. Chao Shu-li      | Novelist and short story writer.   |
| 113. Sun Yu           | Well-known movie-director.   |

**Political Science**

- |                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| 114. Ch'ien Tuan-sheng | Dean, Law School, Peking University.                       |
| 115. Kung Hsiang-jui   | Prof., Dept. of Political Science, Peking University.      |
| 116. Lou Pang-yen      | Prof., Dept. of Political Science, Peking University.      |
| 117. Kao-I-han         | Prof., Nanking University (the former Central University). |
| 118. Ts'ao Han-ch'i    | not available.   |

**Economists**

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 119. Chu Ch'i       | Head, Economics Department, Nanking University.             |
| 120. Yen Jen-keng   | Prof., Economics Chekiang University and Peking University. |
| 121. Chang Chung-i  | Prof., Economics and Secretary-General Catholic University. |
| 122. Li Ch'ung-huai | not available.  |
| 123. Liu Ti-yuan    | ditto.  |

124. Yen Shu-t'ang                      Yale trained student of law, formerly of Peking University and now of Wuhan University.
125. Quentin Pan                        Prof., Tsinghua University.
126. Chao Ch'eng-hsin                Prof., Yenching University.
127. Chiang Yin-en                      Chairman, Department of Journalism, Yenching University.
128. Ts'ui Ping-heng                    Lecturer of physical education, Northwest College of Agriculture.

### Prominents

129. Hsu Ch'ung-ch'ing                President, Sun Yat-sen University.
130. Feng Nai-ch'ao                    Vice President, Sun Yatsen University.
131. Wang I-chai                        Secretary-General, Honan University.
132. Ch'en Chia-wu                    Vice President, Lingnan University.
133. Ho Tsung-chieh                    Dean, Wuhan University.
134. Li Pao-cheng                      Vice President, Tientsin-Tangku University.
135. Chang Te-hsing                    Vice President, Northeast Teachers' University.
136. Lin Chuan-ting                    Assist. Dean, Catholic University.
137. Wang Chung-min                 Chairman, Section of Science of Library, Peking University.
138. Li Cheng-teh                        Chairman, Dept. of Agriculture Northwest College of Agriculture.

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 139. Li Tieh-min    | Chairman, Dept. of Economics, Fudan University.                 |
| 140. Chi Hsien-lin  | Chairman, Dept. of Oriental Languages, Peking University.       |
| 141. Hu Hou-hsuan   | Prof., Dept. of History, Fudan University.                      |
| 142. Kao Min-kai    | Chairman, Chinese Language Research Section, Peking University. |
| 143. Kao Chueh-fu   | Dean, Nanking Teachers' College.                                |
| 144. Peng Ti-hsien  | President, Szechuan University.                                 |
| 145. Yang Chi-sheng | Acting Chairman, Dept. of Foreign Languages, Fudan University.  |
| 146. Yang Tung-shun | President, Central China Teachers' College.                     |
| 147. Chiang I-cheng | Prof., Theological Seminary, Yenching University and P.U.M.C.   |
| 148. Lo Ta-kang     | Prof., Dept. of Western Languages, Peking University.           |

#### **Fine Arts**

- |                  |               |
|------------------|---------------|
| 149. Lao She     | not available |
| 150. T'sas Yu    | ditto         |
| 151. Shaq Shu-li | ditto         |
| 152. Sun Yu      | ditto         |

#### **Others**

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| 153. Wang Kan-yu  | Educated in U.S. (Harvard) and Great Britain. |
| 154. Weng Wen-hou | not available.                                |



155. Kao I-han                      Prof., Nanking University.  
156. Fen Pen-fu                    not available.\*

---

\* The story does not end here. The persecution of intellectuals in China is a never-ceasing affair. The early period of "Ideological Remoulding" which has been discussed in the above article was followed by dozens of literary purges, the better-known of them being the Anti-Rightist Movement, the Anti-Ancient-Love-Modern Movement, the Surrender-Your-Heart-to-the-Party Movement and so on. During the Anti-Rightist Movement, which started on June 8, 1956 and lasted for 4 months, purges were conducted all over China. Students and teachers were forced to denounce each other at public meetings. All classes were suspended. Every teacher or student was required to write a 21-page confession, covering his thoughts from the age of seven.

According to Valentin Chu, a scholar of Chinese affairs, in Peking University alone, 85 professors were put to work carrying nightsoil and gathering cotton. In People's University, 38% of the faculty was exiled to camps in Hopei and Manchuria. Persecution was not limited to non-communist intellectuals alone. At least 188 Communist Party members were branded as "rightists." Four hundred members of the Communist writers' association got hard labour. At the 3rd Plenary session of the 8th National Congress of the CCP held in September, 1957, it was decided that the bourgeoisie and its intellectuals had to be thoroughly reformed, so reformed that they became one hundred percent "labourers". So a campaign called "Reform Through Labour" was started. As a result, in 1957 and 1958, more than one million intellectuals were forced to scrub lavatories, pull carts, feed pigs or work as miners.

## **PART TWO**



## Chapter VI

# **The Chinese Menace to India and Asia\***

Its aims, nature and methods

As soon as Mao captured China, we simply fell in love with him. We hailed his victory as “liberation” of China. We began to find everything connected with him as wonderful. University professors, journalists, trade unionists were taken to China and they came back simply choking with admiration. They brought reports of wonderful things happening there. China became a land of our dearest dreams, a land overflowing with milk and honey, a land which embodied our most cherished aspirations.

There were also a few discordant voices. PTI reporter, Shiva Raman, the very first from India, sent damaging reports which were suppressed in the first instance. K.D. Sethna wrote as early as 1950 some of the deepest things on the “Folly of Recognising Red China”. Raja Hutheesingh and Brij Kishore Shastri, both members of Indian delegations, came away with unfavourable impressions of that country. A.D. Gorwala, Philip Spratt, and Sita Ram Goel wrote most persistently and knowledgeably on the tragedy that was unfolding in China and they also questioned the very concepts and attitudes that shaped our China Policy. But they were unrepresentative of the then prevailing intellectual temper. Sunderlal, R.K. Karanjia, Khwaja Abbas, V.K.R.V.

---

\* This paper was prepared for a seminar on “Communist Chinese Menace to India and Asia”, organised by the “Forum of International Affairs”, held on 27th, 28th and 29th November, 1965.

Rao, Mohammed Habib, Chalapathi Rau etc., expressed the nation's mind on China more truly.\*

In the atmosphere of unthinking and obsessive adulation of New China, an objective assessment of new forces arising there and of the bearing of those forces on our own security and interests became an impossibility. We chose the role of admiring China; when, in fact, as a big nation having our own responsibilities and interests, we should have tried to understand developments in our neighbourhood.

We got so much drugged with the cult of China-worship that nothing could wake us up to the realities of the situation. China's brutal treatment of her own people, her aggressive postures, her constant threats and blackmail made no impression on us. Even personal abuses were accepted with grace. China called Nehru a "running dog of imperialism." But Nehru sought to disprove the charge by working still more loyally and zealously for Maoism. He went about testifying to the peaceful and progressive nature of China and canvassing for her. For over a decade India's foreign policy was governed by the needs of China's glory and expansion. India's own needs and interests were disregarded.

---

\* These are only the consistent and more vociferous names. During 1951-59, it had become a fashion, particularly among the privileged sections, to praise China for all kind of things on the basis of short conducted tours. Ram Ratan Gupta, a Kanpur industrialist-politician told us that "China is a paradise for private enterprise in industry and commerce." A.K. Chanda, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, told the members of the New Delhi Rotary Club: "A new civilization is being developed in China and a new life is pulsating throughout the country." S.K. Mukherjee, speaker of the West Bengal Assembly, found that the peasants led "a contented and well-satisfied life." One peasant told him: "We have worshipped the Buddha for 2000 years; let us now worship Mao, he has given us land".

Only the less privileged section of India stuck a different note. In 1955, nine trade union delegates cut short their trip to China and returned. They said that the Chinese tried to indoctrinate them. They found that the workers in China were not free and that their living conditions were very bad.

China paid by invading Tibet. This created a stir amongst the common people of India. Acharya Kripalani, Shyamaprasad Mukherjee, H.N. Kunzru, M.R.Masani, N.G. Ranga and Frank Anthony spoke in Parliament against the Chinese action. But Nehru had the Congress majority behind him and the whole thing was so managed that the question was first shelved and then in due course forgotten. By 1954, Tibet did not even cost a pang of conscience to the Indian rulers and on the grave of that unfortunate country the five principle of co-existence were written.

In 1953, some of us tried to raise this question and a Tibet Committee was convened under the chairmanship of M.S. Gurupadaswamy. It was followed by a "Himalayan Borders Conference" organised under the leadership of Professor Tilak Raj Chadda and Munshi Ahmad Din. From these platforms we said that Tibet was a moral question as well as a security question for India. But unfortunately Pt. Nehru thought differently and took our attempt as a personal affront and as an encroachment on the country's foreign policies which he regarded as his exclusive preserve. He castigated and threatened the organisers of this attempt in the Parliament.\*

---

\* Speaking in the Rajya Sabha on September 23, 1953, Pt. Nehru said: "Sometimes—not often, I am glad to say—some exuberant people organise some demonstration or other against friendly countries . . . Being a gallant band of three or four they demonstrate their wishes in this manner. Sometimes they demonstrate; at any rate, they did a few days ago, against what they did not like, against the Chinese Government. Now it is trivial matter but I mention it because a member of this House apparently, I believe, associated himself with this matter . . . They proclaimed a Tibet Day. Why anyone should proclaim a Tibet Day passes my comprehension, more especially at this juncture. Who the genius was who suggested it or whose bright idea it was, I do not know." (The author of this book conceived the idea of a Tibet Day, but he never for a moment felt that he was a genius of any sort in doing it. He only felt humble and grateful that he could raise his voice on behalf of his weak neighbour and brother and give a warning to his own country against gathering dangers across our frontiers).

A new wave of terrorism was unleashed in Tibet. The Dalai Lama, the beloved leader of his people, was forced to flee away from his own country and seek asylum in India. The Indian people were shaken. They were indignant and from 1959 onwards, things began to fare badly for the Chinese influence in India.

China began to lay claims to Indian territory and began to occupy it openly what in fact she had been hitherto doing surreptitiously. For some time India's people and Parliament were not even informed about the Chinese incursions and occupation of her land. But a time came when this fact could no longer be kept back. There was anger and criticism in the country.

But it needed a full-scale invasion of India in 1962 to open her eyes. After this, she could no longer hide the fact from herself that China constituted a danger. The defeat and the humiliation suffered at the Chinese hands also discredited the Chinese lobby in the country.

To-day we know in a vague way that communist China is a danger, but we have not spelled out the nature and aims of this danger. This is a grave omission. Only by understanding the methods and characteristics of this danger can we hope to evolve a right strategy of defence.

---

Nehru continued, "But anyhow here was this Tibet Day about ten days ago — nobody has noticed it — but a dozen to two dozen persons marched through the streets of Delhi to proclaim their love of Tibet and marched to the Chinese Embassy and demonstrated in front of it with loud cries. Well, it is rather childish, all this, and extraordinary that grown up persons should behave in this way and show up, because if a couple of dozen persons do this it does not indicate, if I may so say, any powerful body of opinion. In fact, it indicates their own smallness and folly. I mention this because it is perfectly ridiculous. I don't mind if anybody thinks so and wants to oppose us in argument or debate or even in public streets. Well, if he goes beyond a certain limit, any Government will have to take action. We don't take any action normally speaking. We have not, but what I want this house to consider is the extreme, well I use the word 'folly', of such activities."



A view of a procession organised by the "Tibet Day Committee" on the 12th September, 1953. The procession marched to the Chinese Embassy to protest against the Chinese occupation of Tibet.





A view of a 1100-men-strong procession organised by the "Himalayan Borders Convention" on the 30th January, 1954. The procession marched through the streets of Delhi displaying banners drawing attention to the gathering dangers along India's northern frontiers. At the head of the procession are S.K. Razmi MP, Abdul Ghani MLA, K.N. Saigal MLA, Munshi Ahmed Din and Prem Bhasin.



Another view of the procession on the 30th January, 1954. Among the participants are to be seen Shrimati Shanti Devi, Shrimati Ajit Chaddha, Shrimati Vidyapuri, Bhagwati Devi and Som Prakash Shaida.

The burden of this paper is that the Chinese threat is both military as well as ideological-subversive; that her aims are both territorial as well as spiritual. She wants to incorporate other people's land and she wants to destroy their liberties. To achieve these ends she uses the force of arms as well as the fraud of ideology and liberation fronts.

## II

### **Territorial ambitions**

One obvious thing about the new Chinese regime is its territorial ambitions. In a map published in Peking, China has laid claims to the following "Chinese territories stolen by the Imperialists": Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, Assam in the Indian subcontinent; Laos, Viet-Nam, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaya and Burma in South-East Asia; Kurile islands, Vladivostock, Taiwan, Quemoy and Korea in North-East Asia; outer Mongolia, portions of Kazakistan, Kirghizstan and Tadjikistan in Central Asia; and of course Tibet and Sinkiang, the two unfortunate countries which China has been destroying systematically through the last many years.

The point of the above is that India should learn to look at Chinese aggression against her borders as a part of China's aggression against widely-scattered regions and countries. China's aggression is not local; it is a part of a larger pattern and blueprint. Without this larger perspective India cannot develop an adequate strategy of defence. The most desirable thing would have been if the countries similarly situated in relation to China came together in a common defence. There are 700,000 South Korean soldiers, 600,000 Chinese soldiers in Formosa. There are Vietnamese, Thai, Japanese, Malayan, and Australian soldiers. Together they form a mighty force against an ambitious aggressor.

But common interests do not always lead to common action. In the present context, there are practical difficulties in the way of such a consumation. First difficulty arises from

our own inadequate understanding of Maoism. We have so far failed to recognise its aggressive aims except when it threatens our own frontiers. Another difficulty arises from the fact that the threatened small nations of Asia depend upon U.S. help for their armies. India can not develop significant relationship with these small nations without having an understanding with the American State Department which is not quite an easy task for many reasons. Therefore it will suffice for the time being if the countries of South Asia recognised their common interests even in the absence of a common pact. It is enough if India appreciates that the Korean or Formosan or Vietnamese war against Chinese aggression is of interest to her own defence and security.

### **Maoism's True Aim Is Human Servitude**

But the territorial ambition is not the whole of the Chinese aim. In history we have known nations that were powerful and that also developed territorial ambitions. But Maoist China is more than a powerful and bellicose China. This new China is governed by an ideology and mentality alien even to the Chinese past and the Chinese philosophy of life.\* Maoism is directed not only against a constitutional democracy or fundamental rights or checks and balances of a free society, not only against the commonplace liberties and dignities of a personal life cherished in the West, but against all deeper and higher values taught by religions of the East. In the language of the Gita, Maoism is an *Asuric* force. There is neither truth nor clean doing in it. Its values are pride, arrogance, wrath, harshness, insatiable desire, self-aggrandisement, violence, ferocity, falsehood, delusion and a materialist view of life. It is mortally opposed to the values of truth, modesty, candour, straightforwardness, peace,

---

\* As should be clear from the corrent Red Guards' desecrations of the buddhist shrines, disfigurement of icons, burning of scriptures, etc.

justice, harmony, compassion and self-denial. It is perversely opposed to a spiritual view of man.

The point of the above is that a strategy of defence which is conceived only territorially will be insufficient. Maoist attack is ideological. Its target is man himself, his freedom, his soul. So a true defence must also be against Maoist doctrines and philosophy of life. We are called upon to fight not only for our lands and frontiers and security but also for our individuality and selfhood as a people.

### III

#### **Military Threat**

Following from the above two aims of Maoism are its two strategies of conquest. One obvious characteristic of the Chinese menace is its military nature. China has the biggest land army in the world ever maintained by a nation in peace times. According to expert estimates given by Edger O'Ballance in his "The Red Army of China", she has a four million strong army. Of this, the combatant force is estimated to be  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions. Mao has also boasted that the regular army is supplemented by a 250 million strong militia. According to certain estimates, China may have about 7,000 aircrafts, 10,000 pilots and a total air force personnel numbering about half-a-million. Her navy has 340 ships of various types including about 20 destroyers and over 30 frigates. Her total naval personnel is estimated to be about 70,000 men. These estimates are already old by a few years.

China is also becoming a nuclear threat. Her interest in nuclear power is of old standing. Even by 1955, she had installed 36 Nuclear Research Centres. She has already manufactured atom bombs which are not quite as unsophisticated as they were supposed to be in the beginning. She is also occupied in developing a powerful delivery system. Already within the range of her bombers,

we shall soon be within the range of her rockets also. McNamara, the American Defence Secretary, spoke to a recent Nato gathering with concern about the developing nuclear threat to India's North Indian cities. But strangely enough we do not seem to share McNamara's concern about ourselves. Even when McNamara's speech was reported in some of our papers, it invoked no discussion amongst our intellectuals!\*

All this military might China has not created just for the fun and expense of it. Militarism is a necessary dogma of Maoism. The new Chinese rulers have used their strength to impress, to threaten and to aggress. In the very beginning of their career, they aggressed in Korea. Then they used their armies to perpetrate genocide in Tibet and Sinkiang. For the last one decade they have been carrying a war of aggression in Viet Nam. In 1958, they began bombarding Quemoy island till each square kilometre had received 13,000 bombs within a few months! In 1962, they invaded openly our own frontiers. In 1965, they again fought a war with us by proxy through Pakistan, supplementing it with the threat of a direct invasion.

---

\* Again, on the 27th October, 1966, China announced the detonation of a nuclear device with a guided missile. All received it with profound concern. Dr. Ichiro Shinra of Japan pointed out that this development brought all countries within 2,000 kilometers of China within the range of Chinese missiles. American sources thought that China's missile-mounted explosion would introduce revolutionary changes in the international pattern of power and America was already planning to build a screen of anti-missiles to guard against Chinese nuclear attack on the Pacific coast and to strengthen its nuclear bases at Guam and elsewhere. But India which should be most concerned had no reaction to the rising Chinese nuclear power rapidly acquiring missile wings. Times of India reported India's reactions thus: "India has not officially recognised or analysed the meaning of these developments. Some of its statements belittle the Chinese nuclear potential.....There is no definable Indian policy though U.S. experts feel that India's security, in the absence of a guarantee or home-made deterrent, is beginning to be menaced."



The lesson of the above is obvious. Chinese aggression against India is not fortuitous or incidental. It does not arise because we might have displeased China on this point or that. Aggression is indispensable to her military cult, a necessary and organic part of her new ideology, the very stuff and substance of which Maoism is made. Maoism within China can not survive without military adventures abroad. It cannot prosper in an atmosphere of peace.

For containing China's threat, we must understand this aspect of Maoism. It cannot be appeased or propitiated or satisfied by concession or compromise or some give and take or by sweet reasonableness. It could only be restrained by counter strength. And if it could be frustrated in its outward imperialist expansion, its tyranny and brutal hold could be weakened at home too.

### **Threat of Subversion**

China's threat is only partly military. A more important part of this threat is political-subversive. The two parts are finely and effectively combined. If the enemy is weak, then Maoism could use direct military method. But if the enemy is not an easy mouthful in the military sense, then Maoism uses methods of insurrection, subversion and guerillas. The idea of the combination of the two methods has been pithily expressed by Mao in the following language: "Our strategy is one against ten and our tactics are ten against one." In plainer language, it means that if and when you are overwhelmingly strong attack the enemy physically. But if the enemy is strong physically, then propagate, deceive, organise, hide your aims, win elections, infiltrate, engineer strikes and revolts, create a fifth-column, spread defeatism, soften the enemy, start a guerilla warfare till you capture power.

Generally the two methods go together. Aggression from without is dovetailed with subversion from within. Fifth-columns inside a country work hand in hand with a foreign

army form without. But which of the two elements in the warfare will predominate at a particular time depends on several subjective and objective conditions.

The insurrectionary-subversive method is the most potent method in the Chinese armoury. In fact, in this world of atom bombs and rockets, a third world war may not take place at all. But Maoist imperialism could make all its conquests and achieve its aims through insurrectionary methods. As President Kennedy testified, our "security may be lost piece by piece, country by country, without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border."\*

America spends about 20 times more on defence than China; she produces 7 to 8 times more steel than China, generates 80 times more electric power. But all this economic and military superiority does not prevail against China, the reason being that America does not understand political warfare. In fact, in this kind of warfare America is an ally rather than an opponent of Maoism. For how could Maoism succeed in China or other parts of Asia without Edgar Snows, Anna Louis Strong, Owen, Lattimores, Mark Gaynes, and Teddy Whites? How could Castroism succeed in Cuba without a Lippman, a Newsweek, a New York Times? Or Ho Chi Minh in Viet Nam without senator Fulbrights and professor Morgenthau?

### **Professional Revolutionaries**

Political warfare is not a simple affair. It is a complex of many elements. It uses a political pamphlet as well as an assassin's knife. Propaganda, strikes, street demonstrations, smear campaigns, sabotage in cities and guerilla war in the countryside are all parts of this complex. But of all these various and connected activities, a conspiratorial

---

\* Probably these words belong to the ghost-writer of President Kennedy's speeches. Often, Kennedy's words were wiser than his deeds.



organisation consisting of trained professional revolutionaries is the core, the pivot. Lenin had established the outlines of such a professional army in 1902. Later on, when communists captured power in Russia, important centres like the 'Lenin Institute of Political Warfare', 'Academy of Red Professors', and the 'Sun Yat-sen University' were established. Here revolutionaries were brought from all parts of the world and trained in political warfare. According to certain testimonies 100,000 communists from different parts of the world have graduated from these centres.

China has further developed Leninist-Stalinist principles and forms of political warfare. She recruits her own agents and trains them at her own centres. According to certain estimates, about 20,000 students are annually trained in these centres, chiefly located in Peking and Yunan, in subversion, terrorism and guerilla warfare for work in Asia, Africa and Latin America. According to Susanne Labin, a French Socialist leader and an expert on communist affairs, China spends about 32 to billion dollars on political warfare, about equal to what she spends on the more orthodox method of military warfare.

### **Some Examples Of Subversive Work**

Let us give a few examples to illustrate the nature, the ways, the variety and the levels on which China works in this field of political warfare.

Propaganda is the simplest and yet one of the most effective elements in Mao's political warfare. Even in a small country like Ceylon on propaganda literature alone, "Chinese revisionists spend monthly as much as 40,000 dollars", as Pravda of 23rd April 1964 reveals. The same source also tells us that the leaders of the Chinese factions are going "about buying new houses and automobiles and started to live beyond their means."

There is another example of how China utilises programmes of so-called assistance for subversive purposes.

Huang Jung-sheng who defected from the Chinese group working in Nepal tells us that the Chinese “utilized the road construction programme. . . to install political agents and spies . . . that 500 soldiers of the Chinese army were working on the road dressed in civilian attire . . . that commandant Wang distributed light arms to his Nepalese contacts.” (Free China Weekly, July 9, 1964).

Another interesting illustration is provided by Anthony Okotch, an African student who was taught in one of China's Subversion Centres. He says: “The professor started his course with: ‘you know that in certain underdeveloped parts of Africa the people are highly superstitious and one cannot attain political objectives without playing on their superstitions. . . A single witch doctor. . . can accomplish more than a dozen political speakers. . . You see what you can gain if he is a communist.’ The professor then gave a demonstration of his art. He placed the skull on the table and caused it to emit orders such as: ‘I am your ancestor. I command you to go this night and kill the British governor, and bring me his head. If you fail, your family will live forever under an evil eye. . .

“The professor showed how these voices were produced by tiny electronic speakers hidden in the skull . . .

“In other cases we were shown how to throw grenades into a crowd, how to kill quickly and silently with a knife, how to organise surprise attacks at night and the art of effective sabotage, how to blow up a bridge or derail a train, how to disable a machine, and how to counterfeit money. Other courses dealt with the techniques of organising propaganda, intoxication and infiltration.”

#### IV

### **America Is an Undependable Ally**

In the above we have discussed China's threat with particular reference to its insurrectionary component. This component is most important, most fatal and most

treacherous. Yet it is the least understood and most neglected because its working is subtle. Here in this warfare, there are no visible frontiers, no entrenched positions, no identifiable enemies, no clang of guns. Here the frontiers are everywhere, the enemy is right in our midst. His skin is no longer yellow, it is brown like our own. He is not tied down to far-away peripheries in the North. He fights us in Delhi, in Bombay, in Madras and Calcutta. China is fighting us in places which apparently appear far removed from the Indian scene. She is fighting us in South-East Asia, Middle East and Africa. She believes that the road to Delhi lies through Saigon, Singapore, Jakarta and Karachi, etc

Unfortunately this is a kind of war in which not even America could help us. She is in a position to provide hardware for a military engagement. But political warfare she understands as little as we do. She could help us with a crash programme as she did in 1962 if the situation developed to crisis proportions, if China marches into our borders with fanfare. But for slow, enduring, ideological work spread over decades, she is not deep, patient, persistent and sophisticated enough. She is not able to see that neither conventional war nor conventional economic development like simple engineering, sanitation and food supplies, on which she has set her heart, can meet the communist challenge.

Nor should we take America's help for granted in our struggle against China under all circumstances. There is a powerful China lobby in America and there are powerful anti-anti-communist influences in the State Department and the American universities. Anti-anti-communism is a precious ally of communism.\* It functions in a subtle way —

---

\* In this connection it will be instructive to quote from a very interesting letter from an Indian scholar, Mr. A.V. Shakthi, writing from Urbana, Illinois, The letter was published in the *Organiser* (July 31,66). It discusses the proposed Indo-U.S. Foundation, but it is also of relevance to the point we have made. The letter says: "Anti-communists in India regard it axiomatic that America is the main bulwark of the free world against communism.

not by directly promoting and proposing communism but by maligning and attacking those policies, persons and countries that are opposed to communism. India is bound to fall foul with these elements as the Sino-India conflict deepens.

Therefore we should not assume that America's help will be there for the asking; and therefore encouraged by that thought we should not take on a posture vis-a-vis China which is not supported by our own strength and preparation.

We should cultivate self-reliance. We should develop new concepts of warfare, new forms of struggle, new outflanking ideas and strategy which are more effective against Chinese Imperialism.

If India could do that it would be a glorious contribution to the cause of world freedom as well as world peace.

---

Now, nothing could be farther from truth than this. If you step into the portals of American educational institutions, you often start scratching your head and wonder if these institutions really belong to America, supposedly the leader of the non-communist camp. Communism and communists masquerade under various fronts—a technique so very well known all over. The W.E.B. Dubois Clubs, the Students for Democratic Society, the Free (or Filthy) Speech Movement, the Free University of New York and countless other organisations that spring up from time to time and place to place under different names have invariably the same aim viz. undermining American morale and playing faithfully to the tune of Moscow or Peking. From New York to Berkeley, it is the same theme: 'Better red than dead.' . . . American education can take a raw youngman and turn him into an ambitious young man whose only God is MONEY. American education cannot prepare a man to sacrifice material welfare for some higher cause. . . . So, I ask my dear fellows who see everything rosy in America not to be swept off their feet. If you do not want marijuana, LSD and such other narcotics and drugs on Indian campuses; if you do not want teach-ins and demonstrations in the cause of communism on Indian campuses; if you do not want Mao to be idolized and bodies like 'Committee to Legalize Abortion' and 'Society for Free Love'; if you do not want Indian universities to become centers of demoralization then keep this Indo-U.S. Foundation out. The recent disclosure of Michigan State University's clock for CIA activities should serve as an eye-opener to all those who clamour for ever more visiting Professors, various cultural and scientific exchanges, Peace Corps Volunteers etc."

If there was an adequate strategy for winning the cold war there would be less need and less temptation to resort to a hot war.

But this is no easy task. It is certainly very much more difficult than creating a few more mountain divisions and building some modern armament factories. Essentially it means not so much a modernization of our industries but a self-renewal of our life-forces. It means a moral and spiritual rearmament, a new philosophy of life, a new way of looking at things. We should give up all weakening concepts of self-pity and self-belittlement. India should imbibe a new pride and a new sense of her destiny. She should build up her power and cultivate fearlessness. She should give up living on the borrowed philosophies of the West and instead look within for the fountain-waters of her life. Instead of trying to construct mechanically a dead, top-heavy structure based on doctrines and theories she should recover her lost identity and project her true self creatively and respond to events and people with courage and faith and freshness. In that way she would become invincible and a source of strength to her friends.

Chapter VII  
**Foundations of Maoism**

Problems of free Asia vis-a-vis Communist China

There has been an agitation emanating from certain organised groups for opening talks with China on the question of our northern border. This demand is put forward mainly by communists but they are also joined by some pacifists and Gandhians. Many others, some of them holding important positions in the administration and the ruling party, who are used to easy ways and who shrink from any conflict, would also like to reach a settlement with China, whatever be its nature and whatever be its long-range effects.

But public sentiment is against any settlement which is at the expense of India's integrity. The common man has also a lurking suspicion of some of his own leaders and thinkers. Deep down in his mind he has an unformulated feeling that these people have been fundamentally wrong about China; that in spite of speeches to the contrary. The same old policies which brought humiliation to the country in 1962 are being pursued and the same old confusion, wishful thinking and weakness prevail. This suspicion does not cling to any particular individual or group of individuals as such; it clings to the whole ruling party, its attitude, its petty quarrels, its preoccupation with unimportant things, its sloganised approach, its general atmosphere of thoughtlessness, its indifference to the fundamentals of the situation. The common man suspects that our leaders believe more in deals and bargains than in correcting the deeper, suicidal power-imbalance and understanding the nature of the problem and the danger.

But public sentiment should not be the sole arbiter in matters where the stakes are so high. On the other hand there should be a discussion of the pros and cons of the matter so that public opinion is properly educated and an informed policy may emerge. It is true we should not lose an opportunity for a real settlement but we should beware of any phoney agreement which the enemy may negotiate merely to lull our vigilance.

So let us talk with China by all means. But let us study how she thinks and reacts, how she looks at the world and at us what she believes about herself and about others. Let us study the thoughts, inspirations and motivations, of those who today rule over the Chinese people. Let us study Maoism, its world-outlook, its doctrines, its ideas and theories of war ad peace and revolution, its plans and blueprints for Asia, its policies and programmes, its workings, mechanics and instrumentalities at home and abroad. We cannot know it in relation to India abstracted from its ideological motivations, its practices in relation to its own people, neighbouring countries and the rest of the world. If we knew now Maosim behaves towards its countrymen and its own neighbours then we might find a clue as to how it is likely to behave towards us. Such clues may be useful to us in framing our own policies.

## **II. Marxist-Leninist Base of Maoism**

Mao's thinking is completely Marxist-Leninist. His present quarrel with Soviet Russia should not blind us to the fact that the same ideas and thoughts which created Soviet Russia also created Soviet China. In fact, dog-eats-dog quarrels are normal within the communist camp. But the new thing about the present quarrel is that the two protagonists are backed by their own independent armies and police force. Nevertheless, it has to be kept in mind that the origin of the quarrel is factional, not national. Mao's charge against modern revisionism (his description of the

present Russian leadership) is that “it seeks to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism”. He himself claims to remain a faithful disciple of Marx, Lenin and Stalin.

Whether his accusation about his opponents is true or not is not our present point of discussion. But his claim to be a faithful disciple of Marx and Lenin is very true. He is fully a creature of Marxism-Leninism. There is not a single idea which he has contributed to theoretical corpus of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism or its practical manual. His role—and that is a profoundly important role—is imitative and adaptive. His genius and creativity lie in orienting Leninist principles of warfare to Asian conditions and in recasting the political, economic and spiritual life of his country in the image of Stalinism.

Marxism-Leninism provides Mao’s cognitive framework, his categories of thought. Marx taught that Society is made up of classes; that class interest are basic; that the so-called axiomatic truths and eternal values are mere ideologies—that is rationalisations of class interests. Marx gave a materialist, dialectical interpretation of history. He said that at certain stages developing forces of production come into conflict with static relations of production. The imbalance is corrected by a revolution. Mao fully believes in all this. Marx also provided a moral fervour, a belief in the ultimate defeat of capitalism and triumph of socialism. He also taught a “dialectical” way of looking at things and examining events as opposed to the “metaphysical” way.

### **Leninism**

While Marx provides the more fundamental philosophical base, Lenin provides the more specific and immediately power-oriented theory and practice of a proletarian revolution and insurrectionary warfare. He also provides the organisational principles of a communist party which is the indispensable vehicle of a revolution.



The influence of Leninism on the future world communist movement is so profound and far-reaching that it will be worthwhile to discuss it a little more fully. In fact, if one understands Leninism, one also understand Stalinism and Maoism. All these terms mean the same thing. Therefore, a discussion of Leninism is not merely of academic interest. Rather, it will help us to understand those elements in Maoism which makes it so dangerous to Asian freedom. It will also help in planning out a proper defence by providing a truer understanding of the enemy.

Here we shall present only the more salient element of Leninism. In doing it we shall keep close to Lenin's own language. The discussion is bound to be somewhat dry and terse particularly because it is so much removed from the normal interests of common people. But an understanding of this phenomenon is indispensable for all those nations whose freedom and cultures are menaced by it whether in its Stalinist or Maoist variety. We shall discuss Leninism under the following heads: (1) Theory; (2) Strategy and Tactics; (3) Principles of Party Organisation; and (4) Ethics.

### **1. Leninist Theory**

Stalin defined Leninism as Marxism of the era of Imperialism. He further explains it thus: Marx and Engels taught and functioned when Capitalism had not fully matured and therefore when a proletarian revolution was not an immediate practical necessity. But Lenin preached and functioned when Capitalism had become a world system, when all its inner contradictions had matured and it had nothing more to contribute and therefore when a proletarian revolution had become not only a possibility but an inevitability.

Marxist theory had visualized a proletarian revolution in an industrially developed country like England. But Lenin had to explain his proletarian revolution in a backward country like Russia which was qualified only for a bourgeois democratic revolution. Lenin did his explanation

in terms of the above theory. He said that though Capitalism had developed into a world system, yet its development was uneven for different countries. Therefore, it had to snap at a point where it was the weakest. Russia happened to be the weakest link in the chain of world capitalism. Russia was also the focal point of all its matured contradictions. Therefore Russia was ripe for a proletarian revolution.

Besides the *uneven development of history*, Lenin also made one more very important contribution which was to revolutionise the theory and practice of communism: that was the concept of the “Dictatorship of the Proletariat.”

Marx used this phrase only three times in all his voluminous writings and that too in parenthesis. But this became a central concept in the communist movement after Lenin. The “fundamental thing in Leninism is the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the conditions under which it can be consolidated,” Stalin tells us.

Dictatorship of the proletariat has its own features which distinguish it from other dictatorships. Those features are:

(a) It is not a government of the poor people as some people think. It is an exclusive power monopoly of one class, namely the organised industrial factory workers of the cities. As Lenin tells us this “single class knows that it is alone in taking political power in its hands, and does not deceive itself or other with talks about ‘popular Government elected by all’. . . .”

(b) The basis of this power is force, not law. “The scientific concept of dictatorship means nothing more nor less than unrestricted power absolutely uninhibited by law or regulation and resting directly upon force.” Lenin also adds: “Dictatorship means—note this once for all . . . unlimited power, based on force and not on law.”

(c) It utilises power “for the suppression of the exploiters.” Initially, a proletarian revolution may not be popular, but once the revolution has succeeded and the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, popular

sympathy would follow: Lenin says: "Let the revolutionary proletariat first overthrow the bourgeoisie, break the yoke of the capital, and smash the bourgeois state machine; then the victorious proletariat will be able rapidly to gain the sympathy and support of the majority of the non-proletarian masses by satisfying their needs at the expense of the exploiters."

(d) The dictatorship of the proletariat exercises power in *transforming* the society. Some people think that if the communists capture power they will be tamed. But the real tragedy begins when they have captured power and when they are "consolidating" socialism. Dictatorship of the proletariat has been defined as "the armed struggle of the proletariat which has become victorious." After it has seized the state power, its renewed class struggle from the vantage point of state power finds "expression in a series of armed actions by the proletariat against the sorties of the deposed bourgeoisie."

Indeed consolidation and reconstruction are far more difficult than demolition. Therefore communist consolidation "is a most determined and most ruthless war waged by the new class" against the old. Communist consolidation involves recasting the whole nation in a new mould. Lenin says, "It will be necessary under the dictatorship of the proletariat to re-educate millions of peasants and small masters, hundreds of thousands of office employees, officials and bourgeois intellectuals, to subordinate them all to the proletarian state and to proletarian leadership, to overcome their habits and traditions." Just as we must—"in a protracted struggle waged on the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat—to re-educate the proletarians themselves, who do not abandon their petty-bourgeois prejudices at one stroke."

This explains why there is more killing and violence when communists have captured power than before it in the

process of capture, a process which in itself is bloody enough.

(e) Even this so-called dictatorship of the proletariat is really the dictatorship of the party. Lenin tells us that “by the dictatorship of the proletariat we mean, in essence, the dictatorship of its organised and conscious party,” which means the communist party. Stalin tells us that “not a single important decision is arrived at by the organisations of the proletariat (trade union, cooperatives etc.) without the guiding directions from the Party.” So the dictatorship of the proletariat consists of the guiding directions given by the party plus the carrying out of the proletariat, plus their fulfillment by the population as a whole. “Dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the Party,” frankly says another important Soviet leader, Sorin.

## **2. Leninist Strategy and Tactics**

Strategy and tactics constitute the science of a communist revolution. Some people confuse communism with laudable ends like justice, equality and brotherhood. But it is not so. Communism is only a power cult. It is a name for a body of strategy and tactics, the essence of which consists in destroying the enemies one by one.

Stalin defines Leninism as “the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, and the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular.” So tactics are used not only in capturing power but also in consolidating it, in building socialism.

According to Lenin the “fundamental question of communism is power”. This goal of total power is achieved in different “stages of revolution”, though these stages tend to coalesce into one in the new era of monopoly capitalism. A “stage of revolution” is determined by the class configuration of the given time, the relative maturity of class consciousness and class conflict. Each “stage” has its corresponding objective, target, its main force, its reserve

force, direction of the main blow, its plan for the disposition of the main blow. The task of a strategy is to determine the direction of the main blow of the proletariat, the elaboration of a corresponding plan for the disposition of the revolutionary forces, the fight to carry out the plan throughout the given stages of the revolution.

Each “stage” has its allies, its enemies, its vascillating elements. Marxist analysis consists in defining the enemy, the ally, and the possible supporters at each stage. The task of a revolutionary strategy is to isolate the enemies, to neutralize the unstable elements and to win over the allies.

The “enemies” and he “allies” change with the change in the “stage” of the revolution.

Strategy changes with the passing of the revolution from one stage to another but remains essentially unchanged throughout a given stage. Tactics are a subordinate part of a strategy. They deal with the forms of struggle and the forms of organisation of the proletariat. While strategy is the same for a given stage of revolution, tactics may change several times, depending one the ebb and flow, the rise and decline, of the revolution.

In simple language, Leninist strategy and tactics consist in vanquishing the enemies in easy installments, one with the help of another.

### **The Three Contradictions**

Closely related to the above are the three contradictions of capitalism postulated by Lenin. These are (a) contradictions between labour and capital; (b) contradictions between imperialists competing for world markets and raw materials and (c) contradictions between colonial peoples and imperialists.

The three kinds of contradictions lead to three kinds of conflicts and wars: (a) wars between the proletariat and the capitalists; (b) imperialist wars and (c) the wars of liberation.

Wars of liberation constitute the *direct* reserves of the revolution. Imperialist wars are part of the *indirect* reserves.

Other indirect reserves are the conflicts of any kind among the non-proletarian classes of a country which “can be utilized by the proletariat to weaken the enemy and to strengthen its own reserves.”

These indirect reserves or more plainly conflicts among the communist victims are sometimes “of the prime importance for the progress of the revolution.” In fact no revolution is possible unless the conflicts among the enemies intensify. Lenin puts it thus; “We may consider that the time is ripe for the decisive struggle; when all the class forces arrayed against us are in a state of confusion, are sufficiently embroiled one with another, have been sufficiently weakened in combats for which their strength is inadequate.”

It is the task of a revolutionary party to utilize these contradictions. Even if these conflicts do not exist or are not sharp enough, a revolutionary should artificially inflame them, intensify them. The Comintern enjoins, “when there is no revolutionary upsurge, the communist parties must advance slogans and demands that correspond to the everyday needs of the toilers, linking them with the fundamental tasks of the communist international.”

A revolutionary must also be able to give a political turn to every grievance, must be able to group all grievances “into a single picture of police violence and capitalist exploitation.” He must be able “to take advantage of every petty event in order to explain his socialistic convictions and his democratic demands to all, in order to explain to all and everyone the world historic significance of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat.”

### **3. Leninist Principles of Party Organisation**

Now we pass over to perhaps the most important aspect of Leninist contribution: namely principles of party organisation.

Now that we meet often enough monolithic communist parties every where, we tend to take them for granted and assume that they were always there. But Lenin had to wage

a long, relentless battle against his colleagues to establish the principle of a conspiratorial, centralised, well-drilled monolithic party. A communist party is the vehicle of a communist revolution. Its organisation should be equal to its task. Lenin's ideas on party organisation could be grouped around three interdependent thoughts: that a communist revolution could only be brought about by trained revolutionaries; that a communist party is more than a trade union of factory workers and therefore its task is more than the economic amelioration of the proletariat; that a communist revolution will not come about *automatically* but will have to be *pushed through*.

### **Professional Revolutionaries**

Lenin believed that the key to a successful revolt is a secret "cadre" organisation, formulated with hierarchical principles. "Give us a revolutionary organisation and we will turn Russia upside down," Said Lenin. He stuck firmly to the idea that a revolution would not come "spontaneously" but must be prepared for and organised by a specially trained party of professional revolutionaries. In his "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back" written in 1904, he laid the principles of a militant revolutionary party of a new type. The "History of the CPSU" says that "for the first time in the history of Marxism," Lenin "elaborated the doctrine of the Party as the *leading* organisation of the proletariat, as the principal weapon of the proletariat, without which the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be won." Lenin preached that the organisation of revolutionaries must consist first, foremost and mainly of people who make revolutionary activity their profession. Such an organisation must be of necessity not too extensive and be as secret as possible." Because of the importance of the subject, let us look into it a little further.

### **'Economism' and 'Spontaneity'**

Marx had stressed economic factors and the economic

demands of the workers. He had also preached the inevitability of a communist revolution when the conditions are matured. From this some Marxist thinkers concluded that workers should have a party of their own to fight out their economic demands and that revolution would come about automatically when the historical conditions are mature or grow out of these economic struggles of the workers. Lenin rejected both these concepts which he contemptuously called concepts of “economism” and “spontaneity”. He stressed the importance of theory, of political consciousness, of organising a revolution. He said “there could not yet be Social-Democratic consciousness among the workers. It could only be brought to them from without. The history of all countries show that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade union consciousness. The theory of Socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical, and economic theories that were elaborated by the educated representatives of the propertied class, the intellectual. Lenin does not agree with those who limit themselves to “Fight for Economic Conditions,” nor with those who say “politics always obediently follows economics.” To him “all belittling of the role of the ‘conscious element’ means. . . . strengthening the influence of the bourgeois ideology over the workers.” Revolution of the workers has to be pushed through, to be organised. “He who refuses technically to prepare for the insurrection rejects the insurrection itself, and transforms the programme of the revolution into an empty phrase.”

And this pushing through has to be done not by the proletariat but on their behalf by indoctrinated intellectuals, by an intellectual “vanguard” which is “guided by the most advanced theory.”

So one can see that communism is not an economic doctrine, nor does it represent the trade union struggle of the workers, nor is it to be brought about by workers, nor



will it come as a result of increasing proletarianisation of the society under developing capitalism. Communism is a philosophic doctrine, a distinct world-view. It will come about as a result of great organising efforts of a professional revolutionary class. As Churchill points out, "communism is not only a creed, it is a plan of campaign."

The above points should be kept in mind by those who want to fight communism.

Communism cannot be fought by those who think that communism comes out of poverty. It has nothing to do with the 'stomach theory' of communism so popular among certain sections; nor should we regard communism as an epiphenomenon of poverty. Communism is not a by-product of certain evils; it is an evil in itself. It is a conscious agency of aggression, a conspiratorial, deeply-laid plan of world conquest.

Such an enemy will not disappear 'spontaneously' as a result of certain acts of commission and omission in the field of economic development. It will have to be fought *consciously* by a missionary cadre; its plots and conspiracies and secret policies and plans will have to be exposed by those who study them. It will have to be fought *doctrinally* and *organisationally*. Its influence will have to be fought in the trade unions, in peasant organisations, in the press, among the students and the teachers, and in the universities. It will have to be fought in the streets as well as in the realm of ideas by persons as devoted and as trained as the professional revolutionaries. Those who like the Americans are thinking of fighting it by simple 'economic development' are deceiving themselves and deceiving others.

'Economism' and 'Spontaneity' were rejected by communists long ago. But the two concepts completely dominate the thinking of the non-communist world.

#### **4. Leninist Ethics**

It is not enough to say that Leninist morality is positivist

and thus worldly. Its chief characteristics are that it is *relativist* and *expedient* in the choice of its means.

According to Marxism-Leninism, all ideas, all truths, all morals are class-ideas, class-truths, class-morals. All intellectuals and moral ideals and practices represent a certain historical truth, but as history develops they also become outmoded and become *lies*.

According to Leninism, ideas and practices that help a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are true and moral; those that hamper revolution are untrue and immoral. By this definition many things which people regard as immoral and untrue become moral and true; and many things which they regard as true and moral become untrue and immoral.

According to Lenin, there are no true ideas or true morals. There are only “progressive” truths and “reactionary truths,” “progressive” morals and “reactionary” morals.

It is in the light of the above that denunciation intimidation, terror, ruse, lies, deception, forgeries when exercised by the communists have been accepted by them as moral and progressive.

It is because the communists accept this criterion of morality that many things that they do acquire a meaning. In the Stalinist period, Moscow papers used to publish with pride the names of those who denounced their parents, their brothers, their husbands. A communist journal after publishing many such names declared with superior airs that “such facts are impossible in a bourgeois country, but here numerous examples can be cited.” Similarly, communists practise the principle of hostages with a clean conscience. During Moscow trials it was publicly established—though it was privately known fully—that doctors were made to murder their patients and the accused were made to incriminate other innocent people by the simple expedient of holding threats of reprisals against their families in case of non-compliance on their parts.

Similarly on the same principle terror has been

approved by communist leaders. Trotsky taught that “intimidation is a powerful means of political action.” Bukharin said, “Proletarian violence in all its forms, beginning with shooting . . . leads to transformation of the human material. . . .”

Lenin took over from Nechaiev, an old Russian revolutionary, the principle that ‘the end justifies the means’. To those who thought “clean work requires clean hands,” he replied: “He who is afraid of soiling his hands must not go in for politics. Native people with clean hands stand in the way of political success.”

It is this criterion of “political success” which is behind all communist temporising and deceiving, all communist double-talk and double-deal. For this success, “it is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth,” to put it in the language of Lenin. Elsewhere he says: “One can argue and prove that certain forms of civil wars are inexpedient. But from the point of view of Marxism it is absolutely inadmissible to condemn them in the name of morality.”

It has a lesson for the free world. If by its might it could prove to Stalinists and Maoists that a third world war would be inexpedient, then they would be impressed. But if in sheer weakness, it tries to prove that it is immoral, then they will not be convinced.

The principle of expediency in morals explains why communist slogans are different from their deeds. For example, in Russia, Lenin and his Party were the first to clamour for a Constituent Assembly; but their very first act after capturing power was to dissolve this assembly elected by universal suffrage. They promised land to the peasant; but they denied them the right to own the crops they grew on it and later on confiscated the land itself. They gave the citizens the slogan of peace in order to exploit the war-weariness of the people; but in due course they created a state whose whole policy was aggressive militarism. They promised personal liberty; but they established world’s

most ubiquitous secret police and made mutual spying a national institution. Some regard it as immoral; but to the communists it is only a different kind of morality, a revolutionary morality, a progressive morality.

But there is also another dimension of communist ethics which we should fully admit. Communist ethics is ruthless and cunning but it is not ease-seeking. It is flexible in its means but it is fixed in its goal. It calls for great sustained work, great sacrifice, great mental discipline and moral hardihood. Through all its zigzags, detours and deviations, it never loses sight of its goal. Through many vicissitudes, through ups and downs, through thick and thin, it continues its devoted work. It is long-looking. It is active. Its aim is not to make profits but it wants to achieve, to conquer, to win. It has one characteristic which is common to all great moralities; it is never easy. It is cast in a certain heroic mould.

Bourgeois morality on the other hand is without an aim, without a vision. Mostly it is inertia, a habit, a daily routine. It seeks no conquest; it merely seeks fun and enjoyment. It can only be stimulated by profit or pleasure, seldom by idealism. Its interests are petty and ordinary. It cannot look beyond its nose. At best it is amiable and accommodating; otherwise it is clever about small things. It is penny-wise and pound-foolish. It is preoccupied with what the poet calls "getting and spending". Its mind and heart are closed to larger ideas and greater things of life.

Now the point is which morality would win: that which is heroic and strenuous though ruthless and treacherous, or that which is aimless and blind though amiable and innocuous? It is a conflict between tamasic and rajasic systems of ethics.

Of course, both are divorced from the true ethics; the ethics taught in the Upanishads and the Gita and other scriptures; the ethics which is based on the vision of One

Self in All, and All in One Self; the ethics of self-exceeding and self-giving; the ethics which expresses our inherent divinity; the ethics of service, truth, loyalty, love contentment, purity, courage and faith.

### **III. Maoism**

After a discussion of Marxism-Leninism, we are now in a better position to understand Maoism. We can now make a smooth change-over to it. Maoism has no special principles, features or usages of its own. It is only a Chinese name for Marxism-Leninism in the Chinese context.

Some people say that the Chinese Communist Party is Chinese first and communist second. Let us be clear about what is 'Chinese' and what is 'communist'. If by this statement they mean that communism rules in the Chinese land over the Chinese people through yellow-skinned Chinese, then certainly communism in China is Chinese. But if it means that Marxist philosophy has undergone a sea-change by coming into contact with Chinese culture and philosophy then it is palpably untrue. The Chinese way of life represented by Taoist transcendentalism, Buddhist ethics, Confucian social philosophy, Chinese naturalism, its cultural enjoyments, its ancestral worship—all are under physical and moral attack of an alien power philosophy. Maoism uses Chinese language, diction and syntax; but its contents, thought, logic and sentiments are Marxist. Its garb is Chinese; its soul is Marxist.

Mao himself makes the inter-relations between Marxist and Chinese elements in his thought very clear. These inter-relations come to this; that Marxism makes use of local conditions in China to capture power; but thereby Marxism does not become Chinese. Mao says: "Communists are international Marxists, but Marxism must be integrated with the specific characteristics of our country and given a national form before it can be put into practice. The great strength of Marxism-Leninism lies in its integration with the specific revolutionary practice of different countries. In the

case of the Chinese Communist Party, it is a matter of learning to apply the theory of Marxism-Leninism in the specific circumstances of China.” He expresses the same thought when he says that “the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is a universally applicable theory” but warns his disciples not to “regard their theory as a dogma but as a guide to action.” He wants his disciples not merely to “learn Marxist-Leninist words and phrases but study Marxism-Leninism as the science of revolution.” In all this Mao is not trying to make Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism Chinese, he is only spelling out the conditions in which it can triumph in China.

So we repeat Maoism is Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism. Mao has the same Marxist thoughts on history and dialectics. He makes Marxist-Leninist analysis of different sections of the population on the basis of their economic status. He makes Leninist use of class-analysis for the purpose of class-war. His principles of party organisations are Leninist. He seeks the same united fronts in order to destroy those with whom he enters into unity. He follows the same “stages” of revolution and establishes the same party dictatorship. The party dictatorship “consolidates” socialism with the same cruelty and ruthlessness. Common thoughts and common principles lead to the same common practices. Mao subscribes to the same goal of world revolution and world domination.

Let us have a quick glance at what Mao says on such important questions as the importance of Marxism for China, on history and dialectics, on party organization, on untied fronts, on international politics, on wars and revolutions. It will more clearly bring out the basic identity of Maoism with Marxism-Leninism.

### **1. Importance of Marxism-Leninism**

Speaking about it he says that “introduced into China, this theory immediately brought about tremendous changes in the world of Chinese thought.” According to him, the dialectical-materialist theory solves all problems of theory

and practice. It is a “theory of the process of development of knowledge,” a theory of “proceeding from the superficial to the deep.” It solves all problems of revolution and war. Mao says: “The Chinese communist party has forged not only a firm Marxist political line but also a firm Marxist military line. We have been able to apply Marxism to solve not only political problems but also military problems; we have reared . . . not only large numbers of cadres capable of running the party and the state, but also large numbers of cadres capable of running the army.”

## **2. On History and Dialectics**

Following Marx he believes that changes in a society are chiefly due to development of the internal contradictions in society, namely the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, the contradiction between the classes, and the contradiction between the old and the new.

His method of solving these contradictions is also the same: “The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is solved by the method of socialist revolution, contradiction between the great masses of the people and the feudal system is solved by the method of democratic revolution, the contradiction between colonies and imperialism is solved by the method of national revolutionary war, the contradiction between the working class and the peasantry in socialist society is solved by the method of collectivisation and mechanisation of agriculture, the contradiction within the communist party is solved by the method of criticism and self-criticism.”

## **3. On Class-Analysis and Class-War**

Like Lenin, Mao is concerned with the posing of the question: “Who is our enemy and who are our friends?” For “the question is one of primary importance in the revolution.” On a right answer to this question depends the

tactics of alignment. As Mao says: “We must pay attention to uniting our real friends to attack our real enemies.” But how are the friends distinguished from the enemies? “To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitudes towards the revolution.”

After making a detailed economic analysis of different classes, Mao determines their political role, their place in revolutionary strategy, whether they are objects of immediate attack, or whether they are to be wooed immediately but liquidated subsequently. After this analysis Mao comes to this conclusion: “The warlords, the bureaucrats, the compradors, the big landlords and the reactionary section of the intelligentsia dependent on them are our enemies. The industrial proletariat is the leading force in the revolution. All sections of the semi-proletariat and the petty-bourgeoisie are our closest friends. As to the vacillating middle class, its right wing may become our enemy and its left wing may become our friends, but we must be constantly on our guard towards the latter and not allow it to create confusion in our front.”

#### **4. On Party Organisation**

On party affairs too, Mao stresses the Leninist principle of a ‘cadre’ organization, the importance of training the cadres in the theory and practice of Marxist revolution, the need to make the party monolithic and to bring it under one unified command.

(a) *Cadre Principle*: Mao says: The Chinese Communist Party is a party at the head of a great revolutionary struggle in a nation of several hundred millions of people and cannot fulfill its historical task without a large number of leading cadres. . . . to guide a great revolution there must be a great party and many excellent cadres and several hundreds of excellent mass leaders.”



(b) *The importance of theoretical training*: “These cadres and leaders must understand Marxism-Leninism—our revolution depends on the cadres just as Stalin has said, ‘Cadres decide everything’.” On another occasion, Mao stressed the training of Chinese communist leaders in the theory and practice of revolution in these words: “If there are in our party one to two hundred comrades who have acquired a knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, which is systematic and not fragmentary, practical and not abstract, the fighting capacity of our party will be greatly strengthened.”

(c) *Unity of Command*: Mao organizes his party on the following basis: (1) the individuals must subordinate themselves to the organization; (2) the minority must subordinate itself to the majority; (3) the lower level must subordinate itself to the higher level; and (4) the entire membership must subordinate itself to the Central Committee.

(d) *The place of force in creating the party*: This is rather new in Maoism. Force plays a part in creating the party in other communist-dominated countries also but this is not openly avowed. Lenin had only said that once the proletariat is victorious, they will also be able to enlist support for their cause. Mao affirms the role of force even in creating the party. Mao says: “Our principle is that the party commands the guns, and the gun will never be allowed to command the party. But it is also true that with guns at our disposal we can really build up the party organizations, and the Eighth Route Army has built up a powerful party organization in North China.” Here it is not the party which creates the revolution; it is the revolution which creates the party.

## **5. United Front Tactics**

Lenin had said that an agreement “can be permissible, correct and possible in principle only if it supports the dictatorship of the proletariat”. If anything Mao has

followed this principle more unscrupulously than even his preceptors, both in his dealings with parties and classes in his own country as well as in his dealings with other neighbours. He frankly admits that an agreement or a united front are useful weapons of class warfare, that "united front and armed struggle are the two basic weapons with which to overcome the enemy." So the communist aim is to vanquish its victims as much through unity or cooperation or agreement as through more open forms of warfare.

United front tactics have been a very important weapon-system in the Chinese communist arsenal. General guidelines of these tactics are to unite with enemies of yesterday to deal blows against enemies of today, or to unite secondary enemies to deal blows against principal enemies, or to unite with enemies of tomorrow in order to deal blows against friends of yesterday. Its objectives are to erode and demoralise all other parties and nations, to woo the middle of the road forces, to open a battlefield behind the enemy line, to isolate and divide the enemy and pick them one by one. The means employed are: false appearances, propaganda, disintegration and infiltration. The communists pretend to be in favour of a compromise, cover up their real intention, tone down slogans of struggle and engage in clandestine and illegal activities under the cover of open and legitimate organizations. They manufacture opinions against those they ally with, spread rumours about them, create frictions among them. They work for their psychological disintegration. They infiltrate and hibernate till they get an opportunity to rebel or make a war.

In this connection it will be interesting to look at the story of the communist united front in China itself. Under the pressure of the Japanese war when Chiang was forced into a united front with communists much against his better judgment, just at the time when communists were promising to cooperate with Chiang in the prosecution

of the war against the Japanese, Mao was telling his party men:

Our present tactics are for the very purpose of protecting the growth of our secret programme, and of coordinating the secret with the open work;

Our present retreat is to provide a period of recuperation so that we can prepare for the future task with more vigour;

To give up the policy of direct attack temporarily for retreating tactics is really adopting deviating tactics of attack;

For the present the organization of the Communist Party shall be kept secret while members of the Party would openly participate in all patriotic organizations forming a nucleus in them:

The Sino-Japanese war affords our party an excellent opportunity for expansion. Our fixed policy should be 70% expansion, 20% dealing with the Kuomintang and 10% resisting Japan.

### **Some Typical Ideas in Which Mao is Interested**

A look at the titles and sub-titles of subjects discussed by Mao will give an interesting peep into his mind. Do you suppose, he discusses questions of equality and freedom and fraternity, values about which communists talk so much from their public platform? No. These things do not figure anywhere when they talk among themselves. Like Stalin, Mao discusses problems of power, of revolution, of wars in the front and wars in the rear, of strategy and tactics. Some of the subjects of his discussions are:

- I. On Philosophy; On Contradiction; the universality of contradiction; the particularity of contradiction; the principal contradiction and the principal aspect of a contradiction; the identity and struggle of the

- aspects of a contradiction; the role of antagonism in contradiction;
- II. Two policies; two sets of measures; two perspectives;
  - III. Combat liberalism;
  - IV. The basic principle of war is to preserve oneself and to annihilate the enemy;
  - V. Types of base areas; Guerrilla areas and base areas; Consolidation and expansion of base areas;
  - VI. Strategic defence and strategic offensive in Guerrilla warfare;
  - VII. On the protracted war; war and politics; offence in defence. Exterior lines within interior lines; war of attrition and war of annihilation; possibilities of exploiting the enemy's flaws;
  - VIII. Cadre policy, party discipline;
  - IX. How to analyse the classes in the rural area;
  - X. Strategic problems of China's revolutionary war; Characteristics of China's war; Main forms of China's civil war, etc.

#### **IV. Maoism in Action**

Because the same thoughts and ideas, the same principles of organization and revolution have been followed, the same practices have resulted. Today, Chinese society is a faithful replica of Soviet Russia—at least of Russia of the Stalinist days: the same one party rule, unanimous votes, regimented press, concentration camps, forced collectivisation, land confiscation, compulsory loans, brain washing, intellectual kow-towing, atheism, suppression of religions, conducted tours, restricted movements, police surveillance, deportation, fanaticism, self-criticism, liquidation and killing of literally millions of people, organised mutual distrust, mutual spying and mutual denunciation, inflation, artificial prices, wasteful production, long queues, the same mediocrity and boastings and railings, the same fraud and force and chicanery, the same suppression of freedom at home and subversion of free cultures abroad.

“Maoism in Action” is a vast subject and cannot be satisfactorily discussed here. Even in terms of killing its own people its record is most impressive. To give a brief idea of Maoist persecutions, we give below a chart of communist killings based on the painstaking study of some Chinese experts who know their country very well. The figures relate to the first 12 years of Mao’s rule.

| Number               | Time                               | Chief objects of Attack   | No. of people killed | Remarks  |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|---|----------------------|--|
| 1 <sup>st</sup> time | From October 1949 to December 1952 | Landlords and rich peasants   | about 5,000,000      | In the initial period of communist occupation of the mainland, massacre was the chief means of the “suppression of counter-revolutionary” people. Thus during the first five years the number of people slaughtered totalled about 20 millions |
|                      |                                    | Anti-communist guerilla bands   | about 8,400,000      |  |
|                      |                                    | Women who committed suicide at the time of “New Marriage Law Movement”  | about 3,000,000      |  |
|                      |                                    | People of various classes killed during the peak of “suppression movement   | about 1,000,000      |  |
|                      |                                    | Victims of “Religious Reform Movement”  | about 500,000        |  |
|                      |                                    | So-called “feudalistic foremen” and secret society leaders killed at the time of the “Democratic Reform of Factories: | about 1,400,000      |  |
|                      |                                    | Total   | 19,300,000           |  |

| Number                           | Time                            | Chief objects of Attack   | No. of people killed | Remarks   |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> time             | Jan. 1953<br>to<br>Dec.<br>1957 | 1. Hidden Anti-communist people<br>2. Bourgeois Rightists   | about<br>3,600,000   |   |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> time             | From Jan.<br>1958               | 1. Landlords, rich peasants, reactionaries, bad elements and rightists<br>2. Local nationalists   | about<br>6,700,000   |   |
| Deaths caused in "Labour Reform" | From Oct. 1959 to Dec.1961      | 1. Secondary anti-communist elements<br>2. Class elements hostile to communists<br>3. Those in business and industrial circles<br>4. Intellectuals<br>5. Captured Government Army officers and soldiers | about<br>3,500,000   | In the past 12 year 90,000,000 people were forced to undergo "Labour Reforms". Among them over 3,500,000 died of suffering and hardships. |

Grand Total up to the end of 1961 33,100,000

These killings and suppressions have to be read in the light of what we have already noticed regarding the characteristics of the dictatorship of the proletariat: that the communist victory is bloodier than its war, that once communist captures power it utilises the levers of state power "for the suppression of the exploiters" and for "transforming the society." In Mao's language, "the struggle of the proletariat and revolutionary people in changing the world consists in achieving the following tasks: to remould the objective

world as well as their own subjective world. . . Such a remoulding has already been effected in one part of the globe, namely, the Soviet Union . . . The people of China and the rest of the world are either passing, or will pass, through such a remoulding process. And the objective world which is to be remoulded includes the opponents of remoulding, who must undergo a stage of compulsory remoulding before they can pass to a stage of conscious remoulding.”

## **V. International Relations, Wars and Revolutions**

In the above we discussed theory, strategy and tactics of a communist revolution in a country. From this one should not form an impression that communist revolutionary thinking excludes international relations and wars between nations.

A communist revolution has no such exclusive national connotation; it is international. Communist doctrine is based on the theory of class struggle. Class struggle takes place within a nation but it is also fought between nations. Domestic and international conflicts are but two sides of the same coin. Both are the working out of the same fundamental conflict, namely the conflict between the classes.

The world proletariat are one as the world exploiters are one. Their mutual struggle is national as well as international. The exploiters are known as capitalists in one place; and the same people are imperialists in another place.

The conflict against them takes the place of a proletarian revolution in one place and of a national liberation struggle in another place. And both these struggles are linked with the hot and cold wars waged by Russia and China on their behalf.

Mao shows a great awareness of the internal and external aspects of class exploitation and class struggle. He

tells us that the pre-Marxian, fragmentary knowledge of imperialism is shown “in the indiscriminate anti-foreign struggles.” But when the “second-stage” knowledge illumined by Marxism comes, one “sees the internal and external contradictions of imperialism, as well as the essence of oppression or exploitation of China’s masses by imperialism in alliance with China’s compradores and feudal class.”

As imperialism is linked with local feudalism and capitalism, so is conflict against them. Mao in his writings flits with ease from one aspect of the struggle to the other. “When imperialism is not launching armed attacks, the Chinese Communist Party either wages, together with the bourgeoisie a civil war against the landlords . . . or wages a civil war against the landlord class and the comprador bourgeoisie. . . when imperialism launches armed attacks, the Party . . . wages a national war against foreign foes. . . ” At another place he again affirms the double nature of the same task. Almost from the very beginning, the main task confronting the party of the Chinese proletariat has been to unite the largest possible number of allies and to organise, according to circumstances, armed struggles against internal or external armed counter-revolution and for national and social liberation.

### **The Two Aims of Communist Revolution**

The aim of a communist revolution is national as well as international. The international aim of this revolution as defined by the Comintern is “to overthrow the international bourgeoisie and to create an international republic.” For bringing about this aim, “all means will be used including force of arms.”

But this task is very difficult, protracted and complicated. It requires a lot of organising and manoeuvring, a lot of temporizing and compromising, a lot of zigzagging and retracing.



This need of zigzagging in the intervening period has given birth to many new usages in international diplomacy and world relations. It has given birth to fifth-columns and subsidised parties, agents and informers, guerilla wars and wars by proxy. It has also given birth to certain concepts and practices relating to wars and revolutions, relating to “vanguard” countries like Russia and China and “vanguard” local communist parties, and their respective roles and inter-relations.

In communist thinking, wars and revolutions are closely connected. “There has been no great revolution in the world which was not connected with wars,” said Lenin. Out of World War I came the Russian revolution. The task of the Russian Revolution in turn was “to consolidate the Dictatorship of the proletariat in one country using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries.”

In the communist thinking this “base” was more than a “contageous example to the proletarians of all countries.” It was “a powerful and open centre of the world revolutionary movement,” it was “the refuge and school for the revolutionary representative of the rising proletariat.”

The foundations of the Third International were laid. Local communist parties were started in all countries. Subsidies began coming in from this “base’.

The local communist parties in turn had to owe full allegiance to Soviet Russia. In fact, in due course, they were no more than fifth-columns of Soviet Russia. Stalin gives the following definition of a communist: “A revolutionary is a man who, without any reservation, unconditionally, frankly and honestly . . . is prepared to defend and fight for USSR.”

At present, international communism has split into two camps. Officially it is still one camp led by the Soviet Union; but in fact a new power centre has emerged in

Peking and communists everywhere are divided into rival groups paying their allegiance to their respective centers in Moscow and Peking. Now international communism has two "bases" to defend and two sources and centers of subsidies and subversion.

### **Communist Strategy of World Subjugation**

The thinking of the leaders of the non-communist world is parochial. When they give thought to war, they think in terms of battles and engagements, armies and weapons. On the other hand, communist thinking is global and their strategy is world strategy. They have also a more comprehensive idea of war. They think of it in terms of social forces and class wars. In short while the communist thinking is strategic, the thinking of their opponents is only tactical.

Only a global strategist like Lenin could say (when Russia was no more than a third rate military power) that the way to Paris and London lies through Shanghai and Calcutta. Then through the Comintern he developed a weapon and a strategy which were "to use the millions of colonial people against foreign imperialism until the time comes that they be absorbed by the world empire of Communism". This consummation was to come through "peasant agrarian revolution . . . advancing through a series of preparatory stages, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Today, Chinese leaders have the same global mind and the same intuition for the intangibles of history. Their heart is set on world subjugation and for that end in view they are following a multi-faced strategy. One strategy seems to be to utilise the antagonism between Russia and America. China would like to see these two giants locked in an atomic war of mutual destruction leaving the world an easy pray to herself. She could help this to take place by keeping the world boiling, by creating new points of tensions, by advancing left-adventurist slogans which, if

Russia follows, bring her in conflict with America and which, if she does not follow, loses her support in the communist camp.

Even if China could not make America and Russia destroy each other, she could still use their antagonism to keep the world situation frozen in her favour. For example, she utilises the might of Russia in paralyzing effective American intervention in wars fought on her behalf by her proxies.

Besides the above there is also a more direct strategy of world conquest. It consists immediately in capturing the nationalist and revolutionary movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America through subsidized fifth-columns; and subsequently in utilising the united strength of these continents to strangle Europe and America. This strategy was spelled out very recently by Lin Piao, China's Defence Minister, and it received world-wide attention. The following are some of the highlights of this strategy:

1. Identify the main enemy who is to be first defeated;
2. Adopt the strategy of protracted war and gradually weaken the enemy by organizing the masses. Apply "United Front" tactics and utilise the "national banner" to attract the masses;
3. Build a rural base area and use the countryside to encircle and finally capture the cities;
4. The people of Asia, Africa and Latin America (standing for rural areas of the world) should encircle North America and Western Europe (cities of the world);
5. Lin Piao says that conditions for waging peoples' wars are most opportune. He assures that a local war will not develop into a world war and that America would not use unclear weapons in this sort of war.

## **VI. Conclusions**

Now it is time to summaries the results of the foregoing discussion. We started with a practical problem in hand,

namely, whether it was possible to reach an amicable settlement with China on the question of our Northern borders. Because of the peculiar nature of the Chinese regime, we decided it might be a good thing to have a closer look at it and find out what its rulers believe about questions relating to war and peace, harmony amongst nations and classes, and sanctity of agreements amongst different peoples.

This study confirmed what some persons already suspected. It showed the following things:

1. That a settlement of the border question is not altogether impossible though it would certainly be difficult. Border disputes are always difficult to solve but in this case the difficulty is appreciably increased by the intransigence of the communist Chinese regime;

2. That if a settlement was reached it would be a tactical or temporary one;

3. In any case, a settlement will solve no problem. For the Indo-Chinese problem is more than a border problem. India will still be confronted with the Chinese menace. We shall still be spending money on our armies and we shall still be in a situation in which any relaxation of vigilance will be suicidal.

Why? The answer could be given very briefly. It is because in the thoughts of the rulers of New China there is no place for ideas of harmony, peace, conciliation, live-and-let-live, truth or equity.

We have seen that Maoism is Marxist in world outlook, Leninist in strategy and tactics of revolution and principles of party organization, and Stalinist in ruthlessness. We have found that its conscience is flexible and its morality is instrumental. We discovered that its cult is naked, totalitarian power exercised by an indoctrinated elite ruling in the name of the proletariat said to be in alliance with the peasants. We saw that its immediate victims are the Chinese people but its goal is the domination of the whole of Asia. Consolidating itself on the Chinese mainland and armed

with its wealth, power and population it threatens the freedom of all its neighbours. It combines threats of armed aggression with internal subversion and guerilla warfare waged through local fifth-columns. With all the try and determination one could not have a settlement with an implacable enemy like that.

Some apologists argue that Communist Chinese could not be that bad and that probably their bark is worse than their bite. Our answer is no. We have seen their deeds and they are no better than their words. You could examine Maoism at any point, in its theory or practice, in its thoughts or deeds, in its internal expressions or international postures, it is the same. It is of one piece, fraudulent, deceptive, ruthless, egoistic, totalitarian, poisonous and treacherous. Maoist doctrines and deeds are one. The one inevitably leads to the other. Flexible dialectics and amoral ethics are closely linked with tyrannous practices.

Prospects for Asia including India are not altogether bright. But India could retrieve the situation by doing a few things. First is that she should not panic or despair. She should realise that in Asia she alone is in a position to provide the necessary counter-check to Chinese aggressive expansionism; that she has vital interests in the security and freedom of South-East countries. She should not abdicate her natural position of leadership in this area. By becoming strong she should correct the power-imbalance in Asia. This will greatly help forces of peace and freedom in this region.

India should not allow the present conflict to distort the larger vision of Indo-Chinese friendship. In fact the two peoples were never so close as they are today—both being under the attack of Maoism. In fact China's suffering are very, very much greater than India's as we have seen above. Maoism in Asia would be on the retreat the moment we realize that its aggression against us is a part of its aggression against Tibet, against South-East Asian countries,

against the Chinese people. Its subversion in India is a part of its subversion in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Mao's aggression against India is a part of a total plan.

This plan can be defeated. Or, rather, given time, this plan will defeat itself. While opposing its blatantly aggressive designs, the new China should be allowed time to liquidate itself. Communism is full of inner contradictions which mature fast. Conspiracy, intimidations and terror are very poor foundations for building a great and stable society or culture. Communists begin by perpetrating tyranny over others. Very soon, they themselves are overtaken by it and they use methods against one another which they use against others. The communist leaders live in fear and insecurity, more afraid of their colleagues and comrades than of their foes.

Chapter VIII  
**Mao's Two-Pronged Attack:  
Internal Subversion Joins External  
Aggression**

(1)

**Peking Army in Calcutta Streets\***

On the 15th March, 1966, Shri P.C. Sen told the West Bengal Legislature about the forces with “designs to commit violence to terrorise the people and attack the forces of law and order.” He told us of “planned, determined attacks on strategic railway points which required special types of constructional materials” and which needed more than spontaneous violent mobs to perform. He told us of attacks on the police, on peaceful citizens and even on Congress workers.

All these things are no news to the students of communism though they may be to Congress rulers. It is an obligatory part of communism to prepare for violence, killing and sabotage. Even as early as 1949-50, the CPI had assigned 80 trained personnel for sabotaging railways and communications, dividing those saboteurs in groups of 8 each and assigning one region to each group. Not counting thousands of common men and policemen communists

---

\* Published in Hindustan Standard, Times of India, Organiser, Swarajya , Janata.

murdered in cold blood during this period, they killed scores of Congressmen too. In Bengal itself, there were attacks on Congress Party offices at Serampore, Purulia, Ikbalpur, Mahabankati, Shibpur, Hatgobindpur, etc.

But what was the reaction of the Congress leaders? They soon forgot their humble murdered colleagues. They soon forgot that the communists were preparing to establish a party dictatorship; that they were collecting arms and training saboteurs and guerilla fighters in their various camps in India for a yet bigger and more protracted warfare. For a decade important Congress leaders vied with one another in spreading the cult of China and Russia. They lent their names to all communist fronts. The process was checked for a time when China invaded India and the more open pro-communist sympathies and policies of the Congress were discredited.

The recent events in West Bengal have shown that the nation is sitting on a volcano, they show how a small determined minority of trained professional revolutionaries can paralyse the whole government administration under suitable circumstances. There could not be more than 30 cracker-throwers in the city of Calcutta. But the police had to employ 16,000 men to keep some dubious check on them. After the General Strike on the 10th March, even this force was no longer sufficient. The Government machinery was badly overstretched and the life of the city and several district towns was completely paralysed. Now Jyoti Basu talks with P.C. Sen like a parallel Government.

The arithmetic of the above was not lost on the professional revolutionaries. In fact the strategists of the New Warfare have been working on this arithmetic in our neighbouring countries which our bankrupt foreign policies regard of no concern to our security, In Malaya, 8,000 partisans tied down 1,80,000 Malayan Special Police and 80,000 British, Australian and Nepalese soldiers. It cost £30,000 to eliminate one partisan. It took 1,000 man-hours of patrolling to contact one guerilla. In Viet Nam, the same



war is being fought on still more onerous terms. Here in India itself, during an early period to which we have already made a reference, when communists were relatively poorly trained and the Congress was relatively more popular, in the few districts of Hyderabad, 5 battalions of Indian army along with a sizeable police force were tied down in countering communist-led insurgency.

While the enemies of our country are preparing for a new warfare, combining threat of aggression from without with subversion from within, our statesmen are busy with their own petty preoccupations. Our politicians are counting their votes and our businessmen are counting their profits realising little that these will count for nothing if the forces of slavery triumph. Not many are thinking about the subtle forces that are working unceasingly for undermining our liberties and nationhood, our past greatness and our future possibilities.

Today, there seems to be a division of labour between the Congress and the communists. The Congress multiplies bureaucracy, piles taxes upon taxes, prints paper money to spend it on fancy projects, follows arbitrary and unrealistic policies, introduces controls and restrictions of all kinds and makes the economy in general unworkable and makes a war on the deeper spiritual values of the nation. The communists prepare ideologically and organisationally for capturing power in the interests of alien countries.

18 March, 1966.

(2)

### **Police “Excesses” and Vested Interests\***

These days there have been lots of reports of police

---

\* Published in Hindustan Standard, Amrit Bazar Patrika, Current, Janata, Swarajya.

“excesses” in the press. Interested quarters have been making the charges and the press has been mechanically reporting them.

The fact is that the police has behaved in a most restrained manner so far as it was possible under the circumstances. True, there were regrettable innocent victims. But that is a natural corollary of the techniques of insurrectionary warfare that the communists have been perfecting. Surely no one in his senses could seriously maintain that the police should remain an idle witness when hidden hands mixing themselves with the crowd commit arson and loot. Just imagine what would happen to our freedom and security if our society was left to the machinations of those who are working from behind the scene and who have vested interest in creating chaotic conditions. Men and officers of the police deserve our thanks and gratitude for their high sense of duty. They worked untiringly under most difficult conditions, at times at the risk of their lives. Those of the police who died in the present disturbances were martyrs along with other innocent victims of the insurrectionary terror, like; the murdered humble employees of the Anand Bazar Patrika.

Because of the temporary lull that prevailed for some days, the Congress leaders were already in the midst of forgetting the whole episode as a bad dream by finding some easy scapegoat. Some of them began to find fault with the police and the Intelligence when the fault lies squarely with themselves. Some of those faults are:

- (1) The ruling party does not understand the nature of communism, its aims and strategy, its insurrectionary techniques, its fronts and infiltrations, its facade and its reality, its indoctrination, its apparatus, its training in sabotage and guerilla warfare. Till recently, many Congress leaders were flirting openly with communists and were ardent admirers of China. Even today, the Congress ideology has no distinct face of its

- own. Its understanding of world forces and how they are working in our vicinity is most superficial;
- (2) Under the Congress rule, a giant, unfeeling bureaucracy has come into being. You cannot talk to this giant; you can only hit it and strike at it. It is insensitive to democratic and peaceful methods of expressing grievances. It only yields to violence;
  - (3) Congress Government is making a liberal use of the note-printing machine; inflation is breaking the back of the people. There is more money in permits and quotas than in honest work or in true enterprising spirit or in some outstanding skill and talent;
  - (4) The Congress is adopting policies which increasingly require the police to enforce them. The police is no longer expected to perform its traditional function of maintaining law and order and apprehending criminals. It must now enforce Government's arbitrary and unpopular policies. No wonder the police earns the blame which really belongs to the policy makers.

We also have an appeal to make to the patriotic elements in the opposition. We all know that a powerful Chinese fifth column with vast resources is working in our midst. The patriotic opposition should sharply distinguish itself from this traitrous fifth column.

What has been gained by the present riots? Only members of the Chinese fifth column have been let loose on the people while unpopular, impracticable food policies remain intact. Food levies are to continue. Controls are to continue. Such is the measure of the intellectual bankruptcy of the rulers that they are seeking a redress in the very direction which is the cause of the prevailing evils.

The patriotic opposition and the suffering people, after making sure that they have isolated the communist fifth column, should organise a programme of mass education against inflation, against a multiplying bureaucracy, against compulsory levies in the countryside, against controls and

restrictions which are a drag on the smooth functioning of the processes of production and distribution.

26th March, 1966

(3)

**Lessons of the West Bengal Bundh\***

The more visible results of the latest bundh organised by communists in West Bengal on the 22nd and the 23rd September could be summarised thus: Most of the shops in Calcutta were closed but conditions in the districts were near normal. Offices were generally empty but mills and factories did not suffer too grievously. There were no trams but a certain number of buses plied for short distances on limited routes. There were intensive activities and anxious moments but the 48-hour bundh passed off without much obvious violence.

In short, contrary to the expectations of its organisers, the bundh did not clinch. But it was also not altogether a fiasco as Government's spokesmen would like us to believe. True, it was not as dramatically paralysing as was the last bundh in March, but it did indicate pointedly the deep malaise by which West Bengal continues to be afflicted. Bengal is no longer an easy, going concern; it is a problem province. It also represents in miniature India of tomorrow if the present policies of unthinking drift continue.

The latest bundh has certain features which it shares with older bundhs but it has also its own setting and features. It will be interesting to look at some of the more important features, old or new, for any lessons that they might have to teach.

---

\* Published in Swarajya, 15 Oct., 1966.

1. *Intimidation*: Intimidation is a communist weapon *par excellence*. Even unwilling shopkeepers keep their shops closed because they do not want to run the risk of being looted. Willing employees do not venture to go to their offices because they are afraid of being waylaid. Buses do not ply because a cracker might be thrown on them. It is in this way that normal life of the people comes to a standstill. Fear is more powerful and ubiquitous than actual force.

Fear and intimidation played their usual role in this bundh also. The United Left Front (ULF) and the Rashtriya Sangram Samiti brought out processions asking the owners to keep their shops closed. Congressmen also brought out processions asking them to keep them open. But to the extent real and tangible protection was unavailable, shopkeepers thought it better to play safe by keeping their shops closed.

Similarly, office employees, even if they disagreed with bundh-walas and wanted to go to their offices—which for lack of transport they could not do in any case—did not want to take a risk. The communist slogan was that those “who would join duties would have to choose between life and death.” One Dibankar Sen, an employee of the State Transport Corporation, was manhandled when on his way home from the Howrah depot, and was seriously injured.

Basing themselves on past experience, most of the private cars and public buses did not come out at all. Some did venture out, but a cracker was thrown on a private car in South Calcutta and stones were thrown at state buses in North Calcutta. After a few such stray cases, the improvement in the vehicular traffic of the morning of the second day of the bundh wore off again.

Even the Corporation conservatory lorries were not spared. On the first day when many of these lorries came out they were attacked, and had to return. Thirty-seven lorries were lying idle at Grey Street garage alone. The hygienic conditions of Calcutta are simply deplorable but the bundh-

walas had no compunction in aggravating the problem and in playing with the life and health of the citizens.

Thus there was intimidation all around. One manufacturer had supplied a new type of shield to the police which they used as protection against stoning. His house on Chekraberia Road was surrounded twice by bundh-walas.

2. *Counter-Resistance*: There was one new and hopeful thing about the latest bundh: Congressmen were active in resisting it. Such a thing had never happened before. To the people, this was an "eye-opener", as Chief Minister P.C. Sen pointed out. People saw for the first time a large number of Congress volunteers guarding important places in the city and the districts. People who came to intimidate and coerce retreated when they met an organised resistance group. Communists hate soft spots and they rush in wherever there is a vacuum. But they withdraw if they encounter opposition.

Resistance was not well organised but it did deny the communists a free hand. Jyoti Basu's house was surrounded by demonstrating crowds and they identified him and his party as "Chinese agents". In the State Assembly, the Chief Minister was not allowed to speak by communist members; the congress legislators paid back in the same coin. Jyoti Basu was shouted down. There was a cracker at the Congress meeting: a cracker exploded at a communist meeting also. On the second day of the bundh, a cracker was thrown at a Congress procession near Hatibagan at 10.55 A.M.: at 11.25 A.M., there was a cracker on a ULF procession on Beliaghata Main Road. There were CP-Congress clashes at Malda and Hatibagan on the first day of the bundh. Those clashes were repeated on the second day also at Maniktola Main Road and Ultadanga Bazar.

This reciprocity must have had a salutary effect on the communists. One-way intimidation demoralises the victims and encourages the bully. The thought that what they want to do unto others could be done unto them also has a sobering effect on the communists. And in the face of a determined

resistance communists tend to feel also less righteous about their cause.

One result of this reciprocity was that there was less violence. On the 10th and 11th March, 23 bombs and crackers exploded, this time their number was less than a dozen. In the last Bundh, 37 men died. This time no death casualty was reported.

At this point it will not be out of place to make an observation about a shopkeeper from whom Chief Minister P.C. Sen, bought his curd, and for which the poor shopkeeper was put to a lot of intimidation. The threat of reciprocity may prove to be a more effective protection to this shopkeeper against any continuing intimidation than any police help.

Unilateral self-giving is the law of higher life but reciprocity too has its validity on a certain level. When law and reason fail, it provides a necessary balance and check.

3. *Transport*: Transport is the Achilles' heel of a modern city. Paralyse the transport and you paralyse the whole city. Communists have understood this point fully. On the two days of the bundh, no tram plied though there was a fleet of 400 trams. Similarly out of 700 state buses, only 63 came out on the first day and 123 on the second day—and those too for short distances and on limited routes. And even for these buses, drivers had to come from outside—so rumour says. The situation was somewhat eased by the Bengal Bus Syndicate which operated 71 private buses. These buses had been taken off the road by the Government in the name of Socialism, but in an emergency it was found that these Governmental, nationalised buses played a treacherous and sectional role while the much-maligned private buses played a public-spirited and constructive role. This proves that names can be very misleading and that Congress needs to look into its slogan.

As a result of co-operation extended by private bus owners, it was decided that 250 private buses will be on Calcutta roads in the near future.

This is good, but not enough. It smacks of a favour or concession by a high and mighty Government. It could even be interpreted as a price for helping to break a strike. What is needed is that the Congress understands the folly of its own indiscriminate nationalisation. This is not the place for discussing the economy or sociology or ethics of nationalisation, but the Government will do well to take early steps to break the monopoly of transport in Calcutta even in the narrow interests of law and order. In olden days, thousands of people were self-employed in the transport industry which provided Calcutta with perhaps the cheapest and most efficient transport. These owner-workers had a living interest in the smooth running of the transport. Back in 1948-49, during Ranadive period, these owner-workers refused to oblige the Communist Party when it gave a call for general strike. Transport was unaffected, and so the insurrectionary strategy failed.

Now the nationalisation of transport has created a wasteful giant with two faces. One face is the unfeeling bureaucracy; the other face is a dispossessed, rootless proletariat. A few thousand workers who control the life-line of millions of people are themselves controlled through their Union by a few scores of communist party workers. This is bad from the point of view of our nation's security.

4. *Role of the Police*: Last time Congressmen had an ambivalent attitude towards the police. On the one hand, they sought police protection for themselves and their family; on the other hand, they played to the gallery and joined the chorus of their opponents who made speeches about police "excesses". This time when the Congress workers were themselves active, the role of the police did not remain unappreciated.

While there should be a strict check of police activities, we should also realise that the police is called upon to shoulder a noble and indispensable work. Without a police force actuated by a high sense of duty and law, lives of



peaceful citizens would be at the mercy of hooligans and political adventurers. Before they can have police without law, communists want to have law without the police so that they could intimidate people through their Red Guards organised in every street. If a lawful authority thwarts them in their machinations, they call it police “excesses”. But others need not think so.

From the above, one may get an impression that this article discusses the strategy of street action on behalf of the Congress. This is not so. It is true that in the recent encounter, the Congress was not worsted in the streets, and this is important from a certain angle and in the short run, considering the nature of the threat. But in the long run, the heart of the matter is neither police action, nor street action by rival groups contending for power. In the long run, it is not important whether the Congress lives or dies. The important thing is the truth which is being neglected on all hands that India can live only through a larger vision of things, through Dharma. At present, India is dying through statism and materialism and imitation.

30th September, 1996.

