

IN REPLY TO CPI(M)'S 'A WORD TO THE SUC'

People's Democracy is the English organ of the Communist Party of India (Marxist). On the back page of its issue dated April 15 last has been published an article with the caption *A word to the SUC* in which we have been charged by the CPI(M) leadership with "deliberate unscrupulous falsification of facts with the only purpose of maligning the CPI(M)", incapability and lack of "elementary honesty", "anti-Communism" and "hebetude". In fact, the article is full of such reviling epithets against us. All this is supposed to have been done in "fraternal criticisms" of the SUCI, a constituent of the Left Front of West Bengal of which the CPI(M) also is another constituent. At least this is what the article indirectly makes its readers to believe. We do not take this abuse seriously. Because, it is our experience that where reason lacks, some parties try to cover up their weakness by vituperation. Besides, we had gone through in the past and are now going through a campaign of hate, slander and canard of the worst kind by a fanatic section of the ranks and supporters of the CPI(M) instigated against us by their leadership.

Fraternal Criticisms Welcomed

Be that as it may, it would have been proper, had the CPI(M) leadership, instead of making demagogic assertions and comments against us, explained the Marxist-Leninist formulations and, on the basis of them, proved our formulations to be wrong. But they have not done it. They have just made some demagogic assertions and comments stating our formulations as wrong without explaining why they are wrong. Is this the Marxist-Leninist way of fraternal criticism? We ask the CPI(M).

We are not afraid of criticism nor do we despise those who criticise us. On the contrary, we welcome criticism. For, criticism helps a party to detect its failings and mistakes, rectify them, educate and train the *class* and the *masses* and move correctly with renewed strength to reach the goal of socialism. But criticism should be honest and fair, precise and concrete. It should not just make a demagogic assertion that a certain formulation is wrong but must explain why it is wrong. The aim of criticism should be to help in the crystallisation of the correct political line by

giving defeat to wrong politics, educate and train the working class and the masses, cement more solidly the unity of and sharpen the militancy of the left democratic parties and forces, give a fillip to and strengthen united struggles by the people against their main enemy and create conditions for the emergence of leadership of a real working class revolutionary party over the masses and their united struggles. Without the emergence of this leadership, emancipation of the people from the yoke of capitalist exploitation is impossible. It cannot be denied that the present situation in our country is marked by blindness, party fanaticism, philosophical intolerance, attempts to settle ideological differences by the application of physical force or administrative measures, fall in morality and sense of human values, all indicating low level of culture. If they continue to prevail in our society then all reactionary ideas will get scope for easy access and expansion, ultimately creating the breeding ground of fascism. It is for this reason that no real revolutionary party encourages or instils blindness, fanaticism, irrationality and lack of reasonable mind in its ranks

(Contd. to page 2)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
(Fortnightly)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL. 6
No. 19

15th MAY, '73
TUESDAY

PRICE 30 P.
Air Surcharge 4. P.

Statement on Appointment of Supreme Court Chief Justice

The Central Committee of the SUCI has issued the following statement to the Press.

The Central Committee of the SUCI notes that the recent appointment of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court superseding three senior judges has raised a storm of controversy and protest throughout the country. Most of the Bar Associations have questioned the propriety of this appointment.

The Central Committee views this appointment as another step by the ruling Congress party and its Government to enhance their control over the judiciary and encroach upon the relative independence of the judiciary from interference by the executive and the ruling party, which parliamentary democracy is supposed to guarantee. This move by the ruling Congress party and its Government is consistent with their policy of making the judges "committed" to the Congress politics, increasing attacks on fundamental democratic rights of the people and developing administrative fascism in our country.

(Cont. to Page 12)

W. B. State Committee Urges for United Movement

Calcutta, May 14—The West Bengal State Committee of the SUCI met on 12th, 13th and 14th May last and reviewed the present situation in the State. In a resolution adopted in the meeting the State Committee has expressed deep concern for virtual collapse of the rationing system, abnormal rise in prices of articles of daily use, suffering of the people due to power shortage and consequent loss of employment of lakhs of workers, acute unemployment and deterioration in law and order situation because of internal squabbles within the ruling Congress and its policy of encouraging and using anti-social elements for petty party interests.

The State Committee has condemned the continuance of Emergency, detention of political workers without trial even after the Supreme Court had struck down a section of the MISA as unconstitutional.

(Cont. to Page 12)

Demagogic Assertion and Abusive Comment in the Name of Fraternal Criticism

(Contd. from page 1)

for any purpose whatsoever, be it the purpose of keeping the ranks attached to the party or putting the opponents to trouble or for any thing else. This being the state of affairs in our country, it is all the more necessary that fraternal criticisms and polemical discussions covering all aspects of life and environment should be encouraged and conducted. Those who think that if fraternal criticisms and polemical discussions of this type are conducted, the Left Front of West Bengal will break up are innocent of the Marxist-Leninist principle of unity-struggle-unity, the modus operandi of the united front of the left democratic parties and forces and the united struggles by the masses. If the Left Front actually breaks (according to us, there is no valid ground for breaking) it will break not because of fraternal criticisms and polemical discussions but precisely because of wrong politics of the party that leads the Front and its wrong activities emanating from its wrong politics, as was the case in 1970 when the United Front in West Bengal broke up.

CPI(M)'s Fraternal Criticism

The CPI(M) holds that India is in the stage of People's Democratic revolution. We think that this formulation of the CPI(M) is wrong and, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and concrete analysis of condition in our country, hold that India is in the stage of anti-capitalist socialist revolution. On more than one occasion we, in our writings and speeches, including speeches in public meetings, have explained why it is wrong to characterise the present stage of revolution in India as the People's Democratic stage and why India is in the stage of anti-capitalist socialist revolution.

We have even pointed out there the contradictions between the analysis of the Indian situation, as made by the CPI(M), and its formulation of People's Democratic revolution. That is how fraternal criticisms should be made. But the CPI(M) leadership do not follow this Leninist way of fraternal criticism. As a proof of it we quote the following from the article *A word to the SUC*: "...the SUC holds that India is in the stage of Socialist revolution. We would like to explain certain elementary Marxist-Leninist teachings about stages of revolution and why it is wrong to characterise the present stage of revolution in India as the Socialist stage." Every one reasonably expects that after this assertion the CPI(M) leadership will proceed to clearly state those "elementary Marxist-Leninist teachings about stages of revolution" which prove the facts and arguments advanced by the SUCI in support of its formulation that India is now in the stage of anti-capitalist socialist revolution as erroneous. But alas! Instead of the promised discussion we get the demagogic assertion that the SUCI's formulation that India is in the stage of anti-capitalist socialist revolution is wrong. Is not this a way to avoid polemical discussions with the SUCI on so serious a question as that on the present stage of revolution in India? We request the CPI(M) leadership to come out in the open and discuss why it is wrong to characterise the present stage of revolution in India as the anti-capitalist socialist stage, as formulated by the SUCI.

Or, take, for instance, another case. On the basis of Lenin's formulation on imperialism and concrete analysis of concrete condition in our country, the SUCI has

come to the conclusion that, notwithstanding its relative weakness compared to the powerful imperialist capitalist countries, Indian capitalism not only has grown; it has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies, through the merger of bank capital with industrial capital and on the basis of this finance capital has created a financial oligarchy, is exporting capital as distinguished from the export of commodities and is increasingly showing imperialist features and that India is gradually and steadily growing as an imperialist country. How do the CPI(M) leadership make "fraternal criticisms" of us in this case? We again quote from the said article of theirs. They say: "We would like to point out that only those who are totally innocent of Marxism-Leninism and its teachings on imperialism are capable of making such infantile formulations." Here again we see the same thing. There is no discussion, no explanation as to why and on what specific Marxist-Leninist propositions and teachings on imperialism the above formulations of ours are wrong and "infantile formulations" and we are "totally innocent of Marxism-Leninism and its teachings on imperialism". Is it the communist way of making fraternal criticism? By the way, we like to modestly point out that vainglory and an air of superiority are no ingredients of wisdom. They, on the contrary, are the stock-in-trade of the upstarts and high-brows to camouflage their ignorance and have no place in the communist code of conduct. We again request the CPI(M) leadership to state the Marxist-Leninist teachings on imperialism and explain, on the basis of those teachings, why our above formulations are "infantile formulations".

Childish Argument of the CPI(M)

It is our considered view that the CPI(M) has failed to make correct political assessment of the ruling Congress, found anti-big landlord, anti-monopoly, "healthy trend" within the ruling Congress, advocated the formation of a broad "front of the democratic forces, including a section of the ruling Congress" and, on the basis of these political formulations, supported and sometimes even made alliances with the ruling Congress in the name of fighting "extreme right reaction". The CPI(M) leadership have branded this reading of ours as "slanders" having "their origin in anti-Communism" in the article. That it is not slander but, on the contrary, is politically and factually true will be proved by us later on. For the present, we like to examine the way the CPI(M) leadership have argued to establish their case that we have indulged in slander against the CPI(M). They have argued thus: "It is not strange that when an anti-Communist Party like the Right Communist Party charges the CPI(M) with blind anti-Congressism, the SUC charges it with certifying the ruling Congress as "progressive". It is not strange that when Smt. Gandhi charges the CPI(M) with joining hands with the Jana Sangha against her, her party and her Government, the SUC charges it with forging alliance with Smt. Gandhi's Congress. All these are slanders and all of them have their origin in anti-Communism". Wonderful argument unparalleled in the history of mankind! Cannot the CPI(M) leadership see that Sm. Gandhi also may argue in the same way as the CPI(M) leadership have done? She may say: "It is not strange that when the Jan Sangh, Swatantra Party and Congress(O) charge the ruling

CPI(M) Finds Anti-Big Landlord Anti-Monopoly "Healthy Trend" In Indira Congress

Congress with bringing communism, the SUCI charges it with bringing fascism. It is not strange that when the Jan Sangh, Swatantra Party and Congress(O) charge the ruling Congress with joining hands with the communists, the SUCI charges it with joining hands and making common cause with the monopolists and other reactionary forces. All these are slanders and all of them have their origin in anti-Congressism." The way of arguments (not argument as such) in both cases is identical and the same. If you accept as correct the argument of the CPI(M) leadership, you cannot but accept as correct Sm. Gandhi's argument, if she argues in this way to silence her political opponents and prove that she is right. But the CPI(M) leadership certainly will not accept as correct this way of argument of Sm. Gandhi (that would be a correct decision) on the ground that it is childish and fallacious. Similarly, for the same reason the argument of the CPI(M) leadership also cannot be accepted. Furthermore, Sm. Gandhi may also argue: "If a diehard anti-Congress party like the CPI(M) finds within the ruling Congress a n t i-big landlord, anti-monopoly "h e a l t h y trend", it is sheer slander that the SUCI charges the ruling Congress with bringing fascism in the country." In case Sm. Gandhi argues thus, will that establish that the political line and objective political behaviour of the ruling Congress are correct and that it is a revolutionary party wedded to the task of emancipating the people from capitalist exploitation? Not at all. Why? Because, the argument is childish, fallacious and untenable. Same is the case with the argument of the CPI(M) leadership quoted above.

Is it that the CPI(M) leadership cannot see the

childishness and fallacy of their argument? If that be so, just to help them, let us explain. We know what charges the ruling Congress is at present bringing against the CPI(M) or what it is saying against the CPI(M). We also know that the CPI is levelling the charge of blind anti-Congressism against the CPI(M). We are equally conversant with the fiery speeches which the CPI(M) leaders are wont to make against the ruling Congress inside Parliament and in public meetings as a tactical line in election battles and day-to-day political movements. So, it is not because that we do not know all these things but, rather, in spite of our fully knowing them that we have made the afore-said remark about the CPI(M) that it has failed to make correct political assessment of the ruling Congress, found anti-big landlord, anti-monopoly, "healthy trend within the ruling Congress", advocated the formation of a broad "front of the democratic forces, including a section of the ruling Congress" and, on the basis of these formulations, supported and sometimes even made alliances with the ruling Congress in the name of fighting "extreme right reaction". And we are saying this on the basis of some resolutions of the CPI(M), statements made by the Central Committee and the Polit Bureau of the party, letters and articles written by its leaders (all published in the organs of the party) some of its objective political behaviours and the party's evaluation of the ruling Congress. Because, from the little knowledge of Marxism-Leninism that we possess we have so long known that what the real import of the tactics, *i.e.*, tactical slogans, day-to-day tactical behaviours and speeches by the leaders, of a party is with regard to a particular matter has to be

judged in the yardstick of political analysis and main political line of that party on that matter. But, going through the article *A word to the SUC*, especially the CPI(M)'s argument quoted above, we now come to know from the CPI(M) leadership that it is not a correct Marxist-Leninist way of determining on the basis of political analysis and the accepted main political line of the party regarding the ruling class and the ruling party what the attitude of a party (particularly a party that claims itself to be a Marxist party) towards the ruling class and the ruling party is. According to them, the correct Marxist-Leninist way to judge the party's attitude towards the ruling class and the ruling party should be, not on the basis of the political analysis and accepted main political line, but on the basis of tactical slogans, day-to-day political behaviours and speeches made to the ranks and the masses. If even after this we, in place of admitting the CPI(M) as a Marxist-Leninist party, characterise it as a petty-bourgeois party then it would be really very very bad!

Political Line of the CPI(M)

Now let us produce facts to prove that our remark that the CPI(M) has failed to make correct political assessment of the ruling Congress, found anti-big landlord, anti-monopoly "healthy trend" within the ruling Congress, advocated the formation of a broad "front of the democratic forces, including a section of the ruling Congress", and, on the basis of these formulations, supported and sometimes even made alliances with the ruling Congress in the name of fighting "extreme right reaction" is correct. We produce below only a few facts. For shortage of space we cannot publish all the facts that we have, to vindicate our stand.

First, about bank nation-

alisation. What is the study of the CPI(M) about bank nationalisation in our country? In **People's Democracy** dated August 3, 1969 we get the following: "The nationalisation of such institutions (the banks-Ed., P.E.) cannot but be a *big event*". Because, "the measure has *opened up some new possibilities* and the progressive forces of the country should intervene to beat back determined reactionary opposition and see that nationalised banks *become a tool for fighting monopoly interests*." Thus, to the CPI(M) bank nationalisation is a "big event" which "has opened up some new possibilities" and nationalised banks can "become a tool for fighting monopoly interests" even under the present capitalist set up. Is this a Marxist-Leninist approach? Then take Shri Ramamurti's speech in Parliament on bank nationalisation published in **People's Democracy** dated August 17, 1969. He said: "I and my party certainly *welcome* this measure as *a step in the right direction*...If out of factional conflict *something good* has come let us have it and not look at the conflict." So, the CPI(M) regards bank nationalisation as "something good" and "a step in the right direction" and, accordingly, "welcomes" it. Marxism-Leninism teaches us to get down to class reality in every case. But the CPI(M) does not approach the question of bank nationalisation from the point of view of class reality behind the step. Still it is a Marxist-Leninist party! We now come to the statement by the Polit Bureau of the CPI(M) on Shri Giri's election as President published in **People's Democracy** dated August 31, 1969 where we find the following observation that the ruling Congress "sponsors certain *forward measures* like the nationalisation of banks to meet the situation". We again refer to another statement of the

CPI(M) Advocated Formation of A Front With A Section of Indira Congress

Polit Bureau of the CPI(M) published in **People's Democracy** dated November 9, 1969 wherein occur the following words: "the process of mass radicalization and the new mass polarization that have been set in motion following bank nationalization and the winning of the Presidential contest against the Syndicate's nominee". What better certificate can be given to bank nationalisation and the Congress! Lastly, turn to the statement by the Central Committee of the CPI(M) published in **People's Democracy** dated February 15, 1970 which, among others, contains that the Indira wing of the Congress has "taken certain measures (bank nationalisation—Ed, P.E.) which are in tune with the anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people." (All the italics are ours—Ed., P.E.) Is this not certifying the ruling Congress as progressive? To sum up. The CPI(M) has "welcomed" bank nationalisation as "a big event", as "a step in the right direction", as "something good", as "a forward measure to meet the situation", setting in motion "the process of mass radicalization and the new mass polarization" and "in tune with the anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people". And what is the stand of the SUCI on bank nationalisation in our country? We quote from the statement of the Central Committee of the SUCI: "...it is one thing to support the demand for nationalisation of key and large-scale industries by the toiling millions engaged in fierce revolutionary struggle for emancipation from the yoke of capitalist exploitation while it is quite a different thing to support and eulogize an act of the bourgeoisie nationalising them. For, in a capitalist state when the bourgeoisie takes recourse to nationalisation. it does so in

the aggregate interest of capitalism precisely to bring about a coalescence of monopolies with the state and thereby virtually subjugating the state to the interest of the monopolists. In this way the rock bottom foundation stone of fascism is laid. Hence, it cannot be the business of any progressive party or individual, let alone the revolutionaries, to extend support to or praise the act of bank nationalisation of the Indian bourgeoisie. On the contrary, it is high time to sound a note of caution to the working class and other exploited masses of the people that if they fail to step up their revolutionary struggle, overthrow the bourgeoisie and capture state power, the nationalized industries will be a constant source of more ruthless exploitation". (**Proletarian Era** October 3, 1969) Whose analysis about bank nationalisation is Marxist-Leninist analysis, the CPI(M)'s or the SUCI's? Let

us see what Engels say about nationalisation of industries by the bourgeois state. "... nor conversion into state property deprives the productive forces of the character as capital.... The modern state, whatever its form, is an essentially capitalist machine; it is the state of the capitalists, ideal aggregate capitalist. The more productive forces it takes over, the more does it become a real aggregate capitalist, the more citizens does it exploit. The workers remain wage-earner proletarians. The capitalist relationship is not abolished, it is rather pushed to an extreme." (**Anti-Duhring**, published by Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, Page 414). This analysis by Engels of nationalisation of industries by a capitalist state, whatever be its form, fully vindicates the correctness of the SUCI's stand on bank nationalisation in our country. Thus, it is found that neither the CPI nor even the CPI(M) but it is only the SUCI that has been able to give a correct Marxist-Leninist explanation of an event like the nationalisation

of banks by a bourgeois state in our country, provided that the CPI(M) leadership consider Engels a true Marxist and his above-mentioned analysis a truly Marxist analysis.

Second, we now refer to the statement of the Polit Bureau of the CPI(M) on Shri Giri's election as the President of India published in **People's Democracy** dated August 31, 1969 which reads as follows: "The Polit Bureau of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) hails the victory of Sri V. V. Giri in the Presidential contest and views it as a political victory of the popular and democratic forces against the forces of extreme reaction in the country." (Italics ours—Ed, P.E.) It should be realised that it is one thing to vote for Shri Giri but it is absolutely a different thing to characterise Shri Giri's victory as a "political victory for the popular and democratic forces in the country." Shri Giri was a candidate of the Indira wing of the Congress. How then can his victory be characterised as a "political victory for the popular and democratic forces" unless the Indira wing of the Congress is presumed to be a representative of the popular and democratic forces in the country? And in fact, the CPI(M) at that time considered the Indira wing of the Congress more progressive than the Syndicate and so, supported it and sometimes even made alliances with it against the Syndicate in the name of fighting extreme right reaction. It is true that the left democratic parties also voted for Shri Giri in the Presidential election but it goes without saying that by their votes they certainly could not change the character of the Indira wing of the Congress which too is a bourgeois reactionary party; moreover, it represents the the aggregate interest of Indian monopoly capitalism. Thus, by declaring Shri

Giri's victory as a "political victory for the popular and democratic forces...in the country" the CPI(M) gave a seal of progressiveness to the Indira wing of the Congress.

Third, next turn to the writing of Shri M. Basavapunniah entitled *Dangeites' Second Front directly serves Reaction* published in **People's Democracy** dated November 9, 1969 which, among others, contains the following: "With the desperate moves initiated by the Syndicate to take exclusive control of the party and Government in the interest of the avowed reactionary forces and the resistance against these moves put up by Indira Gandhi and her following, the political crisis in the country has taken a new turn. A country-wide front against the avowed reaction and its nefarious political line has come into existence and the battle is on, with initial success (victory of Shri Giri in Presidential election—Ed., P.E.) against the Syndicate and the vested interests it represents." (Italics ours—Ed, P.E.) Does it not show that the CPI(M) at that time regarded the Indira wing of the Congress as more progressive, compared to the Syndicate? Does it not prove that the CPI(M) at that time not only felt the necessity of forging a country-wide front, including the Indira Congress but visualised already the existence of such a front against the Syndicate?

Fourth, we now quote from the letter of the Central Committee of the CPI(M) signed by its General Secretary to the Prime Minister of India published in **People's Democracy** dated February 1, 1970. "In the changed political situation when the threat from the Syndicate wing of the Congress and its alliance with extreme right-reactionary parties such as the Jana Sangh and Swatantra had become imminent and when there were hectic attempts by them to take

TRAGIC IRONY OF HISTORY FOR THE CPI(M)

over the reins of the Government with the avowed objective of shifting the internal and external policies of the Government in a further right and reactionary direction, *our Party openly announced its support to your Government* in so far as it is fighting the Syndicate and its allies, foiling their bid to take over the Government.** Even today, it is our Party's considered opinion that the threat from the Syndicate's projected alliance and political line is far from defeated, and it would be a grave error to underestimate these extreme rightist forces who are firmly entrenched in society, at different levels. The truth is that the fight has just begun against this menace and only initial victories have been scored against it." (Italics ours—Ed., P.E.) This letter of the CPI(M) testifies to the fact that the CPI(M) gave full support at that time to the Indira wing of the Congress and its Government in the name of fighting extreme right reaction.

Fifth, then the statement by the Central Committee of the CPI(M) published in **People's Democracy** dated February 15, 1970 which, *inter alia*, states: "...the Indira Gandhi wing also contains within its fold a healthy trend which hates big landlords and monopolists. Despite the support its leaders seek and receive from the foreign monopolists and Indian reactionaries, it has raised certain slogans and taken certain measures (bank nationalisation—Ed., P.E.) which are in tune with anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people. Above all, its political line is such that the biggest danger threatening the democratic movement in the country—the danger of Hindu communal reaction... is sought to be opposed." (Italics ours—Ed., P.E.) So,

according to the CPI(M), the Indira wing of the Congress has within its fold "healthy trend which hates big landlords and monopolists"; it has even "taken certain measures" which are "in tune with anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people"; its political line is opposed to Hindu communalism. What more glaring testimony certifying the ruling Congress as progressive can there be?

Sixth, we now refer to the last few lines of the statement of the Central Committee mentioned in the immediately preceding paragraph of this article. They are as follows: "This (ideological political struggle—Ed., P.E.) alone will make it possible to remove the confusion.....and pave the way for the development of a far broader front of the democratic forces, including a section of the Indira Gandhi Congress who are earnest about the struggle against the vested interest." (Italics ours—Ed., P.E.) So, it conclusively proves that the CPI(M) also, like the CPI, has advocated the formation of a "front of the democratic forces, including a section of the Indira Gandhi Congress." Is there then any theoretical difference between the CPI(M) and the CPI in the matter of forging a front with a "section of the Indira Gandhi Congress"?

Thus, till the other day, like the CPI, the CPI(M) also has advocated the formation of a united front with a section of the Indira Congress, called upon other democratic parties in the country to join that front in the 'great' struggle against the danger of right reaction to save the country, elatedly and proudly declared that by helping the Indira Government in various ways inside and outside Parliament

the conspiracy of the right reaction has been defeated and the country has been saved from the danger of right reaction and expressed a deep sense of self-satisfaction. But within a period of two to three years thereafter, that very CPI(M), which then eulogised Sm. Gandhi, her Congress and her Government in glowing terms as more progressive than the Syndicate, has to characterise the self-same Indira Congress as the main enemy of the people, charge it with "carrying on semi-fascist" attacks on the democratic parties and forces in West Bengal and urge upon all the left democratic parties and forces to develop mighty mass movements to resist these semi-fascist attacks. Not only that. The situation has come to such a pass that the CPI(M) is now even feeling the necessity of opening dialogues with the then untouchables, the Jan Sangh, Congress (O), etc., that at that time were considered by the CPI(M) the worst enemy of the people and the country representing extreme right reaction, on as to what can be done and to what extent to counteract the menace of the Indira Congress, which was then regarded by the CPI(M) as more progressive than these parties and with a section of which the CPI(M) then advocated a united front. The then progressive party of the CPI(M)'s conception, namely the Indira Congress, has now turned out to be the main enemy of the people responsible for all the sufferings and pitiable plight of our people even according to the admission of the self-same CPI(M). What a tragic irony of history for the CPI(M)!

Our people can see that we have quoted not from the monopolist Press but from the English organ of the CPI(M) itself all the formulations of that party which prove to the hilt the

correctness of our study that the CPI(M) has failed to make correct political assessment of the ruling Congress, found anti-big landlord, anti-monopoly, "healthy trend" within the ruling Congress, advocated the formation of a broad "front of the democratic forces, including a section of" the ruling Congress and, on the basis of these formulations, supported and sometimes even made alliances with the ruling Congress in the name of fighting extreme right reaction. So, this study of ours is no slander having its origin in anti-communism, with which we have been falsely and maliciously charged by the CPI(M) leadership in their article *A word to the SUC*. The fact is that since the split in the Congress, both the CPI and the CPI(M) had been vying with each other to please Sm. Gandhi, her party and her Government by appreciative acts, of course, in the name of fighting extreme right reaction. Sm. Gandhi also reciprocated this warm attitude of these two parties towards her and the good relation between the CPI(M) and Sm. Gandhi continued. In spite of a little strain, it still worked on well even after the fall of the CPI(M)-led Ministry in Kerala. But when the United Front in West Bengal broke up and, notwithstanding Sm. Gandhi's attempts to keep the CPI and the CPI(M) together in view of keeping her position in Parliament secure, when rapprochement between these two parties became impossible and Sm. Gandhi had to choose one in between them, she chose the CPI, particularly because of the fact that in the then Parliament the CPI had an edge over the CPI(M) in so far as numerical strength of members of Parliament was concerned. It was only thenceforward that the CPI(M) has become vociferous against Sm. Gandhi,

CPI(M) Trying to Conceal Truth From Its Ranks By Antagonising Them Against S U C I

her party and her Government. It does not require much intelligence to understand that with all its political analyses and accepted political lines finding progressiveness in the Indira Congress and calling for forming a broad front of the democratic forces, including a section of the Indira Congress, (we have elaborately shown them hereinbefore) remaining still unrevoked (there is no resolution or statement of the Polit Bureau or the Central Committee of the party openly stating that these political analyses and political lines are wrong and, hence, revoked) it cannot be said that the present anti-Congress stance of the CPI(M) is grounded on its political analysis and political line about the ruling class and the ruling Congress party. It is prompted by electoral exigency and the mind to utilise the anti-Congress sentiment of the masses of the people in its bid to pose itself as the most anti-Congress party and a real working class revolutionary party. It may at present appear farfetched but it should be borne in mind that if Sm. Gandhi someday decides to give the cold shoulder to the Soviet Union in place of the existing warm relationship with it, which will invariably strain the relation between the CPI and the ruling Congress, and shows some favourable gestures towards the CPI(M), possibilities of which cannot be altogether ruled out, then the present anti-Congressism of the CPI(M) is sure to be watered down.

In the context of the facts culled from different resolutions, statements and authoritative writings of the party which we have reproduced above, it is sheer blasphemy to charge us with "slanders" having "their origin in anti-Communism" for holding the perfectly correct view that the CPI(M) has failed to make correct political assessment of the ruling Congress,

found anti-big landlord, anti-monopoly, "healthy trend" within the ruling Congress, advocated the formation of a broad "front of the democratic forces, including a section of the Indira Gandhi Congress" and, on the basis of these formulations, supported and sometimes even made alliances with the ruling Congress in the name of fighting extreme right reaction. We request the ranks and supporters of the CPI(M) to go through the resolutions, statements and writings published in **People's Democracy** mentioned above to verify the correctness or otherwise of our above view before swallowing what the leadership of their party are dishing out to them against us as gospel truth. We are constrained to say that the leadership of their party are withholding truth from them.

Reference To Press Statement

In our article in **Proletarian Era** we quoted a report from the Press about the Chandigarh session of the Central Committee of the CPI(M) for which the CPI(M) leadership have, in the article *A word to the SUCI*, severely abused us and imputed motives to us for publishing this report of the **Statesman** in place of quoting from the resolution of the Chandigarh session of the Central Committee which has been published in **People's Democracy**. The reason for not quoting from the said resolution is simple. Had the article of ours discussed the resolution of the Chandigarh session of the the Central Committee of the CPI(M) then the resolution must have been quoted, as we always do, a fact which will once again be corroborated beyond any shade of doubt by the present article. But it was not so and, as such, we did not quote from the resolution. There was no

motive in referring to the Press report, as alleged by the CPI(M) leadership, either. It is an undeniable fact that some of the leaders of the CPI(M) addressed a Press conference and made briefings to the Press after the Chandigarh session was over about the resolution adopted in that session and other allied matters. We saw a report of it published in the **Statesman**. So far as we know, the report published in the **Statesman** still remains uncontradicted by the CPI(M) and the full text of the Press briefings made after the Chandigarh session by the CPI(M) leaders has not been published in any organ of the CPI(M). In the circumstances, is our quoting the report of the **Statesman** in the article in **Proletarian Era** so wrong that the CPI(M) leadership can in a fit of hysterical outburst of anger charge us with digging "into the garbage can of the monopolist Press to lift out this putrid falsification—a trick worthy of all anti-Communists", as they have done? In such a situation any well-meaning party would have pointed out to us that the report quoted by us was false, of course, in case it was really false, and in that case we also would have acknowledged it as false, since we too have our own experience about the monopoly Press and very well know its role. But the CPI(M) leadership have not done it. On the contrary, basing on this reference by us to the Press report and falsely contending that we are in the habit of falsifying facts "with the only purpose of maligning the CPI(M)", the CPI(M) leadership are trying to antagonise the ranks and supporters of their party against us, develop anti-SUCI feelings in them, and encourage them not to read our books, literatures, organs and writings, with a view to concealing from the

ranks and supporters of the CPI(M) the political analyses we have made of the CPI(M) on the basis of its own published and accredited documents. The CPI(M) leadership have questioned our honesty and charged us with incapability and lack of "elementary honesty". But what sort of political honesty of the CPI(M) leadership is this?

But we must express our regret for one mistake that had crept through inadvertence in the article in **Proletarian Era** referred to in the *A word to the SUCI*. The mistake is with regard to the date of the Tirur municipal election in Kerala. After inquiry we have found that it is a bonafide mistake and we thank the CPI(M) leadership for pointing out this mistake to us. The member of the editorial board of **Proletarian Era** who wrote that article should have been more careful about the exact date of the said municipal election before making comment on it. But this mistake with regard to the date of the municipal election, as can be easily understood, does not prove to be wrong our main contention that the CPI(M) has failed to make correct political assessment of the ruling Congress, found anti-big landlord, anti-monopoly, "healthy trend" within the ruling Congress, advocated the formation of a "front of the democratic forces, including a section of the Indira Congress", and, on the basis of these formulations, supported and sometimes even made alliances with the ruling Congress in the name of fighting extreme right reaction. In spite of the mistake about date, this formulation of the SUCI is cent per cent correct.

United Front and the CPI(M)

Lenin in his book, **Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder**, has said: "The attitude of a political party toward its own mistake is one of the most important and surest

History of CPI(M) is History of Right Opportunism and Parliamentarism Interspersed With Sectarianism and Left Adventurism

criteria of the seriousness of the party and how it fulfils *in practice* its obligations toward its *class* and toward the toiling *masses*. To admit a mistake openly, to disclose its reasons, to analyse the conditions which gave rise to it, to study attentively the means of correcting it—these are the signs of a serious party; this means the performance of its duties, this means educating and training the *class* and the *masses*." (Selected Works, Vol. X, published by Lawrence and Wishart Ltd., Page 98). While discussing the question of breakdown of United Front in West Bengal in the article *A word to the SUC*, the CPI(M) leadership have violated each and every of these Leninist teachings on self-criticism. They have not openly admitted their mistakes in the party's approach to and functioning in the United Front, not disclosed their reasons, not analysed the conditions which gave rise to them and not made any attempt, let alone sincere serious attempts, to correct them. They, on the contrary, in their usual typical manner, have heaped abuses and blames for the breakdown of the United Front on other parties. They refuse to learn from their past mistakes and experience.

In the article the CPI(M) leadership have charged the SUCI with helping "the game of splitting the United Front in West Bengal" by joining "hands with the Right Communists who had already aligned themselves with the ruling Congress." Because, in their view, the SUCI had "got frightened when they saw the masses moving under the leadership of the CPI(M). Just as any other petty-bourgeois party, they wanted to stick to the ministerial chairs for the full term of five years and play the bourgeois parliamentary game and when they found that for

the CPI(M) the parliamentary struggle was only an auxiliary struggle, when they saw the CPI(M) calling the masses out into action, they were afraid of their ministerial chairs and found refuge in the camp of the Right Communists which was really the camp of the ruling Congress." A masterpiece of cooked up story indeed!

We like to ask these able disciples of Goebbels some questions. We have been charged with joining "the camp of the Right Communists" as we "wanted to stick to the ministerial chairs for the full term of five years and play the bourgeois parliamentary game." It is known to all that the so-called camp of the Right Communists did not command majority support in the Legislative Assembly. How then by joining this camp could we expect to stick to the ministerial chairs for the full term of five years? The CPI(M) camp was numerically stronger than the Bangla Congress-CPI combination and, so, if we wanted to stick to the ministerial chairs, it would have been more advantageous for us to join the CPI(M) camp and agree to form a CPI(M)-led Ministry, an offer then made by the CPI(M) leadership to us. We did not accept this offer; because, that would have meant giving a premium to the sectarian disruptionist politics of the CPI(M). We at that time tried our level best to restore the unity of the United Front and opposed tooth and nail any move to disrupt it. Had we been so much enamoured of the ministerial chairs, as alleged by the CPI(M) leadership, we would not have scornfully turned down the proposal to form a mini-front excluding the CPI(M) and foist a minority mini-front Government backed by the ruling Congress on West Bengal in the model of Kerala. The CPI(M)

leadership themselves know very well that the plan for setting up a minority mini-front Government backed by the ruling Congress in West Bengal was total and complete but it was only our stout opposition that foiled the plan. Had we been so covetous of the ministerial chairs, as alleged by the CPI(M) leadership, after the mid-term election in 1971, we would not have been the first to throw the suggestion of a unity between the ULF and the ULDF and seriously work for it. When our attempts for forging this unity failed and all other constituents of the EPC sided with the ruling Congress we sat in the opposition in the Legislative Assembly. If we were so much attached to the ministerial chairs, as alleged by the CPI(M) leadership, we could have easily sided with the ruling Congress and occupied the ministerial chairs which the partners of the Congress-led Democratic Coalition would have been too glad to offer, had we just thrown a hint of our intention of joining the Democratic Coalition Ministry. Had we so much hankering for posts and positions, we would not have declined the repeated requests by the CPI(M) leaders to agree to set up Com. Subodh Banerjee as a candidate for election to the post of the Speaker of the House on the ground that the CPI(M) being the largest party, the election should be contested by it and the post should go to it. In the face of these undeniable facts the allegation that we joined the camp of the Right Communists in order "to stick to the ministerial chairs for the full term of five years and play the bourgeois parliamentary game" is a tissue of undiluted lies.

Against this record of ours what was the then role of the CPI(M)? After the fall of the second United Front Ministry in West Bengal the CPI(M) leadership

moved heaven and earth to anyhow stick to the ministerial chairs. They wrote to the Governor to allow them to form a Ministry; they did not even feel any compunction to try to buy over and cause defection of legislators belonging to other parties and rope in a communalist party like the Muslim League to form the Government (This is not uncommon for them. For they made a coalition with the Muslim League and formed a Ministry with the Muslim League in Kerala) After the mid-term election in 1971, they sent feelers to the Muslim League again and the Jharkhand Party in their bid to form a CPI(M)-led Ministry in West Bengal. Nevertheless, the CPI(M) leadership do not feel shy to brag that "for the CPI(M) the parliamentary struggle was only an auxiliary struggle." The entire history of the party, since the day of formation of the undivided Communist Party of India, in spite of its revolutionary verbosity, is a history of parliamentarism and right opportunism, interspersed with sectarianism and left adventurism. No amount of loud protest can controvert this dry reality.

The CPI(M) leadership are claiming that "for the CPI(M) the parliamentary struggle was only an auxiliary struggle." They are also claiming that the CPI(M) was then "calling the masses out into action" and that the "masses were moving under the leadership of the CPI(M)" They have all through been claiming that the CPI(M) is a real working class revolutionary party. Assuming all these claims to be correct for the sake of argument, the position becomes this that the masses under the revolutionary leadership of the CPI(M) were coming out into action. Now for their benefit we like to remind the CPI(M) leadership that at that time, *i.e.*, at the time of the second United Front in

Theory of "Class-based Front" of CPI(M) Mainly Responsible for Breakdown of United Front

West Bengal, along with the above-mentioned claims, the CPI(M) leadership also advanced the theory of "a new class-based front" and in support of this theory had said that the petty-bourgeois parties were being gradually isolated from the masses as a result of which the utility of the present type of united front of the left democratic parties and forces had exhausted, that a large section of the masses, *e.* the workers, peasants and the petty-bourgeoisie "through their life's experience" had been and still was being organised in a political front under the revolutionary leadership of the CPI(M) and that this People's Democratic Front was "no longer in the stage of an announcement" but "a reality today". According to the foregoing analysis of the CPI(M), in such situation when the leadership of a revolutionary party *i.e.* the CPI(M) had been established over the masses and petty-bourgeois parties isolated from the masses, then what could be objective of the CPI(M)'s "calling the masses out into action"? In this situation "calling the masses out into action" can have only one meaning, one objective, namely, "calling the masses out into action" for seizure of power and carry out People's Democratic revolution. But alas! What did we see? In place of "calling the masses out into action" for seizure of power through People's Democratic revolution, the CPI(M) leadership called the "masses out into action" to raise the demand that "general election in West Bengal should be held within six months". Even after this, the CPI(M) leadership shamelessly claim that "for the CPI(M) the parliamentary struggle was only an auxiliary struggle." In this connection we like to show another fallacy of the CPI(M)'s argument that for the breakdown of the United Front in West Bengal

the SUCI and other parties, which are all petty-bourgeois parties in the opinion of the CPI(M), were responsible. For the sake of argument, let us assume that all the claims and allegations made by the CPI(M) leadership, as mentioned in the foregoing lines, are correct. If that be so then we do not find any meaning of the establishment of leadership of the working class revolutionary party over the masses. For, even though the leadership of the working class revolutionary party is established over the masses, the success of the revolutionary movements will depend not on that revolutionary leadership but on the petty-bourgeois parties that have already been isolated from the masses, on whether or not these petty-bourgeois parties will work as agents of the bourgeoisie. Do not the CPI(M) leadership see this fallacy when they argue that petty-bourgeois parties like SUCI split the United Front, though these petty-bourgeois parties were isolated from the masses, the leadership of the revolutionary CPI(M) was established over the masses who were organised in the People's Democratic revolutionary front which had become a "reality" and the masses organised in this People's Democratic Front were "out into action" under the leadership of the revolutionary CPI(M)? When these things become "a reality," can petty-bourgeois parties split the front and disrupt the revolutionary unity of the masses? We request the ranks and supporters of the CPI(M) to seriously think over this absurd proposition emanating from wrong politics and false accusation of the CPI(M) leadership. In fact, the claim of "calling the masses out into action" and their "moving under the leadership of the CPI(M), as made

by the CPI(M) leadership, is more illusory than real. For, had there been so mighty and extensive mass actions, they certainly would have unnerved the main enemy of the people, the bourgeois class, the monopolists. But let alone unnerving, these so-called mass actions did not touch even the hair of the main enemy of the people, as they were mainly directed against imaginary enemies hither and thither whom for obvious reasons we do not like to specify in details for the present.

The day-to-day political behaviour of a party follows from the main political line of that party. Hence, in order to correctly understand the CPI(M)'s political behaviour towards the United Front and mass movements during the United Front days in West Bengal, it is necessary to know what the main political line and approach of the CPI(M) was about the United Front and united movements; otherwise, there will only be mutual bickerings leading to no purpose. So, let us see what the main political line and approach of the CPI(M) was with regard to the United Front and united mass movements. The CPI(M) leadership then completely failed to realise the necessity of the united front of the left democratic parties and forces in the present stage of development of democratic movement in our country, wrongly concluded that the utility of the present type of democratic front had been exhausted and, accordingly, advanced the slogan of "class-based front," meaning thereby people's Democratic Front in contraposition of the broad-based united front of the left democratic parties and forces. That this is true would be evident from the article, *Lenin, our Teacher*, by Shri Promode

Das Gupta published in *People's Democracy*, Lenin Birth Centenary Special issue dated April 22, 1970. Let us quote the relevant portion from it. "Possibilities for development of a new *class-based front* is an integral condition of accomplishing the People's Democratic Revolution, of doing away with exploitation. In many of my recent speeches, I have said that in the towns and villages this new class unity is beginning to appear. In the rural areas, the unity of the people is growing. Through their economic struggles, the peasants and non-peasants are coming to realise the need for *building up unity on a political level*. The workers and the petty-bourgeoisie, *through their life's experience*, are, we find, taking part in peasant struggles. *This is no longer in the stage of an announcement; it is becoming a reality today.*"** This is an indication of the *beginning of the People's Democratic Front* towards which we are to advance. We are, therefore, speaking of a *class-based united front*". (pp 49-50; italics ours—Ed., P.E.) This infantile formulation of the CPI(M) was responsible for wrong approach to the United Front and united mass movements and sectarianism and disruptionist activities on the part of the CPI(M). The capacity of the CPI(M) leadership to shift on to the shoulders of others the pernicious consequences emanating from their wrong theory and bad politics is well known. Even after so gigantic a catastrophe to leftism and united democratic mass movements and consequent political rehabilitation of the Congress with added strength and prestige from a position of virtual extinction, particularly in West Bengal, resulting, in the main, from the wrong political line of the CPI(M) it is a pity that the CPI(M) has not been able to free its

SUC'S Consistent Role in Uniting Left Democratic Parties and Forces

political behaviour from the influence of the bad politics of shifting its our faults and burden of its mistakes on the shoulders of other parties, a convenient trick to keep the ranks and supporters in the dark and shield the mistakes of the leadership.

EPC and the CPI(M)

Now a word or two about the role of the SUCI in forming the EPC. In the article *A word to the SUC* the CPI(M) leadership have charged us with "helping the Congress game of disrupting the democratic front and cheating the people" for forming the EPC. It is only natural for them. For, political myope as they are, they cannot foresee things. As the biggest left party in West Bengal and claiming itself to be a real working class revolutionary party (this claim though false) was it not the bounden duty of the CPI(M) to combine all the left democratic parties in a united front of the left democratic parties and forces and see that none of such parties goes over to the Congress camp and strengthens the ruling Congress, main enemy of the people in the prevailing situation? Did the CPI(M) perform this bounden duty of it? It not only did not perform this duty but, on the contrary, with its fanciful idea of a "class based front", sectarian and disruptionist activities was deliberately pushing most of the democratic parties into the arms of the ruling Congress. At such a critical juncture of time, in the interest of development of democratic movements and containing the fascism of the ruling Congress, the SUCI felt that it should do its best to prevent the left democratic parties from going over to the side of the ruling Congress and thereby increasing manifold the strength of reaction represented by

the ruling Congress. Though the SUCI is a party incomparably smaller than the CPI(M) yet the SUCI successfully carried out this task—a task which the CPI(M) was duty-bound to perform had it been a real working class revolutionary party and had it not been miscarried by the wrong theory of a "class-based front" which followed from wrong assessment and evaluation of the then political situation and mass movements but which the CPI(M) did not perform—and completely frustrated the plan to bring into being a front or an alliance of the ruling Congress with all the parties constituting the EPC other than the SUCI. This consistent anti-Congress role of the SUCI is not unknown to the CPI(M) leadership. In *People's Democracy* dated January 24, 1971 we find the following: "...because of the reluctance of the Forward Bloc and SUC, the revisionists have so far not been able to telescope the EPC into BC-Indicate combination". The in *People's Democracy* dated April 4, 1971, the following comment is made: "One of the main constituents of the Front, the SUC, has opposed the line of surrender to the the Congress and has instead proposed a Government of the ULF and ULDF." In the Political resolution adopted by the Ninth Congress of the CPI(M) held at Madurai the following lines occur: "In West Bengal, renegade Right CP leaders entered into agreement on certain seats, went with Congress in the 1971 elections. A full-scale adjustment and alliance with the Congress could not materialise because others who had split from us could not agree to it." It goes without saying that these "others" include the SUCI. Thus, the CPI(M) leadership perfectly know that it is because of

consistent anti-Congress stand of the SUCI and its stiff opposition to any adjustment with the ruling Congress that the EPC as a front took an anti-Congress stand and the CPI was compelled to take a stand in West Bengal different from their all-India stand of making alliance with the ruling Congress for which our Party was made a special target of attack by the CPI in a resolution after the election in 1971. All these facts are known to the CPI(M) leadership; nevertheless they charge us, in the article, with "helping the Congress game." This is a specimen of political honesty of the CPI(M) leadership! Formation of the EPC and thereby foiling the Congress plan of forging an all-out combination of almost all the left democratic parties with the ruling Congress, or, not forming the EPC and providing opportunities to the ruling Congress to rope in as many left democratic parties as possible into a Congress-led alliance, thus giving scope to the ruling Congress to tremendously increase its prestige and strength—which of these two alternatives was preferable, to serve the interests of leftism and development of democratic mass movements? Certainly the former. The SUCI did it with its limited strength. Only the sectarians and pseudo-Marxists, who were at the helm of the United Front and the mass movements but were responsible for the disruption of the United Front and united mass movements, now for shifting the onus of their own mistakes and misdeeds are accusing the SUCI for the correct stand and branding it as "helping the Congress game."

Right-About-Turn

The CPI(M) leadership have further charged us with doing a "right-about-turn" in 1972 by our "return to the

Left Front" of West Bengal. This is baseless and malicious. From the very beginning, the SUCI has been trying its level best to combine all the left democratic parties in a United Front of the left democratic parties and forces on the basis of an agreed common programme and a code of conduct. When the United Front was discussing the question of inter-party clashes and when the CPI(M) formed a front within the United Front with the Bangla Congress the CPI (in CPI(M)'s parlance the "Dangeite revisionists"), the Forward Bloc and the RSP, the SUCI opposed such groupism within the Front and gave suggestions in writing for not only how to stop inter-party clashes but also how to strengthen the unity of the United Front. To remind our people, we cannot but state here that the CPI (M) which since the breakdown of the United Front has been using fiery words against the Bangla Congress and the "Dangeite revisionists" CPI, had no occasion to differ with these two parties on any question of principle, plan, programme etc. rather the CPI(M) and all these parties combinedly opposed us when we pressed for reduction of land ceiling, reduction of police budget in order to increase the education budget, scrapping off of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules, etc. etc. When the United Front virtually disrupted, the SUCI did not take any side but gave a five-point written suggestion to preserve the unity of the Front against rightist and left-adventurist attacks from within the United Front. After actual disruption of the United Front it was the SUCI alone that seriously moved to restore the unity of the Front when the two blocs were engaged in manoeuvring either to buy over and cause defection of legislators belonging to other parties to form a Government or to set up a minority mini-front Government backed by the

SUC'S Significant Contribution to World Communist Movement

ruling Congress, as the case may be. At a time then the SUCI in a public appeal stated that if the CPI(M) would abandon its wrong theory of a "class-based-front" and sectarian and disruptionist politics and agree to move unitedly with other left democratic parties and develop united movements, there could be united front with the CPI(M) even excluding the Bangla Congress. But the CPI(M) stuck to its fanciful theory of a "class-based front", continued its sectarian and disruptionist politics and blocked all our attempts to again unite the left democratic parties excluding the Bangla Congress in a front. Even when all attempts to revive the United Front excluding the Bangla Congress failed, the SUCI did not lose hope and continued its efforts to unite the left democratic parties in a front and develop united democratic mass movements. The formation of the EPC was an attempt in that direction and had the CPI(M) even then given up its fanciful theory of a "class-based front" and sectarian and disruptionist politics then there could have been a unity of most of the left democratic parties and forces with the CPI(M). But for the CPI(M)'s refusal to change its wrong political line the unity of the left democratic parties and forces could not then take shape. The SUCI did not stop there but continued its efforts to combine the left democratic parties, took active initiatives to start bilateral talks among the left democratic parties and when in course of these talks it was felt that the CPI(M) no longer was speaking of the "class-based-front," the continued efforts of the SUCI to unite the left democratic parties in a front culminated in the formation of the Left Front. It should be realised that the Left Front is not the same as the so-called

ULF of 1971 of the CPI(M). The composition, programme and the code of conduct of the Left Front are all different. So the SUCI has done no "right-about-turn", as alleged by the CPI(M) leadership.

But that is not the case with the CPI(M). The leadership advanced the slogan of a "class-based front" and asserted that the utility of the present type of united front of the left democratic parties and forces had been exhausted. But now they have retracted that slogan and assertion; they have again started talking of united front of the left democratic parties and forces. This is, no doubt, a right-about-turn for the CPI(M).

Charge of Anti-Communism

We have been charged by the CPI(M) leadership with "anti-Communism". A party, that from its very birth (even from before birth; to be precise, since the day of birth of the undivided CPI) has been swinging like a pendulum from right opportunism to left adventurism and never moved correctly on any major issue, that has never made independent concrete analysis of concrete condition in our country on the basis of Marxism-Leninism in determining its main political line but has blindly carbon-copied all the time the political formulations of this or that Communist Party abroad, that has characterised the Indian state differently at different times since independence in spite of the character of the state remaining basically the same all through, that till the other day was speaking of "healthy trend" within and urging to form a front with a section of the ruling Congress, the main enemy of our people now, that (its leaders) abandoned all tenets of proletarian internationalism at the time of border-clash and behaved as the mouthpiece of the Indian reactionaries (we are not

concerned with what they hissed in private), that feels no concern for the present rift in the world communist camp and has made no theoretical contribution to resolve the ideological difference among the different communist parties though it claims itself to be a working class revolutionary party and that by its activities has smeared the noble banner of communism in our country, has charged the SUCI with anti-communism! The SUCI requires no certificate from the CPI(M) to substantiate its claim as the only real Communist Party in India. History is there to prove it. Some of its publications like *Samyabadi Sibirer Atma Samalochana* (Self-criticism of the Communist Camp), *On War Peace And Peaceful Co-existence, On Steps Taken Against Stalin, An Appeal To The Leaders Of The International Communist Movement, Chiner Sanskritik Biplab* (China's Cultural Revolution), *Sanskritik Andolan Prasange* (Regarding Cultural Movement), articles on Tonkin crisis, Cuban crisis, Twelve Party Declaration of 1957, Eighty-one Party Statement of 1960, Czechoslovak incident (entry of Soviet troops), Hungarian counter-revolution and Imre Nagi, Teachings from the events in Indonesia, Fascism, etc, to mention only a few, have made significant contributions to the treasure-house of Marxism-Leninism. In passing, it may be recalled that when all other communist parties, including the Communist Party of China, were showering glowing tributes to Khrushchev, it was the SUCI alone that in the *Statement on The Twentieth Congress of The CPSU* had sounded a note of caution to all the communist parties stating that the formulations of the twentieth congress of the CPSU was wrong and would open the flood-gate of modern revisionism in the world communist

movement. We mention this fact not to belittle other communist parties but to remind our people that as the true vanguard of the Indian proletariat the SUCI has made no insignificant contribution to the world communist movement as well as the communist movement in our country. It should be realised that the name, communist, attached to a party does not automatically make that party a real communist party. History is replete with instances of this kind. We have explained times without number why the nominally communist parties in our country are not real communist parties. It should further be realised that criticisms of the CPI, the CPI(M) and the CPI(ML) are not anti-communism. Anti-CPI or anti-CPI(M) or anti-CPI(ML) must not be confused as anti-communism. On the contrary, to hold aloft the revolutionary banner of communism and make our revolution victorious, it is the sacred duty of every genuine communist in our country to expose and give total and complete defeat to the pseudo-communism of the CPI, the CPI(M) and the CPI(ML).

Big Party Mentality of the CPI(M)

Towards the end of the article *A word to the SUC* the CPI(M) leadership have advised us to have "a little bit of modesty commensurate with" our "size instead of the practice of eulogising" our "leader as one the foremost Marxist thinkers of the age". Because, in the opinion of the CPI(M) leadership, this "might enable the SUC to grow from a group into a party, though it can never become a Marxist-Leninist party." This remark by the CPI(M) leadership is an expression more of annoyance and anger than sober unbiased scientific thinking. We understand the cause of this annoyance and anger of

Bigness or Smallness of a Party no Criteria for Judging Class-Character of the Party

theirs. But we are sorry, we cannot help them.

The CPI(M) leadership have taken exception to our describing our beloved leader and teacher, Com. Shibdas Ghosh, General Secretary of the SUCI, as one of the outstanding Marxist thinkers of the age. To them it has appeared as lack of modesty on our part. Why? Perhaps because, the SUCI is a small party, not even a party, but just a small "group" in the opinion of the CPI(M) leadership. No, sirs, this is neither lack of modesty nor hero-worship nor even practice of the cult of personality. Could the CPI(M) leadership catch the real point, they would not have taken exception to this description of our beloved leader by us.

We all know that the leadership of every real communist party is collective leadership. But what is collective leadership? It should be understood that discussions and decisions on major problems in party bodies, however indispensable they may be, do not by themselves establish collective leadership. Even in bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties discussions and decisions on major problems in party bodies take place. But no Marxist-Leninist will, on this ground, say that collective leadership operates in the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties. In the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties such discussions and decisions are at best committee decisions. Collective leadership is not just a committee decision. *Social consciousness in the form of collective knowledge of all the members of the party is collective leadership.* Then again, the concept of collective leadership is not abstract; it is always concrete. In other words, collective knowledge of all the members of the party must have a concretised form expressing itself through some

leader who best expresses this collective knowledge of the party, covering all aspects of life and society. Thus, collective leadership can be defined as follows: "Collective leadership is the collective knowledge derived from the struggles conducted by the leaders, the ranks, the class and the masses, personified, concretised and expressed in the best way through a person in the highest organism of the party." In a party where this personified and concretised form of expression of the collective knowledge has not emerged, it cannot be said that collective leadership operates there. The emergence of Lenin's leadership in the Bolshevik Party and that of Mao Tse-tung leadership in the Communist Party of China are nothing but the emergence of collective leadership in its concrete form in those parties. In fact, the struggle for the emergence of collective leadership in personified and concretised form within the party involving the leaders and the ranks and outside the class and the masses is the real struggle for the building up of a real communist party. In the absence of the emergence of this personified and concretised form, collective leadership objectively becomes practice of formal or average bourgeois democracy. The emergence of collective leadership in personified and concretised form is an indispensable pre-condition for the victory of revolution in any country. We are proud that in the SUCI led by Com Shibdas Ghosh this personified and concretised form of collective leadership has emerged whereas the big so-called communist parties in our country, the CPI, the CPI(M) and the CPI(ML) have failed to achieve it. It should further be realised that this personified and concretised form of collective

leadership expressed through the leader of the party cannot be achieved by selecting or electing any leader; it emerges through the correct Marxist-Leninist process of building up a Communist Party. In the CPI, the CPI(M) and the CPI(ML) this personified and concretised form of collective leadership has not emerged; because, they have not followed the correct Marxist-Leninist process of building up a real Communist Party. As a result, in spite of the best intentions and great sacrifices by most of the ranks of these parties, these parties have failed to become real Communist Party; they are petty-bourgeois parties masquerading as Communist Party.

The CPI(M) leadership have referred to the "size" of the SUCI with a slant and called it a "group". There was no necessity of it. For, we ourselves know that the SUCI is a small party, compared to the CPI(M). So what? Do the CPI(M) leadership mean to imply by this remark that since the SUCI is a small party, it is not a working class revolutionary party, or its political line is not correct? If that is their point then they are absolutely wrong. Bigness or smallness of a party by itself is no criteria for judging whether that particular party is a working class revolutionary party or not. There are altogether different tests for that which we do not like to discuss here. It should be realised that at a given time a minority, a small party, may be correct while a majority, a big party, may be incorrect. History bears numerous instances of it and Marxism-Leninism also does not negate the possibility of it. Let us cite an instance of it. On Lenin's recognising the small Spartacus group led by Liebknecht, Kautsky, leader of the centrist section of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, organisationally many many times stronger

than the Spartacus group, opposed Lenin by saying that Liebknecht was alone and his Spartacus group had no following among the German working class. To this Lenin retorted: "If Liebknecht is alone then he alone represents socialism in Germany." Lenin did not judge the class character of a party by its size. If the CPI(M) leadership were then in Lenin's position, they would have certainly done just the reverse; they would have given recognition to Kautsky's party. Because its size was many many times bigger than that of the Spartacus group. So, it is naive to argue that since the SUCI is a very small party, it is not a working class revolutionary party.

Had the CPI(M) leadership unbiasedly thought over the question, they would have formed an absolutely different opinion about the SUCI. Twenty-five years ago when it was born, it had no international backing, with none of its leaders having national stature, with no financial resource and backing from the Press and so-called high-ups. Only a handful of young workers with little practical experience started the work of building up a real Communist Party in our country. At that time many a big leader of big parties prophesied its early death. But it has not died; on the contrary, it is steadily, though slowly, making a headway organisationally. It should not be forgotten that during these twenty-five years many of the parties which were many many times bigger than the SUCI at the time of its birth have gone into liquidation; some others have been reduced to splinter groups. Even the undivided CPI, next to the Congress in organisational strength then, with international backing, thousands of trained workers,

(Contd. to page 12)

State Committee Statement

(Contd. from page 1)

The State Committee from its meeting has called upon all its units to carry on campaigns on the burning problems of our people, for intensifying and strengthening the united struggle at any cost, keeping in mind the supreme importance and urgency, at this hour, of maintaining unity as also to expand the united movement, carry on the united struggle to its logical goal and side by side, strive hard for the emergence and establishment of an effective and correct revolutionary leadership over the united movement, the only guarantee to conduct the struggle in a correct way. To achieve this object, along with carrying on intensive united mass movements, extensive political and ideological struggle should be conducted maintaining a healthy atmosphere for such polemics, even on the face of provocations from any quarter, which alone can give clarity of thought, uplift the level of consciousness, ensure the pursuance of the correct line rectifying the past defects and shortcomings, and lead the united mass movements to success.

Central Committee Statement

(Contd. form page 1)

"The Central Committee, in this connection, reminds the people that legal views, legal system and legal institutions, which include the judiciary, are the superstructure of the economic base of society. This superstructure is created precisely to serve, consolidate and further strengthen the economic base. Ours being a capitalist society, the laws, legal system and legal institutions here are meant to serve, consolidate and further strengthen the existing capitalist set up in India. The dictum that in the eye of law every one is equal or that the judiciary is independent in the sense that it is supra-class is an illusion. It should be noted that High Courts and the Supreme Court have taken away many hard-won existing rights of our people.

"But nevertheless, in the interest of safeguarding whatever little democratic rights of the people now exist, the relative independence of the judiciary from interference by the executive and the ruling party must be protected. The plea of necessity of social change taken by the Government and the ruling party in support of their act of appointment of the Chief Justice is a lame excuse. Under no pretext, in parliamentary democracy, can the relative independence of the judiciary from interference by the executive and the ruling party be allowed to be eroded. For, erosion of this relative independence of the judiciary in parliamentary democracy will sound the death-knell of whatever little democratic rights of the people now exist and pave the way for rise of fascism.

"The Central Committee is fully aware of the fact that the ruling Congress party and its Government, by means of appointment of persons actively connected with the Congress politics as judges, promotion of judges on political consideration, distribution of favours to Congress-minded retired judges, including monetary benefits, etc., have been trying to establish "committed judiciary", which is another name of a judiciary "committed" to the Congress politics. The suggestion of seeking approval of Parliament in matters of appointment and promotion of judges, in the final analysis, means investing the ruling party with the power of appointment and promotion of judges. The remedy of anti-people, undemocratic acts by the judiciary lies not in giving more power to the executive and the ruling party but in creating public conscience and developing mass movements against such acts.

"The Central Committee, therefore, urges upon all democratically minded people to resist increasing attacks by the executive and the ruling party on the relative independence of the judiciary from interference by the executive and the ruling party under parliamentary democracy obtaining in our country."

SUCI Appeals to CPI(M) to Fight Blindness and Fanticism

(Contd. from page 11)

huge resources and backing by the Press and a large section of so-called high-ups, could not check disintegration. First it disintegrated into two parts—the present CPI and the CPI(M). But the process of disintegration did not stop there. The CPI(M) was further disintegrated, giving birth to the CPI(ML). The CPI(ML) also is now divided into various groups. At a time when all the big, well known parties are disintegrating, the SUCI is the only party which is not only not disintegrating but, on the contrary, expanding, though slowly. This is no mean achievement. If the CPI(M) leadership were unbiased they would have asked—how it is that when other parties including their own party, are disintegrating, the SUCI shows no sign of disintegration; they would not have chaffed at our size, rather they would have tried to look into the real reason behind it. It should be realised that the SUCI being a developing force (disintegration of the CPI, CPI(M) and the CPI(ML) confirms that they are a dying force), the future belongs to the SUCI.

Appeal To The CPI(M)

This article is meant not to offend or belittle the CPI(M) leadership. This is our reply to refute the false charges levelled against our Party by the CPI(M) leadership, an attempt to vindicate the correctness of

SUC Meeting in UP

Under the auspices of the SUCI a meeting was held at Badalapur College ground, UP. The meeting was presided over by Com. Jagadish Asthana Com. N.R Singh dealt on the stage of Indian revolution and showed that it was anti capitalist socialist revolution and called upon the people to strengthen the SUCI.

A resolution, moved by Com. Dinesh Kant Dubey,

our stand. Our country is now passing through dark days Fascism is raising its ugly head in all spheres of life. It must be resisted and totally and completely defeated. For that, unity of the left democratic parties and forces and united democratic mass struggles are indispensably necessary. Genuine interests of the unity of the left democratic parties and forces and united mass movements require correct mutual understanding among the left democratic parties. Blindness fanaticism philosophical intolerance and discouraging study of political views of other parties will not only jeopardise those interests but also provide greater opportunities to the reactionary forces to propagate reactionary views and ideas and expand their tentacles which will help more in the rise of fascism. We, therefore, appeal to the CPI(M) leadership to come forward, rise to the occasion and conduct struggles against blindness, fanaticism, philosophical intolerance discouraging study of political views of other parties among the ranks and supporters so that a proper atmosphere for conducting ideological struggle on correct norms without bias and rancour with the avowed aim of strengthening united struggles against the bourgeois class, the monopolists, main enemy of the people can be created.

Advocate and seconded by Shri Pal Dubey, Advocate, was unanimously adopted in the meeting. The resolution strongly condemned the imposition of levy on Kisans, suggested all out state trading in food grains including both the whole sale and retail trading and urged upon the people to fight against the anti-democratic, anti-people and the fascist policies of the ruling party.