

The Truth About CPM

A Critique of the Ideological-Political Line
of the Communist Party of India (Marxist)

by
Bhowani Sen

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

The Truth About CPM

A Critique of the Ideological-Political Line
of the Communist Party of India (Marxist)

by
Bhowani Sen

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

No. 1 : January 1972 (C 34)

Price : 50 Paise

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Why the Split? | 1 |
| How CPM Fulfilled "Historical Obligations" | 4 |
| Split in the Congress | 8 |
| The Programme of the CPI | 12 |
| Disruptive Role of the CPM | 20 |
| From Disruption to Terrorism | 24 |
| Anti-Internationalism | 27 |

The split in the Communist Party of India in 1964 was one of the most tragic events in this country in recent times. Many friends of the communist movement still regret the split.

But why did the party split? Why did 30 out of 110 members of the National Council of the Communist Party of India desert the party in 1964 and organise a rival party? They did so at a time when the 7th congress of the Communist Party of India was due and preparations for it were about to begin. Holding of the session in due time was delayed because many party members were in prison and those who remained out had to wait for their release.

It is true that there were serious political differences inside the party on many questions and the party congress was the sovereign body which alone could settle them through collective discussions and democratic decisions. Why the 30 members of the National Council did not wait for the verdict of the party congress?

These are the questions that must be answered on the basis of facts and realities in order to understand the true colour of the Communist Party of India (Marxist).

WHY THE SPLIT?

In November 1964, the splitters assembled in a convention at Tenali, convened by the 30 members of the National Council, dashing to the ground all norms of communist discipline and democratic centralism. The political resolution adopted by this convention advanced its own reasons for the split. Let us first examine them and make an objective estimate of the lamentable event of 1964.

In this resolution, they laid the blame squarely on the "Dange group" which is supposed to have tried to thrust upon the party principles of "class collaboration" and "revisionism"; the party was therefore said to have been weakened and "incapacitated to fulfil its historical obligations" and now "the Communist Party", the resolution declared, "was liberated" from their revisionist hold.

At the same time the resolution claimed that 60 per cent of the party members followed them with their liberated souls and were represented in the "convention". If that was so, why did the 60 per cent leave the party for fear of a minority, i.e. 40 per cent? How could the "Dange group" successfully thrust revisionism and class collaboration on the majority? And if the splitters had the support of the majority in the party, why could they not wait for the party congress in which they could test their views and their majority? Obviously the explanation they have advanced in the Tenali resolution gives no answer to these questions. It is easy to understand that they had advanced certain fake reasons in order to conceal the real ones.

It is obligatory on the splitters to answer some other questions too. Since when had the "Dange group" been foisting revisionism on them? The 6th party congress was held in Vijayawada in the year 1961. In that congress the political resolution was adopted unanimously after prolonged noisy debates; the general secretary as well as the National Council were elected unanimously. No "revisionism" was therefore thrust by anybody on anybody. After the death of Ajoy Ghosh, E. M. S. Namboodiripad became the general secretary and the Secretariat was reconstituted *unanimously* by the National Council. S. A. Dange was chosen as the chairman of the party unanimously and a new Secretariat was also elected unanimously. It shows that the Tenali resolution kept its readers in the dark as to what had forced them to leave the party, how the Marxist-Leninist principles were vitiated by the party leadership of which the splitters were at least equal, if not major, partners, according to their own choice. No answer to these questions has been given in the Tenali resolution which was nothing but a hoax.

Soon after the Tenali convention, they had their "7th congress" in 1964 at Calcutta. This congress is supposed to have been held after their liberation(!) from the "revisionist hold" of the CPI. What is their record about the restoration of principles of Marxism-Leninism in their party congress held in an atmosphere of freedom from every shade of revisionism? The proceedings of this congress reveal that they were unable to adopt any "ideological document" *for lack of common understanding* among themselves, and therefore no ideological discussion had taken place in that session. It was done subsequently, after a long lapse of time. This failure on the part of splitters' congress implied that they had left the party without any common ideological understanding, though they characterised their secession from the CPI as a *revolt against revisionism!*

The ideological debate which followed this first congress after the split showed that they had first revolted against the party without an ideology and then begun to discover their ideological platform.

As a matter of fact inside the undivided party before the split serious political differences did exist on the question of strategy and tactics of the Indian revolution but they did not prevent them from participating in common mass actions together with the rest, from marching towards the common goal jointly defined and defended. This was possible because they were committed to the ideological positions taken by the world communist meeting in 1960, whose statement was unanimously endorsed by the party as a whole. But this joint march became impossible for them during the years from 1962 to 1964 after military conflict between India and China had rudely shaken the entire party. The National Council declared China as the aggressor and called upon the party to play positive role for national defence while fighting against chauvinism. The leadership of the Communist Party of China called upon Indian "communists" either to overthrow the leadership of the party or leave it and form a separate party. The splitters in India had no hope that they would be able to carry out the first command because the story of 60 per cent party members

standing with them was sheer bluff. So they carried out the second command of the Maoist leadership, i.e. they left the party and started a rival one.

From this account, two historical truths emerge very clearly. Firstly, they were inspired to split the party at the command of the Maoist leadership of the Communist Party of China; secondly, the splitters were followed not by the majority, but a minority of party membership. Naturally, they could not wait till the party congress was held because they did not care for innerparty democracy.

They had no intention to submit to the majority in the party congress. It was therefore impossible for them to wait, rather the existence of a rival party had to be made a fait accompli before that. They had thus trampled under their feet the organisational principles of Marxism-Leninism. The historical parallel of their action is the split in the Russian Social Democratic Party in 1903 by the Menshevik revisionists who started a rival party against the party of Lenin.

Splittism introduced by the CPM into the communist movement in India following the footsteps of the Chinese Communist Party's leadership is the opposite of the Leninist principles of democratic centralism, according to which the minority must submit to the majority and lower organs of the party must submit to the higher organs. The anti-Leninist initiative the founders of the CPM had taken was subsequently followed up by certain "extremists" within the CPM and they started a rival group known as naxalites. The process of splitting did not stop there—the naxalites got divided into several groups, each claiming to be the pure Marxist-Leninist. The wheel of splittism thus continued to whirl even to the disadvantage of the CPM itself, which had given it the original start. As a result the common democratic moment led by the communists was a casualty.

HOW CPM FULFILLED "HISTORICAL OBLIGATIONS"

The CPM complained that the "revisionists" within the united party prevented them from fulfilling their "historical obligations". Let us see how they have fulfilled them after their "libe-

ration". In 1964, at the first congress of the CPM, they produced a programme. In this programme they characterised the present stage of the Indian revolution as people's democratic revolution, for which a people's democratic front has been proposed to be built up.

The Communist Party of India also adopted a programme at its 7th party congress in the same year. In this programme the present stage of the Indian revolution has been characterised as national democratic, for which a national democratic front has to be built up.

What is the difference between the two, which of them corresponds to reality, which one is really revolutionary, consistent with Marxist-Leninist analysis?

In order to understand the difference between the two programmatic slogans, it is necessary to point out, first of all, what is common between them. Both agree that the present stage of the Indian revolution is not a socialist one, but a stage preceding that. Both agree that the presocialist stage cannot be skipped over.

Both have come to the same conclusion that the alliance of workers and peasants constitutes the main strength of the revolution and the revolutionary front—the people's democratic front of the CPM as well as the national democratic front of the CPI.

There is also some agreement in the two programmes as to the role of the nonmonopoly section of the national bourgeoisie in the present stage of the revolution. Both agree that the present stage of the revolution is aimed at three enemies—foreign imperialism, Indian monopoly capital and the remnants of feudalism. The CPM programme clearly states that the nonmonopoly section of the national bourgeoisie can have a place in the people's democratic front. The CPI programme considers this section of the Indian bourgeoisie as a possible partner of the national democratic front.

So far the two programmes are almost identical but the agreement ends here, all the rest of the basic positions are fundamentally different.

According to the CPM programme the people's democratic

front must necessarily be led by the working class, or in other words acceptance of the leadership of the CPM is the *precondition* for forging the unity of the people's democratic front. Of course, the people's democratic front for people's democratic revolution by its very nature cannot but be led by the working class. But does the concrete situation in India justify the slogan? If it does, can working class leadership be synonymous with the leadership of the CPM?

According to the CPI programme the class alliance represented by the national democratic front is one in which the exclusive leadership of the bourgeoisie does not exist though the exclusive leadership of the working class has not yet been established. It will be led by "firm anti-imperialist, antifeudal, antimonopoly forces". In other words, the national democratic front will be initially led jointly by proletarian and certain nonproletarian classes, working class leadership will gradually grow through revolutionary experiences of the working people.

The CPM slanders this programme as a revisionist one.

But the united front—people's democratic or national democratic, whatever be the case—in which the nonmonopoly section of the Indian bourgeoisie has a place cannot be forged on the basis that exclusive working class leadership must be the precondition for it. Joint leadership of the firm anti-imperialist forces is the correct perspective because under Indian conditions as they exist today to assume that any section of the national bourgeoisie, even middle and small including the kulaks, can be brought under exclusive communist leadership, i.e. the leadership of the working class, is a sheer subjective wish devoid of any objective validity. The reality is that even a section of the working class itself is at present under the leadership of the same national bourgeoisie (nonmonopoly) which has a place in the democratic front and even the CPM does not deny the latter's partial positive role in the present stage of the revolution because, in spite of its dual role, its objective interests are anti-imperialist, antimonopoly and antifeudal. Communist and noncommunist joint leadership of all anti-imperialist, antimonopoly and antifeudal classes is therefore the correct perspective because, firstly, it corresponds to the real correla-

tion of class forces at the present historical stage of uniting all antimonopoly forces through which our country is passing. Secondly, working class leadership will grow only in course of struggle through the revolutionary experiences of the working people themselves.

The people's democratic front led by the working class, as advocated by the CPM, corresponds to that stage of the revolution in which the working class and the peasant masses stand in opposition to the bourgeoisie as a whole, because it is intertwined with the socialist revolution. But the CPM does not exclude the nonmonopoly section of the national bourgeoisie from the "people's democratic front". The conception that the nonmonopoly section of the national bourgeoisie can be brought under the leadership of the working class in the present Indian conditions is an opportunist one. When the Indian working class will be in a position to become the sole and absolute leader of the revolutionary front, it will not remain confined to the people's democratic or national democratic stage of the revolution, but become the socialist revolution itself.

But the CPM does not call it the socialist revolution; it calls it the presocialist democratic revolution, for the establishment of people's democracy. But the international communist movement has come to the conclusion, through the experiences of actual people's democratic revolutions, that people's democracy is a form of dictatorship of the proletariat. Does the CPM then aim at the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the immediate perspective? No, it does not. Because it does not characterise the present stage of the revolution as the socialist one. Its scheme of state structure, adopted by its central committee in November 1971, does not go beyond the most democratic bourgeois democracy, as it is silent on the question of property and also as the CPM decries noncapitalist path.

It therefore appears that the CPM is not clear as to whether the whole of the national bourgeoisie is reactionary or only the monopoly section against whom the rest of the national bourgeoisie is pitted. In other words, there is confusion of thought in its mind as to the real character of the present stage of the

Indian revolution, there is also confusion as to the class character of people's democracy itself. This explains the zigzags in its tactical line which caused the extremist revolt.

It is neither the socialist nor noncapitalist path that its people's democracy is supposed to follow. At the same time it is under the exclusive leadership of the working class, though the national bourgeoisie has a place in it.

SPLIT IN THE CONGRESS

CPM leaders' confusion about the specific character of the present stage of the Indian revolution leads them to the confusion about the objective significance of the split in the Indian National Congress, the ruling party of the national bourgeoisie. In their programme they have characterised the Indian state as bourgeois-landlord state led by the big bourgeoisie. Such a formulation implies that the whole of the bourgeoisie is considered the enemy of the people's democratic revolution. Such a formulation does not envisage any growing contradiction within the ranks of the national bourgeoisie (vide section 15 of the CPM programme). The alliance of the entire national bourgeoisie as a class with the feudal landlords under the leadership of the big bourgeoisie, who are collaborating with foreign imperialism, does not warrant any split within the ranks of the national bourgeoisie.

But in section 106 of the same programme, it is stipulated that the nonmonopoly section of the national bourgeoisie can go against the bourgeois-landlord state. So the possibility is said to exist for bringing this section of the national bourgeoisie inside the people's democratic front under the leadership of the working class. It is silent on the question as to why and how this possibility is affirmed, while section 15 automatically rules out, by implication, any serious contradiction within the ranks of the national bourgeoisie.

Actual concrete developments since independence do not substantiate either their section 15 or section 106. If the national bourgeoisie as a whole is in alliance with the feudal landlords, and if the state is a bourgeois-landlord

state, why and how does this state abolish the princely states and incorporate them into the Indian republic? How does it hit the landlords, even if only to curb feudalism, by imposing a ceiling on the landlords' land? A bourgeois-landlord state cannot but strengthen feudal landlordism. Again, if the alliance is under the leadership of the big bourgeoisie, how can the growing rift between the monopolies and the non-monopolies be explained? Certainly, the building up of the state sector is the means to curb the unhindered growth of the monopolies, despite all the limitations of the former. Unable to solve these anomalies the CPM virtually reduces section 106 as merely a formal paper statement. In actual practice it had been carrying on its tactical line as if section 15 alone matters. But then suddenly it was confronted with the fact that a section of the bourgeoisie and landlords—the right reactionaries—have been thrown out of the government, while the leadership of the state power is assumed by the other section of the national bourgeoisie. This also happens contrary to its assumption which takes it for granted that big-bourgeois-landlord alliance will retain the state power intact, while a section of the national bourgeoisie will go into the opposition. It is just the opposite that has happened in real life. Yet in the CPM's programmatic concept, the state is still a bourgeois-landlord state led by the big bourgeoisie.

So the CPM is unable to make a realistic assessment of the split within the Congress. The political resolution of the CPM central committee adopted in February 1970 explains that this split was the result of the crisis of capitalism. Quite correct. But it dared not go deeper into the concrete question as to what is the relation between the crisis of capitalism and the split within the Congress. Has there been a crack in the alliance between the national bourgeoisie and the landlords? Has the leadership of the big bourgeoisie over the alliance suffered in any way? Is there any split within the ranks of the national bourgeoisie? The answer given by the CPM is an unambiguous "No". The February 1970 resolution sharply attacks the Soviet propaganda media and the CPI just because they have

(i.e. the latter) characterised the split within the Congress as the reflection of a certain split (though incomplete) within the ranks of the national bourgeoisie. According to the CPM the unity of the national bourgeoisie remains intact, the two wings of the Congress represent two different tactical lines only to challenge the revolutionary forces. The Syndicate Congress seeks to suppress the people directly, while the Indira group wants to bring the people back to the fold of the bourgeois-landlord alliance and for this purpose it gives concessions to the people. But the state remains the same, i.e. "bourgeois-landlord state led by the big bourgeoisie". Can political confusion go any further? The same class remains unified (monopolies and nonmonopolies clung together) and pursues two opposite tactical lines through two different parties—the Syndicate Congress and the ruling Congress! Even with this piece of "dialectical" exercise, it cannot say and do not know how its section 106 of the programme has any bearing on the developing political situation; that is, how a section of the national bourgeoisie can be weaned away from the leadership of the big bourgeoisie and brought under the hegemony of the proletariat if in the midst of the acutest crisis of capitalism they can remain together under the hegemony of the big bourgeoisie.

The crisis of capitalism has only produced a juxtaposition of two opposite tactical lines on the part of the national bourgeoisie whose unity remains preserved. As if they diplomatically divide the Congress into two, as two platforms for the implementation of two tactical lines, for the fulfilment of the same aim.

If that is so, then according to the CPM's own analysis of the situation, the whole of the national bourgeoisie is the enemy of people's democratic revolution. That is the practical conclusion followed by the CPM though something else remains written in its programme adopted in 1964.

The correctness of a theory is verified through practice. Where does the formulation in section 15 of the CPM programme stand in the test of practice? It stipulates that the state is a bourgeois-landlord state led by the big bourgeoisie. Its political resolution adopted in February 1970 could not

altogether overlook the fact that after the split within the Congress, the ruling Congress initiated such radical legislative measures as the abolition of the privy purses, nationalisation of 14 big banks and amendments of the Constitution in order to remove the safeguards enjoyed by big property. So the resolution of February 1970 admits that the political resolution adopted by the central committee in April 1967 had underestimated the contradictions within the Congress. Yet it dares not draw proper conclusions, it continues to maintain that unity of the national bourgeoisie has remained intact and the state has remained in possession of bourgeois-landlord alliance "led by the big bourgeoisie". What has happened is simply a split in the Congress. The split has no other significance than that two different tactics are employed by the two Congresses respectively, by the same class and the same class alliance operating under the same leadership of the big bourgeoisie.

It means that the amendments of the Constitution, nationalisation of banks, abolition of the princely privy purses and privileges and even the Indo-Soviet treaty are trifles that do not count for much. It also means that the crisis of capitalism is not so deep as to split the national bourgeoisie. Obviously the CPM is caught between two irreconcilable alternatives. Either no section of the national bourgeoisie has any place in the people's democratic front or there is a deepening contradiction within the national bourgeoisie, between the monopolies and nonmonopolies, reflected in the split in the Congress and in the new progressive measures adopted by the Indira Gandhi government.

The CPM pursues the line of uniting the workers and poor peasants against the whole bourgeoisie under its leadership, i.e. the leadership of the working class as per CPM concept. In this class alliance, even the rich peasants must be excluded because they constitute a part of the national bourgeoisie.

This means that even the anti-imperialist role of any section of the national bourgeoisie is practically denied. Naturally it works out the strategy of the socialist revolution without taking account the actual concrete historical situation in India.

This line is fundamentally opposed to the line of the CPI and of the overwhelming majority of communist parties of the world.

But if this is the CPM line, how does it explain its political difference with the naxalites and Trotskyites? The strategy of an exclusively toilers' front in a democratic revolution is a Trotskyite concept which the naxalites have borrowed. The CPM expresses its difference from the naxalites only on the ground of the form of struggle and on no political-ideological ground. As a matter of fact it is the CPM which first smuggled individual terrorism into the left movement. In actual practice the CPM has been adopting the same terroristic form of struggle, though the naxalites outdid them. On closer examination it will be found that the political line of the CPM lacks the consistency of the naxalites. There is also a gulf between its programme on paper and in practice. It pragmatically follows the course of events. Its profound aim is to overthrow the ruling Congress from power and to dispel all illusions about its measures. But the majority of the measures taken by the government have been supported by it as they are progressive measures, while continuously accusing the CPI of trailing behind the Indira government and strengthening the illusion about it in the minds of the masses. It is opportunism par excellence!

THE PROGRAMME OF THE CPI

In contrast to the unreal and schematic analysis of the Congress made by the CPM, the Communist Party of India has made an objective estimate of the political situation in its programme even before the Congress split. The relevant passages can be summed as follows:

A rift is growing within the Indian national bourgeoisie, it is not a homogeneous class. Economic power is concentrated in the hands of a few monopoly families. Their growing grip over the national economy is coming into conflict not only with the working people but also with the nonmonopolist section of the national bourgeoisie. Though underdeveloped, capitalism

is in such a crisis that the contradiction is growing between imperialism, feudalism and the Indian monopolies on the one hand against the rest of the people on the other (vide *Programme* (1968), pp. 18, 19).

This is an objective estimate of the situation which fully explains the current events. The Congress has split because, under the impact of the deepening crisis of capitalism and growing discontent of the masses demanding a radical change, the class of the national bourgeoisie itself has split. The split is not yet complete. While the Syndicate Congress represents solely the bulk of the monopolies and feudal vested interests, the ruling Congress contains within it some elements of the monopolies and feudal interests as well as a big section of the democratic forces, i.e. workers, peasants and the nonmonopoly section of the national bourgeoisie. While both the Congresses are parties of the national bourgeoisie, the Syndicate contains right reaction. The ruling Congress has within it mixed forces including the nonmonopoly section of the national bourgeoisie.

The correctness of this analysis is corroborated by certain antiright steps, though many of them are halting and half-hearted, taken by the ruling Congress and the mass upsurge in favour of the latter in the midterm election to the parliament in 1971. Within the ruling Congress here are democratic-progressive forces as well as some right reactionaries. Hence anti-people measures are also frequently taken.

"The state in India", according to the CPI programme, "is the organ of the class rule of the bourgeoisie as a whole, in which the big bourgeoisie holds powerful influence. The class rule has strong links with the landlords."

The CPM has not arrived at this conclusion because it underestimates the contradictions within the national bourgeoisie, overlooks its dual role, exaggerates its class unity and shuts its eyes to the complex events. Its line of thinking is half dogmatic and half pragmatic. These two contradictory trends are so intertwined as to produce a complex of inconsistencies.

The CPI programme and all its political resolutions have taken full account of the fact that all sections of the national

bourgeoisie (and therefore both the Congresses) stand for the capitalist path of development, and none of them is able to resolve the crisis engulfing that very path. But the relative and limited anti-imperialist, antimonopoly and antifeudal role of the nonmonopoly bourgeoisie forces them very often to trail behind the democratic forces under the pressure of the militant democratic movement of the masses, notwithstanding their compromises with the reactionary vested interests. Failure of the CPM to recognise this complex reality drags it along the path of eclecticism and "left" opportunism. The selfcontradictory nature of this path is best illustrated by the CPM's attitude to the public sector.

There is no doubt that the public sector in India is the state-capitalist sector, and not at all a "socialist sector" as most of the congressmen imagine, because the state itself, which owns and manages this sector, is a bourgeois democratic state in which power belongs to the capitalist class. But according to the CPI programme this state sector has the potentiality of becoming a check against foreign capital and the private monopolies. Section 20 of the CPM programme also admits that it has somewhat reduced India's dependence on foreign capital but at the same time in section 25 it maintains that the big bourgeois leadership is preserving the exploitation of foreign capital. Unlike the CPI, the "Marxists" do not see the positive role of the public sector because the state, according to the CPM, is a bourgeois-landlord state led by the big bourgeoisie. In order to fit this characterisation of the Indian state with their evaluation of the state sector, they deliberately shut their eyes to the immense value of Indo-Soviet cooperation manifest in our public sector, taking India forward to economic independence, to the extent and as far as this cooperation is unhindered.

What are the facts? Since independence and up to 1965, the Soviet Union has helped India to build 40 large industries in the public sector—metallurgy, iron and steel, machinery for largescale industries, coal, petroleum and electrical goods. The Bhilai Iron and Steel Works has the capacity to produce every year one million tons of steel. Now it is being expanded to have a capacity to produce 2.5 million tons a year. Besides,

Bokaro will also produce steel. In the Ranchi complex, the plan is to produce annually 80,000 tons of heavy machinery. 45,000 tons of machines will be annually produced for the collieries. In Hardwar there is a factory with a capacity to produce machinery capable of generating 27 lakh kilowatts of electricity. In Rishikesh we are now producing antibiotics for which India was so long entirely dependent on foreign countries. The petroleum complex at Ankleswar can produce 2,300,000 tons of crude oil per year. All these are the products of Indo-Soviet cooperation.

What do these facts prove? They prove the contention of the CPI programme that the state sector in India can weaken the grip not only of foreign capital, but also to some extent of the Indian monopolies. They contribute to India's economic independence. If India's dependence on foreign capital is still very great and monopolies continue to dominate India's national economy, it is because the monopolies had a strong pull on the undivided Congress. The CPM wrongly characterises this "strong pull" as the leadership of the big bourgeoisie in the state, but "leadership of the big bourgeoisie" in the state cannot explain the nature of Indo-Soviet cooperation in our national economy. To imagine that Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation is possible under the leadership of the big bourgeoisie is to ascribe a progressive content to its role. As one-eyed "leftists", the CPM sees only one aspect of the reality, remaining totally blind to the other aspect.

After the split in the Congress, the ruling Congress has made further advance along the path of Indo-Soviet cooperation. The Indo-Soviet treaty is a new landmark of objective possibilities being opened for India's march towards economic independence. This treaty is an effective check against any foreign attack on India and now backed by this treaty India can boldly take steps to nationalise foreign capital without any fear of reprisals. An important material background has now been created in order to reorient India's economic plans in terms of genuine national needs, undeterred by checks and balances imposed on them as the natural corollary of dependence mainly on American aid.

The CPI has at the same time warned the people against compromising policies and antipeople measures of the government, calling upon them to fight ruthlessly against them. But the CPM ceaselessly carries on a vicious slander campaign against the CPI as the tail of the ruling Congress. It refuses to campaign for the Indo-Soviet treaty because it is of opinion that the treaty restricts India from helping the liberation struggle in Bangla Desh! It fails to see that by acting as a security against Yahya Khan's attack on India, it is objectively helpful to the liberation struggle in Bangla Desh. The military junta of Pakistan cannot crush the Mukti Bahini without militarily defeating India, and the Indo-Soviet treaty assures that India cannot be defeated.

Perhaps the CPM leaders are unable to appreciate the value of the Indo-Soviet treaty because it has been concluded with the "bourgeois-landlord government of India led by the big bourgeoisie". They stick to this formula so rigidly that they are unable to recognise the dual role of the national bourgeoisie, the existence of democratic forces inside the ruling Congress and the political distinction between the two Congresses; therefore they repeat like parrots the old dead slogan of an anti-Congress left front. The Communist Party of India maintains that in the existing situation the unity of the left and democratic forces cannot be forged by trying to build an anti-Congress front. The tactics of building such a front played some positive role only so long as the masses behind the Congress did not become so radicalised as to throw the right reactionary leaders like Morarji Desai and Atulya Ghosh out of the Congress.

The CPM ceaselessly campaigns against the Soviet Union through the press and the platform, denouncing even the Indo-Soviet treaty as detrimental to the interests of the liberation struggle of Bangla Desh. There was a significant similarity of this campaign with that of the Jana Sangh and other parties of the right and the reactionary press. It did so at a time when the ruling Congress and the Communist Party of India had been telling people that the Soviet Union and the treaty were the best defenders of the liberation struggle in Bangla Desh.

On 9 August 1971 the Indo-Soviet treaty was signed and Pakistan began the air bombing of Indian cities on 3 December as a prelude to declare its war of aggression against India. For these four months an imaginary harmful role of the USSR continued to haunt the minds of the CPM leaders. Between 5 and 14 December the Soviet Union thrice vetoed the American-Chinese sponsored resolution asking India to withdraw help to the Mukti Bahini of Bangla Desh. The CPM was obliged to come out with thanks to the Soviet Union (*Patriot*, 9 December 1971) and some criticism of Maoist China. Up to 4 December 1971 (vide *People's Democracy*, 4 December) they campaigned mainly for normalising India's relations with the Chinese People's Republic! Will the CPM now admit that their evaluation of the Indo-Soviet treaty was a big blunder?

Let us ask one more question. Are there many major issues on which the CPM did not support the ruling Congress? The nationalisation of the 14 banks, the amendments to the Constitution in a progressive direction, enactment for the abolition of privy purses of the ex-princes—on these issues the CPI and the CPM both were on the side of the Indira Gandhi government. Yet the CPM slanders the CPI as a tail of the ruling Congress because in the midterm election to the Lok Sabha the CPI directed its main blow against right reaction, while the central slogan of the CPM was to defeat the ruling Congress led by Indira Gandhi. Can the CPM deny that the direction of the main blow against the "grand alliance" for the defeat of right reaction was a revolutionary aim and that the masses responded enthusiastically to the joint call of the ruling Congress and the CPI? The CPM rather sailed in the same boat with the "grand alliance" of right reaction by directing the main blow against ruling Congress. The verdict of the electorate upheld the tactics of the CPI and exposed the hollowness of the CPM tactical line.

Do not the liberation of Bangla Desh where the Indian army playing the role of liberation together with the Bangla Desh Mukti Bahini and the recognition of independence of Bangla Desh by the government of India belie all the predictions of the CPM leaders?

They cannot advance any evidence of the CPI supporting the ruling Congress on a wrong issue or failing to fight any of its antipeople measures. The great land struggle of 1970 was led by the CPI and it was the biggest and most militant agrarian struggle in India after the achievement of national independence. The CPM kept aloof from this historic struggle and even slandered it as a phoney Gandhian satyagraha. Such examples can be multiplied. It will be enough to point out here that in the midterm general election to the Lok Sabha of 1971 the CPM indirectly supported the Syndicate (a right reactionary bourgeois party) at least in Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Andhra.

"Left" opportunism as the other side of right reformism is best illustrated by the stand taken by the CPM on the issue of relation between the constituent units of India and the central government. The CPM central committee has decided to amend its programme on this question and formulate that India should be a "voluntary union of nationalities" and therefore demand the right of selfdetermination of the nationalities, i.e. the constituent units of the Indian union. A member of its politbureau (Promode Das Gupta) was reported to have gone to the extent of making a public statement that each nationality in India must have the right to secede, but the report was subsequently contradicted. The position has been apparently modified in a resolution of the central committee published in its party organ *People's Democracy* of 28 November 1971. The resolution on the "State Structure of People's Democracy" states:

"The people's democratic India will be a voluntary union of the peoples of various nationalities of India. The Communist Party of India (Marxist) works for the preservation and promotion of the unity of the Indian union on the basis of real equality and autonomy for the different nationalities that inhabit the country, and to develop a democratic state structure as outlined below. It is opposed to all disruptive secessionist movements."

The resolution does not make it clear whether their conception of "voluntary union" includes the right of secession. According to Lenin's theory of selfdetermination of nationali-

ties, the right to secede is inalienable from "selfdetermination", while at the same time opposing "secessionism", i.e. actual secession irrespective of the concrete historical situation at a given time. The CPM resolution does not even say whether the "Indian nationalities" have any distinctive character so as to exclude the said right. Though they repudiate and pledge themselves to oppose all secessionist movements, yet the question remains unanswered because Leninism definitely isolates the question of actual secession (i.e. secessionist movement) from the right to secede.

In what sense is the Indian union a "voluntary" one? Voluntary union cannot but mean the coming together of the "nationalities" by consent and "consent" presupposes that they have a right to withhold or withdraw the consent. This means the right to secede. The suspicion that the CPM means it to be selfdetermination including the right of secession is strengthened by the speeches of many CPM leaders in which West Bengal has been characterised as a "colony of the centre". Oft-repeated slogans of "centre-state confrontation", "Indira-Yahya ek hai!" (India and Yahya are the same) etc. confirm the same suspicion.

The question is not whether it supports secession, but whether it advocates the right to secede as an inalienable content of the concept of India being a "voluntary union". Vagueness and ambiguity on this question can of course be explained by opportunist considerations for using "Aesopian language". Or it may be sheer confusion of thought due to its inability to understand the peculiar characteristic of Indian unity and the meaning of "voluntary union".

Historically the constituent units (i.e. the linguistic-cultural units) that compose India did not come together through the coercion by any one of these nationalities but all of them were first subjugated by British rulers and then put together under one administration. Since then the rise of the capitalist mode of production and the common struggle against British rule fused them together into common Indian nationhood. The most important historical basis for this fusion is a fairly common cultural heritage and a common psychological makeup in

the midst of diversity. Indian national development has therefore taken place along a dual course—the growth of separate linguistic-cultural entities side by side with a common history, common cultural setup and common psychological makeup. Unequal development under conditions of a capitalist mode of production has accentuated the dual process but the most outstanding development is India's common collective nationhood in course of long-drawn anti-imperialist struggles—struggles against foreign domination. After independence the monopolies discriminate in choosing their fields of investment in the interest of their search for maximum profit and the central government follows corresponding administrative policies. Thus regional differences and conflicts with the centre grow.

That is why the CPI programme stresses on "territorial integrity" of India and the "internal cohesion of our national life"; "at the state level, it will ensure wider powers and greater financial resources to the various states comprising the Indian union in the interest of their rapid economic and cultural development."

Obviously, the CPI programme does not artificially characterise India as a "voluntary union"—a concept from which "secessionism" may also follow. This confused position taken by the CPM actually contributes to the fissiparous tendencies obstructing India's national integration. It is actually designed for the purpose of utilising these tendencies.

DISRUPTIVE ROLE OF THE CPM

As a matter of fact the CPM programme based as it is on a wrong understanding of the "people's democratic revolution" is the source from which nothing but disruptive activities have followed. After having split the party the CPM leaders have split up every mass organisation in India—the All-India Trade Union Congress and the All-India Kisan Sabha being the most notable victims of their disruption.

These and other organisations like those of the youth, women, students, teachers, etc. had been built up in the course of a long period of militant struggles under the leadership of the Communist Party of India before the split. Up to

1946, the Indian National Congress was the main disruptor of mass movements and mass organisations. In 1947, after the achievement of national independence, it was the Congress wing of the All-India Trade Union Congress which split up this organ of working class unity and set up the Indian National Trade Union Congress. Afterwards each party of the left camp, other than the Communist Party, followed suit. Each of these parties contributed to the division of the working class along its party line. Yet the All-India Trade Union Congress had continued to survive and gather more and more strength.

In 1970, at a time when the situation began to become more favourable for the working class than ever before, when the Communist Party renewed the drive for trade union unity, the CPM leaders struck another severe blow against the All-India Trade Union Congress. They went out of the AITUC and set up a separate organisation called the "Centre of Indian Trade Unions" (CITU). What was the pretext for the split? They demanded of the AITUC that rival unions in the same trade, factory or office must be affiliated by changing its statutes accordingly. This was obviously a demand for giving sanction to rival unions and their mutual fights which could serve the interests of only the capitalists and deprive the AITUC of its character as a centre of fighting unity of the working class. Refusal of the AITUC to accept such an anti-working-class demand became the excuse for a split in the AITUC and they made it their target of attack as being "undemocratic", "bureaucratic", "authoritarian" and so on. The CPM was thus repeating the same arguments against the leadership of the AITUC as those advanced by the party of the bourgeoisie, i.e. the leadership of the Indian National Congress in 1947-48, notwithstanding the fact that the General Council of the AITUC had always been adopting resolutions and decisions on all questions on the basis of unanimity. And yet they went out of the AITUC and started a parallel organisation—the CITU.

Even before splitting the AITUC, they had split the All-India Kisan Sabha, the only national platform of the fighting peasants who had fought many a heroic struggle under its leadership as

in the years 1946, 1949, 1953, 1955, 1959 and so on. As distinct from the AITUC, the office and the main office-bearers of the AIKS remained in the hands of the CPM at the time of its split in 1963-64. What did they do to split this organisation? They arbitrarily set aside the validity of a number of provincial conferences and refused to accept membership enrolled by provincial organisations for the simple reason that they were led by the CPI. By virtue of their position as the majority in the central kisan council (though their majority was doubtful in the "All-India Kisan Committee" which was the higher organ), they adopted these steps through the CKC without even convening the AIKC meeting. In order to save the unity of the kisan sabha, the majority members of the AIKC had convened a requisition meeting of that body in accordance with the valid constitutional procedure. But the CPM members in the AIKC boycotted this meeting and started a parallel kisan sabha.

Following somewhat similar disruptive tactics the organisations of the teachers, students, youth and women were also split by the CPM. In any mass organisation in which the office and the office-bearers belonged to the CPM, they just arbitrarily pushed others out and in an organisation in which they were in a minority they themselves walked out and started a rival body. All this they did under the guise of fighting so-called revisionism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism!

Similarly the CPM completely disrupted left unity. In West Bengal the general election in 1957 was fought under the banner of a united left front. Mighty democratic struggles were fought by the masses on the call of this left united front. But in 1962, before the party was split, the united left front broke up because, after the Chinese military attack on India, the noncommunist left parties refused to remain together in a common front with the communists. Subsequently this unity was restored. But in 1967, on the eve of the general election, the CPM denounced the CPI as one of its main enemies along with the Congress and set up a separate front (the united left front—i.e. ULF) together with some left parties and groups which were ready to accept its domineering role. The CPI, the Bangla Congress and some other left parties were then forced

to set up a separate front, the people's united left front (i.e. the PULF) because they could not make the CPM sensible enough to give up its domineering attitude.

CPM leaders cannot give up their aim to liquidate other left parties for the simple reason that they want to replace the monopoly of Congress power by the monopoly of CPM power in West Bengal and Kerala, though they cannot do so in any other state in India or at the centre. Naturally they do not bother as to who rules the rest of India.

All the other parties constituting the two left fronts, including the CPI, directed their main blow against the Congress in order to throw it out of power. There could not therefore be any plea whatsoever for a separate front on the ground of any greater degree of anticongressism. Yet the CPM never ceased shouting that its difference with the CPI historically originated from the fact that the latter is always pro-Congress. The CPM manoeuvred to disrupt the unity of the left forces in the hope that it alone could come to power in West Bengal if only the CPI could be deprived of its electoral support.

So along with some other left groups it formed a separate front to fight the election of 1967 in West Bengal. What was the result? The two left fronts obtained almost equal number of seats (PULF getting one seat more than the CPM's ULF) and the two together constituted the majority in the West Bengal state legislature. This result proved that the electorate rejected the aims both of the Congress and CPM to rule over the state.

Naturally after the election the two left fronts came together on the initiative of the CPI to form the government and fight against the enemies of the people.

The next midterm election in West Bengal held in 1969 was also fought under a single united front composed of 14 parties and groups. The result was a tremendous victory for the united front and a shattering defeat for the Congress, which could win only 55 seats out of a total of 280, the rest going to the UF. A united front ministry was formed, rousing the hopes and enthusiasm of the people of West Bengal to an extraordinarily higher pitch.

But the CPM pursued such policies, tactics and activities as could not but disrupt the unity of the united front and bring about its downfall, not only from the ministry but also from the heart of the democratic movement. It used the administrative apparatus, taking advantage of its key positions in the ministry, to push out the other parties in the united front from important positions, to swamp the administrative apparatus and the educational institutions with unscrupulous men and women willing to serve the narrow sectarian interests of the CPM and forcibly to capture the mass organisations led by the CPI. In order to fulfil these aims "Marxists" went so far as to commit terroristic outrages (killing, burning and looting) against the members of the CPI and some other parties composing the united front. They carried it to such an extent that the chief minister Ajoy Mukherjee of the Bangla Congress lost his balance and resigned. That marked the end of the UF ministry and all the hopes and aspirations of the masses. Once more president's rule was imposed on West Bengal.

This disruptive policy of the CPM is quite consistent with its line of hegemonism, i.e. to dominate over others, in complete disregard of even the need for left unity against the capitalists and landlords.

From 1969 the campaign of terrorism launched mainly and mostly against the left partners of the united front in West Bengal, i.e. against the Communist Party of India, the Socialist Unity Centre, the Forward Bloc, the RCPI and the RSP, became another severe blow against the left movement in the whole of India at a time when the split in the Congress and the rightist bid for power presented a new danger before the entire left movement, as also an entirely new opportunity for political advance. But the CPM successfully paralysed the left forces all over the country by unleashing cruel and senseless acts of killing of leaders, cadres and supporters of the CPI and other left parties.

This heinous terrorism of the CPM in order to instal itself into the position of exclusive leadership of the mass democra-

tic movement follows from its crude understanding of people's democracy for which it is supposed to stand.

The only result of this sectarian-disruptive line has been that it boomeranged on the CPM itself. A section left the party with the same arguments as were used by the CPM to split the CPI, organised itself into what is known as the CPML or the naxalites. They launched a similar campaign of killing against the CPM. Mutual killing became the order of the day in West Bengal.

The situation became intolerable for the people in the state because all social norms receded into the background and anti-social criminals came at the top of the society as volunteer armies of the CPM and CPML in a large number of areas, even within the municipal limits of Calcutta and Howrah. The gangster elements began to rule many areas where any unknown youth coming from outside would get killed.

Even the police became partisans in these bloody feuds, generally taking the side of the CPM. The basis for this partisanship was created by its leaders when it was in the ministry and the police portfolio was in the hands of a CPM leader. The police in collusion with the CPM and together with armed criminals organised massacre of innocent people on a very large scale under the pretext of fighting the naxalite menace. Ultimately certain elements of the Congress appeared on the scene and began to use the same methods against the CPM and the naxalites. West Bengal was thus put to shame and the democratic movement in the whole of India suffered a setback. West Bengal, which was once the most advanced state in the country in respect of the left movement, was submerged in chaos and finally put under president's rule in 1971. But the massacre continued.

Such is the political consequence and the social product of the CPM policies.

The turn of events should make genuine communists inside the CPM to sit up and think afresh as to what is happening in life around them. Its supposed "anticongressism" is not weakening but strengthening the Congress after its split. A

government supposed to be "led by the big bourgeoisie" has been amending the Constitution in favour of progressive legislation. The struggle for the liberation of Bangla Desh is being aided to the extent of war of defence against Pakistani aggression, even by overcoming the political influence of American imperialism. Such is the action of the ruling party supposed to be reactionary! The historic Indo-Soviet treaty was signed by the ruling Congress and denounced by the reactionary "grand alliance". Yet the former is supposed to be of the same political character as the Syndicate and the Swatantra Party!

Let the CPM cadres think as to why the events in actual reality run counter to the political-ideological formulations of their party. If they are Marxists-Leninists, how can they afford to ignore the denunciation of anarchistic-terrorism by Marx, Engels and Lenin? Can they cite any incident in the history of the world communist movement when communists killed their fellow leftists or even political rivals? Can they distinguish between the Bakuninists and the CPM in respect of the forms of struggle? Even Bakuninists never killed Marxists whom they considered as nonrevolutionaries or even enemies of the communist revolution. Let them also ponder over the results achieved. Has the revolutionary democratic movement gathered strength as a result of their disruptive-terroristic policies? Has it not been faced with a crisis at a time when capitalism itself is in a crisis? Has the CPM been growing from strength to strength? Why are the mass organisations dominated by its party in a state of stagnation?

The rank and file of the CPM has to give serious consideration to these developments. Let them ask their leaders what they did when a similar crisis had overtaken the united Communist Party in 1949. How had they revived the sectarian-terroristic line of 1949? Even in 1949, rival leftists were neither killed nor even beaten up. The CPM in 1969 has beaten the record of the united CPI in 1949 in respect of sectarianism and terrorism.

It is even worse than that. In 1949 the CPI attacked and killed landlords and their agents; the CPM in 1969-71 has attacked and killed communists, naxalites and other leftists. In 1949, in Telengana and Kakdwip, terroristic violence was committed by

organising the masses against the landlords and the government. But in the years 1969-71 the CPM has taken recourse to individual terrorism by mobilising antisocial elements against political workers belonging to other left and democratic parties. In 1949 the Congress party in power had not yet begun its orientation towards the socialist world and it was not playing even a limited progressive role in the field of economic and social legislation. In 1969-71, after the split in the Congress, the ruling Congress has certainly ceased to be what the Congress was in 1949. The change is certainly not towards a more reactionary direction. Then on what ground can the CPM justify its programme of 1964 and its action during 1969-71? Is it not a line of "left" opportunism (i.e. leftism in words and opportunism in deeds) which the CPM follows?

ANTI-INTERNATIONALISM

The CPM's "left" opportunist line closely follows Maoist concepts on the major international issues. In the ideological resolution adopted by the CPM central committee in April 1968 the Maoist line of repudiation of peaceful coexistence, denial of any possibility of peaceful transition to socialism at any time anywhere in the world, refusal to understand the significance of a number of newly liberated states taking the noncapitalist path in the new epoch has been endorsed. The unanimously adopted line of the world communist meeting of 1960 and 1969 has been rejected by the CPM in the same way as the Communist Party of China has done.

None can deny, except the CPM, that the meeting of world communist and workers' parties held in 1969 was a great success of the efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and several other communist parties, including the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Communist Party of India, to restore the unity of the world communist movement. A joint statement was the product. The CPM denounced it.

A political resolution adopted by the CPM central committee slandered the meeting and the statement in the following words:

"...the document passed by the conference repeats the errors

and deviations that have plagued the world communist movement for the last ten years and adds a few more."

What are the "errors and deviations" in the opinion of the CPM "that have plagued the world communist movement for the last ten years"?

The fling is directed at the Moscow statement of 1960 unanimously adopted by the representatives of 81 communist and workers' parties, including the Communist Party of China. The "errors and deviations" referred to are the principles of peaceful coexistence, the possibility of preventing war, the new role of a section of the national bourgeoisie and other anti-imperialist forces in the newly liberated states, the new possibility of peaceful form of socialist revolution as one of the roads in a number of countries and so on. These have been decried by the CPM as "errors and deviations" that have plagued the world communist movement.

Let the CPM ponder over the two contrasts—the events in Indonesia and in Chile. In Indonesia the leadership of the Communist Party followed the line of the Chinese Communist Party. It was the line of armed insurrection and coups as the *only* road to socialism. The result was the victory of fascism and the massacre of hundreds of thousands of communists. In Chile the Communist Party followed the line of the world communist meeting of 1960 and the result is hailed even by Fidel Castro of Cuba. After the election of Allende as the president of Chile, the Communist Party of Chile along with other left and democratic parties is taking the country towards at least radical social and political reforms of the national democratic type in transition to socialism. History has been vindicating the Moscow statement of 1960, refuting the hysterical effusion of the Chinese communist leadership which are now echoed by the CPM.

It must be clarified that the Moscow statement of 1960 did not advocate "peaceful" path in all countries and at all times. It pointed out that in the new epoch, the Communist Party of a given country has to choose on the basis of an analysis of the concrete situation as to which path—the peaceful or the non-peaceful—is to be followed. Secondly, the "peaceful path" does

not mean the "constitutionalist" path, but a path of accentuated class struggles without civil war or armed insurrection.

The CPM and the Maoists distort this line of the Moscow statement of 1960 as the parliamentary path without class struggles.

What are the other "errors and deviations" added in the statement of 1969? The aforementioned CPM resolution enumerates them as follows:

"It registers no progress towards a correct and common understanding of the communist parties."

"It gives concessions to revisionism as a price for formal unity among those who attended the meeting."

In other words, because the Chinese Communist Party and some of its followers pursuing "left" opportunist nationalist lines refused to attend the conference, the joint statement of the majority of the communist parties of the world is neither correct nor a common understanding. By "concession to revisionism", the CPM means endorsement of the 1960 Moscow statement which was also signed by the undivided Communist Party of India and the Chinese Communist Party.

Who then is correct? Who is true to Marx and Lenin? The answer of the CPM is—the Communist Party of China. A statement issued by the CPM politbureau in May 1969 glorifies the June 1963 letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China written to the Central Committee of the CPSU, denouncing the entire political line of the world communist movement adopted in 1960 Moscow conference. The politbureau statement says, referring to that letter, "We still hold that this critique is essentially correct."

Does it not follow that on the fundamental questions of the world communist movement, the CPM follows the line of the Communist Party of China? Which line has been corroborated by history—the line of the world communist movement enunciated in 1960 Moscow statement or the Chinese line as incorporated in the June 1963 letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China? History has now corroborated that war can still be prevented or stopped. All the conspiracies

of the imperialist powers to initiate a war against the socialist world have failed. As regards peaceful coexistence—which the Chinese People's Republic embraces after its admission into the UNO—it had once been accepted by the Chinese leadership at the Bandung conference.

On the foreign policy pursued by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the CPM says: "It is appeasement of imperialism all along the line and objectively abetting it at every step." This strange and stupid statement occurs in the ideological resolution adopted by the CPM central committee in April 1968 after four years of innerparty discussion.

About the Chinese Communist Party, the same resolution says:

"It should be said that the Communist Party of China has rendered yeoman's service to the world working class and communist movement in fighting against this menace of revisionism and in defence of Marxism-Leninism."

This statement is a clear partisanship for the Chinese Communist Party's anti-Sovietism, despite the pompous claim that the CPM makes about its being neither for the CPSU nor for the Chinese Communist Party. Of course, it has expressed differences with the Chinese Communist Party on certain aspects of its assessment of the government of India. But on all fundamental questions of world outlook (world peace, peaceful coexistence, the new stage of the Soviet state as the people's state, etc.) the CPM is in the same camp as the Communist Party of China led by Mao Tse-tung.

The CPM leaders also claim that the majority of the communist parties of the world from the CPSU to the Communist Party of China are following either the right revisionist or the left dogmatic path. They have not yet spelt out which communist parties of the world have remained faithful to Marxism-Leninism. But they have made it clear that the CPM is pure Marxist-Leninist. Has the centre of the world communist movement, which is said to have shifted from Moscow to Peking in 1964, again shifted from Peking to Calcutta's Lake Place?

That seems to be the new claim from what has been stated in

the political resolution adopted by the CPM central committee in November 1971 (in the draft for their ninth congress). That resolution contains the following wonderful formulation:

"It is to be noted that not one socialist country has recognised the justness of the struggle for independence of the Bangla Desh people."

This was stated in the month of November. Only a month after that something has happened in the world which makes the CPM a laughingstock for the above pronouncement. Who has saved the liberation struggle of Bangla Desh from the American-Chinese official machinations by vetoing repeatedly the resolution they sponsored in the Security Council? When the CPM central committee adopted the abovementioned resolution, they possessed knowledge about Podgorny's letter to Yahya Khan, the Indo-Soviet treaty, several editorials in the *Pravda* and *Izvestia* supporting the struggle of the people of Bangla Desh. They knew that many socialist countries from the German Democratic Republic to the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia had expressed their emphatic condemnation of the military junta of Pakistan. All of them have been moving right from the beginning to prevent American intervention in favour of Yahya Khan.

Some more pieces showing the CPM's concern for "internationalism" can be quoted from the same political resolution of November 1971.

Section 24 of the resolution reads as follows:

"The deep political-ideological differences that persist in the international communist movement and the continued disunity and division in the world communist camp are having extremely harmful effects on the course of the world socialist revolution and its further advance. The adverse effects can be seen in a striking manner in a number of newly independent countries which are being depicted by a powerful section of the world socialist camp as countries which have either already put themselves on the path of noncapitalist development or are on the way to it. They lopsidedly extol the anti-imperialist role of the states, while totally ignoring or whitewashing their avowed anti-democratic and anticommunist policies at home."

The resolution refers to "Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Sudan, Algeria, Burma, Ghana, Indonesia" in the same breath as examples of those states whose anti-imperialist role is said to be "lopsidedly extolled" by a "powerful section of the world socialist camp". This generalisation contains within it the compressed essence of their whole political-ideological line.

Even a child knows that a counterrevolution had taken place and succeeded in Indonesia and Ghana. No socialist country has ever eulogised these two states after the counterrevolution as performing an anti-imperialist role or pursuing the noncapitalist path. On the contrary the ruling juntas in these states have been condemned.

But the anti-imperialist role of Egypt can hardly be exaggerated. This is true also of Syria and Iraq. These countries are certainly fighting against American-Israeli aggression. No socialist country has ever ignored the anticommunist policies pursued in these countries. As late as in July 1971 the representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Arab Socialist Union (Brezhnev and Sadat) issued a joint communique which contained an agreement to fight anticommunism in the following words:

"The two sides expressed their conviction that anticommunism does damage to the freedom aspirations and national interests of the peoples and should not be tolerated. It only serves the interests of the international imperialist and reactionary circles (*Peace, Freedom and Socialism*, September 1971).

This communique is a strong refutation of the slanderous accusation against them.

It is interesting to note how section 24, quoted above, runs counter to the section 19 of the same resolution. Section 19 applauds the "world socialist community" for "seriously undermining the positions of world capitalism, accelerating the forces of national liberation and social emancipation". Are the countries of the Middle East excluded from this review? If so, then what remains besides South Vietnam and North Korea?

As a matter of fact the CPM suffers from lack of comprehension of the complex realities of the newly liberated countries, because in its eagerness to repudiate the Communist Party

of the Soviet Union and many other communist parties as "revisionists" it tries to understand the world events from the sectarian angle of Maoism. Here is another specimen of this lack of comprehension; section 24 of the same resolution also contains the following passage:

"In Ceylon more than ten thousand youth who rose in revolt were butchered by Mrs Bandaranaike's government and sixteen thousand were being kept in detention camps. Yet the Soviet government rushed MIG planes and the Chinese government gave a huge loan."

This is out-maoing Mao. Everybody knows that in the last general election in Ceylon the united front of all left and democratic parties, including nationalists, communists and even the Trotskyite Sama Samaj Party, won a wonderful victory, defeating the proimperialist right reactionaries like Senanayake. The new progressive government of the left and democratic forces began to introduce social and economic reforms, but in a halting manner. It was unable to cope with the deepening economic crisis. So the discontented youth rose in an adventurist revolt, aided and abetted by the proimperialist right reactionaries in their own interests—they alone would have gained if the revolt had not been suppressed. The Bandaranaike government had not the strength to suppress it without the help of the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic. Both of them acted correctly in giving help to the Bandaranaike government in Ceylon.

Having ridiculed this suppression of the angry youth of Ceylon, how can the CPM justify its murder of naxalites in collusion with the police apparatus of the government supposed to be "led by the big bourgeoisie"?

The CPM leaders do not confine themselves to general international issues. They have also passed their verdict on the internal Soviet regime. According to them the most glaring evidence of the CPSU going the revisionist way is the "replacement of the dictatorship of the proletariat by people's state". The reference is to the Programme of the CPSU adopted at its 22nd congress. In this programme the present stage of the socialist society has been analysed in detail. In the course of

that analysis it has been stated that the exploiting classes in Soviet society have ceased to exist. Naturally, the state is no longer to be considered as the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is an organ of suppressing the bourgeoisie and the landlords. As these classes have ceased to exist the state has ceased to be the dictatorship of the proletariat; it has grown over to the people's state. This is natural in the period of transition from socialism to communism.

The CPM is also very angry because the Soviet state has introduced the economic policy of giving incentives to the workers. This "incentive" is supposed to be their means to revive capitalism! It is a strange piece of argument. The CPM leaders have lost the intelligence to distinguish between incentives to owners of private property and to the workers in socialised concerns.

All this reveals that the CPM leaders have abjured Marxism-Leninism, that they are gravitating towards a "left opportunist" position all along the line, ideologically, politically and practically. Their whole line of thinking is divorced from any objective appraisal of world developments. When they accuse the Soviet Union of revisionism because they give aid to the newly liberated nonsocialist countries, including India, it becomes clear that they follow the same line as the Maoists and have adopted an opportunist position vis-a-vis the world socialist camp. They sometimes criticise the Chinese Maoist leadership because the latter's analysis of the India government as the agent of American imperialism and its support to the military junta of Pakistan cannot be stomached even by them. But some of this demarcation is only formal because the CPM itself characterises the government of India as a bourgeois-landlord government led by the big bourgeoisie, which in its turn collaborates with imperialism. Is it really different from the Maoist position?

This variety of "Indian communism" adopted by the CPM against the world communist movement is a very slippery path leading straight into the camp of bourgeois nationalism from the "left" end. Let the CPM members ponder over these positions to which the leaders of their party have been leading them

if they want to restore their loyalty to Marxism-Leninism. Let them ponder over the question what the repudiation of the line of the world communist movement not only of 1969 but also of 1960 has to do with proletarian internationalism. If not only the CPI but the vast majority of the communist parties of the world, including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, have become revisionist, what future is there, in their opinion, for the immortal ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin? Is capitalism so powerful today as to corrupt almost the entire socialist camp, including the Soviet Union and the entire world communist movement?

The Communist Party of India may be taken to have committed many mistakes. But if it faithfully follows the general line of the world communist movement, if it has applied this line realistically under Indian conditions and if that line is so disastrously revisionist, then what future can India be expected to gain from the theoreticians of the CPM?

Let the members and sympathisers of the CPM ponder over the question: Has any event proved the correctness of the analysis made by the CPM? They were thinking that the Indian Constitution cannot be altered in the progressive direction without overthrowing the Congress from power, lock, stock and barrel, that Bangla Desh will never be recognised by Indira Gandhi. Some of their leaders had been propagating that there is no danger of war with Pakistan, that such a danger is being trumped up only to declare emergency for the purpose of suppressing the CPM; they even came to the conclusion that Indira government is almost as fascist as Yahya Khan regime. What has happened to these conclusions?

They condemn the CPI for supporting the ruling Congress on a number of occasions, on a number of issues and today they have committed themselves to support the war efforts of the Indira Gandhi government, which is supposed to be led by the big bourgeoisie!

Their whole programme is refuted by living reality. Their tactics lead them to blind alleys, as in Kerala and West Bengal. Their disruptive activity has harmed mostly the working class and the poor peasants. Is it not high time for the members of the

CPM to reconsider their entire line so faithfully followed by them at the behest of their leaders, pouring out anti-CPI and anti-Soviet poison all along the line? Whom do they help? The working people or right reaction? Where is the consistency between their theory and practice?

True, some of these questions may today be dismissed by their leaders as untrue, but their cadres know the truth. Even if these are set aside, their programme and political resolution are there in black and white. Let the CPM reexamine them in the light of real events!

(15 December 1971)



Some CPI Publications

COMMUNIST PARTY AND NAXALITES

by Pratap Mitra & Mohit Sen

Rs. 1.75



COMMUNISM AND THE NEW LEFT

by Mohit Sen

Re. 1.00



KERALA'S FIRST COMMUNIST

Life of 'Sakhavu' Krishna Pillai

by T. V. Krishnan

Rs. 2.00



MAKHDOOM

A Memoir

by Raj Bahadur Gour

40 Paise



WHAT IS THE COMMUNIST PARTY ?

by Avtar Singh Malhotra

Rs. 1.25

Please have your copy from

PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE (P) LTD.

Rani Jhansi Road

New Delhi 55

