

# VIEWS

748



/1950

NDER THE



BANNER

748

## LETTER TO FOREIGN COMRADES

13th January '50.

DEAR COMRADE.....

I am writing this very hurried note in a very disturbed emotional state (soon after the news of expulsion in the press).....

1. I would be dishonest if I did not warn you myself that I have not only been expelled but it is also being whispered in Party circles that I am being paid by Nehru, that I regularly pass on the information to the police and visit police Head Quarters. Comrades are being referred to the examples of Rajk and Kestov if they tend express any doubt.

The case against me is one of plain lies and unprincipled distortions. I demanded a Party trial and it was refused. I am going to appeal to the Control Commission and demand a Party trial again. It will of course be refused. I will send whatever documents I have on my own case to as many brother Parties as would let me get near them.

You have my pledge of honour that I will do nothing disruptive, nothing which I know to be unworthy of a Communist.

### 2. DOCUMENTS:

I am enclosing some printed and typed documents. I hope you have our Communist (Theoretical organ from Bombay). The important theoretical documents to understand the standpoint of the Party leadership are the following :-

- Party Thesis (passed by 2nd. Congress)
- Comrades Ranadive and Bhowani Sen's Reports to Party Congress (printed copies)
- On Peoples Democracy (Communist No. 1, 1949). Also separate pamphlet.
- On Agrarian Question do do
- Struggle against Revisionism Today (Communist No. 2)
- Struggle for Peoples Democracy and Socialism:  
some questions of Strategy and Tactics (part of the bigger

120 page cyclostyled document "Strategy and Tactics in the struggle for Peoples Democratic Revolution—Present Phase of our Revolution). Communist No. 4.

N.B. The above documents were endorsed in a Polit Bureau full session that lasted from Sept. to Dec. 1948.

- AITUC Report 1949.
- What is Happening in Hyderabad.
- The typed documents are translations from Bengali and Hindi originals. They are very important as being concrete application of the Polit Bureau line by 2 of its own leading members.....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

I will send some explanatory notes to the documents I am sending now and many more which I will send the next chance to help you follow references to names, incidents etc.

### 3. MY PAST MISTAKES:

Believe me when I say that in writing this I am not seeking either directly or indirectly a justification of my past mistakes. My acceptance of the same at the Second Party Congress (1948) was genuine and sincere. They arose from carrying forward the understanding of war-period to the post-war and led to typically Menshevik mistakes in the Indian context. It is for you all to judge how genuinely self-critical I have been by estimating the worth of my critical efforts in this note.

The central point that will strike you when you study our Party documents and policy is that we have made a swing from Right Reformism to Left sectarianism. The direction of change that we adopted at the Party Congress (Feb. '48) was correct, main slogans were correct. But the Party Thesis itself contains some over-simplified formulations which became the basis of a headlong drive towards crude Leftism the more we were provoked by unprecedented repression.

*The basis for this heart-rending tragedy is the theoretical backwardness of our Party including its leadership. The leadership that*

*acquiesced so long in the serious mistakes I made could not suddenly make a really correct turn without swinging to the other end of the pendulum. My mistakes were very similar to the Chinese during first United Front with KMT and present mistakes are very like those of Li Li San in the period following.*

### 1. SOME FACTS THAT CRY ALOUD

I will give you some facts that are public knowledge and tell their own tale. Contrast our understanding of the "ever mounting revolutionary upsurge" with the following:

We gave the call for an All-India Railwaymen's Strike on 9th March, 1949 and it was a complete fiasco, it remained a call on paper, unanswered by any section of Railwaymen, even our followers. Railways used to be our best organised unions and we claimed a majority of organised Railwaymen.

In June our comrades in Bengal Jails (including our well known T.U. leaders) went on hunger strike and were fired upon. We gave a call for general strike. Another flop. Bengal together with Tamilnad used to be our best organised Trade Union province.

We called upon Calcutta Corporation workers to strike for TU demands, again another failure (Sept. '49). Later the Indian National Trade Union Congress (INTUC) called a successful strike. We had to join up but the INTUC could successfully withdraw it after some concessions and our call for continuance failed.

In Nov. '49 we gave a call for All-Bengal Jute strike. Not one factory responded.

On 2nd January '50 we called for one day protest strike of the All-India Textile Workers. Our press claims 60 thousand struck in Bombay. [This was written on the basis of the first report in the CROSS ROADS. Subsequent issue of the paper gave the figure as 75,000.—P.C.J.] Semi-official News Agency gives the figure 1500, some Bombay dailies 4000. No strike in other textile centres. Textile together with Railway used to be our strongholds.

Madras Tram, our traditional base failed to respond to our strike call.

We have fought 2 bye-elections in Bengal and lost both to the



Practical failure on the mass front, specially fiasco of Railway strike speeds up the passage from sectarian deviation into pure and simple terrorism in the second half of 1949, with the masses holding aloof and Patel (Home Minister of the Govt. of India) happy with getting both documentary and factual evidence to "justify" belatedly his entire repressive policy against the Party.

*The international communist movement has passed in the last 2 years from Zhdanov's Report to Suslov's and Togliatti's Reports with the World Peace Congress and WFTU session thrown in, the rich experience of French and Italian Parties and the Chinese victory looming largest. There is nothing common between international communist policy and the understanding and practice of our Party. This stands self-proved both from party documents and facts in real life.*

## 2 SOME FUNDAMENTAL MISTAKES

Half of what our leadership writes are quotations from Lenin and Stalin, current international communist formulations are used profusely but if its own "specific contributions" are isolated and strung together they really constitute a departure from the international communist line, a sectarian revision of Lenin and Stalin's basic formulations.

### 1. POST-WAR WORLD

*In the Party Thesis (2nd Congress) itself the world situation is over-simplified and world revolution seen as "imminent" (p.5). This is a denial of Lenin's theory of uneven development of capitalism in various countries and hence the uneven development of the revolutionary wave. If the world revolution was "imminent" in Feb. '48 (P. Congress time) then Thorez's and Togliatti's policy has been reformist sabotage. We swore by Zhdanov but forgot the plain meaning of his clear words "consolidate the democratic forces", "disrupt" imperialist plans at every step etc.*

#### WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS:

In our documents we generally do not differentiate between the general crisis of capitalism and the post-war Economic crisis but use them as interchangeable terms. We use the word "collapse" loosely

(Party Thesis, Strategy and Tactics, and more so in agitational literature) instead of soberly studying the world Economic developments at least as much as they are featured in the international literature (in English) available to us and that would tell us that competent foreign comrades in the literature of brother Parties speak of "on coming crisis" "threatening" "deepening" crisis and not of an imminent collapse, which is only a sign of our sectarian wishful thinking.

### 2. POST 15 AUGUST INDIA

The problem is to determine precisely what has changed and what has not changed. There has been a lot of confusion in my own mind on this point and the same is sprawled all over our basic documents (Party Congress Thesis and later PB documents).

#### COLONIAL OR CAPITALIST?

*I think India has changed from a colony to a semi-colony over which Imperialist domination is no more exercised directly but indirectly which does not change but perpetuates the colonial status of our country but it does put the big bourgeoisie in a better bargaining position with imperialism.*

The two extremes are: India remains a colony as before (my old mistake) and India is developing into a capitalist country (present trend of formulations).

*The Party Thesis spoke of colonial order in India but in later Polit Bureau documents (Peoples Democracy and Strategy and Tactics) the formulation "capitalist order" crops up more and more and our agitational literature is based on it. This is forgetting that 50% of basic industries in India are controlled by the British and over 50% of Banking and Insurance capital. This is forgetting the mounting factual evidence that our Economic dependence on Britain has not lessened but increased by the policy of the Indian Government. This is forgetting that the Americans are not only probing, full-scale invasion of US capital has yet to come which will intensify the colonial nature of our Economy. It is no accident that we fail in our press to expose the effects of Marshall Plan in Capitalist Britain, France and Italy to ram home the devastating results that will follow from American "aid". The relative growth of the Indian bourgeoisie consumes up all our class hatred. This talk of "capitalist order" in India is very much like the*

old discredited decolonisation theory (VI Congress of the CI). If we see a capitalist order in India then how has Attlee not liberated us and why blame Nehru who pleads that Socialism cannot suddenly be introduced?

#### PUPPET STATE OR NATIONAL STATE?

The Party thesis rightly spoke of a satellite state.

Later Polit Bureau Documents modify the above formulation. In "Strategy and Tactics" we have "not merely a puppet state". "Peoples Democracy" speaks of "bourgeoisie having won its National state". Stalin defines National State (National and Colonial Question) as arising from the achievement of national self-determination. So Nehru and Patel have completed and not betrayed the National Revolution and we are called upon to go forward full blast to complete its remaining tasks and establish socialism? This is not being far-fetched. Our November Day 1948 Manifesto written while the Polit Bureau was in session and these new basic formulations were being made had the banner slogan "Forward to Socialism." Examples can be multiplied.

Which is the seed that could make a satellite state grow into National State? It is the formulation "sharing power", contained in the Party Thesis. The very concept of power is bourgeois-liberal, a variant of transfer of power idea of the national bourgeoisie.

#### NEHRU GOVERNMENT FASCIST?

The Party Thesis rightly spoke of Nehru Government being collaborationist, reactionary and anti-people, paving the way for fascism. "Strategy and Tactics" objected to "Fascist Government" but only as a matter of fact.

Later agitational documents have "fascist Government" but we have nowhere been told when and how such a decisive shift in the process has taken place.

Dimitrov at the VII World Congress warned against denouncing every reactionary government as fascist especially in face of growing repression for it breeds fatalism instead of a serious and sustained struggle to defend democratic liberties. This is just the mistake we have landed ourselves in. Zhdanov had spoken of the "process of

fascisation" and the latest Information Bureau Conference has not gone beyond it.

#### ROLE OF THE INDIAN BOURGEOISIE.

*Our Party Thesis is wrong when it characterizes the entire Indian bourgeoisie having gone collaborationist.*

Soon after the Party Congress Bolshevik (organ of the CPSU(B) had an article on India which virtually reviewed our Party Congress and positively corrected our mistaken formulations by making alternative formulations. It spoke of the big bourgeoisie as collaborationist. Since it had been painstakingly translated from the Russian it was cyclostyled and circulated among leading cadre, not even printed in the Party press and its formulations ignored.

Liu Shao-Chi's Internationalism and Nationalism was printed by Pravda, CPUSA CPGB etc., but we took no note of it, the para on India was reformist revisionism as per Marxism of our leadership.

R. Palme Dutt says big bourgeoisie in the last chapter of India Today (revised edition).

Suslov in his report to Hungarian meeting of Nine Parties Conference speaks of reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie. I am afraid it will be considered a casual careless formulation.

The importance of this factor is the following:

a) It gives an idea of the broad scope of the national democratic alliance that has to be forged by the Party:

b) Though today the bourgeoisie as a whole is politically behind the Nehru Government yet when the full blast of Economic crisis bursts and as American penetration deepens the middle and small bourgeoisie will see their illusions of aid from America through Nehru going up in smoke as the petty bourgeois employees are already seeing that the "national" government is only the means of satisfying the bosses and not their kind.

c) It should enable us to look out for the concrete forms in which the contradictions inside the bourgeois camp are growing, e.g., demand for and resistance to redemarcation of provincial boundaries and fully exploit them.

## THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

*The Party Congress emphasized the feudal character of our agrarian economy, called for anti-feudal struggle, and special emphasis on agricultural labourers who were being neglected.*

*The Polit Bureau in "On the Agrarian Question" made a radical departure—the peasant struggle not only anti-feudal but also anti-kulak. I think this is Titoite demagogy.*

There is no reason to change the traditional characterisation of Indian Agricultural Economy being semi-feudal with super imposition of capitalist relations.

"On the Agrarian Question" does not deny feudal remnants but creates the impression without stating it definitely as if capitalist relations now dominate Indian Agriculture and not feudal.

The arguments massed are no new discoveries but widely known facts e.g.,

- Commodity production that prevails is historically pre-capitalist production and the element that brings about the change from feudalism to capitalism but as long as land is owned by parasitic feudal lords and our industrial development is thwarted the essential semi-feudal land-relations do not change, the peasant is forced into commercial crops or selling his little surplus of food production only to pay his share of the dues to landlord usurer and the Government. The major part of food production by the mass of Indian peasants is for use except-kulaks and on landlord's personal [puz]
- The peasant economy being part of the capitalist market. Marx noted it as early as in the Manifesto.
- Growth of land in the hands of kulaks at one pole and of landless labourers at the other. This process is also old, it has been speeded up by war and post-war developments.

The decisive questions are:

- Is the National economy as a whole colonial or capitalist?
- who owns the main element in means of production, land? The feudal landlord or not?

- Is the method of production capitalist or primitive pre-capitalist?

The answers are obvious but these are just the questions neither posed nor answered.

It is important to note the growth of capitalist elements but quite another to suggest that capitalist relations dominate Indian Agriculture and thus seek to revise the classic Leninist strategy of the agrarian revolution in the democratic revolution: with the peasantry as a whole. The results of such efforts have been disastrous as I will show later.

## 3. NATURE OF OUR REVOLUTION

Our revolution is national democratic in the epoch of world socialist revolution.

*The Party Thesis spoke of national democratic revolution in some places, democratic revolution in others. In later publications "national" gets completely dropped under the sectarian out-look which loves sticking to the very phrases used by Lenin in his writings on the Russian Revolution forgetting that it is Leninist to note that Russia itself was an imperialist country while ours is a colonial country and Lenin repeatedly emphasised the importance of the national element in the revolution of a colonial country.*

### NATIONAL IN FORM:

The recoil from my past uncritical glorification of the national movement (which was really the outlook of bourgeois nationalism) has been such that you will come across the word national only in inverted commas or only as a sneer. The word patriot has become taboo in our agitation. Readers of our literature never find any appeals to national tradition nor a critical evaluation of the same, glorification and popularisation of its revolutionary democratic trends and exposure of the reactionary ones. The result is that we do not exploit the appeal of national sentiment; our most powerful ideological weapon against the treacherous bourgeoisie.

We talk of Nehru's sell-out to Anglo-US in general terms but do not run a campaign on the day to day moves through which Imperialist pressure is exercised e.g., the following:

We "forgot" to emphasise American inspiration behind the post-party congress repression against us though B. C. Roy (the Premier of Bengal) is Birla's man in Bengal and had come from the American tour just before the ban. Even our bourgeois daily press contained the news that the anti-communist drive was based on a memo on communist menace in India supplied by USA Embassy. How is this not as serious a mistake as the French Party's in not emphasising American hand in the expulsion of communists from the Government?

The police Intelligence Chief of the Government of India went to USA for contact and training and our Party press forgot to note the fact.

We read of the hot reception our Paris comrades gave General Bradley, yet we let Marshall Slim take the salute in parades of the Indian units and have a good time at our cost and do serious business with Indian GHQ unknown to our people.

The Commonwealth issue was an open issue for 2 years yet we ran no campaign against it even and let the situation drift.

There was no nation-wide campaign by the Party exposing the meaning of Nehru's visit to USA. Our omission has only strengthened the Imperialist and bourgeois effort to build Nehru's prestige anew.

The Colombo Conference is on in the back-ground of loss of China and with the main purpose of making India the main strategic base in Asia but we are not taking the issue to our people.

We read of the broad and mighty anti-Marshall plan campaign by our French and Italian comrades but it does not stir us to similar anti-Imperialist effort in our situation. Why? Because despite our "revolutionary" phrases the cry about the inevitable deal between Imperialism and the bourgeoisie only breeds the outlook of passivity ignoring the active role of the people.

#### DEMOCRATIC IN CONTENT

When the national movement was led by the bourgeoisie it made bourgeois nationalism the dominant outlook whose specific form in our country was to turn national sentiment into anti-foreign hatred rather than developing and deepening the democratic consciousness of our people.

We learnt at a tremendous cost to the movement what low level of consciousness means during the country wide communal riots but we have not yet drawn the necessary lessons.

We swing from a demagogic glorification of our people to pompous pity over their illusions.

*We ignore Lenin's teachings in "What is to be Done" on the role of consciousness and rely upon spontaneity. After the Party Congress we have given up agitation and propaganda over day to day issues. Sectarianism plus repression is forcing us to withdraw more and more into our own shell.*

After the bourgeois leadership swings to compromise with imperialism and feudalism the mantle of leading the people forward falls on the proletariat which implies the responsibility of going among all democratic classes, taking up the issues of each and also common issues as the only way of forging democratic unity under proletarian leadership. The catalogue of opportunities and issues missed will be endless. The narrow scope and appeal of our party press is damning enough.

#### INTERNATIONAL IN SCOPE

Since we have been looking out for world revolution to break out any day we have neglected our elementary international duty to tell our people how the two camps are shaping out in real life and failed in our duty from issue to issue.

*It is only in India that the CP ran no mass campaign of support to Soviet Peace proposals at UNO. The more we have neglected anti-imperialist exposures over concrete issues the more difficult we find to win support for anti-imperialist Soviet Peace policy and apathy reigns supreme, e.g., we failed to mobilise one single non-Party prominent public figure besides All India Trade Union Congress President for the All India Peace Conference.*

FSU instead of expanding its activity becomes narrower than before and is left alone to weaken much through repression.

You had one Spain in pre-war Europe. We have 4—Burma, Malaya, Viet-Nam, Indonesia—as our next door neighbours. We



have not even managed to keep a correspondent each in these countries, our press contains rare articles and we talk of revolution.

China was as much our own opportunity as Russian Revolution in post-world war I—was for the proletarian movement in Europe and yet instead of learning from it and popularising its programme and achievement we have distorted and misrepresented China because Mao's policy appeared to us reformist. I am afraid CPI is the only Communist Party in the world that has not published the common programme of PPC in its press. We did not raise the demand of recognition of Mao Government but left it to Nehru as too reformist a task for us. We saved our conscience by pledging to do better in our own country.

WE DENOUNCE BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM BUT WHERE DOES OUR OWN PRACTICE DIFFER, WE TALK OF PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM BUT WHERE IS ITS PRACTICE?

#### 4. REVOLUTIONARY SITUATION

*The self-critical document passed by Dec. 47.C.C. meeting as draft for the Party Congress contained the formulation of "revolutionary situation". I had to vote in opposition to it. In the Party Thesis for Party Congress the formulation was changed into "revolutionary period". I voted for it. After the Party Congress the earlier formulation came back in Party literature and was used indiscriminately with revolutionary period. In agitational and organisational documents of 1949 we have revolutionary situation.*

I think any comrade holding the present situation to be a revolutionary situation is not only unable to use the evidence of his own eyes and ears but guilty of repudiating Lenin's own definition of the same.

Of all our sectarian mistakes this has been the most disastrous for it has led to the adoption of tactics suited to an insurrectionary or semi-insurrectionary situation. The result has been that the masses have not responded to our calls and our comrades have landed themselves into the terrorist mire.

I do not know of the formulation about the revolutionary situation from a fundamental angle being challenged but the rank and file raised doubts about mass response and cadres about "practical diffi-

culties" but it was all considered remnant of Joshi's anti-struggle reformism. They were inspired into momentary enthusiasm through the demagogy of historical parallelism, the tactics of war-time European resistance quoted and the post-war examples of China given. I think this a "mechanical transplantation of the tactics of a different set-up, ignoring the "specific" situation facing our country. The differences are obvious and could be ignored at great peril.

#### 5. SOME ISSUES OF TACTICS

In the post-war situation the bourgeois leadership of India betrayed the revolution, compromised with Imperialism sowing gross illusions in the mass of the people, temporarily splitting and paralyzing the welling mass upsurge. The task before the Party was to carry forward the revolution by regrouping the national liberation forces, weaning them away from bourgeois leadership and bringing them under the leadership of the proletariat. Within the frame work of a sustained and dogged nation wide campaign to explain the real meaning of post-war British imperialist and American manoeuvres and the treachery of the bourgeois leadership, democratic liberties had to be expanded by bringing every section of the masses into action on the basis of their own daily immediate and most urgent demands. The more the Congress leadership discredited itself through failure to solve any problems and implement any one of its pledged democratic reforms the more the mass movement had to be developed and would have come under the leadership of the Party but only IF the Party could work out a concrete tactical line.

At the Party Congress we were promised by Comrade Ranadive in his speech that various Commissions would be appointed for working out tactical line. Nothing was done and repression came for which the leadership had not prepared despite all warnings.

Utmost confusion prevailed. Some units went headlong into mass action with "a Telengana in our own area" on their lips. Others just "lay low" waiting for lead from above. The phrases are not mine but of the units concerned.

For 8 months the PB did not meet and met to produce "Strategy and Tactics" which though it polemised against Azadgari raids, really laid the ideological basis for the tactics of raids in groups and for acid bulbs.

(a) Behind our present tactical understanding lie following traditional sectarian mistakes:

- The crisis is deepening, the bourgeoisie will be unable to solve any problem, the masses must respond to a "revolutionary" lead. This is reliance primarily upon spontaneity and underrating the role of subjective factor.
- From the reformist "without unity no struggle" to "struggle itself will build unity", instead of "unity for struggle" and correctly realising that a minimum degree of unity is needed for the struggle itself while struggle further broadens and heightens unity.
- Neglecting the importance of and fighting for day to day demands and putting either the very programme of peoples democratic revolution or similar basic demands under the double plea—the bourgeoisie in crisis can meet no demands and so why lower our basic demands, the masses are in a militant mood so why not try to achieve our maximum demand.

#### (b) DEMOCRATIC FRONT.

The Party Congress was right in rejecting the National Congress as the basis of National Front any more and advancing the slogan of a new Democratic Front.

After the Party Congress comrades wanted to know how to go about building Democratic Front. They were told that they have to go on struggling and struggling and it will grow and grow, like the Hindu Sanyasi meditating and meditating with a view to ultimately reaching self-realisation.

Any suggestions to give organisational form to DF were denounced as reformist.

After some time DF was just forgotten in the policy documents and manifestoes of the Party. It has become a half forgotten phrase today. Two years are gone by and we are away from and not nearer Democratic Front.

#### (c) T. U. FRONT

The weakening of our working class influence, smash up of our

TU, rise of the Socialists not only at the cost of the INTUC but also ours, 3 rival TU centres in almost every locality faces the Party with a situation like 1932-33 very difficult for foreign comrades to realise.

I have very little live knowledge of 2 years but from what I read in the papers and literature I have come to following provisional conclusions:

the Party leadership is pursuing an ultra left sectarian policy and does not appear to be even seriously studying WFTU organ and literature which should have taught it that basic general demands being also immediate demands in the post-war period is all wrong, that it is not enough to say that the crisis cannot be solved within the framework of capitalism but the task is to work out a concrete programme of demands and action that will immediately mitigate the effects of the crisis and put the burden on the bourgeoisie instead of the working class and fighting for which would enable the working class to turn the balance in its favour (WFTU memo on Economic Crisis).

We have risked the TU unity instead of defending it. Our splitting the TUC at Bombay over the election of a delegate to Geneva was a crazy mistake. We should have done everything to preserve unity at all costs, except basic principles and strike leadership.

We thought we will smash the socialists in the All India Railway mens Federation through Railway workers strike on our initiative (9 March 1948) and despite their opposition. The strike did not come off and we got expelled from the AIRF instead and have formed a rival Railway organisation. We dreamt of the prospect of power through All India Railway strike but woke to see the main aim of Socialist leadership succeed, elimination of Reds from AIRF.

We do not seem to be thinking and solving the problems of achieving TU unity in action nor the steps which we want the broad movement for TU unity to take except that we have to make approaches for unity of action from below, swing non-TUC workers through joint actions into our TUs and the All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC). This does not meet the demands of the situation at all.

It will be of immense help if WFTU could send a small competent delegation of Italian and French comrades to pass on their own experience and together with our TU leadership help to review the

position and chalk out a course of action that will get us out of our present slough and phrase-mongering.

Please note how much our central leadership has talked of "revolution" but not produced one serious self-critical review of the major strike action, not even a decent descriptive account. And in our organisational documents we rant about petty bourgeois degeneration in the past and glorify the proletarianisation of the Party in its present phase!

#### (d) PEASANT MOVEMENT

*Our present tactical line is, start with the most pressing demand to launch mass action and then seize land etc., as soon as possible and go forward to establishing liberated areas backed by guerillas.* This is certainly true of Bengal. Such an understanding led to such day-dreaming that last year (1947-48) we in Bengal were expecting a terrific peasant upsurge beginning with Tebhaga (share-croppers movement for 2/3 share instead of 1/3 share) leading to a liberated area in North Bengal. Even Tebhaga struggle on any serious scale did not take place. This year we are working for a liberated area in South Bengal. It is harvest time now (most of it over) and there has been no province-wide Tebhaga and serious struggle is confined to a few villages in the South and on them we hope to build our Southern Liberated Zone.

This line has led to the virtual liquidation of the Kisan (Peasant) movement. AITUC at least meets sometimes but the All India Kisan Sabha (peasant organisation) has not met even once in 2 years.

The tactical change I would suggest is direct action over most pressing and concrete demands and settling them when we get a good bargain to be able to regroup the forces for the next and bigger battle. Intensive campaign exposing pro-zamindar (landlord) policy of Congress ministries and demanding legislation on the basis of land to the tiller and no compensation to big landlords. Such a suggestion is considered reformism, sowing constitutional illusions instead of seeing that it is capitalising the mass movement into compelling the government to meet peasant demands and introduce as radical agrarian reforms as can be won on the strength of the peasant movement at the moment. It does not impress us that the Communist Parties of Italy and France are pursuing just such tactics with growing success.

#### (e) NATIVE STATES

Before the Party Congress the background was the following:

- (a) Working class and peasant movement had temporarily been paralysed and divided through country-wide riots.
- (b) But the popular rise that was an integral part of the anti-imperialist mass upsurge, demonstrations in connection with the trial of the Indian National Army men etc., working class strikes, Tebhaga (share-croppers movement) movement involving 60 lac peasants of Bengal (end of 1946 to the beginning of 1947) swept on from state to state, with Telengana occupying the centre of attention.

At the Party Congress revolutionary sentiments of the delegates were worked up to an intense subjective pitch by pointing out that the galloping growth of economic crisis will release mightier strike wave, greater and broader peasant risings and with our transforming every native state into Telengana, revolutionary seizure of power will come on the agenda during the coming months.

The Party Thesis correctly pointed out that the native states were the weakest link in the imperialist chain. But it was a sign of our own subjectivism that we failed to note that the peoples movement too was the weakest on this sector. How? The Prajamandals (Peoples' organisations started by Congressmen with ourselves mostly inside them or sympathetic towards them and functioning in UF relations) were based primarily on the urban petty bourgeoisie with the local rich merchants financing and supporting it, TUs only in the few states where there were any industries and organised by us but they were our youngest and hence politically weakest units, peasantry drawn into the movement only casually and irregularly when "direct action" against the Ruler was staged, no separate peasant organisations except in the few places we had begun to start.) A popular movement with such internal weakness had the strength of a popular elemental rising only as long as it was united, with the traditional bourgeois leadership standing for "struggle", and it was directed against the autocratic ruler.

After Patel's Bismarkian strategy, unification from above, began, the collapse of the States peoples movement in 1948 was as sudden as had been its rise in 1946-47.

We failed to note the change in popular temper and inside the hitherto united movement after the formation of Prajamandal or State Congress ministries and an increase rather than fall in Patel's prestige

as the "unifier of India", master strategist of a "bloodless revolution." We went on repeating the old general slogans of immediately leading the movement to mass uprising despite compromise and since the masses did not respond our efforts ended in impotent wordy denunciation of the traitors etc, and whatever TU and other bases we had were bloodily suppressed. We should have rapidly followed the tactic of regrouping the forces and the policy of re-education of the masses and broadening out with immediate demands rather than rising higher with insurrectionary slogans.

*Telengana (1946-48) and Bengal Tebhaga (share-croppers movement) (1946-47) have been two of the greatest revolutionary democratic achievements outside the proletarian actions in the entire life of the Party. Our leadership proudly gave the call in the open rally after the Party Congress for "making Telengana's path India's path". Did it give Telengana itself any of its serious attention as beehooded a Communist leadership? No. You will find it hard to believe but you can get a glimpse by reading the section on Telengana in the PB document "Strategy and Tactics" (cyclostyled and not printed extract in Communist No. 4). The PB collectively seems to have given it no attention throughout the whole of 1948, the most difficult period for our comrades to negotiate, with Razakars on armed offensive, Nizam intriguing with the British Tories for all he was worth defiantly challenging Nehru Govt., Hyderabad Congressmen terrorised and paralysed, the issue going to UNO and finally the march of the Indian army. Telengana was glorified but that was all, no serious solidarity campaign in the rest of the country, the local leadership seems to have been left to carry on as best as it could with just a pat on the back. These should not have been the ways of a Communist leadership for they are the ways of such petty bourgeois revolution-mongers, such arch bureaucrats whose idea of revolutionary leadership seems to have been to give the contract for the same to its local leadership.*

It was correct to carry on armed struggle in Telengana and defend it against the Razakars and seek to spread it through agrarian reforms and armed guerilla as far and as fast as possible. But we should have changed our tactics after the march of the Indian army and demanded the following:

(a) Establishment of a Provisional Government with 50% or so Communist representatives and in alliance with Left Congressmen from Swamji Ramanand (who occupied a centrist position) to his more active left lieutenants like Shroff, Bindu etc., who led the council of

action including nationalist and democratic muslims, eliminating all Nizamite politicians and pro-Nizam state congressmen headed by Ramchandra Rao.

(b) Election of a Constituent Assembly within 3 to 6 months on adult franchise to decide the fate of the Nizam, future of Hyderabad and if merger with neighbouring provinces decided upon, to negotiate details of draft constitution.

(c) No repression of Telengana and instead, recognition (de facto or de jure) of Peoples Committees as local authorities. Purge and trial of officials guilty of atrocities.

Guarantee and extension of democratic liberties.

(d) Status quo of Deshmukh (big feudal landlords) rule not to be restored in Telengana and instead peasants' hold on the gains registered till final Agrarian Law passed by the Constituent Assembly.

(e) Immediate ordinances giving peasants relief, security of tenure, taking over Nizams Sarfe Khas (vast private estate), lands of big feudal lords under supervision of local popular peasant organisations, Feudalists' legal power over land, peasants life etc., restricted.

(f) Pledge by the Congress leadership that it will co-operate with us in introducing a Land Bill in conformity with its own pledge (it was progressive). Encouraging peasant initiative from below.

(g) Economic Relief to workers and guarantee of TU rights.

(h) Calling upon the entire people to form elected local committees to supervise anti-blackmarket measures, implement economic (food, cloth etc.) controls, prosecution of officials guilty of atrocities, organisation of communal peace and rehabilitation of refugees and help prepare for the elections.

I think the above line would be a concrete application of Lenin's teaching on the Provisional Government (two Tactics).

Telengana, however, was called upon by the Party leadership to carry on as before, more doggedly, more defiantly. You can imagine what followed by picturing to yourself what would have happened to the Party in France if the French Party had called upon the partisans after the landing of Anglo-US armies to carry on as before because Anglo-US were imperialists and in fact more dangerous because fascist army had already been smashed by the Red Army itself, but the Anglo-US army was the armed might landing on French soil and of the new pretenders to world domination.

When Telengana could not carry on and comrades asked questions they were told what does it matter if we fail we have set an example of armed struggle, land distribution through peasant committees, establishment of Peoples Democratic Power. It never strikes our leadership that today responsible communists go out to lead better than merely set an example and let the enemy cut our throat as part of the game.

The Commune set the example and could do no better because there was no CPF then. The grand-children of the Communards led and organised by CPF are out not only to repeat the example of the Commune but realise it in life and victoriously. But the argument of "setting an example" goes down among our cadres because the argument is part of our national psychology, both Congress and terrorist leaders made the argument so popular in our national life. That piece of bourgeois demagoguery has become our stock-in-trade now to cover up political bankruptcy.

We have forgotten all our bragging about Telengana as suddenly as we began it. We expected Telengana to spread throughout India and now we live to see it being squeezed to death and remain cold-bloodedly unconcerned. For a year the party press does not even contain any news of Telengana and nobody except the top knows what is happening there. Could political irresponsibility be more criminal, and our leadership more callous?

## 6. INNER PARTY SITUATION

When you see for yourself how infantile are our ideological lapses, how blindly we have degenerated into pursuing the tactic of individual and group terrorism instead of going in for elementary self-criticism when evidence began mounting up of working class itself not responding to our practical lead and our strike calls turning out disgraceful fiascos, it would not be very difficult for you to realise what must have happened to our inner party life. Reality is worse than anyone can imagine. The Party has ceased to function as an organisation. Every single organisational principle of the Party has been done to death in cold blood.

I recall very often Dimitrov's warnings as well as directive slogans at the VII World Congress to help the Communist Parties get out of sectarian ways and into the masses. Our present fate is what happens to a C.P. which deliberately set out to defy them.

## MARXIST EDUCATION

*The new party leadership talked loud and passionately and with every justification against neglect of Marxist education by me but except paying lip service to Marxism it has done no better itself and in fact gone worse. It has not even published study-courses on elements of Marxism. It failed to produce even a study syllabus on Party Thesis. It has failed to produce even material for self-study groups. Like the hypocritical and proud Brahmin Pandit of our decadent past it does not take pride in teaching the classics it claims to hold as sacred truths and only uses Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin's quotations as bricks to hurl at the head of comrades who express some criticism or who also try to imitate it by buttressing their arguments with quotations. It claims a monopoly of Marxist expression inside the Party, to whom the disciples must listen reverently and not attempt to argue back and never themselves attempt to say: "But Marx, Lenin and Stalin said this or that". (PB Letter to Bihar is an example)*

## COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP

The first and foremost task of the new leadership was to become and function as a united and collective leadership. For the first time in the life of the Party the great majority of the PB, CC, PC members had managed to escape arrest and were available for popularising and carrying out the new policy. But the principle of collective leadership cannot obviously be observed when the decisive part of the Central leadership itself turns out to be so crudely sectarian and its practical policy could only be carried out by the General Secretary by himself or in consultation with a few PBMs functioning for the whole PB and even the CC. The PB did not meet for 8 months after the Party Congress. There is no concrete evidence of its having met again after last Sep-Dec. 1948 e.g., in the shape of new policy statement. There is a rumour that during 49 and an enlarged CC Plenum meeting was held where there were some differences whether Calcutta was not going too Left but they were ironed out and the present line re-endorsed. I do not vouch for the rumour. It is one of the numerous gossips that is going round the party circles. Some CC members are reported to have been suspended for Right deviations on the one hand and moral lapses on the other.

*PCs are being reshuffled in an unprincipled manner by a fiat from above. The majority of PCs have been "reorganised" from top.*

Reading of the great concern of the PB against Right Reformist deviation one would have thought after reading "Strategy and Tactics" (cyclo-copy) that the political mistakes of Andhra PC Sectt. led by two junior PB members were far more serious than of the Bengal P.C. which was dissolved by the P.B. The real reason was that Andhras are a united team and the P.B. dare not do any monkey tricks with them while Bengal P.C. asked questions and was not servile enough to the PBMs attached to it. Bengal PBMs were themselves draftsmen of the main political and TU documents of the Bengal PC and responsible for its activities, and instead of them being removed from PB and PC for "reformism" it is the rest of the PCMs who are victimised.

The technique of dissolving and reorganising party committees is following. First, a whisper campaign is started against the "disloyal" Party comrades from top, then a large number of cadres who are critical are just "dropped", not called to Party meeting, comrades are individually met and taken into confidence and then with the help of a section of the leadership a "self-critical report" is produced nailing down the sins of the old leadership and calling for a new leadership, it is placed not before a local Party conference as demanded by the Party Constitution but before an arbitrarily fixed Conference of active elements (no principles are followed in determining who are to be called active). It is called upon to elect or suggest a new leadership.

*Meeting of units are called or banned by the organiser sent from above. Comrades are encouraged to spy on each other and whoever is supposed to be critical or not enthusiastic enough about the new leadership are quietly "dropped" from party meetings, secretly slandered and provoked to make irresponsible remarks or just forced into passivity.*

*Comrades are expelled without charges being communicated to them and I know of Comrades who have not even been informed of their expulsion.*

*If some comrades or some units take a determined stand and stand up for their rights they are "purged".*

The organisational ways of our leadership are not communist but Titoite ways. I request you to read over P.B. letter to Behar. It is written in the singular but at the end "PB" appears, there is not even the sense of propriety to make it "for the P.B." Is the outlook revealed that of

a disciple of Lenin-Stalin worthy enough to be a national spokesman of our Party or of one who out-Titos Tito? Is this the way a national Party leader talks to his provincial leaders or the way the British Managing Director talks to his Indian clerks in Calcutta? (The clerk comrade who typed the document says that even the sabs are more considerate when they talk to them these days.) It is not slip, our Party leadership is so proud of this document, thinks it embodies such Bolshevik wisdom that it will benefit all, and hence it ordered its circulation even to the ordinary rank and file and a copy fell into my hands!

### PARTY PRESS

*It is unreadable jargonous, arguments so involved that even cadres do not read its urgently recommended "basic" articles at one sitting. It features our own activities exclusively especially when there is something to boost. Readers have long given up hope of expecting leading articles on burning current problems for they know that articles will not appear on what is happening in real life but on any subject which in the whim of our Party leadership is important and over which it decides to make its "authoritative" pronouncement. Our press contains unpardonable exaggeration of facts e.g., All India Peace Conference, Calcutta as 2 lac attendance according to Central organ and 1 lac according to Comrade B.T. Randive's greetings to Calcutta ranks, and Left circles in Calcutta are chuckling over different Communist organs exposing each others "facts". It is said that the delegates were told to report back 2 lacs but then it was found that no non-party Calcutta reader could be made to swallow more than one lac, the reality was 30 to 35 thousand and not more and it is a proud figure because of repression. It is no wonder that its circulation has reached unbelievably low level. Pamphleteering by the Central leadership has almost ceased. Publishing activity has rapidly diminished.*

### MASS WORK

It is not just the methods of party leadership become ways of leading the mass organisations under a sectarian outlook but the worst form of this disease.

*No attempt whatsoever has been made to face up to and solve the problems of agitation, day to day organisation, relation between illegal and open work under conditions of repression. All mass or-*

organisations have been without much real concern liquidated as mass organisations. Their offices are merely places where the UG office sends instructions to ranks, to carry out under pain of expulsion. Such a conspiratorial atmosphere prevails inside them that a non-party rank and filer neither likes to nor is encouraged to visit them.

*The legality of the press and mass organisations is recklessly risked, safety of legal cadres never given a thought.*

The blunt fact must be faced that there are no such things as functioning mass organisations under the leadership of the party and neither the approach nor the style of work pursued by party leadership can ever lead to rebuilding them. Some organisations have an honoured tradition behind them and hence their names count. That is all.

*Titote conceit instead of Bolshevik self-criticism. The Principle of criticism and self-criticism is repeated ad nauseam only as a cover for hurling bureaucratic curses at units or cadres. The leadership demands self-criticism from others but never practices it, never applies the principle to itself. It demands self-critical report from units or cadres it wants to cashier but has not produced one of its own writings and activities!*

*In its own ignorant conceit it slanders the entire past of the Party. The Party Congress came to the conclusion that the war policy of the Party was correct and led to the growth of its mass influence and unprecedented rise in membership but in carrying out a sound policy we made some mistakes. The reformist mistakes became general reformist deviation in the post-war period in failing to make a radical turn corresponding to the new period (1946-47). In the P.B. document "Struggle against Revisionism" (Communist No. 2) reformist mistakes become the reformist period, in some documents, of 8, 10 or even 15 years! It never strikes the leadership that if the party was most of its life sunk in reformism how was it Communist Party at all, how did it manage to survive and grow etc. I am not here commenting on the contents of the article, every conceivable item that could rightly or wrongly be associated with my name has been catalogued, but the biggest revisionism we perpetrated was on Pakistan (comrade Adhikari) and extending the principles of separatism to untouchables as well (comrade Randive). They are just "forgotten" among the deviations of the past. How is this intellectual honesty?*

*Party past is being taught in a manner as to blacken the party tradition, destroy the pride of the ranks in the organisation to which they belong. When the present mistakes are found out and authoritatively placed before the ranks the spontaneous reaction will be—our Party leaders seem to have done nothing but make mistakes after mistakes and they have ruined our young lives, did we work so hard only to jump from deviation to deviation, where is the guarantee that the Party is again making the right turn. Is it worth carrying on? Signs of cynicism are already widespread. Slanderees of party heritage are making even the tasks of the future difficult by the way they are corrupting the minds of cadres today.*

*It is not only that party tradition of our own country alone is being blemished. The policy and leadership of our brother parties is being slandered in a manner non-party Bohemian intellectuals do. Cadres were systematically taught not to respect any name but four Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. After them consideration had to be paid to the views of Zhdanov and Tito, who alone together with our new leadership had grasped the nature of problems of the post-war world correctly. Comrade Thorez's report after the Nine Parties Conference about the mistakes of the past was interpreted as evidence of having made only half turn and not full, why did he not frankly own up that going inside the Government together with De Gaulle was itself a constitutional illusion. When he did not take forward the 1947 general strike to seizure of power it was shocking evidence of the fact that the French Party needed a thorough shaking up.*

*R. Palme Dutt is characterised as a congenital social-democrat. Harry Pollitt, a pish shadow of the Chartists and not a Bolshevik.*

*Victories of the PLA was welcome heroism by the Chinese toilers but Mao's New Democracy was reeking with reformism and the Chinese Revolution would not be consolidated and directed towards socialism unless its leadership revised its views or was made to revise them.*

When I heard such irresponsible remarks being made by younger CCs in Central Editorial cells during preparatory discussions for Party Congress I got more than worried and went up to the room of Comrade Randive. I was told that my servile respect toward foreign comrades was the reverse side of my bourgeois nationalism and that my eyes will open when I find that the whole pack of reformists who got control of different Communist Parties after the dissolution of the Comintern has got the sack.

If the Party leadership ever says that I am manufacturing stories there is their own authoritative document passed after a 3 months long meeting—"Strategy and Tactics" (Communist No. 4) If Mao has to be taught "elementary Marxism", if his views are "reactionary and counter-revolutionary" leading to "promoting the rule of Chiangs clique then the hope of Imperialists of Mao turning Tiao also becomes the fear of our leadership. Extremes meet.

*This violent anti-party slandering of leaders of brother parties has had a disastrous effect on the mind of our cadres, it has made them cynical, non-serious, speculating who is going to get the sack next.*

*It is only a Party leadership that is concealed beyond redemption which would indulge in defiling the heritage of its own party and display Titoite attitude towards brother parties.*

With such anti-party ways of our Party leadership the condition of the Party as a whole can be imagined:

— It has become a ghost of its former self, the Right openly expresses contempt and not fear, the Socialists and other Lefts sneer in a superior manner and make our ranks feel small.

— Regular contact with the masses is broken. Small squads of student comrades in their teens, guided by a fanatical underground organiser, and with sometimes a lad or two from working class thrown in, are sent out when a strike call is given or a meeting is possible.

— Every comrade is full of questions inside himself, about lack of response from the masses, problems of policy etc., but dare not speak out his mind for fear of expulsion; spirit of comradeship considered petty bourgeois "softness". Frankness, mutual trust towards all the comrades of ones own locality has been replaced by comrades talking in whispers inside small coterries, inside which to it is not considered wise to be very frank "for one does not know what may happen when and who turns which way."

— Month after month membership has become less and less active till today a tiny percentage is in action.

— Passivity, frustration, demoralisation constitute inner party morale.

— Loyalty alone holds the party together.

It is heart-breaking to see what has happened to the Party.

*But despite everything elements of hope remain as strong as they are in every C.P.*

— Devotion of the comrades, despite the sagging morale, to the great cause of communism remains untarnished however their minds have been confused by the phrase-mongering of our leadership.

— Loyalty to the Party remains absolute. It is loyalty to the organisation and not to any individual. The new leadership has been unable to build any credit for itself, it is followed primarily because it is the Party leadership.

Because of the low ideological level of the party as a whole and the threat of expulsion hanging like Democles Sword over individuals and the arbitrary disbandment of party units who are considered to be "unreliable", serious questioning of Party policy on the basis of principles, the demand for serious political and organisational self-criticism of the political policy and organisational practice of our Party leadership will NOT come from inside our own party or may take time when every month counts.

In the beginning individual comrades and units expressed themselves and because of their own lack of Marxist education either expressed themselves in too Right of too Left terms. The leadership caught on all their weak points and dealt with them in a manner. (Bihar letter is not an isolated but typical example) that the comrades and units have stopped expressing themselves. "I will not think, I will not speak, it is just no use, I will carry out whatever instructions are given to me", were the words just one year back of a member of Beagal PC Secretariat, whose record of loyalty to the Party, devoted work in building up the party organisation in Calcutta and Bengal is unanimously accepted. And he has expressed the mind of the best of the old functionaries of the Party.

*Therefore, brothers, it is you from abroad who have to act and act quick. Imperialist counter-revolution is intervening on a planned basis and manoeuvring fast contacting and regrouping all the revolutionary forces of our country. International communism must intervene as determinedly and make it as quickly as you can. Victory of Chinese Communists is the glory of world Communism. The collapse of Indian Communists its shame. Help us to see our crime, lend us the hand of comradeship, discharge your international duty towards us and the scales of ignorance (result of colonial backwardness) will*



*fall from our eyes, we will face up to the problem that instead of consolidating we have been liquidating the forces of our revolution and since we are sincere and loyal communists we will accept our mistakes when they are authoritatively pointed out to us and struggle our hardest to correct them and get in step with International Communism.*

I will be sending copies of this letter to as many brother Parties as I can reach and of course immediately submit it to the CC here.

With respectful greetings.

(Sd.) P. C. Joshi.

P.S.

Please expect many more documents from me.....I can document not only every word of what I have written above but much more.

## NEXT VOLUME

Important Feature by—

P. C. JOSHI

### WHOM DOES THE TITOITE CAP FIT?

And other valuable material on discussions taking place among Communists in India.

64 Pages—Price Re. 1/-

If you want to make sure of your copy send a postal order for Re. 1/- or place orders through your local book seller. And please don't forget to ask your friends and comrades to do the same.

—PUBLISHER

## Covering letter on "Letter to Foreign Comrades"

TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

C. P. I.

10th Feb. '36.

DEAR COMRADE RANDIVE,

First of all I owe you an apology for not submitting to you the letter I sent abroad and keeping it to myself for a month. The reasons were technical. I did not want to do it for reasons of safety of comrades who carried it till I learnt that it had reached ..... places safe. I had also to await my chance till I could get some one going to Bombay because no Party member here accepts any dak to Party Centre from me. I will of course try to file one copy here as well but after I know it has been submitted to the PHQ safe.

Secondly, I wish to explain to you the spirit that animated me in writing the letter. I wrote it with no desire of self-justification for I have learnt not to attempt it through as bitter experiences as can be the lot of any Party member. I have written it with no desire to just accuse the leadership of the Party. The situation is too grave for it. I am old enough to realise it. I sincerely hold myself primarily responsible for the mistakes of the past and morally hold myself equally responsible with the rest of you for the mistakes of the present. Did not Lenin say that anarchism was the price the European working class had to pay for the crimes of its Social Democratic leadership? I wrote the letter with the sole desire that if I can contribute something towards correcting the mistakes of today it will be some concrete atonement for my past sins.

### BACK GROUND

From the time of the Party Congress to my being sent out of Calcutta on leave (Dec. '48) I was not critical of the Party Thesis at all but thought that the problems were two:

(1) "Lack of a tactical line which the leadership itself was not collectively working out and the result was intense confusion, every Party leader and unit having his own 'theories';

(2) Drift over working out the organisational implications of the new line which led to legal comrades carrying on as before and filling jails and U. G. leaders doing nothing more than sending out "instructions" on chits and endlessly gossiping among themselves and themselves awaiting "instruction from above" for day to day jobs.

I generally agreed with the Party Organ except that I thought the existence of imperialist holds within and its day to day manoeuvres from without and above, London and Washington were being underplayed and when I read 15th August features speaking of bourgeoisie having won its freedom I was assured it was a careless and loose formulation. I spoke out my mind over day to day issue in the informal discussions that inevitably take place inside U. G. dens. Later in the year I heard that the P.B. was sitting in a long non-stop session and I hoped for the best out of its deliberations.

Soon after I went on holiday I was served with the decision of suspension and denied even the full text of the P.B. Resolution on me. I planned to honestly discharge whatever job was given to me and spend the rest of my time in self-study and work out a critique of my own writings of the past. No work was given to me and not even contact maintained. After reading up the classics I applied for permission to go to Bombay to get the facilities to use the Party library for my self-critical document. My request was not even answered. In the meanwhile appeared the new P.B. Document (Communist No. 1 and No. 4.) They were no less disturbing than my suspension, they appeared to me to radically modify the Party Thesis passed by the Party Congress. I spent all my time reading up the classics, studying whatever Party Literature I could secure on my own and despite the efforts by the Party leadership not to let even Party literature reach me. The more I thought over our Party literature and studied them together with the classics and whatever current foreign literature I could get the more I felt myself unable to accept the Party line, as it was being applied and practised, as being sound and I was driven towards the conclusions I have embodied in my Letter to Foreign Comrades (LFC) that,

- *You were not correctly applying in real life but misusing the authority of the classics.*
- *You have arbitrarily and irresponsibly revised the formulations of the Party Thesis, throwing over-board most of what*

*was correct and were running riot with what was incorrect.*

- *You had closed your mind to the contents of the International Communist literature instead of checking up your own understanding and practice through them.*

These were very serious conclusions to be driven to on ones own about ones Party leadership and that too while living in isolation from inner Party life. Having reached this position in the second half of 1949 I decided to read and think out the issues over and over again, reach final conclusions by December and begin in January writing a document for submission to you and finish it by March. And if I was considered mistaken once again apply for permission to go legal and join the University for some Research work in History where I could do no harm and perhaps turn out some good work in the second half of my life and escape the mental agony of isolation from the Party and condemned to a life of passivity which you had fixed upon as my just lot. After reading the Information Bureau Resolutions in the Cross Roads of Dec. 15 and seeing with my own eyes how suicidal the new wave of Hunger-strike was proving itself to be I jotted down my ideas in "Points for Thought and Discussion" on Dec. 23, to serve as the first basis for working out the proposed document and to make the discussion, with the few whom I met and whose opinion I respected, fruitful. You will see from its informal language and some confused and confusing sentences that it was only a memo note for myself.

The new year dawned for me with wide-spread rumours about my expulsion, I read the news myself in the press, on 10th. On the 11th I saw ..... and instead of showing me the door he was good enough to give me his ear and I came back to write off the LFC in 2 long sittings. While writing it, I received "For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy" (FLPPD) containing Suslov's and Togliatti's reports. The Bombay and Calcutta Party Bookshops do not sell me literature and so I have to resort to the subterfuge of getting a friend in U.P. (who cannot be suspected of the crime of passing it on to me) to subscribe them from Bombay PPH and forward the stuff to me here after reading it himself. Hence I get foreign literature about one month after it has reached Bombay. I had no time to assimilate the reports in the 2 days I had to finish my own LFC but a rapid glance convinced me

that my own mind was working along the right rails and I could send it away with an easy conscience.

## II

### FUNDAMENTAL MISTAKES

I am repeating some points only to put them differently and more sharply than I dared in the LFC because I have a right to speak before you more bluntly as it is your duty to listen to me patiently.

I am trying not to increase the size of this covering letter by giving lengthy quotations from the basic documents for which you are yourself responsible nor the classics which you know better than I do but just giving references.

#### I. POST-WAR INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

While adopting the new line we took great pride in the fact that we were basing it on a correct Marxist-Leninist understanding of the international situation as analysed by Zhdanov before the inaugural Conference of the Nine Parties.

I request you to re-read the international section of our Party Thesis together with Zhdanov's report and you will find that we did not apply but misapplied Zhdanov's analysis and even ignored some of his clear and concrete formulations.

Zhdanov's was a fundamental Marxist analysis of the post-war alignment of forces. He did two things. First, he worked out where, within the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, the capitalist and socialist worlds stood how and to what extent the former stood weakened and the latter strengthened. Secondly, he worked out how the above contradiction was expressing itself in the concrete form of the drive of American Imperialism for world domination and war of aggression and the general strategy of the imperialists and their agents. He did not confuse the first with the second which would have led to Trotskyite conclusions and instead formulated concrete tasks to resist and defeat this drive. It is an essential characteristic of Marxist methodology not to confuse the general with the concrete but correctly assess their mutual relationship.

In the Party Thesis we mixed up the above two and hence came to the unwarranted (from Zhdanov's own report by which we

swore!) conclusion that we were faced with the "immediate situation in which the world bourgeoisie as a whole" had gone counter revolutionary the world over and is in one bloc with Anglo-US imperialism.

Our colossal theoretical backwardness and petty bourgeois subjective sense of guilt against our reformist sins and desire to make good the crime by working for the victory of the Indian revolution as quick as we could blinded us to the patent differences between Zhdanov's analysis and our own in the Party Thesis.

## III

### CHARACTER OF OUR COUNTRY.

#### I. COLONIAL OR CAPITALIST ORDER

Lenin wrote one of the classics on Imperialism and characterised the role of colonies and their future of misery and backwardness as long as they remained such. How did it befit the leadership of Indian Communists to forget Lenin's own formulation about our country as you do when you imagine a capitalist order in India, instead of seeing the actual, colonial.

Stalin has made a very *specific* formulation about our country in his speech: "The Political tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East".

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

"As the revolutionary movement progresses the national bourgeoisie in such countries divides into two sections, a revolutionary section (the petty bourgeoisie) and a compromising section (the big bourgeoisie)."

If you re-read the speech as a whole you will see that to Stalin India's being a colony is the primary characterisation, making our struggle national and the development of capitalism within it a secondary, though very important, characterisation; one leading to the birth of proletariat creating pre-conditions for hegemony of the proletariat, inevitability of split in the bourgeoisie and the responsibility of the Party of the proletariat to build a broad national alliance.

Further on in the same speech he refers to our country as one of the "capitalistically developed colonies". I think it will be correct to summate the Stalin formulation about our country as a colony with advanced capitalist development. Is it permissible for a Communist leadership to revise Stalin's own formulation without very and really VERY good reasons, and without unimpeachable evidence of new, really HISTORIC developments.

You know that Lenin-Stalin teachings on the characteristics of a colony are contained in the programme of the C.I. and the Colonial Thesis. You did not even refer to them to see how and where they have ceased to apply before you went ahead to talk of the capitalist order in India.

*With unforgivable intellectual arrogance you revised the formulation of the Party Thesis, passed by the Party Congress.*

Lenin-Stalin teach us that,

(1) Our country is a colony.

(2) We will remain essentially a colony unless our Party can lead the proletariat to build such a broad popular movement that will achieve national liberation, complete the democratic revolution and pave the path for a socialist order in India.

(3) "capitalist order" in India is historically doomed for it pre-supposes our bourgeoisie playing a revolutionary role vis-a-vis imperialism before our "colonial order" can become "capitalist order".

(4) Two perspectives alone are real.

— Either the leadership of the bourgeoisie over the national movement and inevitable compromise with imperialism with our country remaining a semi-colony, people sunk in misery and imperialist powers using us as pawns. This is our present fate.

— Or achievement of proletarian hegemony over the national movement, completion of the national democratic revolution and a transitional stage of thorough-going democratic reforms liquidating the colonial-feudal order and paving the path for a socialist order as part of the socialist-world and with its fraternal help. This is our glorious prospect if you lead us aright, or the Party finds another and better leadership.

Your mistaken attitude leads to leaving imperialism scotfree, just cursing the bourgeoisie in words, and missing out all our concrete tasks.

## 2. NATIONAL OR PUPPET STATE?

In the Party Thesis we characterised the Mountbatten manufactured and Nehru-accepted State set-up as a puppet or satellite state. The P.B. in "Peoples Democracy" transformed the well-considered authoritative formulation of the Party Congress (which was also in line with international communist formulations) of Puppet State into National State.

You have taught the Party not to use terms in any other sense except given to them by Marx-Engels-Lenin and Stalin. This is how Lenin has used the term "National State".

"Self-determination of nations in the programme of the Marxists cannot, from the historical-economic point of view, have any other meaning than political self-determination, political independence, the formation of a National State." (Lenin: "Vol. I Moscow Edition, p. 868).

*So when you say "the bourgeoisie has secured a national state" (Communist Vol. 1, p. 9) you obviously mean what Lenin meant, that it has achieved self-determination for our country i.e. completed the national revolution instead of betraying it as the Party Congress had thought. You have made the black treachery of the bourgeois leadership into the grand glory of leaders having won its independence. Only Patel-Nehru agents inside our Party can say such a thing and you are our Party leadership. Such is the enormity of your insolent revision of authoritative and democratic Party decision.*

I know that your above sentence stands qualified and the full runs as follows:

"The bourgeoisie has secured a national state, linked with world capitalism and therefore a satellite state".

It means that we are internally independent but through class fear of the USSR our bourgeois leadership has aligned with world capitalist powers, headed by Anglo-US imperialists. In other words we are as much independent and depended as Italy, France or even Britain.

Your qualification does not minimise but intensifies the implications of your mistaken revision of the Party Thesis. Do you realise to what it results in practice? Reading and quoting you Patel-Nehru scribes can say—

— The CPI leadership agrees that Patel-Nehru leadership has succeeded in establishing a national state. On the issue of Congress leadership having won India's independence there is no difference and even Communist leaders admit it.

— The only difference is that instead of Patel-Nehru the C.P. I wants to put B. T. Randive, Bhowani Sen & Co in power.

— They falsely slander Patel-Nehru who have won India's independence that in their old age they have agreed to become Truman-Bevin puppets. That is just smoke-screen to hide that they themselves are Stalin puppets.

— The Soviets want to drag India into their net and hence these "senseless outrages" by Indian Communists instead of these intelligent and hard working young men spending their undoubted capacities in building up our newly won national state.

*Your formulation about the National State is the best ideological weapon in the hands of Indian reaction to discredit and attack our party and slander the international camp of peace, democracy and socialism and act as smoke-screen for denoting our country into the anti-Soviet camp.*

### 3. NEHRU GOVERNMENT—FASCIST?

Here again you revise the formulation of the Party Thesis without caring to prove by objective data when and how Nehru Government from paving the path of fascism (formulation of 2nd Congress Party Thesis) came to its actual establishment.

As late as the P.B. Document "Strategy and Tactics" you warn against calling Nehru Government Fascist (Sept-Dec. 48) The fiasco of the Riv. Strike (March '49) mentally deranged you so greatly that you expressed your own impotent rage by cursing the Nehru Govt. with the strongest term you could think of irrespective of its meaning and implications. The concrete task was a broad mass movement for democratic liberties with maximum allies we could

secure from all walks of our national life. Instead, from the characterisation of fascist government you naturally went all out to ..... which detached us from the people, lost us all allies, till today an average petty bourgeois democrat (and that is yet our dominant category) says that the Communists are fanatical fools while the government is running its mad course and he does not know what to do except feel helpless.

When you went in for the formulation of fascist government you did not check up your understanding by re-reading Zhdanov, you ignored Foster's Report to CPUSA Congress. *In the name of hundreds of our hunger-striking leaders and cadres who are dying by inches while you cannot raise any mass movement outside, except sacrifice more cadres by ..... I beseech you to at least now read Suslov and Togliatti's reports with care and humility.*

### 4. ROLE OF THE BOURGEOISIE.

In the Party Thesis itself we came to the conclusion that the bourgeoisie as a whole had gone over to imperialism. This mistaken notion was also the evidence of our theoretical backwardness and subjectivism.

It is obligatory for a Communist not to have any illusion about any progressive revolutionary role of the bourgeoisie as a class in the epoch of general crisis of capitalism.

But it is also obligatory on a Leninist not to treat the world bourgeoisie as a whole as consisting of one solid bloc in the epoch of imperialism and the domination of finance capital. Foster for example speaks of anti-monopoly, anti-fascist, anti-war alliance as the job of the Party for USA. To concentrate against US imperialism as leader of world imperialism and on monopoly capitalists inside each country (who become Anglo-US stooges) is correct. It is the task of the Communists to note the contradictions inter-state and intra-state between different sections of the bourgeoisie to formulate correct tactics, both national and international. To exploit, intensify and utilise the contradictions of the enemy is an essential tactical principle of Leninism. (see Stalin's Leninism) *To state as you do, as a general principle, that you base your tactics on the contradiction between capital and labour, capital and people, and not on contradic-*

tions within the bourgeoisie (which is NOT the same thing as having illusions about the bourgeoisie) is anti-Leninist and arguing like Trotsky and Bukharin against Lenin.

In the colonial countries above all it is impermissible for any Communist, however ignorant to treat the bourgeoisie as one block specially at the moment its leading section goes in for compromise and the proletariat is yet too weak to prevent the compromise. Every thing that Lenin and Stalin have written on the colonial question is full of it and Stalin very concretely and masterfully applied Leninist formulation for India and China in specific terms in his speech to the University of the East (reprinted by the PPH) and his speech on China, Aug. 1, 1927. (in Marxism and Colonial Questions pp. 232-252).

So abysmal was our theoretical ignorance that we all accepted your stand that in the post-war period the bourgeoisie as a whole had gone collaborationist and to that extent Lenin-Stalin formulations about the colonial bourgeoisie and need to differentiate between its different sections have become outmoded. I am myself a party to swallowing your "ideological contribution" though it stuck in the throat a bit but you and other comrades hammered at me so hard and non-stop that I was thus only resisting correction of my reformist outlook that I also yielded, for in my subjective desire I wanted to make amends for my past. I was then trying to assert that only big bourgeoisie had gone collaborationist and stressing the need for us in our own Draft Thesis to differentiate between different sections of the bourgeoisie. BUT the practical political conclusion I drew from the above correct standpoint was to try to differentiate between Patel and Nehru in the old way. You successfully exposed the opportunism of my political conclusion and thus threw the baby out with the bath-water! I came to the practical conclusion of differentiating between Patel and Nehru not because I was an opportunist by temperament as you tried to insinuate and later openly preach but it was the result of old digests of thought continuing to persist in the mind in a new changed period, remnants of an earlier outlook coming back to a mind correctly reacting against what was incorrect in the new formulations but unable yet to work out by oneself an over-all correct outlook and analysis for the new period. *This has been as big a theoretical blamance on our part in the post-war period as the Pakistan one*

*in the war period and has cost us more dew. The outlook "overthrew all"—imperialists and feudalists and capitalists is very militant but embodies such ignorance on our part as to enable the cunning mature big bourgeois leadership of our country to isolate us from the middle strata while we should be isolating the big bourgeoisie itself from the middle strata.*

When reviewing the Party Congress the article in the Bolshevik (CPSU (B) organ) came referring to big bourgeoisie as collaborationist and instead of reconsidering your view point you did not even print it in the P.A.

Throughout 1949 articles appeared in the FLPPD signed by leaders of colonial parties in the East and of Latin America and they noted and utilised the role of different sections of the bourgeoisie. Not one of those articles was reprinted in the P.A.

Togliatti's report speaks of "reactionary groups of Indian bourgeoisie" (In LFC I wrongly gave Suslov's name instead of Togliatti's writing in a hurry, from memory) and you have with-held it from publication.

The latest FLPPD calls upon us Indian Communists to struggle "against the *reactionary big bourgeoisie* and feudal princes collaborating with "Anglo-US imperialists.

There is no room for any doubt left even by the worst dogmatist as to an earnest need for serious and new thought as the Party has every right to expect from you as its leadership.

## 5. AGRARIAN QUESTION

Lenin spent a good part of his life studying the agrarian question as a Marxist economist and revolutionary. The formulations of the VI Congress were a concentrated summation of Leninist teachings enriched by the experience of the post-world war I revolutionary wave in the colonies of the East and especially of China. Just because the Party in its ignorance agreed with your revision of Lenin-Stalin formulations about the bourgeoisie you became arrogant enough to revise Leninist teachings on the agrarian question as well and the Party Thesis passed at the Party Congress. But should the P. B. not have had the humility to throw out its document for discussion at least?

*Your anti-Leninist analysis of the Agrarian Question naturally*

leads to your revising the Leninist strategy of alliance with the entire peasantry during the stage of the Democratic Revolution.

From 1905 Revolution to March 1917 (overthrow of the Czar) Lenin preached alliance with the whole of peasantry to carry out the bourgeois democratic revolution. In July 1905 he wrote about this period as follows:

"The Russian revolution will assume its real-sweep, and will really assume the widest revolutionary sweep possible in the epoch of bourgeois-democratic revolution, only when the bourgeoisie deserts it and when the masses of the peasantry come out as active revolutionaries side by side with the proletariat .....The proletariat must carry out to the end the democratic revolution and in this unite to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush by force the resistance of the autocracy and to paralyse the instability of the bourgeoisie." (Selected Works, Vol. III pp. 110,111)

Differentiating the approach to peasantry between the democratic and socialist revolution Lenin wrote:

"FIRST, with the "whole" of the peasantry against the monarchy, against the landlords, against the medieval regime (and to that extent the revolution remains bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic) THEN, with the poorest peasants, with the semi-proletarians, against capitalism, including the rural rich, the kulaks, the profiteers, and to that extent the revolution becomes a Socialist one." (Selected Works, Vol. VII pp. 190-191.)

At this period the attitude to middle peasantry was one of "neutralising" it.

Lenin defined the middle peasants before the II Congress of the C.I. as:

"In the economic sense small tillers of the soil who also possess as their private property, or leases, small plots of land which, though small, nevertheless under capitalism provide in general, not only meagre subsistence for their families and their farms, but also the opportunity of obtaining a certain surplus which, in good years at any rate may be transformed into capital, and who fairly frequently hire outside labour."

At that time this section was politically vacillating between the capitalists and workers, more towards the former than the latter.

In the summer of 1918 Committees of the Village Poor were formed in the countryside to fight kulak sabotage and help the Soviet Govt. collect grain.

But by the end of the year these committees were abolished and in March 1919 at the 8th Party Congress the policy of establishing "a durable alliance" with the middle peasants was adopted. "Learn to come to an agreement with the middle peasant while not for a moment renouncing the struggle against the kulak; and at the same time placing reliance solely on the poor peasant." said Lenin.

The slogan of neutralising the middle peasantry was considered to be temporarily justified as a political necessity under "War Communism". As soon as the problems of that early phase were surmounted this slogan was considered as damaging to worker-peasant alliance (See CPSU (B) p. 249).

This change of policy from neutralising the middle peasant to a durable alliance with him was hailed as an important factor in the victory over counter-revolution in the Civil War.

During the NEP, the stage of reconstruction and recovery, alliance with the middle peasantry was the corner stone of Soviet Economic policy.

The lesson of the Russian revolution, the teachings of Lenin and Stalin were applied by our brother parties in Eastern European countries as alliance with the entire peasantry during the anti-fascist war-period of national resistance and swinging over to the policy of isolating and restricting the kulak (not yet liquidation) and strengthening the alliance with the middle peasant in their Party Congresses held in 1947-48, after the first Conference of the Nine Parties.

Chinese experience has been published in China Digest articles in 1948 by Jen Pi-shih, which have of course not been reprinted in the Central Party organ nor reprinted as a separate pamphlet by the PPH, our publishing house, with what your views of Mao's theoretical competence and policy are as revealed in Communist No. 4.

You will thus see that in your strategy for the agrarian revolution you have not only thrown over-board Lenin's own directions for all-peasant alliance during the democratic revolution but ignored the rich experience of the CPSU(B), refused to learn from the recent experience of the work and policy of the brother parties of Eastern Europe and China. You obviously do not believe in learning but only misuse Marxist phrases to cover up your anti-Leninist strategy.

Your anti-kulak demagoguery is Titoism, against which the Information Bureau resolution warned us all. With state-Power in his hands Tito talks of socialism and saves and nourishes the kulaks in real life. With only a peasant movement to throw about you have just liquidated whatever peasant movement you inherited through adventurist tactics worthy of a Titoite disruptor from within the movement which had yet to grow on a vast scale, on as broad a basis as possible and when we had to learn to give special attention to landless, organise them separately and fight for their specific demands within the framework of preserving the unity of the peasant movement embracing the entire peasantry.

This was the way to detach the peasantry from the Congress leadership. Yours was the way of liquidating whatever peasant movement had been built up during the last 15 years and thus clear the ground for Nehru's favourite boys, the Socialist leaders, to pick up the banner of the peasant movement and go out to rally the peasantry "against" the Congress Ministries. This is how you did Patel's unpaid job for him. He of course frowns upon Socialists too but knows them to be more "manageable". I recall today the "sweet persuasion", Gandhiji and Patel tried on me, every time I met them, NOT to take our Red Banner into India's villages and attempt to organise the peasantry under it, apart from the Congress. During the last two years unknown and countless sons and daughters of Indian kisans have faced martyrdom under that very banner. There is undying glory and it is as great as is your crime of misleading them with slogans, forms of actions, and organisation, that have led to the liquidation of the peasant movement from the countryside as a whole while "armed struggle" goes on in a few villages besides Telengana (of which there is no news in the Party Press itself). A living broad, nation-wide Kisan movement no more exists but the Red Flag lives in the hearts of those who knew it once. They will rally again and build a greater Kisan movement when our Party is able to give them a more correct lead than you gave revising Lenin's own directions for rallying the entire peasantry in the stage of the Democratic Revolution.

FLPPD Editorial of 27-1-50 should leave you in no doubt about how wrong you have been.

Knowledge of Marxism—Leninism enables the leadership of every Communist Party to make the Party the most effective and growing political force inside its own country by imparting

our cadre the most scientific and hence truly objective knowledge about the character of their own country which can come in the present epoch of world history only from a correct Marxist outlook and methodology. The theoretical worth of any Communist leadership, not the capacity to quote classics but the maturity to apply Marxist—Leninist formulations to their own country,—consists in how deep and thorough is its own knowledge and study of the character of its country and its main specific characteristics e.g.,

- The national status of the country.
- The basic structure of the economic as a whole and the agrarian problem in particular where it is primarily an agrarian country.
- National cultural tradition, both reactionary and progressive trends. The international sources and affiliations of different national trends of thought.

You have gone abysmally wrong about the very character of our country that you have given our cadre. You have repudiated the teachings of the masters about our country instead of enriching them further through your creative theoretical work. You ignored the voice of brother parties instead of correcting your own understanding. When you found the cadres becoming frustrated and critical you led them on to .....to quell their doubts. Instead of educating them you have corrupted their young minds and instead of using their revolutionary ardour to build a mass democratic movement in our country you have callously played with their lives and toyed with their faith in you as the leadership of the Party.

\* \* \* \* \*

(This part submitted to Comrade Robi, PB member Calcutta, for being forwarded to Party Headquarters on 18 Feb. '50—Another copy submitted to PHQ Bombay, earlier).

VIEWS—Need for cash is desperate to be able to bring out the Second volume. All comrades and sympathisers who genuinely feel VIEWS must be continued should send on whatever they can spare individually or collectively.

P. C. JOSHI,

11, Dharamtalla Lane, P.O. Sibpur, Howrah.



## Extract from Letter to C. C. Communist Party of Pakistan

Calcutta

11. 2. 50.

"I am at present working day and night on my letter to CC here which goes beyond the LFC but is in line with it. Its main theme is:—

(a) *The ideological outlook of our Party leadership is Titoite-Trotskyite. Their revision of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism for our country and our revolution and in our class set-up is just what would constitute the ideological Titoite revision in our Party e.g.,*

Capitalist order instead of colonial order and agrarian relations being mostly capitalist instead of feudal;

Our revolution being anti-capitalist instead of colonial i.e., anti-imperialist and democratic, against Imperialism and its collaborationist allies, feudal and big bourgeois elements;

Revolutionary situation instead of revolutionary period.

(b) *Its political policy, from the above revision of Marxist-Leninist basic principles could be nothing else but one of demagoguery about revolution and in objective practice one of provocation from within the camp of the people and hence flamboyant strike-call without any preparations and the smash up of all TU movement, ..... to cover up failures and playing straight into Patel's hands. The analysis of "over throw all"—imperialists, feudalists and capitalists leads to the politics of get isolated from all. Patel-Nehru agents inside the Party could not have done any other job than what our present leadership has done. IN OLDER DAYS WE WOULD HAVE CHARACTERISED SUCH POLITICS TROTSKYITE, TODAY WE CALL IT TITOITE, BECAUSE SUCH IS THE OBJECTIVE POLITICAL ROLE OF TITOISM IN THE WORLD SET-UP TODAY.*

(c) *Inside the Party organisation the ways of our leadership are exactly what FLPPD has exposed as the ways of Tito gang. Do you remember our Pahari skull cap, "Titoism in Party organisation" fits our leadership as well as the Pahari cap the skull of its wearer.*

The same swearing by the Masters of Marxism-Leninism combined with the equally shameless slandering of international communist leaders.

The same intellectual conceit.

The same utilisation of Party authority to purge out "unreliable" elements.

The same policy of liquidation of old cadres through enforced and repeated hunger-strikes of those within jails, and expulsions and suspensions of those outside, to be able to get an unchallenged grip over the Party machine. And so on.

I HAVE NO DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT OUR LEADERSHIP IS TITOITE. IT IS NO QUESTION OF HONEST MISTAKES.

They have ignored international documents ever since the Party Congress and withheld valuable Chinese Party documents from the Party membership by just not reprinting them from the China Digest.

They have also withheld from the Party an article from the Bolshevik [organ of the CPSU(B)] written about May '48 which positively corrected the wrong formulations of our Party Congress and endorsed all that was right in our Thesis.

They have withheld Saillant's report to Peking WFTU and cut out its major part before printing it in *Cross Roads*.

They have ignored the directives of WFTU instead of carrying them out.

They have refused to correct themselves on their own.

This much regarding the intellectual integrity of our leadership.

Now about their organisational ways. I know it in my bones and every drop of my own blood speaks that ..... and ..... are LIARS, cold blooded liars, they make false statements without a blush, they suppress true evidence without a prick of conscience. They have misused the confidence of the CC by misleading them about my own case. I have organisational documents in my possession which show that their treatment of me was no exception but a well-planned technique to shut-up comrades through quotations and bully them into submission by threatening them with expulsion.

To the extent other PBMs have acquiesced in their organisational ways they are guilty of liquidating the Party.

Our Party exists no more as an organisation.

This is the literal truth.

Don't misunderstand me. I do not seek self-justification of my past. I don't claim my old line has been vindicated. I am not out for revenge, though inner-Party gossip has already been started that I am trying to exploit the present situation (utter failure to work up even ..... which led to the hunger-strike having to be withdrawn) to stage a come-back by appealing to brother parties.

Our common friend will tell you when and how I came to my present conclusions, appeal to brother parties was the last stage of my mental journey."

## For Appeal Against Expulsion

CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
C. P. I.

Calcutta  
18. 2. 50.

DEAR COMRADE RANDIVE,

I was reliably informed by old and loyal Party sympathisers who had themselves read the CC Resolution on my expulsion and Bengal PC Secy's circular on the same that the wide-spread rumour about my expulsion was correct. The news was later confirmed in the public press. But you have not yet sent me a copy of the CC Resolution i.e., to the person most concerned with your decision. This will surprise many, but it did not surprise me for every pore of my being had to take in and get used to your anti-Party organisational ways.

Comrade Robi, PB member, for long Bengal Provincial Secy, and at the time also the leading member of Bengal PC Sectt. made on me a report (Sept. (?) '48) demanding that my Party card be taken away from me.

I was then working as a member of the Editorial Board of the Hindi organ of the Bengal PC. I asked my editor-Secy. if he had seen Comrade Robi's Report and when it would be discussed in my own unit. He informed me that he had heard of some such report

but it was a matter between the PC and me and he had been told that it can't be discussed in our editorial unit, "Report" on my work etc., and demand for my expulsion by the senior-most leader of the Party in Bengal NOT to be discussed in the very unit in which I was working!

Very puzzled but persisting I asked PC Sectt. members if and when it will be discussed in the Sectt. I was told that no definite date had been fixed, "let me write out my own answer as other Sectt. Members were also writing out their views and then a day would be fixed". I went on asking for the date and after a time I was told that I had to send my answer straight to the PB., the matter would not be discussed inside the Bengal PC nor its Sectt., the PB had intervened and taken up the matter in its own hands, *A report on my inner-Party life and work ever since the 2nd Party Congress made by the most responsible and respected Party leader (who was also a PB member), himself a member of the PC Sectt., not to be discussed either by the PC or its Sectt., under whose direction I was asked to work and had worked during the period concerned, and which knew the facts etc!*

Again dismayed but yet persistent I requested comrade Robi to get me permission to address the PB personally on his Report and let the PB cross-examine me to its heart's content. I was told that could NOT be done.

More puzzled and dismayed but still more persistent I asked comrade Robi to give me the opportunity to at least meet you, as the General Secy. of the CC, I was told back that even this was not possible.

I now understood the bloody game and was thrown into a subjective fit and wrote off a Reply to Comrade Robi's Report which was at once a defence and a counter-accusation, the best I could do, gripped by the worst fears and yet not wanting to believe the worst of you and Robi, Comrades-in-arms for years, trying my hardest NOT to believe the evidence of my own very demoralising experience.

PB's answer was the decision to suspend me for an indefinite period and reference to CC "for further action" AND the PB did not think it wise nor my right that I be given the full text of its resolution concerning my suspension. I was given the short summary that was also circulated to ranks and sympathisers.

I promptly wrote to the CC—

- Recording my indignant protest against the PB Resolution.
- Demanding permission to appeal to CC against the PB decision and the supply of necessary documents to enable me draft the appeal.

— Pledging my loyalty to the Party for all I was worth.

*I never got an answer, i.e. my right of appeal to the highest Party Committee against its own Bureau was denied to me.*

I did get an answer, however, after one whole year, in the true anti-Party tradition our PB has adopted under your leadership, and that was the NEWS of my expulsion, in the public press.

I am told the CC Resolution on my expulsion is dated sometimes in Dec. '49. It has been circulated among all Party members, all sympathisers and even given to the public press and yet even after two months you have not thought it safe nor wise to send me a copy of the same.

*You ought to know, as well as I do that I have yet the PARTY RIGHT guaranteed to me by the Party constitution itself of appealing to the Control Commission AGAINST the decision of the CC, which you took one whole year to manoeuvre through, and realise your heart's big but foul desire. But try however much, you will not succeed in provoking me to repeat the crime of your own youth, i.e., try to split the Party and start a rival racket. I have learnt my P. lesson much better. My loyalty to the Party is greater, far greater than my holy Party anger against you and what you have done to the Party.*

I've no doubt whatever that the day of reckoning will come, when, besides your other crimes, you will have to answer before the entire Party how and why you violated every principle of Party organisation and deprived me of my inherent Party rights by functioning as an unprincipled arch-bureaucrat, misusing Party authority, ignoring the Party Constitution, denying the inherent rights of an old Party member like me, worse than has ever been done in the entire life of our Party. This I say with a full sense of responsibility and after the coolest and longest thought I am capable of and with my hand on my heart.

If this brings your usual soulless sarcastic smile to your lips it will only mean that the days ahead will be the worse for you, far worse than you made my last two years. Loyalty to the Party saved me, challenging that sheet-anchor of every communists's life you will be made to sink into nothingness, having only earned the deepest hatred of every Party member, and your good democratic and patriotic family (that gave us not only you but also your sisters, brothers wife etc.) instead of being proudest of you will be the most ashamed of you. Think of all that, when you make up your mind about what next to do with me, yourself, our Party as a whole, its policy and its future. You can more than anyone else help to lift up the nightmare stage you have inflicted on the Party, you can also see the break of dawn that has broken for our Party with the FLPPD Editorial of 27 Jan. You can't hold back the bright, life-giving, thought-inspiring rays of Stalinist sunshine that will come spreading wider and wider over, and penetrate deeper and deeper into our Party, by any crooked organisational trick you can devise, nor by digging up any number of quotations from the masters. You can at worst, become a dirty and small cloud, and that too only for a while, trying to hold back the light of the rising sun. That and no other is the prospect ahead. Think of it, think harder and harder, and with all the honesty you can muster, and choose your role to be such that after 20 years or a little more in the Party, all your dear and near ones, all your comrades may think of you that though damnedly mistaken, their "BTR" had the same courage to struggle with himself, which he called upon the Party members to show against the class enemy without and the reformists within.

In the meanwhile decide on this letter and meet whatever you and the PB can of my rightful demands, on your own and refer the rest to the CC.

(1) I request the CC to permit me to appeal to the Control Commission against the decision of the CC expelling me.

(2) You and the PB supply me with all the *documents* you think are necessary for me to draft my written appeal and which you are going to place before the Control Commission to justify my expulsion.

On my own I can think of the following—

- (a) CC decision (full text and also summary) expelling me and Bengal PC circular on the same.
- (b) PB Resolution (full text) on my suspension.
- (c) Opinions on above of CCs, PCs and Party units and members who have chosen to express themselves.
- (d) All reports and notes from me to BC here and the CC and those submitted by others on or about me between the period of my suspension and expulsion.
- (e) All documents about me circulated by the PB to the CC members, PC's or other units in defence of its decision of suspension.
- (f) Robi's report on me which became the basis of PB resolution of suspension.
- (g) Copy of my Reply to above and all the 32 enclosers I filed.
- (h) Documents I left with the PC dump, as directed, during Dec. '48 and January '49, before the resolution of suspension was delivered to me—the subterfuge to deprive me of all documents before handing me the resolution on my suspension.
- (i) Reports and notes by Bengal PCMs on Com. Robi's Report on me.
- (j) Documents asked for by me in Note No. 2 of 49 addressed to Bengal Provincial Sectt. in the enclosure addressed to the CC and entitled "Permission for Appeal-Demand for a Party Trial".
- (k) Any other documents which any one of you in the PB or the Bengal PC (new) or the members of old Sectt. think may help me and which either of you propose to submit against or for me.

(3) Control Commission—The second Party congress elected a Control Commission but I realise the difficulty that it can't function because from whatever I have heard the position is that two of its three members are in jail and the third has been more or less "dropped" from the Party.

If you are thinking of a plenum in the immediate future it can and will of course elect a new Control Commission. In any case

you have to do some thing to get a Control Commission going and it is for the CC to decide how it will elect one whether itself or in consultation with all the PCs.

Since the old Control Commission is not functioning and cannot function I am exercising my right as an aggrieved Party member to suggest the names that I have done in my letter to C.C. Pakistan (being sent to you along with this). I am suggesting names giving them in the order of preference, and also adding one.

(a) ..... or ..... our greybeards and grey-heads who have spent a whole-life time proving their loyalty to the cause of Indian Revolution—OLD GUARD.

(b) ..... (.....) or ..... or ..... (.....)—Party and mass leaders, who pioneered the Party banner in their provinces and whose loyalty and integrity to the Party as an organisation is respected and recognised by all who have known them—FUNCTIONARIES.

(c) ..... or ..... or ....., old and loyal Party members genuinely respected in wide progressive circles as eminent intellectuals that our Party won over the commands—INTELLECTUALS.

(d) ..... Gen. Secretary of our Party in ..... very old comrade, known as "everybody's friend" who won't harm a fly if he can help it but stand up for the Party at all costs.

(e) ..... also from ..... founder and leader of ..... Union and recognised by all as among the best proletarian leaders our Party nursed and trained. I did not mention him in my letter to C.C. Pakistan for I did not know if he is safe or in jail. If he is not available I would have full confidence in any working-class Party cadre, of more than 5 years membership in the Party, which the 3 PCs of the South, Andhra, Tamilnad and Kerala chose to elect—PROLETARIAN CADRE.

CONCLUSION.

In demanding my Party Trial, supply of all relevant documents, and appointment of a Control Commission that will enjoy the confidence and the respect of the entire Party I am only requesting you to respect my inherent Party rights and your title as our Party leadership.

I must have a clear-cut answer to this letter, in writing and signed by you or any member of the PB, WITHIN ONE MONTH, from the date of this letter. If you sit upon me and this letter as you have

done before or just send me an oral message or ask the PC Secy. to send me a chit that the matter has been referred to the CC. (your usual old trick, which stands tattered into rags by now, in my own knowledge and I hope of hundreds more who have spent the best part of their life under the Party banner) I will have to ask my own Party conscience what should I do next to vindicate my Party honour and rouse the ranks here and brother Parties abroad to a realisation of how anti-Party are the ways and deeds of our Party leadership which you unfortunately remain for the time being.

(Sd.) P. C. Joshi.

P.S.

The answer to this note can be sent back through the very channel I am sending this or it can be deposited with..... and it will reach me.

## On Documents to P B and C C. Covering Letter to Comrade Robi

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
C.P.I.

19th Feb. 1950

DEAR COMRADE ROBI,

The PB resolution on my suspension called upon me to work under you and the PC and that you will keep contact with me etc. etc. I am therefore addressing this letter to you and if I am approaching "wrong quarter" it is for you to pass it on to the proper comrades and send me back the answers.

(1) Please acknowledge in writing receipt of the following which I am forwarding with this chit.

(1) My letter to CC, addressed to Comrade BTR, dated 18. Feb. entitled 'For Appeal Against Expulsion'.

(2) My letter, dated 13 Jan. '50, addressed to Comrade..... and entitled "Letter to Foreign Comrades".

(3) Covering letter on above to CC, CPI addressed to Comrade BTR dated 10 Feb. incomplete, 9 typed pages, more to follow next time.

(4) My letter to CC Pakistan on LFC, addressed to Comrade....., dated 11 Feb.

(5) My letter to CC....., dated 14 Feb.

(6) Press statement by me, dated 11, January.

(7) "Points for Thought and Discussion", dated 23 Dec. '49.

(2) CONTACT—No Party member accepts any dak from me after I have been circularised by you as "an enemy of the Party". Therefore please let me know if what I am suggesting below is the proper way of keeping contact with you i.e. the Party.

(a) I keep on sending my relative; (he is reliable and since he is a govt. employee) he does not want to go to any legal office of our Party and mass organisations and risk his job thereby.

Can I go on sending my dak to this very comrade's place or where else? Fix the time and day of the week. A weekly contact is more than enough for me.

(b) Or you would not trust me and my judgement about my relative or let me use this comrade as the contact-man nor can you think of any other comrade's place which I should be allowed to pollute? In that case I suggest that you fix up the office of any..... organisation, .....or.....for example, and permit me to send my dak there through.....(her name and address is known to you).

You should, however, make special arrangements for the safety of the dak, sent this way, for if the dak is caught it will be used by the enemy to damage the good name and prestige of the Party. I have to write the stuff, the story of your crimes, as my Party duty, but I do not want it caught and exploited by the enemies of the Party.

(3) I demand that all the documents I am sending now be PROMPTLY circulated among all CCMs, and Letters to Foreign Comrades among all PCs together with my letter to Comrade BTR.

on LFC, even in its incomplete and draft stage (I will myself supply its final and full text as soon as I can get it ready.)

I will go on forwarding the remaining parts of my political Letter to BTR as soon as I can get it typed and written off and feel a little better to work faster.

I must have an answer from the PB within a month whether it is going to meet my above demand for circulation of these documents. Don't try to fill me with the story that all PBMs can't be contacted in a month. Everyone knows that you, BTR and Gour function for the PB and have decided far bigger matters on your own, without a session of the full PB.

In fact Calcutta has been full of rumours about.....meetings going on. If one is really in session I request you to put the whole material I am now sending before it, without any delay.

And if you or the PB or the CC are in a hurry to get the full text of my (incomplete) political letter to BTR give me your first and last dates and I will complete whatever I have to write, just as I can within the dates given by you. This in case a.....meeting is on or is planned soon.

Don't fail to remember the limit of one month or you will have to regret your silence and take its consequences.

(\*) Once again I assure the PB and CC, through you as our rightful Party leadership yet, of my loyalty to the Party and my most earnest desire being only to help as far as I can and not harm the Party in any way. You can help me to fulfil my party duties better by being straight and frank with me, I may make, however much in good faith, some mistakes if I am left to charter my Party course all by myself in such critical, and to my knowledge the most critical stage in our Party life.

(Sd.) P. C. Joshi.

## On Rival Party

NOTE No. 8  
TO WBPC SECTT.

4th Aug. 49.

DEAR COMRADES,

I had a few notes to send to you but I am told by..... that she has yet to seek contact and can't manage more than a small cover for the first date. I will write in details later.

The main purpose of my wanting contact was to send you the enclosed statement for publication in the Party press Provincial and Central.

AS you know the canard about my starting a rival party has been appearing in the press for some time. I hope you knew enough about me to publish in the Party press at least a prompt and suitable retort to the anti-Party slanderers or ask me to draft one as Comrade Gour had done immediately after the P. Congress. When nothing of the sort happened I thought the P. leadership was taking the line to ignore the story as unworthy of a contradiction. I waited patiently only to hear from the few friends of the family that they hear the slander being gossiped about in P. circles and not contradicted by Party-cadres. I thought my patience is not only working against my Party honour but also damaging the good name of our Party.

Need I assure you once again that nothing will tempt nor provoke me into such a foul deed as attempting to start a rival party. I will wait patiently as I am and remain loyal to the Party till the Party itself thinks I can be of use to it as its active cadre.

If you decide not to publish my brief statements in the P. Central and Provincial press I will request you to let me have your answer in writing as soon as possible. You can send it through the same channel to ..... house.

Again, I await any directions that you may think fit to give me.

### STATEMENT

(From P. C. Joshi for publication in Swadhinata and Communist Bulletin (both Bengali) and for being forwarded to the Party Centre for publication in the Central Party press and for being circularised in the way the Party thinks fit.)

"THE ENEMIES OF THE PARTY USE NOT ONLY TERROR AGAINST US TO BREAK OUR LINKS WITH THE MASSES BUT ALSO SPREAD SLANDERS AGAINST THE PARTY TO CONFUSE OUR CADRES AND THUS SEEK TO DAMAGE THE INTERNAL UNITY OF THE PARTY.

"THE LATEST SUCH SLANDER IS THAT I AM STARTING A RIVAL PARTY.

"THE PETTY SLANDERERS, THEMSELVES KNOW THAT EVERY HONEST COMMUNIST HOLDS LOYALTY TO THE PARTY DEARER THAN LIFE ITSELF. THE ENEMIES OF OUR PARTY HAVE YET TO LEARN THAT NOTHING THAT THEY CAN DO WILL EVER DAMAGE THE UNITY OF OUR PARTY WHICH WILL ULTIMATELY TRIUMPH SCATTERING TO THE WINDS ALL SLANDERERS AND OPPRESSORS THROUGH SUCCESSFUL ORGANISATION OF THE STRUGGLE OF OUR PEOPLE FOR REAL INDEPENDENCE AND PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY WHICH ALONE CAN BE THE ABIDING BASIS TO BUILD A CLEAR AND HEALTHY, HAPPY AND PROSPEROUS NATIONAL LIFE."

P. C. JOSHI.

### IF YOU WANT IT.

Please make up your mind if you want the subsequent, already planned and ready volumes of the VIEWS. If YES please send and raise as much cash as you can right away and let me also know if you can be also banked upon as regular donor every month and for how much. Get some non-Party friend or sympathiser to send the M.O.

I have taken enough loan on my own to bring out this volume. VIEWS has to be paid for by the comrades themselves or stop. There is no space to write more except that please HURRY with your M.O. or Cheque addressed to—

P. C. JOSHI, 11 Dharmatolla Lane, P.O. Sibpur, Howrah.

## Post Script

### NATURE OF PARTY CRISIS

Other communist parties generally do not interfere with the internal policy of a national communist Party. Only when the leadership of a Communist Party departs from the common fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and turns a deaf ear to the fraternal advice and criticism of brother parties that they directly place the alternative, sound policy before its rank and file. Such a grave crisis has arisen within our Party. And it assumes graver shape because our leadership, ever since the Second Party Congress, has been systematically suppressing international documents about our country, even of Stalin's and Mao's Parties. Party leaders who were later revealed as Trotskyites and Titoites are infamous for such crimes.

At long last the PB hailed the FLPPD Editorial as a "brilliant contribution" embodying "a correct lead" for our country. But we communists are not taken in by formal acceptance, and look out for the real worth of the self-critical efforts by our mistaken comrades. The PB produced a statement on 22 February which was so much of a self-justification and so little of self-criticism that it has not been printed in the FLPPD and led to immense indignation from the rank and file. So on 6 April the PB produced a second statement which goes beyond the first but not far enough.

—It admits not one mistake more than what has been pointed out in black and white in international documents and pressed home by the ranks. With a really changed outlook a leadership should be capable of working out its mistakes on most if not all the other points. It has failed to do so.

—It admits Trotskyite deviation on the nature of our society, our revolution and its strategy, what other fundamental issue is then left for its own basic outlook to be characterised as a Trotskyite system of thought and not mere deviations.

—Genuinely admitting Trotskyism on basic issues it should have been capable of pointing out their ideological, political and organisational implications in practice. It has failed to do so.

Such a situation intensified rather than help to solve the inner Party crisis.

## TWO CAMPS—A LA TROTSKY

The PB does not yet see that not only its national but international understanding was Trotskyite and objectively pro-imperialist and helped to strengthen the anti-Sovieters in our country.

By lumping the "world bourgeoisie" as a whole together it tended to hide the main enemy, Anglo-US imperialism. It was this outlook which prevented our leadership from initiating specific anti-imperialist campaign. And to the extent a colonial Communist Party falls in its day to day anti-imperialist duties to that extent the pro-imperialists of the country remain masked and are able to denounce their communists as Soviet Fifth Column and successfully hide their own pro-imperialism through rabid anti-Sovietism. Has this not happened in our own country?

The estimate of revolution being "imminent" in most of the world (Party Thesis) was very much like Trotsky's Permanent World Revolution and had nothing in common with Zhdanov's "capitalism and socialism will exist side by side for a long time." It naturally became the basis of considering almost all International Communist leaders "reformist", the typical Trotskyite slander.

The PB's self-proclaimed "ideological contribution" to the treasury of Marxism, the concept of the national bourgeoisie as a whole in all the colonial countries having gone over to imperialism, was the real basis of slandering Mao and led to such ideological corruption of the cadres that instead of pressing the leadership for solidarity with the liberation struggles in South East Asiatic countries they anxiously waited for the bad news of these revolutions to be betrayed any day by leaders of our brother parties or the good news of the rank and file overthrowing them. What situation could suit the Anglo-US imperialists better than one in which the Communist Party of India was leading no mass campaigns either against their manoeuvres in India or other South East Asiatic countries, in which Mao, Ho Chi Minh, Than Tun and others could not rely upon their brother party in India for solidarity campaigns with the struggles of their own peoples. What else can be a greater disgrace for any colonial Party?

## INDIA AND 'REVOLUTION

The PB admits that its own understanding of the nature of our society was Trotskyite.

To characterise post-15-August India as a transition from colonial to capitalist order is not merely political blindness, "forgetting" to see Imperialism and its manoeuvres, but errant pro-Imperialism, preaching the self-liquidating role of Attlee-Cripps, blessed by Churchill and so sweetly put through by Mountbatten.

To have ever come to the conclusion that Nehru-Patel won a "National State" was not a mere mistake, it was not being really anti-bourgeois but pro-bourgeois in the worst sense, selling the pass to bourgeois nationalism, a glorification of national traitors while the PB thought it was abusing them.

It is not enough to admit that it was wrong to have thought that the Princes had been won away from Imperialism by the Congress leaders, it is necessary to see that it was agreeing with Patel about Princes being patriots and his having achieved the miracle of the national unification of India. And what role did we play in the States peoples' movement with such a mistaken outlook?

It is admitted that we ignored the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal nature of our revolution, for the admission to be real it was imperative to show how and where it has strengthened, as it inevitably must, the pro-imperialist pro-feudal forces. Without such a realistic understanding how can any ideological correction sink deep in our consciousness, how can we get an effective start in our practical work?

It is admitted that we not only attempted to skip over the stage of our revolution but resorted to the strategy of socialist instead of the democratic revolution. Lenin and Stalin have taught us that a Communist Party that stupidly attempts such a super-human leap will only break its neck, reduce itself to being a phrase-mongering sect. The PB does not see this having happened and yet it thinks it has seen through its mistake.

We dropped the slogan of Democratic Front like a hot-potato soon after advancing it at the Party Congress. What happened to the democratic forces because of this? No answer in the PB statements.



## TACTICS

Elementary Marxism, that the PB set out to teach Mao, should have told it that if our basic strategic understanding about our Revolution was Trotskyite our tactics could never be revolutionary but only serve the purpose of counter-revolution.

The experience of international labour and democratic movements teaches us that the tactical role of Trotskyism is, to provoke the working class to destroy its organised strength in mad frontal onslaughts against well-prepared enemy forces, to isolate the working class from its natural allies and disrupt the unity of the democratic forces, and in short, act the role of the pro-imperialist provocateur from within the peoples camp.

The PB wants us to believe that its own mind was neither logical nor consistent. Though forced to admit that its theoretical understanding was Trotskyite it refuses to see that its consequent practice, tactical line on the whole must be Trotskyite too. It admits adventurist mistakes in *some* (not most) strikes and in some hunger-strikes. It seriously wants us to believe that under its Trotskyite leadership our peasant movement has not only grown but has been raised to a level "in many parts of the country" that it can be "led forward only in the Telengana way".

Though rattled by intervention from above and unprecedented criticism from below it is sticking to its original understanding of its mistakes not being so serious as to shout about, the movement has on the whole grown, FLPPD Editorial does nothing more than help it to make up the lag from leading "tens of thousands", to "tens of millions."

This is clear enough from its chief tactical slogan, making Telengana way India's "principal way". What else was the Party being led towards as best as the PB could for two whole years? How is this any thing more than serving old wine in new bottles?

To realise how unprincipled our leadership has gone it is necessary to think over the following points—

— the analytical foundation of PB's past tactical line was its formulation of "revolutionary situation." How unrealistic and anti-Leninist it was will be clear from Lenin's own characterisation of the same (Selected Works Vol. 5, p. 174). In its second statement it

speaks of "a period of revolutionary advance." It is no more than a change of words because the old formulation is not admitted to be mistaken and the main emphasis on tactics suggested is the same as before.

— more than the impression is created as if the FLPPD Editorial considers that India is ripe for armed struggle. The Editorial mentions the name of the countries where the movement has advanced to that stage and India is not among them, and even a cursory reading will show that our country is mentioned in a separate series of paras. To suggest that many means all is Trotskyite *subterfuge*. It of course speaks of the formation of liberation army, "when the internal necessary conditions allow for it." The PB has not cared to *objectively* prove that such internal conditions exist. As before it misleads by misusing international authority.

— the Peking Manifesto is invoked to make Telengana way mandatory in every rural area. Let comrades read over the Manifesto and they will find that in para 11 the names of countries where, against the armed offensive of imperialism, armed resistance is going on are mentioned and our country is NOT among them.

— Comrade Balabushevich's report is copiously quoted to buttress the arguments of the PB and to make the Party swallow its proposed tactical line. Balabushevich has done nothing more than to make simple generalisations about the Indian movement from the *facts* contained in our own party press. The day will come when the PB will have to explain how and why it misused the Party press to print reports which began with exaggerations and ended with big and white lies, again like Trotskyite leaders everywhere.

## INTENSIFIED CRISIS

The PB admits no more organisational implications of its Trotskyite outlook and ways except that it committed the blunder of "refusal to learn", it became somewhat "bureaucratised and dogmatist", and its solution is nothing better than what is relied upon to correct minor mistakes in normal times, viz., functioning "inner Party democracy". The history of the international communist movement shows that the organisational role of Trotskyism is liquidationism.

The PB statements do not mean any real self-criticism but only chucking overboard its already discredited Trotskyite formulations

and desperate efforts to palm off a tactical line which is Trotskyism in practice. Such a stand of the Party leadership makes the inner Party crisis of a mistaken policy the crisis of Party existence itself.

The Party as a whole will of course rise to the occasion, guarding the unity of the party like the apple of one's eyes through the effective and principled use of the ever successful Bolsheviki weapon of criticism and self-criticism.

I am largely responsible for the lack of Marxist education inside the Party in the past and hence continue to feel deeply about it by seeing its calamitous consequences in the present Party crisis.

VIEWS is my bit of atonement. It will contain theoretical polemics, data, study material, and international documents. It will stop the day respected comrades from abroad send me word that I am harming instead of helping the party cause or if Party members and sympathisers here ask me to stop it either by refusing to buy it or not paying enough donations to keep it going. Out of the Party, without a Party Trial, what other and better checks can I make my guides for fulfilling my duty towards the party as long as I regard myself a Communist?

---