

# OPPORTUNISM OF THE CPM AND ITS CONTRADICTIONS

---

---

The growing economic and political crisis in the country, the growing dissatisfaction of the masses, the growing people's struggles throughout the country, though most of them of a spontaneous character, above all the growing rivalry of the two super powers for domination over our country, with the Soviet Union having the upper hand, have been increasing the divisions between the various sections of the ruling classes and their parties and increasing the instability of the ruling classes as a whole.

This has been resulting in continuous splits in each ruling class party. The Congress has been split thrice already. The Janata Party split four times already. The Lokdal has already been split. The Akali Party has been split. Even then, the present ruling class parties including the ruling Indira Congress Party are faced with increasing dissidence in their own ranks.

Now this virus has spread to the CPI. With the open encouragement of Indira Gandhi, the Dange faction, the architect of revisionism in India, has split away from the official CPI.

For all outside appearances, the CPI pretends to be united. If you look at the CPM, right from 1968, first the communist revolutionaries broke away from it, since then small groups have been breaking away from the CPM. How and then some local groups broke away from CPM in West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Karnataka in Kerala in many places local CPM cadres are joining RSS. Now the news comes that one CPM-MLA from Punjab, Daya Singh, has joined the Congress (I), because as per his statement, he has now found more progressivism in the Indira's policies, than in CPM.

The CPM leadership has been trying to cover up these, frequent cracks in its ranks through its hold over the provincial ministries in Tripura, West Bengal and Kerala.

There are inherent contradictions between CPM's declared policies and its actual practices, its political professions and its actual practices. Its political opportunism is coming out more and more nakedly. These contradictions are bound to lead to greater dissensions and internal crisis. CPM cannot escape from facing such a situation.

**Look at these contradictions and its political opportunism more deeply.**

***1. Is it equi-distant between CPSU and CPC ?***

The claim of the CPM leadership has always been that it is opposed to the "right deviation" of the the CPSU and the "left-adventurism" of the CPC, that it is alone following correct Marxism-Leninism, and that it stands for the unity of the whole world "Communist" movement. But its practice is entirely in the opposite direction, always opposing the CPC and always supporting the CPSU on all international issues.

Let us look at the facts. The CPM continues to oppose the Three World Theory, still being upheld by the present CPC leadership even after the death of Comrade Mao. It is opposed to Mao Tse Tung Thought. It is opposed to the major aspects of the internal policy of the CPC.

On the other hand, the CPM leadership has been consistently supporting all the imperialist aggressions of the Soviet Union abroad- the occupation of Czechoslovakia, its intervention in Angola, Yemen, its support to Ethiopia against Somalia, its support to Vietnam's aggression against Kampuchea, Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, the deceptive "Peace" plans of the Soviet Union-its threat of intervention in the Internal policies of Poland etc.

There is not a single issue of international importance on which the CPM dared to oppose the CPSU. There is not a single issue of international importance on which the CPM leadership dared to support the position of the CPC.

Till very recently the CPM leadership has been putting out stories in the daily press that it was going to renew the relations with the CPC on Party to Party basis, that its delegation was going to China for discussions, that it was working for unity between CPC and CPSU.

But practice proved otherwise. In the wake of the threat of the Indira Congress Central government to topple the CPM led government all this deceptive talk evaporated and of late the CPM leadership is more openly coming out to condemn China of "siding" with US imperialism. The General Secretary of the CPM has openly condemned China for "hobnobbing" with US imperialism. A few days back, Jyoti Basu openly declared that China was conspiring with US imperialism and Pakistan against India, and that Indira Gandhi was not sufficiently rousing the people against this conspiracy of China. What proletarian internationalism can there be a more

**shameful statement from one who claims himself to be a communist? Is it not a blatant lie? Let us remember that Basu is telling this blatant lie when the foreign minister of China is coming to India for talks, when our foreign minister is going to Pakistan for talks i.e. when intensive triangular discussions between China-Pakistan-India are in the offing.**

**Thus one can easily see the contradiction between the professions of CPM leadership to be equi-distant between CPSU and CPC and its practice of shameful support to the social imperialist policies of the Soviet Union.**

**How does the CPM leadership defend its policies on this ?**

**Its only defence is that Soviet Union is a Socialist country and not a social imperialist country. Because it did not like open support of the Soviet Union to the Emergency rule of Indira Gandhi, which came in conflict with it's own pretention of opposition to Indira's rule, the CPM leadership says that the CPSU leadership commits some mistakes of "right" deviation. This is the only point of difference between CPSU and CPM.**

**About this "right deviation" of the CPSU, the CPM leadership has been speaking for the last 17 years. Even after this long period of practice, according to the CPM, right deviation does not become revisionism. What is the root of right deviation in CPSU, according to the CPM. Is it not a reflection of bourgeois elements and bourgeois thinking? Enough evidence has come before the world to show that Socialism has been destroyed and capitalism restored in the Soviet Union after the death of Comrade Stalin.**

**We could see the restoration of capitalism nakedly in the Soviet Union's policy of social imperialism abroad, particularly in the export of capital and economic and political pressures on the Third World countries for domination, struggle for spheres of influence, arms race, rivalry with US imperialism for world domination and finally series of imperialist aggressions against other countries. Is there any difference between the practices of US imperialism and Soviet Union on all these issues ? None.**

**How does the CPM leadership justify these aggressions of the Soviet Union? They say that Soviet Union is not committing aggression but helping liberation movement in other countries.**

**Does Marxism-Leninism justify these aggressions in the name of support to liberation movements? Never, There is not a single word in the whole Marxist-Leninist literature to justify such dastardly actions.**

Only during the last stages of the Second World War the Red Army under the leadership of Stalin advanced upto Berlin, to fight Hitler's fascist armies and thus helped in the liberation of Europe from fascism. But that was a war situation.

So no amount of lies and deceptions from the CPM leadership can cover up the imperialist aggressions of Soviet social imperialists.

## ***2. Fake opposition to imperialism-real support to Soviet social imperialism.***

The CPM leadership claims to be the champion of struggle against imperialism particularly US imperialism in India, but in practice they are covering up the growing exploitation of our country by Soviet social imperialism in India, its growing economic and political domination in the country, attempts to convert our country into its neo colony. Another contradiction of the CPM between its professions and practice.

The CPM leadership leadership claims that India is a 'fully sovereign' country, while the reality is otherwise. The big-bourgeois-big landlord classes ruling our country today are comprador in nature, subservient to imperialism and social imperialism and thus helping the domination of imperialism over our country.

The CPM leadership claims that Soviet Union is a "socialist" country and that help to India is "self-less" aid meant to fight against imperialism. But this is another blatant lie and deception.

The Soviet Union in competition with other imperialist powers had begun to enter the Indian market on a big scale with the beginning of the Second Five year plan. Since private industries had already been monopolised by the Western powers, it began to enter the public sector in the name of industrialising the country. Its investments in India are already more than Rs. 500 crores, and by the time the latest promises of "aid" are implemented it is going to reach Rs. 1000 crores. It already occupies the first or second place in our export and import trade. It already dominates our steel, heavy machine tools, electrical machinery, and oil refinery industries. It has got new facilities to enter coal and cement. It is entering our agricultural front too.

With Soviet help the public sector has already reached the commanding heights of our country.

**But if we go deeper into this question, Soviet help to our public sector bears the following characteristics.**

**— Our public sector industries are meant to build the infrastructure industries which our industrialists are not in a position to build on their own. So they are built with public money to enable the growth of private industries. That is why along with the growth of public sector industries, private industries too, belonging to comprador bourgeoisie and imperialist powers have grown. The Soviet help to our public sector industries has only helped in drawing more capital from the western countries into our country.**

**— Soviet Union is using its “help” to our country, to convert our country into its market, to sell its out-dated machinery and technology at high rates and to purchase raw materials from our country for its use at cheaper rates, exploiting the country from both sides.**

**Soviet Union helps certain industries in India, the produce from some of which it purchases at low prices. This is so particularly in some of the engineering industries.**

**It is also utilising the industries like oil refinery, only to refine the crude from the Soviet Union and sell it in India.**

**Thus Soviet Union is using its “help” to India to sell its goods in India, and to capture our market just as any other imperialist power.**

**The Soviet Union is building certain semi-processing industries in India in the form of joint industries to produce certain semi-processed goods and purchase the whole produce from these industries at cheap rates and give a final shape in their own country, thus depriving our country of the surplus value produced by our workers. This is nothing but the old imperialist practice of exploiting the colonial and semi-colonial countries.**

**- The Soviet “aid” to the Indian big bourgeois, big landlord classes has never helped in building an independent self-sufficient economy free from imperialist economy.**

**- The Soviet Union has never helped to train our engineers or technicians to build such industries on their own. On the other hand it is the imperialists who are competing with the Soviet Union to enter our Public Sector industries.**

**The Bhilai Steel industry, built with the help of the Soviet Union has**

not enabled our engineers to build other steel industries on our own. But the British and the West Germans have entered the steel industry.

The Soviet 'help' to our oil refinery industry has not enabled our country to build refinery industries on our own. But the other imperialist powers are building other refinery complexes. Now the prospecting for new oil resources in the country has been thrown open to the imperialist multi-nationals. Many other examples could be cited.

The trade between India and the Soviet Union is on the rupee basis. It is mainly connected with the public sector industries. But the private industries are still dominated by the Western powers and the native big bourgeoisie. So the increase of trade with the Soviet Union has not helped in decreasing the dependence on the Western powers. On the other hand it is increasing. The balance of payments to the disadvantage of India is increasing. And our foreign debt has already reached nearly Rs. 25,000 Crores. Yearly payments towards these debts is already eating up nearly half of our exports.

In short the more the Soviet capital in India, the more the Western capital in India. The more the Soviet capital in India the more the loans from the Western powers, particularly from Us imperialism.

The reality today is that while the Soviet Union keeping its dominance over the Public Sector industries, is trying to enter the private industries. Us imperialism and other western powers, while keeping their dominance in the private industries, are trying to enter the Public Sector.

Just like the old imperialist powers, the Soviet Union is using its economic position in the country, to gain political and military domination over our country. It is buying or controlling dailies and weeklies to defend its policies. Through various corruptive practices, it is trying to get control over our educational institutions. It is trying to gather various sections of the ruling classes in support of its policies.

Apart from pro-Soviet elements in other ruling class parties, the Indira Congress, the CPI and CPM are the main Soviet allies in our country.

In addition, the Soviet Union has almost got the monopoly of supply of military hardware to our government.

Thus we can see that Soviet Union dominates the public sector, the

commanding heights of our economy. It is in a better position to influence the internal and external policies of the country in its favour than Western powers.

As part of their rivalry for world domination, both the Super powers, USA and Soviet Union are contesting for domination over our country, with the Soviet Union having the upper hand. Now with the Soviet military occupation of Afghanistan, the danger of our country becoming a neo-colony of the Soviet Union is greater today.

Thus one could see that inspite of all the big claims of the CPM leadership to the contrary, its policies are only helping the economic, political and military domination of both the super powers in India. This only shows the CPM is fighting neither against Soviet imperialism nor against US imperialism, except in words with regard to the latter.

Thus one could see another big contradiction between the claim of the CPM leadership to be the champion of struggle against imperialism but in practice helping to strengthen the imperialist hold over our country. By not recognising Soviet 'aid' as imperialist and in fact by glorifying it as 'socialist' 'self-less' aid, the CPM is actually strengthening the domination of Soviet social imperialism over our country.

### ***3. Professing Proletarian internationalism and practicing the worst kind of national chauvinism in the service of the ruling classes***

The CPM leadership which claims to be a 'Marxist-Leninist' Party always proclaims to be strictly following the principles of Proletarian internationalism, but in practice has gone to such low depths of national chauvinism on many issues - to gain the approval of the ruling classes and serve them better. Here there is another contradiction between its declared policy and its practice. Let us look at the following facts.

— Ours is a multinational state, where many nationalities are inhabiting our country and the problem of nationalities exists, leading to various contradictions and conflicts in the political life of the country.

Marxism-Leninism has advocated Self-determination for nationalities, including the right of secession combining it with the preservation of unity of the country on the basis of voluntary agreement of all the nationalities inhabiting in a multinational state.

The big bourgeois big landlord classes in our country, in their drive

for complete control of the All India market, never recognise the equality of nationalities and the right of Self determination of nationalities. They suppress the national aspirations of the backward nationalities.

The CPM leadership (the CPI too) in order to curry the favour of the ruling classes has come out against the application of right of Self determination for nationalities to the Indian conditions, with its "profound" analysis that in India there are no oppressor and oppressed nationalities as in Tzarist Russia. The absurdity of this 'theory' can be easily understood if we remember that comrade Stalin argued for the retention of the right of self determination for nationalities in the 1936 Constitution even under conditions of socialism.

With this pretext they refuse to recognise the right of self determination for Mizoram and Nagaland or any other North-Eastern state. They refuse to recognise the Right of Self determination for J&K. With this pretext, they shamelessly supported the annexation of Sikkim by the Indian government.

— They refused to see the expansionist nature of the Indian ruling classes. It is because of their expansionist nature that the Indian classes always rods national chauvinism in our people against Pakistan, Bangladesh and China leading to perpetual wars and conflicts, diverting and disrupting the revolutionary struggle of our people.

They shamelessly supported all wars of expansionism engineered by the Indian ruling classes with the support of Soviet social imperialism against Pakistan and its dismemberment.

Now the CPM leadership is in the forefront of the national chauvinist propaganda against Bangladesh on the Farakka issue.

They are in full agreement with Indira Gandhi in condemning Pakistan, in its efforts to secure arms for its own self-defence and condemn it as US conspiracy. They have gone to such low depths as to denounce China as conspiring with Pakistan and US imperialism against India, while in reality China is making efforts to improve relations with India.

They are condemning the just struggle of the Assam people and rousing Bengali chauvinism against the people of Assam.

*4. A Party of 'armed insurrection's in the cities and 'armed guerilla*



***Peasant struggle' IN WORDS, BUT a Party caught in the mire of  
Parliamentarism never to come back to the path of struggle***

The CPM leaders shout from house-tops that their is the only party of 'Revolution' in India, but in actual practice, it has been confirmed that it is going down in the mire of Parliamentarism, down the path of Millerandism, never to come back to the path of struggle and here we have got another inherent contradiction in the professions and practice of the CPM leadership. Let us look at this point more deeply.

At the time when the CPI and CPM leaderships betrayed the Great Telengana armed struggle of 1946-51 and took the path of parliamentary activities, all of them unanimously bellowed that they had kept the arms in 'secret' dumps, that their participation in Parliamentary institutions was only 'temporary' and would soon dig out the "secret' arms for armed struggle.

Thirty years have elapsed since these "heroic" statement were made by the CPI and CPM leadership. But this "temporary retreat" has never ended. Even after thirty years, the digging out of the "secret' arms dumps has never become a reality. The CPM leadership to make a show of revolution broke away from the CPI but parliamentarism has never stopped. On the other hand it is going down deeper and deeper along the road of Parliamentarism.

The CPM programme declares that when all avenues for peaceful transformation of society are exhausted, the people are bound to take to armed insurrection that CPM believes in armed insurrection in the cities combining it with armed peasant guerilla struggle in the rural areas. Under the mask of such "heroic' statements the CPM leadership has been engaged in the worst form of parliamentary opportunism.

Let us look at the theoretical absurdity of the CPM pundits on this question.

***Does it really believe in armed struggle ?***

If the CPM leadership really believes in what it says about "armed insurrection' in the cities and "armed peasant guerilla struggle' in the rural areas, why should it hate Mao Tse Tung Thoughts and the concept of People's War and take the communist revolutionaries as its main enemies in India at present? The very presentation of the question exposes the pretensions of the CPM leadership on the question of armed struggle.

## ***Participation in elections.***

It is true that Marxism-Leninism does advocate that we should participate in the Parliamentary institutions when the revolutionary movement is at low ebb or boycott the Parliamentary institutions when the revolutionary movement is sweeping the country. But Marxism-Leninism has always said that the aim of participation in or boycott of these institutions as the situation demands, is to advance the revolutionary movement in the country.

For revolutionaries, when they participate in elections the sole aim should be to use it for the propagation of revolutionary politics and strengthen revolutionary movement in the country. This participation should be combined with the strengthening of the class struggle outside with rousing and organising the people - the workers, peasants, students and government employees for anti imperialist and anti big bourgeois - big landlord struggles. In short, it should be combined with organising the people for resistance and thus advance the revolutionary movement in the country.

Does the practice of the CPM leadership have anything to do with this orientation ?

What are the revolutionary struggles led by the CPM or CPI leadership any where in the country? During the last 30 years of parliamentary participation, have they any where or at any time gone beyond economic and legal agitation ? If any clashes have taken place with the armed forces of the government it is nothing but a sponaneous character and inspite of the leadership's efforts to confine them to economism and legalism. The whole purpose of such an agitation has been to captalise on the dissatisfaction of the masses from one election to another.

Participation in and trying to capture various parliamentary institutions gram panchayats, Samities, Parishads, Assemblies and Parliament has been the only orientation of the CPM leadership combined with economic and legal agitation. Will anybody seriously believe that such an orientation will ever lead to "insurrection" in the cities and "armed guerilla struggle" in the rural areas ?

## ***Opportunistic political alliances for electoral gains***

Participating in elections to advance the class struggles to advance the revolutionary movement in the country, as the situation demands, is

entirely different from electoral alliances with sections of the ruling class parties.

Where has Marxism-Leninism said that the working class party should make opportunistic alliances with sections of the ruling class parties for electoral gains ? While the CPI went for electoral alliance with the ruling Indira Congress Party during the Emergency, the CPM went in for the same kind of all alliances with opposition section of the ruling classes. That was the only difference between the CPI and CPM till 1977 general elections. Now the CPI too has begun to adopt the same tactics as the CPM.

In Support of such opportunistic alliances, the CPI and CPM are never tired of quoting to us from the teachings of Lenin from 'Left wing Communism'. But unfortunately for them, Left Wing Communism has explained when we should boycott the elections or when we should participate in the elections to advance the revolutionary struggle. Even when Lenin said that the small Communist Party of Britain should support the British Labour Party in those days, against the Liberals or Conservatives he called upon them to have friendly contest among the workers to find who has the greater strength there to decide the candidate. Does the practice of CPM have anything to do with the teachings of Lenin on this question ?

In 1936-37, during the days of Stalin, Dimitrov's report did advocate electoral alliances with Socialists, Republicans etc. on a clear cut programme of opposition to monopoly capitalism, opposition to Fascism and war. Does the practice of CPI and CPM anything to do with the teachings of Dimitrov's report ?

There is another ideological aspect to this question. Election agreements with any section of the ruling class parties is nothing but political united front with them. Based on Marxism-Leninism, when can the working class have a political united front with any section of the ruling classes ? Practice has so far shown us that in the developed capitalist countries, i.e.. Western countries and Japan etc., the working class had united front with sections of the ruling classes in the struggle against fascism or during times of foreign aggression against their countries as during the period of the Second world war.

In the vast colonial and semi-colonial countries, the working class can unite with sections of the ruling classes against foreign imperialist aggression, in the struggle against Emergency rule, like that of Indira Gandhi as in 1975-76, or when the country becomes the neo-colony of any of the two super powers or other imperialist powers. In other periods it is one of

utilising the contradictions of the various sections of the ruling classes on various issues...economic and political... To advance the peoples struggles against the common enemy, while exposing the reactionary policies of those with whom we unite.

From this, one can clearly see that the policies and practices of the CPI and CPM with regard to alliances has nothing to do with the interests of the class struggle or with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. It is sheer political opportunism in the interests of their Parliamentary path in opposition to class struggle and revolutionary struggle.

## **FORMATION OF MINISTRIES IN VARIOUS STATES**

The opportunism of the CPM leadership did not stop with opportunist political alliances with sections of the ruling classes for electoral gains. Now it has advanced to the level of capturing state power at the provincial levels, through elections. From 1957, this has become the main feature of the CPM tactics.

The CPM leadership is carving for power at the state level under the present big bourgeois-big landlord constitution which is completely reactionary, meant only to serve the interests of imperialism and social imperialism and our ruling classes - an instrument to suppress and exploit the common people of our country. Under this constitution, all power, financial and otherwise is mobilised by the centre, leaving only residuary powers to the state governments. Every Bill or Act of the State Assembly is to be signed either by the governor ----- nominated by the Centre, or by the President. The Central government can dismiss any state govt. at any time; state governments that it does not like and impose President's rule in that state.

Under this constitution, can the state governments do anything useful to the people, solve any of the basic problems of the people? Experience has proved that the CPM led governments in Tripura, West Bengal or Kerala can only implement certain reforms approved by the Central government and nothing else.

What ever reforms the CPM led governments have been able to introduce in these states, let us remember that they have never gone beyond the wishes of the ruling classes at the centre. They cannot touch any basic problems of the people - land to the tiller, living wages to the workers, nationalisation of industries, either of our big bourgeoisie or of the imperialists, the growing prices, growing black market, growing unemployment,

**and growing tax burden on the people etc.**

**Of course one can welcome reforms, if they help to heighten the consciousness of the people for further struggles against the semi-colonial and semi-feudal system of exploitation in the country at present. Can anybody say that the reforms of the CPM led governments are heightening the consciousness of the people for further struggles against the present system of exploitation? The whole purpose of these reforms is to dull the consciousness of the people, to divert the attention of the people from the path of struggle and still further increase the parliamentary illusions of the people.**

**Does the existence of the CPM led governments in the three states help in increasing the tempo and consciousness of the people's struggles in other states as claimed by the CPM leadership? No. They have never gone beyond legal and economic agitation. It has only increased opportunism in the ranks of this Party for still more opportunistic alliances with ruling class parties, with landlord parties for petty electoral gains.**

**It cannot be otherwise. Today in order to save their governments, the CPM leaders and ministers oppose workers strikes in their states, side with Jotedars in their struggles against the peasants, they oppose glehrao by the workers, they shamelessly invite capital even from the imperialist multinational companies.**

**Thus one can see how these governments led by the CPM, instead of being instruments of 'struggle' as their leaders preach, they have become in practice instruments of suppression. One should never forget how it was the CPM ministry in West Bengal in 1967 that suppressed the armed present struggle in Naxalbari. On the other hand, instead of serving as the instruments of 'struggle' these governments have become instruments to breed corruption at all levels of their party, to breed new bureaucrats in the villages, in the co-operative movement, in the Panchayats, Samities etc. They are only breeding 'new' peasant elements "new' landlord elements who are behaving worse than the old landlords.**

**Another question. Are any reforms useful to the people possible under the present conditions of extreme economic and political crisis? To say yes is nothing but deception.**

**Let us remember Lenin's teachings on the relation between reforms and revolution. Lenin says :**

**"On the other hand it is more advantageous to the working class for**

the necessary changes in the direction of bourgeois democracy to take place by way of revolution and not by way of reform, because the path of reform is one of delay, procrastination, the painfully slow decomposition of the putrid parts of the national organism. It is the proletariat and the peasantry that suffer first of all most from that putrefaction. The revolutionary path is one of rapid amputation, which is the least painful to the proletariat, the path of immediate removal of what is putrescent the path of least compliance with and consideration for the monarch and abominable, vile, rotten and noxious institutions that go with it. (Lenin, Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, p.45)

We have seen the practical results of the CPM led governments. Now let us discuss one fundamental theoretical question here. Does Marxism-Leninism agree that a working class party can accept power under reactionary constitutions? If so, under what conditions?

Marxism-Leninism has never said the working class should not assume power till a successful working class revolution takes place. There are occasions when the working class party gave a call for intermediate government with other forces, under specific conditions, to further advance the revolutionary struggle.

For instance, Comrade Lenin, in his famous article, 'Two tactics of Social democracy in the Democratic revolution' written in July 1905, gave the call for the "Provisional revolutionary government," even before the Tzarist government was overthrown.

But let us remember that Comrade Lenin gave the call in the beginning of the 1905 Revolution in Russia. The Third Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, in its resolution on "Provisional Revolutionary government" declared.:

a) That it is necessary to spread among the working class a concrete idea of the most probable course of the revolution, and of necessity, at certain moments in the revolution, for the emergence of a provisional revolutionary government, from which the proletariat will demand the realisation of all the immediate political and economic demands of our programme (the minimum programme).

b) That subject to the alignment of forces and other factors which cannot be exactly predetermined, representatives of our party may participate in the provisional revolutionary government for the purpose of waging a relentless struggle against all counter - revolutionary attempts and of de-

fending the independent interests of the working class.

c) That an indispensable condition for such participation is strict control of its representatives by the Party, and the constant safeguarding of the independence of Social democracy which strives for the complete socialist revolution, and consequently, is irreconcilably opposed to all the bourgeois parties.

d) That irrespective of whether participation of social democrats in the provisional revolutionary government is possible or not, we must propagate among the broadest sections of the proletariat the idea that armed proletariat led by Social democratic party must bring to bear constant pressure on the provisional government for the purpose of defending, consolidating and extending the against of the revolution.

(Lenin, Two tactics of Social democracy in the democratic revolution, P.16)

Explaining the significance of this resolution, Comrade Lenin again and again declared that this Provisional revolutionary government is an "organ of insurrection" that "in origin and basic character such a government must be an organ of popular uprising. Its formal purpose must be to serve as an instrument for convening a national constituent assembly. The content of its activities must be the implementation of the minimum programme of proletarian democracy, the only programme capable of safeguarding the interest of the people that has risen in revolt against the autocracy". (Ibid, P.20).

Answering the question whether it is permissible in principle for social democrats to participate in a provisional revolutionary government Lenin declared :

"It is permissible in principle for Social democrats to participate in a provisional revolutionary government (during the period of democratic revolution, the period of struggle for a republic). By this we once for all dissociate ourselves both from the anarchists, who answer this question in the negative in principle, and from the tail enders in social democracy (like Martynov and the new-Iskra supporters), who have tried to frighten us with the prospect of a situation in which it might prove necessary for us to participate in such a government". (Ibid, P.22).

***What for ?***

1) a relentless struggle against counter - revolutionary attempts.

2) The defence of the independent interest of the working class.

The formation of a Provisional revolutionary government and the participation of communists in such a government-Comrade Lenin described as organising Revolution from "above" he declared :

"The long reign of political reaction in Europe, which has lasted almost uninterruptedly since the days of the Paris Commune, has made us to greatly accustom to the idea that action can proceed only "from below" has greatly inured us to seeing only defensive struggles. We have now undoubtedly entered a new era ---- a period of political upheavals and revolutions- has begun. In a period such as that which Russia is now passing through, it is impermissible to confine ourselves to old, stereotyped formulae. We must propagate the idea of action from above and must study the conditions for and forms of, such action" (Ibid, P.23)

But comrade Lenin also warned that we must eventually be prepared for action from below, He said :

"Having explained all aspects of the party's policy with regard to action from above ... this new, hitherto almost unprecedented method of struggle ... the resolution also provides for the eventuality that we shall not be able to act from above. We must in any case exercise pressure on the provisional revolutionary government from below. To be able to exercise this pressure from below, the proletariat must be armed, for in a revolutionary situation matters develop with exceptional rapidity to the stage of open civil war - and must be led by the Social democratic party. The object of its armed pressure is to defend, consolidate and extend the gains of the revolution i.e. those gains which from the standpoint of the proletariat's interests, must consist in fulfilling the whole of our minimum programme' (Ibid P.24)

Again in 1936-37, during the period of struggle against fascism, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, Dimitrov's report also called upon the communists to participate in intermediate governments in alliance with socialists and other republicans on a clear-cut programme of struggle against in lebanance of the working class interests in the struggle against monopoly capitalism and in defence of peace. But he also said that for the participation of communists in such governments, the mass movement in the country should be in a position to directly intervene and force the government to implement the agreed programme.



After defeating Japanese aggression against China, and before Chaing-Kai-Shek started the second civil war against the liberated zones under the leadership of the communists, Comrade Mao gave the slogan of coalition governments with an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal programme and conducted negotiations with the Chaing Kai-Shek government to expose his reactionary policies and conspiracies for civil war.

From these historical teachings from the great Marxist thinkers, can anyone say that Marxists-Leninists could accept power under reactionary big bourgeois-big landlord constitution? Can the CPM leadership say that its provincial ministries are organs of power as Lenin envisaged? Are they instruments of 'struggle' as the CPM leadership claims? On the other hand they are nothing but organs of suppression and exploitation of the people. Lenin said that people must be armed and people's pressure from below must be constant and consistent on the provisional revolutionary government to break the vacillation of the bourgeoisie. But the CPM leadership is prepared to make any compromise with its allies in the front even against the interests of the people to keep itself in power, as we are witnessing its performance in Kerala in alliance with the Congress (U).

One can see that the CPM has advanced from participating in elections to the opportunist political alliances with sections of the ruling classes and sharing power with them in the provincial ministries. Now preserving these ministries, and fictitious opposition in the other provinces and opportunistic political alliances with big bourgeois big landlord parties "that is the road of Delhi" that is the road that the CPM leadership has chalked out for itself.

Can anybody see any grain of "revolution" in this whole orientation?

Thus one could see the biggest contradiction between the CPM's claim of working for "insurrection" in the cities and "armed peasant guerilla struggle" in the rural areas and its actual naked practice of parliamentary path.

### ***5. Bogus claims of fighting against Indira's authoritarianism.***

The CPM leadership loudly claims that it is fighting against the "authoritarianism" of Indira Gandhi. But does its practice prove it?

What is the basis for authoritarianism? It is the semi-colonial and semi-feudal society that is the basis for all authoritarianism. Its whole programme, whatever be its professions, in practice only helps in the preservation of the

UNIVERSITY OF KERALA

present semi-colonial and semi-feudal society in our country.

As long as this society exists, the basis for "authoritarianism" exists. With our fighting to change the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, its claims of fighting against the authoritarianism is nothing but bog

In the name of fighting against authoritarianism, whom has it gathered around it? Apart from certain forces in West Bengal, the other forces are the Lokdal, the Jat landlords of UP and Bihar, the Congress (U) leaders who have shown by their practice to be just waiting for a welcome sign to rush into the Congress (I) — these are the "heroes" with whom the CPM leadership wants to fight against "authoritarianism" of Indira Gandhi.

The CPM led governments themselves have become instruments for bloody repression against the struggling people. The CPM led government in West Bengal sides with Jotedars against the struggling peasants. It is the same with Kerala government. The Tripura government enacted the biggest blood bath against the tribals and called for more central assistance in its unholy war against the tribals. After this performance can they still claim to be fighting the "authoritarianism" of Indira Gandhi?

Now every one knows the despicable role of the CPM leadership in the Assam agitation. It is this leadership which is mainly supporting the fascist repression of Indira Gandhi against the Assamese people. Can they claim after this, that they are fighting against the "authoritarianism" of Indira Gandhi?

All its political slogans and activities are not in the interest of the people but for the single aim of preserving its own ministries and in this its political opportunism is getting more and more naked!

It is the vote of the CPM and the CPI that is keeping the minority Indira Congress government in power in Assam. Is this not an appeal to the Indira government to allow their ministries to be in power in return for their support in Assam? Support to Indira Congress in Assam, but opposition to it in other provinces, what kind of opportunism is this?

It unites with Congress(U) in Kerala to keep itself in power. But in opposition to the constituent of the very same Congress in West Bengal.. what kind of opportunism is this?

Murderous violence between CPM and RSS, but an appeal to the BJP

for united front against Indira's authoritarianism. What kind of opportunism is this?

All this clearly shows that all its slogans of "left and democratic unity" its slogan of fight against Indira's "authoritarianism"... its sole aim is preservation of its own ministries, and to come to power in the centre in alliance with other opposition sections of the ruling classes.

The election victory of the CPM has nothing to do with the advance of the revolutionary struggle in the country. It is only a reflection of reformist illusions among a section of the people and a weakness of the revolutionary movement at present.

Thus one can see the programme, policies and the practice of the CPM leadership is riddled with inherent and insoluble contradictions. These contradictions are bound to lead to crisis after crisis in the CPM too. As long as it is tied with Soviet social imperialism, the crisis of soviet social imperialism is bound to engulf the CPM too. As long as its practice is to preserve the present semi-colonial and semi-feudal system, the economic and political crisis of this system is bound to have a reflection in the CPM too.

As the Agrarian Revolution advances under the leadership of the communist revolutionaries as the revolutionary struggle of the people sweep the country, it is bound to speed up the crisis of the CPM. That is the dialectics of contradictions.

*Road to liberation*

*July, 1981*