

Whither CPI(M) ?

In a workers' meeting on 8th November last of the CPI(M) on the occasion of the anniversary of the November Revolution, Sri B. T. Ranadive, the CPI(M) leader observed that the Soviet Union and China, the two leaders of the socialist camp were not properly following the principle of proletarian internationalism, a vital teaching of the November Revolution. Sri Ranadive further stated that these two socialist countries were harming the revolutionary movements in different countries. He continued that the revolutionary movements could not gather the momentum which could have been attained in different countries with the great support of the socialist camp, because of the incorrect path of China and the Soviet Union.

It is to be noted that these comments were made by a prominent leader of the CPI(M) in such an important meeting like the anniversary of the November Revolution and since the party has not made any protest and since the speech of Sri Ranadive has been published in 'Ganasakti' the Bengali organ of the CPI(M), we can presume that these comments of Sri Ranadive are the official stand of the CPI(M).

The CPI(M) claims itself to be a Communist Party. It also claims to be a partner of the international communist movement. But the international communist movement is to-day divided into two diametrically opposite lines viz the revisionist line headed by the Soviet revisionist leadership and the real Marxist Leninist line followed by the Communist party of China, Socialist Unity Centre of India and some other communist parties who are fighting against the revisionist line. In this struggle, any party, claiming itself to be a communist party can not remain neutral. Either the party has to back the revisionist line or it will join anti-revisionist struggle and support the real Marxist-Leninist line. Any party claiming itself to be a communist party must have to take a definite and clear-cut position free from any ambiguity. This is the primary international responsibility of any party which claims itself to be a communist party. No party claiming itself to be a

communist party can shirk off this responsibility under any pretext. A real communist party must analyse the fundamental questions that create rift in international communist movement and must understand who is correctly following the Marxist Leninist principles and must give its concrete opinion and suggestion if any on these fundamental questions and join in the struggle. But curiously the CPI(M) leadership since inception after breaking away from the undivided CPI on the plea of ideological disputes, has not publicly expressed its view points on these serious ideological questions that created serious division in the international communist movement. On the contrary, this leadership of the CPI(M) always avoided any discussion on these fundamental ideological questions in their party congresses.

The fundamental ideological questions on which there is a sharp difference between the Chinese Communist Party and the Soviet revisionist leadership are much discussed and everyone is well acquainted with these ideological questions like war and peace, the real revolutionary significance of the policy of peaceful-co-existence, the methods to counteract imperialist aggression, on the question of the correct diplomacy with the imperialist countries, on the question of providing active help to the revolutionary movements in the capitalist countries and

the national liberation struggles in the colonies and semi-colonies, on the question of the method of using the contradiction within the imperialist capitalist camp in favour of the international communist movement, on the question of peaceful transition to socialism through parliamentary process, etc etc. These are the fundamental ideological questions in the present day international communist movement and it is mainly due to the revisionist deviation of the Soviet leadership on these questions that the present international communist movement is divided and the revolutionary movements of different countries suffered for the division in socialist camp. The revisionist policies pursued by the Soviet leadership are creating great hindrance to the growth of revolutionary movement in different countries and the imperialist camp, which after the second world war, was cornered and on the defensive, took advantage of the revisionist policies of the Soviet revisionist leadership and mounted attacks on the national liberation struggles of different countries and even attacked North Vietnam, a brotherly socialist state.

The CPI(M), till today has never expressed its definite view points on these fundamental ideological questions and never attempted to discuss on these vital questions of the international communist movement. Under such circumstance by terming both Chinese Communist party and the Soviet revisionist leadership as incorrect, is not the CPI(M) leadership trying to judge the communist leadership of China and the Soviet revisionist leadership on the same footing? Is it not a sinister attempt on the part of the CPI(M) leadership to bring the Chinese Communist leadership at par with the Soviet revisionist leadership or to put it in other words, an attempt to upgrade the Soviet revisionist leadership in the same rank of the

Chinese Communist leadership?

Without making any discussion on these fundamental ideological questions of the international communist movements and moreover without mentioning why the Communist party of China is incorrect and where it has deviated from the Marxist-Leninist principle, the CPI(M) leadership charged that both China and the Soviet Union were following incorrect path and doing harm to the revolutionary movements in different countries. These are assertions of the CPI(M) leadership and these assertions are far from Marxism-Leninism. Is not the CPI(M) leadership trying to confuse the cadres of the CPI(M) by making such assertion without showing where and how the leadership of the Communist party of China is deviating from Marxism Leninism and thus following a wrong path? If this is not the motive then what can be reason behind this attempt of the CPI(M) leadership to equate the Chinese Communist party with the Soviet leadership which has been declared as revisionist by the CPI(M) itself?

We have observed that the CPI(M) leadership after the split of the undivided CPI, took anti-Soviet revisionist posture because of the continued recognition of the CPI by the Soviet Union. But never the CPI(M) leadership placed any analysis of the revisionist policies of the Soviet Union. What is this behaviour of the CPI(M) due to? Is it not because of their apprehension that in the absence of international recognition they would not get the prestige from the people as well as from the cadres and so by criticising the Soviet revisionist leadership did they not expect recognition from the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party? Is it not true that the CPI(M) leadership after having failed to get recognition from the Communist

CPM Moving Towards Soviet Revisionist

Silchar Food Convention

Party of China, hobnobbed with North Korea and even with the Communist party of Rumania which is more revisionist than the Soviet leadership? Is it because of this reason that the CPI (M) leadership avoided the primary responsibility of ventilating their definite view points on these basic and fundamental ideological questions of the international communist movement? Is it due to this fact that the CPI (M) leadership, with a view to getting international recognition, is leaning towards the Soviet revisionist leadership by bracketing the communist leadership of China with the Soviet revisionist leadership?

We have been observing this tendency of the CPI (M) leadership to become more close to the Soviet revisionist leadership for a pretty long time and we have shown this phenomenon in our writing on the Central Committee resolution of the CPI (M) held in July last. It has been observed that the CPI (M) leadership is trying for an adjustment with Soviet revisionist leadership and it is palpable in the attempt of the CPI (M) leadership to be close to the CPI. But the CPI (M) leadership is taking a round about way in expressing this truth to the cadres of the party as this leadership has in the past, instigated the cadres of the party with anti-revisionist tirade and any *volte face* at the present time will be a great jolt. So the CPI (M) leadership is trying to create the necessary ground work for their ultimate objective.

We quote below the relevant portion of the article on the Central Committee resolution of the CPI (M) published in Proletarian Era to show how the CPI (M) is leaning towards the Soviet Union for a pretty long times —

“It is no figment of our imagination that the CPI (M) is now advancing to have

some sort of recognition from or closer understanding with the CPSU and, for that reason, to become close to the CPI. It is, of course, true so long as the CPSU continues to recognize the CPI as the Communist Party in our country, it cannot formally recognize the CPI (M). For, recognition of the CPI (M) as also the CPI would mean recognizing two different parties as Communist Party at the same time in our country. From both theoretical and practical position that would be absurd. Though the CPSU cannot formally recognise the CPI (M), but when it has found the CPI (M) eager, it does not want the CPI (M) to go out of its hands either. So the Soviet leadership are trying to handle both the CPI and CPI (M) and bring them closer to each other. The reflection of this move to bring the CPI and the CPI (M) closer is to be found in the attempt of the CPI (M) leadership to discover that CPI is going away from its policy of alignment with the Congress. There are facts to indicate that some sort of an understanding has already been arrived at between the Soviet leaders and the CPI (M) leadership. *First*, of late, one after another the CPI (M) leaders are visiting the Soviet Union. Mr. E.M.S. Namboodiripad and, of all persons, Mr. B. T. Ranadive had recently visited the USSR and it is reported that they had discussions with the Soviet leaders. Mr. Harekrishna Konar also made a visit to that country. These visits are not for nothing. *Second*, it would be more clear from the fact that since their visits, one no longer finds outbursts against Soviet revisionism in the pages of the organs and other publications of the CPI (M) which one used to come across before. Rather, in place of outbursts against Soviet revisionism, one is increasingly noticing praise of the Soviet Union. even on issues

which are looked upon with suspicion by the resurgent nationalist countries of Asia and Africa on the one hand and uncalled for, out of place and most unjustified criticism of China on the other. The Report on Economic and Political Situation adopted by the Central Committee of the CPI (M) in its meeting held from 15th to 20th July last bears testimony to it. *Third*, the journal published on behalf of the GDR at Calcutta is now being printed in the Ganasakti Press. This would not have been possible, had not some sort of understanding with the Soviet block been arrived at”

(On the latest stand of CPI (M) Central Committee—P. E. Dated 1.10.73)

Haryana KKM F Conference

Mahem (Haryana): The State Conference of the Haryana State Kishan & Khet Majdoor Federation was held here on November 24.

At the open session of the conference, Comrade Nalini Ranjan Singh, a prominent leader of Bihar SUC, addressing a largely attended peasants' gathering, urged upon the peasants of the State to rally round the KKM F to build up a broad-based movement to realise their legitimate democratic demands.

The conference adopted a resolution incorporating a 13 point demand charter including the demands for work throughout the year; unemployment allowance; regular supply of all essentials at prices within the reach of the poor peasants, need-based minimum wage for rural workers and agricultural labourers, etc.

A strong State Committee of the KKM F, with Com. Balbant Singh as President and Com Ram Prasad as General Secretary, was elected at the conference.

Silchar: The Narsingpur local food Convention was held recently at 483 Putilal School. In spite of widespread terror and intimidation by local Congress gangsters, more than 150 delegates representing workers, peasants, youths and students attended the convention.

Sri Kshitish Bhattacharya, a veteran freedom fighter, presided over the convention.

Prof Radhakanta Tanti, a labour leader, in his address as the Chief Guest urged upon the people to rally under the revolutionary leadership of the SUCI.

Com. Ahin Ghosh, Secretary, Cachar Dist. SUCI in his speech as the main speaker called upon workers, peasants' youth and students to build up united mass movements against the anti-people policies of the Congress Government.

Comrades Shyamdeo Kurmi, Jagnamani Nath, Ramakanta Koiri and others addressed the convention.

A resolution, incorporating demands for introduction of all-out state trading in food and essential goods, distribution of land among landless peasants and retrenched tea garden workers, opening of Darbi-Sildubi-Silchar bus-rout, deficit grant for Narsingpur Janata College etc., was adopted at the convention.

AIDSO To Hold

All India Conference

Cuttack Nov. 20—The all-India conference of the Democratic Students Organisation will be held at the Barabati Stadium here from January 12 to 14, according to a Press release issued by the DSO here.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the great Marxist philosopher Sri Nabakrushna Choudhury, a former Chief Minister of Orissa and Com. Subodh Banerjee, former Minister in UF Governments in West Bengal will address the conference.