

Proletarian Era

Volume 40 No. 17

April 15, 2007

Organ of the SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
Founder Editor-in-Chief : COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

Price : Rs. 2.00

HISTORIC 24th APRIL

The 59th foundation day of the party is going to be observed all over the country on the 24th of April next. It is an occasion for all of us to renew our pledge to re-dedicate ourselves with renewed energy and enthusiasm to the party work, to step up and intensify countrywide ideological campaign to imbibe and spread the thoughts, the teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our leader, teacher, guide, founder General Secretary and one of the foremost Marxist thinkers of the era, with a view to achieving the objective of anti-capitalist socialist revolution that can only free our people from the chains of ruthless capitalist exploitation.

Need for founding SUCI

Realizing the need of Indian revolution marked by the absence of a genuine communist party on the soil, Comrade Ghosh along with a handful of his compatriots took upon themselves the historic task of building up a real revolutionary party of the proletariat following the Leninist methodology. It was revealed in his profound wisdom that the party going by the name communist in the country, the CPI, founded in early twenties, had never grown up as the true revolutionary party of the Indian proletariat, nor could it ever develop into one. From a correct realization born out of deep reasoning based on the invincible science of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Ghosh knew that a genuine revolutionary party of the proletariat must have its independent analysis of the national and international situation in conformity with Marxism-Leninism, a correct political theory or base political line based thereon which correctly reflects the objective process of class struggle in the given socio-economic scenario obtaining in the country. In

other words, it ought to be a concrete analysis of the concrete situation to formulate correct strategy of revolution. As great Lenin taught us, "The main question of every revolution is the question of state power." Elaborating further, Comrade Stalin said "In the hands of which class or which classes is power concentrated, which or which classes must be overthrown; which class or which classes must take power — such is the main question of every revolution." So determining the character of the state as well as composition of the classes is a fundamental prerequisite for strategizing revolution. Secondly, such a party must be the outcome of the correct Leninist process of struggle of formation of a proletarian revolutionary party. Comrade Ghosh reached the conclusion that the CPI (then undivided) had failed to develop as a genuine Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party of the proletariat on both counts. If a political party does not grow in the correct process of building a class-party of the proletariat, it can not reflect proletarian class outlook and so can neither develop correct understanding about the national or international situation nor come out with the correct revolutionary theory and strategy. Moreover, in a class-divided society, if a party does not reflect proletarian class outlook, it must reflect the class outlook of the bourgeoisie or petty-bourgeoisie. So having failed to originate as a correct revolutionary party, the CPI its communist signboard notwithstanding emerged as a typical petty-bourgeois party. So after the arduous preliminary struggle for formation of the party Comrade Ghosh along with a handful of comrades founded the party at the convention in 1948 and set about the task of building up the

party brick by brick in such a vast country like ours.

Correct analysis of national and international situations

In the course of conducting this fierce ideological-political socialist struggle covering all aspects of life

to develop correct proletarian outlook, Comrade Ghosh noted with deep anguish that in the absence of a genuine revolutionary party, the fruits of the freedom movement had been usurped by the Indian bourgeois class, which, capitalizing

Contd. on page 2

SUCI vehemently opposes UPA government's decision to go ahead with SEZ

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, SUCI, in course of a statement issued on 7th April, 2007 vehemently opposed the most atrocious decision of the Congress-led UPA government to go ahead with its policy of setting up out-and-out anti-people pro-monopolist Special Economic Zones (SEZs), the latest blue print of ruthless exploitation of labour under moribund decadent autocratic capitalism, against which the whole of the country has burst in protest and the brave peasants of Nandigram while offering courageous resistance became victims of a diabolic state-sponsored terrorism and planned carnage. Badgered into a corner over the demand for scrapping the SEZs lock, stock and barrel in the aftermath of Nandigram massacre that entailed countrywide condemnation, detestation and raging protest, the UPA government, observed Comrade Mukherjee, had to, in the name of undertaking a review of the entire policy, hold back all proposals of floating SEZs only to come back in a tearing hurry with some cosmetic changes calling them as having provided a human face to the earlier formulation. Only a government bereft of rudimentary concern for the people and dispossessed of even an iota of human essence can afford to undertake such a pernicious move and that too with such cunningness and trickling urgency, said Comrade Mukherjee.

Arraigning the CPI(M) and its blind allies for working hand-in-gloves with the Congress in formulating and implementing such an insidious model of capitalist globalization wreaking havoc in the life of the people throughout the world, Comrade Mukherjee pointed out that these pseudo-Marxists who have their hands stained with the blood of poor peasants of Nandigram are, in a frantic bid to salvage their sullied image, mocking a show of opposition to the latest SEZ policy by resenting non-inclusion of some of their suggestions pending which the policy, according to them, "falls far short of what is required" and does not become 'comprehensive'. Thus, these pseudo-Marxists caring a fib for the surging public demand for annulling the SEZ policy are, in effect, providing a cover to the Congress-led government running on their unstinted support in validating such special enclaves of savage exploitation.

Comrade Mukherjee called upon all right-thinking conscientious people of the country including the honest rank of the CPI(M) to build up a fierce uncompromising organized resistance movement to force the Congress-led government abandon the SEZ model, expose the treachery and duplicity of the pseudo-Marxists and thus stall the impending catastrophe that would impel many a Nandigram with yet more feral ferocity.

CPI, CPI (M) and subsequent factions never grew as communist outfits

Contd. from page 1

on the struggle and sacrifices of the people, had come into state power through the transfer of power on August 15, 1947. Political freedom from the alien rule was achieved, but the people's emancipation remained a far cry. Analyzing the Indian national liberation struggle, Comrade Ghosh way back in forties showed that there were two distinctly different class aspirations working within it. The aspirant Indian national bourgeoisie wanted end of the British colonial rule so that it could capture the state power, establish its control over the national market and with the help of state power enter into the international market as a formidable competitor. On the other hand, by freedom, the toiling millions—the workers-peasants-oppressed middle class meant not only termination of foreign imperialist rule but abolition of all exploitation of man by man. Great Lenin had taught that in the present era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, the bourgeoisie which had entered into a decadent moribund phase, turned out and out reactionary to impede the pace of progress, can no more accomplish the bourgeois democratic revolution which it brought about in the days of advent of capitalism against worn-out feudal social order. Hence, it has been incumbent on the revolutionary working class to lead socio-political revolution today and incorporate the unfulfilled task of bourgeois democratic revolution in the agenda of this proletarian revolution. So the national liberation struggles from country to country could be taken to logical culmination only if the working class party could exercise leadership over these. Otherwise, there will be no revolution but mere replacement of one exploitative order by another.

But the CPI had not even an inkling of this imperative task as was born out by its various political moves. When the Congress in the early days of crystallization of the freedom movement on the soil did not grow as a well organized class party of the Indian national bourgeoisie but was functioning as a loose platform of action of the political parties striving for national freedom, it was the task of a real communist party to shape the Congress into a genuine anti-imperialist people's front by isolating the national bourgeois leadership and establishing the

hegemony of the working class over it. But the CPI under Ranadive leadership branded the entire independence struggle by the Congress as a struggle of the reactionary bourgeoisie and isolated itself from the mainstream of freedom struggle, thus helping the national bourgeoisie to consolidate their leadership over it. But in 1934, in the name of correcting the mistake, they made a volte-face and felt the necessity of forming a national front under joint leadership of the working class and the national bourgeoisie, thus echoing Plekhanov's theory of united front discarded long ago by Lenin as being non-Marxist. The national bourgeoisie that had been reactionary in 1930, had now become progressive and revolutionary in 1934! Again, in 1939, the CPI supported the Muslim League's demand for Pakistan by distorting and vulgarizing the Marxist theory of 'the right of nations to self-determination' by arguing that the Muslims by religion constituted a separate nation and deserved the right of self-determination! They even raised the slogan of Congress-Muslim League unity! Later, when in 1942, during the Second World War, the people of the country rose up in revolt against the British rulers, the CPI opposed it branding the struggle as pro-Japanese, pro-fascist and virtually acted as the stooge of British imperialism. This further alienated them from the freedom movement and helped the national bourgeoisie to consolidate its leadership over the movement. In 1947, it is this national bourgeoisie leading the Congress that came into power through compromise with the British imperialists and a national government headed by Pandit Nehru was formed. With the national bourgeois class thus entrenched in state power, the Indian revolution, as Comrade Ghosh established in course of his all-embracing penetrating analysis, entered the stage of anti-capitalist socialist revolution.

CPI rallied behind ruling national bourgeoisie after independence

But instead of building up an anti-capitalist socialist movement which was the need of the hour, the CPI, after independence, declared all support to Pandit Nehru and presented the strange theory of establishing new democracy by

democratic means through forming a national democratic front with 'progressive section' of the national bourgeoisie under the leadership of Pandit Nehru! There were successive changes in the leadership of the CPI, with each new leadership claiming that while the earlier leadership had committed blunders, they had now corrected the mistakes and set the party on the right course. But all-through, none of these leaderships marked capitalism as the main enemy of the people. Rather, employing diverse phraseology, they all in a bid to superimpose a fundamentally different pre-revolution Chinese condition on the Indian situation described the Indian state as semi-colonial, semi-feudal and the object of revolution still remained anti-imperialist and anti-feudal. In short, the strategy of revolution still remained the same "New Democratic" formulated by the Joshi leadership, but its name was changed to 'People's Democratic Revolution' during Ranadive leadership.

Ranadive in rectification of what he called 'right deviation' hitherto pursued by P.C. Joshi leadership gave a left adventurist call to start a direct war against the state for seizure of power. When the ultra-left policies of Ranadive proved to be a fiasco and dealt a severe blow to the party, he was replaced by Rajeswara Rao as the party chief. Rao endorsed Randive strategy of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal people's democratic revolution, but blindly copying the Chinese experience he adopted the guerilla war tactics in rural belts, just as the Naxalites would do years afterwards. After some time, Ajoy Ghosh took over the rein of the party. He claimed to have freed the party from both the right reformism of Joshi and the left adventurism of Randive-Rajeswar Rao though the main political document adopted in 1951 at the Madurai Congress of the CPI under Ajoy Ghosh leadership, besides the question of tactical approach remained unchanged from the earlier stands of Joshi, Randive and Rajeswar Rao on the questions of strategy. He too, determined the stage of Indian revolution to be anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and characterized the Indian state as a stooge of imperialism.

However, a contradiction soon arose between their theory and the reality unfolding. The Indian national bourgeoisie holding the

state power, in its own class interest, engaged in grouping together the newly independent resurgent nationalist countries of Asia and Africa against the domination of the Western imperialist powers through meetings and conferences at Colombo, Bandung, etc., in order to gain more elbow room in bargaining on matters of trade and aid with those imperialist powers. On the other hand, the Congress-led Indian government, subserving the class interest of the ruling Indian national bourgeoisie, was developing close relation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for the same purpose of increasing bargaining power with the imperialist camp as also to gain alternative source of aid and technology for boosting its own competence level to gain advantage in international competition for grabbing market. Both Soviet Union and People's Republic of China were also eulogizing the Indian foreign policy as anti-imperialist policy to sharpen the contradiction between India and big imperialist powers. Placed in such a situation, Ajoy Ghosh leadership was caught in a dilemma. From their blind habit of copying the international communist leadership, they also started to praise the Indian foreign policy as being an independent, pro-peace, pro-people policy. But the obvious question was how could a state characterized as the stooge of imperialism as per their own analysis, have an independent foreign policy? In order to solve the contradiction, the CPI central committee discovered at a meeting in Delhi that the Indian government could adopt an independent foreign policy since the influence of the national bourgeoisie on the Indian economy and the state was on the increase and since the conflict between the imperialists and the national bourgeoisie in the economic spheres was getting more and more intensified. According to them, all this was reflected in the consolidation of the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru. So the CPI by dint of its own formulation found a natural ally in the ruling bourgeoisie and discovered progressiveness in it, thus forgetting the need of struggle against capitalism while the capitalist class, saddled in state power, went on developing and consolidating capitalism in the country.

Further, Ajoy Ghosh leadership

Contd. on page 3

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh followed correct Leninist principles to build up SUCI

Contd. from page 2

attached great importance to participation in parliamentary elections. It was at this stage that an addiction towards bourgeois parliamentary democracy began to grow within the undivided CPI to unfold its social democratic character in a much pronounced way. And with the passage of time, the undivided CPI embraced more and more the vote-based parliamentary politics. Whatever little participation it had in the democratic mass movement was to exploit the opposition sentiment with a view to getting more seats in the legislatures. At the same time, in the given context of international situation, it, though not being a working class party, had to use the indulge in revolutionary phrasemongering to usurp the glory of international communist movement dangling its 'communist' signboard and thus preserve a 'left' image in buttressing parliamentarian aspirations.

CPI split in 1964—birth of CPI(M)

But as a sequel to excessive tilt towards reformist parliamentarian line, there was a fresh resentment brewing inside the party. Since its very political theory masqueraded as communist formulation was fundamentally flawed, a clear swing between two extreme stands—one pursuing rightist reformism and the other ultra-left adventurism—was but a natural fallout. Comrade Ghosh, in course of his penetrating analysis showed that "As the theory of people's democratic revolution is not the objective reflection of the most complicated process of Indian revolution but is actually a utopia, superimposed in a subjective way on the objective conditions, this so-called revolutionary theory itself is giving birth to two opposite trends inside the party. Moving along the path of parliamentary politics, whenever some sort of stability is growing, a section of the party leaders are trying to arrest the party within the narrow confines of parliamentarism though, of course, with revolutionary vocabulary and catchwords. Another section within this party who have become thoroughly disgusted with the opportunism of the parliamentary politics ...because of the wrong political theory, are showing ultra-

revolutionary trends or tendencies and untimely pushing the unprepared and unorganized forces of revolution before the repressions of the state machinery, thereby inflicting harm on the cause of revolution by objectively helping the coercive apparatus of the state to be tightened up." (*Why SUCI is the only Genuine Communist Party in India*, page 31)

In course of being more and more inclined towards reformist-opportunist line, the CPI leadership even went to the extent of giving up whatever little allegiance, even if customary, it hitherto showed towards proletarian internationalism. As we mentioned earlier, the ruling Indian national bourgeoisie in its own class interest, was trying to combine the Afro-Asian countries against Western imperialist powers and in the process tried to capture the markets of these countries and fulfil its hegemonistic aspirations. On the other hand, socialist China under Mao Zedong's leadership was liberally helping these newly liberated Afro-Asian countries to break the chain of imperialism. This extension of help and assistance by socialist China posed impediment before the Indian national bourgeoisie in achieving its objective of grabbing those markets. Hence, a conflict with socialist China ensued and became intensified as the days progressed. In the course of this intensification, a border clash broke out between the two that ultimately snowballed into capitalist India's China war. But the CPI leadership under S. A. Dange had no qualms in aligning with the Nehru leadership to foster national chauvinistic feeling and supported the China war of the Indian national bourgeoisie with Nehru as its political mouthpiece. This rankled the aggrieved section within the party so much that a split could not be averted. A section of the party leaders provoked the disgruntled cadres to revolt against the 'revisionist Dange clique' and reassemble under the umbrella of new party CPI(M). A new party was born no doubt, but there was no fissure with the parentage. The CPI(M) claimed that it was representing the original party and in fact called its party congress held in Calcutta immediately after the split as the 7th Congress in

continuity with the undivided party. It was evident from the political thesis and resolutions of the CPI(M)'s Calcutta Congress that it mimicked all the formulations of the old party which its leaders branded as revisionist, whether it was characterization of the Indian state or deducing the stage of revolution or the class alignment of the revolutionary forces. While the undivided party named Indian revolution as 'National Democratic Revolution' with the national bourgeoisie as an ally, the CPI(M) preferred to term it as 'People's Democratic Revolution' with national bourgeoisie and rich peasants i.e. rural kulaks, as partners of revolution.

Commenting on that development, Comrade Ghosh said that "although the CPI(M) leaders formed a new party on the plea of and raising high sounding slogans about 'fundamental difference' on theoretical questions with the CPI, they have, in reality, no such difference. It was mainly due to group squabbles that they formed this new party which differed only on minor tactical approach and certain vocabulary.... while forming their party, the CPI(M) leaders failed totally to grasp the all-important point that in order to build up a genuine communist party based on correct revolutionary theory it was an absolute necessity to bring about, first of all, in their own thought process a break with the revisionist and non-Marxist process of thinking of the old party, as they did not conduct the primary, all-essential and painstaking struggle to accomplish the threefold task in order to bring about a break with the non-Marxist process of thinking and analysis of the old party ...they carried along the heritage of the same old mental make-up, method of analysis and method of approach. ...This party, therefore, has also become a neo-revisionist party." (*Why SUCI* -p. 59) He also predicted that because of this wrong theory, the CPI(M) would also undergo a split.

Leninist model of party formation

Based on the deepest understanding of the Marxist ideology and proper grasp of the Leninist principles of party organization as well as being

enriched by the experience of the history of success and failure of formation of correct communist parties in different countries, Comrade Ghosh realized the imperativeness of releasing a threefold struggle for building up the SUCI as the real revolutionary party of the Indian proletariat and accordingly conducted that historically important struggle alongwith his compatriots before foundation of the party in 1948. This is already being considered as an important enrichment, elaboration and development of the Marxist-Leninist methodology of party formation. The struggle Comrade Ghosh emphasized upon as *sine qua non* for building up a true Marxist party, detached vanguard of the proletariat, warrants fulfillment of three essential preconditions. First of all, the task was to lay the foundation of ideological centralism covering all aspects of life among those having taken the initiative in the struggle for formation of a correct Marxist-Leninist party. This Leninist process of giving foundation to ideological centralism warrants engagement in an all-embracing socialist movement to develop one process of thinking, uniformity of thinking, oneness in approach and singleness of purpose on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and Dialectical Materialism not only on the economic and political questions but on all questions covering every aspects of life in order to achieve ideological centralism. Then the task is to build up organizational centralism on the basis of this ideological centralism. Only this can make proletarian democracy effective inside the party and give the real structural shape to the principle of democratic centralism in the party. That is why, Lenin said that democratic centralism could be established only through the process of fusion of proletarian democracy and centralism. The necessary condition for proletarian democratic principle to operate inside a party can be guaranteed only when the level of consciousness of the party cadres has attained a minimum standard which enables all or at least most of them to play an effective role through dialogue and discussions in the inner-party polemics and ideological struggles. Attainment of

Contd. on page 4

Wrong theory always created two extreme trends within CPI, CPI (M), Naxalites

Contd. from page 3

such a minimum standard to make critical analysis of theories requires, as a pre-condition, attainment of a higher cultural-ethical standard by the cadres through concrete struggles covering all aspects of life. Only after the attainment of such a standard can the rank-and-file members play an effective role in the inner-party polemics and ideological struggles and does the relationship between the leaders and the rank-and-file really assume a dialectical character. Only then is the path paved for the emergence of collective leadership in the party as the concrete personified form of expression in an individual of the collective knowledge of all the members of the party derived through conflict and interaction of ideas and experiences not only on political and economic questions but on questions covering all aspects of life.

The second precondition was the imperativeness of creating a band of ideologically attuned professional revolutionaries, the most advanced section of militant and conscious proletariat, unwavering in very many complex battles of revolutionary life rising above all personal questions, devoted and dedicated to the cause of revolution, proletariat and the party.

And finally was the important issue of developing in the course of concretizing, elaborating and enriching Marxism-Leninism, a revolutionary theory not just as a political programme and line of the party but also a complete epistemological category through dialectically integrating the understanding and experiences of the different branches of knowledge and science.

CPI(M) breaks in 5 years

This is a task the neither undivided CPI nor the CPI(M) ever undertook in right earnest and hence though going by the name 'communist', none developed as a party of the proletariat. CPI, it may be added, was formed on the basis of congregation of some people attracted by the appeal of international communist movement. No doubt the founding members of the party had a dream and many of them underwent commendable sacrifice to give shape to their dream. But they were more spurred by the glory of the movement and less mindful of adopting the Marxist methodology of party building. And

hence, as discussed earlier, it, in a class-divided society, reflected the class character of a petty-bourgeois party practising social-democratic politics. Because of this non-working class methodological approach, the CPI(M) also like undivided CPI soon found itself, as foreseen by Comrade Ghosh, riven between two extreme thoughts of right-revisionism and revolutionary phrase-mongering. Within a span of 5 years, the Naxalite leaders came out of the CPI(M) branding it as neo-revisionist and formed CPI (ML) in 1969. But this third splinter of the undivided CPI also had no difference in general orientation and policy matters with either undivided CPI or CPI(M). In fact the political theory of the CPI (ML) besides certain differences in tactical approaches and vocabulary was a replica of the theoretical stand adopted by the undivided CPI in its Madurai Congress in 1951 where it characterized the Indian state as a satellite of imperialism-feudalism and hence harped on collaborating with the national bourgeoisie. In fact, the CPI (ML) confused the movement of land reforms with revolutionary movement and in overzealousness to imitate the strategic line of Chinese revolution being dictated by the old habit of blindly copying others erroneously concluded that theory of people's democratic revolution and tactics of encircling cities by creating liberated zones at countryside were synonymous with guerrilla tactics. Once again, Comrade Ghosh emphatically said, "I assert ...that the same fate will befall the Naxalites. And I am sure you will see this come true hundred per cent within a year or two.... (because) the process of thinking and the methodological approach of the party carry the tradition of the same old party" (ibid p.31)

Disintegration of Naxalites

This also became prophetically true in no time. After the initial euphoria centring round so-called call of revolutionary upsurge died down, a pale of gloom and frustration descended upon the Naxalites. Instead of engaging into a scientific analysis of the cause of failure, they were found to be on a spree of mutual bickering, suspicions, mistrust, fault finding. The CPI (ML) disintegrated into several factions each calling the other a traitor and agent of the ruling class. Many of them preferred to

return to either the CPI(M) or the CPI and looked for greener pastures in parliamentary vote-politics. Some of them even found the Congress under Indira Gandhi a better refuge. The others got divided in innumerable groups only to exist as a sort of ex-revolutionaries, bookish ideologues or 'progressive' individuals. Some of the groups congregated under banner of a new party named on parentage to participate in election politics. With the same theory of considering India as a 'semi-feudal semi-colonial' state that validates a unity with the national bourgeoisie, none of these Naxalite factions has any problem in aligning with even the rightist forces for reaping electoral mileage. At the same time, some of the groups moving to the other end of the pendulum have been preferring to toe the line of terrorism and adventurism to flaunt their 'revolutionary' credential. But some of these groups also after a brief tryst with 'ultra-revolutionist' line are turning half-circle to adore parliamentary politics. This is how the swing is continuing and division, dissociation, one or two regroupings followed by splits are going on within the Naxalites. Thus though these splinters are under different umbrellas and signboards, they all are pandering to the politics of social democracy, the last resort of the moribund decadent bourgeoisie.

CPI(M)'s rise to power with class backing

However, barring a few initial years of Naxalite movement, the CPI (ML) and its innumerable offshoots have never been on the centrestage of leftist politics. On the other hand, the CPI(M) spared no stone unturned in coming to the forefront by usurping all credit of the left-democratic movement that surged forth in West Bengal and parts of Kerala in the post-independence period. Being rattled a bit at the rebellion of the Naxalites, the CPI(M) decided to secure a permanent berth in the corridor of power by appeasing the ruling class overtly or covertly. At present it is the CPI(M) which has emerged as the most organized social-democratic force with a left cloak. The CPI, it may be mentioned, has been of and on requesting the CPI(M) for a merger of the two but the leadership of the latter has not so far shown any positive response. The CPI is, in fact, functioning as an appendage to the CPI(M) today.

If one analyzes the last forty years of the CPI(M), it will be clear

that it has been a chronicle of developing more and more closer link with the national bourgeoisie and becoming integral part of the bourgeois state apparatus. In late sixties when Indira Gandhi was trying to salvage the image of a discredited Congress by raising slogans of reviving the party on a new plank of 'garibi hatao' (Remove Poverty) and such other catchy radical slogans and dissociating from the old leadership of Morarji Desai and others, the CPI commensurate with its policy of aligning with the Congress became a trusted advisor of Indira. But the CPI(M) leadership knew that such open alliance with the Congress at that time would considerably erode the outward left image it was so keen to maintain for hoodwinking the masses. So feigning an opposition to the Congress with a view to encashing the heightened anti-Congress sentiment prevailing in West Bengal in particular, it embarked on working out a tacit understanding with her. The CPI(M) central committee observed that the Indira wing of the Congress has "taken certain measures which are in tune with the anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people" and "the Indira Gandhi wing also contains within its fold a healthy trend which hates big landlords and monopolists." (People's Democracy, 15-02-70) Prior to that, the then CPI(M) General Secretary wrote a letter to Indira Gandhi conveying that his "Party openly announced its support to her government" (P.D. 01-02-70) Indira Gandhi also reciprocated this warm attitude of both the CPI and CPI(M) and the good relation between her and the CPI(M) leadership continued. However, the CPI(M) leaders took umbrage at Indira's preference for CPI over it because of CPI then commanding more numerical strength than the CPI(M) in parliament and maintaining a closer tie with revisionist Soviet leadership. But this was not that big hostility which became apparent when the CPI(M) did not join the people's movement against Indira Congress led by Jayprakash Narayan on the plea that rightist forces were within it. The CPI(M) leaders also stepped up their initiative towards strengthening ties with the revisionist Soviet leadership and some other degenerated communist parties round the world to stay afloat as a useful social-

Contd. on page 7

Lies Concerning the History of the Soviet Union

Mario Sousa

Member of the Communist Party Marxist-Leninist Revolutionaries Sweden KPML(r)

[As a mark of our respect for and recognition of Comrade Joseph Stalin, the great Marxist-Leninist leader, we decided to publish this article (on 15 June 1998), which gives striking and deadly exposure to the Lies Concerning the History of the Soviet Union during Stalin's rule. For want of space, we were constrained to print this article in instalments, fully aware that the process hampers smooth reading. Unfortunately, we could not bring out any instalment of the article in our last issue. In this issue, we publish the third and final instalment, which presents vital factual details that help establish the truth. A few political points, otherwise well known, are retained in summary for the sake of clarity in understanding the facts.]

An important factor – dearth of medicines

Let us now come to the third question posed. How many people died in the labour camps? The number varied from year to year, from 5.2% in 1934 to 0.3% in 1953. Deaths in the labour camps were caused by the general shortage of resources in society as a whole, in particular the medicines necessary to fight epidemics. This problem was not confined only to labour camps but was present throughout the society. Once antibiotics had been discovered and put into general use after the Second World War, the situation changed radically. In fact, the worst years were the war years when the Nazi barbarians imposed very harsh living conditions on all Soviet citizens. During those 4 years, more than half a million people died in the labour camps - half the total number dying throughout the 20-year period in question. Let us not forget that in the same period, the war years, 25 million people died among those who were free. In 1950, when conditions in the Soviet Union had improved and antibiotics had been introduced, the number of people dying while in prison fell to 0.3%.

Let us turn now to the fourth question posed. How many people were sentenced to death prior to 1953, especially during the purges of 1937-38? We have already noted Robert Conquest's claim that the Bolsheviks killed 12 million political prisoners in the labour camps between 1930 and 1953. Of these 1 million are supposed to have been killed between 1937 and 1938. Solzhenitsyn's figures run to tens of millions, among them 3 million in 1937-38 alone. Even higher figures have been quoted in the course of the dirty propaganda war against the Soviet Union. The Russian, Olga Shatunovskaya, for example, cites a figure of 7 million dead in the purges of 1937-38.

The documents now emerging from the Soviet archives, however, tell a different story. It is necessary to mention here at the start that the number of those sentenced to death has to be gleaned from different archives and that the researchers, in order to arrive at an approximate figure, have had to gather data from these various archives in a way which gives rise to a risk of double counting and thus of producing estimates higher than the reality. According to Dimitri Volkogonov, the person appointed by Yeltsin to take charge of the old Soviet archives, there were 30,514 persons condemned to death by military tribunals between 1 October 1936 and 30 September 1938.

The check of the archives also tend to conclude that the number of common criminals and the number of counter-revolutionaries condemned to death were approximately equal. The conclusion we can draw from this is that the number of those condemned to death in 1937-38 was close to 100,000, and not several million as has been claimed by Western propaganda. It is also necessary to bear in mind that not all those sentenced to death in the Soviet Union were actually executed. A large proportion of death penalties were commuted to terms in labour camps. It is also important to distinguish between common criminals and counter-revolutionaries. Many of those sentenced to death had committed violent crimes such as murder or rape. At that time such crimes were punishable by death in a large number of countries.

Question 5: How long was the average prison sentence? The length of prison sentences has been the subject of the most scurrilous rumour-mongering in Western propaganda. The usual insinuation is that to be a convict in the Soviet Union involved endless years in

prison — whoever went in never came out. This is completely untrue. The supposed eternity of prison sentences in the Soviet Union is another myth spread in the West to combat socialism.

The statistics reproduced in the *American Historical Review* show the actual facts. Common criminals in the Russian Federation in 1936 received the following sentences: up to 5 years: 82.4%; between 5-10 years: 17.6%. 10 years was the maximum possible prison term before 1937. Political prisoners, on the other hand, convicted in civilian courts in 1936 received sentences as follows: up to 5 years: 44.2%; between 5-10 years 50.7%. As for those sentenced to terms in the Gulag labour camps, where the longer sentences were served, the 1940 statistics show that those serving up to 5 years were 56.8% and those between 5-10 years 42.2%. Only 1% were sentenced to over 10 years. For 1939 we have the statistics produced by Soviet courts. The distribution of prison terms is as follows : upto 5 years : 95.9%; from 5-10 years : 4%; over 10 years : 0.1%. This shatters another myth that prisoners were sentenced for eternity in the Soviet Union.

A brief summary of political questions involved

The research conducted by the Russian historians shows a reality totally different from that taught in schools and universities of the capitalist world over the last 50 years of the cold war. During this period several generations have learnt only lies about the Soviet Union. Capitalist political propaganda has always presented Soviet prisoners as innocent victims and even the researchers have taken up this assumption without questioning it. But the fact of the matter is that most of them were thieves, murderers, rapists etc., criminals whose types would never be considered to be innocent victims by the press, had they committed the crimes in Europe or the USA. It appears, since the crimes were committed in the Soviet Union, they were branded differently.

The kulaks and the counter-revolution

In case of the counter-

revolutionaries, it is also necessary to consider the crimes of which they were accused. According to the research reports insofar as they deal with the kulaks there were 381,000 families, i.e., about 1.8 million people sent into exile. A small number of these people were sentenced to serve terms in labour camps or colonies.

For hundreds of years, they had subjected poor peasants to boundless oppression and unbridled exploitation. Of the 120 million peasants in 1927, the 10 million kulaks lived in luxury while the remaining 110 million lived in abject poverty. Wealth of the kulaks was based on the badly-paid labour of the poor peasants. When the poor peasants began to join together in collective farms, the main source of kulak wealth disappeared. But the kulaks did not give up. They tried to restore exploitation by use of famine. Groups of armed kulaks attacked collective farms, killed poor peasants and party workers, set fire to the fields and killed working animals. By provoking starvation among poor peasants, the kulaks were trying to secure the perpetuation of poverty and their own positions of power. The events which ensued were not those expected by these murderers. But this time the poor peasants had the support of the revolution and proved to be stronger than the kulaks, who were defeated, imprisoned and sent into exile or sentenced to terms in labour camps. Of the 10 million kulaks, only 1.8 million were exiled or convicted, as a result of this massive class struggle in the Soviet countryside, which involved 120 million people more or less.

The purges of 1937

Conviction of counter-revolutionaries in the 1936-38 trials followed the purges of party, army and state apparatus. Millions of people had participated in the victorious struggle against the Tsar and the Russian bourgeoisie. Many of them also joined the Russian Communist Party. But among them there were, unfortunately, some who entered the party for reasons other than fighting for the proletariat and for socialism. But the class struggle was such and the time was so difficult for the young Soviet state,

Contd. on page 6

Lies Concerning the History of the Soviet Union

Contd. from page 5

that the great shortage of cadres - or even of people who could read - forced the party to make few demands as regards the quality of new activists and cadres. Because of this problem, there arose in time a contradiction which split the party into two camps - on the one hand those who wanted to press forward in the struggle to build a socialist society, and on the other hand those who thought that the conditions were not yet ripe for building socialism and who promoted social-democracy. The origin of these ideas lay in Trotsky, who had joined the party in July 1917 and had secured the support of some of the best known Bolsheviks. This opposition, united against the original Bolshevik plan, provided one of the policy options, which were the subject of a vote on 27 December 1927. Of the 725,000 votes cast, after a great inner party debate over years, the opposition secured 6,000 i.e., less than 1% of party activists.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party had to expel from the party the principal leaders of the united opposition. Trotsky was ultimately expelled from the Soviet Union for his anti-state activities. Zinoviev, Kamenev and Zvdokine afterwards made self-criticisms, as did several other leading Trotskyists. All of them were once again accepted into the party as activists and took up once more their party and state posts. But later it became clear that the self-criticisms made by them had often not been genuine, since they got united again on the side of the counter-revolution every time the class struggle sharpened. The majority of the oppositionists were expelled and re-admitted another couple of times before the situation clarified itself completely in 1937-38.

Industrial sabotage

The murder in December 1934 of Kirov, the chairman of the Leningrad party and one of the most important members in the Central Committee, sparked off the investigation that was to lead to the discovery of a secret organisation engaged in preparing a conspiracy to take over the leadership of the party and the government by means of violence. Their main weapons were industrial sabotage, terrorism and corruption, causing terrible losses to the Soviet state. Trotsky,

the main inspiration for the opposition, directed their activities from abroad.

The American engineer John Littlepage, one of the foreign specialists contracted to work in the Soviet mining industry, mainly gold mines between 1927 and 1937, wrote in his book *In Search of Soviet Gold*: "*I never took any interest in the subtleties of political manoeuvring in Russia so long as I could avoid them; but I had to study what was happening in Soviet industry in order to do my work. And I am firmly convinced that Stalin and his collaborators took a long time to discover that discontented revolutionary communists were his worst enemies.*"

Littlepage's book also tells us from where the Trotskyite opposition obtained the money that was necessary to pay for this counter-revolutionary activity. Many members of the secret opposition used their positions to approve the purchase of lower quality machines from certain factories abroad. The products approved were of much lower quality than those the Soviet government actually paid for. The foreign producers gave Trotsky's organisation the surplus from such transactions, as a result of which Trotsky and his co-conspirators in the Soviet Union continued to order from these manufacturers.

Littlepage observed this in Berlin in 1931 when buying industrial lifts for mines. The Soviet delegation was headed by Pyatakov and Littlepage was the specialist in charge of verifying the quality of the lifts and of approving the purchase. Littlepage discovered a fraud involving low quality lifts, useless for Soviet purposes, which Pyatakov and the other members of the Soviet delegation wanted to overlook and insisted he should approve the purchase. Littlepage would not do so. At that time he took it as a case of personal corruption and that the members of the delegation had been bribed by the lift manufacturers. But after Pyatakov, in the 1937 trial, confessed his links with the Trotskyist opposition, Littlepage was driven to the conclusion that what he had witnessed in Berlin was much more than corruption at a personal level.

Zinoviev, Kamenev, Pyatakov, Radek, Tomsy, Bukharin and others much loved by the Western

bourgeois press thus used the positions entrusted to them by the Soviet people and party to steal money from the state, in order to enable enemies of socialism to use that money for the purposes of sabotage and in their fight against socialist society in the Soviet Union.

Plans for a coup

The opposition's activities went much further. A counter-revolutionary conspiracy was being prepared aiming at taking over state power by means of a coup in which the whole Soviet leadership would be eliminated, starting with the assassination of the most important members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The military side of the coup would be carried out by a group of generals headed by Marshal Tukhachevsky.

Marshal Tukhachevsky had been an officer in the former Tsarist army who, after the revolution, went over to the Red Army. In 1930 nearly 10% of officers (close to 4,500) of the Red Army were former Tsarist officers. Many of them never abandoned their bourgeois outlook and were just waiting for an opportunity to fight for it. This opportunity arose when the opposition was preparing its coup.

The Bolsheviks were strong, so the civilian and military conspirators endeavoured also to muster strong friends. According to Bukharin's confession in his public trial in 1938, an agreement was reached between the Trotskyite opposition and Nazi Germany, in which large territories, including the Ukraine, would be ceded to Nazi Germany following the counter-revolutionary coup in the Soviet Union. This was the price demanded by Nazi Germany for its promise of support for the counter-revolutionaries. Bukharin had been informed about this agreement by Radek, who had received an order from Trotsky about the matter. All these conspirators who had been chosen for high positions to lead, administer and defend socialist society were in reality working to destroy socialism. Above all it is necessary to remember that all this was happening in the 1930s, when the Nazi danger was growing all the time and the Nazi armies were setting Europe alight and were preparing to invade the Soviet Union. The conspirators were sentenced to death as traitors after a

public trial. Could those found guilty of sabotage, terrorism, corruption, attempted murder and who had wanted to hand over part of the country to the Nazis expect anything else? To call them innocent victims is completely misleading.

Many more lies

It is interesting to see how Western propaganda, via Robert Conquest, has lied about the purges of the Red Army. Conquest says in his book *The Great Terror* that in 1937 there were 70,000 officers and political commissars in the Red Army and that 50% of them (i.e., 15,000 officers and 20,000 commissars) were arrested by the political police and were either executed or imprisoned for life in labour camps. In this allegation of Conquest's, as in his whole book, there is not one word of truth. The historian Roger Reese, in his work *The Red Army and the Great Purges*, gives the facts which show the real significance of the 1937-38 purges for the army. The number of people in the leadership of the Red Army and air force, i.e., officers and political commissars, was 144,300 in 1937, increasing to 282,300 by 1939. During the 1937-38 purges, 34,300 officers and political commissars were expelled for political reasons. By May 1940, however, 11,596 had already been rehabilitated and restored to their posts. This meant that during the 1937-38 purges, 22,705 officers and political commissars were dismissed (close to 13,000 army officers, 4,700 air force officers and 5,000 political commissars), which amounts to 7.7% of all officers and commissars - not 50% as Conquest alleges. Of this 7.7%, some were convicted as traitors, but the great majority of them, it would appear from historical material available, simply returned to civilian life.

One last question. Were the 1937-38 trials fair to the accused? Let us examine, for example, the trial of Bukharin, the highest party functionary to work for the secret opposition. According to the American ambassador in Moscow at the time, a well-known lawyer called Joseph Davies, attended the whole trial, and wrote to Washington that Bukharin was permitted to speak freely throughout the trial and put forward his case without impediment of any kind. He added that during the trial it was

Contd. on page 7

All round degeneration marks 30 years of CPI (M) rule in West Bengal

Contd. from page 4

democratic force deserving to be picked up by the ruling class for its policies both at national as well as international levels.

After emergency, when the Indian national bourgeoisie from its dire class-need of finding an alternative to discredited Indira Congress and ushering in a two-party parliamentary system to channelise people's mounting grievance and resentment into parliamentarism-legalism-reformism as well as restrict people's choice between two parties or combinations of its own choice created Janata Party in 1977, the CPI(M) could sense that the class in the aggregate interest of capitalism was slated to assume power at the Centre. Immediately, it underwent a somersault and found in Janata party, composed of heterogeneous groups and parties including communal Jan Sangh, a friend. It called Janata party-led central government with Vajpayee-Advani as cabinet ministers a 'friendly' government.

Both the CPI(M) and CPI like any other social democratic party in the world working as forces of compromise between labour and capital came to the rescue of the class at the hour of need either by standing behind the Congress or the Janata conglomerate. But, at this point CPI(M) scored over the CPI in cunning display of much refined social-democratism as it never bluntly exposed itself as bosom pal of the ruling class. The CPI(M) leadership could clearly send across the message to the bourgeoisie that given a chance, it could serve as a better alternative to either Congress or Janata party since it with a 'left' tag on and having considerable influence over the workers-peasants could skillfully and effectively 'kill' the very vitality of the militant working class struggles which the class dreads most as the biggest threat to its rule and at the same time implement the economic-political-social agenda of moribund decadent capitalism in a much camouflaged way. The class took note of it and allowed the CPI(M) and its associates to ride to power in West Bengal in 1977 to ascertain its loyalty as well as effectiveness as its political manager. Subsequently, Tripura and Kerala also came under the rule of the CPI(M).

It may be added that when in 1967, the first United Front government was formed in the state,

a chill was sent down the spines of the ruling bourgeoisie following the tide of working class movements sweeping across because of implementation of pro-people labour policy at the initiative of the labour ministry handled by our party. Right from Tatas to foreign imperialists hatched all conspiracies to dislodge the government. Since then, there was pressure from the quarters of the vested interest to keep us out. Lest our party as constituent of left-democratic combination then in vogue in West Bengal disrupts this smooth ride to power with the blessings of the class, the CPI(M) leadership pulled all strings to drive us out of the combination. Sans SUCI, any front under the CPI(M)'s command posed no danger to the class, knew the CPI(M). So immediately after forming the government in West Bengal in 1977, Jyoti Basu, the CPI(M) polit buro member and the then state Chief Minister assured the monopolists that as the SUCI was no more a part of the government, there was nothing to worry about. Since then, there has been no looking back for the CPI(M).

On being saddled in power, the CPI(M) leadership for all practical purpose moved away from whatever little participation it used to have earlier in democratic movement spurred by the desire to create a vote-bank exploiting opposition sentiment. Instead it openly pursued a reformist line. On the economic-political front, its alignment with the ruling class was amply manifest. For running the economy, it sought advice and direction from the chambers of commerce and corporate bigwigs. As per their advice, the CPI(M) leadership counseled the workers to shun path of agitation and instead co-operate and collaborative with the capitalist owners for maintaining industrial peace and keep the pace of 'development' unhindered. Commensurately, it discouraged all initiatives to build up legitimate working class struggle, precipitated frustration among the working people and systematically engaged in emasculating working class movement from within. In the political sphere, its total devotion had been towards creation of illusion in favour of bourgeois parliamentary democracy and arresting everything within the four walls of parliamentary politics. While the people were tormented

day in and day out by the burning problems spawning from the oppressive exploitative capitalist system, the CPI(M) as custodian of the worn out moribund bourgeois order preached that since it had been voted to power, there was no need for the toiling masses to build up legitimate democratic movements demanding mitigation of their hardship. By dint of its being in command of the government and administration, it would resolve all problems through constitutional means. Movements would disturb that process, send wrong message. Alongside, it relentlessly fostered all kinds of economism, opportunism, self-centeredness and such other vices to break the very moral of democratic movement. At the same time, in the name of maintaining law and order, it like any other bourgeois party began to ruthlessly crush all sprouting class and mass movements developed by our party and others. All this obviously elated the ruling class. Reciprocation from the class in the form of showering praise, extensive media coverage and full backing ensued almost immediately and a long stint of the party in the governmental seat was evident from all indications. And as the days rolled by, the CPI(M) became more and more committed to the ruling national bourgeoisie by

extensive and vigorous pursuance of the aforesaid anti-people pro-capitalist socio-economic agenda.

Aftermath of 1977

In the meanwhile, Rajiv Gandhi took the reins of the Congress after Indira Gandhi's assassination and the CPI(M) alongwith the CPI which by 1977 crossed over to the CPI(M) camp, preferred not to release any purposive movement against him. In 1988, V. P. Singh deserted Rajiv and explored the possibility of securing the prime ministerial seat. The BJP which by then grew as a formidable force to counter the Congress threw its gauntlet behind V P Singh. The CPI(M) could immediately make out that the ruling class was in favour of projecting the BJP as alternative to the Congress at national level and to be in the good book of the class joined hands with Vajpayee-Advani in supporting a VPSingh-led government at the Centre. Jyoti Basu, the then CPI(M) chief minister of West Bengal even held Vajpayee's hand firmly and raised it on the dais of a joint meeting held in Calcutta as a mark of fraternity. Thus, the CPI(M) leaders in deference to the wishes of the class helped BJP to gain ground. Later on, when the BJP flaunting its communal Hindutva credential

Contd. on page 8

History of the Soviet Union

Contd. from page 6

proved that the accused were guilty of the crimes of which they were charged and that the general opinion among diplomats attending the trial was that the existence of a very serious conspiracy had been proved.

Such are the lies, the capitalists-imperialists, headed by the US imperialists and the CIA fabricated to blacken the image of the Bolshevik revolution and socialism, the lies which, more particularly, the Khrushchevite revisionists and Trotskyite counterrevolutionaries, spread to blemish the lofty

revolutionary image of the great Proletarian leader Comrade Stalin. But, to the dismay of all reactionaries and revisionists, the truth is ultimately emerging out. As Stalin expressed it:

"Charges of crimes will be leveled against the Bolsheviks that they never committed. But the gusty winds of history will inevitably sweep away all the dead leaves of slander from our graves, unveiling the truth."

The wind is blowing. The bold and solemn utterances of truth are vindicating themselves.

Corrigendum

In Vol. 40 No.15 of Proletarian Era on p.7, fourth column in the reprinted article "Lies Concerning the History of Soviet Union" by Mario Sousa, Soviet archive figures on persons committing political crimes, on death in labour camps and on political prisoners in labour camps came out respectively to be 454,000, 160,000 and 578,000 as against the corresponding figures given by Conquest as 9 million, 3 million and 12 million respectively. So the actual figures were 'meagre' 0.5% of Conquest's figure in the first case, slightly more than 0.5 % (i.e., half percent and not about half as printed) in the second case and slightly less than 0.5 % (and not less than half as printed) in the third case respectively. We earnestly regret this inadvertent overlooking. — Ed. P. Era.

Analysis of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh vindicated by turn of events

Contd. from page 7

captured power at the Centre and became unpopular because of years' of rule, the CPI(M) leaders anticipated a change in preference of the ruling class for the hot seat in Delhi. Immediately, in the name of combating communalism the CPI(M) started hobnobbing with the Congress and ultimately entered into electoral adjustments with it to increase seat in parliament. In fact, Harkishen Singh Surjeet, the then CPI(M) General Secretary became an emissary of Sonia Gandhi, the Congress supremo. Now, as everyone is aware of, the Congress-led ministry at the Centre is running on the unstinted support of the CPI(M) and its associates. The CPI(M) leaders have themselves admitted that they are providing the 'content and character' of the Congress government. This is how the CPI(M) demonstrated to the class, how eager it is to be part of mainstream bourgeois power politics and play an important role in serving bourgeois class interest at national plane as well. It is through this process that it has now emerged as a national party of the bourgeois with a left cloak on and waiting on the anvil to 'shoulder higher responsibilities' in servitude of the class. One would recall that Comrade Ghosh, way back in the sixties, said that the CPI(M) had already turned into a nationalist communist party and hence were slated to serve the ruling bourgeoisie like any other fascist outfit.

At the international level, the CPI(M), CPI lent full support to Gorbachov's perestroika and glasnost invoked to put the last nail in the coffin of socialist Soviet Union. After dismantling of the USSR and collapse of the socialist camp, the ecstatic imperialist camp led by the US imperialists embarked upon the path of capitalist globalization with a view to squeezing out even the last drop of blood of the toiling people in a unipolar world. The Congress government under Narasimha Rao at the behest of the ruling Indian monopolists seized the opportunity to liberalize Indian economy to give effect to the formulations of capitalist globalization. Though for public consumption the CPI(M) leaders pretended to be opposed to capitalist globalization, they in fact

adopted the same economic path in the states under their rule. It was in early 1990s that the CPI(M) government of West Bengal announced its new industrial policy offering all help and support to the monopolists in promoting their business interest in the state. No-holds-barred, the CPI(M) leaders became champions of the out-and-out revisionist formulations of Deng-Xiaoping, the anti-Mao renegade and Chinese capitalist roader and embarked upon an opportunist-reformist line to subserve capitalist class interest. Culmination of that has been in its latest clamouring for so-called industrialization under the aegis of domestic and foreign monopolists and working overtime to establish Special Economic Zones (SEZs), an agenda of capitalist globalization mooted by revisionist Deng clique, which the erstwhile BJP-led NDA government rolled out and the present Congress-led UPA is implementing with alacrity. But to stay ahead of both the BJP and Congress in propitiating the class by going ahead with the SEZ proposals, it was the CPI(M)-led West Bengal government which first passed necessary bill in the assembly as far back as in 2003. Today, one is aware what a beastly savagery raved wild on the peasants of Nandigram and Singur who stood up against forcible acquisition of fertile multi-crop land for setting up SEZ and a sophisticated automobile plant of Tatas respectively.

Saga of all-out degeneration

The last thirty years' uninterrupted rule of the CPI(M) in West Bengal has been a saga of all out degeneration in every sphere of life. While the people have been reeling under peril and penury, assailed in every walk of life, the CPI(M) leaders and a section of the cadres are found to be prospering in terms of not only power but wealth as well. They have been so behaving as if the state is their fiefdom. With full backing from the class, they are now unbridled in pursuance of unlimited despotism.

One can gauge the extent of downslide from the marked deterioration in the realm of culture. Comrade Ghosh has taught us, "The essence, the living soul, the kernel of any great and revolutionary ideology of every age is ingrained in its higher cultural and ethical standard." (*ibid*

p.78) We know that Marxism-Leninism is the loftiest ideology of this age. So if there was really a genuine communist party in the governmental power, then it could be well-expected that as a sequel to its growing influence over such a prolonged term, there would have been a corresponding and discernible decline in the influence of most rotten and vile bourgeois culture among the masses. But the reality is just the reverse. The very cultural mosaic of the state is now full of stench and the stench is spreading with alarming speed. Overtly or covertly, the CPI(M) leaders are allowing the degraded western imperialist culture to spread and devour the masses. All sorts of moral vices, sex-perversion, crime on women, worst individualism have become hallmark of a state like West Bengal once revered as the citadel of left-democratic movement and abode of higher culture. And the way the CPI(M) cadres behaved during 'operation carnage' in Nandigram bear enough testimony of what brand of culture they possess and nurture. In every respect, the CPI(M) has turned out to be a fascist outfit subserving the ruling bourgeoisie. Already the party has stopped talking of class struggle and revolution. Had there not been an exigency of deriding the masses with a Marxist(?) cloak, perhaps it would also have like other degenerated communist parties of various countries changed their name.

CPI(M)'s identity with ruling class is no accident

It is not that the CPI(M) and the ruling national bourgeoisie have suddenly emerged as strange bedfellows. Such has been logical in every respect. The very basis of this camaraderie lies in the anti-revolution fear complex of the CPI(M) stemming from its social democratic petty-bourgeois class character. To cover up that, there arose the necessity of wrong characterization of the Indian state and portraying the national bourgeoisie as progressive as well as an ally in the fight for social transformation. It is in continuation of that very formulation that the CPI(M) today completely identifies itself with the class interest of the national bourgeoisie so much so as not to hesitate even in orchestrating such carnage in Nandigram.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's prediction proved right

So it is clear from the above discussion that Comrade Ghosh's penetrating analysis and conclusion about the stage of Indian revolution, characterization of Indian state, strategy of revolution, methodology of party building as well as categorization of the CPI at the time of formation of the SUCI stands vindicated today. Following correct Marxist methodological approach, Comrade Ghosh came to the conclusion that the then CPI formed on the basis of congregation of some people attracted by the appeal of international communist movement, only used the glory of the movement to create a noise on this soil and notwithstanding sacrifices of many of its founding members and organizers and conduction of a few struggles over people's demands, remained a typical petty-bourgeois party that had no future but indulge in naked tailism of the ruling class. The journey the undivided CPI, disintegrated subsequently into so many factions, began by assuming without any basis that the national bourgeoisie was a progressive force has now reached full measure with the CPI(M) alongwith CPI making no secret of their complete subservience to the class interest of the ruling monopolists. This is exactly what Comrade Ghosh had foreseen and forewarned six decades back based on correct Marxist-Leninist method of analysis. On the eve of the 59th foundation day of the SUCI, the revolutionary party of the Indian proletariat, the most conscious and revolutionary core of the working class, the instrument to fulfil all its class aspirations—political, social, economic, cultural—the best creation of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the great leader of the proletariat, worthy continuator of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin-Mao, history adjures to us the task of correctly comprehending and assimilating the essence of Comrade Ghosh's teachings and accordingly of being conscious of the responsibility we all must shoulder in bringing about anti-capitalist socialist revolution with due expediency. We also appeal to the honest rank of the CPI(M) as well as its associates not to spurn this responsibility.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : NIHAR MUKHERJEE