

PROBLEMS OF REVOLUTIONARY TRADE UNIONISM

Theses Adopted by the Eighth Session
of the Central Council of the R.I.L.U.

* * *

I. TWO ECONOMIC SYSTEMS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE CONDITIONS OF THE WORKING CLASS

Since the Fifth Congress of the RILU there has been a further deepening, extension and intensification of the world economic crisis. During this period France has also been drawn into the orbit of this crisis.

The crisis embraces thus all the capitalist countries, all branches of industry and agriculture, with the exception of the war industry, which in capitalist countries is continuing to develop and the production of which continues to grow without a break. The decline in production has assumed dimensions unparalleled in the history of capitalism. The world industrial production has declined by 30 to 35 per cent by October 1931, as compared with 1929.

Foreign trade has fallen on the average by 45 to 50 per cent in the advanced capitalist countries. Notwithstanding the unprecedented decline in production from 1930, the stocks of the most important commodities are continuing to increase.

Unemployment has assumed monstrous dimensions. In November, 1930, there were 26 millions completely unemployed in 26 countries - in November, 1931, this number has increased to 40 millions. Millions of workers are partially unemployed. Millions of peasants are driven from the villages to swell the many-millioned army of unemployed.

Despite the big decline in the wholesale prices of raw material and agricultural produce on the world markets, monopolist capital, with the aid and under the protection of prohibitive duties, is maintaining retail prices on the home market at a high level, and in some countries it is even increasing them, making the crisis still more painful for the wide toiling masses.

Supported by the high prices on the home market, monopolist capital is practising unprecedented dumping in relation to foreign countries, which leads to still further competition on the world market, to the growth of customs barriers, to economic war and to a further intensification of the world crisis.

As a result of the deepening and sharpening of the industrial and agrarian crisis in 1931, a financial crisis has also broken out which is assuming the forms of a credit, currency, and banking crisis, and in some countries also of a crisis in the state finances, which has seized, in one form or another and not in an equal measure, the entire capitalist world.

The growing deficit in the trading and paying balances, the failure of a number of big banks and concerns, the flow of gold from one country to another, the flight of capital and the growing deficits of the State budgets, the withdrawal of short-term foreign loans, the withdrawal of deposits from the banks, the panic on the money market, the catastrophic fall of all kinds of securities, the devaluation of currencies, the abolition of the gold standard, inflation - such are the manifestations of the financial crisis which intensifies still more the crisis of the whole capitalist system.

Inflation....

Inflation means a reduction in real wages. The failure of banks and concerns means the closing down of a whole number of factories, a new wave of unemployment, the depreciation and loss of those savings which the best-paid workers had been able to effect.

The bourgeoisie in all countries is trying to cover the deficits of the State budgets by increasing the taxation of the toiling masses, by reducing the so-called social expenditure (social insurance and social benefits), by reducing the wages of State employees, of workers in State enterprises, by reducing expenditure on health protection, on education, etc.

The offensive of capital on the standard of life of the working class since the Fifth Congress of the RILU has become sharper in all capitalist countries, has become still more cruel, intense and wide. The main characteristic features of the offensive of capital during the last year ¹⁹³³ follows:

(1) The offensive is directed not only against all categories of workers but also against the middle and lower State employees;

(2) The periods between attacks on one and the same group of workers is becoming shorter;

(3) Various forms of direct forced labour (public work, labour service duties, etc.) are being more and more applied;

(4) A special attack against married women and youth;

(5) All sorts of limitations and deportation of foreign workers.

The capitalists are applying direct and indirect methods of reducing the standard of life of the workers, the working women and working youth, and mainly the direct reduction of nominal wages, the reduction of wages by way of the application of low-paid women and child labour, by way of the displacement of skilled workers by semi-skilled, by the transfer of skilled workers to lower wage grades, by the application of a reduced working week and a lengthened working day, by way of inflation, reduction in real wages, by increasing retail prices on the means of subsistence of the workers, by reductions of wages by increased taxation of the workers, by increased contributions for social insurance, etc.

As a result of all this the wages of workers have been reduced during the two years of crisis by 25 per cent in Germany, 30 per cent in U.S.A., 20 per cent in England, 35 per cent in Japan, 10 to 12 per cent in France, etc. The working class of the U.S.A. has lost, during the two years of crisis, and as a result of unemployment and reduction in wages, the sum of 22 milliard dollars, the German working class lost 16 milliard marks, etc.

The bourgeoisie is leading an attack not only against the employed workers, but also against the unemployed (reductions in benefit, increase in workers' contributions, narrowing of the circle of the insured and the circle receiving benefit, etc.), it leads an attack against the sick, the invalids and the aged, reducing their benefits and pensions, the position is still worse in those countries where there is no unemployment insurance (U.S.A., Japan, etc.) where the unemployed have to rely upon alms and charity or are simply doomed to death by starvation.

Only one country has not been seized by the crisis, only in one country is there a growth in the whole national economy unprecedented in history - this is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The working class of the USSR has attained decisive success.....

successes in the field of Socialist construction. While the world industrial production has declined by 30 to 35 per cent during the last two years, the production of the USSR has increased in 1930 and 1931 by 45 per cent. 62 per cent of all the peasant households have already been organised in collective farms in 1931.

The advantages of planned Socialist Soviet economy over the anarchic, decaying planless capitalist economy have never yet been so striking. In the lands of capital more and more factories are closing day by day - in the USSR in 1931 alone hundreds of great factories have started work. In the capitalist countries the productive apparatus is working tremendously below capacity - in the USSR the entire productive apparatus, all the factories and works are working unceasingly.

In the capitalist countries there is forced labour, the labour for the benefit of an alien class, of a class of exploiters and oppressors. In the USSR free socialist labour, labour for oneself, for the strengthening and consolidation of the might of the toilers, for the material and cultural bettering of the working class. In the capitalist countries - unheard of terrorism in the factories, espionage, the employers' drive, and work, the stimulus of which is hunger and fear of dismissal. In the USSR is tremendous labour enthusiasm.

In the USSR there are 3.5 million shock workers, enthusiasts of Socialist construction, voluntarily raising the productivity of labour, so as to reach and outstrip the advanced capitalist countries technically and economically. The working class of the USSR is proving to be the working class of the whole world the advantages in practice of Soviet Socialist economy as against the capitalist system.

Side by side with the economic pressure, and marching in advance and support of it, a political attack is also developing in the capitalist countries on the elementary rights and gains of the workers (the shooting on workers' demonstrations, the destruction of workers' organisations, the workers' Press, mass arrests, etc.). Fascist reaction has raised its head everywhere. The bourgeoisie, from a dictatorship covered by "democratic" ornaments has in a number of countries passed over, and in others is preparing for the transition to an open fascist dictatorship. The USSR, at the same time, is liquidating with a strong hand the kulaks as a class and is leading the whole country along the path of developed proletarian democracy.

In the capitalist countries there is a huge growth in unemployment; in the USSR on the contrary, there is a sharp deficiency of labour power and a huge growth, numerically, of the proletariat. In the capitalist countries - huge wage cuts - in the USSR, increases in wages (by November 1931, by 20 per cent, as compared with 1929).

In the lands of capital the lengthening of the working day and the wide application of the shorter working week (partial unemployment), in the USSR the 7-hour day with increased wages.

In capitalist countries evictions of the unemployed from their homes, and the complete cessation of house building for the workers, in the USSR grandiose workers' housing construction and the building not only of many thousands of new workers' districts but of entire cities. In capitalist countries, relentless reductions in social insurance, in the USSR a huge growth in the social insurance budget.

In the.....

In the capitalist countries a reduction of expenditure on national education, in the USSR an impetuous growth in the number of schools, technical colleges, and high schools attached to the big factories for the toilers and their children.

As a result of the great achievements and the heroic struggle of the workers, the building of the foundations of Socialist economy is being completed in the USSR. The sympathy of the wide toiling masses in the capitalist countries for the land of the proletarian dictatorship is, in this connection, growing day by day. The bourgeoisie and the social-fascists consider as a danger for themselves, not only the realisation of the great Five-Year Plan, but even the comparison of the unprecedented crisis in capitalist economy with the great upsurge of the USSR, for this comparison is a sentence of death for capitalist economy. It convinces the widest masses of the oppressed workers of the advantages of Socialism over capitalism. It drives them along the path of a revolutionary way out of the crisis, poverty and wage slavery. It is this, that two worlds, two systems of economy and labour, confront one another.

The struggle for markets, for the sources of raw material, for gold, for a new redivision of the world, has become more extremely intensified. The imperialists are seeking ever more actively an outlet from the crisis along the path of new wars (plundering seizure by Japan of Manchuria, etc.), the International bourgeoisie is straining all its efforts so as to put a stop to the growth and flourishing State of Socialist Construction and is preparing military intervention so as to put an end to the country which is building up Socialism.

The danger of war of the imperialists among themselves, and particularly of the imperialists against the USSR, has grown considerably since the time of the Fifth Congress. The workers in the whole world are struck more and more vividly with the radical difference between decaying capitalism and flourishing Socialism. The world of capitalism and the world of Socialism are continuing to develop in opposite directions.

The capitalist system is becoming more and more shattered, Socialism is growing and consolidating in the USSR, a revolutionary upsurge is rising all over the world, class antagonism is becoming ever more intensified and the international proletariat is being faced more and more pointedly with the question: a capitalist or a revolutionary way out of the crisis.

II. THE REFORMIST AND REVOLUTIONARY TRADE UNION MOVEMENTS IN CONDITIONS OF THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS

THE Amsterdam International which is under the leadership of international Social-Democracy and which supported capitalist rationalisation and hailed prosperity is feverishly seeking a capitalist way out of the crisis together with the whole bourgeoisie. The fundamental position of the Amsterdamites consists in - that the working class must help the bourgeoisie by all means, as quickly as possible, to come out of the crisis, and that the main thing is to maintain capitalist economy.

The reformists insist that a way out of the crisis is possible only along international paths, and the reformists of one country strongly put forward as the culprits of the crisis the bourgeoisie of the competing country, and not the bourgeoisie of their own. With this as a starting point, the Amsterdam International puts forward the slogan of regulating credit according to plan, the public control over trusts, control over banks, redistribution of land, international regulation of prices, etc.

The national reformist organisations complete this "labour programme" with the demands of a Supreme Industrial Council and a Five-Year Plan(U.S.A.), inflation, protection, planned national economy and nationalisation of the mining industry with compensation (Great Britain), State capitalism(Austria), strengthening of the influence of the social principle in private economy(Germany), payment of reparations in kind and percentage limitation of immigration to the factories(France),etc.

The reformists in all countries actively collaborate in and frequently even take the initiative in carrying through a regime of economy at the expense of the working class by way of lowering the living standard of the working masses (the Labour Party and the General Council in Great Britain, support of the Bruening Govt., its emergency laws, the support of the anti-workers' policy of Hoover by the American Federation of Labour).

The more the crisis sharpens, the more that the discontent of the working masses grows, the more are "left" slogans being put forward by the Amsterdamites, who desire by "left" phrases and fraudulent manoeuvres to run away from the growing anger, dissatisfaction and demands of the masses. The reformists speak of the bankruptcy of the capitalist/and of the necessity to replace the bankrupt regime by another regime but simultaneously with this they propose the tactic of the "lesser evil," and warn the workers of the ruination of civil war and of the necessity of finding a way out by ~~peaceful means through the~~ League of Nations and its institutions.

Together with all the bourgeois Parties which can only see a way out of the crisis by putting all its burdens on the shoulders of the working class, international reformism is supporting all the reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie, covering up its anti-workers' policy by the theory that if we do not retreat and if we do not voluntarily make concessions to the capitalists, the bourgeoisie will carry through still more cruel measures against the workers. The revolutionary trade union movement must systematically carry on the struggle against all attempts of the reformists to cover up their participation in the political and economic attacks on the living standards and elementary rights and gains of the working masses.

It is necessary untiringly to expose before the masses the old and the new social-fascist slogans and their capitalist programme of a way out of the crisis, special attention being paid to the exposure of the leaders of the "left" social-democratic groupings in the reformist trade union movement who are striving by their "left" phrases to prevent the break away of the workers from social-fascism(Seidewitz, Brandler, Maxton, Dumoulin).

The All-German Federation of Trade Unions at its last Congress in Frankfurt(September 1931), declared the necessity of sacrifices on the part of the workers, and the German trade unions carried through in practice a series of agreements with the employers in this very spirit. The British Trade Union Congress in Bristol (September,1931), declared itself in favour of protection and against ~~the~~ struggle of the masses for their urgent demands. The Congress of the Reformist Confederation of Labour in France (September,1931), passed a resolution, which obviously agreed with the Government of Laval, giving in advance its agreement to all the anti-workers' measures which the bourgeoisie may decide upon. The last Congress of the American Federation of Labour (September,1931) has declared in favour of Hoover's slogan "work in turn"(Stagger system), covering up the slogan of Hoover by the slogan "equal distribution of work."

The leaders....

The leaders of the reformist trade union movement have carried through a lowering in the standard of life of the working masses not only in co-operation with the representatives of the other reactionary unions, but have also come to an understanding directly with the employers, and have supported all the measures of any capitalist Government from Hoover and Laval to Bruening and Baldwin (Great Britain, Germany, France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, U.S.A., Japan, etc.). These leaders of the trade unions not only came forward in favour of economy at the expense of social insurance (the General Council of the British Trade Union, the All-German Federation of Trade Unions, etc.), but even declared themselves with determination against the introduction of social insurance in such countries where this does not exist (the American Federation of Labour).

A characteristic peculiarity of the activity of the reformists during this period is their initiative in the voluntary reduction of wages and in all other anti-workers' measures. There is complete unity of views in this respect, notwithstanding differences in practical methods, among the leaders of all the reactionary trade unions, beginning with the Amsterdam, Catholic and Hirsch-Dunker trade unions and ending with the yellow Kuomintang ones.

And so, the intensification of the economic crisis is encouraging still more before the masses the bourgeois capitalist essence of international reformism and is bringing out its active role in the matter of passing all the burdens of the crisis on the shoulders of the wide working masses.

The crisis has unmasked all the reformist twaddle about prosperity, about the beneficial influence of capitalist rationalisation and has compelled the reformist trade union bureaucracy to engage openly in saving not only the capitalist system, but individual capitalists who have become bankrupt, by supporting Governments which pay out milliards of the people's money to industrialists and financiers covering up this policy by phrases of the "public good" and even of "Socialism."

The crisis has brought about that the workers have before them, in the practice of the day-to-day struggle, a comparison between the reformist and the revolutionary trade union movement. International Social-Democracy, this chief Social prop of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, has converted the trade unions which it leads into bulwarks of the capitalist system, into organisations which serve the bourgeois state and support it, and who have become the closest and most necessary collaborators to the bourgeois State machine, which increase and will continue to increase more and more the growing antagonism between the mass of the membership, and the blackleg trade union apparatus (the textile workers' strike in Great Britain, the miners' strike in the Ruhr, etc.). The saving and improvement of the capitalist system; this is what determines the theory and practice of the reformist trade union movement.

The question of the relations to the bourgeois State, the capitalist system and the crisis of capitalism is the fundamental political line of demarcation between the reformist and the revolutionary trade union movement. The revolutionary trade union movement determines its tactics not from the point of view of the interests of the maintenance and consolidation of the power of the bourgeoisie, but only from the point of view of the interests of the working class, and the problem of the seizure of power by the working class.

For this reason it was only the revolutionary trade union movement which has organised and rallied the workers for the struggle against....

against the offensive of capital, alone it organised strikes, and it was only the revolutionary trade union movement which called upon and roused the masses for the defence of their every day demands and final objects.

The experience of the economic struggle since the time of the Fifth Congress is exceedingly rich, with the struggle of hundreds of thousands of proletarians under the leadership of the revolutionary trade union movement and the unheard-of open and behind-the-scenes betrayals on the part of the reformist trade union bureaucracy, which has many a time headed strikes only for the purpose of betraying them all the more easily.

The capitalist nature of the reformist trade union movement comes to the surface with especial clearness when it is compared with the ^{Soviet} trade union movement. The Soviet trade unions subject their day-to-day work to the development of Socialist economy, the reformist trade union bureaucracy subjects the whole of its work to the saving of capitalist economy. The Soviet trade unions strain all their efforts so as to help to accomplish the "Piatilekta" (Five Year Plan) in four years, the reformist trade unions strain all their efforts, frequently under the cover of "left" phrases, so as to fulfil all the plans for saving capitalism, which are worked out by the bourgeoisie. The Soviet trade unions are doing everything so as to improve the condition of the working class (raising wages, the seven-hour working day, etc.), and the reformist trade union bureaucracy is straining all its efforts so as to assist the bourgeoisie to improve its position at the expense of the working class (~~reducing wages, reducing unemployment benefit, grants to capitalists on account of taxation, etc.~~).

The experience of the last years especially has shown that the reformist and the revolutionary trade union movements differ from each other not only in the question of their relation to the State, but in the practical day-to-day questions which are before the ~~working class, arising from the developing crisis~~. It is just because of this that it is necessary to increase tenfold our activity in the struggle against the reformist trade union bureaucracy, with the object of wresting the wide masses from social-democratic theory and practice.

The strengthening and sharpening of the struggle against social-democracy (which is the moderate wing of Fascism-Stalin) and the reformist trade union bureaucracy is the most important pre-requisite for the successful struggle against Fascism, and for winning more rapidly the majority of the working class, for a revolutionary way out of the crisis. The Amsterdam International and its sections, led by international social-democracy, is the most important obstacle in the struggle of the working class against the offensive of capital.

The Amsterdamites not only keep back and tie down the initiative of the masses, but actively disrupt all the movements of the workers by way of open strike breaking or back-stair machinations with the employers. The exposure, therefore, of the policy and practice of the Amsterdamites and their participation in the offensive of capital on the standard of life and the elementary rights of the working class is the most important task of all adherents of the RILU.

Experience has shown that there is only one trade union movement which mobilises the masses against the offensive of capital, which is making tremendous sacrifices in the class war, and that is the revolutionary trade union movement united in the RILU. And so stern experience impels the masses to compare the reformist and revolutionary trade unions, and to choose the way of constant capitulation and defeat or the way of class struggle - the way of Amsterdam or RILU.

III. LESSONS OF THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE SINCE THE FIFTH CONGRESS.

THE period that has elapsed since the Fifth Congress of the RILU has entirely and fully confirmed the perspective of the Fifth Congress of the inevitable growth of the economic struggle of the proletariat with the further development and intensification of the crisis and the offensive of capital. In all the most important capitalist and colonial countries we have before us a considerable growth of the economic struggles (Germany, Poland, Great Britain, France, India, U.S.A., Czechoslovakia, China, etc.). The strike movement has seized a number of countries in which for a long period there had been almost no economic struggles (Austria, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, the Balkans, a number of the small colonial countries, etc.).

At the same time, we have had a wide development in all countries of such forms of economic struggles of the working class as strikes in departments, ca'canny strikes, stay-in strikes, protest demonstrations, etc. The unemployed movement has assumed mass dimensions and is more and more linked up with the economic struggles of the workers employed in the factories. The further radicalisation of the masses has found its expression, besides the various forms of economic struggle and unemployed movements, in the most various forms of political demonstrations, right up to mass political strikes (Germany: Braunschweig and Naves; Czechoslovakia: Freiwaldan; Poland: Grodno; etc.).

The peculiarities of the economic struggle of the proletariat after the Fifth Congress are as follows:

(a) The increased importance of strikes as a means of defence and counter-offensive of the working, in conditions of the development of the crisis. Hence, the growth everywhere of police repressions and the pressure of the State apparatus during the economic struggles the formation of special armed strike-breaking columns, which together with the Fascists, come forward against the workers. Hence the new tactics of the employers who apply different methods of attack on the working class (reductions of over-tariff wage rates, reductions in working time without the maintenance of the old wages in some cases, and the lengthening of the working day in others, abandonment tariffs, disadvantageous for the bourgeoisie and the forced continuation of collective agreements which are advantageous for it, etc.), which is striving by false promises and negotiations to lull the vigilance of the working masses for the purpose of an unexpected attack and blow (Berlin: metal workers' strike in 1931, the strike of textile workers in Northern France in the summer of 1931 and others; the January miners' strike in South Wales). Hence the new tactics of the reformists, who are increasingly applying "left" manoeuvres and, at the same time, acting more than ever they did before in co-operation with police apparatus at times of strikes (the textile workers' and miners' strikes in France, the port workers in Duisburg and Hamburg, the seamen's strike in Germany, the miners' strike in Pennsylvania, etc.).

(b) The resistance of the workers has become more stubborn, despite the unprecedented terrorism of the employers and the police and the subtle treacherous manoeuvres of the social-Fascists (strikes in Germany, Poland, Bulgaria; the miners' strike in Pennsylvania; the agricultural labourers' strikes in Germany and Czechoslovakia; the textile workers' strike in France, and others). Much more sharply and frequently than hitherto, strikers come up against the entire political apparatus of the bourgeois government. More rapidly than hitherto and thanks to the pressure of the police apparatus, economic strikes are growing into mass and political strikes (the struggle of the Czechoslovakia quarrymen in Freiwaldan, the...

Swedish paper workers, etc.). Even a small economic conflict becomes transformed into a mass political movement more easily than hitherto (the Warsaw tramway workers, the "Renard" mine in Dombrovo, etc.).

(c) The decline of the element of spontaneity in the economic struggles, notwithstanding the tactics of unexpected attacks on the part of the employers and the manoeuvres of the reformists (all the recent strikes in Germany, Poland, and others) - although spontaneity is still a predominating feature in the economic struggles in a number of countries. The RILU adherents have not yet learnt how to direct this movement of the masses into an organisational channel.

(d) The growth of strike solidarity, the almost complete absence of strikebreaking on the part of the unemployed, despite the incitement by the bourgeoisie of the unemployed against the employed; the failure of the Fascist attempts to create a mass movement in the factories and among the unemployed for the organisation of strikebreaking, both within the factories and the rear of the strikers (Germany).

(e) The growth in some countries of strikes, which ended successfully despite the crisis and unemployment, both in the sense of the direct satisfaction of the demands of the workers as well as in the sense of beating off the attacks of the employers.

(f) Considerable achievements in a number of countries by the revolutionary trade union movement in the organisation and independent leadership of the strike struggles. The independent leadership of the economic struggles has been more vividly expressed in countries with a higher state of revolutionary upsurge (Poland, Germany, Spain, China). At the same time, the revolutionary trade union movement up to the present has succeeded in drawing into the struggle only part of the workers, and it, therefore, succeeded only partially to keep back the tempos of the offensive of capital.

(g) In the progress of all the economic struggles which took place after the Fifth Congress of the RILU, the revolutionary trade union movement, despite the considerable weaknesses still existing was the only force that came forward in the organisation of the proletariat against the attacks of capital. And it was just this role of the revolutionary trade union movement which was the main reason why the reformist leaders frequently felt themselves compelled to mask their treacherous work of disruption of strikes by "left" phrases about the struggle and even formal "support" of strike movements so that they might more conveniently disrupt them. At the same time, the Central Council of the RILU declares that the revolutionary trade union movement has not yet, to a sufficient degree, utilised in practice the directives of the Strassburg Conference and the Fifth Congress of the RILU.

In the leadership of the economic struggles since the Fifth Congress, the following weaknesses and defects of the revolutionary trade union movement have come on the surface.

(1) The weakness of the revolutionary trade union movement in the factories as the main source of all the weaknesses of the independent leadership of the economic struggles. Hence the insufficient mobilisation of the wide masses of workers for a strike. Hence the reliance on the spontaneous movement of the masses in the factories for a strike. Hence the reliance on which frequently doomed a strike to failure even before it had begun. Hence the insufficient concreteness in the demands for every

every factory separately. Hence the weakness in carrying through the united front from below.

(2) The strike activity of the revolutionary trade union movement and the independent leadership of the economic struggles, with its general undoubted successes since the Fifth Congress of the RILU, is still lagging behind considerably despite the development of the objectively favourable conditions and growth of the fighting capacities of the masses.

(3) The elements of spontaneity in the economic struggle are still much too high; the employers succeed in their offensives - to catch the revolutionary trade union movement napping, as the latter has not yet learnt how seriously to take into account the situation of the struggle, and to choose the moment for the beginning and end of a strike.

/ The preparation of a mass basis for a strike

(4) The organisational preparation of the economic struggle is still considerably lagging behind the agitation and propaganda for a strike, in the factories before and during the struggle (strike committees, elected by all the strikers, the discussion and adoption of the demands worked out by them), and consolidation after the struggle, all this is still extremely weak. There is still an insufficient understanding of the importance of a mass basis for the strike committees as a weapon in the struggle against the reactionary trade union apparatus; the membership of the reformist and other reactionary trade unions are still insufficiently drawn into the economic struggle, into its preparations and into the organs which should lead it.

(5) The fear of the masses, the lack of faith in the fighting capacities of the masses in conditions of crisis, are still very great; also the incapability, and sometimes the fear of extending the territory of the strike struggle; also the incapability and sometimes the fear of transferring the strike to higher forms of political mass strike, and side by side with this, the incapability of combining a strike with other forms of economic struggles, and also the incapability of utilising all forms of protest of the working masses against the offensive of capital for the preparation of mass economic and political strikes.

(6) The contact, at times of strikes, of the unemployed with the strikers is still insufficient; due attention is not devoted to the prevention of strike-breaking on the part of the unemployed, to drawing the unemployed into the strike struggle. The cases of organisation of the simultaneous concrete movements of strikers with the object of supporting the demands of the unemployed are very rare.

(7) The incapability of beating off the treacherous manoeuvres of the reformists; the lack of understanding of the importance for the economic struggle of the proletariat of winning by the revolutionary trade union movement, of positions within the reformist trade unions; the weakness of these positions were the greatest obstacle and one of the most serious reasons for the defeat in a number of the most important strikes; the lack of understanding of the importance of the united front of all the workers in the factories for the success of the economic struggle.

(8) The much too general character of strike agitation; insufficient concreteness of the struggle against the offensive of capital and the incapability of taking advantage of the slightest conflict between labour and capital for the development of a wide economic struggle.

(9) Insufficient capability of profiting by the discontent of the masses and all forms of protest, and the economic struggle for the recruitment....

the recruiting of new members into the Red trade unions and trade union opposition, and the systematic consolidation and development of the independent revolutionary trade union movement.

The main task of all the adherents of the revolutionary trade union movement for the immediate future is the fulfilment, with the maximum energy and persistency, of the policy of the Fifth RILU Congress on the independent leadership of the economic struggles on the basis of the widest united front of the working class against the attacks of the employers, for the every-day demands of the workers and for the revolutionary way out of the crisis.

IV. THE GROWTH OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE LAGGING BEHIND IN THE LEADERSHIP OF ~~THE UNEMPLOYED MOVEMENT.~~

~~UNEMPLOYMENT~~ has continued to grow since the Fifth Congress, and all signs show that unemployment will also continue to increase in the future. Forced labour for the unemployed has ~~been introduced~~ in a number of countries, not only on public work, but even on work for private individuals, who, by agreement with the Government, are utilising the unemployed as cheap labour power with the object of decreasing the State expenditure on social insurance. The reformists, in some countries, put forward the slogan, "The workers must work one day for the benefit of the unemployed," or "The workers must temporarily yield their place at the bench to the unemployed."

We must carry on the most determined struggle against these attempts to free the employers and the State from expenditure and to place on the working class the burden of maintaining the army of unemployed. Insurance at the expense of the State and the employers - such must be the main slogan of the revolutionary trade union movement, on the basis of which we must mobilise the masses of unemployed and those in employment.

The reformists, fearing the revolutionary energy inherent in millions of starving people, the reformists, even if they organise the unemployed, do so only for the purpose of keeping them from the revolutionary struggle. The Fascists are displaying great activity, energetically working among the unemployed and recruiting among the hungry people, strike-breakers and fighters for their shock troops.

In order that unemployment may be lessened, the ruling classes with the sympathy and the support of the reformist bureaucracy, are putting forward schemes of emigrating the unemployed to Africa (Germany), and in such places where there is a large labour immigration, the bourgeois and social-Fascist parties and the reformist and other reactionary trade unions insist, not only on the prohibition of entry into those countries of foreign workers, but also upon the mass deportation of foreign workers (USA, France). In the presence of tens of millions of unemployed, all the revolutionary trade unions should have closely taken up the organisation of this potential revolutionary power and yet almost all the sections of the RILU have taken up this work considerably late.

The International Day of the Struggle against Unemployment, February 25, 1931, brought to the surface the great weaknesses of the RILU sections, which do not systematically work in the unemployed movement, but by the way, which leads to a considerable lagging behind of the unemployment movement from the rapid growth of unemployment. After the special resolution of the Executive Bureau of May 5th, and decisions of the Prague Conference, there was an improvement in

improvement in some countries, but all the same, the organisational and political work among the unemployed still lags considerably behind the growth of unemployment and revolutionisation of the masses.

The main weakness of all the unemployed organisations (committees and councils) is the breach between the everyday demands of the unemployed and the general class demands of the proletariat. Instead of concentrating all their work on the day-to-day needs of the unemployed, of trying, day by day, to secure from the village communities, the municipalities and the State immediate and direct assistance, instead of fighting against evictions, against the cutting off of gas and electricity, and fighting for the issue of coal, milk for children, etc., and linking up this struggle with the general class tasks of the proletariat, instead of doing all this, the committees and councils of unemployed, in a number of countries, occupy themselves with questions of but a general character, and put forward all-embracing programmes which the masses were frequently unable to understand.

In those places where the councils and committees of unemployed have carried on a systematic struggle for the everyday demands and to the extent to which they linked up the urgent demands with the demands common to the unemployed and those in employment, the influence of the unemployed organisation, and equally of the sections of the RILU, have grown (Poland, Czechoslovakia). As soon as the adherents of the RILU weakened the struggle for the everyday needs of the unemployed, the unemployed organisations fell to pieces and there was a weakening of the whole movement.

A great weakness of all the unemployed organs is their lack of crystallisation, the constant disappearance of organisation and the birth in its place of another, the insufficient control of the unemployed themselves over the work of the committees and councils, and the weak contact between the unemployed themselves and the leading organs.

While in some countries (Germany) the unemployed organisations were and are a part of the revolutionary trade union opposition, the unemployed organisations in other countries are not linked up at all with the employed workers (France, Czechoslovakia, Great Britain) which separates the unemployed movement from the struggle of the workers in employment. In some countries (Spain), where the unemployed movement is already now playing a big revolutionary part and where the connection between the unemployed with those at work for joint action against the counter-revolutionary republican socialist governments is doubly important, the formation has begun of unemployed trade unions, which is an unpardonable distortion of the line of the RILU in the domain of the organisation of the unemployed.

Upto the present the methods of demonstration predominate in our work among the unemployed over the organisational consolidation of the unemployed movement and the concrete insistence upon their everyday interests. The revolutionary trade union movement organises and leads the struggle for the demands of the ~~juvenile~~ unemployed to a perfectly insufficient degree. There is as yet no serious break in the methods of work and the organisation of the unemployed, and for this reason, the huge masses of the unemployed are still outside the influence of the revolutionary trade union movement. And yet the character of the post-war general crisis of capitalism is such that mass unemployment is not a temporary, a quickly passing phenomenon.

It is and will remain a constant concomitant of the decaying capitalist system. Consequently, the development of the unemployed

movement, in its linking up with the struggle of those at work, who up to the present time have not yet rendered sufficient aid to the struggle of the unemployed, is becoming in the conditions of the present economic crisis and the huge additional growth of unemployment, not a temporary but a constant and one of the most important tasks of the international revolutionary trade union movement.

The experience of the last months has shown that with serious work among the unemployed it is possible to secure the leadership of the mass unemployed movement (Great Britain, Germany and Poland). The Eighth Session of the Central Council of the RILU, in confirming the decision of the Executive Bureau of May 5th on the forms and methods of the organisation of the unemployed and the decisions of the Prague Conference, charges all its sections to develop work among the unemployed on the basis of these decisions.

V. FIGHT FOR THE UNITED FRONT FROM BELOW

IN the conditions of the increasing poverty and discontent of the masses, and the growth of class struggles, the most important task of the RILU adherents is the capable organisation of the united front of the workers of all tendencies, as well as the unemployed, for the joint defence against the offensive of capital and for the counter-offensive of the working class. The struggle for the unorganised and organised workers, and for wresting them from the reactionary leaders can only be successful, providing the adherents of the RILU are able to put before every worker the question as to how he is to defend his wages and his working day, etc., in practice, how to organise resistance to the attack of capital, and the forms which the collective movements of the proletariat are to assume.

The task consists in explaining to the entire working mass in the very factories the character and dimensions of the present offensive of capital; to approach in a comrade-like fashion the rank and file worker, regardless of the organisation to which he may belong, so as to draw him into the joint struggle against capital. The right opportunist and left sectarian deviations which have been noted by the Fifth Congress of the RILU in some sections in this domain have not yet been outlived. Some, in the interests of the united front, are prepared to keep silent about the main thing in the united front, namely that it is created for the defence of the interests of the workers, not for agreement with but for the fight against the bourgeoisie. Another extreme, not less harmful and not less dangerous, is the mixing up in one pile of the rank and file workers and the leaders, the refusal to work out together with the workers of other tendencies a joint programme of day-to-day demands.

Both these deviations from the line of the RILU must meet with a determined resistance. The most important task of the adherents of the RILU is the mobilisation of the workers for definite concrete movements and action. The demands must be formulated simply and in a manner which will make them generally understood so that every worker should understand that here is a question of vital interest to him. The adherents of the RILU must organise the united front in the factories with the rank and file workers, the members of the reformist and other reactionary trade unions.

The more intense the pressure of the capitalists on the living standard of the working masses will become, the more rapid will be the growth of ferment and discontent within the reformist and other reactionary trade unions, and the opposition movements of the factory trade union organisations against the general line of the reformist and other reactionary leaders. The adherents of the RILU

must....

must propose the united front on the basis of a concrete programme of demands of all factory organisations of the reformist and other reactionary trade unions, who come forward against the transfer of the burden of the crisis on the shoulder of the working class, against class collaboration and for the class struggle.

Together with the growth of discontent of the masses, the "left" manoeuvres of the leaders of the reformist and other reactionary trade unions are becoming more frequent (proposal of the united front, unity, "left" demands, "threats" against capitalism, short-term demonstrative strikes for the disruption of the struggle which is being prepared by the revolutionary trade union movement). The adherents of the RILU must reply to these manoeuvres of the trade union bureaucrats by increasing the struggle for the united front from below, by discussing the whole tactics of the reformist leaders and all their manoeuvres at workers' meetings, and by contrasting the words of the strike-breaking trade union bureaucrats with their deeds. The main task in these cases is to explain to the working masses the difference between the united front of the leaders of the reactionary trade unions for the support of the bourgeoisie and the united front of the working masses for the vital demands of the workers against the bourgeoisie.

A number of cases may be noted during the past period when the initiative of the united front was taken by the "left" reformists. One must pay the greatest attention to such kinds of proposals, since they bear most frequently the character of a manoeuvre against the revolutionary trade union movement. One must carefully consider whom this proposal of the united front comes from; does it come from the notorious politicians, from the leaders of local trade union organisations, or from rank and file workers? What is of special importance is the situation in which a proposal for the united front is made? One must, with all determination, come forward against negotiations behind the scenes; one must propose to transfer the discussion of all questions connected with the working out of the basis of the united front (programme of demands), to general meetings of workers or special meetings of representatives of the factories and workshops.

It is necessary to treat with special seriousness proposals regarding joint movements of workers who are members in different unions at times of strikes. The adherents of the RILU came up against this question at the time of the miners' strike in Pittsburg. The adherents of the RILU should have taken advantage of the ferment and the strike of the miners of South West Virginia so that by means of sending special delegations from the striking miners of Pennsylvania to the miners of West Virginia - who were under the leadership of the Mute group - to establish the united front in the struggle between the miners of both areas and to unite these two strikes on the basis of a unified programme of demands. This was not done, and the miners' strike in West Virginia which was proceeding parallel with the miners' strike in Pittsburg, passed on outside the influence of the adherents of the RILU.

Insofar as all the forces of the employers, the State and the reformists are directed towards driving out the revolutionary workers from the factories and towards the isolation of the adherents of the RILU from the working masses, the most important task of the RILU adherents is the formation of the united front first of all in the factories. For this purpose it is necessary to take the initiative of electing preparatory committees or commissions for the defence of wages or mixed committees of the united front, and commissions for the collection of funds for an impending strike, regard being taken to the conditions and providing there is discontent and ferment among the masses, such committees or commissions being elected before the beginning of the struggle.

The...

The organisation of joint meetings of the members of the revolutionary, reformist and other unions, for the joint discussions of burning questions in which the wide masses of workers are interested - this is a serious method for clearing the ground for the united front. The adherents of the RILU must penetrate into all workers' meetings and everywhere explain the point of view of the revolutionary trade union movement. We must, at all costs, break through the trade union barriers and, with the support of the workers, secure the right of speaking at all trade union and other meetings.

The forms of the united front which have existed uptill now, are not sufficient, because they are too uniform and too much of one type. The forms of organisation and the names may and should be changed, but the main thing is not the form or the name. What is important is that the organs of the united front should be:

- (1) Formed for the struggle against the employers.
- (2) Elected by the workers in the factories.
- (3) They should consist of workers of various tendencies.
- (4) They should not substitute the revolutionary trade unions.

It is necessary, therefore, to display the maximum organisational elasticity in the form of organisation and name of the organs of the united front. The Central Council condemns all secret negotiations, and headquarters' combinations and emphasises that proposals on our part for the united front from above are opposed to all the decisions adopted and can only confuse the rank-and-file workers.

The adherents of the RILU must oppose combinations from above by the united front from below. The united front is not something in the nature of a mean between the reformists and revolutionary tactics, which is a mistake made by some elements in our ranks, but is a combination of workers who are ready to fight against the employers. The work of the RILU sections will be measured in future by their ability to draw into the struggle the members of the reformist and other reactionary trade unions and the unorganised.

The united front for the struggle is the starting point for the class education of the new sections of workers and the preliminary condition in countries with a split trade union movement, for the unity of the trade union movement on the basis of the class struggle. But simultaneously with this we must carry on a determined struggle against attempts to bring in reformist contraband under the flag of unity, as is done by the reformist opposition in the Unitarian Confederation of Labour in France.

The Minoritarians are demagogically utilising the healthy attraction of the French proletariat for unity and are striving to decompose the Unitarian Confederation of Labour in the interests of the French bourgeoisie. Coming forward under the slogan of unity at all costs, denying the elementary principles of the revolutionary trade union movement, the Minoritarians, these 'disciples' of the programme and tactics of French reformism, are one of the causes of the organisational weakening of the Unitarian Confederation of Labour (CGTU).

While putting on record the mistakes and lagging behind displayed by the CGTU in the question of unity, which made it easier for the Minoritarians to accomplish their disruptive work under the flag of unity, the Central Council approves the decisions of the Executive Bureau of the RILU of August 20th, 1931 on the Minoritarians, and proposes to the Unitarian Confederation of Labour of France and the Executive Bureau undeviatingly to watch this agency of reformism in our ranks and persistently and systematically to work for the break-away of the rank and file workers from these politically corrupt leaders.

The....

The Minoritarians and reformists openly declare that they desire the unity of the trade union movement, but do not want the united front. By this very declaration they reveal that what they want is not unity for the struggle against the bourgeoisie but unity for its support and for the disarmament of the revolutionary wing of the labour movement. We must carry on a determined struggle against those elements which oppose trade union unity to the united front, and must prove to all workers that unity without the previous united front in the struggle is impossible, and represents but a simple fraud. The united front and unity can and should be formed on the basis only of the joint struggle against the bourgeoisie. Every united front or unity created on any other basis is opposed to the interests of the working class.

VI. THE ORGANISATIONAL STATE OF THE R.I.L.U. SECTIONS

THE Fifth Congress put before all the sections of the RILU, as a task which brooks no delay, to secure at all costs and in the shortest period possible, a decisive improvement in the organisational work, to carry through a reconstruction of the revolutionary trade union movement on a factory basis, to reorganise the Red trade unions on an industrial basis, and in such countries as Germany and Poland to take up the formation, from bottom to top, of independent organs of the revolutionary trade union movement, and to adapt the methods of work and the whole structure of the revolutionary trade union movement to the tasks which stand before it.

The Eighth Session of the Central Council notes that there are, for the past period, in the domain of organisational building up, a number of achievements in the matter of the reconstruction of the Red trade unions and the revolutionary trade union oppositions on the basis of the Fifth Congress decisions. It should be noted as a serious achievement of the revolutionary trade union movement during the past period, first of all the growth and organisational crystallisation, from top to bottom, of the RTUO and the formation of a number of Red trade unions in Germany and Poland, some increase in the membership of the Red trade unions in Czechoslovakia, USA, Japan, etc. Side by side with this, the sections of the RILU in a number of countries, and in Germany in the first place, have achieved certain successes in the matter of the reconstruction of the revolutionary trade union organisations on the basis of the factories and the widening of the trade union activities.

Together with this, the Eighth Session of the Central Council declares that on the background of a sharp intensification of the class struggle, and despite the narrowing manoeuvring possibilities of the social-Fascist trade union bureaucracy, the achievements of the individual sections of the RILU AND THE entire revolutionary trade union movement as a whole, in the domain of the reconstruction of the Red trade union movement, are clearly insufficient, and the position in some sections (France) may be characterised as alarming. The organisational state of the RILU sections does not conform to the tempo of growth of the revolutionary rise and the whole favourable objective situation, and forms for the RILU sections a danger of finding themselves at the tail end of the growing revolutionary rise and the fighting initiative of the working masses.

The organisational weakening of the Unitarian trade union movement of France, which has already lost a number of positions which had been won, is particularly alarming. Thus, the Unitarian trade unions have not only not constructed any new factory trade union sections in the factories, but even in those two unions which had been built up on a factory basis (railway and municipal workers) the number of trade union sections in the enterprises has declined.

The....

The Eighth Session of the Central Council emphasises that the weakest link in the RILU sections, even in those which have certain successes (Germany) is the rank and file trade union net work and work at the factories. This is a consequence of the non-fulfilment of the decisions of the Fifth RILU Congress. The revolutionary trade unions meet at the factories with the relentless resistance of the employers, the reformists and Fascists, and the problem is not to retreat before the difficulties but to overcome them at all costs. And yet, the overwhelming majority of the RILU sections are clearly proceeding along the line of least resistance, since they have not reconstructed their work on a factory basis.

The number of factory trade union sections is insignificant, and what is particularly important is that all the organs of the revolutionary trade unions are not carrying on real mass work in the factories for the uniting and rallying of the workers. Weaker than all in the entire work of the revolutionary trade union organs is the mobilisation of the masses at the factory itself round the day-to-day demands and the struggle against reformism, fascism, factory espionage, and strike-breaking organisations.

A serious defect of the factory sections and groups is that they have not always put forward, in time and correctly, demands based upon the burning needs of the workers in individual factories and depts., that they have not always headed the discontent which arose in connection with the everyday disputes between workers and employers, and have not always taken the initiative in the solution of these disputes by way of the application of various forms.

The extremely limited number of revolutionary delegates and the insufficient definiteness of their functions and inter-relations with the revolutionary trade unions at the factories, has led to this, that this institution, even in such places where it was formed, was not utilized in the interests of strengthening the revolutionary trade unions. The revolutionary trade unions, in a number of countries where there are representatives elected on the basis of the law (delegates of miners, railway workers in France), while having secured the election of a considerable number of revolutionary candidates, they have yet frequently left them without any assistance and control, which led to their separation from the revolutionary trade unions, and sometimes also to their direct transition into the camp of the reformists.

The absence of work (meetings, instructing, etc.) with the existing representatives of the revolutionary trade union organisations in the factories (collectors of dues, distributors of journals, etc.) has led them to fulfilling only technical functions and not being drawn into the extension of our influence and the further consolidation of our positions in the factories.

In the conditions of the systematic offensive of the employers and the removal of the revolutionary workers from the factories, the factory committees attain special significance for the struggle against individual and mass dismissals, against the closing down of factories, and to unite all the workers against the attack of capital. And yet, the Red factory committees in those places where they exist (Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia), have largely, as a result of their passivity, not yet become an instrument for the extension of the political and organisational influence of the revolutionary trade union movement. This is to be explained, chiefly, by the fact that the RILU sections did not direct the day-to-day work of the factory committees and did not educate the leading functionaries of these important organs of the united front at the factories.

A big weakness of the revolutionary trade union movement is the almost complete absence of inter-union amalgamations, and in those places....

places where they exist (Councils or Cartels of trade unions) they are still in a primitive state. In a number of countries the revolutionary trade union organisations still bear a local character and are not united on an industrial basis and a national scale, and are not united territorially (Japan). An end must be put as quickly as possible to such a state of dispersion.

Despite the categorical decisions of the Fifth Congress on the strengthening of the work within the reformist and other reactionary trade unions, all the RILU sections have not only strengthened this work, but on the contrary, the work among the workers united by these unions has become weaker during the past period, and this has especially to be noted in the case of Germany and Great Britain.

The drawing of the wide working masses into the struggle and the widening of the influence of the revolutionary trade union movement within and without the reformist trade unions is possible only on the basis of an attentive attitude to the everyday needs of the workers and their all-round service. A number of RILU sections, however, have not devoted sufficient attention to the service of the daily needs of the workers; they have not carried out the decisions about the organisation of the cultural and legal service of their members as well as for the improvement of their living needs. And this has led to the position that the workers who have even been recruited have not been consolidated. The fluctuation, which was noted by the Fifth Congress, has not yet been outlived in a considerable number of the RILU sections.

A more backward sector of the work in all sections is the work of preparation, selection, and bold promotion of new cadres. With the exception of a few sections, there has nowhere been any arrangements made for the education and re-education of the cadres, especially the rank and file ones, by means of courses and schools. The question of the work of studying the cadres has not yet been raised in a single section. It may be noted everywhere that there is insufficient experience, particularly of the rank and file trade union militants, on important questions of trade union work (tariff work, labour legislation, etc.).

The Eighth Session declares that the decisions of the Fifth Congress on this question have not been carried out in practice and that the RILU sections are not devoting any attention at all to the education and promotion of a non-party trade union body of militants. The Eighth Session instructs all the RILU sections to carry on systematic work for the fulfilment in practice of the Fifth Congress decisions on this question.

In all such places, where the revolutionary trade unions and trade union oppositions have taken upon themselves the organisation of the defence of the interests of the masses and the leadership of the economic struggles, the revolutionary trade union movement became stronger politically and organisationally. This means that the revolutionary trade union movement grows and will grow as a fighting trade union organisation of the working class. We must prove to the working class. We must prove to the working masses that we have not only the best programme, but also the best tactics and the best practice.

For this purpose we must attain a state of affairs in which the day-to-day life, the methods of work, the relations between the members of the union and the leading organs, the methods of education of the membership, etc. - that all this should radically be different from the reformist trade union movement. And yet all our organisations still do not live a wide and active life. Trade union democracy is not sufficiently practised. Questions are frequently decided at
headquarters....

headquarters without discussing them with the masses. The control of the rank and file and the reporting to the masses is still very weak, which may give rise to a certain amount of irresponsibility.

Self-criticism in our organisations is not yet an instrument of the betterment of our everyday work and the correction of our weaknesses and shortcomings. The struggle against deviations from the revolutionary line of the RILU bears rather a declarative character. New problems, necessary tactical changes are not always discussed with the masses, they are not explained but decreed, which weakens ideologically the rank and file members, and by this itself lowers their fighting capacity. We must at all costs secure a change and carry through, systematically and persistently, trade union democracy all along the line of our trade union organisations from bottom to top.

VII. THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE R.I.L.U.

The fundamental task of the T.I.L.U. sections is to mobilise the wide masses for the struggle against the attempts of the bourgeoisie to place the burdens of the crisis on the shoulders of the toiling masses. This mobilisation of the masses can and should take place on the basis of the more vital questions which affect the interests of tens of millions of toilers. The struggle for the standard of life for the working class in the present situation is growing into a struggle for Communism, since it raises the question not only of wages, but also the question of the abolition of the entire system of exploitation and oppression.

The forms of struggle may and should be various. Every adherent of the RILU should understand that the economic struggle has now more than ever a profoundly political character, and that there are all the objective pre-requisites for the inter-twining of the economic struggle with the political struggles, for the utilisation, as a weapon in the struggle, of mass political strikes with the object of shattering the apparatus of the bourgeois state.

The leadership of the economic struggles and unemployed movement demands in the present situation the unconditional fulfilment, in practice of the political, tactical and organisational decisions of the Fifth Congress, the remodelling of all methods, new tempos of work and adaptations of forms of activity of the RILU sections to the rapidly changing events. In order that defensive battles may be successfully led, in order to organise and lead the movement of the masses for a counter offensive and to knock reformism out from all its positions, the RILU sections must direct all their efforts towards the solution of the following problems:

1. Systematically and untiringly to fight against the slightest worsening of the conditions of the workers against all kinds and forms of lowering in the living standard of the masses, under whatever "democratic" or "Socialist" banner these may be carried through (the 40-hour week with a corresponding reduction in wages, equal distribution of work, etc.). The RILU sections must work out, with the active participation of the interested wide working masses, the economic demands, not only for all the workers, but separately for the workers in the individual industries, individual professions, groups and enterprises. We must in every way fight against the haughty attitude to the everyday needs and to brand as empty phrasemongers and opportunists those who propose not to fight now for the everyday demands and needs of the workers but to postpone this until the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie.

The revolutionary trade union movement will never be able to prepare the proletariat for the overthrow of capitalism if it is not capable....

capable of winning the confidence of the masses in their day to day struggle, which is the fighting elementary school of solidarity, and the starting point for the winning of a majority of the working class on the side of the revolutionary class struggle.

2. We must, more carefully and better than was hitherto the case, prepare the economic struggles and mobilize the masses for the struggle, and choose the moment for this struggle with the utmost seriousness. The role of the sections of the RILU is untiringly to explain to the masses that their condition will uninterruptedly grow worse unless they fight. The task of the RILU sections is to prepare the struggle of the masses, not to substitute the masses, and we must, therefore, declare resolutely against leading out only the vanguard for the struggle when the main mass does not yet want to fight or does not understand the need for the struggle.

We must strictly and consistently carry out the line of independent leadership of the economic struggles, fighting both against the right opportunist hopes for assistance on the part of the reformist trade union bureaucrats, and against the "left" sectarian moods which express themselves in striving to do without the reformist workers. We must form strike committees elected by the whole working masses, re-elect them and add to them in the event of new detachments of strikers joining in, not to scatter the strike leadership by way of the formation of youth and women's strike committees in a common strike (Japan), but carry on the struggle in the spirit of the Strassburg Conference decisions on strike tactics and the Fifth RILU Congress decisions, i.e., on the basis of democratic centralism; not to command, not to substitute the strike committee by the trade union, not to destroy the initiative and work of the elected fighting organ, but to develop its initiative and work to form and crystallize a body of militants; not to shunt the revolutionary trade unions during a strike (USA), but to strengthen the revolutionary trade union movement in the process of preparations and development of the economic struggles.

We must strive to end every strike by a collective agreement signed by the red trade union, the trade union opposition or the strike committee. We must carry on a determined struggle against the reformist-employers' tariff policy and against secret negotiations in regard to tariffs. We recognize only those tariffs and those collective agreements which have been discussed and endorsed by the workers themselves through their elected representatives. All sections of the RILU must make a careful study of every successful and unsuccessful strike and discuss the positive and negative sides of our tactics at mass meetings.

We must openly recognize defeat, where such there be, before the workers, and not attempt to describe a defeat in the form of a victory. The tactics of self-consolation is harmful because it makes it more difficult for the masses to understand the reasons for failures, and ~~xxx~~ this disarms and weakens them in the struggle against capital. We must apply different forms of economic struggle, which should depend upon the situation and the correlation of forces; a protest strike, a strike while remaining in the factories, a slowing down in the tempo's of work, a delay in the conveyor, a demonstration in the factory, at the gates of an enterprise, on the streets, bad work for low wages, strikes in separate workshops and professions, etc. The important thing is not to overstrain the power of the fighters but to lead into the struggle ever newer and fresher forces.

(The slogan of the...

The slogan of the mass political strike, put forward by the Fifth Congress of the RILU, remains also for the future slogan which unites and directs the whole economic struggle of the working masses towards a revolutionary way out of the crisis. With this it is necessary to take into account that in a situation of growing revolutionary upsurge, and provided we have strong revolutionary trade union organisations, it is possible to have a rapid transition of the most simple forms of the struggle into higher forms, partial strikes into wide mass economic and political strikes, embracing entire regions and branches of industry.

In the application of various supple forms of struggle corresponding to local conditions, in resolutely fighting against the proclamation of strikes without a preliminary careful consideration of all the concrete conditions and without serious preparatory work amongst the masses, the revolutionary trade union movement must place in the centre of its attention the struggle against the chief opportunist danger—the lack of faith in the power and fighting capacity of the working class, and against all tendencies which, starting from the difficulties of the struggle in the present moment, take up a line of policy of abandoning the struggle in view of "the danger of spending our forces," and of abandoning partial strikes "by which nothing will be gained," and of abandoning mass political strikes in view of the non-preparedness of the revolutionary trade union movement and so on and so forth.

3. Tens of millions of working women and working men have become unemployed and the task of the RILU sections is to head and organise this huge army. An end must be put to attempts of converting this movement into a simple appendage of the RILU sections and to put forward any political conditions for the unemployed who desire to join the unemployed organisation (Japan). An end must be put to improvisations in this domain and it must be understood that the organisation of the unemployed is not something secondary and auxiliary, that this work may be carried on, by the way, it must be understood that it is one of the primary and most important tasks of the revolutionary trade union movement.

We must carry on a resolute struggle against nationalist incitement on the part of the reformists against foreign workers and the attempts to incite the local workers against the emigrants under the slogan of "let us reduce unemployment by the deportation of foreign workers" (France, USA). The task of the RILU adherents is to expose the criminal anti-labour character of such badgering of foreign workers and to organise unemployed foreigners together with the native workers. We must understand and take into account the fact that if we will not organise the unemployed mass, this will be done by the enemies of the proletariat who are trying to hammer out the unemployed into a fighting force for the disruption of the proletarian struggle.

What is particularly important is the linking up, the close collaboration and joint movements of the unemployed and those at work for the demands of both the one and the other. This is the pre-requisite for the consolidation and rallying of the forces of the forces of the revolutionary trade union movement.

4. However great unemployment is; the work in the factories is the central and most important task. The employers, together with the reformists, with the assistance of an extensive network of espionage and factory police, are driving out from the factories all revolutionary workers. This gives rise among some parts of our cadres to pessimistic moods and the search for easier forms

(and methods of.....

and methods of uniting the workers who are engaged in production. Such moods represent a great danger for the revolutionary trade unions.

We must carry on a determined struggle against the penetration into our ranks of the agents of employers, combine legal and illegal methods of work (organising, instead of general meetings of trade union groups, shop meetings and even meetings of aggregates, careful checking up of the leading functionaries of the trade union groups, utilisation of workers from other factories as speakers at meetings of workers of the given factory, etc.), and undeviatingly fight for the open existence of the revolutionary trade union organisations in general and in the factories in particular. We must carry on a determined struggle against those, who from fear of difficulties and obstacles propose to abandon work in the factories and to enter deeply underground and send to the factories only written directives (Japan). Such moods represent the greatest harm and the greatest danger for the revolutionary trade union movement.

The work in the factories is, was, and will remain the most important task in all countries, regardless whether the revolutionary trade unions are legal, semi-legal or illegal. This means that we must untiringly mobilise the workers in the factories for the struggle, and unceasingly build up the factory sections, systematically check up the organisational and propagandist work of the rank-and-file organs in the factories, including red factory committees, check up the methods of recruiting, the forms of preparation of the struggle, etc., subjecting all the organisational tasks to the task of the development of the economic struggle and the winning of a majority of the workers.

The factory is the fortress which must be captured; this is the only way to win a majority of the working class.

5. The reactionary trade unions still contain millions of workers. The experience of a number of countries (Great Britain) has shown that the members of the reactionary trade unions are ready to fight despite the will of the reformist leaders. It is impossible to direct this rebellion of the rank-and-file workers against the treacherous social-fascist leaders from without. We must be within and must win influence on the masses by our self-sacrificing and devoted struggle against the bourgeoisie and the defeatist trade union bureaucracy. We must at all costs work within the reactionary trade unions and carry on a determined struggle against the inclination towards the line of least resistance.

This means that all attempts to abandon or weaken the work within the reactionary trade unions, under whatever flag this be covered, must meet with unflinching resistance. Simultaneously with this we must decisively fight against the slightest attempts at crumpling up the revolutionary work in the name of this task. The work within the reformist organisations is not an end in itself; but a means to an end. The most immediate aim is to win the members of the reformist union for the class struggle, and to organise the resistance and counter-offensive of the proletariat. The work within the reformist unions means the struggle for the masses and a tenfold struggle against the strike-breaking reformist trade union apparatus.

Instead of strengthening, as was directed by the Fifth Congress, the work within the reactionary trade unions, of organising all the revolutionary and oppositionally inclined workers (included in them, . . .

included in them, and rousing them against the reactionary strike-breaking trade union apparatus, instead of this, we have had in a number of countries a weakening of this necessary and obligatory work, i.e., the abandonment of positions and capitulation before the reformist trade union bureaucracy. In those places where workers are to be found in fascist organisations, the task of the RILU adherents is to form in these organisations their groups so as to wrest the workers from fascism.

6. We must fight against the slightest attempts of opposing the work within the reformist trade unions to the consolidation and development of the revolutionary trade unions and trade union oppositions. The formula, either the consolidation of the red trade unions and trade union oppositions or the work within the reformist trade unions is profoundly opportunist and must be sharply condemned. This is just the line of the reformist opposition within the Unitarian Confederation of Labour in France, which in the name of work within the reformist unions and unity with them proposes to liquidate the independent revolutionary trade union movement.

Work within the reformist trade unions strengthens the trade union opposition and weakens the trade union ~~bureaucracy~~ and this very thing strengthens the revolutionary trade union movement. On the other hand, the consolidation and development of independent trade unions, the drawing into the trade union opposition of the unorganised, may considerably strengthen the revolutionary trade union opposition provided we do not separate one task from the other, but will look upon it as a two-sided single task. We must unceasingly recruit working men and working women into Red trade unions and trade union oppositions, concentrating our attention on the main branches of industry (mining, metallurgy, engineering, chemical, textile, railway and water transport, etc.), without the ideological and organisational consolidation of the workers who have joined the revolutionary trade union movement, without this it is impossible to strengthen and widen our positions, it is impossible to put an end to fluctuation and become a powerful factor in the class struggle of the proletariat.

The independent leadership of the economic struggles will remain an empty phrase unless we form an independent revolutionary trade union movement, which will wage a struggle without, apart from, and against the will of the reformist trade union bureaucracy. The RILU adherents are bound, therefore, to consolidate with all their efforts the Red Trade unions and to draw into them new masses and build up on a wide basis a revolutionary trade union opposition. The development and consolidation of the independent revolutionary trade union movement is the pre-requisite of a wide development and successful waging of the struggle of the working masses and is the most important task of the RILU adherents, and therefore, the whole work of the RILU sections must be subjected to the task of developing an independent revolutionary trade union movement.

7. Special attention must be paid to the organisation of women workers, in the whole work of the revolutionary trade unions. The experience of a number of strikes since the Fifth Congress of the RILU (Germany, France, Poland, Italy, China, Japan, USA, etc.) testifies to the huge role and fighting capacity of this detachment of the working class. The Central Council declares that in the domain of the work among the masses of working women, in the domain of their organisation and of their bring won for the side of the revolutionary trade union movement, there is a still greater lagging behind than in other domains and this is a serious defect since it undermines and weakens the whole work of the revolutionary trade union movement.

(The Central Council...)

The Central Council proposes to all the sections of the RILU to secure, in conformity with decisions of the Fifth Congress and the First International Conference of women workers, a real development in the work of our trade union organisations among the masses of women workers, and to ensure firm revolutionary direction of this work, considering it is one of the component parts of the entire trade union work and as the duty of all our trade union organisations and trade union organs from top to bottom.

The Central Council points out to the RILU sections the necessity of a determined struggle against the under-estimation, which still exists in some of our organisations, of the role of the working women in the struggles and their fighting capacity and to fight against the tendencies of ignoring the partial demands and needs of the women workers. The Central Council stresses the necessity of educating from among the women workers new leading cadres for trade union work and as organisers and leaders of the masses.

8. The Central Council declares that the winning of the working youth, their mobilisation for the economic struggles and their organisation within the ranks of the revolutionary trade unions, has been carried out successfully in but a few countries, but that it is still impossible to note a general turn towards the masses of the working youth in conformity with the resolutions of the Fifth Congress. The development of work among the youth lags behind the general work of the revolutionary trade union movement.

The Central Council points out to all the sections of the RILU that the correct fulfilment of the decisions of the Fifth Congress and Central Council are indissolubly connected with the real development of mass work among the working youth, for the winning of which the fascists and social fascists are carrying an increased struggle. The drawing of the young workers and apprentices into the general struggle as well as the organisation and carrying through of the independent struggles of the youth on the basis of their demands such as the pre-requisite for the winning of the mass of the working youth.

The Central Council emphasises the responsibility of the leading organs of the revolutionary trade union movement in relation to the youth and binds them, when preparing and waging economic struggles, to mobilise the working youth for the struggle side by side with the adult workers, by way of including the demands of the youth in all programmes of demands (Central and factory demands) and to popularise them among the mass of working youth as well as by way of formation of youth commissions of all leading fighting organs.

The particularly weak fulfilment of the resolution of the Executive Bureau of May and the resolutions of the Prague Conference in the matter of the mobilisation of the juvenile unemployed, compels the Eighth Session of the Central Council to point out to all the RILU sections that they must take immediate steps for the development of the struggle of the juvenile unemployed.

9. The revolutionary trade union movement differs from the reformist both in practice and in theory. In order that we may continuously widen the political influence and successfully consolidate organisationally this influence, it is necessary to carry on systematic educational work in the masses and prepare ideologically consistent cadres. The revolutionary trade union movement devotes attention to the ideological education of that non-Party militant group, without the formation of which it cannot become a mass movement. To be a non-Party does not mean to be indifferent or neutral between reformism and Communism. It is necessary that the cadres of the

(revolutionary trade union...

revolutionary trade union movement should be imbued with the spirit of the irreconcilable class struggle and that they should know wherein is the difference between Amsterdam and the RILU and should be capable of carrying out, in a disciplined fashion, the decisions of the Congresses and other leading organs of the RILU.

The sharper the struggle becomes, the greater the ideological consistency which is required from the leading cadres of the revolutionary trade union movement. Consequently, the consolidation of the whole of our trade union activity, the promotion of new cadres (especially of those who had passed through the school of economic struggles), the instructing and education in theory and practice, assistance to the promoted new revolutionary leaders, all this becomes extremely important. All ~~xx~~ the sections of the RILU must ensure for all the trade union functionaries a revolutionary-class education in theory and especially in practical mass work.

10. The tremendous work which was carried out by the trade unions in the USSR during the fourteen years of proletarian dictatorship, is of exclusive interest and an important lesson for the labour movement of the whole world, and therefore, the acquaintance of the widest masses in the capitalist and colonial countries with the work of the Soviet Trade Unions in connection with Socialist Construction, the accomplishment of the Five-Year Plan in four years, and the raising of the material and cultural level of the working masses, this must be one of the most important tasks of the international revolutionary trade union movement.

The trade unions of the USSR must, to a still greater extent and still more closely, link up with the revolutionary trade unions of capitalist and colonial countries so as to make known to them how the revolutionary trade unions of the USSR have won the majority of the working class and have become the most powerful trade union organisation in the world. In connection with the looming menace of war, the Central Council considers it necessary that the VCSPS (the Council of Trade Unions of the Soviet Union), should organise together with the revolutionary trade unions of other countries and exchange of labour delegations so as to consolidate the fraternal inter-relations and to prepare for joint action in the event of serious complications in the international situation.

11. The young labour movement in the East and the colonies is at present passing through special difficulties in connection with the development of the crisis and the growing terrorism. Notwithstanding this, the labour movement of the Far, Middle and Near East and the Negro Colonies are carrying on a courageous struggle against the imperialist and native exploiters.

The Central Council notes the extremely insufficient and unsatisfactory work of the Unitarian Confederation of Labour of France, the Minority Movement of Great Britain, the Trade Union Unity League of the USA, and the trade union opposition in Holland, in the matter of assistance to the labour movement of China, Indo-China, India, Cuba, the Philippines, Indonesia and all Colonies, exploited and ruined by the imperialists. The systematic support of the struggle of the working class and the toiling masses for the emancipation of the colonies, especially on the part of the revolutionary trade union movement in the imperialist countries, is one of the most important tasks of the RILU adherents.

(The Central Council...)

The Central Council demands from all the RILU sections, and in the first place from the adherents of the RILU in imperialist countries, undeviatingly to carry out in practice the decisions of all the Congresses of the RILU on this question. Special support should be rendered to the heroic Chinese proletariat, the Soviet Government, and the Red Army of China, who are waging a fight against world imperialism, unbridled militarism and the bloody regime of the right and left wings of the Kuomintang, and waging it under the heaviest possible conditions.

12. The brigand attack of Japan on China, the assistance on the part of the League of Nations to this act of brigandage, the support of this attack by Japanese and international social-fascism and the open and unbridled call for an anti-Soviet war of the important organs of the imperialist Press, all this signals the near approach of the danger of the transformation of war in Manchuria into a world war directed in the first place against the land of Proletarian Dictatorship. The war which has begun in Manchuria and the near approach of the world war must impel all the revolutionary trade unions and their Press to carry on a relentless struggle against all those (and in the first place against the reformists) who, in the interests of the bourgeoisie, disguise the war of Japan against China and declare that there is as yet no war and deny the danger of war against the USSR.

The Central Council welcome the courageous conduct of the revolutionary trade unions of Japan who have so resolutely come forward against the predatory attack of Japanese imperialism on the Chinese people. The conduct of the Japanese revolutionary trade unions in the Sino-Japanese war should serve as an example for the whole world revolutionary trade union movement which may already in the near future be faced with a new world war. The working class of all countries must prepare their forces so as to end the war, begun by the imperialists, in the same way as the proletariat of Russia ended the war in October, 1917.

VIII. FOR A REVOLUTIONARY WAY OUT OF THE CRISIS.

In face of the world economic crisis, the furious offensive of the bourgeoisie against the working class, and the preparation of a new world and especially an anti-Soviet war, the Central Council calls upon the world revolutionary trade union movement to exercise the greatest vigilance and revolutionary activity.

The bourgeoisie and its reformist assistance are seeking a way out of the crisis by the further enslavement of the workers and are ready to throw tens of millions of toilers into a new world war, so that in the struggle for a new re-division of the world, to drown in blood the revolutionary labour movement and the land of the Soviets.

The capitalist world is shattered and the objective conditions, notwithstanding the unequal growth of the conditions requisite for a revolutionary crisis, are becoming more and more favourable for the development of economic and political struggles and the creation on this basis of a powerful mass revolutionary trade union movement, embracing millions of workers, and winning a majority of the working-class for the overthrow of the power of capital and the establishment of the power of labour.

Not a bourgeois reformist, not a capitalist, but a revolutionary way out of the crisis - such must be the slogan of every adherent of the RILU, of every proletarian.

!!!!!!!!!!!!

A Note on the Composition of the O.C. for United Maharashtra

This note is an attempt to explain in brief the selection of the personnel of the OC for United Maharashtra.

1- The new CC while selecting the personnel of the O.C. has attempted to adhere as far as possible to the principles which were laid down in selecting the personnel of the new CC. It has allowed no other consideration except that of principles to prevail upon in selecting it. Because it is convinced that one of the hindrances which has obstructed the growth of the Party can be cleared only adhering to principles and by not allowing the slightest scope for opportunist compromises with them. Strict adherence to principles is one of the indispensable conditions for unifying the Party, consolidating it, strengthening it and revitalising it so as to enable it advance and discharge its political tasks and responsibilities of the revolutionary Party of the working class. The letter of the new CC has laid down these principles.

2- Obviously this is not an ideal OC. But it is the best under the circumstances. For selecting the personnel of the OC if the new CC had applied the test that only those whose understanding and practice had not a shade of left sectarianism, who had a correct conception of the national liberation revolution, its stage, strategy and tactics, who had differed basically with the left sectarian line of the old PB and who had voiced their differences and consistently fought for a correct line, no OC could have been formed. There is no comrade either in Bombay or Maharashtra who could have stood this test. If there had been such comrades available for selection of the personnel of the OC none who have been selected by the CC would have had a place on it. None in Bombay or Maharashtra had either opposed or voiced his differences with all the full-fledged left sectarian documents of the old PB, namely, the Tactical Line, the Agrarian Question and People's Democracy. Only a few had voiced some differences with some of the basic formulations in some of these documents, had raised some doubts regarding some of the basic formulations, and had been raising doubts sometimes regarding some of the issues such as the 'National Bourgeoisie', the 'internal contradictions among the imperialist countries' when articles in the Cominform and other authoritative documents started appearing.

Under such circumstances setting up of an ideal OC was impossible. Compromise with principles was rendered necessary and inevitable by reality and was the only way for putting the Party units and mass movement in United Maharashtra on the correct path based on the new revolutionary line of the new CC. The new CC has laid down the basis for the evolution of an ideal provincial unit. But it can be only at the end of the process of inner-Party discussions on the new line which alone can unify the Party, of a thorough criticism and self-criticism from top to bottom and of election of the leadership of the units at different levels resulting in a Provincial conference or a provincial plenum. The Provincial leadership evolved in such a manner and under conditions when unified and common understanding and outlook have emerged as a result of inner-Party discussion on the basis of the new line, alone can enjoy the confidence of the entire Party ranks. The organisation of the inner-Party discussion and the preparation of the critical and self-critical reports in the light of the Political resolution and the organisational report of the new CC, are the initial indispensable steps of this process.

3- The basic understanding of the comrades who have been selected for the OC was left sectarian to a more or less degree. They have been guilty of left sectarian mistakes to a more or less degree in their day to day practice. A concrete self-critical review of the mass movement in Maharashtra and Bombay since the Second Party Congress on the basis of the new understanding and in the light of the new line, and a full criticism and self-criticism of different comrades in relation to different struggles and movements, will alone enable us to have a critical and accurate estimate of the comrades who have been appointed on the OC. It will be one of the primary tasks of the OC to prepare such a concrete self-critical review in the light of the new political line as embodied in the documents adopted by the new CC.

In selecting the personnel of the OC the new CC was fully aware of the fact that the personnel selected by it consisted of comrades whose basic understanding was left sectarian, and who had committed left sectarian mistakes in practice. But the new CC had to select this personnel as there was no alternative. Reality did not permit of a choice which could have been better, than the one which the new CC has made. Because firstly the selection had to be made from among those who are mature enough to constitute the leadership of a Provincial unit. And secondly among such comrades available for selection, there was none who had been less left sectarian in his basic understanding and practice than those who have been selected for constituting the OC. This however is but the negative aspect of the consideration that weighed with the CC to select them. But the selection was based on some positive considerations also. And that consideration was that most of the comrades who have been selected are those few who have voiced their differences with some of the basic formulations of the left sectarian documents of the PB and had raised some doubts regarding them. Taking lessons from life and reality some of them had been groping towards a more or less correct understanding of the basic task of unleashing the agrarian revolution, of the necessity of organising armed resistance for fighting back repression in the countryside and of developing the agrarian revolution into armed struggle where conditions permitted it. Some of them had put up a stubborn resistance against some of the left sectarian practices of the old PB, e.g., on the issue of the Railway Strike of March 9, 1949.

4- All the members of the OC were the members of either the BC or the Maharashtra PC. Since they were responsible for the left sectarian mistakes in Bombay and Maharashtra, it is but natural for one to entertain the doubt that they have no right to be on the OC. It is true that they were in the main responsible for the left sectarian mistakes. It cannot be an issue of dispute. But this is not the whole of the reality but only a part of it. Its other part consists of the fact that these comrades were less left sectarian in their understanding and practice than anyone else who can replace them. It is therefore necessary to state a few facts in brief which would show the justification for the selection of this personnel. This brief statement is not and cannot be a substitute for the self-critical review of each individual comrade and his work during the past two years. But it is only meant to indicate how the selection is the best under the circumstances.

Selection of Comrades on the OC from Maharashtra

Three members of the Maharashtra PC are on the OC. They are Kamat, Gautam and Shukhar. Vishram Patil who will be on the OC in case Com. Vikram is dropped is ^{the} working class leader from Amalner. Com. Kisan Patil was arrested at the time of the selection of the personnel.

1- The understanding of all these comrades was basically left sectarian. Their conception of the path for the victory of the People's Democratic revolution was 'strikes, general strike, political general strike and armed insurrection'. But this is however not the path for the victory of the national liberation revolution in colonial and semi-colonial countries. Their understanding regarding the nature of the revolution, its stage, its strategy and tactics was left sectarian. They thought that the entire bourgeoisie had finally gone over to the side of imperialism. But despite this basic left sectarian understanding, they were groping towards a correct evaluation of the significance of the agrarian revolution in the People's Democratic revolution and were thinking that development of the agrarian struggles into armed struggle was also necessary along with armed insurrection in the cities. The following relevant brief quotation from the Provincial report which was prepared by Kamat in Oct. 1948 after discussing the points with Kisan Patil and Gautam will indicate the direction in which they were thinking.

"How far have we planned our work among the peasantry on a provincial plane with a view to discharge our tasks as formulated by the Second Congress?

"Our answer to this question is in the negative. Our failure in this respect arises from the fact that we do not fully realise and appreciate

the place, relation and importance of the agrarian revolution in the Democratic revolution. National independence and democracy cannot be achieved without an anti-imperialist policy and struggle; and without the agrarian revolution feudalism is the strongest and staunchest ally of imperialism and capitalism and the foundation of their rule. The struggle against feudalism which is the crux of the agrarian revolution, is one of the main contents of the democratic revolution.

"What are our specific tasks in the peasantry? Our primary and urgent task is rousing of the peasantry to struggle against feudalism with the object of ending all feudal exploitation of the peasantry. Rapid intensification of the agrarian struggles in the rural areas and vigorous organisation of the peasantry is the immediate task.

"What should be our plan of work?....Differentiation of regions becomes necessary as our struggle must be concentrated in those areas where we can rouse the peasantry against feudalism and feudal exploitation.... For concentrating our strength we must select the areas where feudal exploitation prevails and the poor and tenant cultivators constitute the overwhelming proportion of the rural population. Because the basic force on which the agrarian revolution can rely is the poor and pauperised peasants.

"The emphasis on the importance of the work among the poor and pauperised peasantry must not be construed to mean that the work among the middle peasants where the peasant proprietors are in preponderating numbers can afford to be ignored. Work among the middle peasantry and winning it over to the side of the poor peasantry is important and necessary. The middle peasantry in the rural areas is the nearest ally of the poor and pauperised peasantry, without whose sympathy and support, the poor peasantry cannot successfully carry on the struggle against feudalism. The poor peasants must not be isolated from the middle peasantry."

This report further stated that "Our second weakness (in the textile centres of Khandesh) is that the workers stand isolated from their closest ally, the peasantry of the respective districts....

"The task of winning over the closest ally of the working class, i.e., the peasantry, has been neglected in Khandesh....Our vision of weakness was blurred. Even when we had the financial resources and there was no dearth of cadre, our resources were not utilised for extending our influence to the rural areas."

2- Now I come to the post-Tactical Line period. Com. Kamat, in the course of expressing his opinion on the PB document, namely the Tactical Line, had expressed his disagreement with some of the points and had raised some doubts. The following brief quotation will indicate his points of disagreement and doubts:

- a) He had expressed his disagreement with the criticism of Mao in the Document. He said: "Lastly the Cominform has not yet reviewed the Chinese revolution, its strategy and tactics in the different periods and the deviations and mistakes committed by Mao. We should hesitate to tread where Cominform has not stepped."
- b) Regarding the slogan of rejoining different linguistic provinces of Hyderabad state to different provinces, he had stated: "It is true that the bourgeoisie has taken initiative in raising the slogan for promoting its own interests. But it cannot evade the fact that it strikes sympathetic chord in the hearts of the people as it expresses their desire for unification. The response from the urban petty bourgeoisie is so sympathetic that the issue is becoming a burning one. It is our task to see that the bourgeoisie does not utilise the desire of the people for unification to run into a channel which will promote its interests. We must raise this slogan and explain to the people why and how they must fight for a revolutionary unification by establishing people's power."
- c) Regarding the slogan given for putting up "militant defence in Telengana"

he had raised doubts and said: "There is a qualitative difference between militant defence and armed resistance for saving the embryonic state forms in the liberated areas and militant defence including armed resistance for retaining the economic gains in that area. The first kind of struggle would entail on us the task on consolidating the embryonic state forms, extend the liberated areas, etc., while the other would entail on us the task of retaining the land to the peasants. Armed resistance for retaining the economic gains would in practice mean the defence of the embryonic state forms. It would be wrong to erect a Chinese wall between the two. The document is not clear on this point and this point needs to be cleared."

- d) On the question of counterposing the Chinese to the Russian pattern of revolution, while agreeing with the formulation in the PB document that it was wrong to so counterpose, he had raised some doubts and said: "A question therefore arises in my mind as to what the prospect in India is. Is it not quite likely that the bourgeoisie will initiate a civil war for routing our strength before the Party is completely prepared, before it has gathered and organised forces of democratic revolution, before it has broken down the influence of the Bourgeoisie? That the bourgeoisie will resort to this course seems to be a certainty. How do we prepare for it?....How do we prepare ourselves to meet the possibility of a virtual civil war being initiated by the national bourgeoisie?....I feel that the urgent need of the hour is that the several aspects of this question are considered by us."

I shall proceed to take the other PB document, namely "On the Agrarian Question". Com. Kamat had consistently opposed one of the basic formulations of this document. This issue was discussed by Kamat and Gautam who had expressed his agreement with the views expressed by Kamat on this issue. Kamat had stated:

"While the development of the capitalist mode of production was undoubtedly evident, I think that the pace of development of cultivation by hired hands instead of letting out is overestimated in the document.

"The generalisations overestimate the extent and pace of cultivation with hired labour by the new class of the rural bourgeoisie as they are sweeping. They are only partially true....It is perfectly true that the new class aspires and exerts to exploit land by exploiting hired labour. Exploitation of hired labour by this new class is on an increasing scale. But to conclude therefore that "it cannot exploit these lands unless it exploits hired labour" is a sweeping generalisation. The new class of the rural bourgeoisie being a creature of the disintegration of the peasantry as a result of overpowering of the feudal economy by the capitalist economy, aspires to develop capitalist mode of exploitation of hired labour in agriculture. But circumstanced as he is by the conditions of the colonial economy, his aspirations do not fully materialise. He is compelled to exploit land by letting it out....The rich peasant is still more of a landlord than a full-fledged capitalist exploiting hired labour."

In the course of his criticism on the chapter dealing with the measures of the Government for abolition of landlordism, Kamat said:

"This chapter fails to focus the attention on the main tasks of the Party. Our central task is to defeat the manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie directed towards checking the tempo of the agrarian revolution. This task can be discharged only by developing and carrying forward the struggle for the seizure of land and land to the tiller.

Kamat continued to criticise and object to the basic formulation embodied in the PB document, viz., the Agrarian Question. He had written a pamphlet in April 1949 on the Bombay Act to Prevent Fragmentation and to Promote Consolidation of Holdings. He had discussed the pamphlet with Gautam who had agreed with the formulations in the pamphlet. Shekhar did not raise any objections to it. The PBM in Bombay to whom the pamphlet was shown, criticised it at length and said "It could very well have been

written before the PB document on the Agrarian Question. Shekhar thereupon agreed with the criticism levelled against the pamphlet by the PBM. Kamat replied to the various points raised by the PBM in his criticism. Shekhar did not express any opinion on Kamat's reply whereas Gautam agreed with it in the main.

In the reply Kamat criticised the formulation made by the ex-CC course of his article on the UP Zamindari Abolition Bill, which had appeared in Communist, and wrote:

"There are two small paragraphs in the article which had appeared in the April issue of the Communist on the UP Zamindari Abolition Bill, the implications of which do not seem to be correct.

"It is true that the relations between them (the moneylender landlord who lets his land and the poor peasant or the expropriated peasant to whom it is let out) are not continuation of the purely feudal relations. But it is also true that the relations between them are not the same as those which exist between the capitalist landlord and the agricultural labourers whom he hires. These relations contain the features of both feudal and capitalist systems as the system of such landlord farming is transitional one from feudalism to capitalism. As long as the peasants' instruments are not substituted by the instruments of the landlord, purely capitalist relations between the moneylender landlord and the peasant tenant do not come into play."

3- Now I proceed to briefly state their practice on the peasant front. Basing themselves on the evaluation of the significance of the agrarian struggles in the People's democratic revolution, which had been made in the Provincial Report of Oct. 1948, Kamat, Gautam and Kisan Patil planned their work on the peasant front with a view to unleash the agrarian revolution where it could be done immediately and to prepare for unleashing it where it could be easily unleashed. This decision was basically correct.

In Nagar district, in view of the historic and anti-Sowcari struggles of the peasantry of the district at the time of the Deccan Riots in 1872, they decided to take steps for unleashing the agrarian revolution by taking offensive against the most hated moneylenders in the area where the Party had been able to build a strong peasant base as a result of very intensive campaign for over six months by the comrades who had to go u.g. on April 1, 1948. It was also decided to take up the issue of the procurement plan which had produced acute food crisis in the district and to organise resistance to it. These decisions again were basically correct.

The agrarian struggle against the worst and the most hated moneylenders which was organised in Akola taluk of the Nagar district and the plan and the various steps taken for launching it were basically correct. The offensive taken against the moneylenders at Khirvira unleashed the century-old smouldering discontent of the peasantry in the area against the moneylenders. It inspired the peasantry. This struggle was organised after a thorough discussion and agreement between Kamat, Gautam and Kisan Patil and also between the UG comrades in that taluka.

The struggle reached a decisive stage in April 1949, when the Govt. let loose ferocious repression in the area for terrorising the population which was supporting it. It was at this stage that Dagdu Patil, one of the DC members, raised the question of armed resistance for fighting back repression in Nagar DC. The DC disagreed with Dagdu Patil on the issue of armed resistance to repression. Kamat and Gautam had to intervene and convince them that the path of armed resistance advocated by Dagdu Patil was correct. That was the only way of fighting back demoralisation and helplessness which was creeping among the peasantry, of developing the agrarian struggles to a higher pitch. The problems posed by life were guiding us in the direction of the correct path of agrarian revolution. This decision of resorting to armed resistance for defeating repression and developing the struggle was basically a correct one.

When offensive was launched against a number of goondas who were help-

ing the police and harrassing the people and against the police when they were in a disadvantageous position, the demoralisation among the peasantry disappeared. They were enthused and their tempo rose high.

In October 1949 Kamat, Kisan Patil, Gautam and Shekhar met together for a fortnight for the purpose of planning to develop the struggle to a wider area. After prolonged discussion it was decided to extend the area of the struggle to the adjoining area of Thana and Nasik districts which was hilly and where the overwhelming proportion of the population consisted of poor peasants and pauperised peasants and where there was an influence of the Kisan Sabha. It was also decided to organise our comrades in the area into batches of not more than five. The issues which should be taken for extending the struggle to a wider area were also discussed and decided upon. These decisions, so far as they go, were also correct decisions.

But they were not conscious of the fact that armed resistance and armed struggle in the countryside must necessarily adopt the guerilla form of struggle. Nor had they the conception of building Party organisation/suited to armed resistance and armed struggle. (/and the mass organisation)

As a result of these serious shortcomings, the struggle has suffered heavily during the last three months, when the most ruthless measures of repression were adopted. There have been very serious losses of cadre in the area since the arrest of Kisan Patil by the end of May 1950. Many key comrades have been arrested recently. To interpret these losses as being due to the fact that adventurist tactics were adopted, would be politically wrong. This serious setback is due to the fact that we had no conception of how to conduct the agrarian struggle when it reaches the stage of armed resistance, how to build the Party organisation and the mass organisations suited to this stage of agrarian revolution. It may also be stated that these losses might not have been so heavy if the decisions which we had taken in Oct. 1949 had been implemented. This does not mean that other mistakes have not been committed in conducting the struggle. But only a critical and concrete review of the struggle would reveal what these mistakes are.

To characterise the struggle in Akola as basically left sectarian, adventurist and terrorist is right reformism. It amounts to denial of the Telangana way and the Chinese path as the only way for advancing the national liberation revolution and leading it to victory.

Our task in Akola is to regroup our shattered forces in the area, to equip them with the correct perspective of the Chinese path and the knowledge of guerilla forms of struggle and advance further with adequate preparations.

(b) The decision taken by Kamat, Gautam and Kisan Patil after discussing at length with the comrades in Nasik to start work in the peasantry of Kalwan and Penth talukas where the overwhelming proportion of the population consists of poor peasants and agricultural labourers who are hill-tribes, with a view to organise them, to unleash the agrarian revolution on the basis of their immediate and acute problems and to develop it into higher forms of struggle was a correct decision. This was a new area where work was to be started. It was therefore decided to organise the peasants on the basis of their day-to-day demands as an initial and preparatory step. The result of the work on the basis of the plan chalked out, showed that our understanding of the agrarian revolution was not left sectarian and adventurist. The work in the district came to a stop when all the comrades who were working in these talukas were arrested in August 1949. These arrests were due to non-vigilance and non-observance of Tech. rules. Because all of them were arrested when they had/ together for planning the work. (/come?) It is after a lapse of several months than an attempt to revive the work could be made.

(c) Kamat, Gautam and Kisan Patil who happened to go to a village in Igatpuri taluka in Jan. '49 revised their earlier decision regarding the impending struggle of Igatpuri peasants was wrong. They decided to support this struggle and work in cooperation with the local Bahujan Samajwadi Group. It was also decided that our comrades should not hasten a premature conflict

with them. But at the same time they were instructed to expose the treacherous role of D.S. Wagh and other leaders as it unfolds itself, to criticise and expose the limitations of Satyagraha as a weapon of class struggle, to popularise alternative forms of struggle and to adopt militant forms of struggle when and where they became possible. These decisions were correct. A review of the Igatpuri struggle which was prepared by Kamat after discussions with Gautam was also basically correct. They were trying to build united front relations with the Peasants' and Workers' Party on correct basis, i.e. both from below and from above in this struggle.

(d) The situation in the Warli area was totally different, from any other area where we have been working among the peasantry in the province. The potentialities of the struggle are great. No sooner the struggle is launched, it is bound to take the form of armed resistance from the initial stage itself. Kamat, Gautam and Shekhar discussed the question of launching the struggle on several occasions. But they did not decide to launch it as they thought Govt. would use its might to crush the struggle if it was hastily launched without adequate preparations and without rebuilding a solid organisation and also because they did not know how to develop the struggle without being allowed to be crushed by governmental repression. They had no conception of the guerilla form of struggle, which form will have to be adopted from the very beginning of the launching of the struggle and which alone can defy all repression. They therefore hesitated to launch the struggle, though it was possible to launch it. Gautam was making efforts to rebuild the solid organisation which has been very loose after the last heroic struggle of the Warlies.

This brief survey of their practice on the peasant front shows that their understanding of the task of unleashing the agrarian revolution was not basically left sectarian. However, their understanding of the role of the rich peasants who do not carry on feudal exploitation was left sectarian from the beginning. Those rich peasants who do not adopt feudal forms of exploitation were considered to be the enemies of the People's Democratic revolution. They accepted the left sectarian formulation of the PB Document on the Agrarian Question that the middle peasant was not a firm ally in the national liberation struggle and the struggle against feudalism. (~~but only a vacillating ally~~)

4- Trade Union Front: The understanding of these comrades about the trade union struggle was basically left sectarian. They equated the crisis with the upsurge and the upsurge with the revolution. They thought and correctly so that it was the white terror that held in check the mounting discontent of the working class from bursting forth into strikes and general strikes. But from this premise they drew the left sectarian conclusion that the best way and the only way to break through the white terror was to prepare for attacking the police and the state machinery. The attempts of the state machinery to terrorise the working class can be defeated by taking an offensive against it. That the white terror in the colonies cannot be successfully fought back by armed struggle in the cities but only by unleashing the agrarian revolution and developing it into armed struggle in the countryside, was totally absent in their consciousness. This basically left sectarian understanding naturally reflected itself in the instructions which were sent by them during the strike struggles which broke out in Jalgaon, Dhulia, Ambernath, Sholapur and the railway strike of March 9 in 1949 and 1950. Instructions were sent to the workers at Ambernath, Jalgaon and Dhulia that clashes with the police should be organised and higher forms of struggles should be introduced while conducting the strikes. The necessity of organising fighting squads for leading the clashes in times of struggle was emphasised. They did not criticise the left sectarian slogan given by Sholapur Town Committee that the workers of the Sholapur Old Mills should break open the gates and take possession of the mill as they thought it to be correct. These are some of the examples of their left sectarian instructions and understanding.

But while committing left sectarian mistakes, they struggled to fight against right reformism which was rampant and had struck deep roots in the various Party units. It is true that they could not successfully wage this struggle since right reformism cannot be fought by left sectarianism. Their

criticism of the vacillations, hesitations and indecisions of a section of the local leadership of the various Party units arising out of deep-rooted reformism was correct. Many instances can be cited as proof of the deep-rooted reformism of sections of local leadership of the various Party units. A few of such instances can be cited.

In Jalgaon the City Committee fixed 25th of May 1949 as the date of the strike for fighting against the cut in dearness allowance which was declared on May 3. It pleaded lack of preparedness and lack of tempo among the workers for not fixing an earlier date. But the reality was otherwise. 200 workers went to the office and insisted that a call for strike must be given at the earliest moment. The leadership had to change the date of strike from 25 to 17 May. The strike on the 17th was a complete success.

At the instance of a similar character which happened at Dhulia may be cited. A meeting of the General Body was called for considering the question of strike for fighting against the cut in the dearness allowance. A section of the Party membership opposed the proposal of the strike on the plea that there was no tempo for strike among the workers. They withdrew their opposition to the call for strike when the Secretary announced that he would call a meeting of the workers the next day, in which he would declare that the Party members were prepared to accept the cut in dearness allowances and were not prepared to accept the cut in dearness allowance and were not prepared to give a call for strike because the workers did not want a strike. The date for strike was fixed for June 16, 1949 and the strike was a complete success.

A third typical instance from Sholapur may be cited. In the month of July 1948, the wave of discontent among the workers because of inordinate delay in declaring the award by the Industrial Court regarding the dispute over the question of minimum wage and standardisation of wages had reached a very high pitch. The workers were impatient to go on strike. The City Committee which met to consider the situation dispersed without coming to any decision as to whether a call for strike should be given or not. There were four trends in the City Committee. One of the trends was that if the Party gave the call for strike, it will be charged with instigating the strike. No call for strike should therefore be given. The second trend was that there was no tempo among the workers. The Party would be isolated from the workers if the call for the strike was given. The third trend was that if the workers spontaneously went on a strike, the Party would lead it. The fourth trend was that a call for a strike must be given.

The Peasants' and Workers' Party took the initiative in giving the call for strike. The Party unit followed. These illustrative examples will suffice to show how deeprooted reformism was in a section of the local leadership of the various Party units which was rightly criticised as an expression of crude reformism by Kamat, Gautam and Shekhar.

(b) Regarding the March 9 Railway Strike in 1949, both Kamat and Gautam thought the slogan of the strike was wrong, after it had failed. They felt that the tempo of the workers was overestimated. Kamat expressed his doubts to the PBM and one CCM with whom he discussed the railway strike. He did not however stick up to his stand because of his basic left sectarian understanding, when he was confronted with the argument that to characterise the slogan as wrong amounted to denial of unurge. Kamat convinced Gautam that his opinion was wrong by repeating the same argument.

(c) Another thing may be stated in this connection. The Ordnance Factory Workers' union at Amherst was entirely under the control of the INTUC. By patient and persistent work of exposure by comrades under the guidance of Gautam for a number of months in that union, it was captured by us in the end.

(d) The Secretary of the All-India Textile Fraction had given instruction to the Secretary of the Sholapur unit in November 1949, that the handloom workers should consider the 'asamies' as their enemies and fight them. Kamat, Shekhar and Gautam took the stand that these instructions were wrong and opposed them. They instructed that the handloom workers should

formulate common programme, including the just demands for the 'asamies' and fight against the common enemy, the monopolist traders, who were trying to squeeze out both the meagre profits of the 'asamies' and thereby compelling them to cut the wages of the handloom workers.

(e) They sent instructions to comrades at Sholapur that they should build united front relations on the basis of common programme with the Peasants' and Workers' Party who had considerable influence among the textile workers, both from below and above, while sharply exposing the opportunism of the leadership whenever occasion arose.

(f) The Party organisation and strength of the Party has suffered heavily. But to attribute these heavy losses to left sectarian mistakes alone would be wrong, as it amounts to ignoring another crucial factor, namely the general offensive of the employers and the ruthless repression let loose by the Govt. for crushing the Party and its strength. To what extent the losses were due to left sectarian mistakes will have to be investigated concretely in each individual case.

5- The Student Front: A solid basis for the student movement in Maharashtra was laid during this period. It developed rapidly. The potentialities of its development were great, but we could not utilise them fully. A special characteristic of the student movement in Maharashtra is that the vast bulk of students who have rallied under the AISE, studying in High Schools and vernacular schools, comes from the peasantry.

The PC which met in October 1948 took the decision to hold the first provincial conference. It was held in December 1948 at Nagar and was a success.

In December 1948 Kamat, Kisan Patil and Gautam decided in consultation with Sadashiv and Chumare to organise a conference of the students residing in boardings throughout Maharashtra. There is a network of such boardings. The students coming from the middle and poor peasants take advantage of these boardings for educating themselves. The conference was held in December 1949 and was a success. United front tactics with students under the influence of the Peasants' and Workers' Party were successfully used in organising it. They actively participated in it.

On this front also some left sectarian mistakes were committed. A critical and concrete review of this work is necessary to trace what they were

6- Organisational: In respect of inner-Party organisation, these comrades are not guilty of either Titoist or Turkish methods in dealing with comrades who differed with them on political or organisational issues. They tried to argue their point of view and tried to convince those who differed from them. Sharpness of criticism is not to be misunderstood for Turkish or Titoist methods of functioning. To so characterise it is to attempt to deprive the Party of one of its most powerful weapons of self-education and of correcting wrong methods and understanding. They have taken disciplinary actions against some comrades during this period. These decisions will have to be reviewed in the light of the new line of the Party. But it may be said that the decisions of disciplinary actions in a number of cases stand justified.

Selection of Comrades from Bombay Committee (-Kedar, Dhanaji, Bhai and Vikram-)

The understanding of all these comrades was basically left sectarian, capture of power through political general strike, armed insurrection in cities, etc. They did not see the correct path, the Chinese path of national liberation in colonies and semi-colonies, agrarian revolution as the axis of the national democratic revolution.

But despite this basic left sectarian understanding, some of these comrades were raising serious doubts as regards the formulations made in the main PB documents such as People's Democracy and The Agrarian Question, which clearly showed that they were groping towards the correct path.

In September or October 1948, Com. Kedar had asked the GS to explain why Com Alexeyev's article in Bolshevik referred to big bourgeoisie and not the whole bourgeoisie as having gone over to imperialism while the Political Thesis characterised the whole bourgeoisie as collaborationist. Com. Vikram also had raised the same doubts regarding Alexeyev's article in his correspondence with Zedar.

On the document of People's Democracy, Com. Kedar took objection to the formulation re. struggle against imperialism. He had pointed out that to say that the struggle is not against this or that imperialism but against world imperialism in general, is to think that India had attained the same status as France, Italy, etc. who are tied to American imperialism, have become its vassals.

In a long note submitted to the PBM in Feb. 1949 Com. Vikram had raised several points regarding the basic formulations in 'People's Democracy' and 'The Agrarian Question'.

The document of People's Democracy had stated that in the new situation the fight against imperialism "is carried on at a different level...Freedom now means freedom from world capitalist order, not from this or that imperialism only". Com. Vikram questioned the correctness of this formulation and asked whether according to the new document British imperialism had retreated from India, had disappeared from the scene for all practical purposes and fight for freedom is fight against world capitalism in general. If so, Com. Vikram asked, what happens to the British vested interests still remaining intact in India and the new ones which are likely to be created by joint Indo-British capital. In support of his argument Com. Vikram mentioned the articles of RPD in Lasting Peace and other articles of Soviet writers.

Regarding the formulation of the PB that whole bourgeoisie has become collaborationist, Com. Vikram raised the following doubts: "Why have almost all Soviet writers and RPD formulated the new setup in the colonies and India as an alliance between Imperialism, big bourgeoisie or top ranks of the bourgeoisie, why Com. Stalin also makes a distinction between big bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie whereas in our Thesis as well as in the new documents we refer to the national bourgeoisie as a whole having made alliance with imperialism. Is there not a vital difference between the two formulations, has it not an important bearing on the question of the new alliance of the democratic front?"

Com. Vikram also had raised doubts regarding the development of capitalist relations in agriculture. He had asked "Can we visualise rapid development of capitalist agriculture in the immediate future? Is such bourgeois reform of agriculture, i.e., slow elimination of feudalism by legislation and development of large-scale capitalist farming possible within the frame-work of colonial economy?"

Further Com. Vikram also had raised the following point regarding the stage of the revolution and class alliance. He had criticised the conception of interlacing, interlinking, of the two stages of revolution in the PD document. He contrasted this conception with Lenin-Stalin conception of passing into or growing over of bourgeois democratic revolution into proletarian revolution and asked "But when do we visualise the state that will arise as a result of democratic revolution to be the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat?"

While these important points re. the basic left sectarian formulations of the PB had been raised by Com. Kedar and Vikram, Com. Dhanaji and Bhai were not in a position to raise such questions because they got the documents translated into Marathi very late and even then only in Parts.

In implementing the left sectarian line of the PB in practice, the BC in general adopted a cautious attitude upto March 9, Railway Strike, 1949.

In the Municipal strike of July, 1948 the 11th August strike call given by the Socialists the BC did not commit any adventurist mistakes. In the 11 Aug. strike the BC gave a correct call for united front with Socialists and

and tried to extend the strike to other industries. At the time of the "police action" against Hyderabad, while the article in PA did not sharply bring out the real meaning of the Nehru Govt.'s police action, viz., attack on Telengana, the leaflet drafted by the BC sharply exposed the real game behind the same. The draft of this leaflet was changed by Lok'yug comrades on their own on the lines of the PA article, but they were pulled up for this by the BC Secretary.

On the issue of Samyukta Maharashtra Conference the BC took on the whole a correct stand tried to radicalise the conference both organisationally as well as politically. It is worth noting that Dyakov in his pamphlet approvingly refers to the role played by the Communists in this conference. The BC could not pursue this campaign further because of confusing and wrong criticism made by the PB of the stand taken by the BC.

The 9 March Railway strike was a major turning point for the BC. When the strike call failed miserably almost all members of the BC Sectt. sharply reacted to this biggest jolt of reality. Having correctly seen the adventurist nature of the call, they expressed their individual views in writing and submitted them to the PBM. In these notes Coms. Kedar, Dhanaji and Vikram stated clearly that the railway strike call was wrong and adventurist.

All of them were bitterly attacked as reformists by the PBM and CCM in charge of the Railway Fraction. The latter had even prepared a document in which Coms. Kedar, Dhanaji, Vikram and Patkar were condemned as rabid reformists of the same type as JP & Co. This document also stated that these comrades by questioning the correctness of the strike call of March 9 had shown utter lack of faith in the line of the second Congress.

This instinctive and correct reaction of leading BC Sectt. members to left sectarian and adventurist call of March 9 shows clearly that till then at least they had not only not followed blindly, the left sectarian line of the PB, but they even sharply fought against it when the call failed. Thus on a major all-India issue like the Railway strike these comrades did try to oppose the left sectarian policy of the old PB.

The real left sectarian twist in the politics and practice of the BC however came after the suppression of the resistance of BCMs to the PBM's evaluation of the setback to March 9 call. Till March, they were in general following a non-adventurist and in practice more or less correct line on day-to-day issues. No bogus strike call was given in this period nor were individual strikes that took place conducted as 'struggles for capture of power'. The strike in the suburbs, the Jam mill strike, 11 August, Firestone, One Day Strike in Mazagaon and EMI Docks are instances in point.

The review of the March 9 Railway General Strike made under the guidance of the PBM marked the turning point in the political understanding and practice of the BC Sectt.

The campaign to rally popular support behind the hungerstrike of jail comrades, particularly the May 8 demonstration, the call for anti-Constitution protest general strike on Jan. 24 and the demonstration on Jan 26 are examples of the crassest type of left adventurism of the BC Sectt. However two facts in connection with the support to hunger strike campaign must be noted.

The decision to hold the meeting at Lalbaug Maidan and stage the demonstration in defiance of the ban was not taken by the Sectt. It was taken by the comrades on the spot. The Sectt. nevertheless cannot be absolved of the responsibility, because its outlook, the spirit of the instructions were clearly adventurist.

Secondly, the BC Sectt. reviewing the demonstration, and the 11 May strike fiasco, on its own came to realise its adventurist blunders and had also arrived at correct conclusions which were to be incorporated in its self-critical review. That the resolution was not drafted and circulated to the ranks was doubtless a serious failure of the Sectt.

Learning from the costly experience of May 8 demonstration, the Sectt. pulled itself up and moved in the subsequent developments with caution, giving particular attention to organisation and saving cadre. This was immediately seen in relation to the AITUC session. First Com. Dhanaji and Vikram and later all of them opposed the proposal to hold the open session of the AITUC in defiance of the ban.

The way the BC Sectt. guided the bonus strike campaign of June 25 and after, emphasising the activation of militants, building of mill committees, pursuing vigorously the tactics of the united front from below with the Socialist ranks, clearly shows that the Sectt. had not failed to learn the lessons from the past. This campaign wherein the Socialist leadership was subjected to concrete criticism and the correct manner in which the struggle against the staggering scheme and 8½ hours day in textile mills was led, paved the way for the success of the All-India textile conference.

The implementing of these lessons further in connection with the Jan. 2 one day strike, brought us a significant success. Over 75,000 workers came out on strike on the general demands formulated by the textile conference despite the opposition of Socialist leaders.

The strike of 12,000 Municipal workers was another occasion when it was seen that the BC Sectt., instead of giving 'b'd call' for sympathetic strike, tried to build up a broad united front for rallying the support of the workers and other democratic sections of the people.

The conception of the BC Sectt. even during this period of left sectarianism, of the peace campaign was not narrow, but one that sought to rally the maximum number of masses by applying the tactics of united front both from above and below.

Correcting some of the comrades who thought that the Peace Front can only comprise of the Party and the mass organisations under its influence, the Sectt. had pointed out that the cause of peace had definitely a wider appeal and therefore it instructed that organisations like the Peasants' and Workers' party and Forward Bloc must also be enlisted in the struggle for peace. The mass rally to observe the International Peace Day on Oct. 2 and the open session of the Bombay Provincial Peace Conference showed the success attained by the Peace campaign.

On the student front there are two distinct stages. The line of demarcation between the two consists in the intervention by the AISF central fraction.

The BC Sectt. was in general guiding the Bombay Students' Fraction, generally in the correct direction. During the period, the BSU led by our Party became the leading force among the Bombay students. It led barring a few exceptions all the struggles of the students, among them, four major all-Bombay one-day strikes; (1) Protest against increases in fees, about 20,000 students participating; (2) Support to the no-payment of fees struggles of medical students, about 50,000 students participating; (3) support to the struggle of the WJTI students against the expulsion of their leaders from the Institute, about 45,000 students participating; (4) Solidarity with the Secondary teachers' leaders of the King George High School.

The strength of the BSU also rose from 1400 in 1947-48 to 3200 in 1948-49.

Although there were various defects in the work of the Student front, the Student Fraction under the guidance of the BC Sectt. had to pursue the tactics of the united front with the students under the influence of the Socialists, made sober estimate of its strength and the strength of the Socialists, refrained from giving adventurist calls and did not rush into inopportune and isolated clashes with the police.

The AISF Fraction Centre charged the BSU Fraction of opportunism, etc. The PB directed that student work throughout the country be led and guided

not by the Provincial Committees but by the AISE Fraction Centre. This did shunt the whole of the student front onto the rails of left adventurism, the effects and results of which have yet to be examined.

The twist towards left adventurism in the politics and practice exacted very heavy losses from the Party in Bombay. Between the three events, March 9 Railway Strike, May 8 demonstration and 11 May support to hungerstrike actions and the January 26 demonstration, the Party organisation in Bombay lost a large number of cadres into Jail (about 175).

In organisational methods, these comrades are not guilty of Titoist Turkish terror. They have not suppressed any Party member or Party functionary for his political and organisational differences. They have undoubtedly taken disciplinary actions against a few members. Barring two most of the others may be found to be justifiable. Of course each of these will have to be reviewed. The two cases are of the leading comrades and the BCO of Lalbaug, on the charge of seduction of a girl. Here the Sectt. and the BC are guilty of drastically a PM who hardly committed an offence. The latter was suspended from the Party for outraging the modesty of a woman Party member. In this case the BC Sectt. and the BC can be blamed for taking a non-political view of the offence, for judging it strictly on ideal basis. (/those of Narayan Surve and P.B.Vaidya. The former was expelled in endorsement of the decision)

I am not talking here of the Patkar-Tambitkar question. The matter is under investigation of the CC which has appointed a Commission into the whole question of disruption in the Bombay Party unit.

Conclusion: This is neither a concrete nor an exhaustive self-critical report either of work in Maharashtra or Bombay or of the individual comrades of the OC during the left sectarian period. Such a review will be prepared as soon as the OC starts functioning. This note is meant only to indicate the grounds on which the personnel of the OC was selected.



2.11.49

FB LETTER TO BIHARRe. PB Documents for All PMS.

During the last two months the following PB Documents have been issued:

1. PB Resolution on Assam PC.
2. PB Note on Reformism in Assam.
3. PB Resolution on Biswanath Mukherjee.
4. PB Note on Student Struggles.
5. PB Resolution on Reorganisation of West Bengal Prov. Committee
6. PB Note on Reconstitution of W. Bengal Provincial Committee.

All future PB documents for all PMS will be numbered - thus this document is:

PB Document for All PMS - No. 7

PB Letter to Bihar 7

P.B. LETTER TO BIHAR

6.9.49

My dear Bharat,

Now coming to your documents and minutes. Let me first come to the minimum points of agreement. There is no doubt that your documents as well as the discussion on these documents have served to do one big thing - shattered the illusion that all has been more or less well in Bihar - an illusion which no doubt was created last time. I do not at this stage discuss who all were responsible for this illusion. But till your reports come - and the discussions were gone thru, the illusion was there.

I entirely agree with you that Raghu the CCM did not do anything to shatter the illusion, even though he had seen some of the documents.

It is equally true that till now he has made no self-criticism. I have plainly told him so long ago, though I could not hold any serious political discussions with him because of his continued illness.

~~Your demand that now that he has made no self-criticism~~

Your demand that now that the documents were there, including the Minutes, the PB should concretely discuss and assess the documents is very correct and just demand.

If it has not been done all these days it is because (1) you had already upset the time-table and did not come in April or so. The time from then onwards was taken by other provinces. (2) I wanted Raghu to be given an opportunity to have his say before the PB could sit for final assessment.

Further you should have no misgiving that all that the PCMs have said against Raghu is treated lightly by the PB. A CCM who cannot command the confidence of his colleagues in the province will have to answer the CC and the PB. He will not be allowed to evade the issue. The PB or the CC will then decide whether he really does not deserve the confidence of the PCMs or whether these PCMs are wrong in withholding the confidence from him.

There are no favourites inside the Party. No one is going to get special treatment from the PB. You should read PB resolution on Bishwanath - take it from Jatin - and see for yourself that no one is spared. Everyone is judged by the same measure - Marxism.

You must also realise that if the PB acts as irresponsibly as you have done in your PC meeting - nothing will remain of the Party. The PB has to treat every CC member with the highest amount of respect and consideration - for the CCMs were duly elected by the Congress. For you comrades, Party Congress, Party democracy, Party constitution are all unreal which shows your blatant reformism. What will happen to the Party if on the basis of vague charges given by you the PB decided to take steps against a CCM? Won't that be reducing the verdict of the Party Congress to a mere farce? This will be the grossest form of bureaucratism. If we ourselves do not take our own constitution, our provisions for democracy seriously - who else will take it?

You will now understand why I wrote you an indignant letter about the ~~XXXX~~PC's attack on Raghu. You all are entitled to make formal serious political charges & ask the PB to investigate. You all were entitled to write a sharp polemical political document exposing his politics - and demanding his removal from the CC & This is the proper Party form - showing proper respect to the CC elected by the Congress and at the same time discharging one's duty. But for you nothing, not even the decisions of the Congress, and the constitution of the Party are sacred sanct. You are laying down precedents under which cell or district meetings may casually demand removal of PCMs from DCs, of DCs from cells - thus smashing all centralism. What you have done in casually asking for Raghu's removal from PC - is just liquidation of the principle of centralism and assertion of reformist principles in organisation.

Besides the charges against Raghu suddenly flare up at the end - in discussions on reorganisation. I have gone thru all your reports; quotations, allegations etc. and I do not find the least evidence till now to decide that Raghu was a worse reformist than any one of you, perhaps with the exception of Asin, while there is plenty of evidence to show that some others perhaps were worse reformists than Raghu.

If you have proof enough to show that Raghu was worse reformist than others, that he was mainly responsible for all the evils, that in any case his reformism is of such a persistent type that he will always derail the PC you and Mahesh should still produce it. If there is really something in what you say, I mean what you all together say, and if you are able to put it clearly - you will be rendering a distinct service to the Party. For such a person in the first place cannot be allowed to remain in the CC.

Firstly, the PC should have demanded his removal from CC along with removal from PC. You cannot reduce the CC to a farce by removing CCMs from PCs on the charge of reformism and say nothing about their membership of the higher committee. This is pure Joshian conception of Party organisation.

Secondly, you comrades seem to have extremely light-hearted attitude towards making charges and allegations, and leaving them there without investigation. In the first place no political case is made for throwing out Raghu from the PC. The fact that he is a CCM and therefore to remove a CCM from the PC is a grave matter for the PB and the CC - is forgotten. And lastly, Girdhar and Mahesh, especially the latter make all kinds of personal charges against him. Many of these charges are of a serious type and they cannot be just made and allowed to remain in the minute book. Does anyone take responsibility for substantiating these charges? Or are they just made for creating effect? Besides not one there has got the elementary conception of Party democracy - that a Party member has a right to reply to the charges - and till he replies a final decision normally cannot be taken. You all thunder against Raghu's bureaucracy - and I have no doubt that you must have had a just grievance. But you yourself do not even qualify your decision by saying that final decision be taken after hearing Raghu's reply.

Do not think these are small things. These are things involving basic principles. What will happen to the DCs, TCs, PCs, if in the absence of certain member decisions are taken regarding them without giving them an opportunity to explain - and forward to higher committee and the higher committees act on them. Will anything remain of the Party? This itself is part of the Joshian heritage and it is not surprising that your entire PC has fallen a victim to this bureaucratic behaviour - the open violation of every form. I do not want to blame you too much for this. I only want you to realise how reformism asserts itself on every point.

What further takes away my breath is your cool adoption of double standards. All agree that Bishnu should be on the IC. Yet Bishnu admits that he has appropriated Party money for private purpose - i.e. he has taken from Party money a certain sum. He explains it thus: He got Rs.500/- from Jeshi for building a house. Of these he took Rs.250/- and kept Rs.250/- with someone who perhaps spent it for the Party. Later on Bishnu takes Rs.85/- from Party collections - I do not know on whose authority. I may be misunderstanding Bishnu - but from the minutes it is obvious that Bishnu picked up a sum from Party collections which he had no authority to pick. The fact that some Party member or leader had spent Rs.250/- belonging to him on Party work, does not give him any right to take Party money without special sanction in repayment of the sum spent. Party members cannot be allowed to behave as money-lenders attaching Party collections.

None of you revolt against this - not even protest. It is difficult for me to relate your connivance of Bishnu and your passion against Raghu to any objective Marxian standards.

Mahesh makes a serious and grave charge against Raghu - that he wanted Bishnu to be arrested, thus charging him with conduct worthy of an agent provocateur - None protests - You perhaps only say no - This is a serious charge. Mahesh does not report it to the FB, though he was staying with us.

If the charge is real and serious Raghu deserves expulsion. If it is fabricated Mahesh deserves expulsion. The CPI members cannot be allowed to behave like gangsters. Again I may be misreading the minutes - and wrongly judge him. The minutes might have been wrongly rendered. But my impression is that Mahesh is in the habit of making wild charges - and in this matter he behaves not as if we are members of a common revolutionary organisation - but of a cheating gang in which each is trying to cheat the other. I am glad to find that Asim has pulled him up on one occasion when he charged you with deliberate distortion. To say the least it is disgusting to come across such allegations in a Party meeting - and even those who do not protest against these must be reprimanded.

I will tell you what honest rank and filers will say after reading the minutes - especially those dealing with reorganisation. They will consider all of you to be thoroughly dishonest persons intent on passing on the blame to each other - and finally agreeing to agree among yourselves to pass it on to Raghu. Their cry will be a plague on all of you. That is how they will see all of you including Raghu and they will be justified.

The general impression that people might get thru your discussion is each is trying to pass on the ball to the other. The PC as a whole tries to hold the Sectt responsible for the state of affairs. Among the Sectt members Bishnu wants to disclaim all responsibility saying he was not consulted - a facile way of getting out. He does not tell us why he tolerated, why he did not kick up a row, why he did not inform the Centre.

So far as Mahesh is concerned his role is to see that even the most blatant formulations made by him should not be nailed down - as anything different from what others had said. His so-called struggle against the two trend theory - is a bogus struggle - an unconscious and indirect attempt to escape individual responsibility for some very horrible formulations he made and the dogged and persistent and open fight carried on by him against some of the directives of the Party Thesis.

All want to hold you three - Raghu, Girdhar and yourself - responsible for the main mistake. When many of them fight against the so-called theory of two trends - it is not an honest fight - but a fight to establish that all members of the Sectt, especially you three, were equally reformist. Again the basis is not objective estimate of Party line as a whole, but an attempt to establish that the Sectt. members were the main sources of reformism. No doubt the other comrades often admit their mistakes. Everyone seems to be in a repentant mood and one feels as if one is attending a prayer house, or a confessional meeting. But this does not lead to an objective estimate of the mistakes of the Party as a whole. As soon as the formal confession is made and conscience is satisfied each returns to the charge to prove that others - especially the Sectt. was the most guilty party.

In this respect even Asim fails to judge himself objectively. Asim who seems to have an objective standard alright. I have not seen his latest.

So far as you and Girdhar are concerned you feel that you must share the responsibility, but inwardly you feel that Raghu is the source of all mistakes and you come out openly in the discussion on reorganisation & give yourself away.

Had all of you shown a little objectivity - you would have asked yourselves the question - if Raghu were the source of all mischief why are we in doldrums - when he has been away for nearly a year? The other FCMs would have to ask the same question - especially after changing the Sectt. - why are we deadlocked. But none of you had either the humility, objectivity to ask the question and face the answer.

Remember that even if all that you say about Raghu is correct and the IB decided to remove him from the FC, still nothing will change there - since a new consciousness, a correct understanding of the situation is required. Thus the facile understanding of Mahesh that Raghu was Joshi - and all the rest his followers - this pose of innocence must be described as a perversion of facts, worthy of those who dare not see themselves in the mirror.

You should thus see how you have reduced the Bolshevik weapon of self-criticism to a farce. The result is no clear understanding of anything - an unconscious justification of oneself - by holding or thinking that someone else is more guilty than you and finding satisfaction in that. The mind of a petty bourgeois is like a dog's tail. It never gets straightened.

Now let me turn to your Report on the Right Reformist Deviation in Bihar FC. Some days back I wrote to you that we reject it as showing petty bourgeois ego and ~~xxxxx~~ individualism. You will now see how correct that judgement is.

However our rejection has nothing to do with the criticism and attack levied by other Sectt. members - who no doubt have shown even worse egoism in attacking the report in the way that they did. They perhaps thought that the report attacked other members too much. The fact is that the report attacked them too little in comparison with what they deserved. But their fight against two trends meant that they were hardly to blame - a dishonest fight in which Mahesh takes the lead and misleads the other members.

as

So far/you are concerned, however, the report fails to unmask your own politics i.e. the politics of the Sectt. - screens it behind phrases, behind formal admission. Failing to unmask yourself you do not get the moral and political courage to unmask others - and you go on praising people for the slightest excuse. You make a mockery of self-criticism and you think it consists in somehow apportioning blame and praise equally - irrespective of reality. You praise Mahesh for some thing - and discover profundity in Bishnu's "discovery" of rich peasant and his role. And it is not without reason that you discover profundity in Bishnu for having located the rich peasant. You do it because you had failed practically to mention the rich peasant in your note on Agricultural Labourers - notwithstanding your vain claim to have taken a correct stand on agricultural labour organisation. Instead of debunking yourself before the FC Sectt., and telling them that the most elementary thing had escaped your notice, that your document was a raw immature attempt - and realising that Bishnu had seen an elementary truth - you flatter Bishnu by calling him profound, just to satisfy your own ego. To you this elementary truth appears profound just because it escaped your notice - all conceited persons think that what they fail to understand must be very profound.

Thus both in your criticism and your praise you are wrong. This happens because you do not apply Marxist criterion - you fail to do so because of your ignorance of Marxism and a little realisation of this would have made you more objective.

It is just because you fail to debunk yourself - a failure due to lack of Marxism - and partly to your vanity and self-esteem - that you are unable to hit out with sufficient sharpness against others - even when you know their views deserve such sharpness. You thus come down to the level of a decadent bourgeois professor - with his final summing up - Much can be said on both sides.

Then what is the aim of self-criticism? Is it to give opportunity to conceited intellectuals to record on how many occasions others were less right than themselves? Or is it to teach the working class and its Party from its living experience, from the mistakes of leaders, organisation and individuals - to change practice, to what results mistaken ideas lead and sharpen their ~~sk~~ consciousness.

Whose consciousness will be changed by your review, who will benefit? Yours is not a review of the line, of mistaken policy in practice and action; not drawing of the lessons from actual struggles and judging individuals, formulations etc. in the light of the results of the struggles - so that formulations and individuals

are tested on the basis of the common experience. What you have done is a review of the formulations of certain individuals, and only vaguely connected them with the practice of the Party. Even when you criticise the Sectt. formulations - you are not able to relate them to practice to show what practice it produces. Thus others do not realise that they were part-ners in the sin and they further do not realise that certain disastrous consequences did follow the wrong formulations of the Sectt. - results which would not have followed if the DCs and ranks had correctly detected the mistakes. Thus you fail to make others realise that they also have to change their practice and outlook - that their practice was based on the acceptance of the Sectt. formulations and it was wrong. The DCs and other Sectt. members are more or less taking the pose that certain members of the Sectt. alone were wrong; that they made wrong formulations, they forget that they themselves tried to implement them, failed to see things and that the formulations led to certain practice. They practically argue as if the wrong lead had no practical consequence - and thus attempt to exonerate themselves.

No doubt it was a very difficult job to execute. And I do not blame you for not being able to do it. It would be most unfair to blame you for failure. What you must be blamed for, is however, failure to develop certain minimum standards & accept the concrete lead given to you in writing.

The result has been that your reviews only judge between individuals and that too on a petty personal intellectual level - without reference to whether any help-ed to change practice - without reference to the effect of the formulation, execution of the Party tasks. Struggles, masses, practice etc. come only incidentally. The main thing becomes who said what on each occasion - a concrete instance how a petty-bourgeois slyly and surreptitiously substitutes himself for the masses and the movement.

Your reviews therefore teach no one - and the ranks on reading them will only draw one conclusion - all leaders commit mistakes. Do not accept their lead - Thus you smash all faith in provincial centre.

You come to this sad end because you totally ignored the Centre's note on Bihar Report - a note which correctly nails down the main maladies of the Party there, but which fails to hold the Sectt. responsible for it along with others. It was because I was given to understand that the Sectt. was fighting reformism; that on a very wide front the deviations have been corrected. That is why, if I remember correctly, we hardly discussed the August Report, but we discussed the oral report and self-critical report of Santosh and others perhaps.

At the same time all the wrong formulations current in Bihar and made in the August report are debunked in my note of January 1949 - which you have ignored. The main defect of that note was failure to hit the Sectt. on the head with a hammer-blow, debunk its pretensions in the same way as the pretensions of some other provinces were debunked. And for this all the Sectt. members who came here - Girdhar, Raghunath, Mahesh, Santosh and yourself were responsible.

I tended to accept your claims because they were made after reading the Tactical Line documents - which really exposed all the current reformist formulations. That is why no frontal attack on the Sectt. was launched but since you expressed complete agreement with the T. Line you were asked to draft your own self-critical report - so that things could be judged properly. At the same time Centre note on organisation and report - gave you all the necessary generalisations, formulations and criticism of some of your formulations - spontaneity etc. - to enable you to make a fairly objective self-criticism. You ignored all this and bungled the whole thing.

There is however no doubt that you all created an impression that now you were already on correct lines, that the Bihar Sectt. was more or less united - and I was glad. I spoke highly of all of you. At the same time I gave you only a few days to draw your self-critical report so that the Final decision can be taken quickly.

I am writing about all this because if you remembered all this - and especially the Centre's note - you would have directed the main fire against the August Report of the Sectt. - which is a blatant revisionist draft which repeats all the opportunist formulations made in Bengal by certain comrades and constitutes a rehash of Joshi's Fol-Org letter. Your criticism of that draft is of such a type that we are again where we were before the T. Line.

Firstly your August Report, when it comes to practical guidance, gives all the possible directives - in a vague and general manner - without in the least helping the ranks to understand which directive is to be followed on which occasion. The directives given constitute a dishonest way of cheating and silencing the ranks - of bluffing them, of making them believe that the leadership had given all directives - only the ranks failed to implement them. You only save your vanity, your conceit and your conscience by giving a number of contradictory and all-time directives.

Coming to your analysis and content, you commit all possible deviations - common to Joshism - all the deviations combated in the Tactical Line.

Firstly in typical Joshian manner you and the other colleagues of the Sectt. including Raghu whom all of you considered to be in a class by himself - all slyly repudiate the major struggle - that between the capitalist class and the working class; between the imperialist-feudal-bourgeois combine and the exploited masses - by giving equal or more importance to the so-called inner contradictions among exploiters. It was a familiar trick of Joshi to juggle with the phrase - owner class contradictions - they mean only some difference among the exploiters - and in the name of taking into consideration and utilising these contradictions, tone down and ignore the major contradiction - class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and thus tie the latter to the apron-strings of one or the other sections of the exploiters. The Andhra Sectt. theoretically formulated the essence of this policy and its stand had to be rejected. But you after reading the Tactical Line documents which polemise against the stand of the Andhra Sectt., commit the same mistake.

"Politically the crisis has expressed itself as a crisis for the ruling class - a crisis in its government, its politics, its morals and its efficiency. More and more the Congress Govt. is getting exposed as a govt. of the exploiters, of the feudal-bourgeois collaborators of imperialism, incapable of solving any real problem of the people, incapable of maintaining 'law and order', and corroded from within by bribery corruption and nepotism, factional quarrels inside the ministry and the provincial Congress Committee (which seem to have been 'settled' now only to flare up again), 'disputes' between the ruling feudal-bourgeois group of the different provinces (e.g. Bihar, Bengal, Orissa, C.P. etc.), disputes between the Bihari and the non-Bihari bourgeoisie (over the mines clause in the Zamindari Bill) and between the provincial govt. and the big zamindars - all point to the inherent and growing contradictions inside the ruling class, symptomatic of the accentuation of the political crisis." (para 3, page 1, Bihar Pol. Report for the period April to 15th Aug. 1948).

Can there be anything more monstrous than this understanding of the situation? You lump the most ferocious class-war launched by the capitalist state with their inner squabbles - describe all of them as a crisis in govt. - in the bargain you vulgarise the Marxist conception of "crisis of ruling class, governmental crisis" - and thus successfully screen the main reality - the masses fighting and challenging the govt. in a ferocious class-war, more ferocious than what was seen in our country in recent times.

After this even when you add that these inner conflicts do not break out into open clashes - when you say that they only quicken the pace of exposure, you only save your conscience. You have already sold the pass by equating these conflicts with the struggle of the basic masses. Corruption and jobbery, molasses scandal get the same importance as mass shootings of workers, heroic struggles of industrial and agrarian workers.

This is how you take a straight dive in the reformist muck in the very beginning - and by you I mean all the members of the Sectt. - those who drafted this & those who acquiesced in it.

This is not accidental, however. You are only resurrecting Joshi's discredited theory - which propounded in December 1946 - that it is counter-revolution that is on the offensive - not revolution. When in your usual way you quote in a distorted fashion - "Revolution organises counter-revolution", you exactly mean this; you are really emphasising the organisation of counter-revolution, its strength etc. Here I must warn you against this type of thing. You show both ignorance and contempt for Marxist theory when you quote without knowing the meaning of the formulation made by Marxist founders. The ordinary honesty to see that the quotation really means what you say is not shown. The ranks are cheated with a show of learning,

and by abusing the name of founders of Marxism. Such an attitude is tantamount to committing forgery. It is ideological forgery and nothing else.

To continue, as I said you only see the counter-revolution on the offensive, while you see the masses only on the defensive. On p. 3 you write, "...indeed all the labouring classes of the population have been set in motion by the crisis and have been forced to stand up in defence of their living standards". By itself the sentence may not be objected to - if all that it meant was that economic necessity was compelling backward and advanced sections alike to defend their standard of living - and join the battle against capital. In such a formulation the emphasis would not have been on the idea of defending as distinguished from taking the offensive, but on the idea that the masses are on the move, impelled by sheer necessity to protect their living standards - the beginning of all revolutionary fights in capitalist society.

But for you because you nowhere see the heroic resistance of the masses, the counter-offensive against terror, the formulation means masses are on the defensive - while their enemies are attacking. That is why though you say in the same para that the masses are turning every factory and farm into a battle-ground between the exploiters and exploited, it remains mere phrase - for your conclusion is this: "The crisis has accentuated class antagonism so far that the ruling classes have started taking fright at it." What a revolutionary conclusion! So the bourgeoisie is only taking fright and not fighting a last ditch battle; not a desperate and ferocious struggle but just fright. This is how you evaluate the battles. Crisis has not accentuated class antagonism to the point of open class-war fought with all the strength on both sides; not accentuated class antagonism to the point at which the working class fights with all its strength and resources but just to the point at which the bourgeoisie are just taking a fright.

You must realise that such formulations are not accidental. They are born out of the idea that the working class is not resisting, it is on the defensive, at best it is fighting partial battles; and that it is not conscious. It is not for nothing that when on page 3 you say, "numberless legions of fighting masses are taking up positions," you add in parenthesis - though not yet quite consciously - thus attempting to belittle the revolutionary consciousness of the masses. If all that you wanted to say was that the masses were not fully conscious of the need for immediate overthrow of the Govt. or of the final aims of Communism - that would be very correct. If ignoring this anyone were to imagine that the partial struggles that are breaking out are insurrectionary struggles - that the masses are ready for insurrection, and that as soon as a strike breaks out power should be captured - he would have to be criticised for not seeing that the masses are moving forward towards seeing the necessity of overthrowing the govt., but not yet seen it. It is only in relation to seeing the necessity for the overthrow of the govt., or final aims of Communism - that one can say that the consciousness of the masses is not yet fully developed.

But when you casually, and in a general way state that the masses are taking positions and turning ~~every~~ street into battle-ground - but not yet consciously - you qualify and belittle the actual consciousness of the masses and seek to make out that the factories etc. are turned into battle-ground need not be taken seriously; it is not consciously done. It is just a part of the ordinary economic struggle, spontaneity - as you would call it. This is wrong and anti-Marxist. The fact that the partial struggles of the present period - are no longer peaceful, they are converted into battles - they call forth armed intervention of the state - and that the workers resist this armed intervention - all these betoken a high degree of revolutionary consciousness. These reveal that the masses are grasping the truth that without battles, resistance, without bloody conflicts the capitalist govt. will not yield - no illusion - and at the same time they reveal the confidence of the masses that with sufficient resistance the govt. will be forced to yield. The consciousness of their strength and numbers, the class-consciousness which sees in the ruling class only a tiny section of exploiters and not the leaders of the people - it is these that give the confidence to the workers to march ahead. These constitute the beginning of the realisation of the necessity to overthrow the govt.

This is the truth that has to be seen and put before the ranks. This represents correctly the level of consciousness and inspires our adre to go ahead. Instead you understand the level of consciousness wrongly, belittle it, deprive the class battles of revolutionary consciousness and undermine in typical Joshian manner the revolutionary character of the battles.

Some of our cadres themselves do not see that the masses are fighting with a new fighting spirit and consciousness, that the struggles of the present period are of a qualitatively different type than of the past, that consciousness is of a higher level - they funk and run away failing to see the heroism and revolutionary consciousness of the masses - and you aid and abet them in this by slandering the masses and belittling the consciousness of the workers.

All this because you do not believe that the masses are resisting. Your analysis is that only the capitalists are resisting and fighting. This is openly stated in your report. On page 11 end and page 12 you sum up the experience of working class struggles. The experience that you give is of a professional strike-breaker and not of a revolutionary leader.

On page 12, para 1 you write: "Struggles are usually protracted and long-drawn out because neither the employers nor the govt. are in a mood to concede even the most elementary demands unless they feel compelled to do so" - struggles are not protracted, long-drawn out battles because the workers, despite starvation and suffering refuse to break their ranks, their solidarity, and carry on for months - Oh no. They are long-drawn out because employers do not concede the demands. All that is required for a protracted struggle is obduracy of the employer - working class unity is not required; working class solidarity is not required - the fact that the protracted struggle is carried on despite police and goonda terror, murderous assaults - is hidden - working class resistance is done away with. So according to you protracted class-struggles are due only to the obduracy of the capitalists. This is where the theory that counter-revolution is on the offensive, and masses are on the defensive leads. Liquidation of all mass resistance - and advocacy of strategy and tactics based on a defeatist analysis that the class enemy of the working class is triumphing.

It would be perfectly legitimate to hold the capitalists responsible for protracted stoppages in production - if we were discussing who was responsible for these stoppages. But when you are analysing the character of class struggles - and not responsibility for stoppages - then it is sheer opportunism and defeatism to paint that the class battles are all due to capitalists - that the workers are only a passive force in them.

In the next para you talk of repression, terror, etc. - but there is not a word about the resistance of the workers to all these. It is one of the biggest slanders on the heroic working class of Bihar.

And finally you draw the following 'revolutionary' and logical conclusions from your defeatist analysis: "In these conditions the struggles either completely fail and win very minor demands. This leads to demoralisation and defeatism among the workers - among whom it is temporary - but mainly among the militants some of whom usually crack up and go over to the employers, the INTUC or the Socialists."

Thus you have once more returned to all the Joshiian conclusions, liquidating revolutionary resistance of the workers and making demoralisation supreme. Can there be anything more repulsive than this open slander of the workers - and repudiation of the line laid down by the 2nd Congress?

Finally you slander both the workers and militants - and you allege that the militants, i.e., the advanced sections get more demoralised than the mass - a strange thing. By using the word 'some' you spread another slander - about large-scale defection of militants to Socialists, INTUC. No doubt there will always be a few individuals crossing over - not only from militants, even from the Party. But a Party leader who makes a generalisation on this basis - as if this is a widespread phenomenon among the militants - and includes this as a special experience of recent working class struggle, must be branded as a slanderer.

Do you realise what your experience of working class struggles amounts to? It is something which even Joshi dared not put on paper. According to you (1) there is of course no resistance on the part of the working class - now type of revolutionary resistance is not party experience of recent working class struggles. (2) It is not the unit of the working class and their solidarity that leads to protracted and long-drawn-out battles, but only the refusal of capitalists to concede their demands. (3) Only police terror and goonda terror exists but not the resistance to it. (4) Not that the militant resistance of the masses make it more and more difficult for the capitalists to shift the burden of the crisis on the

back of the masses, but even minor demands are not secured. (5) Out of the fire of struggle, the indescribable suffering, and the glorious heroism of the masses it is not their will to resist that is strengthened, steered - but they are demoralised; new cadres and leaders are not born, new cadres for the Party, new leaders of the masses are not gained; it is not the Party and revolutionary movement that wins and strengthens by getting new recruits in large numbers - but it is the INTUC and Socialists. This is what your analysis says.

That is why I denounce it as a professional strike-breaker's analysis. This is how you understand, "Revolution organises counter-revolution". Marx uses it to show the ~~strength of the masses, the last-ditch stand of counter-revolution.~~ You use it to show the strength of counter-revolution, to show that it is counter-revolution that is on the offensive, to show that its offensive is succeeding, that the masses are getting demoralised, to show that no resistance is taking place, that the masses are on the defensive, are being driven to the wall. You try to save your conscience by saying that though counter-revolution is on the offensive, it shows its weakness, but this is only formal. Besides you think you have given sufficient recognition to the existence of the revolutionary forces when you say, "Revolution organises counter-revolution". You reduce this sentence from Marx to a vulgar truism. For according to you it only means that the attack of counter-revolution - by which you mean only repression is directed against forces of revolution - which is a truism. It certainly could not be directed against the forces of counter-revolution. And you think that by saying this you have given sufficient recognition to the strength of the revolutionary forces. In reality you recognise only the strength of counter-revolution.

Such are the nauseating conclusions of your defeatist line; of a line which replaces basic class contradictions by intra-class sectional contradictions; a line which liquidates revolutionary resistance of the working class and preaches demoralisation and frightens the ranks with the strength of the enemy.

Is there any wonder that with this defeatist and counter-revolutionary outlook your Sectt. gives strike-breaking advice to the ranks - of cowardly retreat covered by specific phrases?

On Page 23, para 3 from below, you give the following solemn advice: "The form of demonstration shall depend on the degree of indignation aroused, and degree of mobilisation achieved. When big mobilisation (emphasis mine) is not achieved, then it is better to have meetings and rallies, central or local where they can be held, and as peacefully as possible." This advice is given in connection with demonstration before courts etc. where interference from police or armed goondas is expected.

The way in which the formulation is made, and the conditions under which it was made - show that it is not an advice to fight but for abject surrender. When this advice was given a section of Party ranks and leaders was shirking to lead the militant fight and resistance which the masses were spontaneously developing.

Does this formulation, this advice, teach the wavering section to give up its vacillations; does it put across the heroism of the masses? Not in the least. On the other hand the formulation is made under the belief that the Party is suffering from adventurist mistakes. That is why the advice is in the direction of putting shackles on the struggle.

Apparently the formulation that "the form of demonstration shall depend on the degree of indignation aroused and degree of mobilisation achieved" seems to be alright. In reality the sectt. uses this general statement to avoid facing the realities in Bihar and give a clear call for increasing certain types of actions and demonstrations as the new form. When in Bihar certain ranks were failing to see that the masses were desperate, that they could be easily roused to action and anger on every important issue, when a section of the ranks and leaders are failing to see this palpable truth, what was necessary was to put across the truth and tell the Party members that the workers were spontaneously developing all kinds of militant demonstrations and actions, which shows what can be done with our organisation, which shows that on all important issues militant forms can be developed. That would be concrete lead.

Both the leaders and a section of the ranks were forgetting that a general explosive situation existed - whether today in a particular locality there was struggle or not. The general explosive character of the situation is precisely the characteristic of a revolutionary period. They failed to realise that there was general desperation among the masses. Because of this everywhere militant forms of resistance were spontaneously developing and could be extended and developed by the Party if it moved decisively. This was the concrete lead required, - a lead which would have exposed the vacillators and inspired the ranks to really lead the masses, and not lag behind; inspired them with the confidence that militant resistance could be developed because masses themselves were in militant ~~and~~ mood. This is how the formulation-form of demonstration must conform to the degree of mobilisation and indignation - should have been applied - by taking into consideration the indignation already and spontaneously raised by economic distress etc.

Instead the Sectt. makes only a general formulation leaving the vacillators to decide whether the situation is ripe and makes it in a way as if the Party was suffering from outrunning the consciousness of the masses - when in reality it is lagging behind.

In making this general statement the Sectt. forgets the revolutionary period, the general mood of the mass - and makes it appear as if only local situation and issues will decide the form of demonstration; as if the desperation created by the crisis all over India and the general indignation arising from it, are not main elements and the local situation - only the last link in the chain.

Thus under the guise of a profound formulation, the Sectt. refuses to give lead, and tenders advice which leaves the initiative into the hands of the vacillators and sabotages militant demonstrations.

The sentence "When big mobilisation is not achieved it is better to have meetings and rallies, central or local, and as peacefully as can be possible", climaxes this opportunist advice. What is meant by big mobilisation? It is left to the vacillators, local leaders, so that no blame attaches to the Sectt. And whom did the Sectt. learn that Communists organise demonstrations only with "big mobilisation" - that otherwise there should be peaceful meetings and rallies? The question is not how big or how small - but whether a demonstration rouses the masses, exposes the govt. - has propaganda effect, attracts the masses, - so that they themselves get ready for the next stage or participation etc. Now how big or how small but how far it advances class-consciousness, class-struggle, organisation etc. Naturally the bigger the demonstration the bigger effect it will have. But at the same time our Party and the working class has shown on many occasions that a determined though small number can also rouse hundreds by its courage notwithstanding its numerical smallness. Such has been the experience of all countries. Our aim is of course to draw the majority as large a number as possible. But that is no reason why that action by small number should be tabooed as the Sectt. does. This is counter-revolutionary, trying to win the majority without showing in action the determination of the advanced elements. In effect it is abjuring all claims to lead in action.

If after putting the issue as has been put here the Sectt. had given a warning that care should be taken to see that all actions whether done with bigger or smaller mobilisation, lead to greater organisation and determination of the proletariat, that they do not get cut off from the class; that therefore the issues and time are properly chosen; that they keep the vanguard linked with the mass; that to be carried away by the success of initial militant demonstration and to forget the class and be unlinked with it in the name of action is parody of revolutionary tactics - it would have been justified. The likely danger of some petty bourgeois intellectuals forgetting the class would have been correctly forestalled.

The Sectt. again makes the following opportunist formulation - In connection with the defence of demonstrations against police attacks, the following is stated, "The question of resistance to the police or to the goondas is linked up with the question of mass mobilisation and the preparedness of the masses to resist. Communists do not act without the masses behind them; they act together with the masses and at the head of them. This must be understood as a cardinal principle. Bolder action with weaker mobilisation is a wrong step. It gives an opportunity to the police and the goondas to terrorise and demoralise the masses." Thus the Sectt. again resurrects Joshi's "Don't provoke the police" theory. Every sentence here is wrong and the entire advice is cowardly. Firstly let it be remembered that the Sectt. is here talking only about defence of demonstrations

against the police and goonda attacks - not of attacking or raiding police stations, or organising insurrection.

And what is its advice? Its treacherous advice is that there are occasions on which we should not resist the police even if it attacks our procession lest the police might be provoked and the masses get demoralised, and we should not resist the goondas also lest the police might be provoked. The profound formulation that resistance to the police (when a demonstration is attacked) is linked up with the question of mass mobilisation - means that if any leader thinks that there are not sufficient masses in the demonstration, he is at liberty to run away, disperse the demonstration, as soon as the police or goondas are sighted. All this is done in the name of being with the masses, and looking to the preparedness of the masses to resist the police. The Sectt. again slanders the workers. It forgets the explosive character of the situation, the angry mood of the masses, and the repeated instances of mass heroism and resistance, in Bihar and elsewhere under our leadership and in the absence of direct leadership also. I dare say that there will be any occasion today when the masses - whether in big or small demonstrations would want to run away at the sight of the police, or goondas? No doubt there might be vacillations in face of attack in some cases - but a determined stand by the advanced elements will invariably stop all vacillations. And there will not be a single case when resistance by a determined vanguard will be misunderstood by the masses, even if the mass fails to put up a fight. On the other hand this will make the mass fight actively on next occasion. In the overwhelming majority of the cases the masses will directly resist when attacked - it is a lie to suggest that the masses may not be prepared to fight - the police

Another specious formulation, "Communists do not act without the masses behind them; they act together with the masses and at the head of them - is a thinly veiled cover to give up the leading role, to abjure responsibility for organising the fight against the police; to abjure leadership in action and run in the name of keeping with the masses. And all this is written at a time when the masses are forging ahead and leaders are lagging behind. To be able to run with the masses and be at their head Communists require bolder tactics and courage for the masses are already ahead of many Party leaders. And the task of Communists is not only to be with the masses, but consciously lead them, anticipate their militancy and raise it to higher level. The Sectt. is unaware of this. It thinks remaining with the masses and at most at the head of a demonstration is enough - it even here it advocates desertion.

And lastly "Bolder action with weaker mobilisation is a wrong step." This may mean anything. Under conditions when in spite of mobilisation and mass heroism Communist leaders are failing to lead against the police, the formulation is open passport to opportunism. It opens the floodgate to all kinds of opportunism and cowardice. It means that opportunist leaders will always be able to say that - say unless there are 10,000 or 20,000 or 100,000 - in any procession there should be no clash; unless everybody is with them there should be no clash - unless all the workers are there - there should be no clash.

Following this you once more abjure struggle against terror by giving the following directions: "Terror tactics of the employers, the zamindars, and the govt. should be countered by general strikes in towns, industries or rural areas concerned. Lockouts should be countered by occupation of machines. Squads of the victims of terror and repression should be organised to parade before other factories, other villages, schools and colleges. Similarly solidarity squads of other toilers should be sent to areas that have suffered repression." (pp.23-24)

Once again everything is here except direct resistance to terror - When you are precisely discussing how to combat such terror, you refuse to go beyond test actions - and do not say a word about direct resistance to terror. You content yourself with solidarity demonstrations - visits of squads and go upto protest strikes, which no doubt constitute a very important weapon of mobilisation. But protest strikes in the absence of resistance to the police when resistance must be offered is reduced to a form of satyagraha. If you were not discussing how to fight police terror, or if the question of resistance to police had not been put

by the situation itself, extension of protest actions thru strikes by themselves might acquire a progressive meaning - as the first step leading the workers to deal with the state. To only talk about protest strikes and solidarity demonstrations when the question is one of resisting police terror, and to remain silent on how directly to combat this terror, how to throw the weight of the masses against it, is to reduce the revolutionary weapon of strike to a farce, to a symbolic protest. There may be exceptional situation even in a revolutionary period when protest strike against terror may be organised as peaceful protests - as for instance when we ourselves are manœuvring and want to postpone a clash - but such are exceptional cases. You are making it a rule and laying down that terror tactics of gov can be combated only by extending strikes, and not by fighting this terror directly resisting it. You forget what role protest strike plays in fighting this terror. It enables us to bring our full strength on the ~~street~~^{streets} and challenge the enemy. We of course will not be able to give a successful challenge unless we get our full strength on the streets. But having ~~we~~ got it on the street you do not intend to throw it against the terror of the state. You must realise that you are discussing here not protest strikes in general - protest strike against arrest, detention - but protest strikes against police terror against the masses of the locality - yet you do not raise the question of fighting this terror thru the strike.

No one suggests that every protest strike must inevitably lead to a clash. Nor can anyone suggest that every protest strike against police terror must inevitably lead to a clash. There may be exceptional cases. But you are laying down a rule that there should be no resistance - when the rule should ^{be} that there should be resistance.

And following this you give the following treacherous advice: "Use every form of fight from poster propaganda to clashes with the police according to the needs of the situation and objective ~~possibilities~~ (By the way, how do you distinguish between needs of the situation and objective possibilities?). Be aggressive when the enemy is off its guard, be cautious when the enemy is warned. On a particular occasion choose that form of demonstration which has the best chance to bid a score over the enemy and raise the self-confidence of the people." (p.24)

Apart from the fact that once again you put upon others the responsibility of what to do in any concrete situation, without supplying them with correct criterion to judge the situation - the paragraph sums up all the opportunism involved in preceding paragraphs.

Firstly in a thoroughly opportunist fashion you juxtapose poster propoganda with clashes - and describe both as fight - You consider poster propoganda to be a form of fight and clashes to be another form of fight. Don't you see the utter ridiculousness of this juxtaposition, which only glorifies poster-propaganda, and gives an alibi to the vacillators who were refusing to fight the police. Obviously there may be persons in the Bihar Party who may think that poster propoganda is not necessary, who may not see its importance, as a weapon of conveying to the masses the Party directives, line, exposure of gov't. Such elements have to be given elementary lessons in weapons of agitation and how to use them; how it is imperative to use every weapon to reach the masses, with no legal press existing etc. But ~~that~~ that is no reason why you should juxtapose poster propoganda with clashes - and make people believe that poster propoganda as a form of fight which conforms to the needs of the situation. Remember you are describing poster-propaganda as a form of fight - in a revolutionary period - which throws up revolutionary forms of struggles, armed clashes. Can opportunism go further? If in any area you ~~cannot~~ cannot do anything except poster-propaganda it only shows extreme organisational backwardness and backwardness cannot be glorified as a form of fight and juxtaposed with clashes. The logical conclusion from your advice is - in some areas poster-propaganda is a revolutionary form of fight in the present circumstances - which is a lie.

It is one thing to say that you should not neglect any method and weapon of reaching the masses; and quite another to say that elementary methods of reaching the masses, like posters, meetings are forms of revolutionary struggle, and give them a place by the side of clashes with the police. Just because in a general way every activity of ours is a struggle against the capitalist society, we should not confuse weapons of agitation with revolutionary forms of struggle.

But as you will see this is not accidental. There is no place for working class resistance in your conception and analysis. Because of this the idea of clashes with the police is only formally accepted. And just because it is formal, you do not feel the least embarrassed in juxtaposing it with clashes with the police. You do not see the growing clashes with the police as the dominant form of struggle - in the new situation. To you it is an exceptional form at most - hence you mention it side by side with poster propaganda.

"From poster-propaganda to clashes" - this formulation sums up your opportunism and the utter cowardice involved in the advice of the Sect. How could you like a formula saying "from running away from battle to conducting the battle; from abandoning all weapons to wielding all weapons - we use every form of struggle according to the needs of the situation"? Your advice is no better.

And finally you liquidate all mass resistance in the following sentence: "Be aggressive when the enemy is off its guard, be cautious when the enemy is forewarned." - This advice is given to those who are supposed to lead the masses - mass demonstrations against the police. What will be the effect of this advice? Create vacillation and break up every demonstration without the enemy being forewarned? Of course not. We are not thinking here of secret organisation of raids etc., but of demonstrations. Every demonstration, even after a sudden and lightning strike, is known and is confronted by the police in sufficient strength. What is the advice on such occasions? Be cautious when the enemy is forewarned - which means in every demonstration you should be cautious, i.e. vacillate, not attack decisively, shut to give battle, get it broken, or run away. Instead of telling the cadres, that terminated resistance to the police will crack up the police force, its morale and the govt. in a fright, instead of giving a call for decisive action when heading mass - the treacherous call for ~~cautious~~ caution, i.e. sabotage is given.

And when are you to be aggressive? When the enemy is taken unawares, i.e. when a demonstration comes across a couple of policemen caught unawares - then you are supposed to resist aggressively. Can cowardice go further? Catching the enemy unawares has no other meaning except this in connection with street demonstration.

And since even this pleasure of meeting a couple of policemen unawares will be a rare pleasure, since normally the enemy will always be forewarned, the word is caution - liquidation of all resistance.

And after all this treacherous advice you ask the ranks to choose that form of struggle which enables them to bid a score over the enemy, and raise the self-confidence of the people. Can cynicism go further?

Surreptitiously you have started arguing as if you are forced to act in two's and three's and not in hundreds. Your slogan 'Be cautious when the enemy is forewarned' etc. has this meaning. You hardly believe that the Party will be acting as the leader of hundreds and thousands in demonstrations. This is because you have no faith in the resistance of the masses and you begin to argue as if we will be acting only in two's and three's.

Thus resistance by masses is finally liquidated. It is already reduced to resistance in two's and three's. Need we then wonder that following this some comrades indulge in acts of petty bourgeois terrorism.

And finally see how strong is the link with Joshiism and Joshi's method of confounding. It was Joshi who used to juxtapose all kinds of things together - strikes, struggles, and baithak meetings; forms of struggle with methods of agitation; class-positions with methods of approach to the vacillating classes - obliterate the distinction between the fundamental and incidental; dominant and accidental - equate the basic with the subsidiary and derive opportunist practice from it. And you by putting poster-propaganda and clashes together produce the same result.

Compare with your analysis and understanding of working class struggles, the analysis and understanding of the Tactical Line and Thesis - a on political situation, working class struggles etc., and you will see the difference between an opportunist and revolutionary understanding. How does the PB put its understanding of the working class struggles in the Tactical Line document?

"Out of this have arisen the great struggles of the last eight months - the struggles of workers and peasants, students - struggles against which most barbarous methods of repression were used (Kerala, Andhra, Tamilnad, West Bengal) - struggles which saw fascist terror against the toilers.

"These struggles bear one special character. Not only are they born out of economic desperation, but they come in the wake of growing disillusionment with the Congress Govts./In them are being trained and steeled the new forces which are destined to end the bourgeois rule. They reveal not only the rapid process of disillusionment, the rapid decline of the influence of the Congress, but also the growing desperate determination and militancy of the masses. They often develop into armed clashes in the face of terror. The terror - one-tenth of which would have formerly demoralised the fighters - now evokes only indignation and greater determination. How often have the leaders of the Party, in recent struggles, underestimated the power of resistance of the masses under terror (Coimbatore, Kerala), and thinking that all resistance is broken have been surprised by the masses who have refused to yield to terror and decided to continue resistance? All old standards measuring the resistance power of the masses have gone to the winds. The masses are no longer the old masses, afraid of terror, always dragged back by the illusion of a secure life. They are the new masses on the eve of revolutionary battles - those who more and more realise that retreat is impossible and those who are developing a great confidence in the victory of their cause, because they have begun to see their real strength. /and are undertaken in direct defiance of the Congress Govts.

"The partial struggles of the present period, therefore, become wide mass battles, miniature civil wars, which, when they are organised on a sufficiently big scale, easily develop into political battles and throw up embryonic state forms (Telengana) - such is the logic of the situation. No Chinese Wall divides the two as it did divide during the period of stabilisation. The terroristic repression teaches the masses to march forward and to challenge the state with all their power. It convinces them that without such a fight no struggle is possible, thus raising the struggle to a political plane - its stage being determined by the form and successful character of the resistance offered.

"But despite this terror and the ruthless repression launched against the Communist Party which is rapidly assuming its role as the vanguard of the revolutionary forces, despite the terror launched against the masses - the bourgeoisie and the Congress Govt. have been compelled by the resistance of the masses to go slow; the Congress Governments have found it increasingly difficult to solve the crisis at the expense of the people and hence had to adopt tactics of postponement, disruption, concessions etc., before a frontal offensive could be launched.

"The glorious resistance offered by the workers of Coimbatore, in the prolonged four-month textile strike; the recent strike of the South Indian Railway staff; strikes like the militant sweepers' strike in Bombay; the doggedly fought strikes of Calcutta Port Trust workers and of other workers; the textile strikes of C.P & Berar; the innumerable strikes all over India led by the unions of the AITUC, led by the Communist Party leaders; and often by unions belonging to Socialist and other organisations - the dogged resistance offered to every new offensive, or the doggedness with which every new demand was fought - have all created fear of the working class resistance in Govt. quarters and made them realise that any sudden all-round offensive will meet with general resistance, and pass into even a general strike, bringing the whole structure crashing down.

"The organised working class led by the Communist Party bars the way to an easy attack against the workers./It is this fear of working class strength that has saved the railway, postal and other govt. workers from immediate unemployment, from retrenchment. If the Govt. has hitherto succeeded in postponing the redress of their demands - thanks are mainly due to the treachery of reformists like Jai Prakash Narain. The Govt. similarly dared not sanction the textile millowners' proposal for three shifts by distributing the present number in three shifts because an attempt to do so in Ahmedabad led to a revolt on the part of textile workers against Nanda & Co last year. /It inspires the workers under the leadership of other ~~Communist~~ parties.

"In spite of the repeated demands of the capitalists for retrenchment and rationalisation, the govt. representatives, who have been mass leaders, and who, therefore, were able to judge the temper of the masses correctly, would not rush into such measures. They resorted to disruption, softening of the workers thru the INTUC, disruption thru the Socialists, thru protracted negotiations, postponement

thru arbitration etc., so that they should have sufficient time to deal with the masses. They banned strikes, repressed strikes; at the same time they established arbitration tribunals to deflect the discontent in constitutional channels, to amuse the reformists, and to be able to put off the strikes. In many cases they also granted wage increases to the workers, at the same time leaving the way open to the capitalists to launch rationalisation.

"Meanwhile, compelled by the resistance of the organised workers, the Govt. has been moving slowly. It is even now afraid to challenge the organised strength of the workers. It relies on disruption, propaganda, and illegalisation of the Communist Party and help from the reformists who promise to retreat and betray at the first official offensive.

ⁱⁿ
"In the coming period, therefore, the game of fighting inflation the Govt. will embark upon wholesale offensive. It is heralded by the withdrawal of cheap gas facilities for railway workers. The Govt. relies on ruthless repression and sharp and swift struggle. But the forces of the working class are strong and if they take an unbending attitude, the govt. offensive can be defeated. It is not at all easy for the govt. to challenge the strength of the workers. The govt. wants to do it piecemeal. It is afraid of the united strength of the workers.

"The resistance offered by the workers to the capitalist method of solving the crisis thus has till now thrown the govt. on the defensive and forced it to move slowly. It has saved the jobs of tens of thousands. It is a big testimony to the strength of the workers.

"The last eight months have not been months of victory for capitalists and the govt. They have been months of struggles which have forced the govt. to be cautious in inciting the workers to take up the challenge.

"Similarly resistance has grown in rural areas with peasants and agricultural workers in a militant and fighting mood. The recent struggles show that the peasant masses were beginning to hurl the full force of discontent against every aspect of govt. policy - procurement, prices, land, wages, etc. the coming months which will see governmental procurement, and which will mean more hardships for the smaller peasants, will see a general movement for not giving any grain to the govt., accompanied by no-rent and land to the tiller campaigns.

"Along with the crisis and the repressive measures which have accompanied it, the last eight months have seen a growth of mass resistance which makes it more and more difficult for the govt. to solve the crisis at the expense of the people."
('Communist', No.4, pp.25,26,27 & 28)

You will now see the real difference between your capitulatory understanding - the understanding of the Bihar Sectt. and the correct revolutionary understanding of the PB. You will also see that almost every formulation that you made in your August Resolution is negated by the Tactical Line and exposed as sham.

And yet neither you nor any member of the Sectt. used this correct understanding to understand your own past, to understand your August resolution and make genuine Marxist self-criticism of your document.

May I know why you do not refer^{to} all this basic aspect of your August Resolution, - the resolution embodying the entire opportunist policy and outlook of the Bihar Sectt. The Tactical Line was there. Your document was there. And you prepared a special document on self-criticism styled Right Reformist Deviation in Bihar PC. And yet you failed to correctly estimate the low depths of degenerate reformism preached in your document. Why?

Will you answer to the Sectt., the PUMs and the Party ranks in Bihar why you chose to remain silent on the question of basic analysis, strategy of trade union fights and struggles, experience of working class struggles etc. in your self-critical review, why you failed to unmask the most blatant strike-breaking formulations made in the August report? Will you explain why when you refer to opportunism on the TU front, you quote Janak, Girdhar, Santosh - but never once mention the August document and the strike-breaking anti-resistance cowardly advice it gives? The formulations made in that resolution, the joint product of the collective wisdom of the Bihar Sectt. are far more blatant than any that one quoted in your review.

Now you will realise how correct the PB was in rejecting your self-criticism as expression of egoism and individualism. A self-critical review which forgets main reformist formulations, which forgets that the analysis in past document was based on substituting the main class contradiction by intra-class contradiction among the exploiters, which ignored that the document to be reviewed made a professional strike-breaker's analysis, and liquidated mass-resistance - such a review can only be denounced as one screening the reformism contained in the earlier documents. If you fail to roundly denounce the August document and reject it wholesale, when you ignore its main horrifying formulations, and struggle desperately to see some good in it - are you not unconsciously protecting your ego from denunciation, saving your prestige - and concealing from yourself that the document was based on bankrupt politics? Is it not correct to describe it as only expressing your egoism, your exaggerated conception about yourself? We are not concerned here with intentions. We are concerned with objective standards and objective results. Whatever may be your intentions did you apply in practice the objective standard of Marxism to your document? You did not. You were deflected from applying objective standards by your pre-possession in your own favour. And what objective results does your review produce? Not denunciation of the grossest form of reformism but its screening and masking. It is because of this that your self-critical review can only ~~be~~ be described as an expression of reformist egoism.

You failed to catch the main basic formulations of ~~your~~ your August Report firstly because of your ignorance of Marxism. That you fail to catch them after reading the T. Line documents shows how deep is your reformist outlook, and also reveals how superficially you read Party documents. Secondly you fail to grasp the basic weakness of the August documents because of your subjective outlook. Notwithstanding your weakness in Marxism, had you applied the same vigilance to yourself that you applied to Mahesh and others, you could have caught some of the points I have made against the August Document.

Neither in your report on right reformist deviation, nor in your "self-criticism" - these points are caught and nailed down. In both perhaps you mention some of your formulations like "too much crisis" or "impossibility of securing even minor demands." In your self-criticism you are sharper about some of your formulations than in the report on reformist deviation in Bihar PC - and even then you did not see that what you had advocated in your August document is pure Joshian liquidation of all struggles and resistance.

Your self-criticism is ~~x~~ more methodical than Report on Reformist Deviation in Bihar PC, because for the first time you seemed to have realised that all criticism and self-criticism must be related to the accepted collective consciousness of the Party - as embodied in its Thesis, T. Line, other PB documents - along with classics of Marxism. You have however failed to follow this method even in its elementary form in your report on reformist deviation.

Now will you try to understand why in your self-criticism you only write about the kisan front and fail to mention the formulation on the TU front. When I read your report and documents it puzzled me for quite a long time to understand why you should concentrate on kisan front, and why your report on deviations on Kisan Front and Report on Reformist Deviation should be almost identical. I got the answer only when I went thru the minutes of the Sectt. meeting and read the August Report.

Then I realised how subjective you were in your self-criticism. For you the weapon of self-criticism unconsciously became a weapon of fighting Mahesh, justifying your position to the utmost and not of objectively locating the sources of reformism inside Bihar Party. And like all combatants out to defend themselves - you chose the most advantageous ground for yourself - the kisan front - because somehow you had brought yourself to believe that you were mainly right in your ideas about the agrarian struggles and classes, at least more right than Mahesh. It is the subjectivism that unconsciously leads you to swallow the most monstrous formulations on working class struggles, political crisis etc. for which all of you were collectively responsible, and concentrate on formulations about agrarian front. You will thus realise how correct it is to say that the self-criticism which all of you make is veiled self-justification and only intended to prove that one was more right than the other.

I am drawing your pointed attention to all this to explain you how without knowing it, one's subjectivism drags one down till one loses all objectivity.

And but for this subjectivism you would ^{not} have attached so much importance to

your support and advocacy of the demand for separate agricultural workers' organisation. For after the clear directive of the political thesis to form separate organisation of agricultural workers - one could neither claim originality nor the credit of having made a new discovery.

You would have had legitimate justification - for taking pride in your advocacy of separate organisation of agricultural workers - had you carried forward the understanding embodied in the thesis and made new ideological contribution, as the PB's resolution on Agrarian Question did. You no doubt attempted to give an ideological explanation, but you not only failed but indirectly reached ~~some~~ reactionary conclusions, strengthened the old reformist outlook, and instead of carrying forward the understanding of the agrarian question attempted to drag the Party back. In open repudiation of the Political Thesis you made new formulations which were nothing but a justification of the reformist practice on the agrarian front. I will discuss your contribution a little later.

So you could neither claim originality in supporting separate organisation of agricultural workers; nor claim new ideological contribution. This latter point should have been clear to you after reading the Agrarian Question. And yet you continue to advertise your stand, & put across as if you really made some new contribution and attached so much in ortance to this bogus claim of yours that you almost made it the central point in your review of the August resolution. You did it all the more because you found that Mahesh had taken a stand opposing separate organisation and that ~~was~~ suited you. You tried to draw a demarcating line, a fundamental line of distinction between him and you posed as if the dividing line between revolutionaries and reformists in Bihar was to be seen on question of attitude towards agrarian workers. It is obvious that Mahesh's opposition to separate organisation of agrarian workers had to be specially mentioned. For it was the most blatant and shameless opposition to the directives given by the Second Congress. And one must be a very hardened reformist, and totally alien to Party forms to take such a stand. But it was wrong to make this the dividing line between you and him - or between revolutionary line and reformist line. For as we have seen there were other and equally grotesque forms of reformism exhibited by all of you together.

To give you but one more instance, you correctly criticise Mahesh for refusing to support the agrarian workers' demand for living wage. Only a person awayed by rich peasant ideology would do that. But you forget that you and the Sectt. together forgot to mention the demand for living wage in connection with the industrial workers in your August report. Can anything beat this? You of course do not oppose it but just forget. You do not even notice this omission which comes from a reformist outlook. Am I wrong when I charge you with applying double standards?

It is because of this double standard that you not only fail to nail down the common crime embodied in the document, but fail to nail down that the August crime committed by the Sectt. - Raghunath, yourself and others - was directly responsible for the betrayal of railway strike in Bihar. You not only forget but gloss over this crime in your report on Reformist Deviation but just mentioning a few words that the Sectt. did not do much for the railway strike. To have not done much for the the railway strike is itself a big crime, as big as treachery - and this is the first time I hear that you did nothing. You and the rest of the Sectt. owe an explanation for this act of ~~it~~ treachery - when you were released from here early precisely to organise the railway strike. There is no reason why some of you should not be expelled from the Party - for this single act of treachery. What was the Sectt. doing if it was not organising the railway strike? And you also admit that the Sectt. did not do much for the student struggles - the biggest student struggle that Bihar has seen. And for you it is enough to mention these treacherous crimes in a couple of sentences. While you devote pages and lines to the deviations of Mahesh or your petty formulations here and there which you claim to be correct.

This is to say the least, rotten dishonesty - to bypass main political crimes like this, to keep silent over them, or just to mention them in passing.

It seems your own railway reports on strike have not taught you anything - not even modesty. Had you cared to produce self-critical report early in February, had you debunked your August reformism and the base cowardice that it justified - the cowardice created by years of reformist policy - had you not supplied a fresh ideological cover for a cowardice in your August resolution - and finally on the basis of all these had you come out with a decisive bold lead to fight - much of the cowardice that was shown in the railway strike would have been avoided.

You cannot be held responsible for all that happened. Obviously there were a number of rotten individuals who had got into strategic positions inside the Party - and who could be unmasked in actual struggle. The Party in the days of

reformist could not purge out reformist elements and they were all there. And you cannot be held responsible for all their doings.

But you are certainly partly responsible because of your failure to repudiate the reformist practice advocated in August resolution, which gave a fresh lease of life to these reformist elements; your failure to warn the honest elements and rankers who were bound to vacillate because of your own line advocated in your August resolution; you were certainly responsible for emasculating the fighting ranks who would have made mince-meat of the cowards.

I do not wish to go into the details to be found in your report on railway strike - the facts supplied by the Sectt. The evidence of cowardice, running away, desertion is too plainly written there to be denied. And both with the honest and dishonest, with the confirmed cowards and vacillators - there is one common fear - the fear of acting alone to lead, the fear of taking the lead, initiative, when to them the masses appear to be apathetic - i.e. the fear of leadership - fear of individual suffering. While the confirmed cowards would have acted in any case as they have done, do you realise that you and the Sectt. are directly responsible for the vacillations of others in leading - because you had created such a holy terror of acting "apart from the masses". You had belittled individual leadership to such an extent, individual resistance as a weapon of rousing the people to such an extent - that you find the leaders, ordinary Party members and others deserting, demoralised when they felt and they felt wrongly - that the workers were not with them and would not act; you yourself quote instances from Jamalpur, when some of our comrades got themselves tamely arrested inside Jamalpur workshop and did not resist arrest when such arrest would have brought the workers on strike. This is where wrong formulations of the type - with the masses - leads. As I have pointed out earlier the formulation - with the masses and at their head - meant under conditions of Bihar - failure to lead, abjuration of leadership and individual responsibility. The concrete instance is Jamalpur where even working class comrades tamely allowed themselves to be arrested when resistance would have roused the workers. Had you inspired our comrades that in the present explosive situation every act of heroism in the interest of the masses, and on issues vital to them will rouse them - you would have prevented the debacle of those comrades tamely submitting to arrests. This is how your report on Jamalpur puts it: "Second category of comrades who were the leaders of their shops and office-bearers of the Rail Road Workers' Union demoralised the workers of their shops by getting themselves peacefully arrested. Had they resisted the arrest, the workers would have responded. The arrest of Sakhaldip had created much resentment among the workers of his shop. Any attempt at defiance on the part of these comrades would have roused the militancy and the fighting capacity of the workers. But their timidity and tameness poured cold water on the militant mood of the workers"

But who was responsible for creating this mood of vacillation, this hesitation in taking individual lead - in the minds of Party members. Those who never repudiated the reformist heritage, those who in the August resolution advocated liquidation of the leading role of Party members.

Secondly, your reports on OTR and Jamalpur clearly show the utter funk before police terror developed by some comrades - including some DC members. The report sent by Santosh correctly nails down these and says many correct things. But have you again thought who it was that was responsible for undermining the morale? If the Party leadership itself does not see working class resistance anywhere, if it itself gives slogans of liquidating working class resistance, if it never thinks of combating police terror directly, but only advocates symbolic protest actions - what else but undermining of the morale of the Party members, smashing their faith in working class will result? Whether your August resolution was read by anyone or not, whether the Party members who wavered had the August resolution in their consciousness or not, is immaterial. For the August resolution summed up all the cowardice and vacillations of the reformist period - which were already there in the minds of a section of the cadres. It did nothing to remove them. The task of the Sectt. was to fight the heritage of reformism which it not only did not do, but it strengthened old reformist ideas. So that the ranks or section of leaders - even when they did not read the resolution, were exactly where they were - rooted in reformism.

Yesterday I clearly nailed down the real meaning of your tactics to fight police terror. It is now seen in action in connection with the railway strike.

Do you want to see how what I described as the advice of professional strike-breakers was utilised by a PCM to break the strike? How the same phrases, the same

hypocritical pose of being a realist and of carrying on the fight? I am quoting Santosh's report on strike preparation on OTR - on the basis of reports reached on 6th March. "It seems that even after a week's campaigning the Katihar comrades could not look forward to the organisation of picketing on 9th, were not confident about the organisation of strike on 9th March. The PCM in his report said 'waking up the mood of the workers and in accordance with actual mood prevalent on 9th or after and utilising any particular issue (this emphasis mine), the key militants will have to come out openly inside the department at a particular moment - for a strike with flaming agitation and rousing the workers in a demonstrative fashion.'

And how is this blatant defiance of Party directive, by deferring strike beyond 9th March justified? See if you see yourself in this justification.

"The PCM concerned in his report to the OTR Fraction Secretary says about the decision, "It is a tactics of mustering all our forces as quickly as possible, and as cautiously as possible and then throwing all our forces at the right moment for bringing the workers on strike. It is a blitzkrieg tactic - namely lightning strike. I don't feel that strike is possible through any other tactics at the present stage."

Do you hear the echoes - of your treacherous tactics here: Be cautious when the enemy is forewarned; be aggressive when he is taken unawares? You see the real meaning of your phrases. Retreat when the enemy advances; appear aggressive in phrases when you are breaking a strike in action. This wonderful PCM enriches your contribution - you thought of taking the enemy unawares; he thinks of taking the workers unawares - his advocacy of lightning strike is really a retreat before enemy propaganda, and pressure. Having no confidence to win over the majority of the workers even for a strike, he wants to rely on a select group of militants who were to suddenly bring out the stoppage on some ~~xxx~~ issue or the other. He is acting exactly as the bourgeois believe Communists act - as only agents of the bourgeoisie really act in practice, as only reformists act in practice or goondas act. His practice is coupist practice. And in the bargain he does not understand what a lightning strike is. He has got bourgeois ideas about lightning strikes. He thinks they can be brought about with the majority being moved. This is wrong. This is a lie spread by the bourgeoisie. A lightning strike takes place only when there is accumulated discontent among the majority of the workers. It takes place without a previous plan and often bursts forth on non-essential issues - because of lack of conscious organisation and preparation, and leadership. It only shows that the workers are not brought under the influence of trade unions led by Communists. But this does not mean that the strike takes place without discontent or that in reality it takes place all of a sudden. It is the result of accumulated discontent, suppressed discontent over months. It arises when working class discontent fails to find organised expression. That is why it often breaks out on petty issues - and actually the real major demands are added by the workers afterwards. The capitalists take advantage of this and propagate that the major demands were not the real issue but some petty demand was the cause of the strike. The fact that the strike breaks out on some small matter - shows the really primitive spontaneous character of the strike - when distinction between major and minor demands itself is not made very clearly. It shows backwardness. This great PCM wants to go back to the days when neither the trade unions nor Party existed and organise "a lightning strike" all to cover up strike-breaking and conceal that he is shamelessly refusing to carry out the directive of the CC.

But the point is do you realise the responsibility of the Sectt. in this treacherous game? You had said, "Be cautious when the enemy is forewarned." This ~~is~~ PCM finds the enemy not sleeping to oblige him. He therefore wants to gather his forces but as cautiously as possible - how well put exactly in your style? You had advocated strategy of fighting in two's and three's - and he follows you and ~~xxx~~ asks the militants - who number only a few - to take their enemy unawares. The picture is complete.

And about all this - you members of the Sectt. say not a word and keep silent.

And after doing all this you and your Sectt. had the audacity to criticise the PB note on the railway strike - the note written I believe on 17th March. Instead of understanding how when there was no information in the hands of the PB - since no reports could have been received from the provinces - the PB could lay its finger on the exact spot - you want to find fault with the PB letter and allege that it plays into the hands of the reformists. You should have thought ten times before writing such a letter.

The trouble with all of you is that you never knew and understood the real way of fighting reformism. You think it is the same as making verbal points at one another - or solving the doubts of all the fools in the world. You do not use it as a weapon of training the Party members by putting the real state of affairs before the ranks and teaching them the real meaning of events.

The PB letter very correctly nailed down and anticipated the stand of the reformists inside the Party. The PB knew that in a typical Joshian fashion these reformists, running away from police terror, would seize upon the failure of the strike to prove that the date of the strike was wrong, that there was no support, that it should have been earlier etc. - that in any case they would take a position to undermine confidence in struggle. This is always the method of reformists. They will never say all struggle is wrong. If they say it they will be found out. They therefore oppose every struggle in concrete and thus undermine the confidence in the struggle in general. The familiar Joshian trick is to keep silent about the activity of the class enemy - repression - paint that repression was there because the struggle was premature, because we failed to win over the people - and thus give a clean certificate to the capitalists and their govt. At the same time there was another Joshian trick. In assessing the failure of struggles a real estimate of the mistakes of the Party was never made. Reformism was never unmasked. Cowardice was never uncovered. Cowardly leaders were not denounced. All this served to mislead the people into the belief that struggle itself was a mistake.

The PB having just finished the T. Line documents where this same deviation was attacked, could not fail to realise that these things would crop up again. And it correctly nailed down everything. And the surprise is how correctly and precisely it nailed them down. You in your arrogance and conceit do not even study your own reports - factual reports about what happened in the railway strike and rush to blame the PB.

Does the PB note create the impression that repression cannot be defeated? Only hardened reformists can read this meaning in it. Because the PB not only mentions repression, but also reformism, and cowardice, and you want to conveniently forget the latter two, which is not very unusual with you and the members of your Sectt. Was the PB wrong in raising the question - how is it that there could be no strike in our strong areas also and answering the question by saying - Repression was the most intense there. The PB was 100 per cent correct. It was a fact that repression was intense in our strong areas and the Party ranks in other areas were unaware of it.

How to fight this repression, what its full meaning was - was given in the PB circular of 22nd February. I hope you have read it and other Sectt. members have read it. The PB did not get jittery after 18th February as some people did. The PB asked the PMs to carry forward the struggle despite repression and fight it out. You seem to forget all this - mainly under the pressure of the reformists of the railway fraction. Only when the strike actually failed - the PB had to conclude that our comrades proved unequal to the task, got disorganised, and in cases demoralised before repression.

Secondly the PB presumes a certain level of consciousness among Party members. Those Party members or leaders who require to be taught the elementary lesson that repression can be fought should not be admitted into the Party. If there are such inside the PC, they should be expelled. The CPI can't be turned into a joke, an assortment of political idiots, who require to be told that repression can be fought, after the 2nd Congress.

/of the PB letter - that you succumbed to their interpretation

The real reason of your demand on PB and criticism of the PB letter - is that you yourself got so thoroughly demoralised by the propaganda and clamour of the reformists - being unable to reply to their interpretation/and charged the PB with producing a document which was liable to be utilised by the reformist elements. You should have blamed your own understanding and not the PB. For the PB document was a powerful weapon in your hand to study the actual facts and prove the guilt of the reformists. Santosh very nearly ~~se~~ does it and does it well in the two or three short reports and there is enough to show how the PB document was correct.

The reason why the Sectt. came to this sad end was that it allowed itself to be confused by the other vacillators - who wanted to sidetrack the issue - and really wanted to say that the strike was premature, but they dared not say it openly. They almost forced you to change the outline of your report and put prominently their own understanding - that the strike should have taken place on 1st January - which was only another way of saying that on 9th March it was wrong. The reason for taking this stand

betrayal. You succumb to the blackmailing pressure which shows that you were as much reformist as they were - though it must be admitted Santosh's report was on correct lines.

The fact is that you could not answer the simple question - which even a cell member is expected to answer - if repression could bring about such a collapse could we have not waited and prepared better - which was the new way of putting the old theory of police-provocation - of saying that our struggle was premature and it provoked the Govt. to take the offensive. You yourselves - i.e. all the members of the Sectt. - have been such hardened reformists, that you were not able to see through the question thus put - sometimes by honest elements and often by hardened reformists. The PB gave you a powerful weapon to counteract reformist interpretation of the collapse of railway strike; you could not use it the moment the vacillators began to preach the same old theory somewhat differently.

What you really wanted the PB to do was to come out with a bogus bucking up letter - saying at the end better luck next time and so on - and screening the grim reality of repression and the equally grim reality of cowardice and reformism. What you wanted the PB to show was that repression could have been countered and defeated - despite cowardice and reformism on the part of certain railway leaders & cadres; sabotage on the part of Provincial Committee. You all thought that this would have been an effective reply to those who draw the conclusion from the fact of repression and ~~xxxx~~ from the PB letter - that strike was not possible in view of the repression, and hence should have been postponed. A wrong reply however is never an effective reply. Your reply would have meant yielding to vacillators who having got this reply would have raised the next question - if the repression could have been countered in spite of all that happened in the leadership of railway workers - why could it not be countered - Is it not a fact that the workers themselves were demoralised and not prepared for strike and repression - in fact statements about the workers being demoralised have been made ^{by} some railway comrades and following in the footsteps of the Secretariat's August report - they charged the workers with demoralisation. Did you not say in your August report that the net result of all struggles was demoralisation of the working-class?

And these comrades, like you not daring to see their face in the mirror, wanted to escape blame - and read in the PB letter only repression and not the denunciation of reformists. And you succumb to it and are bound to reply in a way which screens the treacherous role of reformism and gives false assurances about the future. Your reply would not have even scored a debating point but only made them change the ground to carry on their reformist attack better. You fall into this trap because you and the Sectt. members had refused to make any self-criticism, and therefore could not see things clearly and even when you saw reformism in railway strike and correctly located it, you could not defend yourself against it when attacked. Because not having made your own self-criticism you totally underestimated the depth of reformism and its responsibility for the betrayal.

The PB however could not take such a stand and be a party to cheating the ranks and screening the reformists, screening the vacillations of honest elements. The PB takes the Party members seriously, as revolutionaries, as serious proletarian fighters and not as children who need false bucking up. It would have been an act of treachery to hide from the ranks that reformism inside the Party was a factor in the utter collapse of the strike. You now know how it betrayed the whole struggle in Tamilnad; also in your place. The PB at that time had no detailed information; yet it laid its finger correctly. The Party could progress only by unmasking the treacherous hold of reformism and not by covering it. The PB did not and does not for a moment believe that the Party will ever be able to meet repression and defeat it if its own ranks are not purged of vacillators and traitors - if purging and revolutionary education do not steel the ranks of the Party. The Sectt. wants the PB to tell the ranks that we can defeat repression without unmasking reformism - the PB cannot be a party to this cheating.

For the benefit of the Bihar Sectt., and those others who attacked the PB letter, let me produce the following quotation from Lenin:

"With reformists, Mensheviks, in our ranks, says Lenin, it is impossible to achieve victory in the proletarian revolution, it is impossible to retain it. That is obvious in principle, and it has been strikingly confirmed by the experience in Russia and Hungary.....In Russia, difficult situations have arisen many times, when the Soviet regime would most certainly have been overthrown

had Mensheviks, reformists and petty-bourgeois democrats remained in our Party....In Italy.....as is generally admitted, decisive battles between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie for the possession of state power are imminent. At such a moment it is not only absolutely necessary to remove the Mensheviks, reformists, the Turatists from the Party, but it may even be useful to remove excellent Communists who are liable to waver, and who reveal a tendency to waver towards 'unity' with the reformists, to remove them from all responsible posts...On the eve of a revolution, and at a moment when a most fierce struggle is being waged for its victory, the slightest wavering in the ranks of the Party may wreck everything, frustrate the revolution, wrest the power from the hands of the proletariat; for this power is not yet consolidated, the attack upon it is still very strong. The retirement of wavering leaders at such a time does not weaken but strengthens the Party, the working class movement and the revolution. (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol.X, pp.256-58). - Foundations of Leninism, p.91

This should be enough to expose the seriousness of the crime of the Bihar Sect. on this question. And finally it must be understood that fighting reformism is not scoring debating points against a few reformists, but exposing the whole trend represented by them, in a way which educates the ranks, and changes the practice of the Party. This means not verbal victories, but application of Marxism to a given question or vacillation or standpoint, and its exposure on the basis of realities - not replies given on the basis of bucking-up as if Party members were school children.

Another Sectt. member who commits this same mistake in the grossest manner possible is Asim. The confidence of Asim in disposing of the PB letter in a few lines written on a scrap of paper - it is no doubt admirable, but it is entirely misplaced and betrays both ignorance and a frivolous bent of mind.

Asim says that the results of the PB letter would be disastrous; that PB's characterisation that repression combined with treachery has given the first temporary setback to the railway strike, will be a weapon in the hands of cowards and traitors. This is what X Asim writes with supreme confidence:

"The PB note on failure of railway strike in my opinion brings out disastrous logic which instead of helping us to see the roots of our failure will be a weapon in the hands of cowards, traitors and reformists to say that repression combined with treachery has caused failure.

"We have done our best. Some will even say that Calcutta decision was wrong as we did not foresee unprecedented repression nor treachery of the Socialists - hence the Party was wrong." Offering advice to the PB, Asim writes with further confidence:

"The PB should have brought out and nailed down our reformist failure in exposing Socialist treachery and making organisational preparations to face the repression."

Asim's note is characteristic of all reformist elements inside the Party. Firstly it shows that what I wrote about the Secretariat getting floundered before the offensive of the reformists and succumbing to it because of its inability to answer the question of the reformists, is correct. Asim himself poses the doubts of the reformists - which seem to be his own doubts because he suggests an alternative line of understanding - which betrays his own reformism.

It is obvious that Asim either does not understand the meaning of plain words or is so steeped in reformism that the sharpest attack against reformism does not make any sense to him. How can one say that the formulation "Repression combined with treachery caused the failure" plays into the hands of reformists?

The PB letter in the very opening attacks the traitors and vacillators inside the Party. Treachery includes not only treachery of the reformists but also ~~xxxx~~ treachery from within the Party. In fact in the PB letter the word treachery is more often used in connection with the traitors from within. And besides the PB ~~xxx~~ assigns a special place to this treachery and reformism inside the ranks and puts it explicitly as one of the causes of the collapse of the strike - puts it clearly and beyond doubt though at ~~xxxx~~ that time the PB had not had the reports from the provinces. On page 2 of the letter the following is ~~xxx~~ written:

"Thirdly there is also a nauseating tale of vacillation, betrayal, cowardice

in our ranks also; and apart from this a complacency born out of our failure to understand that the govt. will strike, with all its strength. The tempo and organisation of work since January seems to be of the days of legality - of the days when strikes could be easily postponed for another six months. Otherwise how could one explain the Tamilnad Committee's plan for postponement under the plea that there was not enough time to organise the strike? Can you ever get more than 2½ months in times of revolutionary developments to organise a strike?

"Horrible opportunism, reformist mistakes, complacency etc. were shown on the GIP."

One must be utterly blind or a reformist beyond hope of redemption to miss this attack against the reformists, attack against treachery from within - and declare that the PB letter gives an opportunity to the reformists to say that they have done their best.

And this was not the first time that the PB warned against the reformists. Apart from T. Line documents which opened an all-round attack against reformism, the 22nd February Circular on Railway strike stated that there would be plenty of vacillators inside the Party, and that they might sabotage the strike and demanded that they should be removed from key positions.

Having ignored the role of treachery, and reformism inside the Party, Asim wants to give an explanation which would completely screen the reformists, also if possible the Provincial leaders and hold the PB responsible for giving a premature call for strike. He takes the same position as the Tamilnad Secretariat took with such disastrous consequences for the Party and for which the Tamilnad Sectt. had to be dissolved.

What is Asim's advice to the PB? "The PB should have nailed down our reformist failure in exposing Socialist treachery and making organisational preparations." Apparently this advice seems to be honest and innocent advice, but in reality it is dishonest. Has the PB ignored in its letter the failure to unmask the Socialists earlier? The earlier documents of the fraction, PB's advice to the fraction before the strike - had already pointed out that the fight against the Socialists must be carried on ruthlessly. The PB letter itself once more nails down the failure in the following words:

"The repression would have had no effect on the strike, rather it would have strengthened the strike, if the Party had taken up the fight against JP earlier, and the illusions and hopes about him had been fought earlier. With a greater section of railwaymen already free from confusion and illusion, the repression would have been completely defeated."

Secondly did not the letter correctly characterise the organisational failure due to reformism? The letter states this to be one of the reasons for failure of strike in our stronger areas:

"Secondly the arrest of 2,000 from our strongholds was not only a heavy blow; it was a crushing blow, because the Party had not yet got out of reformist methods of organisation - with its emphasis on the whole-time worker and lack of attention to the working worker and his leadership. The formation of strike-committees had hardly begun; like the old days the mass was to be drawn in - after the strike.

"Now more than ever our comrades will see how every failure to stick to basic organisational experience and truths leads to disaster. The strike committees are weapons of rank and file leadership in strikes; the TU leaders or Executives are not enough; for they can be easily suppressed."

How can anyone assert in face of this that the PB letter failed to nail down organisational preparations? It is not however accidental that Asim ignores these formulations. It only shows that his conception of organisation does not extend beyond agitation and other elementary forms. Obviously he does not see even faintly the meaning of strike committees etc., as the form of organisation - suited to conduct revolutionary struggles. And this organisation could not be built not because there was no time, but because of reformism inside the Party. It is because of this that though the directives were given as early as December itself, strike committees were not even thought of till the last.

Asin's comments and proposals show that not only is he a hardened reformist but is making active efforts to smuggle a reformist understanding of the railway strike and give a fresh lease of life to cowardice and treachery. If Asin's proposals had amounted to saying that failure in organisation and failure to fight the Socialists should be nailed down along with other things - he would have been at best charged with careless reading, superficial understanding. But his proposal is to make organisational failure, and failure to fight Socialists as the only causes of failure on a railway and ignore and screen the personal cowardice and betrayal that was in evidence during the strikes. What else can be the conclusion from the proposals of a person who criticises the attack on treachery as playing into the hands of reformists, and suggests some other things - as the only source of failure? He can be justly accused of objectively trying to cover the traitors.

If Asin's bankrupt formulations are accepted what will be the result? It means that:

- (1) the cowards and traitors who deserted and ran away and sabotaged struggle will be screened - and the Party will face danger of sabotage again;
- (2) it will mean the brutal role of Nehru Govt. will be screened and the fact that such repression is going to be the normal state of affairs ignored;
- (3) it will mean that the cause of the failure did not lay in reformism, in the most brutal repression, but lay in failure to do a few organisational tricks, made in time - not in having a reformist outlook on organisation itself;
- (4) and further it will mean making the failure to fight the Socialists - one of the two basic causes of the failure of strike - whereas in fact the failure to expose the socialists was a part of the same reformism whose hideous form was seen in desertion and betrayal.

Thus under the guise of locating reformism, of nailing down the failure to fight the socialists - Asin wants to screen treachery among P. leaders and divert sidetrack attention on the socialist party.

This is typical of all reformists. To give exaggerated one-sided picture of certain factors so that the revolutionary essence is thrown out.

The reformists in their dishonesty distort all correct arguments, apply them in the wrong way and create confusion. Thus in reply to the argument that the 9th March call was premature, it is very correct to state that far from being premature, it was overdue, and that the strike should have taken place on 1st January itself when the withdrawal of cheap grains concession came into operation.

But when this argument is used by others to say that because we could not organise a strike on January 1 - we should have given up organising it on 9th March - the time had already passed - the dishonesty of these people, must be exposed. They are cowards who dare not come out openly against the strike as premature; therefore they say that opportunity had already slipped by after 1st January. They appear as defenders but are really saboteurs of strike.

Similarly in reply to those who argued that we should not have attacked JF & Co. so soon, it is correct to argue that we should have attacked much earlier, that we should have concentrated fire on the socialists long before we actually did. But those who distort this to mean that our failure to do so had sealed the doom of the strike, and it was this that was responsible for the failure - must be denounced as liars and rogues who want to screen the treachery from inside. As the PB letter puts it, all the required opportunities for a successful strike existed, repression and reformist betrayal could succeed because the railway leaders failed to act as revolutionaries. It is a lie to suggest that failure to expose the socialists had sealed the doom of the strike. It had not. It had made the strike difficult, no doubt. Till February 15 the Party could reap the full advantage from the fact that the AIRF itself was formally committed to a strike - and if this had been utilised to strengthen will to strike and expose the socialists and build revolutionary organisation - there would have been no failure.

Asin is thus wrong on all points. Incidentally if Asin's points had been accepted it would have helped the reformists to screen themselves and in the name of self-criticism pass on the blame to the Central Committee and PB for its alleged failure to organise exposure of the socialist party - though ~~not~~ in fact this charge could not have been substantiated. The real thing that comes from Asin's note is (1) Save the traitors (2) Blame the Socialists (3) Blame the PB

(4) Say that we could not organise - did not prepare - say it in a way which will show that the Party was going for strike without preparation - he forgets that was sabotage.

This stand of Asin is not accidental. Asin it seems was absent, could not be contacted by the Party or the railway workers' leaders between 12th February to 1st April. In the most crucial period of the railway strike preparations, between 12th February and 9th March - during the period when the most brutal oppression was let loose on the workers, this member of the Sectt. was out of 'contact', could not contact any DC or railway leaders, and remained unemployed. Nothing could be more disgusting and repulsive than this. In its 22nd February Circular the PB had warned against this in the following words, fully knowing that there would be such comrades in the ranks of the Party:

"Remaining in u.g. should not mean remaining u.g. from the class-struggle, from one of the biggest class-actions under our leadership."

In his so-called Self-Criticism submitted to the Prosectt. Asin writes the following about his being away from the Party and the working class in the crucial hour:

"However I reached the Centre anyhow and found almost all tech cadres are panicky. Shelter man had run away; they could not provide me a single shelter even for two days so that I could go away to bustee area. I left my centre for the provincial centre but on way I decided to remain in my midway centre and contact the local DC for centre directly. Two attempts failed. Then I contacted province - a strong reply for my failure and directive to reach Hazara DC centre and therefrom contact Manbhun DC and go ahead with our plan of coal general strike along with the railway. In case I fail, then contact Menghyr DC and work for railway strike. I contacted Giridih - they asked not to go there, they can't provide shelter. Already to contact Mahesh I sent messenger. But after many failures due to bungling of my messenger and contact man, could meet very late. Then he asked me to take up the full responsibility of Tech work as railway strike period had ended by that time. So I stayed on to make some preparations for shelter, production centre and dumps.

"So as a whole from 12th February to April 1st I remained of no use to the Party. This was a great failure on my part and how serious it is other comrades will opine."

To say the least this is not self-criticism but self-justification. The comrade is not horrified by what he has done, his absence from the field of action at the most crucial moment; does not see it as a crime; has no regrets; he attempts to explain it away and throws the blame on others, and towards the end graciously concedes that it was a great failure on his part but does not think it necessary to pronounce any other verdict and seeks escape by saying other comrades will judge. Other comrades will of course judge and they will not have the slightest hesitation in denouncing this kind of self-criticism as dishonest, and expressing boundless ego.

Need we then wonder why Asin takes a stand on railway strike which seeks to cover the deserters and vacillators.

The Sectt. instead of unmasking Asin's stand succumbs to his pressure and sends a letter to the PB saying that part of the PB letter were unfortunately worded. It is true that the Sectt. very correctly condemned the railway fraction for its report, rejected it, and advanced some correct reasons also. But all this it seems was done out of a sense of duty, carrying out the directive of the higher committee without inner conviction. Otherwise the Sectt. letter complaining about the PB letter, and repeating the same complaints that were made by Asin and others - cannot be explained.

Such is the failure of the Sectt. to understand the railway strike, the happenings connected with it, the PB lead in connection with it. It is obvious that though Santosh guided by the PB letter laid his finger on the spot, though he correctly nailed down cowardice and reformism; though the Sectt. correctly nailed down cowardice and reformism; though the Secretariat condemned the railway fraction - still because the Sectt. itself had not unmasked its own reformism, it was not able to use the PB letter as a weapon to fight the reformists and unmask them.

And then why are you all without exception silent on the students' struggle? Why do you bypass it in a few words? It is known that the PC lead was not a good

lead; that the most disgusting and disgraceful exhibition of opportunism, cowardice before reformists and funk before militancy of the masses - was in evidence in the student struggle in Patna - that our comrades shared with others: betrayal practised against the students; that you yourself took an opportunist stand and attacked, if I believe correctly, Girdhar's report from the right (I am basing myself on Jatin's note). In any case had you at that time learnt even the slightest degree from the students' struggle you would have been tremendously helped in organising the railway strike. For what happened on this front in Patna was nothing but the forewarning of what was to come on the railway front - reformism, cowardice, funk etc. You refused to learn and had to pay a heavy price. And in your self-criticism - all of you are unanimous in bypassing this shady episode because the fingers of all of you were equally dirty.

Before I turn to your, i.e. the Secretariat's claims to have taken a correct stand on the agrarian question - I will mention one or two points. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~
~~xxxxxx~~

In your August report in typical Joshian fashion you pose to fight for a bigger cause and in reality stultify the Party and liquidate its vanguard role in the consciousness of the masses.

On page 5, under the sub-title "Repression and Terror", though you admit that the K.C.P. is leading the upsurge and that is why it is being attacked - yet this is only a formal admission; for you and your Sectt. forget it as soon as it is made, equate the CP with other parties and argue like a liberal when defending the CPI. This is what you write:

"Thus what we are witnessing today is just not simple repression against Communist Party. It is the onslaught of counter-revolution against the great forces of the democratic revolution. It is the beginning of the emergence of colonial fascism."

May I know under what conditions a simple repression against the CP takes place without it simultaneously being a repression of the democratic revolutionary forces? If a liberal were to put like this, if Sachidanand Sinha were to say it it will be a progressive for him. When the Bihar Secretariat says this it means they have abjured Marxism and accepted liberalism. It will be very correct to say that in attacking the CP the Govt. is attacking the revolutionary forces etc. But this is not what you mean. You unlink the CP from the revolutionary movement. It shows that when you said that the CP heads the upsurge, it had not much meaning for you.

This is because in typical Joshian fashion you unconsciously equate the other reformist parties to the CP. You write:

"But the attack is not confined to the Communists alone. All other struggling elements - rank and file socialists, Forward Blocists, workers of other left parties and groups (e.g. RSPI, ROPI, Swami-ites), even Congressmen (in Madhubani and anti-flood struggle) have been subjected to the same brutal repression."

You here try to save your conscience by only talking about the rank and file, but you tend to think that other parties themselves are being repressed - and draw wrong and opportunist conclusions.

Firstly your statement that the ranks of other parties are also being subjected to the same brutal treatment as our ranks is a barefaced lie, a shameless perversion of facts. If in Bihar this is the case, if repression against our ranks and the Swami-ites is of the same type, it only means that we are conducting our fight in a reformist way. Everywhere else there is no comparison between brutal repression launched against us - and the measures taken against the ranks of other parties. We are talking here of the ranks and not the masses who are brutally suppressed - whenever militant struggles take place. This is simple to understand. The wholesale repression of their ranks will not be attempted unless their policy changes.

Through equating repression directed against both you equate not only the ranks completely but also the parties. It is not difficult to understand that whatever repression may be directed against their ranks can only be casual, incidental, since the policy of these parties is reformist policy. Besides in many cases repression is directed against the ranks when they disobey their reformist leaders and go in faction over their heads, i.e. when they turn towards us.

Thus forgetting the leading role of the Party, you tend to equate our ranks with their ranks, and our Party with other parties. You see it is not here a question of protesting against repression directed against followers of other parties. We will always protest against it. Nor is here a question of offering united front to the ranks of other parties. What you are laying down is that repression against the ranks of other parties is as fierce as against us - and from that drawing the conclusion that we are not the leading force, that if we protest that our Party is being repressed we will be isolated. See now in a thorough-going opportunist manner you pose the issue on page 23 under Tactical Lessons: "In agitation never pose the issue as govt. versus the Communists for this leads to the neutralisation of the common man and the isolation of the Party. ~~And~~ That is precisely how the Congress leaders try to pose the issue. Hence the aim of our agitation should be to turn bourgeois propaganda upside down and pose over issue as between Government and the people. It is only then that we get maximum response, for that is what corresponds to reality."

If ~~you~~ you had stated that the Congress leaders in justification of repression against us propagate that we artificially incite the masses, that our aims and struggles are not the genuine product of the social movement, and thus try to isolate us, and that we should defeat their game by repeatedly stressing the fact that we are repressed because we boldly lead the masses in their struggle for emancipation, that we should always bring to the forefront the fact that it is the demands of the masses that we express, that the struggle conducted and led by us is the struggle of the millions - and thus defeat all attempts to make it appear that the movement led by us is something different than what the interests of the masses required, and that whatever happens the CP will continue to lead and be in the forefront - you would have been right. The masses themselves are to be taught that the aims of the CP and their interests are indivisible. They are to be made conscious through action, agitation, and propaganda, that the CPI is their leader - their only leader and vanguard.

Instead of this what do you advocate, how do you put the issue? You ask comrades to abjure propaganda about the vanguard role, the leading role of the Party, you ask them not to put forward before the masses that the Party, their Party is being repressed because it alone has the courage to lead them, and you frighten the Party members in typical Joshiian fashion that if you talk about your own sacrifices and leading role of the Party you will be isolated.

This and nothing else is the meaning of your apparently innocent directive to never pose the issue as govt. vs. the Communists. Obviously there will be some comrades in Bihar who might put the issue wrongly - make it appear that it is a narrow quarrel between the govt. and the Communists and the masses have nothing to do with it. Such comrades have to be educated in the proper method of agitation and proper understanding of the issues involved. Instead you make opportunist formulations. You give directives which make it appear that the Govt. is not getting isolated but it is the Communists that are likely to be isolated; you put the issue as if a terrific anti-Communist feeling exists among the masses, i.e. existed when you wrote the report - and that one has to be extremely cautious in referring to the Party. This fits in with your theory of counter-revolution on the offensive; with your idea that the ranks of all political parties are being equally suppressed; there is nothing exceptional about the CPI. You do not see that the govt. is getting rapidly discredited; and that we are gaining; that is why you dare not come out with a bold call telling the comrades to boldly put forward the sacrifices of Party members, the courageous lead of the Party, and consolidate our position of lead.

You know that in the period of reformism it was considered to be sectarian to glorify the Party, its sacrifices, before the masses. Only the virtues of the two bourgeois organisations - Congress and the League were sung before the masses. You continue this Joshiite policy in your August Report.

In Bihar as in other provinces, there was fear of fighting for the Party among the masses. Enough evidence of this is to be found in the way the student struggle was conducted in Patna, when petty bourgeois members showed that they were ashamed to own that they were Communists and failed to work as Communists. Instead of breaking thru this shameless spectacle the Sectt. gives an ideological cover to it. The fear of talking about the Party, the fear of isolation if the Party is glorified is nothing but the petty bourgeois hesitation about the Party of the working class - hesitation of petty bourgeois members who have not yet forgotten the election days when the bourgeois leaders temporarily set

sections of the people against the Party. It is real petty bourgeois funk before the Party, lack of faith in the masses. This fear was natural when the Party considered the Congress petty bourgeois masses to be the masses. But now when the Party has again turned towards basic masses decisively, it only betrays that certain people will not learn.

A correct call in this respect should have been (1) explain to the masses the identity of the aims of the Party and the interests of the masses (2) boldly put across ~~kk~~ before the masses the leading role of the Party (3) glorify the sacrifices of the Party and glorify the Party as the only champion of the masses (4) attack the govt. boldly and precisely (5) put the Party's role in an inspiring manner (6) have no fear that you will be isolated - masses are in a fighting mood and the Party line reflects their interests and present mood.

What you have written is however not accidental. Your Sectt. does not accept the leading role of the CP. This is what your Sectt. writes in utter repudiation of the Party Thesis, "Precisely because sections of the toiling masses are getting disillusioned but are groping for want of an alternative leadership, it is necessary to popularise the idea of the democratic front, as the coalition of fighting people against the coalition of the ruling minority. The Communist Party, the Kisan Sabha, the Trade Unions, the Students' Federation should be popularised as elements of the democratic front..... "

your

From where does ~~kk~~/Sectt. collect this nonsense, how dares it to introduce a Party document? Why didn't show the modesty to quote the Political Thesis of the Party on the democratic front? You put the Democratic Front as an alternative leadership - Not the Communist Party - nor working class leadership as expressed thru the CFI - but the Democratic Front - was to be the alternative leadership. This is Tito nonsense and nothing but abjuration of the working class leadership and the leading role of the Party.

And as if this was not enough you openly state: "The CP, Kisan Sabha, Trade Union, Students' Federation should be popularised as elements of the democratic front." So CP is only one of the important elements, on the same level as any mass organisation. Do you want any more convincing evidence of the abjuration of the leading role of the Party, and of the hegemony of the working class?

The Political Thesis throughout talks about working class leadership. And when it once mentions the CP and the mass organisations led by it as the core of the democratic front - it does so in relation to the other masses - the masses not yet directly under the influence of the Party. The Thesis never puts the CFI and mass organisations on the same level and suggest that they all are just elements of democratic front.

And finally you make confusion worse confounded by saying that the struggle for democratic front should be conducted as an integral part of the partial struggle of the fighting masses. You could as well have put that the political struggle, the revolutionary struggle to overthrow the Nehru Govt. - is an integral part of the struggle for wage-increase in Monghyr tobacco factories - and it would have been on par with your formulation in the August Report.

Further in typical Joshian fashion the Secretariat regards politics, political campaigns etc. as something apart and in isolation from the real class-struggle of the masses. Read your learned disquisitions on political campaigning, the way you put political campaigning in relation to the partial struggles - and you will see that the Sectt. is carrying out Joshi's traditions. For Joshi the epithet of the petty bourgeois leader - on an issue which they thought to be important - i.e. on issues considered important by the bourgeoisie - was political campaigning - was politics. The actual struggle of the masses, the experience gained therein, the politics learnt therein was all trade unionism. And when Party leaders attempted to carry forward the developing awakening coming out of the daily struggles and link it with the revolutionary aims and movement of the proletariat - when directly from the daily class-struggles they pushed the workers forward to the realisation of the revolutionary aims and did not allow the workers to be sidetracked into bourgeois politics - it was called sectarianism. The main trick was to regard political awakening as apart from the actual class-struggle and you commit the same mistake.

To such as you and the members of the Bihar Sectt. the following from Lenin will be of great benefit: "When the bourgeois gentry and their uncritical chorus of satellites, the social reformists, talk priggishly about the education of the masses by education they usually mean something school-masterly, podantic, something that demoralises the ~~xx~~ masses and imbues them with bourgeois prejudices.

"The real education of the masses can never be separated from the independent, the political, and particularly from the revolutionary struggle of the masses themselves. Only the struggle educates the exploited class. Only the struggle discloses to it the magnitude of its own power, widens its ~~xxxxxx~~ horizon, enhances its abilities, clarifies its mind, forges its will; and therefore even reactionaries had to admit that the year 1905, the year of struggle, the mad year, definitely, buried patriarchal Russia." (Lenin Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 66)

The great discovery of Raghu and the Secretariat, that what was needed for the working class was education, and in the absence of it they were getting demoralised, that without political campaigning it was impossible to conduct the partial struggles - and hence for some time the partial struggles be stopped or toned down till the working class had completed its education in schools run by you - is nothing but the most stinking reformism. This was an attempt to educate in isolation from the struggle. Secondly the understanding of the malady was wrong. The masses were completing their education rapidly in the fierce class struggles but were not able to learn quickly precisely because their leaders the Communists were lacking in revolutionary education. The working-class - the masses - learn quickly and rapidly firstly in the struggle and secondly when the struggle is led by a real Marxist-Leninist leadership, which at every step is able to organise their consciousness and make them realise the meaning of events, happenings and developments quickly, enable them to take decisive action and learn from its own action. In the absence of such leadership the process of learning is no doubt slow and painful through plenty of mistakes. But the masses never learn apart from the struggle. Your idea of substituting education for struggle was a reformist idea and showed contempt for the masses who were learning more quickly than ~~axx~~ many Communists.

What was the disease? The real disease was that certain petty bourgeois cadres, as well as working class members were getting demoralised in face of brutal repression, because of their total failure to fulfil the tasks of the leadership. They were neither able to understand the brutal repression, nor properly plan the repeated resistance of the masses to it. If you had formulated that masses were forging ahead, and our members were not able to fulfil the function of the leadership for lack of Marxist-Leninist training - you would have been right - for that is what the Second Congress also had laid down. You would have been right in opening schools to train Party members in Marxism-Leninism, to train them in the science of revolutionary leadership. This itself however can never be done by toning down struggles or contrasting Marxist education to struggles of the masses which the Secretariat ~~xxxx~~ indirectly did.

The Secretary's cry of education was not a genuine demand for Marxist-Leninist training of cadres, Party members and advanced elements from the masses, but an excuse to withdraw from the fierce class struggle.

Coming to your claims on the kisan front, and the Sectt. document - including the August report - it would not have been necessary to ~~discuss them in detail~~ discuss them in detail. After the PB resolution on agrarian question you should have been able to make your own self-criticism and your mistakes. But you have failed miserably and tried to make out that you and some other members of the Secretariat took a correct stand from the beginning at least in some respects. Raghu also took the same stand when he first read the document on agrarian question and claimed that he and the Bihar Sectt. independently reached more or less the same conclusion, as the PB.

If it were really a fact, it would have been a very good thing - for it would have meant strength of Marxism inside the Party. But unfortunately the claim had no basis except in the imagination of certain individuals.

Ordinarily we are not concerned with such opinions. But when it harms the Party and Party comrades, and prevents their development it has to be taken note of.

Such opinion prevents the leaders or members concerned from changing their outlook completely, from understanding where a complete break must be made and therefore keeps them where they are. The Party units under their leadership also remain where they are. This exaggerated opinion about oneself thus becomes a crime against the movement.

Firstly your "Note on the Question of Agricultural Labour" is an alternative thesis on agrarian question - repudiating the Party line as laid down in the Political Thesis. Needless to say it is in utter contradiction to the understanding of the agrarian situation as developed in the Agrarian Question. No one can blame you or the Bihar Sectt. for not reaching the same clear conclusions as those in the PB document. But you deserve condemnation when you repudiate what was written in the Political Thesis - and in the bargain make impermissible basic formulations. Under the guise of writing a note on the Question of Agricultural Labour, you smuggle in basic formulations not accepted by the Party. Every formulation that you make is an open repudiation of the Party line and of the principles of Marxism. Your note is an essay of a liberal bourgeois professor who seeks to embellish his liberalism with phrases from the Marxist terminology to fool the people.

The fact that Raghu the CCM and all the members of the Bihar Sectt. and PC - all those who attack you supported your note enthusiastically, or swallowed it - the fact that none has unmasked it as a crude hoax shows the deplorable level of Marxism of all of you.

That You have produced such a document and supported it after the Second Party Congress was a crime in itself. Not to have seen thru it, denounced it, after the PB's resolution on Agrarian Question, People's Democracy, Tactical Line - etc. was a bigger crime. And not to have nailed it down when you were given an opportunity to review it, is a still worse crime. And this crime is committed by all of you - all the members of the Sectt. or PC - all of them fail to admit this common crime.

Firstly you and all those including Raghu who accept your documents, all those who do not protest show boundless impertinence and reveal your repudiation of Marxism-Leninism when you sit in judgement over Lenin's definition of agricultural labourers and ask the ranks to pronounce their verdict on it. In the entire history of the Party there has not been another instance of this impertinence, this open repudiation of Leninism. You and your Sectt. think that Lenin's definitions are to be bandied about by people like you. You do this after the Party Congress when Comrade Adhikari was strongly criticised for deleting a certain passage from Stalin's writing. You do it after the Party Congress which gave a call to study Marxism-Leninism, to show proper respect to the works of founders of Marxism, to the classics written by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. For this amazing (action) you deserve to be denounced in Party journals, as open revisionists. In this respect the crime of Comrade Adhikari exceeds yours. He was elected by the Party Congress to wage a war against revisionism, and to defend Marxism-Leninism. It was expected that he would not commit revisionist mistakes, that he would guard himself against at least the grossest of mistakes, at least against these which were denounced in the Congress itself. The hopes have been belied. He betrayed the trust. And in his supreme ignorance and blindness he is still unconscious of the betrayal.

This is what you solemnly write in your introductory note: "We are ourselves trying to study more of Lenin's writings and find out if he had anything very specific to say on this question. But as the problem is one of ~~kk~~ great practical importance and urgency we would like you to ~~xxx~~ enlighten us about a precise definition of agricultural labourers and their relationship with wage-earning poor peasants or agricultural labourers or even rural artisans." So when Lenin could not enlighten you, you seek the light from Provincial Committee members, flatter them in the meanest possible manner, and thus prove that you are democratic. Surely democracy and flattery are ~~x~~ synonymous terms with you.

After reading Development of Capitalism, Lenin's Agrarian Thesis - you say Lenin had nothing definite to say about agricultural proletariat and you were making further researches. And you ask PCMs to sit in judgement over Lenin. This is how you understand Leninism. Surely there are no limits to the effrontery of the Bihar Secretariat.

And all this because a certain member of your Sectt., Mahesh - did not agree with Lenin's definition. You therefore refer the dispute to the arbitration, the

vote of the PCMs - instead of branding Mahesh as an anti-Leninist. You also become an anti-Leninist, compromise with Mahesh and substitute Lenin's definition by the definition of Yen-Pi-Shih - and restore working agreement. And in the bargain when you quote Lenin you interpret wrongly.

You and your secretariat have read Stalin's Leninism. And you still do not realise that Lenin's analysis, directives, definitions cannot be made subject matter of discussion. And Raghu the CCM supports you in this repulsive crime.

Coming to the contents of your document, for which you claim credit in your self-critical review, what does it say? Your document though it formally talks of agricultural labourers, appears to recognise the role of the agricultural labourer in the agrarian revolution, in reality repudiates this role in the crassest possible manner. Though you bandy the phrase "development of capitalist relations" a lot, it is obvious that you do not see the major classes that emerge out of this development superimposed on the old. You do not understand the meaning of capitalist development, the meaning of commodity production - and how classes develop out of it, in what relation they stand to the agrarian classes already existing. All this you should have seen at least after reading the "Agrarian Question" and criticised your own document. But you do not do it.

Instead of seeing growth of capitalist relations you see a throw back to serfdom and feudalism; "The growth of the Batai system - a semi-feudal system in the midst of the general trend towards development of capitalism - is the expression of deterioration, retardation, and stagnation of this development. For while the expropriation of the mass of the peasantry at a fairly rapid pace is leading to the inevitable concentration of land in the hands of a small section of landlords and rich peasants and to the creation of a daily swelling army of landless proletariat, yet the absence of ~~xxx~~ technical facilities for the growth of capitalist farming, is leading to the batai system, to the creating of a new serfdom adapted to the needs of a feudal colonial economy yoked to capitalism - the economy which is so characteristic of our country at the present time." You try to save your conscience by referring to capitalism, by describing our economy as yoked to capitalism - but it is obvious you understand nothing of capitalism and the phrase has no meaning for you except to deceive yourself and others into the belief that you are saying something which is according to Party line.

The real thing that you want to stress here is new serfdom - and this you allege arises from the mass expropriation of the peasantry. The mass expropriation does not create the new class of agrarian proletariat, but a new class of serfs, and you and those who support you claim that you are champions of agricultural labourers, that you stand for agricultural labourers, that you correctly saw how capitalist development was taking place in agriculture.

You make this same impermissible formulation in a different way, in your August Report.

"The Central development on the Kisan Front during and since the war year is the consolidation of the feudal-bourgeois alliance in the countryside. The old feudal zamindars have taken to capitalist forms of exploitation like farming (still on a small scale) grain-trade (profiteering) money-lending and investments in industries, ~~xxx~~ banks etc. The new rising class of capitalist kulaks (as also industrialists, bankers, sugar mill owners, etc.) village money-lenders, and traders have concentrated huge areas of land in their hands, large portions of which they have let out on feudal forms of rent like batai, Sarah, Manhunda etc. Thus, the distinction between feudal landlords and capitalist kulaks is largely being effaced in practice, both resorting to rentiering, grain-hoarding (profiteering), money-lending and land grabbing on a more or less equal scale. This development is leading to the expropriation of the peasantry on a mass scale and the concentration of land in the hands of this small class (of zamindars and kulaks) at a fast pace. The forms of this expropriation are purchase, nilami, settlement or forceful evictions.(p.28)

Here once more under the guise of placing capitalist development you assert that feudalism is triumphing - assert that capitalists are becoming feudalists. You assert in the most nonchalant manner - "the distinction between the feudal landlords and kulaks is being effaced in practice" - as both resort to feudal exploitation and profiteering. A more nonsensical formulation cannot be imagined. For according to this it means that while landlords are becoming capitalists, capitalists are

becoming feudalists. You forget the simple fact that landlords will not resort to pillaging, grain trade etc. unless the strength of capitalist relation has developed i.e. of commodity production and exchange had developed. And you also fail to see that while some of the now rich might be investing in land and using old forms of exploitation, yet the content is new, the purpose is different - commodity production, sale for profit. The form more and more becomes only the form with a new content.

The facts cited by you should have served you and the Sectt., to deduce the strength of capitalist relations. Not being able to do this you in reality deduce that it is feudal relations that are triumphing and afraid of openly stating it. You come ~~xxx~~ out with a new theory of integration of the bourgeois and feudal elements - a formulation never made in any Party document especially in the sense in which you make it - capitalists going back to feudal methods of exploitation. Obviously so long as a thorough-going agrarian revolution does not take place, feudal methods of exploitation ~~xxxxxxxx~~ continue to exist, but the point is to see the new trend, the relative strength of the old and the new. Obviously if the forces of struggle are defeated and a revolutionary solution is not found, the most barbaric methods of serfdom forced labour may be combined with exchange and sale of commodities. Even then this will be done in the service of commodity production and exchange - which will be the dominating reality.

It is because of this impermissible formulation that your Sectt. totally misleads the Party ranks in Bihar in its analysis of the Zamindari Bill. According to you the Zamindari Bill "seeks to abolish the distinction still existing (i.e. of legal status) between the zamindars and the capitalist kulaks, to consolidate both in the new class of capitalist 'ryots' (i.e. land monopolists) and to aid and support them in expropriating the poor and the lower middle peasants." Barring the reference to the expropriation of peasants everything is wrong here. According to you the bill seeks to make feudal landlords out of kulaks. For what also is meant by abolishing the distinction between the two when you say that distinction is one of legal status only, and that the kulaks are feudal exploiters - since they use feudal forms of exploitation. At the same time you add that by abolishing the distinction between kulaks and landlords, by giving the same status to the kulaks, zamindars and kulaks will be consolidated in a new class called capitalist 'ryots' (i.e. land monopolists) Even you will not be able to make any sense out of this formulation. Zamindars + kulaks = capitalist ryots - land monopolists. What is one to make out of it?

It is because of this that you fail to see the growing collapse of the old agrarian system, in the growing number of agricultural workers, in the mass expropriation of peasants, and fail to see both the importance of the agricultural workers, the new character of their struggles, the character of the agrarian revolution, and the nearness of the agrarian revolution.

You and your Sectt., after witnessing the glorious struggle of Tel engana, are so inspired by it, that you very cautiously talk about the agrarian revolution as if it were far off, as if we are not in the midst of it. The August Report writes: "Thus, the central ~~xxx~~ task of the Party on the kisan front is to lead all these spontaneously growing struggles, to consciously raise them to a higher stage and mould them towards the goal of agrarian revolution round the central ~~slogan of land to the tiller~~ slogan of land to the tiller." This long-winded formulation which reminds one of "the progressive realisation of self-Government" slogan of the British, shows what faith in the agrarian revolution you have. It almost appears as if you and your Sectt. are in a fright that Party members might think the agrarian revolution is very near, and your effort is to disabuse their mind of this frightful idea.

You no doubt ~~xx~~ write about the agricultural workers - relying on agricultural workers and poor peasants etc.; but in reality you often argue as if only serfs exist, and the stage of revolution ~~of xxx~~ is for making the serfs private property owner - the anti-feudal revolution of the French Revolution type.

In your note on agricultural labourers you make the following statement: "But the growth of the Batai system is not explained by this queer complexity alone. For behind this seeming confusion of different forms and features lies a definite trend - the trend of transition towards capitalism. It is this trend which constitutes the driving force behind the struggles of the Bataidars, the Bowli peasants, and the serf and semi-serf labourers towards assertion of the occupancy over the land under their possession and the fixation of a capitalist (and not feudal) cash rent."

This constitutes the essence of your understanding about the capitalist development in agriculture. It is nothing but again covering the reformist policy and understanding of the pre-Congress period and in a manner in which no one dared to do it. You and your Sectt. members claimed when you last met us - and Raghu was perhaps persistent in claiming that the Bihar Sectt. had already come to an understanding of the capitalist development in agriculture. After reading the Agrarian Question it should have been clear to you that your understanding of capitalist development in agriculture is diametrically opposite to the understanding of the PB. The PB when it sharply brought forward the fact that capitalist relations have developed in agriculture, drew from it the conclusion that along with the feudal landlord the capitalist exploiter also has to be fought, that the capitalist monopoly also is to be broken, that out of the revolution not petty producers' property, but nationalisation - which will lead to socialisation rapidly - as soon as the material conditions for large-scale production are created.

For the PB the development of capitalist relations in agriculture meant that the fight could be decisively led by the new class of agricultural labourers, since it was not only an anti-feudal fight; it meant a complete break with the past understanding that the fight was against feudal landlords only and the peasants were an undifferentiated mass.

For you and the Sectt. the development of capitalism in agriculture means - now the ground is getting ripe for the ordinary type of bourgeois revolution - installing petty producer, i.e. for capitalism and capitalist exploitation of agriculture - since petty production only leads to that. That is, you are saying the same thing that was being said before the Party Congress - and much worse. No one had suggested in the last 20 years that the next era in agriculture in India is that of capitalism. Such a formulation was not made even in the worst period of reformism, though the practice was based on such an understanding. But you are making the formulation and going back on the accepted understanding of 20 years back - the understanding given in the Thesis of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International. You are saying something which has been exploded long ago - the possibility of capitalism playing a progressive role.

How do you argue - You openly state that the struggle of the peasants is a capitalist struggle; that it is a struggle for fixing capitalist cash rent - which in relation to the small peasant can only mean for capitalist exploitation - i.e. the peasants are demanding that they should be exploited in the capitalist way and not in the feudal way. This is what you mean by capitalist development in agriculture. You reduce the peasants' and agricultural workers' struggle for agrarian revolution, for abolition of landlord monopoly, for overthrow of all exploitation - as only a struggle for ushering capitalist exploitation, capitalist relations. You & your Sectt. not only slander the agrarian masses but you become apologists of the capitalist order. And to lend semblance to this argument you do away with the existence of agricultural labourers by calling them serfs and semi-serfs. The reality is that according to your understanding there are no agricultural labourers, but only serfs and therefore the type of revolution is 18th century bourgeois revolution.

So firm is your conviction that we are in the 18th century - that you negate the existence of agricultural labourers, and try to prove that only serfs exist; that there is a throw-back to feudalism. "The growth of the Batai system - a semi-feudal system in the midst of the general trend towards capitalism is the expression of distortion, retardation and stagnation of this development. For while the expropriation of the mass of peasantry at a fairly rapid pace is leading to the inevitable concentration of land in the hands of small section of the landlords and rich peasants to the creation of a daily swelling ~~xxxxxxx~~ army of landless proletariat yet the absence of technical facilities for the growth of capitalist farming, is leading to the batai system, to the creation of a new serfdom adapted to the needs of a feudal colonial economy yoked to capitalism....."

Thus the ~~xxxx~~ expropriated peasant, the landless proletariat becomes a serf. And after serfdom what is the next progressive stage? You have heard that after serfdom came the petty proprietor of land in 18th century. So you think and say that the expropriated peasant, agricultural labourer, who has become a serf - is now again becoming a proprietor, he is a budding proprietor - ".....the bataidar is a semi-serf peasant who represents a lower (i.e. more backward) economic category than the agricultural labourer. Moreover the bataidar is a peasant, a budding though brutally exploited small proprietor and is not a proletarian." See how many contradictory formulations you make.

The private producer, proprietor expropriated, becomes landless labourer, who becomes serf - becomes bataidar.

The bataidar is thus a serf - an expropriated peasant - landless workers - turned serf.

The bataidar is a semi-serf peasant.

The bataidar is a peasant, a budding though brutally exploited proprietor.

But there is a method in this madness of formulation. The method consists in attempting to prove that notwithstanding mass expropriation of peasantry - which really comes only because of development of capitalist relations, notwithstanding the growth of landless workers which is the surest sign of development of capitalist relations, of commodity production and exchange - there is nothing but serfdom in land, there is no development of capitalist relations, no commodity production, no growth of capitalist exploiters - Only classical feudalism exists and the only way in which capitalist development asserts itself is the struggle of the serfs to convert themselves into proprietors - i.e. just now the fight is only between feudalism on the one hand and capitalism in agriculture based on small private production on the other - i.e. the fight is for establishing capitalist relations and capitalist exploitation in agriculture.

Such is your thesis. That is why you repeatedly negate the agricultural labourer equating him to the serf. That is why notwithstanding the fact that you repeat like a mantram that we must rely on agricultural labourers, that they are the leading force - you do not understand the meaning of all these. What reliance can be placed on such phrases when all that you contemplate is development of capitalist exploitation? How can you make the agricultural worker play a leading part in ensuring capitalist exploitation of which he is already the worst victim.

It is therefore not accidental that you talk of freedom of competition in connection with the agricultural workers. Having imagined that the agricultural labourers are mostly serfs, you consider that freedom of competition is a progressive step. But what is freedom of competition of labourers. It means freedom to sell your labour power to the capitalists, freedom to be exploited by the capitalists. Is that a progressive step today? No doubt when only pure serfdom exists freedom to sell labour power marks the transition to capitalism, and can be considered progressive only so long as capitalism is progressive. Today whosoever talks in terms of freedom of competition as a progressive step only reveals himself as an apologist of the capitalist order.

You say that usury, wages in kind, and lack of homestead lands - all prevent freedom of competition and therefore these factors should be remedied and freedom of competition be ensured. All that you are demanding is freedom of capitalist exploitation, and removal of all obstacles to it - the same thing that a kulak or a capitalist farmer might demand.

As you see this horrible formulation logically follows from your theory that there is no capitalist development in agriculture, no capitalist exploitation, no rise of new classes, no commodity production, but only serfdom, no agricultural labourers but only serfs.

And all this because for you capitalist development does not mean commodity production and exchange, rise of new classes; you do not see these new relations rising from the old; for you capitalist development means replacement by small producers, of feudal serfs and landlords - and this you make the aim of the agrarian movement. Your standpoint really denies that capitalist relations have already developed and are developing within the feudal shell; you assert that the agricultural labourer is a serf.

Under these circumstances your claim that you understood the role of the agricultural labourers correctly, is a claim not substantiated by facts. No doubt you stood for separate organisation of labour but that is all.

Your perspective of agrarian revolution is wrong from beginning to end. You stand for capitalist development. The masses want to end capitalism. The present phase of the revolution is directed both against feudalism and capitalist exploiters. Just because it is directed against capitalism exploiters also, just because the agrarian revolution is taking place in the midst of a world anti-capitalist revolution

revolution, only the agricultural worker will be able to take firm lead in the rural areas. Why should the agricultural workers take the lead and act decisively if the aim is to ensure capitalist exploitation? You will thus see that ~~the only way~~ that you say agricultural worker must lead, you yourself will never be able to convince him why he should lead, why he should fight for his class enemy. Therefore you only verbally assert that he should lead, but you give him a perspective which only disbands him. What importance can then be attached to your claim that you understood the role of the agricultural worker correctly.

So blind you are to any real understanding of the development of capitalist relations in agriculture, to the rise of new classes, that you do not even see the conflict between the kulak and the agricultural worker. In your long document the rich peasant comes somewhere at the end, quite casually, and this is in keeping with your understanding that the agricultural worker is a serf and the fight of the serf is only against the landlord. You will see that on this understanding no successful leadership of the agricultural workers can be developed. This is nothing but the rich peasants' viewpoint and the only difference between you and Mahesh is that he does not want separate organisation of agricultural labourers while you stand for it. But in reality neither wants to fight against the rich peasant.

Obviously in Bihar as elsewhere the landless peasant, while he is forced to sell his labour power, is also encumbered with number of feudal restrictions, all intended to reduce his status to that of a serf. This is an obvious fact, if anyone were to ignore this fact, ignore these real restrictions, which are great weapons of rousing the agricultural labourers against the entire system of landlordism, if anyone were to act as if a fully grown proletariat with the consciousness of the proletariat exists, that its quarrel is only with the capitalist elements, that it is not interested in or oppressed by the landlords - then it will be wrong. It will amount cutting off the agricultural workers from the common movement for agrarian revolution.

But this is no reason why you and your Secretariat should see only serfdom and ignore the new relation, the cash relation, the sale of labour power, the new capitalist relation - which is the rising relation, which is the developing phenomenon. On the other hand you and your Sect. should have drawn the conclusion from all this about the intensity of the agrarian crisis - of the intense conflict between the two trends - the mass proletarianisation due to the development of commodity production, to capitalist relations and the constant effort to retain the old system, to hold back the clock, by attempting to put feudal restrictions on the released peasant - a conflict which never gets solved but only intensifies misery, expropriates the masses - and brings them to the realisation that it can be solved by forcibly changing all the existing social relations.

In this case what must be noted is what is progressing, and what is dying and decaying. The imposition of feudal restrictions, rendered possible by backward economic conditions, does not change the character of the social movement, does not transform the agricultural labourers into a serf. It is only the attempt of the dying and decaying to impede the march of new relations and only makes the conflict fiercer and intense. It does not signify throwback to feudalism but the fact that feudalism is crumbling. You fasten your attention only on feudal restrictions but forget the whole social process of expropriation - completely unsettling the feudal relations, because expropriation took place because of development of capitalist relations, of commodity production and exchange.

And finally this opportunist analysis of the agrarian question culminates in an open attempt to replace modern class antagonisms by caste-antagonism, in preaching disruption among the toilers, in adopting an Ambedkarite analysis of the agrarian struggles. Your analysis and understanding is only less bankrupt than the bankrupt article I once wrote on the question of untouchables in the period of reformism - an article which most shamelessly justified every separatist demand of Ambedkar. The basic mistake in your analysis as well as mine is the same - forgetting the main class-contradiction of the present day, and therefore forgetting the toilers' unity that was growing and must grow thru these struggles.

You think you have made a great discovery when you noticed that exploiters from upper-caste generally exploit the people of lower caste. So have noted this as a new thing after the disruptive role of Dr. Ambedkar, to have noted this two decades after the non-Brahmin movement in South came to an end and collapsed in face of the bourgeois national awakening, only betrays both ignorance and vanity. When you gave the slogan of Babhans and Banias - you were only saying what the non-Brahmin leaders, who had become agents of imperialism, and who were being used by imperialists against the bourgeois nationalist movement to wean away the peasant

from the Congress, were saying in Maharashtra in 1922-30, but dared not say after 1930. They were basing themselves precisely on the fact that the peasant was mistaking new class antagonism for old ones - since the Brahmin and Bania appeared as his exploiters - though in reality it was ~~the~~ Brahmin either as money-lender or landlord, that was exploiting them. To screen this new relation they made plenty of use of the caste superiority of Brahmins, the domination of the priest, the inferior status of non-Brahmins, the invidious social distinctions - all to show that it was not so much exploitation as landlord or money-lender, but as Brahmin that was the main thing. No doubt they made plenty of use of the fact that there was economic exploitation - but all this was laid at the door of the Brahmin - He was not attacked as a landlord or money-lender only - for that would lead ~~xx~~ to an attack against non-Brahmin moneylenders also.

The rallying cry of the non-Brahmin movement was against Bhatji - which means the Brahmin priest; and against Shethji - which is ~~xx~~ a specific term for Marwari or Gujerati moneylenders and capitalists. Thus the discontent was attempted to sidetrack into provincial channels also apart from caste channels and class realities concealed.

There was once more some basis for this attempt to sidetrack the struggle into anti-Gujerati, anti-Marwari channels. The textile mills in Bombay were largely owned by Gujeratis - not one by Maharashtrian capitalist. Trade and commerce were their monopoly. In the villages the moneylenders, traders etc. were mostly Marwaris or Gujeratis. People could thus be easily ~~xxxxxx~~ fooled. What was imperialism seeking to achieve? Anti-Brahmin feeling meant feeling against the bourgeois intelligentsia and its petty-bourgeois educated followers who constituted the mainstay of political agitation till then. Feeling against them meant in the rural areas they will be isolated and Congress will not get support from any section of the peasantry.

Anti-Gujerati feeling - meant distrust in Gandhi - the leader of the Congress, i.e. create distrust in the oppositional movement and disrupt it.

The first big blow to this strategy came from us - when in Bombay we formed mass trade unions, thru strikes, brought forth the class reality before the workers, and smashed whatever influence the non-Brahmin clique was securing over the workers who were 99 per cent non-Brahmins. It was not a small fight. But it was achieved quickly. The non-Brahmin leaders at first attacked Dange and Nimkar as Brahmins - but they had to run away before our class politics.

Now after two decades you raise the same slogans and think them to be revolutionary. You have no doubt realised that it was impermissible for you to raise the slogan of Babans and Banias, but you do not realise that it followed from your agrarian analysis, which seems to have been upheld by at least Raghunath.

Your agrarian analysis having reduced the agricultural labourer to the status of a serf formally gives a special place to caste conflict and in reality substitutes in place caste-conflict for class-conflict. Your thesis is that though differentiation has started inside each caste in the final analysis it is the upper-caste that exploits the lower castes. You start with saying that only a tiny section of upper-caste exploiters exploit the lower-caste masses; but later on you end by saying that the poor peasant is an exploiter - both as employer of labour and as belonging to a higher caste. You reach the same result by concealing the fact that the upper-caste exploiters in their role as landlords exploit not only the lower-caste masses, but the masses belonging to their own caste also - thus you snap the link between the toilers; thus you conceal the fact that caste antagonism is being replaced by class-antagonism - for what else is the meaning of the fact that the majority of upper-caste people are also impoverished, exploited by their own caste men. It means that caste has collapsed - the caste line is not the dividing line between exploiter and exploited. But the new class line demarcates the exploiters ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ from exploited.

This is how you put the problem "Although class antagonism has appeared more or less inside every caste, yet majority of the feudal-capitalist exploiters (the landlords, the kulaks, the moneylenders, traders and industrialists) even now belong to the three upper and so-called 'touchable' or 'Savarna' castes (and sub-castes) of the Brahmins, Kshatriya and the Vaisya; and the majority of the exploited (agricultural labourers, poor peasants, rural and urban artisans, industrial etc.) continue to belong to the lower castes, the so-called 'Shudras' and 'untouchables'.

You have done the trick in the very posing of the question. You have neatly forgotten the exploited section of the upper-castes, which forms the majority of the people belonging to these castes. Had you remembered then you would have at once come to the conclusion that it is no longer certain upper-caste people that are exploiting - but certain new classes are exploiting - that the line of exploitation cuts across caste-divisions.

Even if you had failed to note that the majority of the upper caste people were exploited, you should have at least seen that the method of exploitation adopted by the upper-caste exploiters, in exploiting lower-caste masses ^{were} not caste methods - but feudal and ~~capitalist~~ capitalist methods - which thus ~~makes~~ them distinct classes.

You first bypass the fact that the majority of the people belonging to upper-caste - are also exploited. But when that fact thrusts itself on your attention you content yourself by saying that it has no material bearing on the situation. "Hence what we have in our society today is not only landlord-capitalist exploitation but combined social and economic exploitation of the lower-caste people by the same set of upper class upper-caste exploiters. Presence of a handful of landlord-kulk or trader-industrialist exploiters among the "Shudras" and in very rare cases even among the "untouchables" does not modify the general validity ~~of~~ of the formulation. Nor does the undeniable distinction and poverty of the vast majority of the members of the upper-castes modify it in any serious manner." (emphasis mine) See how you have offended elementary Marxism to justify that it is certain upper-caste people that are exploiting lower castes. You openly state that the exploitation of the upper-caste masses by exploiters belonging to their own caste does not matter - what matters is only the exploitation of lower-caste masses. This and nothing else is what you mean when you say that the undeniable ~~of~~ destitution and poverty of the majority of the members of the upper-caste is not relevant; for from where does the distinction and impoverishment of this majority arise? Surely from class exploitation by the same masses that exploit the lower-caste mass. But you do not want to recognise this common exploitation because it blows up your caste theory.

But having mentioned the impoverished majority from the upper-castes, you are forced to talk about a joint determined struggle of the upper-caste and lower-caste masses. You write: "On the contrary it points to the great need of a proper understanding of the peculiar mixing up of social and economic serfdom and to the building of a determined struggle of all the poor and the exploited, belonging both to the 'upper as well as to the "lower" castes, against the tiny gang of upper-caste and upper-class exploiters, aided and served by the equally tiny gang of lower caste exploiters - mostly middle and petty."

All this call for joint struggle however is mere phrase. In reality you believe that the upper caste masses are also exploiters. In the succeeding para you write: "Hence it is not enough to say that there are rich and poor, exploiters and exploited among 'all' castes and that all the exploited have to join hands to fight against all the exploiters. This will be a very general and abstract and hence only a partially correct statement. We have to concretely see that almost all the middle class labourers are either 'shudras' or 'untouchables' and that the upper-caste peasants though themselves poor and exploited, are also the employers and exploiters of the lower caste agricultural labourers (emphasis mine). And lastly we have to concretely see that the majority of the middle and rich peasants - and of course the zamindars and the capitalists, belong to the upper castes and indulge in both economic as well as social exploitation."

This is where you land notwithstanding your talk of joint struggle. The upper-caste poor peasants are exploiters of lower-caste labour. Not only therefore the zamindars, the middle peasants, the rich peasants and the capitalists - but the poor peasants from the upper-castes also are exploiters. Thus it is not a class that exploits agricultural labourers but an entire caste - all its exploited as well as exploiting ~~ex~~ members. It is this nauseating stuff that you solemnly produce - a sort of "Marxism" which will delight the heart of an Ambedkar. You are not original either. This sort of "Marxism" was shown 20 years back by certain renegades from the Party in Bombay when they left the Party and joined Ambedkar. Adulterated by few Marxist ideas they produced an analysis showing that the struggle of the untouchables against caste Hindus was real class-struggle and class-war.

You equate the poor exploited peasant from the upper-caste with the landlord capitalist.

You break the bond of common exploitation existing between him and the agricultural labourer.

You roundly denounce the poor peasant as an exploiter and thus prepare the way for the disruption of the toilers' front.

You attempt to prove that it is one caste that exploits another and thus play into the hands of the worst communalists and caste-mongers.

You naturally fail to see the common class enemy.

No doubt certain upper-caste poor peasants in Bihar may not be touching the plough. They may be employing labour. But from this to roundly describe them as exploiters is wrong. If they are exploiters they have no place in the joint struggle. You forget that in such cases what is incidental and what is fundamental must be distinguished. And this fundamental fact about the poor peasant, if he is really poor, is his own exploitation. If he employs labour because of his caste prejudices against certain form of work, and not for profit as is the case with the rich peasant, this fact may slightly strengthen his property and employer complex but will not alter the basic reality of his being an exploited poor peasant. You call him an exploiter and prove that one caste exploits another.

~~You~~ No doubt caste oppression exists today also. In the caste of the untouchables it assumes the most tyrannical form. Caste-prejudices continue among the toilers disrupting the common front. To take account of caste-oppression is not only correct and is necessary.

But as Marxists how do you take note of this oppression? First by recognising the main oppression - the class oppression which is today the dominant form of oppression and exploitation in Indian society. Whosoever denies that this is so, that caste oppression is replaced by class oppression as the main reality - is not a Marxist.

The common enemy is the new exploiting classes - this truth has to be learnt and is being learnt by the masses. Certain Communist leaders only are lagging behind.

Second point which follows from this - since the masses from all castes are equally subject to exploitation from the same exploiting classes - their unity is essential for their emancipation. Whosoever under whatever pretext breaks this unity, creates disruption among the toilers is an agent of the enemy class. The unity of all the exploited is a precondition for success in struggle.

It is the task of the Party to bring about this class-consciousness ~~in~~ by removing all separatist caste consciousness in the course of the struggle, through the experience ~~x~~ gained in class-struggle; by consciously fighting against caste-prejudices of upper caste toilers, showing them that these create disruption in the common front and help the common enemy; doing this thru propaganda, agitation, joint struggle.

By making the victims of caste oppression realise that it can be fought only thru class unity, the unity of all toilers against the common class enemies; by making them realise that untouchability will not go without a thorough-going social revolution, overthrowing the present classes and putting power in the hands of the exploited people and this cannot be achieved without unity of all toilers to end the imperialist-feudal-capitalist alliance - and there is no struggle to abolish untouchability apart from this common struggle.

By championing the special demands of the untouchables etc. as part of the common platform, and popularising them among all sections of the masses.

By fighting the corrupt communal leaders who seek to mislead the untouchables away from the revolutionary struggle.

And not by yielding to the prejudice of caste vs. caste, not by hiding, toning down, or underestimating the common bond of exploitation.

With this correct outlook you are able to place things properly. For instance with this outlook one is able to understand the significance of the facts cited by you in a very different way. The fact that the zamindars, rich peasants etc. come from upper-castes - is understood to mean not that caste oppression exists, but that it is easier for ~~disruptive~~ disrupting leaders to create an impression that only caste oppression exists and therefore the Party is forewarned to combat it. This fact is understood by the Party to mean that special efforts should be made to put the

class reality before all sections of toilers - since it is being screened by the fact that the exploiters belong to upper-castes

The fact that poor peasants sometimes employ labour, and have also caste-prejudices against the untouchables is taken to mean that the unity of the toilers is vulnerable, it must be made impregnable by special propaganda and agitation.

The fact that certain movements of these down-trodden castes suddenly flare up is not regarded as proving disruptive, but often regarded as a sign of great awakening among the down-trodden castes - an awakening which is often ~~xxxxxx~~ disrupted by the reactionaries. In many cases such flare-ups may be disruptive - engineered by reactionaries who base themselves on the fact of caste oppression, and on the illusion that all class oppression is caste oppression.

In many cases it is a spontaneous outburst against caste oppression, sometimes going into disruptive channels because of lack of proper direction or because of machinations of the reactionaries.

In many cases these are spontaneous outbursts against class oppression, but represented ~~by~~ in the consciousness of the participants as a war against certain castes - and in some cases again ending in disruptive channels - like attacks against the exploited section of the caste attacked etc. This for instance happened in the past in parts of Maharashtra and Berar when the riots against money-lenders took the form of anti-Brahmin riots. All such unplanned outbursts generally end in disruption because they lack proper guidance and a sense of direction; because they burst with the consciousness of caste oppression, fail to rouse the common toilers and get sidetracked.

But once the central point is grasped, the central point of class-struggle is realised, all such outbursts and conflicts can be correctly placed, thus link with the ~~xxxxxx~~ general struggle uncovered, or their delinking discovered.

The Party has committed two types of mistakes in relation to struggles and movements of such type. In the period before the second world war the general tendency has been to decry all such movements as reactionary in typical bourgeois fashion, without analysing where the masses participating in the movement were going, whether the class movement itself had certain duties to the masses participating in these movements etc.

After the second world war another type of opportunism started, that of supporting all the demands put forward by these movements irrespective of the fact whether these demands really united the toilers and strengthened the revolutionary struggle or not. In both cases the fundamental measuring rod - the main class-struggle and how each struggle stood in relation to it, whether it helped the main struggle forward or retarded it, was lacking. And that is the only rod that can be used.

You will now realise that neither you nor your Secretariat had any inkling about the agrarian situation; that your outlook was wrong from beginning to end. Under these circumstances how can it be argued that you and your Sectt. understood the role of the agricultural workers, its leading role in the agrarian revolution. You no doubt repeat that we must rely on poor peasants - agricultural workers must lead, we must ally with middle peasants - but all these are just words. From your analysis and understanding the leading role of the agricultural worker does not come forth. How can it when you only ask for establishment of capitalist relations? Even the fact that agricultural worker has to fight the rich peasant does not come forth. How can it when all you demand is establishment of capitalist relations - i.e. paradise for the rich peasant? The leading role of the agricultural worker in the fight against landlordism does not come forth. How can it when you regard him as a mere serf? When you talk of reliance on poor peasants you again do not see their entire antagonism to the feudal and capitalist conditions. You lump them with exploiters - and thus show that for you such Leninist terms as reliance on poor peasants ~~is~~ has no meaning. Thus all the claims that you make for yourself, the claims that the Sectt. made, or your claim that you understood more about agricultural workers than Mahesh - are just claims which cannot be substantiated.

That this document should be recommended by Raghu in his covering note only unmasks his own ignorance and bankruptcy. That he should not have seen thru it even after the Agrarian Question, that he should have claimed that you all had very

nearly reached the same understanding as the PB, only reveals that the PB document did not alter his consciousness.

Mahesh also fails to make a single relevant point against this opportunist document and reveals his bankruptcy completely. He is unable to catch the main opportunist formulations and swallows them lock, stock and barrel.

Such is the level of the Secretariat members.

How number of comrades failed to see thru this anti-Marxist opportunist document can be seen from the following. Asim in his note on Agricultural Labour Document pays the following tribute to this document: "Com. Binda's document on Agl. Lab. is really most valuable and educative for the entire Party. For this I thank and congratulate the PC Sectt. as well as Com. Binda.

"This is a historic document. For the first time, meaning, significance and all-round implications of the controversy - (a) Kisan Sabha and separate agricultural labour organisation (b) who is an agricultural labourer - a section i.e. only an economic category of the same class i.e. peasantry or a different class and the most revolutionary class in the countryside - brought before us on a theoretical plane."

As we have seen there is no reason whatsoever for paying this tribute and it only shows that Asim failed to note the anti-Party line given in the document.

At the same time Asim correctly attacks the Sectt. for its compromise with Mahesh - and says such compromises on policies are impermissible. He exposes Mahesh's slogan of Gaon Garib Sangh and correctly states who should be organised in the separate organisation of agricultural labourers. With all this Asim fails to catch the real anti-Party character of the document - hails it as a historic document - and gets enthused over it, which ought to show that though Bharat was the author of this document, he had many allies, and enthusiastic allies in this opportunist misadventure.

Before I close this section I must enter into a strong denunciation of your methods. This denunciation applies to you only and not to the members of the Secretariat. You must realise that the PB is not and cannot be intolerant of honest mistakes. There is not one member of the PB who has not committed mistakes in the past and who is not committing them today. But while honest mistakes can be argued, the PB cannot tolerate certain things - and one of these is a dishonest charlatan-like attitude to the classics - to the works of founders and leaders of Marxism, Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin. Wrong interpretation of the classics, distorted meaning may arise from lack of understanding - and can be corrected. But comrades who claim to quote the classics, or interpret the writings must observe minimum precaution to see that the classics are not misrepresented. Otherwise it amounts to cheating the ranks, exploiting their faith in Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. And you are guilty of this. I am making this charge after making full allowance for your honest failure to understand certain things.

You confuse labour rent with produce rent - though you yourself quote the difference between the two in your note. You at one place correctly state that batai is produce rent and yet you continuously refer to it as labour-rent (ostrabotki). This distortion is made to justify your point about bataidar - that though he is expropriated peasant, yet he is a peasant, not worker.

Then following this you quote a passage from Marx which really applies to rent in kind, and not to labour rent. Once more you press this into your service making it appear that both passages refer to the same kind of rent. You thus claim that batai is both labour rent and produce rent to prove your point.

Not satisfied with this you invent a term "feudal money rent" - which is a bogus idea and ridiculous to the extreme. You could equally talk about free serf or a free slave. The development of kind rent into money rent is a sign of the development of capitalist relations. The same page from which you quote on produce rent, gives the following from Capital: "Money rent requires a considerable development of commerce, of city industries, of the production of commodities in general and with them of the circulation of money." You do not exercise the minimum care in quoting or interpreting - You will see that there is no such thing, and there can be no such as feudal cash rent. You only humbug the Party members and your colleagues by using such expressions.

Then you commit another unpardonable crime by confusing capitalist ground rent with money rent. You first talk about capitalist money rent - which is a bogus expression. There is no such term used by Marx. Without any authority, and at the same time making it appear as if you are basing yourself on Marx and Lenin you state: "...feudal money rent which is different from capitalist money rent in which not the whole but only a part of the surplus produce is appropriated by the landlords the remaining to the farmer and his profit. The fixed occupancy rent is a rent of this kind or is a near approach to this rent."

Firstly the fixed occupancy rent - if it is a cash rent - is just what Marx calls money rent. It is not what Marx calls capitalist ground rent. You allowed yourself perhaps to be misled by the word surplus - of which you do not understand the meaning. The rents which the rich tenants in India may pay to the landlord is ~~not~~ not a capitalist ground rent. They are what Marx calls money rent, though the tenants concerned may obtain an excess of income over expenditure after paying the rent. Money rent no doubt means growing strength of capitalist relations, increasing power of money; yet it does not yet mean complete subordination of land to capital. The rent therefore is determined by the strength of the land monopoly of the landlord - though these possessing money find themselves in a better position to bargain.

Capitalist ground rent on the other hand arises under conditions when land is completely brought under the sway of capital, when only capitalist farmers, undertake to exploit the land. Here the relation between the tenant and the landlord is reversed. The size of rent is determined by the size of the profit - the profit of the capitalist farmer is the first charge on the soil. Otherwise he will not plough and no one will undertake to exploit the land. Before fixing the rent the capitalist farmer takes precaution to ensure the average profit on capital. Rent comes from the surplus, the excess over the average profit - this is what Marx and Lenin mean. This relation shows the complete domination of capital over land. Under any other kind of rent landlord's rent is the first charge - the tiller may get his wage or not; here on the other hand the landlord is entitled to the surplus left out after satisfying the capitalist.

And this comes only when capital is completely dominant both in industry and agriculture. You thus confuse everything, make people believe that you are quoting Marx correctly but do not take the minimum honest precaution either to interpret the founders correctly; nor do you take the trouble of reading them carefully. By a show of learning you make the unwary believe that you are basing yourself on Marx and thus mislead them.

In the agrarian section I forgot to give a critical estimate of Vishnu's article on "Agricultural Labour". Ordinarily I would not have taken any note of this article since I am confining myself to the common product, the common documents which unmask the reformism of all and conclusively prove that howsoever certain individuals might have differed from others on specific questions - there could be no question of a fundamental difference, of a difference in outlook, between the members of the Secretariat.

But since you, Santosh and a few others have chosen to boost Vishnu and flatter him in the most blatant manner - unbalanced praise or unbalanced condemnation both are often signs of factionalism, intrigue and underhand methods of securing majority - and since Vishnu has not been averse to receiving such praise - I must refer to his article, just to show his own limitations as well as the political level of those who undertook to praise him so generously.

What I have written in the agrarian section, what has been besides written in the PB document on Agrarian Question should be sufficient to lay bare the limitations of Vishnu's article. When you were discussing your self-critical report you had before you at least the Agrarian Question. Since a study of that document did not enable you to see thru the crude character of Vishnu's document, since after reading the Agrarian Question you continue to praise it, it only means that you failed to understand the PB document itself.

I had read Vishnu's article as it appeared in Janashakti. And it was with my permission that the Hindi Janyug and PA published the article. Coming almost immediately after the Party Congress the article had the merit of stressing the Congress decision to organise agricultural labour separately. For the time

being this was good enough to focus attention on the decision to organise agricultural labour. No one looked upon Bishnu's article as a theoretical contribution, or saying something new; it was looked upon as an endeavour to implement the Secret Congress directive to organise agricultural labour independently. It served the purpose of again emphasising that the Party stands for independent organisation of agricultural labour.

Now that you have got the Agrarian Question, is it not obvious that Bishnu's article was rooted in the past, that he does not look upon or see in the agricultural workers a new revolutionary class destined to lead the agrarian revolution, but looks upon it as one of the exploited classes whom we had hitherto neglected? Vishnu naturally does not see, and no one will blame him for that, the rise of capitalist relations, hence rise of new classes, hence the role of the agricultural worker in leading the agrarian revolution, in liquidating feudalism, in popularising nationalisation of land, in carrying on a simultaneous fight against feudalism and the new capitalist elements.

Search for all this in Vishnu's article and you will search in vain. His article is at best a trade unionist article which understands the immediate demands of the agricultural workers, but has no inkling about their political role. That is why the call for unity, for united struggle for agrarian revolution does not come forth from Bishnu's article. What comes is an apology for unity. And naturally so. For failing to see that the poor peasants and middle peasants will get nowhere unless the agrarian worker acts as the leader, Bishnu tends to exaggerate the conflict between agricultural workers and lower section of employing peasants - and is forced to make only general appeals to the middle and poor peasants - that the struggle is one, they must stand together.

In short Vishnu's standpoint is that the agricultural workers should be organised in separate unions to defend their day-to-day demands. Beyond this he does not go; and it is amazing that you all consider this to be very profound and deserving of full praise.

No one can blame Bishnu for not seeing all these things - which could come only after a Marxist analysis of the problem and not on the basis of general sympathy for the agricultural worker. There would have been no question of making any criticism of his article which was written before the PB document and which more or less embodied the defects in the understanding of the Party itself. But when Vishnu and all of you claim exceptional merit for this performance after reading the PB document then it is impossible to keep quiet, and impossible not to unmask the crude reformist understanding embodied in the article.

Coming now to the self-critical Report on Deviation in the Trade Union Front - a report which it seems is unanimously accepted by the Secretariat, it is no doubt true that Santosh has made an honest endeavour to apply the lessons of the Tactical Line to the struggles in Bihar and nail down the mistakes as they arose in the course of the struggles, of the practical ~~xxxxxxx~~ activity of the Party.

Secondly in this document at least Santosh does not make any effort to show that he was less reformist than others, and does not attempt to pit his own understanding against others, under the guise of impartial self-criticism.

Santosh therefore sees many correct things - and his criticism of the conduct of struggles is correct. His review will no doubt be useful in placing some of the old mistakes in conducting struggles and warn against a repetition of such mistakes in future. This is because unlike Bharat who was primarily concerned who made which formulation, Santosh went to the struggles, the real experience of the practical activity of the Party, and tried to locate reformism in action.

In spite of this, Santosh's review fails to see the link between the treacherous August resolution of the Secretariat and the reformist practice on the trade union front. Santosh as the Secretariat member in charge of the trade union front has attempted to nail down his own errors and reformist formulations but has hardly anything to say about the August Resolution in which every formulation justifying reformist practice is to be found.

It will be of course wrong to say that it was the August Resolution of the Secretariat that alone was responsible for the reformist conduct of struggles. Some such attempt to hold the Secretariat alone responsible for the continuance of reformism and to make out that the DCs were on the right path is being made by some DC members - and it must be denounced as a dishonest attempt to escape one's own responsibility and share in the common crime.

It will be more correct to say that the August resolution gave open ideological cover to the grossest form of reformism that existed in the Party in Bihar - and barred all ways against getting rid of this reformism. The DCs themselves were deep down in the mire of reformism and could not see thru the August ~~xxx~~ Resolution; nor could they think of changing their own practice. At best a few individual members here and there protested against ~~xxx~~ some specific formulation or course of action, but there never was any fundamental difference between those who protested and the members of the Secretariat.

No doubt in all this the guilt and responsibility of the Secretariat is much more than that of the DCs - for it was the duty of the Secretariat to lead and guide - in which it miserably failed.

Santosh states the following in his Report on Deviation in Trade Union Front :

"But Santosh had a different conception about these struggles. He said, 'Unless the workers are educated about the present revolutionary situation when the bosses and the government are bound to take more and more brutal measures to perpetuate their privileges, when it is necessary to overthrow the Government to rally and unite the entire toiling masses for revolution, when it is necessary to shed blood and make every type of sacrifice, it will not be possible to rouse the workers for fighting the partial struggles properly (Roots of Reformism in Madhubani).

"Not that Santosh did not see that partial struggles do not assume political character, but he asserted that the working class cannot carry on such struggles unless the perspective of revolution is put before them. It amounted to saying this that in the present period since it is necessary to enter into direct struggle against the Government even for winning economic demands, since it is necessary to shed blood etc., the working class won't fight unless they are given the political perspective. Thus it was the rehash of the same old Joshian reformist idea which belittles and slanders the masses in order to cover up the funk of the petty bourgeoisie.

"Santosh stated this even more clearly in another place in the same report: 'It is seen today that any and every struggle, however small ~~xxx~~ the issue might be, lead to open clash with the entire forces of this government.....It is also seen that before the sweeping offensive of the Government, mass arrests of workers, show of military, tear gas etc., a large section of the workers, and even a section of militants, PMs including DCMs are feeling nervous. They have a feeling that they are helpless before mass arrests and bullets."

Commenting on these passages Santosh writes: "Here was a typical ~~xxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxx~~effort of the reformist to screen his own cowardice by slandering the revolutionary masses - an effort which has been made by vacillating comrades over and over again."

Following this Santosh again comments that this attitude meant refusal to lead the partial struggles that were breaking out.

In all this comment Santosh no doubt catches the main crime - the sabotage and betrayal of the spontaneously developing struggles due to the sheer petty-bourgeois funk before repression and attack of the class-enemy.

But Santosh fails to see that this attitude and formulation was not accidental; that it was the direct result of Joshian outlook which the Bihar Secretariat had not got ~~xxxxx~~ rid of. It was a familiar trick of Joshism to cover the betrayal of the elementary class-struggle of the masses, the spontaneous struggles which continued to retain their spontaneous character because the Party failed to lead

lead and organise them from the beginning, by windy talk of politicalisation, by which was meant acceptance of bourgeois reformist politics by the masses. This was sought to be achieved by contrasting political campaigns against elementary struggles - thus replacing the elementary class struggle by verbal political campaigns, by which was meant meetings, and other harmless forms, but never political protest, strike or independent political action. Another familiar trick was "education" to replace the struggle - education which was conceived apart from the experience and need of the actual struggle of the masses, and was to be a substitute for the struggle itself.

Santosh when he virtually demands disbandment of the struggles in the name of putting the perspective of democratic revolution vomits only Joshiian poison. He separates the political understanding and political consciousness of the masses from the real struggle they are waging and thinks that political education of the masses can come by abandoning elementary class struggle, of the masses.

The August Resolution of the Secretariat, as has been pointed above, accepts this Joshiian conception, lays emphasis on political campaigning conceived in isolation from the mass struggles. This finally ends in Secretariat members supporting sabotaging or toning down of struggles in the name of educating the masses.

The August Resolution of the Secretariat, as has been pointed above, accepts this Joshiian conception, lays emphasis on political campaigning conceived in isolation from the mass struggles. This finally ends in Secretariat members supporting sabotaging or toning down of struggles in the name of educating the masses.

It was obvious that the lack of class-experience and class education of the masses, combined with the lack of Marxist-Leninist education of the Party members and militants, was creating lot of confusion and vacillation before repression sometimes even temporarily paralysing the initiative of the masses. It was of course a lie to say that masses were getting demoralised. But it is true that in the absence of class-experience, there are too many vacillations; the mass struggle is in danger of losing its direction, and decisiveness, stands in constant danger of being sidetracked; and it becomes difficult to keep sustained resistance which struggles of class-conscious masses led by the Party are capable of.

If Santosh had said this and suggested that to avoid this paralysation etc. it is necessary to overcome quickly the lag in class-consciousness by focussing on the class-character of the struggles, by dispelling illusions about reconciliation of interests between the exploiters and exploited, by unmasking repression as a class weapon, by propagating the necessity for the overthrow of the present regime, by explaining to the workers their own leading role, the necessity of alliance with peasantry etc. - he would have been right. This would have meant educating the masses in the course of the struggle; it would have meant linking the political issues of the day with the partial struggle; it would have meant linking partial struggle with the immediate general aim and objective of the movement - overthrow of the present regime. Here all such issues as Hyderabad etc. would have found their place. They would have been means of rousing the political consciousness of masses who had already embarked upon partial struggles or about to embark on them. But in all cases they would have been regarded as part of the struggle of the masses - not something apart from it; not political issues which stand in isolation and therefore are in need of propaganda in isolation from the day-to-day struggle of the masses; not political issues fight for which is totally unrelated to the developing elementary struggles of the masses.

Obviously Santosh had no such idea; nor for the matter of that the Secretariat. They were only carrying on Joshi's traditions. That is why, when they talk of education, political campaign, it is but another word for sabotage of elementary struggle of the masses. That is why when they talk about the education of the masses - they mean education as a substitute for mass struggles. Also when they find certain PMs and militants getting demoralised before the offensive of repression because of lack of Marxian understanding - they again wish to withdraw from struggle in the name of educating the cadres. The Party leaders, ranks and militants lacked Marxian education; the results were no doubt disastrous. The remedy was to overcome this lag as quickly as possible while leading the struggles -not to turn one's back on the struggles.

Santosh's formulation which was subsequently endorsed in the August Report.

of the Secretariat, is only one step short of Joshi's notorious slogan in Pol-Org letter - 'Don't resist the police till they ~~rape~~ and burn'. Joshi was giving a directive to the workers not to resist; Santosh had made up his mind that the working class could not resist.

The Report on Deviation in trade union front further states the following:

"Right reformism was also expressed in the failure of the TU comrades to see how there is a big opportunity to win over the workers from the influence of the INTUC, Socialists and other reformist organisations. They failed to see how ~~the~~ over-deepening economic crisis made it difficult for the reformists to delude the working class with all their tricky propaganda, how it is more and more becoming difficult for the INTUC to hold the workers under their control in the name of adjudication, tribunals, constitutional methods, industrial truce etc. The INTUC is being forced more and more to resort to open gangsterism ...and yet they are failing to disorganise the growing forces of working class upsurge. Failing to see this our TU comrades instead of boldly working for winning over the workers from under the control of the INTUC and Socialists helplessly waited till the influence of the INTUC and the Socialists would wane. They betrayed absence of understanding of the present revolutionary period by thinking that it will take a long time to win over the workers. Thus time and again when the mass of workers were restive due to severe attack, efforts for swinging the workers into resistance against the attacks would be postponed on the plea that our existence organised influence was small, because the reformists 'controlled' bulk of the workers. Instead of throwing the workers under our influence into action under such circumstances and openly coming out against the "leaders" or to postpone the initiative of the struggle on our own, till a ~~sufficiently~~ sufficiently long period of exposure campaign was carried on, which often led to dissipation of the wrath of the workers due to ~~delay~~ delay."

Judging from the instances given, and the fact that the Party in Bihar was in the grip of reformism this criticism of the TU comrades seems to be correct. What has been written above about the reaction to the failure of the railway strike, and the facts given by Santosh about the railway strike and the behaviour of comrades in connection with it ~~apply~~ apply bear out this criticism and show that the TU comrades of Bihar were guilty of this opportunism.

But Santosh forgets the main culprit - the Secretariat which gave an ideological cover to every crime mentioned by Santosh and justified it as revolutionary practice.

But what other practice could follow, what else but funk and demoralisation should result in Party ranks from the formulations and line embodied in the August Secretariat resolution which solemnly stated (1) struggles are protracted because neither the employers nor government are in a mood to concede (2) struggles either completely fail or win every minor demands (3) This leads to demoralisation and defection among the workers - among whom it is temporary - but mainly among the militants some of whom usually crack up and go over to the employers, the INTUC or the Socialists.

Thus with working class resistance completely liquidated, the revolutionary period ~~shoved~~ shoved out of sight, the employers and Government dominant, and the results of struggles shown as failure and defection of militants to INTUC and Socialists, what else but funk and demoralisation before reformists, before struggle should result? Isn't it strange that Santosh completely forgets the Secretariat and only criticises the TU comrades?

Santosh's report very correctly nails down other gross deviations. Every deviation nailed down by Santosh fully bears out the criticism made of the August Document. I have sharply attacked the August document for liquidating resistance to police terror, for reducing protest strike to a farce, for talking about everything except real fight against police terror. The practice on the TU front fully bears out this criticism and unmask the counter-revolutionary character of the formulations and directives of the Secretariat.

Santosh writes: "Vacillation has also been shown on the issue of organising resistance to repression. When Prabir Chinnoo and Mohan were arrested in Bhowrah about 500 workers gathered round them and they suggested they should beat out the police and get the arrested comrades released. But this our comrades discouraged on the plea that clash with the police will result in untold repression on the workers. Thus in the name of saving the workers from repression the three DCMs chose to go to jail when the mass of workers wanted to secure their release in a revolutionary way.

"This behaviour of the petty bourgeois comrades of Manbhum stands in sharp relief to the resistance organised by some of the working class comrades of Giridih and Khelari. In Jubilee Pit when a number of workers were arrested because of assaulting a dalal, there was a spontaneous strike and it continued till the arrested workers were released and taken back after a week.

"In Deep pit when the police came to arrest a number of workers, the miners surrounded the police truck and got the workers released.

"In Khelari and Karkatta too the cement workers and miners went on strike 3 or 4 times whenever the workers were arrested and did not go back till they were released.

"It is important to see that in Manbhum the petty bourgeois comrades prevented the workers from going into struggle against the police, while in Giridih Pits, in Khelari and Karkatta our working class comrades boldly led the workers into struggle against police arrests, in organising resistance against the police. The petty bourgeois comrades of Manbhum betrayed their own fear in the name of saving the workers from repression, and thus disorganised the spontaneous development of the struggle against the government repression and prevented the workers from going into direct clash against the Government, prevented the development of revolutionary forms of struggle, of further heightening of political consciousness of workers, which would have enabled them to raise the slogan of "Down with the Nehru Government."

"Similar reformist fear of fighting against repression in a revolutionary way has been betrayed in many trade union centres. In many places comrades have satisfied themselves with organising merely a protest strike against arrest while there was the opportunity of leading the working class into struggle against the police and armed forces when the latter came to effect arrests. In many places the workers have demonstrated that they are not satisfied with mere expression of protest against arrests and repression, but have showed their preparedness and eagerness to beat back Government offensive thru direct clash with the police and the armed forces."

What else but this line of treachery should result from the Secretariat directive, "Be aggressive with the enemy is off its guard, be cautious when the enemy is forewarned." The petty bourgeois leadership remains cautious, very cautious ~~whenever the enemy is forewarned~~ because they saw that the enemy was forewarned.

What else but this funk should result when the Secretariat solemnly gives the following directive: "The question of resistance to the police or to the goondas is linked up with the question of mass mobilisation and the preparedness of the masses to resist..... Bolder action with weaker mobilisation is a wrong step."

And what else but only symbolic peaceful protest strike should result when the Secretariat solemnly advocates only extension of strike action but no militant resistance to police terror in detailing out how to fight terror?

And what else but desertion from struggle should result when the Secretariat gives a handy weapon to all opportunists to interpret the situation anyway they like and desert struggle? The following directive of the Secretariat could have no other result: "The form of demonstration shall depend on the degree of indignation roused and degree of mobilisation achieved. When big mobilisation is not achieved then it is better to have meetings and rallies, central or local where they can be held and as peacefully as possible."

How effectively the Secretariat screened open treachery and disarmed Party members in the fight against betrayal can be seen from the following from Santosh's report:

"Sudhin who was supposed to work out the detail plans and organise the agitation, however, disappeared from Katihar ten days before the date, so no agitation or propaganda, or preparation for ~~gating~~ gate-crashing was made among the workers. It was a case of open treachery by Sudhin to let the Katihar workers down at such a crucial time, but the PC or DC did not take even cognisance of his crime at that time. However, the workers gathered at the gate and when they heard that only 700 out of 1800 workers will be taken, they refused to enter the mill. Only about 200 in all, including supervisors, dalals, and new recruits entered the mill.

Such is the temper of the working class today. After 2½ months of lockout, after mass terror and repression, when there was no prospect of a general strike or hope of any help from any quarter, when the gates are opened, the 700 workers who are offered jobs refuse to enter the mill. And it is such workers that Sudhin betrayed and the Party allowed the traitor to betray knowing full well how he had been vacillating and showing funk for a long time. By 1st April however, all save 200 workers were taken in and then the workers joined.

"What were the conclusions drawn by the Party on the basis of the above developments? The PC Secretariat in its report to CC in May 1948 stated that the setback in Katihar is the result of "adventurist" mistakes by the comrades. The gate-crashing slogan of 29th March, instead of nailing down the vacillation, treachery and betrayal before sharp class-struggles, it only saw "adventurism" in Katihar & pleaded for further retreat. Asim violently protested against such a characterisation and pointed out that the failure was due to betrayal and funk by the petty bourgeois comrades, that the slogan was not ahead of the consciousness of the workers, but that they were let down by the petty bourgeois leaders. But yet the PC Secretariat in its meeting in August 1948 characterised the mistakes in Katihar as "adventurist" which led to complete crack-up of militants before terror and repression."

This is how the Secretariat screened treachery.

It is not necessary to go further into the report. The conclusion reached by Santosh, and accepted by the Secretariat - in relation to the conduct of the struggles fully bear out my criticism of the August Resolution of the Secretariat. Santosh's report, in spite of some of its limitations will serve to educate the ranks in the concrete application of the Tactical Line documents to Bihar. His document will not only help Bihar but also other provinces since it catches practices, trends, and crimes - which are common to all the provinces. His document ought to show to all how an honest and serious endeavour to apply the Party documents to the situation in the province, how honest effort to recast one's understanding on the basis of the documents of the Centre, is bound to lead to fruitful results helping the Party forward.

Coming to the Secretariat Resolution on Organisation of PC and DCs - if you have circulated this resolution, you have been guilty of an anti-Party act because the concrete proposals made savour of one-sided factional outlook. Besides if a document attacking a CCM is circulated without the permission of the PB and without the knowledge of the CCM concerned, it can only be taken to be an act subversive of all Party discipline.

The first part of the document - the part dealing with the effects of reformist policy on organisation - reads well, and places the past mistakes precisely and convincingly. This part is very good and it constitutes again a honest and serious endeavour to apply a self-critical attitude to the past, to organisational questions. It also is free from the mistakes of your August document on organisation, which thought of organisation in isolation from the political line and practice of the Party - a document which was cast in typical Joshian fashion and which I had occasion to criticise in January last. This is what I wrote in January '49 about your August Organisational Report:

"The report attempts to break new ground, makes a critical review of the past, and the situation following immediately after illegality and lays down new tasks.

The main characterisations made in the report are very correct. The Secretariat has correctly grasped many of the mistakes and the review must no doubt have helped the comrades to a great extent.

Yet it must be stressed that the review still stands rooted in the party organisational outlook and its mistakes have to be nailed down.

The historical survey - self-criticism relating to the past is mainly non-political, tech. type. Not that the conclusions about the past are wrong. On the other hand they are very correct and should teach the members what happened.

But they appear a tech faults, faults due to lack of some mysterious knowledge of formally "functioning the form", and not directly linked with the type of politics that was pursued, though here and there a generalisation is made that all this was due to the old reformist politics. The review steps so much into tech explanation, and used so profusely phrases about "spontaneity", "economism" that it could not have been found objectionable even by Joshi, and it would in practice perpetuate the same evils which the Secretariat wants to fight.

It puts the past in a wrong manner, and finds fault with committees for "economism", "spontaneity", "failure to become political" leaders as if it was this or that organisational trick that was not done. It actually belittles the economic struggles - the only real struggles of the masses waged in that period by the Party, the only struggles which kept the Party alive, in the traditional Joshian manner and makes a general formulation that political struggles were not led.

The characterisation that practice of the committee and Party resulted in economism is of course correct. But its link with the line of the Party is not seen. Hence in a wrong way the economic struggle is contrasted with the political struggle.

The reality is that the politics of the Party was class-collaborationist, bourgeois politics which was daily coming into conflict with the real class struggle of the masses which was breaking out in economic struggles as its elementary form. A successful and consistent carrying out of the political line would have meant abjuration of all mass struggles, betraying of economic struggles themselves - a situation which Joshi was heading towards. And it was Joshi who was loudest in raising the cry of "economism", "spontaneity" - in organisation - by which he meant do not carry on any economic struggle which offends the bourgeoisie. Any organisational or political report which misses these things, and dubs the economic struggles of that period, as 'economism' etc. only strengthens reformism. It must be understood that the economic struggle of the period saved us.

What then is the correct understanding? Because of reformist politics there was no independent revolutionary politics of the proletariat, a revolutionary organisation - the C.F. could not be built on the foundation other than the revolutionary politics of the proletariat decisively leading the masses. The form of organisation arose out of it. The organisation did not develop into political leader because its line was one of political surrender. All that remained was leading of mass struggles as they broke out, tailing behind because they were treated as a nuisance, not a revolutionary class struggle - hence only a hesitant leadership leading or tailing behind mass struggles could be created. The nearer it came to the masses the more unreal became to it the compromising line of the Party, hence it could not implement it, hence it was charged with 'economism'. Charge of economism was not made because a revolutionary political line was rejected, but because the compromising line could not be executed. Hence the mass leader alternates between violent advocates of struggle when the struggle was on, and of the worst type of reformism when it was defeated, broken etc. The result was a leadership hesitant of mass struggle, which was unrelated to revolutionary struggle for power.

Naturally on this basis the workers etc. could neither be recruited, nor promoted to key positions. The workers developing their hatred against bourgeoisie in economic struggles could not be won politically or inspired by collaborationist political slogans. It was the same fate that awaited the Socialists. The political slogans of the Party could not go down among the fighting masses. The latter often accepted its lead in economic struggles but rejected it in politics.

Hence practice reformist, party not grown; leading cadres intellectuals; out of this only a reformist organisation could grow. Passive cadres - talkative leaders - Formalism and bureaucrats - organisational tasks unrelated to class struggle - quota, sale of literature, Party funds - these were divorced from the real struggle - the theory of "functioning the form" the most absurd theory developed - functioning without discharging main political tasks, understanding that the units must be political leaders above all - that all committees in the Party are committees of action - only if this is understood the subsequent conclusions in your resolution be properly placed in the political setting - be related to political tasks. Obviously the elementary instructions about tech etc. are absolutely necessary but the main generalisations about functioning, must be related to political tasks and this will be done only if the past is correctly understood and in the presentation of the present the political part permeates the whole organisational review."

It is easy to see that the present Resolution on Reorganization of PC and DC bases itself mainly on the criticism made and is therefore able to produce a different kind of document than the one in August. It deduces organisational practice from political practice; it nails down violation of the basic principles of Bolshevik organisation, and examines the whole field of organisational activity - including the relationship between our Party and Report, content itself with giving safety tips or present organisation in isolation from political practice.

It must be admitted at the same time that there are a number of loose formulations in the document. And in some cases lack of clarity in presentation. To mention but one instance of lack of clarity - the portion dealing with failure to function mass organisations democratically, only negates past practice, but does not lay down correct practice. It is obvious that the majority of the Party members in Bihar do not have a correct idea about the relation that should exist between the Party and the mass organisation. Under these circumstances your criticism of the failure to function mass organisations democratically may create the impression that the correct way is to have mass organisations completely independent of the Party, that is free from the guidance and leadership of the Party.

Secondly though your report talks a lot about democratic centralism still it commits breaches of the principle of centralism and conceives of democracy in a bourgeois reformist way, every time the question is posed in the concrete. For instance your old Secretariat was dissolved, who gave you the authority to do it? You had no authority to reorganise it. The authority belonged to your PC or CC or PB. You did not even care to consult Party constitution.

Secondly the same opportunism and repudiation of elementary understanding of organisational principles is to be seen in your proposal No.2 under Section B. You demand reconstitution of PC, which is a correct demand but then add "But this should be done by a thorough evaluation of each individual's understanding and activity, and by the sanction of the PB and majority opinion of the DCs (emphasis mine). So this is how you understand centralism and democracy? You put the authority of the PB on the same level as the majority opinion of the DCs. It appears as if you are afraid of the verdict of the PB and are seeking to buttress yourself by support from the DCs and in the bargain flattering them by making it appear that you stand for democracy, the rights of the DC. All that you are doing is to introduce anti-Party methods, and cheat the DCs into the belief that their majority opinion is of the same importance as PB decision, and that a PC cannot be formed without the backing of the majority of them. This is open war against centralism, pitting the DCs against the PB, and shows that the Secretariat though it produced a 25 typed page document on Reorganisation with lot of prattle about democratic centralism, has understood nothing of it.

The criticism you make of Raghu in demanding his removal from the PC shows that you all have thrown overboard the last pretence to objectivity and rushed headlong with your prejudices. No doubt the part dealing with Raghu cites certain very serious lapses, not only before the Party Congress, but also after the Party Congress. If these charges are true they do constitute a serious political criticism. Such charges as failure to fight against the capitulatory attitude of certain comrades in jail; silencing of all genuine criticism against those who weakened in jail before the class-enemy; his formulation that neglect of relief work will mean vanguardism; his capitulation before Mahesh on the question of agricultural labourers; his formulation that no serious upsurge can be expected because of extreme misery and devastation caused by the flood; the charge that he

did not tolerate any criticism of his action; and that on one occasion when he was criticised in a PC meeting for "his individual non-Party method of raising finances and spending them he violently protested without arguing out his standpoint and refused to have to do anything with the PC meeting - constitute serious political lapses needing self-criticism on his part and the final judgement of the PB and the CC.

But it is difficult to understand how all this places Raghu in a category by himself. As regards politics and political deviations I have already shown that all the members of the PC Secretariat and perhaps PCMs - were partners in the sin committed through the August documents - and that all of them were equally guilty of reformist practice.

On the question of refusing to accept criticism of his actions also it cannot be said that Raghu was lone. It seems all the members of the Secretariat were guilty of the same crime in varying degrees. This is what your report states on page 7:

"Criticism and self-criticism was completely non-existent. Slight criticism led to worst subjective reactions and even to resignation from the PC or the Party. At the least the PCM criticised left the meeting in protest and thus bullied the PC to withdraw the criticism. This is how the PC Secretary behaved and virtually set up a reign of political bullying inside the Party. This tactics went to such lengths that if any decision was not to his liking, the PC Secretary would end by saying, "You may take the decision but that will be mechanical and coercive and I feel myself unable to implement it." This was more or less the common attitude of all PCMs with the only difference that nobody except the PC Secretary dare to be so arrogant and brazen-faced in his bullying. Whatever criticism occasionally took place became abusive when directed against others and Gandhian heart-beating when it concerned oneself. Criticism, (right or wrong) led to worst subjectivism even to the limit of resignation from the Party or threats of resignation, as for example when on the issue of Giridih strike, struggle between Santosh and Chapal was going on, PC connived with the reformist and anti-struggle line of Chapal which led to resignation letter from Com. Santosh. Similarly other forms of reaction like satyagraha or refusal to do certain jobs, "I am incapable to do it" were common in other members without exception."

This is clear enough to show that all members of the PC were guilty of setting themselves above the criticism of their comrades, and that Raghu was not alone in this conceited ~~xxxx~~ individualist and anti-Party outlook.

To mention this crime only in connection with Raghu when discussing the personnel of the ~~PC SECRETARIAT~~ PC, to make out as if he alone was guilty of it is to leave the domain of objective criticism and enter that of subjective and dishonest criticism.

The second specific charge that you make against Raghu is about ~~political~~ political reformism and organisational opportunism. I have already shown by reference to the common August Resolution that you all were guilty of the worst kind of reformism after the Second Party Congress. In this respect Raghu does not stand alone. You further charge him with opportunism of yet another type. Your resolution states, "In political reformism and organisational opportunism he has led the way. We have seen how he most opportunistically tried to adapt himself to the twists and turns in the line of the CC. Here his extreme reformism manifests itself in another way also. (His spontaneous reaction and early attitude to the ~~new revolutionary line~~ new revolutionary line was entirely different from the attitude to the notorious Pol-Org letter of Joshi. He spontaneously and instinctively accepted the Pol-Org Letter declaring that he had already come to the same conclusion through his own experience. With the new resolution of the CC in December 1947 he violently disagreed and under his leadership the PC almost took the decision to suppress the resolution from the ranks of the Party in Bihar and not to publish it in Janashakti.....Very soon however, Raghu was an enthusiastic champion of the new Party line. And this was quite in line with his practice to adapt himself to the dominant trends in the C.C."

However was Raghu alone in uncritical acceptance of the reformist line of the CC - in his failure to fight against the prevalent opportunism? Not in the least. The Secretariat knows that the members of the Secretariat, and perhaps PC were equally guilty. This is what you write in another place of your report: "Raghu's report to the CC on riots in December 1946 was written within the framework of August 1946 resolution. That represented the common understanding of the PC. While in Bombay Raghu discussed things with Joshi and in January 1947 PC meeting he warned the Party against the danger of vanguardism. The whole PC uncritically agrees with him. Within a few months Joshi circulates his notorious Pol-Org Letter and immediately Bihar PC Secretary declares that he had already come to the same conclusions thru his own experience. Again the entire PC whole-heartedly agrees with him and Jogi fresh from Naokothi battle declares that the upsurge does not exist. By the end of the year the CC publishes its draft resolution for the Party Congress and very soon Raghu is found as enthusiastic a champion and fighter for the new line as a few days ago for Joshi's reformism. Of course, he is everywhere followed by his colleagues of the Secretariat and this without ever any attempt at serious self-criticism. It cannot be explained in any other way except as the worst type of opportunism which always tried to adapt itself to the lead given by the CC"

Thus it is clear that Raghu cannot be singled out for exclusion on account of his uncritical acceptance of the reformist line advocated by the CC or his support to the Joshi's swing from the line of August 1946 to a purely reformist line. All were equally guilty in strengthening Joshi's hands. The precise and correct formulation in this respect is that though the CC in August 1946 opened a new path before you - whatever may have been the limitations of the August Resolution, you all individually and collectively joined Joshi in restoring the pre-August reformism. There is no difference between you all and Raghu in this respect.

The way in which you formulate "It cannot be explained in any other way except as the worst type of opportunism which always tried to adapt itself to the lead given by the CC" - is a wrong formulation. One does not talk of adaptation when one accepts the line of the CC which everyone has to accept. The way you formulate it appears as if individual comrades have the right not to implement the line and directive of the CC. This will lead Party members to put their own opinions above the CC in the name of not adapting themselves to the CC line if they think it to be wrong. Your formulation is not accidental. You all have most cold-bloodedly attempted to murder the Party line given by the Second Congress and produced your alternative line in your August Resolution. The correct way of stating is that you did not contribute anything to the fight against reformism that was going on inside the CC; that you easily accepted the most blatant reformist evaluations made by the CC; that when the CC began its fight and opened the way to a correct revolutionary understanding of the situation your instinctive reaction was to support Joshi in his fight against revolutionary understanding and that you carried on in this way after the Party Congress also. This is something very different from what you call adapting yourself to the CC line. You are only screening yourself - that is all.

In this respect I must mention that all of you were so steeped in reformism that even personal and direct talks on concrete problems had no meaning for you before the Party Congress. I remember in November 1947 or thereabout I met both Santosh and Jnan in Bombay. I attempted to debunk the anti-strike attitude pumped into them by Joshi, poured ridicule on it, gave them the analysis of the economic crisis. Apart from this there were the resolutions of the General Council of the AITUC - passed at the same time. All these had no effect on them. They continued their reformist practice to the last. This ought to show that you all were steeped in reformism to the marrow of your bones.

How hardened reformists you all were could be seen from one thing alone. The AITUC resolutions which were of course sanctioned by the Party did nowhere contain a hint that we should support production, sabotage strike, and yet you continue the Joshi's line openly and shamelessly.

You further add, "The entire functioning of Raghu was a violation of the principle of collective functioning. We have already seen how he had established a reign of political bullying inside the Party. He acted more or less like the boss of an industrial concern. Inside the PC meeting he would insist on his viewpoint and if it was not accepted he would come out declaring 'you may take any decision, it cannot be implemented'. The scant respect in which he held the PC was ~~xxxxx~~ revealed

was revealed when he left DC Conference in the middle and chartered a plane to Ranchi to meet the Premier."

Don't you realise that this indictment of Raghu is your own indictment? Don't you realise that in making this indictment in this way you forfeit all right to be treated seriously, to be taken as men of conviction who would stand by their principles and conviction? What respect can one have for P.C. members, the members of the P.C. Secretariat, who say that one individual established a reign of political bullying over them in the P.C. and the Secretariat, who shamelessly seek to parade as innocent victims of political bullying. When you demand that ~~XII~~ Raghu be excluded on the ground of political bullying - you really exonerate yourselves and stoop to very low level. Why don't ask yourselves the question as to why you did not exercise your majority to curb him or remove him, and bring him to order? Why you did not accept his challenge and challenge him to defy your decision? Why didn't you refer the matter to the CC and demand disciplinary action against him if you had thought it would be better done by the CC? What happened to the principle of centralism - why didn't you seek CC intervention? What happened to the principle of democracy - why didn't you exercise your majority and remove him from the post of Secretaryship? And why did you re-elect him as the Secretary at the Party ~~and~~ Conference? And why didn't you enforce collective functioning - by enforcing the majority decision of the Secretariat?

To raise these questions is to condemn you, indict you. Those who fail to uphold Party principles, forget Party methods of functioning, allow these to be trampled underfoot by one individual and dare not exercise their majority in defence of the Party must be considered as big criminals as the one who violates Party rules. The reason behind what you call "political bullying" was the fact that you all were utterly devoid of any conception of Party principles, Party methods of organisation; that you therefore saw nothing anti-Party in this method of bullying - since each one in his turn adopted it; that you dared not accept his challenge because you were afraid of assuming responsibility for leading the Party without him; you were not confident; that you did not refer the matter to the CC because you did not attach the slightest political importance to this behaviour; besides you had federal conception of organisation; that you thought the PC to be a 'friends' club - in fact your outlook was anti-Party. It is because of this that you failed to fight. Instead of nailing this ^{down} you make yourselves the martyrs and Raghu the aggressor.

How does this happen? Why do you forget the obvious facts and hold Raghu alone to be responsible for these crimes? The fact is that you all attempted to observe some objectivity in the first part of your report where you discuss the collective mistakes, together with mistakes and lapses of individuals. But when you come to the discussion of the personnel of the new committee you forget objectivity, forget all that you said about the lapses of all, and having previously made up your mind to exclude Raghu by hook or crook, you argue as if he alone was guilty of these crimes, and make this the ground of his exclusion.

How do you deceive yourselves, and do the trick? By imagining, suggesting, hypnotising yourselves into the belief, that Raghu was the leader and you were merely unthinking followers and therefore he must bear not only greater responsibility, but sole responsibility.

Mahesh in the course of the discussion - vide minutes of Secretariat meeting - made the formulation that Raghu was the Joshi of Bihar and you all were his followers. In your action dealing with tasks you write "Raghu as the leader of the Bihar PC bears greater responsibility for the worst reformist and opportunist crimes of the P.C."

From where do you get this idea of the Secretary as the leader of the P.C.? It is not a Bolshevik idea; you will find it nowhere in the Party Constitution. Article IX Section 2 of the Party Constitution says the following about the Secretary of the Provincial Committee: "The Secretary of the Provincial Committee directs the proper distribution of Party work and ensures the fulfilment of the decisions of the Provincial Party Conference, the Provincial Committee and the directives of the Central Committee of the Party." This is what the Constitution says about the Secretary. From where then do you get the idea of Secretary as the leader? Had anyone appointed him as the leader? Had the CC appointed him as the

leader who must be followed by you all? Is it not true that you chose to accept his viewpoint throughout because you were at least as much reformist as he was; that you had no fundamental differences with him. No doubt we often use such expressions as Secretary leading the team - the unit etc. - but this is never meant in the sense you mean. You mean leadership in the same way as Congressmen do - leaders to lead and followers to follow - with leaders solely responsible for the consequences - i.e. dictatorial leaders and blind followers.

When we however use the expression - Secretary leading the team, we never for a moment forget the individual responsibility of each member in all matters pertaining to their unit, as well as the collective responsibility of the unit as a whole. For us the expression has this meaning - the Secretary occupying a strategic position has to take initiative in all matters, has to take initiative in coordinating activities, in implementing decisions, in supervising the implementation of the P. line etc. If he does not do it the work of the unit will be hampered, for no other member is in a position to take that initiative which the Secretary is able to take by virtue of his position as a Secretary. The Secretary has this special role - and this is often called his leading role. No doubt to be able to do this successfully the Secretary must have a high level of ideological development.

But this does not mean that when fundamental deviations occur, when all members of the unit commit ^{an} opportunist mistake after another, you can turn round and say that it was all because the Secretary was the leader and failed as the leader. This is practically demanding that the Secretary must be an inspired man with an inner-voice, so that he must be in a position to assert Marxism even when a reformist trend has invaded the Party from top to bottom. This is an open and shameless attempt to evade the responsibility of the unit, and of each member. Besides this conception of leadership almost borders on the fascist conception which also demands an infallible leader and unthinking ranks. You choose to forget that the Secretary was one of your colleagues and had no more authority than what you chose to give him.

You indulge in all this talk about the Secretary being the leader just to escape your own responsibility. That is why it must be said that once more you have made no case for Raghu's exclusion from the P.C. You may give new arguments for exclusion and the PB is prepared to examine them. You may expose his functioning as the Secretary of the Committee - but you must do it on the basis of Party principles and Party Constitution.

I have done with your common documents - I will go through the individual documents like Mahesh's Atmasamalochna later on if necessary. In the meanwhile I give you three days - from the time you receive this instalment to write out what you have to say about yourselves after reading this document, and if you think you are guilty of any lapses - what disciplinary measures to be taken against you.

I am writing to Raghu to meet you as soon as possible. In the meanwhile send me your own reaction to this document. Write as brief as possible.

Greetings,

29.9.49

P.B. RESOLUTION
ON THE BENARES D.C. SECRETARY'S APPEAL TO THE CC

10.7.49

The Prosect of the U.P.P.C. dissolved the Benares DC by a resolution passed on 16-17 February, 1949, and appointed Com. Rajendra, a member of the Prosect, to take charge of Party work in Benares and particularly to concentrate on the organisation of the impending railway strike at MGS. On receipt of the resolution certain members of the DC appealed to the Prosect to hold the resolution in abeyance but the appeal was rejected. On the 29th February Sunil Dasgupta, Secretary of the DC prior to its dissolution, and S.F. Tripathi, a member of the DC, addressed a letter to the General Secretary appealing to the CC to postpone the dissolution of the DC and instead dissolve the UPFC and hold an enquiry into Party affairs in U.P.

The appeal clearly attempts to give the impression that it has been made on behalf of all the members of the dissolved D.C. as it repeatedly speaks of "we" not only in connection with the signatories but the entire DC. And this has been done despite the known fact that not all DCMs either agreed with its contents or its "demands".

What are the clear, recognised, and relevant facts of the whole case?

On the 8th February 1949 Sunil Dasgupta as DCS addressed a letter to the Prosect saying that "they" had learnt from a member of the Provincial Railway Fraction that it was decided to begin the all-India railway strike from February 27th. The letter proceeded to characterise the decision as "vanguardism of the worst type which will be disastrous for the revolutionary working class movement." It further proposed that railway unions led by the Party should first come out of the A.I.R.F., form a new central organisation of Indian railway workers, and then proceed to a general strike through exposure of reformist traitors and local partial struggles extending over a period of two months.

According to Dasgupta, comrades Rustam, Shrivastava, Tandon and Tripathi, besides himself, agreed with this letter.

Immediately on receipt of the letter the Prosect decided that a D.C. of which the Secretary and so many leading members held such a totally defeatist and anti-strike position on the very eve of the strike could, under no circumstances, be permitted to lead the strike and the local Party. The least that such a treacherous position demanded was an immediate dissolution of the D.C., the removal of all its members who subscribed to such a view from responsible work in connection with the strike, and the appointment of a Prosect member to organise and conduct the strike and organise a new DC in Benares from worthy P. elements.

The Prosect was also of opinion that considering the revolutionary importance and imminence of the strike and the opinions expressed, even suspension or expulsion would be justified in certain cases but it decided to give the guilty comrades a chance to realise the horror of their mistake and correct it promptly, while authorising Rajendra to take further action against those who refused to see and accept their guilt after explanation.

Such, in a nutshell, were the criticism and operative decisions contained in the Prosect resolution of February 16th against which Dasgupta and Tripathi have appealed to the C.C.

To any Party Member possessing a minimum of understanding of Party policy and functioning, to one not totally devoid of elementary self-criticism and modesty, the justification of the Prosect decision would be self-evident in a moment. The Prosect had done nothing beyond removing the DCMs from their position and from any responsible work in connection with the strike. If anything, this meant that while the Prosect, under no circumstances, was prepared to allow defeatists and deserters to do any harm to the Party and the fate of lakhs involved in the prospective strike, it was still prepared to give the comrades concerned a chance to correct themselves in time and save themselves from the utter ruin and ignominy towards which they were heading.

The D.C., or at least most of its prominent members had thrown up their arms in panic and terror at the very moment when the most momentous proletarian battle for which the Party had ever striven and worked was on the point of being declared. The railway general strike was coming not merely on the crest of innumerable heroic battles of railway workers all over India (two of which had taken place at MGS which was in Benares district itself) but of great workers' and peasants' struggles spread all over the country. For months it was THE issue of issues on which the strength of the Party was being concentrated on a nation-wide plane. The workers' demands and the decision to serve strike notice had been vociferously endorsed by the overwhelming majority of workers through a ballot held under ferocious repressive conditions. The treacherous Socialist leadership of the A.I.R.F. was wriggling and trembling, not knowing how to back out of the ballot decision and yet save itself from the wrath of railway workers. The Nehru Government had started enforcing virtual martial law all over the railways treating all strike-preparations as preparations for an insurrection. In such conditions, and at a vital railway centre like MGS, the DC of the Party whose supreme task and honour it was to fight back repression and treachery and lead the workers into action - an action that would have placed India on the revolutionary map of Asia - declared the prospective strike to be the "worst vanguardism and disastrous for the working class movement"! If this was not cowardly desertion and a criminal stab in the back of the workers then all words are meaningless. And none none but shamefaced strike-breakers could suggest that such a DC should not even have been removed from all responsible work in connection with the strike.

Those who have appealed to the CC against the Prosect decision should have asked themselves a simple and obvious question if nothing else. If the MGS and Benares railway workers were to elect a strike committee after the all-India ballot and persons holding openly anti-strike views had dared to stand before them with chatter about vanguardism and disaster how would the workers have dealt with them? Would they have met with any other fate but that of cowardly traitors? And yet when the Party which was the leader and guide of the entire strike simply removed them from responsible positions they pretend to be struck with horror and not only call for the revocation of that decision but come out with still worse anti-Party declarations. Of course this only proves the age-old experience of Marxism that anyone who attempts to "defend" an anti-working-class position can do so only by shifting to still more revolting positions.

The first point made in the appeal is that it is "monstrous to dissolve a DC simply because it frankly and honestly placed its political doubts before the Prosect with a request to get rid of mistaken ideas." A more disgusting and dishonest use of the words honesty, frankness and doubts could hardly be conceived. If after the Second Party Congress, after all the demands and slogans of action for which railway unions led by us fought at the Lilloah AIRF Convention, Nagpur AIRF General Council, and the Delhi AIRF Working Committee meeting, after the verdict of the strike ballot, and after all the circulars of the AIRF Fraction & the U.P. Prosect making it clear that we would have to organise the railway strike by March and organise it in opposition to the C.S.F. leadership - if, that is to say, after everything had been decided, the army had taken its positions and the only thing that remained to be done was to issue the order to fire, - it is permissible for a DC to question the final order of assault in the name of "honesty", "frankness", and "doubts", then such a DC can only be condemned and summarily dismissed from its charge.

For the only meaning of such a claim is that cowardice and sabotage must be permitted to masquerade as honesty and doubts; that every strike-breaker must enjoy the "freedom" of strike-breaking if he "honestly" considers such action to be in the "interest of workers"; that the supreme custodian of the revolutionary interests of the working class, namely the C.P., should waste days and weeks in the luxury of "convincing" a handful of intellectual traitors of the correctness of going into action at a time when every moment and every atom of its energy have to be concentrated on bringing about that action. The criminality of the DCs demanding that a Prosect member should be sent to "rid them of their doubts" when every moment wasted meant blood and suffering for thousands of railway workers and their families at MGS, and through them for all others, can only be imagined.

Did those DCMs ask themselves for once what was to happen to the railway workers if the "mission" of the Prosect member they invited had failed to achieve its purpose? Naturally they did not. For what mattered to them was not the fate of workers but the "clarification" of their own cowardly doubts, their "differences," their "right" of betrayal and desertion.

The exploitation of such words as "honesty and frankness" for such a detestable betrayal must be doubly branded precisely because it gives the gloss of decency to a dishonest crime, because it stabs the working class by creating confusion and vacillations in uninformed sections, and panic and loss of faith in those who are already vacillating.

Moments of action are always the most critical and decisive in the revolutionary working class movement. The one honest virtue at such moments is initiative and daring. The worst treachery and dishonesty are to paralyse action by capitulating to hesitation, doubts and confusion. The real meaning of the "honesty" pleaded by the Benares DCMs must be clearly grasped because it is the most misleading and dangerous cover behind which petty-bourgeois treachery hides itself when all other arguments are lost.

The second point of the appeal is that the Prosect resolution had no justification for characterising the Benares DC as being "persistently reformist" and its characterisation of the strike proposal as the "worst vanguardism" as culmination of its past. In fact the signatories say that the Prosect does not "cite a single instance," "a single proof" of its past reformism because "it is not easy to prove it." They further say that "during the whole year after the Party Congress the Prosect did not even once point out our "reformism". " (underlining and quotation mark from the original)

Both factually and logically this point is so indefensible that it is impossible to describe it in any other terms than as a downright lie.

First a few facts. The very same DCMs who called the railway strike decision as the "worst vanguardism" had stated by July-August last year that the Party generally and particularly in Benares had swung over from right reformism to "vanguardism and adventurism" after the Second Party Congress. In fact, one of the signatories to the appeal had gone to the length of besmirching the Party Centre by circulating a "report" that such was the opinion of the P. Centre itself. Secondly a member of the Prosect visited Benares at least twice during these months and gave the Benares DC a written note on its intervention in various strikes sharply criticising it as extremely reformist and illustrating his criticism in detail. Any attempt on the part of the signatories after this to claim that the past reformism of the DC was difficult to prove or that the Prosect had flung the charge in its face without citing "a single instance," - and indeed, that the Prosect had made the discovery overnight after the DCMs' letter of February 8th - is something that only unabashed liars are capable of attempting.

The fraudulence of the signatories, however, is clear from their own document. The signatories cite about ten cases of mass actions dealt with the DC in Benares between February 1948 and February 1949 as proof of their correct understanding of Party policy and "argument" against the charge of continued reformism. Apart from the fact that DC policy in many of these actions had already been criticised ~~xx~~ by a Prosect member as stated above, and the fact that mere participation in mass action is no proof against the charge of reformism, the signatories, on their own part, do not make the slightest effort at criticising their participation in these actions beyond blandly claiming that such participation was a self-evident proof of the falsity of the charge levelled against them. Only an utterly ignorant or childishly innocent person could make such a claim. But what is still more ~~amazing~~ amazing is that one of the actions cited is the spontaneous lightning strike of the MGS. workers on July 26th 1948 with which the DC ~~xxx~~ had absolutely nothing whatever to do! Could deception go further? If a DC fails utterly to intervene in one of the biggest working-class actions taking place under its nose, is it a proof of its intense reformism and inactivity or of its revolutionary merit?

The signatories are conscious that even logically their claim to have followed a correct policy for a year and then lapsing suddenly into panic by characterising the railway strike decision as utterly vanguardist could not hold water. As the tree, so the fruit. So they have a reply for this "lapse" also. Inevitably and unfortunately, it only makes their position still more heinous and ludicrous.

They explain this "mistake" as resulting from the fact that they had "only the local picture" before them, and "this picture was not bright." "We judged the all-India situation on the basis of the local situation." So having argued (rightly) at length that Benares was seething with mass discontent and actions for a year and (wrongly) that the DC had all along given such actions an essentially revolutionary lead, the signatories end up by saying that the local situation was bleak! The grossest inconsistencies and the worst slander of the fighting masses are justified provided my prestige is vindicated. If that is not bloated petty bourgeois ego, what is?

And even supposing for the sake of argument that the local situation was not very promising how did the DCs conclude that the slogan of an all-India railway general strike was wrong? Is the slogan of an all-India railway strike to be decided in terms of the all-India situation or the situation in a particular locality? Such is the irreconcilable tangle in which a person ties himself up when he replaces Marxism with jugglery.

Having "proved" that politically there was no case whatsoever for the dissolution of the DC the signatories proceed to "explain" why according to them the Prosect took that action. In this attempt they sink to the lowest depth of degradation.

The third point, made in this connection, is that the Prosect is a group of "bosses sitting tight for more than five years" and that "it has all along a feeling of antipathy" and even "hostility" for the Benares DC. In this connection the signatories also "attack" a number of reformist and bureaucratic actions of the Prosect. Certain of these points are obviously correct, but it is not possible immediately to know how many of the others are mere allegations and which are true.

But here that question is entirely beside the point. Every Party Member & Party unit has certainly the right (and it is also its duty) to clearly state & attack reformism and bureaucracy in other PMs and Party units, including higher ones. It is also true that it was very wrong for the Prosect, not to include the necessary criticism of its own mistakes in its resolution on the Benares DC. But when the signatories rake up this issue as an "explanation" of why the Prosect took action against them on the specific issue of their treacherous characterisation of the railway strike, they are doing nothing but indulging in pure mudslinging and anti-Party slander.

For if the signatories had at all tried to be objective and detached towards themselves as towards others, the first thing they would have seen is that the Prosect had acted correctly (and certainly not in a bureaucratic and reformist way) in dissolving the DC and removing the "vanguardists" from responsible strike work. But such, of course, was not the anti-reformism and anti-bureaucratism of the signatories. Criticism and anti-bureaucratism for others, and glorification of one's own crimes and reformism for oneself, such is their definition of Communist self-criticism.

Further, and this is ~~far~~ far worse, what is the character of the "critical attack" of the signatories against Prosect reformism and bureaucracy? Even divorced from its so-called link with the "underlying motives" of the Prosect in taking action against the DC, it is nothing but a disruptive and criminal slander against the Party itself shamelessly sheltering behind the pretence of inner-Party criticism and democracy. It is a scandalous attempt to provoke the entire ranks of the Party in Benares against all Provincial centralism and Party discipline.

The signatories state that the Prosect is a group of bosses sitting tight for five years. Could there be a more dishonest and disruptive way of inner-Party criticism when the signatories know that the Prosect had been elected by a PC, itself elected by the Provincial Party Conference held in 1948 after the

Second Party Congress? In this Conference the earlier PC had come forth with a criticism of its own record in the light of the Second Party Congress, as also of each individual member of the earlier PC. This was followed by full discussion in the conference in which delegate after delegate got up and not merely expressed himself freely but in the most vehement manner criticising the earlier PC and its members. It was after this that the new PC was elected. After this to attack the Prosect as bosses sitting tight for five years and a group nourishing an antipathy for an entire DC is definitely not inner-Party criticism but the crudest attempt to work up and inflame the worst anti-Party sentiment in Party ranks in Benares. It is to undermine the authority, not of this or that Prosect and its members, but of any Provincial Centre whatsoever. Only crooked bourgeois agents inside the Party can attempt to break up all Party authority and functioning in the name of criticising reformism and bureaucracy.

Let it be clear once again that it is perfectly open to a DC or any Party member to raise the question of the proceedings at a Party Conference and the question of any PM attempting to influence the opinions of delegates in a factional, anti-Party manner. But between this and challenging the verdict of the entire Conference there is absolutely nothing in common. One is Bolshevik self-criticism, the other is bourgeois criminality. And if it was the former that the signatories wanted, they would certainly not have waited for ten months after the Provincial Party Conference but raised the issue, nay, within a couple of months after it. And in no case would they have linked it with the issue of the dissolution of the DC.

Any number of quotations can be given from the "appeal" of the signatories themselves that clearly bring out the dishonest and anti-Party character of their "criticism". One of the most glaring ones is that while the signatories repeatedly state that they got no guidance from the Prosect on preparations for the railway strike they themselves admit that they got three circulars from the Prosect and the Provincial Railway Fraction in January on which they took no action whatsoever. These circulars were based on the AIRF Fraction circulars of December 1948 and had worked out its directives in detail for all railway fractions and DCs in the province. The signatories repeatedly refer to these circulars as "gems" but do not say a word as to what the DC did to carry out their instructions.

Having sunk to the level of the market place, the signatories freely use a language and phraseology which is absolutely impermissible in inner-Party criticism. Communist sharpness has nothing to do with vulgarity and abuse. To refer to an entire Party unit as "these "revolutionary" bosses", to speak of its representatives as "Shahjadas", to refer to IFTA comrades as IFTA "fellows", has nothing whatever to do with Party discussions. This is turning Party discussion into a Holi gutter bath which is nauseating for any Party Member who indulges in it.

The petty-bourgeois ego, provocativeness and sabotaging tactics of the signatories rise to a new height when they refer to themselves as persons who "commanded the respect of PMs" and to the dissolution of the DC as "a murder of one year's work," "throwing the entire Party organisation into chaos", and "betrayal of any (strike) preparations at MGS". It is the limit when a person is capable of arguing that strike-breakers command the respect of Party ranks, that their removal from leading strike positions is betrayal of a strike and their continuance in such positions the guarantee of strike victory!

Of course nothing else could be expected of persons who had fallen so low. If a P. functionary is capable of justifying his cowardly betrayal of a great proletarian struggle in the name of "honest doubts", if he is capable of inciting the ranks against all Prov. P. centralism, if he is capable of dirty mudslinging and lies in the name of inner-Party criticism, he must end up by attempting to libel & discredit the entire P. Centre and the highest P. representative. Every enemy of the working class has ended and must end by slandering and maligning its Party, & above all its highest leadership. In this respect the signatories are not and could not be an exception, & are in the company of all the contemptible creatures who have gone the same way before them.

For writing such a slanderous, anti-Party, anti-working class document along and attempting to palm it off as appeal to the CC, the signatories of the document must be summarily expelled from the Party & publicly denounced, apart from what they may have done since writing the "appeal". This also applies to any other members of the DC who supported the "appeal" to the CC, if any did. Their expulsion must be an object lesson to all the P. ranks, as to how an egoistical defence of reformist blunders & crimes inevitably leads to utter fraudulence & deceit, to a person becoming an unmitigated bourgeois liar and cheat & the worst enemy of the working class & the Party. It must also rouse all PMs to vigilance & relentless struggle against all such elements so that the Party becomes stronger & more steel-ed to carry out its revolutionary obligations to all workers and the toiling masses.

18.8.1949

P.B. NOTE ON TAMILNAD

THE RISE OF TAMILNAD PARTY

Left Congressism leading Trade Union struggles - left critics of the Congress bourgeois leadership - the implications of this -

Left Congressism was only an orientation to the masses - the working class - but it was petty-bourgeois in approach. It considered working class to be one of the classes - only a section of the people and saw no qualitative difference between the working class and the rest - vacillating classes. It saw oppression of all - exploitation but did not see the special class position of the various sections in society.

What is really left-Congressism - bourgeois or petty-bourgeois radicalism - which under Indian conditions meant what?

Preaching and practising in a manner as if the entire people was homogeneous unit against imperialism - failure to see the role of the classes - the compromising and treacherous role of the bourgeoisie(b) the leading role of the proletariat(c) the vacillating role of the other classes.

In words Left-Congressism meant trying to achieve Socialism, revolution, liberation - without the working class, its leading role and its revolutionary principles.

Its postulates were - activate the Congress - by which was meant the bourgeois leadership. Its independent role consisted only in acting as a left critic of the bourgeois leadership and not as the independent mobiliser and initiator of anti-imperialist forces, basing itself on the working class. It was a difference between more and less - the left were for more bourgeois radical action; the Rights were for less action.

In the initial period when the proletariat was just building its mass organisation, when it was just entering the political arena - it was inevitable that the Communists should appear as left critics - though their building of mass organisation itself was an instrument to overcome this limitation and start on independent political activity of the working class.

The politics which ended on the eve of Mocrut Trial was practically the politics of left-Congressmen talking Socialism and it ended with the building of mass trade unions which gave the Communists capacity to set workers in motion and independently - on economic as well as political issues.

Left-Congressism decked itself out in Socialist colours (Congress Socialist Party) and Communist colours (trend inside Communist Party) - that is why it became very deceptive.

In reality this role of left critic - as against independent class lead - was the crux of the abjuration of proletarian hegemony. The role of left critic was maintained even when the proletarian movement outgrew that stage - In Bombay there was a forcible reversion to it.

It started in the name of popular approach - hence no talk of proletarian hegemony - in the name of mobilisation of the people - it meant mobilisation in the way that the bourgeoisie did - i.e. by their method, by their programme, by reliance on vacillating classes - press on them, appeal to them to be just to workers, to take up revolutionary line - thus pandering to the non-class conception of national struggle.

In Bombay

In Bombay, Left-Congressism was given up and proletariat entered into a fight against the bourgeois political movement - in 1930. There were sectarian mistakes in approach, etc., but basically it was correct to expose and unmask. The bourgeoisie threw themselves against the new force with all their full force and resources, temporarily isolated the Communists from the working class itself - yet Communist cadres were born and within a couple of years all lost ground recovered. So quick was the recovery that Gandhi's meeting in 1931 could be captured.

Yet, the petty-bourgeois Congressism decried this as sectarian and made it a cardinal principle to repudiate this past, this formation of proletarian Party - foundation of Joshism. In this they primarily based themselves on the vacillating class, petty-bourgeoisie, which was equated with the people.

In Bombay, however, the first cadres were born out of a direct clash with the Congress and Royists - on CA, Soviets, Revolution, violence vs. non-violence, salt satyagraha vs. general strike, etc. These controversies were often carried in mass meetings. This is called independent mobilisation, as a class - independent ideology, platform, unmasking of bourgeois ideology and politics.

The triumph of Joshism inside the Party meant the triumph of the pre-Moerut ideology - of a period when the working class had not yet started independently moving, when its economic struggles were just being led by radical intellectuals who could not in reality think of an alternative leadership to the Congress bourgeois leadership.

One of the basic factors in forging the early Communist cadres and steeling them in the struggle against Royism, Gandhism, was loyalty to the Communist International, its discipline, its principles of organisation, its line, its method of posing problems and attacking them; its world estimation in deciding the role of classes, parties, ideology and individuals in the country, loyalty to the Soviet Union and judging all parties, groups, individuals by reference to their attitude to the Soviet Union.

Thus loyalty to Proletarian Internationalism based on Marxism - loyalty to Communist International as the acid test of Marxism were the basic conditions in forging the first working class cadres.

Without this the Party in Bombay would never have seen proletarian cadres and Bombay would never have gone out of the Left-Congress period.

In fact, inside the Bombay working class illusions about the Congress, Left-Congressmen were strong and they could be broken through only by pursuing independent proletarian policy - by playing the vanguard role and not succumbing to the nationalist illusions of the workers.

This historical review is necessary to understand the sources and origin of reformism in Tamilnad.

The report of Mithu and Sankar is no doubt a good exposition of what happened in recent times. The nauseating tale of betrayal by the leadership, the cowardice, -vacillation before the bourgeoisie, the open sycophancy of the upper classes - all masquerading as fight against adventurism is clearly put. But in the final analysis the report together with the supplementary note of Murugan only examines the policy of the T.N.P.C. on the basis of its attitude to partial struggles and the policy chalked in respect of them from time to time. The repeated reference to failure to lead this or that partial struggle in a revolutionary way, the fact that the centre of self-criticism lies in the handling of partial struggles and practically nothing else - in the first betrays the low level of T.N. leadership - betrays the fact that this leadership never got out of the bog of primary partial struggles, was never able to train the proletariat of Tamilnad, one of the most courageous section of the Indian proletariat, politically and take it out of the mire of bourgeois politics.

With Andhra and

With Andhra and Telengana on one side and Kerala on the other - enacting heroism, entering civil-war, with TN proletariat showing unbounded resources of heroism, this tale of partial struggles is a nauseating comment on the betrayal and low level of the politics of Tamilnad leadership.

The T.N. Secretariat members - Muthu, Shankar and Murugan are thus forced to only talk of partial struggles in their criticism. They could not help it for that is where their lead stood.

These comrades, therefore, are not able to see beyond partial struggles - only pose the question as between struggle and anti-struggle - and fail to see the roots of reformism - the origin and source of reformism. They also talk about left Congress, abjuration of proletarian hegemony, failure to expose bourgeoisie, etc. but these words have no precise meaning. Murugan reduces it to Trade Union fight against Congress leaders, and the other two correctly criticise him and make a correct generalisation about bourgeois ideology. But nonetheless, they also fail to understand the real source of reformism, opportunism and cowardice leading to gangsterism against the Centre and utter intellectual and moral degeneracy as in the case of Raghu, one of the CCM.

The leadership of Party units in different Provinces, almost in all Provinces, have no doubt revealed reformism in practice but in all cases the source and origin has not been identical. The source and origin has to be found from the history of the growth of the movement in the Province and the existing stage of the movement. The erroneous idea that because the Party is there, each Province represents the same stage of the movement, that Provinces differ from each other only from the fact that here the Party is weak and there it is strong - must be given up.

What then is the essence of the situation in Tamilnad so far as the leadership of the Party is concerned - so far as the consciousness of the Provincial leadership and the P.B. member who hitherto led them is concerned - is that their consciousness, and conception of Marxism, proletarian struggle, proletarian hegemony, partial struggles - are all pre-Meerut conceptions - conception of radical Congressmen who mistake their own bourgeois radicalism for Communism and Marxism.

In reality it means their outlook is anti-working class, anti-Marxist - one which betrays the working class into the hands of the bourgeoisie - in short there is hardly anything to distinguish between them and J.P.'s Party.

This means, the practice of TN leadership is to repeatedly press back the working class into the old stage of no politics, or politics subservient to the bourgeoisie and because economic struggles develop into clashes and lead politically advanced consciousness, sabotage and betray them - the role of Social Democracy all over the world.

The betrayal becomes glaring all the more because the fighting working class of Tamilnad whose heroism knows no bounds, and whose capacity to fight against all odds has forcibly transferred the centre of proletarian fight and consciousness from Bombay and Cawnpore to the South - can no longer be compressed within the treacherous framework of bourgeois politics.

The INPC hitherto covered this growing contradiction between its bourgeois treacherous politics and the advanced consciousness of the proletarian masses by fooling the ranks with pseudo-Marxist analysis, by abusing the name of the Party, by exploiting the trust of the proletarian masses in the Party with its past traditions of fight and with its reputation for Marxism. The TN leadership exploited the world prestige of Communism and the leadership of the all-India Party to betray the workers and make them accept their analysis and interpretation of events.

This standpoint in effect would have meant fight against working class leadership - pushing it under bourgeois leadership.

The TN left-Congressism - the Party leadership precisely does this. Having gathered the workers through the elementary struggles which began there except for Buckingham Mills, etc. - more than a decade later than in Bombay - and under conditions of the growth of the all-India Party - the TN party dared not move forward because of the reformism inside the Party - could never break through to build Marxist proletarian cadres, have independent mobilisation of the working class for politics and approach the mass of workers directly on Socialism.

That is why the TN leadership lags behind the consciousness of the working class - masses - the consciousness of Party cadres - consciousness developed directly out of trade union struggles mixed with minimum political agitation. The workers see the capitalists and their agents Congressmen in true colours and hate them. The TN leadership criticises them as sectarian, isolationist; the workers lose all faith in the Congress and with unerring class instinct direct their attack, their hatred against the Congress, its Ministry, Prakasam Ministry; they are demoralised and admonished by the TN leadership and by Joshi - his spokesman Mohan. The workers having outgrown elementary struggles, having learnt the elementary lessons of organisation move forward to militant forms of action - confident of the strength of their number and guided by an unerring class-instinct which tells them that the enemy would attack fiercely. Their heroic resistance which breaks repression, frightens the chicken-hearted petty-bourgeois leadership who, of course, has no pride in the class and they are dubbed as adventurists, vanguardists.

The development of militant forms of action has got historic significance not only in the context of general development of working class struggle; it has special significance in India because it was precisely militant forms of resistance that were avoided in the name of organisation by the earlier Communists - the step from elemental outburst to organisation was often taken by emasculating militant resistance and converting elemental struggles into peaceful struggle. This was surrender to Gandhi's non-violence, bourgeois pressure - the petty-bourgeois leadership instinctively feeling that if they are charged with violence, workers would be isolated, i.e. they would be isolated from bourgeois opinion.

Under these circumstances, when the working class resorts to militant forms in our country, it means it is throwing overboard the last remnants of its early stage, the leadership of petty bourgeoisie and coming into its own. But the TN leadership prevented it from doing so in the name of the Party.

That is why the Party lags behind the masses - behind mass struggle and the masses drag it into the struggle. The S.I.R. strike was imposed on the Party and Union leadership by non-Party militant, pro-Dravida Kazhagam workers - and not really launched by the Party. As in the case of all reformists, the organisation in the hands of Communists also becomes a drag on struggle and is used for such purpose.

The Party continually lags behind the masses - the untrained masses as yet.

It is not a question of attitude and tactics on this or that struggle but a whole epoch of reformism, stage of reformism that is reflected in all this.

Naturally, in the Left Congress outlook, the working class is not really the revolutionary class but a section of the poorer and down-trodden people, hence its special role, importance, is not seen and acted up though it is prattled about. With the continuous lagging behind the consciousness of the working class the Party fails to meet the ideological, political and organisational needs of the working class - which are expressed as formation of the workers into a class - with its class Party, common consciousness of its tasks and united in action for its historic mission.

The outlook and policy pursued by the TN Party meant attempts to disintegrate this growing consciousness, disintegrate the growth of class outlook - all because the petty-bourgeois Congressmen who came at the head of the Party really did not recognise the separate existence and role of the working class in the liberation

liberation struggle and the struggle for Socialism.

With this outlook, independent class politics of the working class is not developed - class politics which debunks bourgeois politics and bourgeois ideologies is not thought necessary - basic Marxist outlook is not broadcast among the workers. All these are considered to be sectarian - and acquaint with Marxist principles becomes the monopoly of petty bourgeois intellectuals.

The political agitation and awakening that is done among the workers is precisely on issues on which the bourgeoisie has moved. Rajkot, etc. and that too is done as mere critics. The popular issues are supposed to be those taken by the bourgeois leadership - though it was true that such issues had to be tackled because they rouse popular interest - but issues on which the bourgeoisie surrendered, kept quiet, were not unmasked before the workers.

The popularisation of independent political platform of the proletariat was of course not done - for this meant exposure of Congress politics. On the other hand, all that appeared to be common - and it was not really common - was stressed while fundamental differences on the outlook and platform were concealed.

The fashion of basing oneself on Congress platform, and Congress pledges was not a question of popular approach, but a question of left-Congress politics as if their pledges could ever be fulfilled without shattering the faith in Congress leadership.

It was forgotten that the high-sounding Congress pledges about abolition of landlordism^{etc.} were the direct result of independent popularisation of the proletarian platform and even then the pledged were surrounded with reservations.

In the name of national discipline, non-violence was accepted instead of combating it and thus surrender was complete.

Under this outlook partial struggles were not a link in the chain of the revolutionary struggle, not the skirmishes in class-battles, but just means to acquire influence with the workers, so that whenever the leaders thought of any political action, the masses should be ready at their command. It was sheer exploitation of the proletariat, as the Congress and Socialists did for their own purpose of election or influence. The Communists only talked in the name of revolution.

The tactics of partial struggles were derived from this anti-revolutionary conception - the conduct of each struggle was determined not by the class needs of the proletariat, the needs of that struggle together with the growth in class consciousness, discipline, but by the needs of leadership - whether this or that move would keep the influence of leadership in tact - and since there was divergence between Party policy and the needs of the working class, this influence meant reformist influence.

Naturally, this did not keep the influence but began to create disintegration - recent instances - the appearance was created that we were gaining because we were mostly capitalising the elementary strikes - and as yet there was no serious rival trade union leadership.

Hence the leadership talked big and acted betrayal. When the working class - or section of workers were beginning to move on any issue, they would immediately talk about general strike, etc.; when the working class entered upon serious preparation for a strike after clash with Government, they were so frightened by the initial battles that they called off the strike under one pretext or another. Railway, etc.

They adopted all the weapons of hardened reformists to escape mass action. They postponed Coimbatore textile strike in the name of Railway strike; and they then sabotaged Railway strike.

It is not necessary to go into details of every period - People's War - Production, etc. The main happenings have been detailed in Mathu's and Shunkar's report.

The happening since 1946 - and after the Party Congress - offer a direct link with the past - and show that Left Congressism continued to the end - and was at last revealed as gross betrayal.

Here we must distinguish between the Joshiian conception of Left-Congressism and the correct conception. Joshi often charged the Andhra, TN and perhaps Bengal Committees with Left Congressism by which he meant sectarianism. In a controversy in 1947 over the Socialist Party, Joshi justified attacking the Socialist Party more than Sardar Patel by saying that Patel represents the movement, JP only a trend by which he meant a narrow section. For him all Lefts were mere sects not the first attempt of the radical petty bourgeois to express discontent against the bourgeoisie - and hence sectarian. Thus Left-Congressism meant one who ran ahead of national consciousness, too extreme, too radical. This is fundamentally different from what we are stating. Joshi's estimate was made from the point of Sardar Patel.

This then is the essence of TN politics.

Naturally, the comrades who held such outlook could not be anything but alien to the elementary principle of Marxism - as all of them have been.

They were just petty bourgeois radicals who came to the Party thinking it to be a more radical Congress Socialist Party. All their petty bourgeois outlook, prejudices, etc. were provided by Joshi's reformist line and they were egged on.

They came at a time when inside the Party the large influx of petty-bourgeois elements was loosening the disciplined outlook of the C.I. - at a time when under a wrong understanding of 7th Congress of the C.I., Marxism was being thrown overboard, Soviet was being kept in the background, working class was being ignored - or at a time when Marxian discipline and study were at a discount.

Therefore, they could not develop any understanding of such basic conception as period, epoch, crisis, tactics, etc. in all of which they read their own prejudices. They had no respect for Marxism - they regarded basic books - the most sacred trust of the proletariat - as mere dictionaries for reference to defend their narrow outlook.

They had great contempt for the masses. They never learnt from them. When did arrogant petty bourgeois intellectuals learn from the masses - unless Marxism had enabled them to shed their arrogance? Their reviews, self-criticism, etc. by devious routes proved two things - (1) Generally the masses were wrong and not the leadership; (2) if at all the leadership was wrong, it was because it over-estimated the revolutionary consciousness of the masses - a smug petty bourgeois way of saying 'what could we do - these fellows do not keep pace with us'.

Because of all this, it was obvious that they could never feel the need for implementing the revolutionary principles of organisation of the proletariat; nor that they should be acquainted with them. Their only acquaintance with organisational principles was derived from the reformist liquidationist conceptions propagated by Joshi. As late as 9th March or so, Ramamurthi attempts to appear profound by using Joshi's liquidationist formulation - leaders, followers, masses. By thus formulating the organisational situation at that time, Joshi was attempting to liquidate the Party and calling for the Party to merge with the masses. Joshi was precisely asking us to give up the vanguard role.

Bankrupt in their organisational outlook, the TN leadership import Congress conceptions in the Party; and import methods of petty-bourgeois gangsterism inside the Party to maintain its policy of betrayal. It thinks of the Party leadership, its central apparatus in the same way as confirmed class enemies think - a gang of crooks out to resort to any means.

The class

The class enemy of the proletariat describes guerrilla fighters in Telengana as bandits and dacoits. The TN leadership considers the Central leadership to be a gang of crooks - a la Joshi. This is their pride in the Party. No doubt they must have glorified the Party in their speeches, etc. but all this is to be done only in so far as they are the provincial leaders. The moment they are face to face with their own bankruptcy, nothing of the Party remains in their mind except the idea that they have to defend themselves anyhow and save their own skins. What does it matter what happens to the movement? What does it matter if the Party Congress has been appreciably reviewed in the Bolshevik?

They themselves have now concretely unmasked their own failings without reservation which has helped the situation in no small way.

Their own writings show that deep in their minds, they had all the prejudices and poisonous ideas about the Party which the bourgeoisie and other base slanderers repeatedly pump into the minds of the unwary about the Party, about the USSR, etc. The Communist Party is based on dictatorial principles - shouts the slanderer. And our TN leaders echo it the moment they are called on to observe minimum discipline. Communists are crafty people - say the slanderers. And our TN comrades imagine that they will be kept in isolation, they will be badgered, their will-power will be shattered and confession will be extracted. Only the drug is lacking - otherwise the story is a full replica of anti-Soviet stories - Tuchachevsky trial, etc.

Then they themselves think of telling lies to the Party and degenerate into chauvinism, etc. though one or the other pulls up, some conscience is still left.

All this degeneracy is not accidental. This is the logical conclusion of rejection of Marxist - the logical result of a situation when petty-bourgeois elements do not want to accept working class outlook but to betray it. They can only degenerate into gangsterism - open to themselves all the sluices of their reformism mind. You cannot fight Communism except by adopting gangster methods.

It is, therefore, not a question of violation of the principle of Centralism. It is utter repudiation of all principles and resort to gangsterism.

This besides is not accidental. It shows the difference between petty-bourgeois elements and the working class. Compare the loyalty of the proletarian elements of the Party with the repudiation of the Party by these. For the working class, the Party is the vital condition of its existence, the hope of its future emancipation, the weapon of liberation. For the petty bourgeoisie it is a luxury to be discarded as soon as it ceases to satisfy his ego. The TN Secretariat had the same ideas as those against whom Lenin thundered - in One Step Forward. And their ideas and Joshi's ideas are like two peas.

The TN Secretariat in their anti-Party policy attempted to disrupt the Party and liquidate it as the all-India unifier and leader of the proletariat - the last step in their reformism. They wanted to what imperialism and capitalists, what the Nehru Government, failed to achieve. They wanted to go back on the heroic struggle waged by the workers for the last years to form a single union of revolutionaries - the Party - the vanguard of the proletariat.

Their consciousness is more backward than that of the Trade Union workers who resist attack on the AITUC and see the necessity of the all-India organisation.

It is not necessary to refer to their Document on People's Democracy. I have already discussed it with them. I will prepare a note on it. Its essence, however, may be stated - they in all seriousness want us to believe that August 15th was not a betrayal of the revolution but was February Revolution. Servicing the bourgeoisie cannot go further.

These mistakes and crimes will not end in TN with the corrective efforts of these comrades. There will be many more in TN who will manifest these same trends - because the

because the situation in TN represents the lag of a whole decade or more. Unless this is understood even fine working class cadres might be victims of these vacillations, this lag. The real source is the lag - the fact that TN is still in left-Congress period; that because of this even experience of working class comrades is limited, and hence they protest only occasionally and not always on clear issues. Unless the lag is liquidated consciously by changing practice, training workers in Marxism-Leninism, nothing can be done. We must proceed along these lines.

The PB believes that all the three comrades have made honest attempts to re-understand their past and mercilessly unmask their own failings. They have succeeded to the extent that their understanding went. The report of Muthu and Shankar is a good one in so far as it deals with partial struggles and general failings of the Party - its deviation on certain questions - though it does not go to the root. It can be used for explaining recent happenings in relation to railway strike, other strikes, etc. Also the additional facts supplied by Murugan about strikes may be utilised. The PB does not hold to all their generalisations.

Because of this honest effort, the PB believes that it is not necessary to take drastic action against these comrades. The PB censures them and denounces their conduct. It holds that none of them can be put in a responsible position inside the Province till such time as the PB is satisfied about their capacity to wield new responsibilities.