

**A CORRECTION FROM SUNITI KUMAR GHOSH, A MEMBER
OF THE CENTRAL ORGANISING COMMITTEE OF THE CPI(ML)**

(Frontier Aug 3, 1974)

As a member of the Central Organising Committee of the CPI(ML), I feel it necessary to correct some wrong statements made in the article "On the statement of the Central Organising Committee of the CPI(ML)" (*Frontier*, July 20, 1974). The article says: "The present document (the statement of the COC) limits itself to the aim of mobilising the party on the line accepted until the death of Comrade Charu Mazumdar". Nothing can be farther from the truth. Far from upholding the tactical line the Party followed from about 1969 to the death of Comrade Mazumdar "the line accepted by the party Congress" the COC placed before the cadres and people an alternative line which is basically different. One should not mistake the strategy for tactics; the COC held that the strategy not the tactical line adopted at this phase, was broadly correct. The Political-Organisational Report accepted at the Party Congress stated as "the correct thesis" the theory that "the annihilation of the class enemy is the higher form of class struggle and the beginning of guerilla war" and declared that "The class struggle, i.e. this battle of annihilation, can solve all the problems facing us and lead the struggle to a higher plane, raise the political consciousness of the people to a higher stage, create conditions for the emergence of a new type of man.., develop the people's army and can thus ensure the formation of a permanent base area". The COC held that the battle of annihilation of class enemies, carried out by secret squads of militants, cannot solve our problems nor can it serve as the beginning of guerilla war. That is why the COC considered it necessary "to participate in and lead mass struggles of the people on all fronts – economic, political and cultural – and establish the Party's political leadership over mass organizations with a view to organizing armed struggles of the peasantry on the basis of an Agrarian Programme and for building up base areas in the countryside". This method of strengthening the Party, establishing the Party's leadership over the people, developing armed struggles of the peasantry, building up the people's armed forces and rural base areas is fundamentally different from the method propagated and practised at a certain phase that ended with the death of Comrade Mazumdar. While the method defined by the COC depends for its success on the masses of people led by the Party, the earlier method relied mainly on the vanguard.

The article wrongly observes:

"Comrade Charu Mazumdar referred to this aspect (the need for participating in economic struggle) in his last article. Therefore, the COC made a reference to this aspect and it was included in the third task".

In the autumn of 1971, quite a long time before Comrade Mazumdar wrote his last article, the Bengal State Committee of the Party had issued the call for seizure of the landlord's crops. Comrade Mazumdar's article does not refer to the necessity for mass organizations without which no mass struggle can be conducted. So when the COC undertook the task of participating in and leading mass struggles on all fronts

and of establishing the Party's leadership over mass organisations, no member of the COC even mentioned Comrade Mazumdar's writing as it had no relevance to the method that the COC was defining. The COC's statement does not state, nor does it imply, nor did the COC intend it to imply, that, as a form of struggle, annihilation of class enemies should be combined with other forms of struggle. The interpretation that the COC's statement does imply this is wrong and unauthorised. We expect comrades not to be misled by the "explanation" offered by "a member of the Central Committee" (our Party organisation has no Central Committee at present), whose identity is not known to us.

Suniti Kumar Ghosh, Member, COC (CPI-ML)