Basavappanahia's Laborious Intellectual Exercise

Attempt To Assure Soviet Leaders that CPI (M) is Pro-Soviet

revisionist Leadership

Anyone going through the article that has been published in the Russian Democracy dated 10th Dec, 1973, under the heading “Indo-Soviet Agreements and the CPI (M)”, written by Mr. Basavappanahia, a well-known leader of the CPI (M), would wonder what might be the real purpose of the said article?

It may superficially appear as if Mr. Basavappanahia in his article has attempted to give reply to charges labelled against the CPI(M) by the CPI that the former is anti-Soviet and is following a policy between the Soviet Union and the Socialist China. But, is it really so? Or is it an attempt, thatunder the pretext of replying to the CPI, Mr. Basavappanahia has actually made to assure the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union that whatever the CPI might say against them, the CPI(M) is not at all anti-Soviet revisionist leadership?

Let us examine if such an idea is a product of one’s wishful thinking or based on objective ground. For this purpose let us at first see what might be the reasons that have led the CPI to label the charges against the CPI(M) as stated above.

Like us, along with others, the CPI knows that recently CPI(M) leaders, one after another have visited the Soviet Union.

It also knows that a journal published on behalf of the CPI(M) in Greece, ‘Pana’ in the Greek language, ‘Ganapathi’ in the Press owned by the CPI(M). Like us, along with others, the CPI must have noted that one no longer finds outbreaks against Soviet revisionism in the papers of the organs and other publications of the CPI(M) which one most often used to come across in the past. Rather, in place of criticism against the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union, one is increasing noticing praise of the role of the said revisionist leadership even on issues which are not only upon with suspicion by the resurgent nationalist countries of Asia and Africa but also at times strongly condemned by the freedom-loving people all over the world. A glaring example among many such issues is the shameful humiliating censure-fire resolution on the recent West Asian conflict that was jointly presented by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union along with the U.S. imperialists and imposed on the fighting Arab people with the result to their betrayal of their cause.

Like us, along with others, the CPI must have also noted that for sometimes past, the CPI(M) leadership while, on the one hand, are praising the Soviet revisionist leadership on and even on trivial issues, on the other, contrary to their previous attitude towards the CPC, are more and more reflecting an attitude of bitterness criticism towards the CPA and the socialist China in their gestures and deportments. Again, in the wake of understanding with the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union the CPI(M) is trying to be closer to the CPI for a better mutual understanding and with this end in view, the CPI(M) instead of calling the CPI any more as ‘Dangote revisionists’ has begun to term it simply as ‘Right CPI’.

Moreover, like us, along with others, the CPI must have also noted that for sometimes past, the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union on their part are also showing an attitude of softness towards the CPI(M). The CPI can easily understand that the advice given to it by Mr. Brezhnev during his last visit to our country, to come to a closer understanding with the CPI(M) is an outcome of this soft attitude that is being at present expressed by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union towards the CPI(M).

Now, like us along with others, the CPI also understands very well that all these facts and incidents clearly show that attempts are being made by both the CPI(M) leadership and the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union to come to a closer understanding behind the screen.

Now, for obvious reasons, the CPI, being apprehensive of the fact that any sort of relation developing between the CPI(M) and the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union might jeopardise its own interest, has actively engaged at impairing the growth of the same. To fulfill this desired objective, the CPI has attempted to mislead the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union by trying to depict the CPI(M) before them as anti-Soviet revisionist leadership.

This is quite understandable and any sensible man can easily follow the meaning of it.

Now, if Mr. Basavappanahia would not have desired to misguide the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union that they were not anti-Soviet revisionist leadership and, more over, if he would have meant to maintain at least on word for word’s sake, their once announced old position that the CPI(M) would fight against modern revisionism and particularly the revisionism practised by the Soviet revisionist leadership then he could have stated in his reply to the CPI that what is wrong in one’s thinking anti-Soviet revisionist leadership? The CPI(M) leadership were always against revisionism and anti-Soviet revisionist leadership which they are still now.

But Mr. Basavappanahia has not uttered anything like that.

On the contrary, it would clearly appear that the CPI(M) leader has become perturbed at the possibility of their growing relation with the Soviet revisionist leadership being impaired by the CPI’s attempt, and with a view to frustrate this attempt has promptly come forward to denounce the charge labelled against them by the CPI that they are anti-Soviet revisionist leadership.

The CPI(M) leader, in his reply to the CPI has virtually assured the Soviet leadership of the Soviet Union that they are not anti-Soviet revisionist leadership though sometimes they have to criticise the said leadership on certain issues. In no case this proves that the CPI(M) is going against the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union. For, they have to do this for preserving their so called ‘revolutionary image’ among two and half hundred millions they expect of their revisionist friends of the Soviet Union to understand. Moreover, in his argument, Mr. Basavappanahia has pathetically tried to impress upon the Soviet revisionist leadership that: when they even criticise them, do they not do it in a fraternal tone like a close ally or friend? Do the Soviet revisionist leadership not appreciate that any unguarded or more critical of the CPC?

To any critical reader it would therefore appear that on the plea of replying to the charges labelled against them by the CPI, Mr. Basavappanahia has in reality tried to assure the Soviet revisionist leadership that whatever the CPI(M) might say against them, they are really pro-Soviet revisionist leadership. But this has not been an easy task for him. For, apprehending lest their so called ‘revolutionary image’ would become tarnished if his real motive behind his efforts is recognized in their cadre, Mr. Basavappanahia has to take recourse to a subtle way of assuring the Soviet revisionist leadership through which he assumes they can escape the danger of being exposed to their own cadre. In fact, being guided by this deep rooted objective, Mr. Basavappanahia has to perform a laborious intellectual exercise through which the substance of which has taken the form of the present article under examination, though how far he has succeeded in his job is anybody’s guess. No doubt, it is due to the low standard of ideological education in the cadre of CPI(M) that Mr. Basavappanahia has dared to launch such a futile attempt.

For, any cadre of a revolutionary party, with adequate political and ideological education would have grasped the inner motives that have led Mr. Basavappanahia to perform such an unsuccessful struggle.

We would like to raise some pertinent questions before the CPI(M) leadership including the author of the article under review. When the CPI(M) emerged as a separate party from the united CPI, its very emergence was the result of the party leadership making the pledge that it would have to fight against modern revisionism and particularly the revisionism practised by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union—a trend that, after being once developed in the past as the main danger to the world Communist movement, has now become the worst enemy against the healthy growth of the international Communist movement.

But, do the CPI(M) leadership still consider modern revisionism the immediate danger to which has been opened up by the Soviet revisionist leadership, at least as the main danger if not the main enemy before the international Communist movement which they openly stated in the past at the time of the formation of their party from the united CPI? Do they still pledge to fight against modern revisionism, the rotten enemy of the international Communist movement which they pledged to do in the past during the formation of the CPI(M) out of the split in the united CPI? Moreover, and perhaps one need not be surprised is, do they still consider the present leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet state as arch revisionists? If not, then how can they justify the existence of the CPI(M) any more as a party separate from the CPI(M) other than for preserving the group interests of the leaders, as against all other points of its difference with the CPI relate only to a tactual questions? We hope the rank and file of the party would seriously ponder over the matter.

We have had to raise these questions, because for sometime past, along with others, we too have been observing the party leadership getting closer to the Soviet revisionist leadership and that too, in a very surreptitious
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ous way at the very back of their own rank and file, supporters and the masses.

Apart from the facts and incidents that we have already mentioned, the manner in which Mr. Basavappanahiah has given rather unqualified support, both before and after the谈话 agreements, Indo-Soviet treaty and eulogised Soviet aid, has also revealed without any doubt that with days passing on, they are gradually becoming more and more inclined to cooperate with the Soviet revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union. In this regard, Mr. Basavappanahiah has quoted the relevant portions of the Politburo resolution of the CPI(M) where the Soviet aid, economic cooperation and assistance to the Soviet Union and Indo-Soviet treaty have been highly praised for fulfilling our CPI(M) friends' wishful thinking that they have 'helped in lessening the dependence of our country on imperialist powers' and 'given an impetus to our national liberation struggle'...

Now, so far as the Indo-Soviet treaty is concerned, we would like to refer to our former issue (Prolet. era 15th Sept. 1971) where we have thoroughly analysed the said treaty in detail and placed our considered views on the same. For the present, with a view to place our main observations on the said treaty vis-a-vis the view point of our CPI(M) friends that we have already stated above, for our critical readers, we would like to quote certain relevant portions from our earlier issue that has been referred to above. It is important to note here that at a time when China is attempting to normalise her relationship with all countries including India, this treaty was concluded with hot haste by the Soviet Union taking advantage of China's complete dependence on her due to Bangladesh issue. So, in the background of prevailing hostility between the Soviet Union and China, such an apprehension can not be ruled out that this treaty, particularly the Clause X of the said treaty, was a move towards the necessary move required from the side of India to restore our old friendship with China.

A question still haunts the minds of conscientious public why the Soviet Union particularly chose this time in signing this treaty and hastily concluded it containing certain clauses which may be directly aimed at keeping India closely with her against China, now a hostile country of the Soviet Union taking advantage of India's difficulty on Bangladesh issue. Where as it was expected of the Soviet Union carrying a long revolutionary tradition as socialist state to take a patient, real, energetic and objective approach towards restoration of normal relationship with China, then the recent hasty, slipshod manner of the socialist camp, the Soviet Union on the contrary is obstructing China's sincere effort to develop friendly relationship with all countries which is clearly evident from their recent hectic diplomatic move precisely designed for that purpose...

Soviet Union was worried and anxiously, noticing for sometime, the growing symptoms of India's eagerness to restore normal relationship with China.

Precisely under this background one is likely to presume that the Soviet Union has particularly chosen this moment for signing treaty with such a haste with the sole motive of keeping India closely with her against China when India is in a difficult situation and a complexly dependent on Soviet Union's help for Bangladesh issue...

If it is seen that in the course of time it becomes possible to have a rapprochement between the Soviet Union and China...then this particular clause of the treaty will have practically no bearing on India in playing her full independent role...But if such a situation is likely to arise in the near future and the hostile attitude of the Soviet Union against China still continues then whatever small benefit the Indian side might have accrued out of the treaty with the Soviet Union Bangladesh issue...this treaty in the long run in course of 20 years, will virtually subjugate Indian interests and this particular clause will definitely act as a brake on our attempts to normalise relationship and restore old friendship with China.

So our question is how can anyone, other than the choice boys of the Soviet revisionist leadership eulogise such a treaty which was solely designed to realise the interest of the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union and to bind India along with her against China, with a view to frustrating any attempt on former's part to restore her old friendship with China, by observing that this 'have helped in lessening the dependence of our country on US imperialism'? Is it not a wishful thinking on the part of the CPI(M) leadership if they still consider the leadership of the party and state as Soviet revisionist leadership? Of course, the position would fundamentally change if the CPI(M) leadership no more consider the Soviet leadership as revisionist. We hope the rank and file of the CPI(M) will think over this pertinent question.

Now, let us concentrate our attention on the issue of the aid given to India by the Soviet revisionist leadership and the economic cooperation in which the said revisionist leadership have entered...

It is known to all that on the questions of giving aid to India either in the form of economic cooperation, or making treaty with any under developed or developing capitalist country, the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist leadership has been guided by the principle that the aid must improve the living standard of the people of the countries and also strengthen the revolutionary movements in those countries. powdered by this criterion, for instance, in the case of the aid given to India by the Soviet Union, who from the role they have repeatedly played in the important international events that have happened since the twentieth party congress of the Soviet Union, Vietnam war, Cuban crisis, Naxalegin, summit of Asia, etc., have clearly revealed that they have the ultimate stage of pervasion in the game and tactics of revisionism, and are hand-in-glove with the U.S. imperialists to enter into nefarious agreement for mutually extending their spheres of influence so can they fulfil the desired objective? What about the said aid programme that we have earlier elaborated? No Marxist-Leninist can ever believe that.

At present, when it is being glaringly testified that the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union are in collusion with the U.S. imperialists for mutually extending their spheres of influence and on the other, to restrain any possible attempts on the part of the ruling bourgeoisie of our country to normalise relationship and restore old friendship with the Soviet Union...

A true Marxist-Leninist can easily see to it of the fact that Mr. Basavappanahiah is trying to make us believe otherwise.

Even if the CPI(M) leadership do not agree with our observation that in the present situation the aid to different countries is actually an attempt on the part of the Soviet revisionist leadership to increase their spheres of influence, still we hope that they would agree with what we earlier stated in regard to the primary and basic objective of the aid given by the Soviet Union to the socialist countries. But what is most curiously lacking in the observations made by Mr. Basavappanahiah is a critical examination of the character of the aid given by the present Soviet revisionist leadership in the background of the fulfillment of these objectives. Not only that Mr. Basavappanahiah is trying to make any such critical examination; over and above the manner in which the CPI(M) leadership have
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highly praised to the super-

lative degree the Indo-Soviet treaty and the aid given by

the revisionist leadership of the

Soviet Union through their observation that they

have helped in lessening the
dependence of the U.S. imperialists’ has
glaring revealed their
growing inclination to the

Soviet revisionist leadership.

However, from all these
tings one should not

conclude that the CPI(M)

criticisms made are completely

refrained from criticising the

Soviet revisionist leader-

ship any more. It is a fact

that they no more call them

revisionists. They even

unequivocally lend support
to those activities of the

revisionist leadership of the

Soviet Union which are

condemned by the freedom

loving people all over the

world. But, apprehending lest

their motive may become

exposed, they have done

certain obfuscations against the

Soviet revisionist leadership.

In fact, in the present

article too, Mr. Basavpunnaiah has

made some criticisms of this sort.

For obvious reasons, these

criticisms made in the very

mild tone are fraternal in

nature.

But, side by side along

with this sort of attitude that

is being expressed by the

CPI(M) leadership towards the

revisionist leadership of the

Soviet Union, for some-
times past, it is a position

and that the said leadership

have gradually revealing an

degree of intensitive

unprincipled criticism towards the CPC and the

Socialist China—a
criticism that is not based

on even a single fact and

correct understanding of the

principles of Marxism-

Leninism. In this regard, we

would like to quote a

relevant portion from an

article by Mr. Sundarayya, the

General Secretary of the

CPI(M) (People’s Democracy

23.12.71), where he has

bracketed the CPC and the

Socialist China with

the Jansangh, Congress(O)

etc., for their alleged

anti-Soviet position, and

stated, “It is unfortunate that

the Socialist China, its press

and Radio (the Chinese

Communist party and the

Chinese Government) carried

away by its sharp conflicts

with the Soviet Government

and Soviet Communist party

(not even a single word is

mentioned a bout the

revisionist character of the

leadership—I-writer), have been

attacking Indo-Soviet

economic relations from the

same angle as that of the

Jansangh, Congress(O) and

other reactionary forces

in our country.” We

would have appreciated if Mr.

Sundarayya, before making

such rotten false allegation

against the Socialist China

and the CPC would have

placed an analysis in support

of his observation. But we

are constrained to note that

such an attempt is lacking

on his part.

Moreover, the CPI(M)

leadership claim themselves
to be Marxist-Leninist. But,

any Marxist-Leninist knows

it well that situation may

arise when a particular

issue is opportunistically

suffer criticism from both

the revolutionary Marxist-

Leninist viewpoint and the

right reactionary angle. For

that reason, no other than

fools and idiots can equate

those two positions that they

possess identical angularities

in views. So, any sensible

man might conclude

that Mr. Sundarayya, though

he claims himself to be a

Marxist-Leninist, has

been behaving like a

simpleton who equates the

angularity of the revolu-

tionary viewpoint at pore

with that of the reactionary

view on the plea, that both

have opposed a particular

issue, without judging at all

which has opposed it from

what view point and for

what underlying reasons.

A growing tendency of
directing unprincipled crici-
mism towards the CPC and

Socialist China has also

been reflected by Mr. Basavpunnaiah in his

observation that the CPC

showed opportunistic distor-
tions of some basic ide-

ological and politcal|

questions. Here Mr. Basavpunnaiah

too, has failed to establish

his contention and the political

resolution adopted by the

CPI(M) in the Ninth Congress,

may not support many acti-

vities of the CPC. But, with-

out even ascertaining the

validity of one’s contentions

regarding those observations

and activities of the CPC,

what one would like to ask

is, how can any one under

such circumstances criticize

the criticism of the CPC which

in the main is at present

reflecting the correct revolu-

tionary line, at par with his

criticism of the revisionist

leadership of the Soviet Union

practising worst possible type of revisionism? But,

this is exactly what the

CPI(M) leaders are doing at

present. Does this not tan-

amount to a crime, particu-

larly for people claiming to

be Marxists-Leninists? This

clearly shows, what direction

the CPI(M) leadership are

actually moving in. We

think this is very important

to note and all fighting people

including even the rank and

file of the CPI(M) should

take note of this.

In fact, solely with the

view to shield their revi-

sionist character, to covering

up their growing inclination
to and understanding with the

revisionist leadership of the

Soviet Union, the CPI(M)

leadership are engaged at

posing themselves to be

pursuing a policy of equi-
distance from the Soviet

revisionist leadership of the

CPC, while in actuality they

are advancing in a surprrising way towards the

revisionist leadership of the

Soviet Union.

More over, Mr. Basav-

punnaiah in his article has

not only attempted to cover

up their growing inclination
towards the revisionist

leadership of the Soviet

Union by posing them-

selves to be pursuing a policy

deplorable to her against both

the revisionist leadership

of the Soviet Union and the

CPC but also tried in vain to

establish the same on the

basis of the principles of

Marxism-Leninism through a

ludicrous intellectual exercise.

He has stated, “It is no secret

that our pro-Sovietism and

our pro-Chinism is born out

of our fundamental loyalty to

the cause of Marxism-Leninism

and to the cause of Socialism

and Communism ‘ We

ever have come across

and do not know if any real Marxist Leninist has
ever come across through such terminology like ‘pro-

Sovietism’ and ‘pro-Chinism’

in Marxism-Leninism. We

will appreciate if Mr. Basavpunnaiah can help us

in this regard.

We feel a real communist, being a prole who is anti-internationalist, as a co-fighter in the

ternational Communist

movement would feel ideological

identity, in spite of difference

on any issue, if there is any, with

fraternal Communist

parties of different countries,

all fighting for the common

cause of social progress,

emancipation and world

revolution. For obvious

reasons, he will feel sympathy

for and obligation to the

world socialist system in
general. He will not only try to do with one’s becoming inclined towards the

revisionist leadership of a

party, like the CPI(M) which

in the name of its so-called

‘pro-Sovietism’ is, in reality

advancing towards the

revisionist leadership of the

Soviet Union? Mr. Basavpunnaiah

has tried to gloss over this

fundamental question under

the pretext of rendering

support to all including even the bend of the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union.

It is one thing to feel obli-

gation to a socialist state and

a Communist party but it is

completely different thing to

sacrifice oneself at the feet of the

revisionist leadership of

the party in the name of ren-

dering support to the socialist

state and the Communist

party, which we doubt if Mr.

Basavpunnaiah’s intellectual

ability is up to the mark to

understand.

Again, Mr. Basavpun-

naiah has stated that, ‘The

CPI(M) is decidedly pro-

USSR and pro Peoples’ Re-

gublic Of China since these

are two of the big socialist

states in the World Socialist

system. We would like to tell

Mr. Basavpunnaiah, what attitude would you have shown to these states had these states been small

states of the socialist system?

What would be one’s attribute to any small state of the anti-socialist system? Does the size of a

socialist state, big or small has any relevancy in the question of

(Contd. to page 7)
Once More an Anti-People Railway Budget

That Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, her party and her colleagues in the Central Ministry are very pro-people—spend sleepless nights for the betterment of the lives of the people is glaringly revealed in the Railway budget placed on 27th February in the Lok-Sabha by the compassionate Minister of Railways. Kind-hearted and sympathetic as he is, he has assured us that he has carefully scanned the budget and prepared it in such a fashion that it will not affect the daily life of the toiling people of our country. Very very kind of him indeed!

We are moved by his kindness when we find that a meagre ₹ 136.38 crores of rupees have been decided to be collected extra on and from the following heads:

(i) From III class passen-
gers with an increase of 5 paisa to ₹ 8 rupees per ticket total rupees 35 crores.

(ii) From increased fare of Air-conditioned and Shatabdi class coaches rupees 4.4 crores.

(iii) From increased rate of freight on carriage of coal rupees 39.33 crores.

(iv) From increased rate of freight on carriage of other commodities rupees 44.90 crores.

The railway authorities have assured us that due to this extra levy of ₹ 136.38 crores, the price structure of commodities will only be affected by a meagre 10%. We are, of course, delighted! Not very much, is it not? When we are already shouldering a 26% rise, can we not shoulder another 10% extra?

The big losses of the society, air-conditioned and first class coaches, a te a te shouldering 44 crores! The Minister of railways was very apologetic about this burden on the big bosses! Of course he should be!

But it is our sad experience that never the Government estimate of probable price rise tallies with the actual rise in the market. Due to profiteering, the market-price always remains at a few times higher level than the price estimated by Government.

The traders have already started to say that they will not pay this increased freight from their own pocket. Naturally, prices will go up.

Can we demand of the traders to curtail their profit? It will be sheer injustice to them!

The Minister of railways have been very sympathetic on us and have not enhanced the freight on the carriage of food-grains because any rise in cost of food-grains will cause great hardship on the people! What is it? Foolishness or humour? If it is foolishness we are constrained to say that such a talent should not be wasted in such a place. It is humour then he should be better placed as a manager in a slaughter house.

When according to the railway authority the wholesale price-index will go up by 10% due to the enhanced rate of railway freight, how is it that the price of food-grains will remain static, even if the price of carriage of food-grains remain static, is best known to the Minister of Railways. Even a simpleton will understand that with the enhancement of the cost of commodities required for farming as well as subsis-
tence of farmers, the cost of production of food-grains will go up automatically. As a retrospective effect the price of food-grains will go up. Over and above, this will come the production of the Joteli-
dars, landlords and monopo-
lists. Of course we should not be surprised at such wisdom shown by the Minister! Man-
upant, the great French writer, once said that to be a Minister one must acquire common sense even the ability of tall-tales and flattery will be considered fit for the position.

We may recall the econom-
ic review placed in the

Communist parties of other countries, this or that and at times express their identity as 'pro-Soviet' or 'pro-Chinese'.

The CPI(M) which at present, with a view to covering its gradually growing inclination towards the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union is attempting to pose itself to be both pro-Soviet revisionist leadership and pro-CPC, immediately after its formation out of the split in the united CPC mechanically and blind ly distroy the line of the CPC for something just to get recognition from the same and thereby strengthen the party by drawing the militant section of the cadre of the united CPI in its favour. Circumstances including the fact that the Soviet revisionist leadership gave recognition to the CPI, led it to attempt to get closer to the CPC.

At this stage the CPI(M) was highly critical of the leadership of the Communist party and the state of Soviet Union and the leaders of the party never even touched water before bitterly criti-
cising them as revisionists in a
criticism.

But, after the split in the CPI(M), when the newly formed CPI(ML) which attracted the militant section of the rank and file of the CPI(M) to its side, attempted to be closer to the CPC, the CPI(M), with a view to finding a new ally in the international field, once even tried to be closer to the Rumanian communist party, a party whose leadership are more right in the direction of revisionism, than the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union.

Now, at present in the changed situation, after being confident that the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union would give due recognition to their growing allegiance to the said leadership, the CPI(M) leadership are becoming gradually more inclined towards the Soviet revisionist leadership.

Of course, they are at liberty to render allegiance to any revisionist leadership of any Communist party, even if the party too has become revisionist, and we have nothing to say against it. On the contrary, we are rather happy to note that by this, they are gradually exposing their revisionist character before the masses. But, for what any right thinking man would accuse them is the fact that with a view to covering up their revisionist character and conceal their growing inclination to the Soviet revisionist leadership from the people, they have taken recourse to fraud and deceit.

Finally, we would like to conclude that at present, the CPI(M) leadership are trying to cover up their growing allegiance to the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union by posing themselves as a pole of equal-distance from the CPC and the Soviet revisionist leadership. But, if the leaders succeed in bringing a change through propaga-
danda by surreptitious methods, in the mental make up of the rank and file of the party that once was tuned high with revolu-
tionary phrases by the same leaders being guided by political exigencies and pra-
gnostic considerations, then we would not be astonished if in near future we find the CPI(M) leadership, like the CPI, openly let loose their antagonistic attitude towards the CPC and the Socialist China (the ground of which they are utmost trying to prepare amongst their rank and file) and ultimately completely identify themselves with the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union.