

AN APPEAL TO THE WORKERS OF CPI(M)

The leaders of CPI (M), at the time of formation of the party, declared that it was because of some 'fundamental difference' cropping up between them and the 'revisionist Dangeite clique' that made the split inside the undivided Communist Party of India and hence the formation of CPI (M) inevitable. According to them, the 'fundamental difference' which assumed utmost importance was mainly on the question of characterisation of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union vis-a-vis that of the Chinese Communist Party. Difference also arose, they asserted, on the question whether the Congress was an out and out reactionary organisation representing the interest of Indian monopoly or whether, inside the congress, there was a progressive national bourgeois section—particularly the section represented by Pandit Nehru.

Characterisation of CPSU vis-a-vis CPC

It is known to all that at that time the CPI (M) concluded that "notwithstanding the fact that there have been certain dogmatic manifestations in individual parties and on individual propositions and actions—modern revisionism represented by CPSU had been and still remain the main danger to the world communist movement." Regarding the disunity in the socialist camp—particularly between the CPSU and the CPC—the CPI (M) leadership held that the "root cause and the main reason for this sad state of affairs should be directly traced to modern revisionist theories as practised by the leadership of the CPSU." They further maintained that "unless modern revisionist theories are defeated and discarded neither can the unity of the world socialist camp and communist movement ensured, nor the danger of further disruption and splits in it averted." They said that "the positions taken by the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on all the fundamental questions connected with the Indian communist movement completely coincide with those of the Dangeite revisionists and this is corroborated by a spate of statements, articles and writings in the Soviet press...and by their whole-hearted endorsement of the Dangeite party programme and policy resolutions as Marxist-Leninist and proletarian interna-

ionalist." Under the circumstances, they claimed to have taken upon themselves the 'historic' responsibility of "waging a principled and determined fight against the menace of revisionism in all its manifestations and conducting a sustained struggle in defence of Marxism Leninism without which consolidation and further rapid advance of world communist movement was inconceivable." They also opined that the "world reaction headed by USA had singled out Communist China as their main target of attack simply because they saw Communist China as the biggest stumbling block to their new expansionist drive in Asia" etc. etc.

We have given above some of the observations of CPI (M), mostly verbatim reproduction of their own writings, which found place in abundance in the literatures of CPI (M) [Vide 'New Situation and Party's Task'—adopted by the Central Committee (April, 1967), Central Committee's Draft for Ideological Discussion (Aug., 1967) & Central Committee's Draft for the Eighth Party Congress—published in People's Democracy (October, 1968)] We have quoted only a few excerpts from their documents to the exclusion of others.

It is a common knowledge that of the two—the CPSU and the CPC—the CPI (M) took CPC as the correct party and not the CPSU. So in most of the cases they used to name CPSU as "revisionist" (Contd. to Page 2)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 9
No. 21

1st JULY '76
THURSDAY

PRICE 30 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

Hail Unification of Vietnam!

The proletariats of the world, the forces of peace, Socialism and progress who uphold the revolutionary line have a particular cause of rejoice on the completion of a very significant phase of struggle of the Vietnamese people in the unification of Vietnam free from the exploitation of imperialism-capitalism.

The Vietnamese people following through the course of revolutionary line with exemplary courage and determination have given a crushing defeat to the US imperialism the arch and main enemy to world revolution as also the

hated revisionist line that has appeared as the main danger in the international working class movement—the line that seeks to divest the theory of Peaceful Co-existence of its revolutionary kernel by reducing it to peaceful capitulation to imperialist blackmailing.

The Vietnamese people have exploded the myth of thermo-nuclear war phobia of the revisionists who under its cover conceal their treachery to the cause of world proletarian revolution. The Vietnamese people have proved to the hilt that the organised revolutionary power

of the people is mightier than the lethal weapons of imperialists and that it is not arms but the revolutionary consciousness and determination that determine the course of history.

Red Salute to the Vietnamese people who to-day are fulfilling the behest left to them by Comrade Ho Chi Minh!

Red Salute to the Vietnamese people for their glorious fulfillment of this historic task of unification!

Vietnam, to-day, is one and united!!

Down With Racist Vorster Regime!

The racist regime of Vorster in South Africa is setting one record after another of undiluted brutality. In its latest instance, in the course of a week, the streets of Black townships on the outskirts of Pretoria were soaked with blood—blood of hundreds of school children who were demanding education reforms, for change in the medium of instruction from Afrikaans to English. This is a long-standing demand of the African people to bring an end to inequality and discrimination in educational system and as one of their nationalist leaders has said: "Our children are doing what we should have done long ago". Yet to this modest demand

the racist regime of Vorster has reacted by what seems to be the worst kind of brutality, even worse than Sharpeville Massacre in 1960 that outraged the conscience of the entire civilized world. From the Government account this outrage is said to have taken a toll of 140 lives of school children and maimed about 1,200 people.

This brutal massacre of the South African Students by the rulers who are trying to have a lease of life under cover of racial discrimination and apartheid shows the utter desparation of a tottering regime and is sure to set ablaze patriotism and determination of the people for a

quick end of this morbidity in the name of a rule.

Amidst darkness there is yet a silver lining. A considerable section of white students have joined with their black brethren in a common struggle against the worst enemies of humanity. If this awareness prevails, if this consciousness is firmly grounded on working-class world outlook, it would not be difficult for them to see the very class-motive and class-purpose of racialism and apartheid that the imperialist-capitalists, are resorting to, to buy time before they are forced to make their exit.

Vorster regime in South Africa is the outpost (Contd. to Page 8)

CPI(M) now says that "CPI(M) is decidedly Pro-USSR and

(Contd. from Page 1)

Soviet Party' or 'revisionist Soviet Leadership' and not simply the Soviet Party or Soviet leadership without the epithet "revisionist". Similarly, whenever they used to refer to CPI—they would say the "revisionist Dangeite clique" or the 'Dange-Party'. But never CPI, not even Right CP (they used to take serious exception even to using the term Right CP at that time) which they use today without any difficulty. It is known to all that among the rank and file members of CPI(M) a deep-seated anti-Soviet and pro-Chinese bent of mind developed at that time. In fact, to claim themselves as pro-Chinese was some sort of a capital to them as it helped, under the circumstances, the "militant" cadres to swell in the rank of CPI(M). Naturally, crusade against both 'Soviet revisionism' and the 'revisionist Dangeite clique' formed the very basis of their political stand.

already pointed out that during its formation the CPI(M) used to consider the Chinese party as the correct one and characterised CPSU as the 'revisionist Soviet Party'. But when a group split away from CPI(M) and formed CPI(M-L) and when the Chinese leadership recognised this CPI(M-L) fraction for certain period and withdrew its support from CPI(M), then the situation started changing. But in view of the already created hysteria among the rank and file both against the "revisionist Soviet leadership" and the "revisionist Dangeite clique"—it was not possible on the part of the leadership to change its position overnight. They had also to recognise the strong feeling of admiration and reverence created among the members towards the Chinese leadership. So the CPI(M) leadership took to changing its position very slowly—as slowly as possible—so that the members could hardly detect this slow change. The

this very fact that under the cover of these apparently revolutionary slogans the party was, in reality, reducing itself to a typically revisionist party. The most difficult and painstaking task to raise the level of political consciousness of the rank and file members had been ignored from the very beginning, even from the time of formation of the undivided CPI. As a result, adequate standard of political consciousness that alone can equip the comrades with the power to make critical analysis and deep appraisal of theories was found seriously missing. It may be incidentally referred that the CPI(M) leadership, devoid of any international recognition, was then frantically searching for an international recognition and in spite of still maintaining an apparently anti-revisionist stand started hectic attempts to be friend with those parties of Europe which were themselves following the revisionist line. There

the Socialist camp and in its place made both the CPSU and the CPC equally responsible for this "sad state of affairs". No longer they used to say that unless Soviet revisionism was defeated and discarded, the question of unity in the socialist camp was not only a far cry but was also fraught with the danger of greater disruption and splits in future. But on the contrary, they raised the slogan that CPI(M) was neither pro-Chinese nor pro-Soviet which was a clear departure from their original stand. They started saying that both the CPSU and the CPC were communist parties although they had difference with both of them on a number of questions. They said that they had been guided by their own study and understanding and had not toed line of either the Soviet or the Chinese Party. They further said, following the same logic, that it was possible that the CPI(M)'s analysis on some issues may coincide with those of

modern revisionism? To remain absolutely silent on such vital issues and to assert simply that "we are neither pro-Chinese nor pro-Soviet" tantamounts to nothing but, what they posed to have taken, an "equidistant" position. Of course, it should be noted, in this connection, that no serious party, not to speak of a party masquerading as Marxist or Communist, can ever officially accept any 'equidistant' position on ideological questions. So this is absolutely a bun-kum to be engaged in a trifling debate whether any of their documents contained the word 'equidistant' or not. The fact is this that apparently they were posing for a long time somewhat neutral attitude towards both the CPSU and the CPC. In a recent issue of People's Democracy (May 23, 1976) it has been stated that the "CPI(M) is decidedly Pro-USSR and pro-People's China since these are biggest Socialist States of the world socialist system". May we ask certain questions in all

Pro-People's China"—was it their position when they formed

We hope that the members, supporters and sympathisers of CPI(M) can still recollect those days and they would do well to recall the declarations, claims and assertion of the leaders at the time of formation of the party and compare them with their practice as at present. Let us, therefore, carefully examine what has become the fate of that 'determined' and 'principled' fight or 'sustained' struggle against (i) Soviet revisionism and (ii) revisionist Dangeite clique collaborating with Congress that represented out and out reaction and monopoly—the two 'fundamental' slogans raised by the CPI(M).

Shift towards right

But it is astonishing to note that this party had been shifting its position with regard to both the slogans mentioned above very slowly, subtly and surreptitiously. We have

motive behind this move was quite clear. What the leadership was trying to achieve was to create very slowly an anti-Chinese sentiment and make-up among the comrades so that they could one day revert to the Soviet side very easily at the call of exigency and given a favourable situation.

The course of slow, subtle and surreptitious change of political line rather a shift towards right was adopted with this end in view. So even while continuing to mouth "revolutionary slogans" as before against both the 'revisionist Dangeite clique' and the 'revisionist Soviet leadership', this party had been shifting its position in a very subtle way so much so that it was practically impossible for the workers and supporters of CPI(M), in view of the low standard of political consciousness which was allowed to be kept at such a low level by the leadership, to detect

the party?

had been a curious co-existence of diametrically opposite policies of conducting "fight" against revisionism on the one hand and making friendly relations in the same breath with those parties which were even more revisionist than CPSU itself on the other—the parties that indulged in ultra-independence and thought that to accept any general fundamental line of international communist movement and to show allegiance to any international centre of leadership were nothing but to submit to interference. The Rumanian Party was one such example the attempt to make friendly relation with which, on the part of CPI(M) leadership, is not unknown to the CPI(M) comrades. Following the same process we find that at one stage the CPI(M) leadership no longer made the revisionist Soviet policies and theories responsible for the split in

CPSU as on some other issues their stand could be identical with CPC's. Apparently it seemed to their comrades that there was nothing wrong in taking such a stand by the Party. But what the leadership completely concealed from its rank and file was the fundamental question whether of the two, i.e. revisionism and dogmatism—modern revisionism represented by CPSU had been still the main danger or not.

What attitude the CPI(M) still possessed towards the Chinese leadership which was correctly considered by them, at the initial stage of formation of the party, as the bulwark of fight against modern revisionism? Whatever difference might have cropped up between CPI(M) and the CPC, could that basically alter, or even minimise in the least, the significant role played by CPC in fighting

humility in this connection? When this decision to become "decidedly pro-USSR and pro-People's China" was adopted in the party? Was it the position when they formed the party with the avowed objective of conducting a "principled" and "determined" fight against revisionism? Does not this statement conclusively prove that they are holding both the parties, i.e. CPSU and CPC at par, meaning thereby that they are placing both of them on equal footing? So when the Soviet revisionism is the main danger then is it not, in reality, nothing else than covering revisionism and thereby helping it? Can any revolutionary party afford to maintain "equal" attitude both towards revisionism and to the correct revolutionary line? Then what type of revolutionary party is it? The suggestion that the CPI(M) is

(Contd. to Page 3)

The Congress which was once considered by the CPI(M) to be "as a whole

(Contd. from Page 2)

always in favour of a correct stand—no matter whether it comes from CPSU or CPC cannot also save the position, because we are yet to know which stand of the CPC in recent times they have declared to be correct. Moreover, the main question is not to pick up the so-called "correct stands" of this or that leadership and to side with them but to categorically ascertain which leadership is *in the main* holding aloft the banner of revolution and which one is acting as the main danger to the world communist movement. This is a question which no genuine communist can gloss over even for a moment.

To call this particular stand of CPI(M) 'equidistant' would be, in fact, incorrect in as much as its basic contention was, under the cover of 'equidistant' theory, a 'shift' or 'tilt' towards CPSU which has been corroborated by facts more and more. This became evident from the fact that although they posed themselves to be apparently neutral and as if they adopted an 'equidistant' position by saying that both the CPSU and the CPC were communist parties despite their differences with both of them on certain issues—the fact was this that they started praising Soviet line on and often and making uncalled for and out of place criticism of the Chinese line. So, however loudly they might have declared about their differences with both the CPSU and the CPC they could hardly hide their pro-Soviet leanings either which even the Soviet leadership did not fail to take note of. It may be referred in passing that the CPI(M) leadership has not gone unrewarded by the CPSU for such acts. Not only the anti-CPI(M) tirade, which once used to find place in Soviet journals was stopped, but also the previous epithet of "splinter group" or "spli-

nters" about CPI(M) was no longer attached. The Soviet leadership started referring to CPI(M) in the manner as if it was a parallel Communist Party. (How can there be two Communist parties in a country parallel to each other is best known to the leaders of CPSU). Though the CPSU cannot and could not recognise the CPI(M) as it already gave recognition to CPI, but since it found the CPI(M) eager, it did not want the CPI(M) to go out of its hands either. So the Soviet leadership was trying to handle both the CPI and the CPI(M) and bring them closer to each other.

To summarise, in place of outbursts against Soviet revisionism, one was increasingly noticing praise of the Soviet Union on the one hand, and uncalled for, out of place

dominated by reactionary elements" is now said to contain "wide sections who

and most unjustified criticism of China on the other. Side by side with the praise for Soviet leadership, a subtle campaign was at work that the CPC was practising cult of personality in Mao-Tse-Tung and that the CPC had deviated from Marxism-Leninism, so on and so forth. The showering of praise for CPSU was, in fact, equally matched by its denunciation of the CPC. Anybody connected with CPI(M) knows it well how the Soviet leadership had been praised and eulogised on the occasions of Indo-Soviet Treaty, Bangla Desh issue, on Soviet economic advance, on the question of Chile and last but not the least on Angola. It is also not unknown to them how on all such issues and in what language the CPC had been criticised and held guilty of gross violation of the tenets of Marxism-Leninism. If these facts are not any indication of a shift towards right—then what

else are there in the stock—will the CPI(M) leaders answer?

Present attitude Towards Congress

Along with the changing attitude towards CPSU vis-a-vis CPC a change in the attitude towards Congress and CPI was also discernible. The Political - Organisational Report adopted at the 7th Congress (Fight Against Revisionism—Oct. 31-Nov. 7, 1964) posed certain questions and made some observations which are worth quoting in this connection. It said, among others, "It would be clear that the crux of the differences is the same question which had repeatedly been raised for nearly a decade—against whom—the Congress or against its opponents from the right—is the Communist Party

alone playing an oppositional role and abandoning it in face of growing class contradictions and consequent threat of its very existence at the hand of revolution." (Central Committee Resolutions on Divergent Views between Our Party and the CPC on Certain Fundamental Issues).

It is interesting to note that the least time taken by CPI(M) to change its attitude was probably that taken towards Congress. With the passing of a few years only this difference gradually faded away practically unnoticed by the CPI(M) workers. After the Congress split when Sm. Indira Gandhi adopted measures like nationalisation of Banks etc, the CPI(M) leadership "welcomed" that step as "a big event" and a "step in the right direction". They characterised it not as an ordinary measure but as a "forward measure to meet the situation" which had set in motion

forces who are firmly entrenched in society, at different levels. The truth is that the fight has begun against this menace and only initial victories have been scored against it" (Central Committee's letter to the Prime Minister signed by its General Secretary and published in People's Democracy dated February 1, 1970). Naturally, nobody can remain contented with initial victory. The Prime Minister was assured continued support so that final victory could be won. So, the party which was formed in 1964 "to direct its main fire" against the Congress visualised "a country-wide front" with the same Congress against right reaction in 1969. Can the practice of a political party be more faithful to its promises—will the CPI(M) workers ponder over?

Now, although this political line of CPI(M) clearly revealed its growing akinness towards Sm. Indira Gandhi and her Congress, the common public and the cadres were served with distinctly different dishes of diametrically opposite anti-Indira slogans in their public speeches, postures and day to day activities. The wave of anti-Indira wall posterings that figured prominently well in 1971 election campaign, particularly in West Bengal, was mainly directed to conceal the truth and divert the attention of the common public and the cadres from the pro-Indira line adopted by the CPI(M). What else can be attributed to such acts, other than "double standard"—will the CPI(M) leaders answer?

(i.e. the CPI(M)—Ed.P. Era) to direct its main fire?" It observed that "...the monopolists and landlords are with Congress and look to the Congress government to protect and foster their interests". It continued, "...despite the relatively progressive policy declarations of the Congress, and despite the subjective good intention of some of its leaders, the fact remains that the congress as a whole is dominated by reactionary elements, the bulk of whom are in it."

"the process of mass radicalisation and the new mass polarisation".

It discovered within the Indira wing of Congress "a healthy trend which hates big landlords and monopolists" and gave a certificate to the ruling Congress to the effect that "it has raised certain slogans and taken certain measures which are in tune with anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people" and advocated for the "development of a far broader front of the democratic forces, including a section of the Indira Gandhi Congress" and visualised "a country-wide

feel concerned about the future of Parliamentary institutions and democracy"

This observation and analysis regarding the Congress were at that time reiterated in a number of documents, one of which we quote below for reference. The CPI(M) said, "The other non-big bourgeoisie has neither so far split away from the big bourgeoisie nor politically differentiated with it, let

front" with Indira Congress against extreme right reaction. (Vide People's Democracy, issues dated 3rd, 17th and 31st August and 9th November 1969 and 15th February 1970)

The CPI(M) further opined that "it would be a grave error to underestimate these extreme rightist

Coming to the main point we find that the CPI(M) not only thought that there was a progressive section inside the Congress but also extended its fullest cooperation against the Syndicate Congress and the forces of the right. It is because of this support extended by

(Contd. to Page 4)

(Contd. from Page 3)

both the CPI and the CPI (M) that Sm. Indira Gandhi was able to helm even a minority government at the centre. Till to-day, notwithstanding its occasional anti-Indira postures, the CPI (M) leadership has been persistently following a decidedly pro-Indira Congress political line of action. On the assessment of the overall present political situation and particularly about 'the danger posed by right reaction and US imperialism' there is hardly any difference between Congress and CPI (M). The CPI (M) leaders, in tune with Sm. Indira Gandhi, are concentrating fire against the right reaction and US imperialism, remaining absolutely silent about who is the main enemy of the people. The CPI (M) leaders have openly expressed their anxiety about the serious and sincere implementation of the 20-Point programme which they think will give relief to the people. So the difference of CPI (M) with CPI in their approach towards Congress lies not in content but in form. Whereas the CPI is advocating a joint programme and direct alliance with Congress, the CPI (M) has adopted the policy of indirect or tacit support, a support by implication maintaining a constant and continuous dialogue (no matter overt or covert) with Indira Gandhi at different levels.

In reply to Mr. Rajeswara Rao, the CPI General Secretary, Mr. Jyoti Basu said that "on the question of ruling party there is no blindness in our stand". So the Congress, which, according to the Political Organisational Report adopted at the Seventh Congress in 1964, was supposed to "protect" and "foster" the interests of the "monopolists" and the "landlords" and which was considered "as a whole" to be "dominated by the reactionary elements" is given a certificate to-day that "among the members and supporters of the Congress there

The CPI is no longer termed the "Revisionist Dangeite Clique" or

are "wide sections who feel concerned about the future of parliamentary institutions and democracy." Further, he said, "It must certainly be our task to approach them, along with others, in course of the broad mobilisation of the people, which has become so urgent....."

(Jyoti Basu's replies to Rejeswara Rao—People's Democracy, February 29, 1976).

Mr. Rajeswara Rao was definitely cent per cent wrong, we agree with Mr. Basu, in saying that CPI (M) was "blindly" anti-Congress! A careful scrutiny of the recent policy resolutions of CPI (M) would reveal that these resolutions generally contain some portions which are meant for the cadres and some other portions which are mostly (naturally implicitly) meant for administration. This duplicity is supposed to be more paying to them in the sense

has been the case with CPI to-day. It should be understood that it is as a part of this duplicity of politics that the CPI (M), before the promulgation of emergency, did not join in J.P. movement by saying that they could not do so because of its association with the rightist forces which helped them get favour of Indira no doubt; while they were at the same time very much busy in "sittings" and "meetings" with J.P. in their bid to usurp the anti-Indira feeling in the next election without taking the risk of mass movements but posing as a pro-movement force. The recent attitude of CPI (M) so far expressed towards the formation of a new party under J.P.'s leadership only confirms this view.

Meeting with Prime Minister

The submission of memorandum to the Prime Minister on

where when a deputation meets with any authority with any memorandum. Even the CPI (M) Bengali evening daily "Ganasakti" could not give any indication as to whether the demands were raised, discussed and stressed upon and whether the Prime Minister agreed with the points or not and if so, then what were the points of agreement. It seemed, on the contrary, what the CPI (M) leaders wanted to do was to show the Prime Minister how close they were with the viewpoint of the ruling party at this 'difficult' hour of the country, in their bid to get some "hint" or "assurance" from her as to how far they will enjoy the freedom to move as a responsible opposition. The following remarks made in People's Democracy (May 16, 1976) simply confirm our view. It said, "Recently, the Prime minister has advised that the opposition must

"Dange Party" but simply Right CP —a term which was rejected by CPI(M) just the other day

that as it does not fail them to earn the favour, if not protection, of the administration, so it also offers, at the same time, the scope of being highly vociferous against Indira Gandhi at times depending on the mood of the people and particularly during the elections. When the CPI (M) launches any anti-Indira campaign that should not necessarily mean that they do not have any desire to come to an understanding and arrangement with Mrs. Gandhi. Similarly, when they do come with any understanding with Indira Gandhi they cannot afford to give up their anti-Congress stance either in order to maintain their anti-Congress image both before the rank and the public and to save them from the ludicrous position of being an appendage of Congress as

behalf of the Polit Bureau of the Party on 9th April last is another example of the same pro-Congress politics and double-standard of CPI (M). If to focus the demands concerning emergency, restoration of democracy etc. would have been the main object of this meet, then one is at a loss to understand why did they not arrange for it earlier which they could have done easily? Why has been this particular time chosen? What was the outcome of this deputation? We curiously note, not from bourgeois press but from their own organs, that at no stage, as far as the report goes, point by point considerations of the demands embodied in the memorandum did come up for discussion which is the general practice every-

behave and act in a responsible manner. We are anxious to know from her what exactly is meant by this." By this, the CPI (M) leaders have expressed their anxiety to behave as a responsible opposition and thereby to give a seal of approval to 'Conducted democracy' which the ruling class is trying to achieve for a long time. Then again in the write-up on the 13-page memorandum (it has been alleged in some quarters that even their workers were not provided with the full text of the memorandum) the CPI (M)'s People's Democracy (April 25, 1976) said, among others, the following:

"The party's record, the memorandum asserted, is one of consistently carrying on a political ideological fight against rightist policies, whether pursued

lby internal or external forces and against policies of extreme left"... "...The CPI (M) has a consistent record to fight against imperialism and particularly against US imperialist machination and we have never hesitated to support the government whenever it took an anti-imperialist and anti-colonial stand...."

"...The party is of the opinion that if these points (relating to 20-Point Programme—Editor, P-Era) relating to peasants and agricultural labourers are honestly and sincerely implemented they would give some relief to these sections."

Of course, there is nothing new in it. In his "Working Class, Unite to Defend Rights", Mr. Jyoti Basu wrote a few months back the following:

"The emergency requires us to be more watchful against anti-national imperialist conspiracies, and safeguard the fight for democratic rights from being exploited by such elements who specifically direct their fire against the Indo-Soviet Treaty, to explain the emergency and the steps taken by the Government" (People's Democracy, Nov. 23, 1975)

Now anybody acquainted with the cross-currents of contemporary Indian politics knows it well what statements were made by the Prime Minister Sm. Indira Gandhi and her Party before the world at large and to the countrymen both during and after the promulgation of emergency as to why such steps had been taken. She categorically declared that "the emergency had been promulgated with a view to saving the country from the conspiracies of the rightist forces to push the country to chaos, to overthrow the democratically elected governments in a most undemocratic manner, which they were indulging in with the backing of the foreign imperialist forces." Later on, regarding the economic programme she said, that "it was in the 20 Point Programme that one could

(Contd. to Page 5)

If the CPI has made an open attack on Left United Front from out-side because of open

(Contd. from Page 4)

find the 'blue-print of progress'. So if the CPI(M)'s memorandum and Prime Minister's statement are simply juxtaposed, their identity of views would become very clear even to a layman.

Now what made this deputation to Prime Minister so imminent and imperative and what acted as the determinant in selecting this particular time? Coming as it does, when the talk of election is already in the air, and the manner in which this party appeared before the public after a long spell of silence, it is not difficult for anybody to get the answer. But since for a party of CPI(M)'s standing masquerading as champion of Indian revolution, it is very difficult to expose publicly, lest its "revolutionary" posture is misunderstood, that they are going to meet the Prime Minister to have talks on election and that too at the time of emergency, they have adopted this tactics to pose this occasion simply as a deputation to discuss on the memorandum containing the demands concerning emergency and all that just to divert the attention of the public from the very fact that their sole purpose was to obtain certain assurances from Sm. Indira Gandhi and, if possible, to come to a prior arrangement also regarding the next election. This point has become palpably clear from the fact that the demands of the memorandum were not raised, discussed or stressed upon by the leaders. (So submission of memorandum was a cover).

It is interesting to note that the more the CPI(M) leadership is trying to impress upon that their deputation had nothing to do with election, the more they are adding strength and lending credence to the belief that this deputation was mainly arranged to obtain some assurances

from Sm. Indira Gandhi and, if possible, to come to an understanding with her regarding the next election. The political line as pursued by CPI(M) for a long time and as embodied in the memorandum does not also pose any hindrance in its path. It may not be out of place to mention, in this connection, that whereas most of the bourgeois dailies cast grave doubts about the motive behind this 'meet' with Prime Minister, it was only the *The Statesman*, the mouthpiece of the Indian monopoly represented by the Tata group that came to the rescue of CPI(M) by making a special arrangement of interview with Mr. Jyoti Basu, the CPI(M) leader and giving that news a quite prominent publicity on 1-5-76.

From all available accounts we find that the party which left the people at the hour of their great danger and difficulty just the other day and practically disappeared from the political scene has started coming to the surface again, here and there, after this meeting with Prime Minister. Judged from that it is clear that CPI(M)'s mission has not been in vain. But the questions which cannot arise in people's mind deserve serious consideration. They ask—how could this party get rid of the fear to which it succumbed only a few days ago? Definitely it is not due to any mass movement taking place in the meantime. Then what it is due to? Is it for any assurance already obtained? If so, what is the nature of this assurance? They also wonder—is it not the prime task of a political party that claims itself to be a revolutionary party, to stand by the side of the people at the hour of danger and difficulty? Is it not another yard-stick to judge whether a party is really a revolutionary party?

Be that as it may, this

whole incident once again proves to the hilt the correctness of our analysis that the CPI(M) was trying (then also the talk of election was much in the air) to come to a clandestine understanding with the Congress and was out to increase its bargaining power with it—an analysis which we made on the occasion of CPI(M)'s forging alliance with rightist Prafulla Sen in a left-oriented State of West Bengal, and that too at the cost of left unity, not for any movement but for holding a joint convention only declaring in the same breath that the party had rejected the idea of joining people's movement in Bihar because of its rightist association. So what was secret yesterday, is no more secret to day—and it has come out in the open publicly. Those who took our above observation as a slanderous campaign and sharply reacted against it, we would request them to deeply probe into it.

Attitude towards CPI—a right about turn

With growing pro-Soviet attitude and increasing identity of viewpoint with the ruling party, it is crystal clear what can be the attitude of CPI(M) towards CPI. It has already been pointed out that the CPI is no longer called by CPI(M) the "revisionist Dangeite clique" or the "Dange-Party" but is named as Right CP to which they used to take serious exception just the

alliance with Congress, it is the CPI(M) that has launched an attack from within

other day. Increasingly pro-Soviet attitude taken by CPI(M) cannot but make this party very much closer to CPI also. It was only our party that did not make any mistake in detecting the fact that the CPI(M) was going to be more and more close with CPI when the CPI(M) leadership, all on a sudden, discovered,—knowing fully

well that the sole intention of CPI was to disrupt the possibility of development of a serious joint movement in West Bengal which was in the offing under the auspices of the left parties by calling a BANGLA BANDH on July 27, 1973—the so-called 'Convergent theory' and joined hands with CPI even at the cost of left unity for sheer opportunism. Only we made this analysis categorically clear in all our writings. We pointed out that this so-called 'Convergent theory' was a cover to conceal the very fact that the CPI(M) was going to be more and more close with both the Soviet and the CPI. But many thought at that time that it was too much to say so and we said all this because of our differences with CPI(M). To-day they find that what we observed few years back has now come out to be true.

Paradoxically enough, the proof of our above observation was first given by none else than the Central Committee of CPI(M) when it declared that "forced by the developing crisis, the leadership of Right CP is making some moves away from the policy which made it break from the Left and join the Congress camp. The funniest part of the game is when the CPI leader Sri Bhupesh Gupta wrote an article in *New Age* captioned "Who is going away?" and asserted that it was wrong to say that the CPI had shifted from its earlier pro-Congress position and further opined that if any shift was there, that was in the policy of CPI(M), then

months in which the Right CP and the CPI(M) had to come together—a feature that was rare during the last three years or more?" Quoting certain observations of CPI, Mr. Basavapunniah asked, "Don't these utterances show that the Right CP is less equivocal and more forthright in its stand regarding the Congress party and the government when compared with earlier stand?" He continued, "If all these moves and pronouncement are not to be understood as some moves away from earlier moves of closer alliance and collaboration with the Congress party and government, then how are they to be assessed?"

So, when the CPI leader reiterated that it was still pursuing its pro-Congress line then the CPI(M) leader gave the certificate that it "is less equivocal and more forthright in its stand regarding the Congress party and the government". What can be funnier than this?

The question joint of action including CPI and Congressmen

That the CPI(M) is still now pursuing the same old pro-Congress and pro-CPI stand will also be revealed from the following. According to Mr. E. M. S. Nambudiripad his party has sought the cooperation of 'all those who speak of left and democratic unity, including the right communist and the young Congress for a minimum programme.' (*Indian Express* dt. 12.2.76). Mr. Jyoti Basu in another statement said 'We can

only have joint movement on issues affecting the people with the CPI and its organisations, such a joint movement may also include Congressmen".

(*The Statesman* 1.5.76)

But in spite of all this, the CPI(M) leadership is trying to cleverly draw a line of demarcation between the CPI and the

(Contd. to Page 6)

Mr. M. Basavapunniah, the CPI(M) leader in its reply wrote an article "The Right CP's Ire" in *People's Democracy* on August 26, 1973. In this article the CPI(M) leader raised the following questions:

"But can Bhupesh Gupta disprove the fact that there were a number of united actions in recent

(Contd. from Page 5)

CPI (M) on this point by saying that it cannot have any political front with CPI unless it changes its pro-Congress policies as if it is itself not pro-Congress. The type of confusion which the leaders are trying to create will be clear from the following :

Mr. Harkishen Singh Surjeet in an article captioned 'Predicament of the Right CP leadership' (People's Democracy March 14, 1976) said— "But despite all this, the CPI (M) has all along said that while it can have no political front with the Right CP as long as it pursues this policy (meaning pro-Congress policy—Ed. P. Era.), in the interests of our toiling masses, in the interests of democracy and progress, in the interest of our very freedom, the CPI (M) will have joint actions with the Right CP on class and mass issues". It is nothing short of trickery to say that the CPI (M) cannot have political front with CPI so long as it pursues its pro-Congress policies as if CPI (M) itself is not pro-Congress and then to plead in the same breath for joint actions with CPI on class and mass issues in the interest of toiling masses, democracy, progress, freedom and all that as if political front has nothing to do with all this!

The statements and appeals of the CPI(M) leaders just now quoted at length cannot but reveal one glaring fact that so far as CPI(M) is concerned it is quite interested to have joint actions with CPI, its organisations inspite of CPI's open alliance with Congress and even with Youth Congress or Congressmen on issues affecting the life of the people for a minimum programme. Has this concept any difference with CPI's well known formulation of "left and democratic unity including a section of the Congress?" So the CPI(M), in reality, is doing the same job which the CPI could not do so successfully because of its open alignment with the ruling Congress.

The question of left unity—from class-based front to issue-based front

Coming to the question of left unity we find that while the CPI(M) is very much eager to have joint actions with CPI and even with Congressmen, it thinks that the formation of united front of left and democratic parties is "unrealistic" "covering all aspects of the economic and political life of the people" as "every party, group or organisations has its own specific approach to the problems facing the country—an approach different from that of the other parties, groups and organisations (Vide P.B. Statement published in People's Democracy 16th September, 1973)

THE URGE FOR UNITY WITH AND NECESSITY OF CONDUCTING

Any student of Marxism-Leninism knows that since all the political parties are class parties, the question of their "approach to problems facing the country" being the same does not arise at all. The question of united front is mainly related to that as to whether or not, at a particular stage of development of struggle, there exists any basis of working out an agreed minimum common programme, in spite of different approaches and angularities among the like-minded parties, towards the problems facing the country. Moreover, had all the parties the same approach to problems, then there

IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE AGAINST CPI(M)— BOTH ARE EQUALLY REAL

would have been hardly any real necessity of separate existence of parties and there would have been no necessity, under the circumstances, of a united front. Moreover, political united front of the left and democratic parties is formed on the basis of an *agreed minimum common programme*, which exists in a historically given phase of development of struggle, and not on the basis of a

common programme "covering all aspects of the economic and political life of the people" as stated by the CPI(M) leadership. This shows the hollowness of Issue-based front, the unprincipled character of the theory of "Unity in action" on the basis of "specific issues", which can at best serve the petty sectarian interest of CPI (M) in as much as it keeps the door open to unite with any party it likes, as per exigency which can naturally give no direction to mass movements. This not only helps to disrupt the objective process of formation of a united front of the left and democratic parties and forces but also deprives the masses of a platform of common action, their instrument of united struggle

against the main enemy.

So the once protagonists of class-based front during the U.F. regime in West Bengal (Vide Mr. Promode Dasgupta's article in People's Democracy, Lenin Birth Centenary issue, dated April 22, 1970) have now reverted to issue-based front—both of which are equally dangerous, of course, from different directions. Whereas the former was an open advocacy of disruption of the united front which developed through bloodshed and sacrifices of the people, the latter smacks of a Trotskyite understanding of developing united front from the bottom opening the path

left movements. Not only that; if the CPI(M) has made an attack on united front from outside because of its open alliance with Congress, it is the CPI(M) that has launched an attack from within by its disruptionist policy and failure to grasp properly the historic necessity and role of United front as the instrument of struggle and the only ray of hope before the people in the given circumstances.

The result of all this has been disastrous. The entire left movement of the country including its erstwhile citadel, West Bengal, has been in a complete disarray and is suffering from greatest discomfiture today. Not to speak of developing a sustained united struggles on the basis of a common

minimum programme against the main enemy and forming a United front of left and democratic parties throughout the length and breadth of the country as the alternative to the party in power and the only instrument of struggle of the people, a chance which appeared in 1969 in West Bengal—the common people have been completely left to themselves without even the minimum protection against any attack from the vested interests. Today, there is not even any semblance of united movement in the country and most of the parties are simply marking time for and pinning hope against

given a radical orientation? Then why this failure to-day? Why could we not prevent such a catastrophe? May we remind the CPI(M) workers what pointer was given by us at that time? Is it not a fact that it was our party, SUCI, that time and again criticised the sectarian politics of CPI(M) leadership and pointed out that unless this sectarianism was nipped in the bud it was the reactionary forces that would survive with greater aggressiveness? History of United Left movements will bear it out that at every stage it was our party that came forward with severe criticism pointing out the serious weaknesses, defects and limitations inherent in the movement as a sequel to the wrong understanding and even disruptive attitude of the leading party, i. e. CPI(M) towards united movement. We were conscious that despite the boom of United Left movement that was there particularly in West Bengal, the virtual burial of it might not even be far off barring a correct Marxist-Leninist or revolutionary approach to govern such movements. It was this feeling which made us highly concerned and critical about the politics of CPI (M). But all our attempts were in vain. What the CPI (M) leadership had to offer against all these criticisms? Not any reply of it, right or wrong, but the propaganda barrage among its own rank that 'SUC is typically anti-CPI (M) and its only business is to criticise CPI (M) and nothing else.'

Why criticism of CPI (M)'s politics is indispensable

When we speak of united front we do it precisely with a view to developing a sustained united movement against the main enemy. But when the policy or stand taken by CPI (M) disturbs that very united movement then, as we have already pointed out, we have no alternative than to, in the interest of united movement, criticise

(Contd. to Page 7)

(Contd. from Page 6)

CPI (M). But when we make such criticism, does that mean that we are unwilling to build up united struggle or to forge united front with CPI (M)? Or when we form united front with CPI (M) does that in any way signify that we have no difference with CPI (M) whatsoever? Both of these above observations are equally incorrect. While we pay greatest importance to the task of developing a united front of all left and democratic parties and forces on the basis of a common minimum programme against the main enemy, we are equally interested to enjoy the fundamental right to criticism without which, no united movement, worth its name, can be built up on a sound basis and principle. So when we fight for the protection of that fundamental right to criticism, it is the CPI (M) leadership that try to paint this as an anti-unity move and brand us as a disruptionist party before the rank and file. A closer examination would reveal that lest the hollowness of CPI (M)'s stand is exposed before the rank and file by the relentless ideological struggle conducted by our party done in the interest of left movement—the CPI (M) leadership try to create the notion that SUCI is typically anti-CPI (M) and SUCI considers CPI (M) the main enemy and not the Congress. They charge us with making "unfriendly" criticism and raise this hue and cry only to block that particular type of criticism which exposes the real character of CPI (M) leadership. Thereby they make their rank and file forget the essential point that the main question is whether a criticism is political or not. If a seriously political and correct criticism is taken by the leadership as "unfriendly" since it exposes the real face of that leadership—then how can it be helped? This is exactly what happened on the occasion of CPI (M)'s joining hands with Prafulla Sen in West Bengal for holding a joint convention

It is the correct political line that should come first, the question of

when the CPI (M) leadership attempted to impose certain conditions on us in their bid to take away the very fundamental right to criticism and thus offered their last blow on united left movement of West Bengal.

We must admit that the CPI (M) leadership have been able to achieve one thing they desired. For a long time they have been trying to destroy the reasoning faculty of the rank and file members and the supporters to read in between lines, i. e. to read the hidden things that do not usually come out on to surface beyond what is seen apparently. Constant and continuous contempt for theoretical cult inside the party rendering most of the workers almost incapable of judging a thing critically provided a fertile soil for the leadership to turn a good section of them fanatically anti-SUCI, particularly when SUCI comes forward to expose the hollowness of the stands taken by CPI (M). On our part, we sincerely express that we have no malice or hatred against CPI (M). We very frequently criticise the CPI (M) leadership no doubt. But we do so not from a sense of animosity against them but for the fact that despite CPI (M) following a wrong political line from the very beginning, it is a reality that a large section of anti-Congress, pro-communist masses, due to their wrong understanding, still pin faith on CPI (M) and take this party as the only alternative. To the general left forces, militant anti-Congress and pro-communist sections of the people, the CPI (M) is still accepted although wrongly, as the Communist Party. If the CPI (M) was not considered by the left section of the masses as a revolutionary party, we would not have felt a new concern about what policy they have adopted or what type of activity they are conducting as we do not feel any serious concern in case of

other left parties of the country which have practically very little influence over the masses. We are aware, so far as the general masses is concerned—they look mostly at the strength of a party and not at the correctness or otherwise of its ideology or politics. This calls for a serious ideological-political battle, a painstaking campaign among the people—without which it is impossible to make common people conscious about which party is right or which party is wrong and thereby isolate the wrong party from the masses in the long run. We consider the CPI (M) as the typical social democratic force forming the social support of capitalism and an out and out compromising force between labour and capital. The CPI (M) also may take us to be equally compromising and social democratic in nature. But does it mean that the historical necessity of uniting with the social democratic forces is no more? No, not at all. As the role of the social democratic forces has not yet been exhausted in the present stage of democratic movement of our country, so we strive for unity with CPI (M), even while conducting ideological struggle against that party. The urge for unity with and necessity of conducting ideological struggle against CPI (M)—both are equally real. These two can and should combine at a time. The CPI (M) workers may note that when we extend our

while making such sacrifice unitedly, our ceaseless ideological struggle against their wrong politics is sure to continue. So it is not at all a question of malice or hatred against CPI (M), far less it is the question of considering CPI (M) the main enemy. We therefore, raise the question—what should be the attitude of a genuine revolutionary towards the forces of compromise? What lesson should we draw from the experience of revolution in different countries? It would be helpful if we turn a few pages of history and refer to the teachings of Russian revolution.

Comrade Stalin after the overthrow of tsardom and in the period of preparation of October Socialist revolution in Russia while explaining the question of strategy and tactics said:

"In this period, the petty-bourgeois democratic parties, the Socialist Revolutionary Party and the Menshevik party were the most dangerous social support of imperialism..... Naturally, the Bolsheviks at that time directed their main blows at these parties, for unless these parties were isolated there could be no hope of the Soviet Revolution...achieving victory. Many people at that time did not understand this peculiar feature of the Bolshevik tactics and accused the Bolsheviks of displaying 'excessive hatred' towards the Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, and of 'forgetting' the princi-

strength should come second in order of priority

pal goal. But the entire period of preparation for October eloquently testifies the fact that only by pursuing these tactics could the Bolsheviks ensure victory of the October Revolution." (Certain peculiar features of the tactics of the Bolsheviks during the period of preparation for

should be the attitude of a real revolutionary towards such a force—will the CPI (M) workers think over?

October—Problems of Leninism, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1953)

Comrade Stalin also emphasised on this point by making a theoretical formulation thus: "It is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to Social Democracy in the labour movement." (The International Character of the October Revolution—Problems of Leninism). It may not be out of place to mention that Comrade Stalin made the following divisions in the strategy of revolution in order to have a thorough appraisal and clear understanding of the problem: 1) objective 2) Main force of the revolution 3) Immediate reserve 4) Direction of the main blow and 5) Plan for disposition of the forces (Strategy and tactics—Problems of Leninism).

Now what is the significance of this policy of "Direction of the main blow"? Does it have any bearing on the day to day united struggles of the masses? To a revolutionary the real meaning of the policy of "direction of the main blow" lies in the fact that it is only through conducting a relentless battle against all shades of social democracy at different stages of united mass movements and thereby isolating them from the masses that the condition for seizure of power by the proletariat can develop in a country.

So when CPI (M) is the compromising force between labour and capital, when it is the embodiment of social democracy in the labour movement in our country, then what

An Appeal To The Workers Of CPI (M):

In spite of all the criticism that we have to make against the CPI (M),

(Contd. to Page 8)

An Appeal to the Workers of CPI(M)

(Contd. from Page 7)

we know that even to-day there are a good number of serious workers in CPI(M), who are mentally prepared to make any sacrifice in the interest of revolution. But is it the question of sacrifice alone? Is it not a fact that there had been no dearth of sacrifice, no lack of bloodshed in our country supposedly for achieving revolution? This sacrifice and bloodshed notwithstanding, what was seriously lacking is the correct base political line of the proletariat which is the line of anti-capitalist socialist revolution in India. So if anybody thinks that the solution lies in removing this or that leader from the leadership or installing in its place another set of leaders—he will be completely mistaken. Any rethinking in the line of 'purifying' the present leadership is bound to meet with failure as was met repeatedly in the past. It is true, they love their party. But do they not love revolution most? What for is a revolutionary party? What should be the attitude of a real revolutionary if he finds that it is his party which he loves very much that stands as the greatest obstacle in the path of revolution? What position should a real revolutionary adopt if he finds that unless his party is destroyed and a genuine revolutionary leadership is built up in its place—the question of revolution in India will be a far cry? What attitude was adopted by Lenin himself in dissolving the Second International, which later on turned completely rotten, and building in its place the Third International? Does not a real revolutionary give topmost importance on the question of correct base political line? If a revolutionary extends support and offers patronage to a party which is a typical petty bourgeois party with its wrong political line, then will it not tantamount to opposing revolution? Now if such

a wrong party, for what so ever reason, appears with substantial strength then should it be a cause of delight or should it call for serious endeavour on the part of the genuine revolutionaries to build up the real revolutionary leadership with utmost dedication? Do not the CPI(M) workers know the Leninist teaching of "Fewer better, but better fewer"? When the base political line is wrong, then greater strength of a political party means to put greater obstacle in the path of revolution. So to look at the strength of a party regardless of the correct line is to put cart before the horse. It is the correct political line that should come first, the question of strength should come second in order of priority. A big party with wrong line is bound to lead all movements, despite bloodshed and sacrifice, to boundless frustration because of the failure which it is ultimately doomed to meet with. But a correct line, even if it is represented at a particular stage by a small party is sure to gain in strength day by day braving all odds and emerge with invincible power to lead the people to socialism which is, for this reason, inevitable.

These valuable lessons have been highlighted again and again by no less a person than Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, an eminent Marxist thinker of the present era, our beloved leader, teacher and the General Secretary of SUCI. The workers of CPI(M) are well conversant about the warnings which Comrade Ghosh had been giving for a long time about the incalculable damage done to Indian revolution by those parties masquerading as 'Communists'. Can they not be one with us and say that it is Comrade Shibdas Ghosh who for the first time has concretised, developed and enriched Marxism-Leninism in Indian soil and has appeared as the living inspiration of Indian revolu-

tion? We would appeal to the genuine lovers of revolution who are still inside the CPI(M) to shake off hesitation, if there be any, and to accept the truth. To take a casual attitude, under any pretext to such vital questions will greatly damage the cause of Indian revolution. Let them rise to the occasion, come forward to find out the correct base political line of the proletariat, the real revolutionary leadership and the real party of the Indian proletariat. That is the Call of the Hour.

Down With Racist Vorster Regime

(Contd. from Page 1)

guarding the interest of finance capitals of the USA, the UK, and West Germany, to be specific. It is known to the world that the UN economic sanctions against Vorster's and Smith's regimes have been violated by these imperialist powers because of the economic military interests in copper, chrome, cobalt and such other rich minerals and for geopolitical importance. It is also known to the world that the West German imperialists are supplying through their pipe-lines of military help to South Africa not only their own hardwares but those of US make. No wonder therefore, that Vorster would contabulate with Kissinger and West German politicians, to sort out his problems and get the brief for prolonging his regime.

Sensing the great shock in the world opinion as also the simmering rage that may well burst into open in Africa, Kissinger and West German spokesmen are counselling Vorster to disengage from Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) and Namibia (South West Africa) where Vorster has created calculated buffers, as a sort of smaller outposts. This will be, in effect, side tracking the main issue of a minority racist rule in South Africa.

The British Govern-

"The Government today turned down in the Rajya Sabha the demand for deleting the right to property from the fundamental rights. The deputy labour minister, Mr. Balgovind Verma, said that if the property right was abolished it would put an end to the saving habit and affect capital formation."

—The Times of India, May 27.

"While addressing the 89th Annual conference of the Bengal National Chambers of Commerce on Friday, the Chief Minister

Mr. S. S. Roy assured: Because of the inclusion of the term 'Socialism' in the Preamble of the Constitution by the Swaran Singh Committee some people are making propaganda that the government intend to abolish private enterprises—but this is quite baseless. We want to develop equally private and public sectors both. The Chief Minister is one of the important members of Swaran Singh Committee."

—Anandabazar Patrika 5.6.76

"After seconding the Swaran Singh Committee's recommendations for Constitutional amendments at the Delhi session of the AICC, Siddhartha Sankar Ray, who wears the triple crown as a member of the Congress Working Committee, of the Party's Parliamentary Board and as a State Chief Minister rushed to assure businessmen that the proposed inclusion of the word 'Socialist' in the Preamble of the Constitution need not worry them..... In any case, she (Prime Minister) had not asked the West Bengal Chief Minister to employ his gift of the gab to explain AICC resolution before a gathering of the businessmen....."

—Bhupesh Gupta 'New Age,' 13.6.76

Read

"BANNER"

Malayalam
Organ of
Kerala State Committee,
S.U.C.I

Per Copy—0.20 Paise

S.U.C.I. office, Quilon-8
KERALA

Read

"Fascibad Ke Prasang Me" (Hindi)

Price—Rs. 2.00

S.U.C.I. Office
Boring Road
Patna-1, Bihar

Just out

'STUDENTS PLEDGE'

Organ of
All India Democratic
Students Organisation

Price—Rs. 1.00