

**“I hate the pack of Gods, either of Earth or of Heaven”.**

**Prometheus, quoted by Marx**

### **WHY DID I BREAK WITH SUCI-BRAND OF PSEUDO-MARXISM**

On 19<sup>th</sup> September’87, I submitted my resignation from the party following the Central Leadership’s inability and persistent reluctance to answer my long-pending questions, their continuous obstructions to the inner-party ideological struggle that I was carrying forward, their repeated hindrance to my free pursuit of Marxist studies, and moreover their fictitious and unsubstantiated charges against me with the naked threat of disciplinary action.

On different occasions and in different forums I have raised inter alia the following questions before the central party leadership –

- 1) The SUCI’s characterization of the entire postwar (II) period from 1945 onwards) as the third phase of the General Crisis of World Capitalism and ‘day in and day out’ in nature is wrong. The conception of the third phase has been borrowed by SUCI leadership without acknowledgement from the analysis of Comintern Executive (1932) and the then CPSU (see Leontief’s ‘Political Economy – A Beginner’s Course’ published before the second war) and applied mechanically and uncritically to the Postwar (II) world capitalism. Leontief’s third phase pertained to the period beginning from 1929 (Great Depression) up-to the start of the Second World War, the earlier two phases being 1914 to 1921, and 1921 to 1928. According to Leontief the ‘relative stability’ which was there during the second phase got lost in the third phase (1929-39).

According to SUCI leadership the entire period of interwar years from 1919 to 1934 was a period of relative stability of world capitalism which was lost only following the end of the Second World War. Such a view about the entire interwar period is wrong if we follow Leontief whereas the latter’s analysis of the third phase falling under the interwar period has been plagiarized by the SUCI leadership for characterizing the entire postwar period.

The SUCI leadership has not made an independent analysis of either interwar or postwar (II) period. They have uncritically borrowed the concepts like ‘relative stability’ from Comintern and Leontief, and arbitrarily applied them to the postwar (II) conditions. SUCI leadership has falsely pictured an over glorified image of world capitalism as during the entire interwar period (that there was relative stability) on one hand, and an underestimated image of world capitalism as during the entire postwar (II) period (that there is no relative stability) on the other.

The SUCI leadership only talks of third stage or phase of the General Crisis without defining in chronological terms the preceding two stages or phases. As a matter of fact, the Comintern in its Executive Meeting in 1932 divided the General Crisis of World Capitalism which began since the start of the first war and which we can now retrospectively call the first stage (not phase) of the General Crisis, into three phases (not stages) as mentioned above. Mind it, the SUCI leadership does not distinguish between stage and phase (sub-stage).

In my view which I had placed before the Central Committee, the years following the end of second war (from 1945 up-to end of 60s) witnessed a great world-wide capitalist boom (a period of relative stabilization, to use Leontief’s expression) and cannot be characterized as a crisis ‘day in and day out’ in nature. A world wide capitalist crisis of course set in only after early 70s as manifested through dollar crisis, oil crisis, collapse of Bretton Woods system.

I, therefore, had pleaded for a complete recast of the mechanical application of Comintern’s prewar (II) analysis to postwar (II) period and a clear-cut chronological demarcation of the oft-repeated three General Crisis on the basis of intensive research into the developments of World Capitalism in all its stages and phases.

*Contd...*

- 2) While many communist parties the world over including the CPSU have made a thorough assessment of the ongoing Scientific and Technological Revolution (STR or Third Industrial Revolution) the SUCI leadership has failed to take note of it. In my view which I have repeatedly placed before the C.C. and C.C.–convened meetings the world has hitherto passed through three Industrial Revolutions; the first one with iron as basic good and steam as basic energy, the second with steel as basic good and electricity basic energy, and the third with plastic as basic good and nuclear power as basic energy. Lenin had talked of the Second Technological Revolution in his article ‘Agrarian Questions and Critics of Marx’. The third revolution or STR has been being talked about by many communist parties and Marxist scholars including Maurice Cornforth, J.D. Bernel and Ernest Mendel.

When I placed this point in one C.C.–convened meeting (Ghatsila Nov.’86) a Central Committee member went to the extent of saying that the hue and cry over the so called Technological Revolution is a fad of bourgeois academicians and there has been no second Industrial Revolution after the one that was witnessed in 19<sup>th</sup> Century and analysed by Marx. Back at Calcutta, I showed to the General Secretary the necessary quotations from Lenin and Stalin corroborating my contention. Despite my insistent request for a discussion on it he simply evaded this question.

- 3) The SUCI leadership has failed to take note of and analyse such new startling developments in science and technology as nuclear physics, Informatics, Micro-Electronics, Cybernetics, Robotics, Computer, Materials Engineering, Bio-Technology etc. and their deep implications for the study of the contemporary world capitalism and for the epistemological perfection of Marxist Dialectics.
- 4) The party leadership says that the SUCI’s analysis of the international situation is original and has not undergone any substantial change. The earlier party literature quite in tune with the Soviet analysis was very much eloquent on ‘approaching third world war’ and called upon all to turn it into a situation of revolutionary civil war in every capitalist country. As soon as the Soviet leadership changed its stance from impending ‘third world war’ to the possibility of preservation of world peace, the SUCI leadership also made a quick and corresponding shift without admitting it of course.

The earlier party literature called for the heightening of peace movement in India and the world comprising all peace-loving forces and people even including the Govt., ruling party, reactionary trade unions, religious organizations etc. I raised the question: What did the party leadership do specifically to build up such broad based anti-war peace platform and why was not the peace campaign continued and given the necessary priority as was promised by them initially? I had again argued: What was the harm in SUCI’s joining the peace campaign conducted by CPI, CPI(M) etc. even if they did not invite us?

- 5) I had pleaded for party’s emotional identification with the world non-alignment movement since it is a powerful bulwark against imperialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid, war hysteria etc. I had further pleaded for party’s support to the movements for New International Economic Order, New Ecological Order, New Information Order, New Human Order etc. as these are meant to bring about a move just and equitable order of international relations.

I had further argued for party’s identification with such new world-wide movements as Women’s Liberation, Civil Rights campaign, Movement on Eco-degradation, Youth and Student Revolts, Black Agitations and Anti-Apartheid movements etc.

- 6) I had pleaded for restoration into the pantheon of world communist movement quite many a thinker, leader and scholar who on account of theoretical differences with Stalin-led mechanically run Comintern and CPSU(B) were executed, degraded or blacked out. To name a few they are Rosa Luxemburg, Gramsci, Lukacs, Bukharin, Wilhelm, Reich, Kollontai, Balabanoff etc.

- 7) On different occasions I had pointed out that Shibdas Ghosh's analysis of various issues has not been made in continuation with the classic works of Marx, Engels, Lenin etc. For instances, Sibdas Ghosh talked of scientific, secular and democratic education system while Marx had expounded 'all-round polytechnical education'. The SUCI leadership has not done anything to show the link between the two concepts.

Again, Sibdas Ghosh in a speech in 1974 had pleaded for 'nationalisation of education' permissible under certain circumstances. Karl Marx had vehemently opposed state control of education in 'Critique of Gotha Programme' and different works. Lenin even after November Revolution did not favour 'nationalisation' but demanded in stead 'democratisation' or people's control of education. In my view, nationalization of education is not permissible under any conditions capitalist or socialist.

- 8) Quoting Lenin and Stalin I had pointed to the need for a thorough going analysis of the socio-economic-political situation existing in different countries of the world, if at all the party was serious about revolution in India and the world. As both Lenin and Stalin had shown, the revolution even in a particular country needs a deep thoroughgoing and accurate understanding of the many-sided situation existing in all countries, at least in majority of the countries.

In spite of my repeated pleading for it, the SUCI leadership did not show slightest interest in the question.

- 9) I had pleaded for exposing the entire rank-and-file of the party to the writings of the so-called dissidents within the world communist movement right from the time of Marx down to the present, such as Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Bernstein, Plekhanov, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Tito, Lukacs, Nagy, Kalakowski, Reich etc. Such an open and free study will help the rank and file to enrich themselves with the knowledge of the multiple currents that have been working in the international communist movement and to have thereby a fresh look at the old ideological and organisational controversies so as to comprehend the present situation in a better and more all-inclusive manner.

The SUCI leadership far from accepting the healthy content of this proposal tried to obstruct my independent and free enquiry into the history of the world communist movement. One day the General Secretary of the party could tell me "Why did you read Leon Trotsky's 'Permanent Revolution' without prior permission of the leadership? You should obey party methodology of study which means that a comrade should seek the consultation of his leadership before reading any book other than party literature". I replied that such a conception of party methodology of study is not only inconsistent with the practice of Marx, Engels, Lenin etc. but also goes counter to the teachings of Sibdas Ghosh who had enjoined upon the comrades to study freely and intensively even the literature of the enemy camp. After this dialogue I however insisted on my continuing study of the writings of different Marxist thinkers (recognized or not by the party) for which I was repeatedly criticized by the leadership. In spite of my protest to the mechanical process of study, the General Secretary continued to harp on the so-called party methodology of study in his speeches and discussions.

In my view there should be absolutely no bar by the party leadership on free, independent, personal initiative by the comrades in studying the divergent trends and outlooks concerning any subject. This is fundamental to the very theory and practice of Marxism which the SUCI leadership has failed to understand.

- 10) I had argued that we should not use the expression 'Com. Sibdas Ghosh thought' without a clear and precise definition of it. The definition should incorporate the differentia specifica, that is the distinct features which make him in party's view the 'Eminent Marxist thinker of the Era'. Without a precise definition, the use of 'Sibdas Ghosh Thought' is not only unscientific but vulgarly propagandistic.

I had further argued that the adjective 'Eminent Marxist Thinker' or Great Leader of the Proletariat' should be completely dropped. 'Eminent' means famous, popular etc. which Sibdas Ghosh is not even before a fragment of India's population, let alone of the world. No thinker has been made 'eminent' by propaganda. The party should, I had argued, get down to the real business, that is, defining 'Sibdas Ghosh Thought' and carrying out the scientific line (?) among the people so that the latter would spontaneously accept him as an 'eminent thinker'. Both Marx and Engels were quite indignant at the use of eulogies after their names. During the life time of Lenin, neither he nor any of the leaders of world communist movement did indulge in such obnoxious practice. As a matter of fact, with Stalin having been placed in the leadership of Comintern and CPSU(B), the cult of personality started eroding the very fundamental principles of collective function. Stalin is dead since long but the personality cult persists. SUCI leadership is worst victim of it.

To my queries, the party leadership did not have any reply except the blind assertion "the party has decided so, it cannot be changed".

- 11) I had raised the question before the party General Secretary – "When did the SUCI (a platform supposedly to serve as the Centre for unity of all socialist forces) turn into a party?" In my view the SUCI leadership should not have made a broad based platform into a centralized monolithic party around undefined 'Sibdas Ghosh Thought' until and unless the historic mission, the unity of all Socialist Forces, was achieved. The SUCI leadership should explain to its rank and file – what specific efforts did they make to unite all socialist forces before conversion of the platform into a party.
- 12) Karl Marx towards the close of his life had admitted that for lack of opportunity he could not write a comprehensive treatise on Dialectic which would have made really a total transcendence of Hegel's Dialectic. I had pleaded that the moment has now come for fulfilling the unfulfilled behest of Karl Marx. Once completed, it will prove an invincible theoretical weapon in the hands of the world proletariat for delivering mortal blows to tottering world capitalism.
- 13) I had argued for a clearcut, distinct definition of the term 'Negative Dialectics' used by Sibdas Ghosh since the term according to T.Adorno and many other Western Marxists meant something other than what it was to Ghosh.

Again, going by the Ghoshian explanation of Negative Dialectics, the study class conducted in the headquarter organization (Calcutta) itself, has no trace of it. According to Sibdas Ghosh, the leader should speak nothing or least allowing thereby the general comrades to raise questions and resolve those among themselves through a process of arguments and counter-arguments by them.

There has been an instance when the leaders instead of answering my questions or allowing the general comrades present in the house to reflect on my questions gave the ruling "there shall be no discussion on this subject in the study class any more".

In the name of 'Negative Dialectics' the study class of the headquarter organization has become a pulpit for hackneyed sermonizing by the leaders.

- 14) The present party leadership says that there is no vestige of Feudalism in any sphere in India except the culture (see Draft-thesis on National Situation). In my view, there are vestiges quite significant of not only Feudalism but of all earlier modes of production like primitive barbarism and slavery in different fields, economic, social, political and cultural. Not only that the Asiatic Mode of Production which Marx had shown to be peculiar to India and many other Asiatic countries has still its relevance for India. The SUCI has not made any study whatsoever of Asiatic Mode of production – a job which should have been done prior to and immediately after the formation of the party. Marx was vehemently against the mechanical application of

the European pattern of development of socio-economic formations (primitive, slave owning, feudal, capitalist and so on) to India and other Asiatic countries. SUCI has not heeded this profound warning of Marx and goes on parroting the European model for India.

On different occasions I have pointed out it to the party leadership. The latter far from recognizing the scientific content in my view tried to silence my further discussion on it. In one regular study class held by Calcutta District Committee of the Party I drew the attention of the leaders present there to the wrong observation made in the Draft-thesis that....., there is no vestige of Feudalism in India in any sphere except cultural. Quoting Lenin who in 1922 had pointed to the co-existence of 5 modes of production in Russia even after 5 years of Revolution (primitive barbarism, slavery, small commodity, state capitalism and socialism) I argued that in present day India, the situation is much more complex and the party should not make any rash comment on complete disappearance of feudalism, without making an intensive research into the multi-form socio-economic conditions of India. I had suggested that the party should bring out a work like Lenin's 'Development of capitalism in Russia' or Mao's 'Analysis of classes in Chinese Society', in order to determine the exact degree of development of capitalism and also survivals of earlier modes of production including feudalism and Asiatic mode of production and thereby to formulate more concretely and minutely the correlation of class forces in India. The three party leaders present there (considered to be front ranking next to Central Committee and 'reared' under the direct guidance of Sibdas Ghosh) far from heeding my views ruled that there would be no further discussion on it in the study class, since the question did not concern the majority of the house. When I insisted on the need for an open dialogue, they further ruled that the comrade concerned can discuss the issue separately only outside the class.

Having found no chance for an open dialogue in the house I had to agree to their proposal. Some days later, on my insistence the central office Secretary discussed the question with me. He told me that since the land-tax was being collected directly by the Govt. without intermediaries, there was no vestige of feudalism. I said that it was one of the criteria, not the sole or decisive one for determining the capitalistic nature of economy. I gave instances of religious trust property, tribal economy etc. as vestiges of pre-capitalist economic forms. He could not reply to my arguments.

The central committee also did not answer this question of mine even though I repeatedly wanted a discussion on it.

- 15) I differed from Sibdas Ghosh's description of Gandhism as the philosophical foundation of fascism in India. According to Sibdas Ghosh, fascism is a fusion between technical science and spiritualism. The question arises— how Gandhi who was thoroughly opposed to technical science could be considered as philosophical founder of fascism. In my view, anybody subscribing to spiritualism, theory of belief or theory of intuition cannot be called fascist. But Sibdas Ghosh has branded Gandhism as fascism because of Gandhi's faith in intuition (not history, science or logic) as the basis of truth.

In my view, Lenin's evaluation of Gandhi is correct. In his dialogue with M.N. Roy who pleaded for communist party's complete discard of Gandhi, Lenin had warned Roy that in spite of Gandhiji's conservatism on many, many social questions he was a revolutionary for his utmost identification with the masses and his success in bringing the dumb millions into the vortex of anti-imperialist struggles for the first time in India's history.

Again, I had argued that sine Gandhiji emphasized decentralization of political power down to every village, every man he cannot be called the philosopher of fascism which, as every body knows, places utmost emphasis on centralization and regimentation of power. Gandhiji like Marx before him had envisioned 'total man', 'all-round man' etc. while fascism seeks to render man 'one-dimensional', 'robot like'.

- 16) SUCI's conception of Leninist party is a perversion of both theory and practice of Lenin on party organization. The model of party as was presented in 'What is to be Done ? (1902), Lenin admitted, was relevant only to the peculiar conditions of the period when there was no possibility of legal activities due to Czarist coercion. The 1902 model having based itself on Kautsky's presumption that 'Socialism comes from without' (mind it, Lenin was then under the spell of Kautsky, the then most outstanding spokesman of Marxism) stipulated that (1) only a band of professional revolutionaries can form the core of party leadership, (2) centralization is necessary for uniformity of thinking and action, and (3) strict observation of party discipline is essential at all levels. Even at this stage Lenin had put great emphasis on inner party ideological struggles.

In course of time Lenin went on modifying and refining his conception of the party. He gradually abandoned the Kautskyian elitist propositions on party and said, "the workers are instinctively social-democratic" (meaning revolutionary). According to him the party congresses should be held annually and all bodies must be elected. The inner-party ideological struggle should be conducted openly and freely involving the common people. The party organs and forums should express freely the views and counterviews of the leaders, cadres and entire supporting masses (As Iskra and Pravda did) instead of being the mouth piece of only Central Committee. Lenin did not say that a party was the vanguard of the proletariat once and for all. He used to say that a party always strives to be vanguard of the proletariat. According to him a party in spite of its correct line may lose its vanguard position at any moment due to slightest tactical error. Lenin further made it clear that a communist party should keep always the overwhelming multitude of the exploited and oppressed masses in view as the central concern of its ideological and organizational endeavours.

More than once Lenin criticized the Bolshevik party for its isolation from the masses despite its correct line. Just before November Revolution, Lenin threatened to resign from the Central Committee and go directly to the masses because of dogmatic refusal by almost all members of C.C. to heed revolutionary mood of the popular masses.

He had then said that the masses were ten times more revolutionary than the cadres, the cadres were ten times more revolutionary than the leaders, and thus the leaders were hundred times more backward than the masses. The revolutionary mood and the Soviets spontaneously sprang from down below in an atmosphere of intense popular resentment irrespective of support or opposition of the political parties at the top. Lenin was prepared to join the November Revolution leaving aside the Bolshevik Party had the latter not heeded Lenin's call for seizure of power.

Lenin was confident that November Revolution could have taken place irrespective of Bolsheviks.

As Marx and Lenin have shown, the Paris Commune (1871) the first dictatorship of the proletariat took place without any party leadership, and the 1905 Revolution and 1917 February Revolution of Russia also occurred without Bolshevik leadership over the majority of the masses. Further, as every one knows, the majority of the years of Marx and Engels were spent for the working class movements all over the world without their association with any party. The Communist League and the First International were merely brief interludes in their long party less (not non-partisan) life.

In my view, revolutions can occur without parties. A genuine revolutionary party if it be there at all can at best facilitate the act of revolution by the masses. The SUCI thesis that the predominant influence of a revolutionary party over the majority of masses is a precondition for a successful revolution belittles the spontaneous self-creative and history-creating revolutionary potential of the masses. According to Sibdas Ghosh, a party becomes genuinely revolutionary only when the collective knowledge of the party is best expressed by a member

of the C.C. In my view, the test of the revolutionary line of a party is achieved if and when the teeming millions spontaneously uphold the line as that of the party. Not an individual howsoever great, but the masses constitute the acid test of a revolutionary party.

In my view, a communist party should not counterpose itself to other workers' parties, or stand itself above or outside the proletariat. Marx and Engels in their Communist Manifesto and Lenin-founded Third International in its 'Principles of Party Organisation' had expressed this spirit. From this point of view SUCI's oft-repeated slogan 'Strengthen SUCI, the only genuine Communist party on Indian soil' is only a self-defeating and sectarian one.

I had argued that the days of the band of professional revolutionaries' are gone and the days of 'mass proletarian organisations' have since long arrived. All inner party theoretical differences should be exposed to the people so as to involve them in the process of party building (As Iskra and Pravda did during Lenin's time). The party building and the building of revolutionary mass movements should go together and be coterminous.

In my view, there is only centralism from up downwards but no democracy horizontally or vertically inside SUCI, and the party leadership has distorted and prostituted the very conception of 'democratic centralism' for the perpetuation of their own position. According to the existing norms emphasized by the party leadership, there is a definite process of the central leadership's knowing the stand and moves of each member of the rank and file, but little possibility for free and open exchange of critical theoretical views among the comrades themselves or for checking of the activities of Central Committee by the lower bodies. A comrade is supposed not to criticize the wrong theoretical views of a leader before his colleague or junior. I had agreed that theoretical differences within the party could be discussed with anybody, colleague, junior or even the masses. But the party leadership said, "No, you can't. If you do it disciplinary action will be taken against you".

I had argued that the very process of party building (non-holding of congress, non-elective bodies, flow of information from below to the top but chain of command from up downwards, the non-exposure of inner party theoretical differences to the rank and file and the common people, deification of a leader etc.) which has been claimed as an original contribution by SUCI is only a gross distortion of Leninist principles of party organization. As a result of all this, the general level of capacity of the rank and file for holding critical dialogues with leadership on different theoretical issues has gone down to a miserable low. The party leadership has been instrumental in institutionalizing this wrong process and has turned deaf ears to the proposal for rectification. I had submitted long notes on these questions to the highest leadership and begged for discussion but to no effect.

- 17) I had pleaded for "United front from Below", the experiment that was made by French Communist Party to resist the fascist menace in the 30s. I had explained that instead of emphasizing the address of letters to different parties for unity and waiting for their reply, the party should see that its entire rank and file be engaged in strengthening and widening the ongoing movements of the masses from below irrespective of the attitude of the parties. That is the surest process of bending the recalcitrant leadership of various parties before the united mass movements. Since the overwhelming majority of the common people remain outside the parties, the stress should be given on the mass movements below, not on the agreements between the parties at the top.

In spite of my emphatic plea for it, the party leadership persists in the old stereotyped practice and in the worst, vulgar cult of putting all blame on other parties.

- 18) The SUCI leadership despite their clamour for all-out unity of left democratic and opposition forces against fascism is sectarian to the core in practice. On one occasion at the party centre at Calcutta where I was staying, I donated my clothes to the CPI(M)'s relief fund for Kalahandi famine-stricken people. I was then severely criticized by several leaders on the ground that I

*Contd...*

behaved arbitrarily in helping the relief fund of a party who is a potentially fascist force and more dangerous than outright bourgeois parties, even Congress (I). I refused to accept their sectarian criticism and had pleaded for a spontaneous collaboration between different parties on common humanitarian issues.

- 19) I had argued for observation of such internationally accepted occasions as May Day and November Revolutionary Day with due importance in contrast to the exaggerated emphasis given at present on purely party-centred occasions such as Party Foundation Day and Sibdas Ghosh Memorial Day. Due to non-observation of internationally accepted working class occasions the party has only alienated itself from the broad masses of the people.
- 20) I objected to the practice of singing the song of Sibdas Ghosh from the party rostrum as it hinders the heterogeneous masses coming forward spontaneously to the party even if they support the cause of revolution. The common people who are ignorant of/allergic to Sibdas Ghosh do not feel like standing during the song. Thus the ritual of song acts as a brake on party's natural identification with the heterogeneous proletariat.

I had argued if the people of their own sing the song, let them. But the songs should not be played from party rostrum.

Again, the song on Sibdas Ghosh which is given equal status as that of the International and which does not contain any reference to the name of Marx, Engels etc. is a factor of personality cult around the name of Sibdas Ghosh.

I argued, I may sing the song on my own or with my friends and comrades but I do not feel like standing while the song is played from party rostrum. The party leadership told me point blank. "As a matter of party discipline you have to stand, otherwise the door is open for you, you may leave the party."

I thought to myself: it was the teaching of Sibdas Ghosh not to show outward respect for somebody if you do not have genuine respect for him. Under the circumstances, how can I stand if I do not feel like standing and if I consider the very ritual of song detrimental to the cause of revolution? It is better that I say goodbye to such blind, mechanical and authoritarian discipline.

- 21) In view of the forthcoming 1<sup>st</sup> Congress of SUCI I have proposed the followings:
- (a) The party leadership should explain – what harm would have been done by regular holding of the annual congress since inception?
  - (b) Why the party has not been able to touch even a fringe of India's workers and peasants during so great a span of time?
  - (c) Why the party leadership has not been able to present a systematic body of 'original' contributions of Sibdas Ghosh to Marxism–Leninism'?
  - (d) Why the amendments and criticism of the rank and file on Draft-thesis for Congress not be published and circulated among all members and supporters of the party?
  - (e) What harm should have been done if the party bodies at various levels would have been formed on elective principle right from beginning?
  - (f) Why the original resolutions adopted in the first Convention of SUCI held in 1948 be not circulated to the general members along with the amended drafts of the Central Committee for a comparative and critical study?
  - (g) Why the proposal for Congress be kept secret from the people at large?
- 22) While the party leadership claims Sarat Chandra as the greatest literature of the world, they have however not analysed the multifarious literary trends in different countries of the world so

as to bring home their version through a comparative and critical study. Without making an in-depth worldwide comparative literary survey such a claim would only belittle Sarat Chandra and also Sibdas Ghosh who is said to have made such a claim.

- 23) I had raised the question : Why should the photograph of Sibdas Ghosh be placed next to Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao ? Why not of Rosa, Ho and the like ? I demanded that until and unless the party has made adequate research into the entire body of thoughts of Rosa and Ho etc. vis-à-vis Sibdash Ghos, the latter's photograph or projection should not be made as has been done until now. Again, there is no need either for the ritual of photo-display from the party rostrum at all.

In spite of my repeated questioning there was no answer verbal or written.

In my last conversation before the resignation on 18<sup>th</sup> September, the party leadership told me as regards the above question: "The party has decided to display the photographs; you have to accept it as a matter of party discipline."

- 24) The SUCI leadership has made one worst vulgarization of the concept called 'Commune' which according to Marx and Lenin is a spontaneous self-managed organization of the proletariat.

I had raised the question: Why should domestic servants be kept in the party communes? Why should the communes, if they are really novel experiments at all, be not open and accessible to the common people.

The party leadership instead of answering my question sharply rebuked me for inviting my closely known friends to the party centre without the leadership's prior approval.

- 25) The SUCI leadership claims that the leaders of CPI, CIP(M), CPI(ML) RSP etc. have not made any contributions to Marxism, and rather have been responsible for distorting and degrading it before the common people. I had argued that in spite of deviations, they have helped the spread of Marxism in our country. I pleaded for their writing and biographies to be read by SUCI's rank and file and their positive contributions to be recognized open-heartedly.

- 26) I have pointed out that a hierarchy of privileges is growing inside the party. The status of a person in the party echelon was being attached with some extra benefits or the other. I gave the example of serving of tea only to the top party leaders or their invitees in the party office while other comrades and lay visitors will be looking on. Keeping domestic servants in the party communes is also a case point. I told them that if we do this before the revolution, we shall be doing on a much larger scale after the capture of power. Where lies then the moral justification behind our criticism against the Soviet and other communist parties for their alleged offer of material incentives to the leaders?

- 27) SUCI leadership waxes eloquent on its high ethical, cultural and moral standard and criticises all other parties right or left for lacking in it. According to them, the private life of the leaders of all other parties stands in sharp contrast to their profession of tall ideals in public life. But my experience and direct living and contact with SUCI leaders has convinced me beyond doubt that they are filled with worst vices of private property mental complex such as slavish obedience to higher leaders, haughty and highhanded attitude towards the juniors, insensitiveness to the arguments of others, a closed mind towards scholars and leaders not owing allegiance to them, intolerance towards the self-initiative and self-creative thinking and practice of the juniors, indifference and discouragement to the cult of classical Marxism, deep-rooted authoritarianism (why did you do this without consulting the leadership ?), lack of direct touch with the masses, deep hatred towards other parties especially leftist ones, hot-headedness, envy and intolerance towards the independent quest for truth, sermon-mongering, suppression of argumentative mind in the juniors, a crude dislike of liberal scholarship, disregard of norms of democratic and collective life, love of sycophancy, curiosity in others'

*Contd...*

private lives but hesitancy and secretiveness about their own, and the like. As I have mentioned earlier, a hierarchy of material privileges is increasingly attached to the hierarchy of leadership in the party. None is a natural beloved leader of the masses, each of them being a mere party leader bureaucratically imposed from above.

It is not that I am telling all this after my resignation from the party. I have told them to their face on different occasions. The very day the General Secretary of the party took me to task for going to National Library and reading Trotsky's books, I sensed deep incurable cancer in the supposedly highest echelon of party bureaucracy. I had to protest against this attitude, and carry on defiantly my free and independent enquiry which I consider the élan vital of Marxism. The day the party leadership severely criticized me for donating clothes to CIP(M)'s relief fund, I discovered deep-seated sectarianism and hypocrisy on their slogan of all-out anti-fascist unity in the top party leadership. I had submitted a 25-point questionnaire to the Advisor AIDS0 just before the Delhi Conference on his highly irrational conduct towards AIDS0's functioning. In spite of repeated requests by me for discussion on it, he evaded it. The day he angrily reacted to me for showing him the questions from Lenin and Stalin on a particular question, I sensed his deep aversion towards classical Marxism. I pointed it out to him but he again evaded any discussion on it. The day I was obstructed from carrying on further discussion on the question of feudalism in the Calcutta study class by three high ranking leaders, I sensed the hollowness and hypocrisy behind the leadership's off-shouted slogan on philosophical tolerance. The day a central committee member told that STR is a fad of bourgeois academicians, I found how ignorant and foolish are these leaders. The day when the Orissa State Secretary told me that Marx or Engels has not talked of 'end of philosophy' even after I showed him the necessary quotations, I found him ignoramus the great on classical Marxism. Every time I was rebuked by the party leadership for inviting my friends to the party center, I felt how poor and heartless creatures they were. I can give thousand and one instances when the so-called model professional revolutionaries supposed to have been reared under the direct guidance of Sibdas Ghosh have proved moral lepers, intellectual dwarfs and heartless robots. What I have mentioned here is a mere tip of the iceberg. The so-called 'band of SUCI's professional revolutionaries' is a band of professional frauds in the guise of Marxism-Leninism-Sibdas Ghosh Thought thriving on the trade in hot tears of the oppressed masses, and tireless toil of the innocent ranks.

- 28) The question arises, to what extent I tried to reform the party from within before leaving it. In fact I have left no stone unturned in my capacity to reform the party leadership. Whenever the questions cropped up in my mind as regards the party line I placed them before the highest leadership of the party. But the latter in stead of answering my questions went on criticizing my going to National Library and reading non-recommended books in the name of disciplining my 'erratic' habit of study. Whenever I met new persons in libraries and different places, I was falsely charged of contact with strange and mysterious forces and individuals. Whenever I invited my friends and closely known persons to the party center for the purpose of introducing them to the party comrades I was severally criticized for doing so on the plea that the party centers and communes are meant only for specific number of party comrades.

Having found no answer to my questions from the highest leadership, I tried to avail the Calcutta District study class for ventilating my views. But the day when I questioned the contention of Draft-Thesis on feudalism, I was prevented from carrying on the discussion in the study class. I again wanted to avail the chance for personal dialogues with the leaders on my unresolved questions. But they showed a very casual and evasive attitude. Both the doors were closed to me by the party leadership: inner-party ideological struggle in the study class and personal dialogues with the leaders.

I was left in a situation where neither the leaders answered my questions nor did they allow me to interact with the rank and file members in the study class, where my self-study

*Contd...*

was obstructed, where my visit to libraries and friends was sought to be restricted, where the visit of my friends to the party center was taken to task, and moreover, when I continued to be charged and blamed every now and then for every act of my free movement.

Under the circumstances I wanted to clinch the issues from my side with the leadership. I did not feel at ease with questions unresolved in my mind. On 18<sup>th</sup> September, I sought a talk with the party leadership. As soon as I opened my mouth, the party leader threatened me: “Disciplinary action will be taken against you for you have discussed your fundamental differences with the party here and there”. I replied, ‘please show me a single instance’. He said, “We can’t give you any instance, but we have got definite reports”. I said, “Then your charge is baseless”. The party leader again told, “Be that as it may, you have violated party discipline. You can leave the party and may go for formation of a new party, if you so like”.

I was just taken aback by such words of threat. I begged for 24 hours of time for taking a decision. I thought to myself in the night, when there is no minimum freedom of movement and expression inside the party for me, and when the party leadership insists on disciplinary action against me on unsubstantiated charges, let me leave the party rather than accommodate and obey a leadership which appears to me to be a brake on the self-activity of the proletariat and on the natural flowering of the science and art called Marxism.

- 29) As regards what is to be done now, I will involve myself along with the like minded fellow travelers in an intensive but fresh study of the questions on revolution that remained unanswered by the party leadership on one hand and plunge myself as far as possible into all broad-based, just and legitimate movements of the people wherever they are taking place, in India and the world which the degenerate bureaucratized party leadership has failed to develop during the nearly forty years of its vegetative existence on the other. I do not bear any feeling of animosity towards any body in the party, but I am again prepared to cross swords with anybody who dares distort, pervert and prostitute the great science called Marxism or play for his or her narrow ends with the tear and toil of the oppressed mankind.

I fervently crave for counsel and criticism of yours at this hour of loud reflection.

With warm revolutionary greetings,

Comradely yours

Chitta Behera,

C/O Smt. Saila Behera

Sukanya,

Manisahu Chhak, Cuttack-1, Orissa

PIN: 753001, PH: 0671- 25793(res.)

□ □ □

Cuttack.

13<sup>th</sup> October, 1987.