

*“We have to unhesitatingly admit the truth, whichever quarter it may come from, even from the enemy”*  
- Shibdas Ghosh

## **What is to be undone?** **[An open letter to SUCI on the occasion of its 1<sup>st</sup> Congress]**

It is already a few months now since I resigned from the party [September 19, 1987]. Since the party leadership played, and continues to play right upto now, a dubious tactic over both the fact and reason of my resignation, I am constrained to issue this open letter, my only hope being to reach out to as many comrades as possible through it. I being the one who shared your struggles and sufferings for the 17 years last on end [from 1970 to 87], who spent almost the whole of his youth under the banner of this party and moreover, who was mentally prepared till the moment of his resignation, to carry forward this banner throughout the rest of his life do have only one prayer to make before you: lend me a bias-free ear before dismissing me.

Soon after the Delhi Conference of AIDS0 was over [February’86] I got rid of my pre-occupation with student politics in the capacity of its General Secretary and got down to grappling with the task [self-chosen, of course] of reforming the party from within, which I thought and still think was long overdue. My main concern, rather the problematic was: why a party founded as long as forty years back and despite the exemplary honesty and dedication of its rank and file could not make any tangible headway either in terms of parliamentary politics which it accepted right from its inception albeit as a tactical means, or in terms of mass movements on a country-wide scale which it emphasizes in its writings and speeches as its principal business? On a personal plane, this self-interrogation was mixed with certain amount of pain and anguish: While the majority of the founder-leaders including Shibdas Ghosh himself had already expired leaving only three members in the Central Committee as at present, and while the second line of leaders are fast growing into oldies, the party does not yet seem to move ahead, and, on the contrary goes on losing its bases and ranks [such as in Orissa, Andhra, Bihar, West Bengal etc]. Many a brilliant, self-sacrificing individual who had joined the party out of the purest revolutionary intentions, have after some years left or are in the process of leaving the party out of disillusionment with its ideology and /or internal life. I know personally quite a number of them across the States. Though disillusioned with the leadership they are still burning with revolutionary zeal, as pure as it was when they joined in the party.

This all-too-depressing party scenario led me to a study, rather a re-study of the whole range of issues that concern the party in particular and the communist movement in general. I can’t claim to have succeeded in acquiring a thorough grasp of all the relevant issues. But one thing I became conclusively sure of: the party was in dire need of a drastic reform from within if it at all meant to match the tasks of the day. As I did not then belong to any committee proper except being assigned from time to time with piecemeal jobs as in the capacity of a staff member directly by the General Secretary of the party. I thought it proper, and in a way, a rare privilege to conduct dialogue straight with the central committee on the issues that agitated my mind. During the period under question, which is roughly one and half years, I submitted copious notes before the central committee on various issues in the hope of stimulating a rethinking on the part of party’s top leadership. The questions that I raised in course of my deliberations in different party forums, and notes submitted on different occasions included inter alia;

(1) Platform to Party: How the SUCI, supposedly a platform for the unity of all socialist forces (as conceived by the Resolution of the first Convention held in 1948) could be converted into a monolithic party wedded exclusively as it is for quite some years now to Shibdas Ghosh version of Marxism-Leninism, and standing in isolation from, nay, in opposition to almost the rest of country’s socialist forces? As there has been no Congress or Conference of the party since its inception, the wisdom of this conversion has not been debated at any point of time inside the party covering the entire rank and file. It is the Central Committee which has unilaterally set into currency the term party in place of platform as if the conversion is a fait accompli.

(2) Democratic Principles: What was the harm if the party would have gone for regular holding of the Congress, election etc. as Lenin had insisted (see his Preface to Collection Twelve Years, 1907) for a

genuine communist party intent upon promoting the leadership from below, and arriving at decisions concerning ideology and policy not by dictates from above but through the involvement of entire rank and file below?

(3) 1921 Principles: Why does SUCI still stick to Comintern's 1921 'Principles of Party Organisation' which Lenin himself described in 1922 as one 'thoroughly imbued with Russian spirit' (see Lenin's Speech to Fourth Congress of the Comintern) and unsuitable for the countries other than Russia?

(4) 1921 Principles and SUCI: Assuming that SUCI is correct in its theoretically adhering to 1921 Principles, how far has it been able to emulate them? The Comintern 'Principles' for all its Russianistic limitations provides for mutual supervision by higher and lower bodies over each other. For last 40 years, as the fact goes, the Central Committee of SUCI supervised the activities of the lower, even the lowest bodies, but where was the provision, nay, chance for the lower bodies to supervise the activities of the Central Committee? The Comintern 'Principles' emphasises the elective principle, while the SUCI was doing without it all through till yet.

(5) Professional Revolutionary: Why does the party still cling to the concept 'Professional Revolutionary' (staff member) in present-day, legally-free situation of India, which was but applied by Lenin under the peculiar conditions of Czarist coercion, only to be abandoned at the very approach of a legally free atmosphere in Russia as early as 1905 (see Lenin's Preface to Collection Twelve Years, 1907)?

(6) Inequality in the Party:- While the rest of the Communist Parties the world over (including the 1921 Comintern Principles) recognize only two kinds of members such as Candidate Member and Member, and the principle of equality among the members in respect to any office inside the party, the Draft Constitution of SUCI provides for three-tier membership (Candidate Member, Member and Staff Member), and non-eligibility of general members for election to the posts of Central Committee, Secretary of State Committee and even of District which are reserved only for staff Members (so-called Professional Revolutionaries). And further on, the Staff Members don't derive their bona fides from the general members through election by them, but from nomination by the Central Committee above. The provision that the very Staff Members who are chosen, nay, handpicked by Central Committee can only constitute the Central Committee and also the core of State level and district level leadership goes all the way to serve one definite purpose, that is, institutionalization of self-perpetuation of the Central Committee and of its ideological-organizational hegemony over and against the rest of the party. The right of the minorities, autonomy of every unit, free and open expression of dissent by the rank and file members etc. the very principles which Lenin used to emphasise as indispensable marks of a true proletarian party will be simply smothered as under this totalitarian and authoritarian model of party organisation.

(7) Need for Party's Openness :-While most of other communist parties (not to speak of Russia's & China's) are used to the healthy practice of circulating the draft-documents of the Congress among the wider public, the SUCI leadership kept them confined only to its selected ranks (even many supporters of the party have been deprived of access to these top secret documents). If the people are asked, as they are very often by the party leadership, to 'contribute generously' to the funds for the Congress, and 'attend en masse' its Open Session, why should we not let them contribute to party's line of thinking on ideological-organizational questions?

(8) Shibdas Ghosh:- How could the Central Committee conclude that Shibdas Ghosh is the 'Eminent Marxist Thinker of the Era', next to Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao? Has there been at any point of time a debate inside the party as to why should we not accept, say for instance, Rosa Luxemburg, Gramsci, Ho Chi Minh, Lukacs, etc.? How is Shibdas Ghosh greater than all these figures? Has the party produced any single document showing as to why these great authorities are irrelevant to our time or not worth being considered as continuers of the Marxist tradition?

(9) Thought undefined:- For all their penchant for 'Scientific analysis' how would SUCI leadership pass on the as-yet-undefined term 'Com. Shibdas Ghosh Thought' for its widespread use within and outside the party? The so-called epithet that "Com. Shibdas Ghosh Thought is the highest

understanding of Marxism-Leninism in our epoch” is not a definition by any standard, and begs more questions than it answers. The moot question which the definition should answer: how is it the highest understanding?

(10) Personality Cult of Ghosh:- For all their criticism of Stalin (inadequate though) on the issue of personality cult, how could the Central Committee since during the life time of Shibdas Ghosh himself encourage and institute a personality cult around Ghosh and that too on a scale much larger than the cult of Stalin or Mao? How could the Central Committee right from the days of Ghosh allow such grotesque rituals as singing of the song on Ghosh (virtually party anthem) from the party rostrum with equal dignity as given to the Internationale (all keep standing during the song), use of superlative expressions like ‘Great Leader of the proletariat’, ‘Eminent Marxist Thinker of the Era’, ‘Our beloved leader, teacher and guide’, etc., mention of his name in party organs in bold letters, building of his statue (still kept in Calcutta Office), naming of the party fund after him (G.S. Fund), and placing of his photograph beside that of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao? In a gurubadi country like India, while the foremost need was to demystify and dissolve the tradition of ‘hero worship’ as prevalent in society in general, and cleanse thereby the communist movement of its cancerous impact, the SUCI leadership added to this all-powerful irrationalist tradition by giving free rein to Shibdas Ghosh personality cult.

(11) Democratic Centralism:- As to why there was no Congress for last 40 years, the SUCI leadership usually come up with ready-made explanation that they wanted to develop in a real, non-formal way the actual practice of democratic centralism inside the party before giving it a formal, constitutional shape. So far so good. But the moot question remains, what was the actual content of the so-called real, non-formal practice of democratic centralism inside the SUCI so far? Whereas for Lenin, the party organs should carry the views and counter-views of all the members of the party, not of Central Committee alone (see for instance, Pravda on the issue of Workers’ Opposition, Democratic Centralist Group, Peasant Question, Autonomisation Plan, and even earlier, on armed uprising versus constituent assembly debate just before the November Revolution), the SUCI Central Committee monopolized the party organs for themselves without allowing the views of the rank and file members to find place in them. What harm would have been there, for instance, in giving free vent in the party organs to the theoretical questions and criticisms put forward by the Andhra Comrades (Comrade Srinivasan, Vikram and their group) and thereby raise a debate among the rank and file members of different states in stead of going for an organizational breach with them? What harm would have been there again in publishing the criticism of Comrade N.R. Singh (Bihar MLA) on the post-Shibdas Ghosh performances of the present Central Committee and thereby setting an example of self-criticism by the Central Committee? Again, what harm would have been there if the party leadership were to undertake an inner-party debate before severing the connexion with Com. Ramesh Mohapatra and his group, Com. Prafulla Das and his group and Com. Sailendra Mohanty and his group in Orissa?

In the name of democratic centralism what has been practiced so far in a non-formal, conventional manner is the mechanical centralism by the Central Committee above, which is precisely reflected in every clause and sub-clause of the Draft-constitution, slated for formal adoption by the Congress.

(12) Abstract to Concrete:- According to Lenin the concreteness or otherwise of party leadership is proved if the masses outside the party think as the party does. As against this, Shibdas Ghosh proposed that the party’s collective knowledge and collective leadership is realized only when there emerges ‘a leader of leaders’, a beloved leader, teacher and guide of the entire party, in the highest echelon, the central committee, who is the concrete, physical embodiment, expression of the party’s collective will, no matter how small the party is and whether masses think alike or not. Thus the Ghosian discourse is the diametrical opposite of well-grounded Leninist discourse on party since it seeks to turn the Communist’s attention away from the masses below [the real concrete] to the central committee and its leader of leaders in the top above [the real abstract]. No strange that such a jugglery of abstract-concrete by Ghosh reinforced the personality cult around him in his life-time inside the party.

[13] Ghosh’s Originality - The SUCI leadership has been claiming that Shibdas Ghosh has made ‘original’ contributions to Marxism-Leninism on different questions including dialectical materialism,

fascism, world communist movement, socialist realism etc. Such a claim has been made without subjecting the post-Lenin Marxist thinkers and scholars and their positions and counter-positions to a comprehensive critique vis-a-vis Shibdas Ghosh on any single issue. To illustrate, has the SUCI leadership taken into account in a documented manner, the views of Wilhelm Reich, Poulantzas, Fourth Internationalists etc. on Fascism before saying that Shibdas Ghosh has made original contribution on it?

[14] Ignorance about Lenin: Not to speak of study of post-Lenin thinkers, Shibdas Ghosh or for that matter, the SUCI leadership have not made an exhaustive study even of Lenin's works. On the question of party organisation Ghosh has wrongly quoted Lenin from his, 'What is to be Done?' that 'Socialism comes from without', little knowing that the quotation was originally Kautsky's and secondly, Lenin himself abandoned this Kautskyian position only after a few years (Preface to Collection Twelve years). Again, the SUCI continues to harp on Comintern's 1921 'Principles of Party Organisation' little knowing that Lenin himself had called for its abandonment just in the next year. On the question of philosophy, Shibdas Ghosh thought himself to have achieved a great feat by fighting Lenin's mechanical materialist conception of knowledge that 'Consciousness is reflection of matter' (Materialism and Empirio-Criticism) little knowing that the same Lenin had to offer almost a reverse thesis afterwards that 'Consciousness not only reflects but constitutes reality' (Philosophical Note books).

(15) Lenin's Model: Shibdas Ghosh's understanding of Leninist model of party Organisation is stuck up at the primitive level of 'What is to be Done?' (1902) which Lenin had presented at a particular juncture of Czarist Russia and which Lenin went on modifying and recasting throughout till the end of his life. In the years preceding 1905 revolution, that is, during the period of lull, Lenin had emphasized the prior role of theory, or for that matter, of the vanguard party as equipped with the advance theory over the spontaneity of the masses. But in the period of revolutionary ferment that followed, Lenin was prudent enough to quickly shift his emphasis as from organisation to spontaneity. In the years 1908-12, one can again notice in Lenin a shift back to organisation from spontaneity. But in the period of war and revolution that followed, Lenin was again for party's coping with the spontaneous upsurge of the masses from below. So much so that he in fact tendered his resignation before the central Committee for the latter's lagging behind the masses on the question of armed uprising. And again, the 'Principles of Party Organisation'(1921) which for all its thrust on vanguard role of the party was recommended by him was dismissed by Lenin himself in the next year as one 'thoroughly imbued with Russian Spirit'. Under the circumstances, to erect one, uniform, universal, cut and dried model of party organisation taking the cue from some tactical utterances of Lenin made at particular junctures of time and circumstances and stamp it as the genuine Leninist model (as Shibdas Ghosh has done basing himself on Kautskyian Young Leninist proposition that Socialism comes from outside) is simply to butcher the ever dynamic, multi-faceted soul of Leninism.

(16) SUCI's Critiques of other Parties:- The party has not produced as yet a critique of RSPI (from which the founder leader broke away back in 1946 to form SUCI). Peculiarly enough, Shibdas Ghosh's speech "Why SUCI is the only genuine communist party on Indian Soil" (so to say, the handbook of SUCI) is conspicuously silent on RSPI, their mother party and the party whose stage theory is same as SUCI's (Anti-capitalist Socialist Revolution), while it goes all the way to expose the fallacy in the lines of CPI, CPI(M) and CPI(ML). On theoretical plane, the Central Committee should have analysed more in depth the diverse versions of Anti-Capitalist Socialist Revolution as presented by different parties/groups (such as RSPI, RCPI, Bolshevik Party, Communist League of India, Lal Nishan Party, Inquilabi International Communist Sangathan, Mazdur Mukti, Young India Project etc.) vis-à-vis their own version of it.

(17) Suggestions on Congress: In view of the 1<sup>st</sup> party Congress, it was suggested to the party leadership that the draft-document of the congress should be circulated not only among the broad rank and file of the party but among the people at large, that the resolutions of the 1948 founding convention so long put into cold storage should be printed and circulated for helping the comrades and people draw a comparison between SUCI's position then and now, and that the Central Committee should so arrange as to enable the comrades of different states know each other's amendments on draft-documents before the Congress instead of maintaining C.C.'s monopoly over them.

(18) Ghosh and Proletarian Democracy: Shibdas Ghosh has counterposed the proletarian democracy to bourgeois democracy in such a manner as to mean as if democratic rights and freedoms as such have no decisive import and relevance, and are all-too-dispensable in a proletarian party or state. Such a view diametrically runs counter to Lenin's according to which proletarian democracy is the consummation, so to say, the fullest flowering of democratic content of bourgeois-democracy which remains truncated, partial and half-hearted even in the freest of bourgeois republics, while it is at the same time full-scale negation of the bourgeois content [that is, inequality arising out of property relation]. Proletarian democracy is thus both affirmation and negation of bourgeois democracy. Lenin's formula in 'State and Revolution' that quantity of democracy as under bourgeois democracy if magnified to its furthest limit leads to a new quality, that is, proletarian democracy has, in all probability, gone over the head of Shibdas Ghosh. That is why, we notice in Ghosh a conspicuous lack of emphasis on democratic principles of party organisation, and a perceptible choice for rigid, monolithic, non-pluralistic, centralistic, totalitarian, elitist-Kautskyian model of party organisation albeit on the ground of uniformity of thinking and action. The young Lenin of 'What is to be done' grew into mature Lenin of 'State and Revolution' whereas our Comrade Ghosh remained stuck up there where he was in the beginning on the question of proletarian democracy.

(19) On Socialism: According to Lenin, not State ownership/control as such, but the control of production by the owners/producers themselves is the decisive thing in Socialism. State ownership/control may exist and is, in fact, increasingly resorted to by almost all varieties of capitalist states fascist/welfarist. But what is lacking there despite ever increasing state control is the control by the masses below [real socialism]. Similarly, the fact of revolution [overthrow of the bourgeois state] and the consequent placement of the communist party in state power does not ipso facto lead to socialism [social control or workers' control]. In absence of direct control of the production by the workers themselves as through the Soviets, the post-revolution situation may lead to increase of state power/party power but not necessarily to that of the people's power. That is why, Lenin said, the proletarian state is not the state proper (in the sense of a standing body) but is in the process of withering away with the proletariat themselves increasingly taking over and directly controlling the affairs of the state, otherwise, their own affairs [State and Revolution]. In view of this, Lenin used to call Soviet Russia a State Capitalist Society till his death, not a socialist society proper.

Shibdas Ghosh for all his penchant for critiquing the socialist states [Soviet Union, China, Hungary, Czechoslovakia etc.] has not subjected them to a re-examination from this classical Marxist-Leninist perspective. To him, the moot question as regards the socialist society is the question whether the party leadership is genuine or revisionist. The Ghosian critique of socialist society is thus not an immanent classical Marxist-Leninist critique, but a contingent, deflated statist-partyist one.

(20) A plea for Glasnost: It was argued before the Central Committee that the party set itself the task of re-reading of such dissidents and non-Orthodox Marxists as Trotsky, Gramsci, Lukacs, Rosa Luxemburg, Kollontai, Balabanoff, Reich etc. who were marginalised, discriminated against, executed or blacked out by the Comintern during Stalin era in order to appropriate what is best in each of them to the present day Marxist tradition.

(21) India's Mode of Production: The party has not made as yet an in-depth independent analysis of India's complex, variegated socio-economic formation, that is, as to whether and how far are the vestiges of pre-capitalist formations still in existence along with capitalism. And quite strangely, the present party leadership admit of no such vestiges except of course in cultural sphere while Shibdas Ghosh had admitted some of them.

Did Lenin not speak of co-existence of five modes of production [primitive barbaric, serf, small commodity, state capitalism and socialism even after 5 years of 1917 November Revolution? Without an in-depth analysis of our mode production like Lenin's 'Development of Capitalism in Russia' and Mao's 'Analysis of classes in Chinese Society' the party cannot hope to make correct decisions in the sphere of tactics despite the strategy of Revolution being correct.

The SUCI did not take part in the mode of production debate that raged in the '70s and has not made any appraisal of it also. Further, there has been no discussion at all of Marx's Asiatic mode of production in any document or forum of the party- a task which should have been taken up right at the time of party formation back in 1948.

(22) Comparative Survey of Literary-Cultural Traditions:

The SUCI without having discussed the different literary-cultural traditions and trends of India's past and present [such as Phule of Maharashtra, Periyar of Tamil Nadu, Prem Chand, Thazaki Pillai of Kerala etc.] has been over-playing Sarat Chandra of Bengal as 'the model' for India and the world. And again, Shibdas Ghosh has borrowed his evaluation of Sarat Chandra from M.N.Roy without acknowledgement.

(23) On Gandhism: The SUCI leadership still wrongly clings to Ghosh's description of Gandhism as the philosophical foundation of fascism in India. Even going by Ghoshian understanding of fascism as a fusion between technical science with spiritualism how can Gandhism, which is thoroughly opposed to technical science, can be called fascism? SUCI before characterizing Gandhism as fascism should have taken into account the opinion of Lenin who in his discussion with M.N.Roy had said that Gandhi for all his conservatism was a social revolutionary because of his thrust on bringing the common masses into the vortex of anti-imperialist struggle [see M.N.Roy's Memoirs].

(24) On Other parties: The SUCI leadership do not recognize the contributions of any party or trend other than themselves to India's Communist movement. Whereas Lenin despite his differences of outlook and opinion with Narodniks, Plekhanov etc. openly acknowledged their contribution to popularization of Marxism in Russia, the SUCI looks upon all others including CPI, CPI(M), RSP etc. as only distorters and perverters of Marxism here.

(25) On Left Unity: The SUCI has all along been calling for all-out unity of the left, democratic and opposition parties and forces which inter alia include CPI, CPI [M], RSP etc. against fascism, but practicing sectarianism all the time contrary to their proclamation [such as by treating Left Front and Congress as equal enemies of the people as in the last Assembly election in W. B]

(26) United Front: To SUCI leadership, United Front means only united front of parties which is actually not so. A united front of parties may not be a united front of the people since the majority of the latter remain outside the purview of all parties taken together. I had suggested that the party should experiment with the concept of 'United Front from below' as was done with good result by the French Communist Party during the anti-fascist resistance of 30s. But the SUCI leadership without paying heed to it goes on issuing only letter after letter to other parties for unity on one hand, and, in the event of their non-response, blaming them for their alleged lack of sincerity on united movement.

(27) Peace Movement: The SUCI leadership had promised at the time of foundation in 1948 to undertake a vigorous programme of anti-war peace movement, but have neither joined of their own the movements conducted by other parties nor have an independent programme by themselves on this score.

(28) SUCI Then and Now: The party leadership claims that no substantial change has since taken place in the party's positions as adopted in 1948. But how do they explain such changes- (1) The SUCI turned into a party from a platform, (2) The SUCI leadership which then insisted on not branding the other fraternal left parties as betrayers, pseudo-revolutionaries etc. in the interest of left unity has no hesitation now in describing them as potential fascist forces, (3) Trotskyites who were considered then as having a positive role in the anti-capitalist revolutionary movement are now looked down upon as inveterate enemies of socialism, (4) SUCI had then joined the bogey of approaching 'third world war' while it says now that the war both is and is not inevitable, (5) SUCI then stood for 'anti-feudal, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist people's unity whereas it squarely pleads now for anti-capitalist socialist revolution.

All these and many more substantial changes have been effected in the original positions of the party without any inner party theoretical debate having been held.

(29) General Crisis of Capitalism: The SUCI has not yet a theory of the general crisis of world capitalism. Without having a single document where one can find as to what were the first and second General Crises, it has been talking parrot-like for last forty years, of the third general crisis. And the very expression 'day in and day out nature of the crisis' is borrowed from Comintern's 1932 analysis of the Great Depression years [third phase of the first General Crisis- see Leontiev's Political Economy- A Beginners' Course] and is wrongly applied for the entire post-war [II] period which however has undergone several turns of boom and slump including the long capitalist boom [1945 to 70].

(30) New Forces and New Movements: The SUCI leadership only see crisis and crisis everywhere in the post-war (II) world. They have not taken due account of the new forces and new movements that have since long come upon the global scene as a response to capitalist crisis situation. Such new phenomena which have deep revolutionary potential in the concrete situation of to-day include inter alia Civil Rights Movement, anti-Apartheid Movement, Women's Liberation, Ecological Movement, Student and Youth rebellion [France, USA, etc] and so on.

Similarly, the SUCI has still nothing to offer on such post-war[II] developments in the world left movement as New Left, Far Left, Euro-Communism, African and Latin American Communism etc.

(31) New Developments in Science and Technology: The SUCI leadership for all their concern for constant perfection of dialectico-materialist methodology in the light of ongoing scientific progress, have not analysed such startling developments as micro-electronics, cybernetics, genetic engineering, space technology etc. and their implications either for Marxist dialectics or for an updated understanding of post-war [II] capitalism.

(32) Scientific and Technological Revolution: The SUCI leadership has neither recognized nor theoretically critiqued anywhere the concept called Scientific and Technological Revolution [or Third Industrial Revolution]. As is recognised by almost all the communist parties of the world, there have been three successive Industrial Revolutions [the first one in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century, the second in first half of 20<sup>th</sup> century and the third, present one, in its later half, roughly speaking]. The first Industrial Revolution [IR] had iron as basic good and steam as basic energy, the second IR had steel as basic good and electricity as basic energy [see Lenin's 'Agrarian Question and Critics of Marx'] and the third IR or properly speaking STR has plastic as basic good and nuclear power as basic energy [see Maurice Cornforth's 'Open Philosophy']. As Stalin himself has argued, it is the very imperialist epoch that pushes up 'gigantic' 'unprecedented' developments in science and technology which in turn accentuate two contradictory but mutually conditioning tendencies at a time and uneven development between different countries on one hand, and uneven development between them [new countries outstripping the older ones] on the other [see Stalin on 'Left Opposition'- Peking publication].

Why is so important an analysis of STR for revolutionary praxis? Because, it would show us, [1] the degree of globalization of both capital and labour, [2] the degree of increase in labour productivity, [3] the degree of gap between the forces and relations of production, [4] the rate of exploitation of labour through increasing growth in organic composition of capital, and moreover, [5] the degree of potential maturity of a capitalist society for transition to collectivist-socialist one.

SUCI leadership unless and until they make a thorough assessment of STR would continue to fail, as they have hitherto, in grasping the law of uneven development as working in post-war [II] capitalism through manifold stormy developments and crises, and in deducing the rightful conclusions on international plane.

(33) Stalin Question: The party leadership has yet to produce a comprehensive critique of Stalin era. Not only brutal non-communist martial methods were used to dispose of ideological controversies, but serious scientific and philosophical debates such as those around Einstein's theory of relativity, Lysenko's genetics, Marx's Asiatic mode of production etc. were squashed by administrative fiat by raising the bogey of Menshevism idealism. What kind socialist historiography is Stalin's 'History of CPSU [B]' which does not at all recognize the positive contributions of such figures as Trotsky,

Bukharin, Zinoviev, Kollontai etc. ? Is it not less than liberal historiography which despite its inherent eclecticism, insists at least on putting the facts as facts?

(34) So-called Fifth Contradiction: The SUCI's claim that the discovery of fifth contradiction (in addition to fourfold contradiction as enunciated by Lenin) is an original contribution of Shibdas Ghosh is utterly unfounded both factually and logically. The dual stance of newly independent capitalist countries (NICC) vis-à-vis both the capitalist and socialist blocks (so-called fifth contradiction) was pointed out long before by Soviet Communist Party. Secondly, socialist block is itself rent with antagonistic warfare within (in contrast to the presupposition of non-antagonistic contradiction between the countries of this block), and the NICCs are also engaged in internecine warfare (in contrast to the presupposition of united face of them as in the shape of so-called third world). The very attempt to understand the present multi-polar (not bipolar or tripolar) world as in the light of four or five contradictions is bound to be self-defeating.

(35) Raising the theoretical Standard: In view of the fast, declining theoretical standard inside the party, it was suggested that there should be an intense cult of classical Marxism and an exposure of the rank and file to the whole gamut of debates and controversies that took place in the world communist movement from the time of Marx down to our present day, say, between Marx and Bakunin, Engels & Duhring, Kautsky and Bernstein, Rosa and Kautsky, Lenin and Rosa, Lenin and Plekhanov, Lenin and Trotsky, Lenin and Stalin, Stalin and Mao, Mao and Togliatti, Stalin and Tito, Third Internationale and Fourth Internationale, Soviet Communism and Euro-Communism, Orthodox Left and New Left and so on and so forth. This suggestion went unheeded by the leadership as on other questions.

(36) Need for Self-Criticism: At no point of time in the past, or even in the present Draft-documents of the Congress, the party leadership has made any self-criticism of their conduct as to why the party has not been able to come to real grips with the basic issues facing the proletariat at home, let alone, the proletariat abroad, over the decades last. As Lenin himself had pointed out time and again, the Communists do not stand to lose anything by exposing their own mistakes and shortcomings before the people at large. Rather, the merciless attitude towards one's own mistakes, free and fearless admission and exposure of them, and moreover, persistent, conscientious striving to overcome them are the hallmark of a genuine communist party. No doubt, Shibdas Ghosh has paid lip-service to this all-important Leninist proposition in his magnum opus 'Why SUCI is the only genuine communist party on Indian soil'? But the real good would have been served if Ghosh or for that matter his successor-central committee were to admit openly their mistake even for once in their party organs in stead of blaming other left parties as responsible for their stunted growth.

### **Why did I resign?**

Such and many more were the questions that I felt impelled to raise before the party leadership in the interest of party's all-round growth itself, that is, in the interest of assisting the party in my limited might to come to grips with the issues and imperatives which it happened to bypass or ignore owing to its increasing insulation from the outside world and ossification inside over the years. But alas! Instead of allowing a debate on them, the party leadership evinced an increasingly tense and inhospitable attitude towards the very attempt of mine to raise these questions, especially, the questions relating to the personality cult of Shibda Ghosh. Yes, in the last conversation before my resignation I had told pointblank: "I don't feel like standing during the play of song on Shibdas Ghosh as it is a mark of personality cult." To this the reply of the concerned party leader was; "You have to; otherwise the door is open for you." Despite such an authoritarian attitude of the leadership, I could have carried the ideological struggle among the ranks down below. But since there was no institutional arrangement open to me, that is, since I belonged to no committee proper except being directly responsible to the central committee top above [against whom my charges were basically leveled], I had to resign from the party in the very interest of carrying forward the same struggle from outside. What I am doing at present is nothing but what I had intended to do while within the party. I do not have any remorse left, since the party is not an end in itself, but a means to a higher end, that is, the revolution and establishment of the power of proletariat. In this spirit and only in this spirit alone, it may be recollected, Lenin had on the very eve of October Revolution tendered his resignation letter before the Bolshevik Central Committee which he himself had reared up for more than a decade before and

wished thereby to go directly to the ranks below when he found his central committee standing up against him on the crucial question of armed uprising [see Lenin's 'Crisis has matured' -1917]

### **Project Ahead**

The moot question before myself and for that matter before all of us is: How to further the cause of Indian revolution and for that matter to evolve step by step the correct form of proletarian organizations out of the ongoing struggles of the proletariat themselves. It is not the other way round as the SUCI leadership would have us believe: "Build up SUCI the only genuine communist party on Indian soil" as a precondition for revolutionary activity of any kind. Mind it, organisation, or for that matter a communist party, is necessary only to ensure the self-emancipation of the proletariat, that is, "the emancipation of the proletariat is the task of the proletariat themselves" (Marx).

The moment a party or an individual places itself as the head of the proletarian revolution as if the proletariat is headless and it alone represents the revolution in head, it ultimately beheads both the revolution and proletariat, no matter how much revolutionary phrase it forces into the head of the proletariat in the immediate moment.

Yes, the proletariat needs the party since, as Lenin said, with organisation it is everything while without organisation it is nothing. But party or organisation, for what? Again, only to ensure the self-emancipation of the proletariat. Reversely put, a party or an individual who places itself right from beginning as emancipator [leader, teacher and guide] of the proletariat becomes thereby contingent, not immanent to the project called self-emancipation of the proletariat and only deserves to be cleared away by the latter as soon as possible.

As to what is to be done, it is all the more important to sort out what is to be undone now from the standpoint of proletariat's self-emancipation.

Chitta Behera  
P-519, Basunagar,  
P.O. Madhyam Gram  
Dist. 24- Parganas[ North]  
West Bengal,  
Pin- 743275  
**Dated : 14. 3 1988**