

Here are some of our immediate reactions to the G.S.'s Letter to the PHQ General Body.

1. No useful purpose would be served by entering into a controversy whether and to what extent Com Deven misreported his talk with the G.S. Let us accept that the impression Deven conveyed was wrong.

We have, however, not been judging the PB on the basis of Deven's report or on the basis of rumours, etc. We have been trying to understand the PB's functioning from its practice, the decisions taken by it, the documents that have so far reached us. It is these which have made us feel that the way the PB has been wanting to solve the inner-Party crisis has only accentuated it.

2. In regard to certain very important decisions the PB has now changed its decisions. This is the clearest evidence of its earlier wrong attitude.

i) The PB has come to the conclusion that "nothing short of a Party Congress can unify and save the Party from the present crisis." Ordinary Party members have been insisting that the calling of a Party Congress was imperative. But it has taken more than three months for the new PB to realise this simple fact. What does this reveal? That the PB's understanding of the crisis was wrong, that its solution was anti-democratic.

The Party crisis cannot be solved by a handful of leaders from top in the name of centralism. The decision to convene only a CC Plenum with representatives from Provincial Committees, which also were not to be reorganised from below on the basis of elections, was an attempt to impose a new line on the Party from above, an attempt to solve the crisis apart from the Party ranks.

The CC's letter to the ranks studiously avoided any reference to elections of Committees. In fact, in one place it characterised as disruptive the demand for reorganisation from below.

ii) The PB is calling to the next CC meeting the ex-CCMs who were unable to attend the last meeting. This again is an indirect admission that the new CC's earlier stand that only those who unreservedly accept its line could be members of the CC. This means in practice that the PB is now forced to accept that ~~the PB is now forced to accept that~~ in this period on inner-Party discussions, when the Party line is on the anvil, unquestioning acceptance of the CC's line cannot be a precondition to membership of leading bodies.

iii) The decision to encourage Party members to submit charges, etc., against any CC members, old or new, of complicity in the activities of Tito agents is also a belated admission that the rooting out of Titoism and Titoites has to be done by the entire Party.

3. The PB does not give any explanation why it has taken such a long time to accept certain correct demands raised by the ranks, it does not explain why it has revised its earlier understanding, what was wrong with it. Valuable time has been lost. By now we should already have been in the midst of preparations for the Congress, while today merely the decision for it is announced - no details have yet been given. Who is responsible for the delay? Can the PB deny its responsibility - for the Party members had seen the need for it long ago? The PB was so cocksure of itself, so supremely confident of its own correctness that it thought it had nothing to learn from others, everything to teach.

4. It is obvious that the new decisions are the result of pressure from below, which the PB could not withstand any longer. The G.S., however, on the strength of these decisions, ~~xxxxxxxx~~ wants to suggest that the ranks should have full faith in the PB, that it will do all that is needful. Such an attitude can only lull the ranks into complacency. Actually, the need is for greater vigilance, increased initiative.

To what extent the PB has really revised its earlier wrong attitude will be determined by what further steps it takes. In fact, certain minimum steps should already have been announced by it as necessarily arising from the decision to convene a Congress.

The CC should have annulled the decisions reconstituting Provincial Committees from above.

Secondly, it is essential to withdraw the Letter to Party Ranks. Its organisational decisions are ~~xxxx~~ anti-democratic as is its insistence on the implementation of a Party line before its acceptance by the majority of Party members after proper discussion. In view of what has happened in the last two years, the new CC cannot automatically set itself as the new leadership. Its line cannot be for implementation especially in regard to certain controversial issues on which there are serious differences inside the Party. For any further mistakes on our part might well prove disastrous for the Party.

The CC must regard itself as an interim committee mainly charged with the task of making the necessary preparations to speed-up the inner-Party discussions and to convene the Party Congress at the earliest date.

Of course, the Party must, meanwhile, carry on certain minimum tasks. The most urgent of ~~xxxx~~ these is the peace campaign about which the international movement has given enough directives.

We must carry on factual exposure of the bogus independence, show the nature of our colonial economy linked with imperialism's interests, etc.

The mass organisations have to be rebuilt on the basis of simple day to day demands. Some general slogans on immediate issues like food, refugees, civil liberties, etc., can also be easily worked out.

It is absence of any slogans on day to day issues which is further isolating the Party from the ~~xxxx~~ people, and it is in this respect that the CC has failed most.

5. The PB's earlier wrong understanding of the steps necessary to reunify the Party cannot be unlinked from its political understanding. Failure to apply the mass line among the people, as Liu Shao Chi has explained, goes hand in hand with failure to apply the mass line inside the Party.

When a leadership tries to impose from above forms of struggle, when, in utter repudiation of the Leninist understanding, it considers that it is outstanding individuals who "unleash" and "initiate" struggles, it is nothing surprising that it should also in relation to the Party ranks set itself above them, suppress inner-Party democracy and frown upon everything coming from below.

6. We should demand the following (to be worked out more concretely and in greater details):

- a) Immediate holding of a ~~22~~ meeting of new CC to which all CC members debarred from attending the last meeting and all those since released should also be invited.
- b) The Political Resolution of the CC should be immediately released so that the Party members are enabled to express themselves on the Party line as a whole. There has already been criminal delay on the PB's part in not issuing it so far.
- c) All ~~xxxx~~ differences inside the Party CC should be placed before the ranks. Any alternative documents prepared by one or more CC members should also be released.
- d) On the basis of WFDY's criticism the CC should review the peace campaign and issue necessary political and organisational directives. This criticism should form the basis of a reexamination of the entire political understanding of the CC.
- e) The CC should also work out general slogans on immediate issues like food, refugees, civil liberties, etc.
- f) The CC should prepare a report on the state of the Party and the mass organisations in the various Provinces. A factual report on Telengana, Andhra, Rajang areas should also be prepared.
- g) The convocation of the Party Congress should not be delayed beyond three months. The Congress to be preceded by District and Provincial Conferences.

Ramnath

September 10, 50.

Dear Comrade,

Yours of 8th inst asking for leave.

You may go on leave. As regards the question of your working O.G. on return from leave, if our lawyer comrades as well as comrades on CR feel there is no danger to your safety in working o.g., I have no objection to your doing so on return.

Greetings,

CCM.

Com. Nimai,

September 6, 1950

Your note of 5th inst. concerning your need of a typewriter in Breeze.

On receiving your earlier note I had asked Com. Phillip to transfer a typewriter from Das to your place. I do not know ^{why} this was delayed. I am making inquiries, and asking them to send the typewriter immediately. I am sending a copy of this note to Com. Phillip.

I have received your replies referred to in your note. These will be circulated to dens and sent to PB as asked by you.

Greetings,

Kamat.

We have received from you a copy of the Das Unit resolution, dated 2/9, on Com. Hemide's statement in Breeze. We do not know if it is intended to serve as a reply to our note of 3/18 'on Discriminatory Treatment + Loyalty Test Methods', for, we have so far received no other communication from ^{you} in this regard, not even a bare acknowledgment.

The Das Unit resolution, however, answers none of the points raised by us ~~and~~. In fact, it only confirms the facts as given in our note.

In the first place, it is obvious that that Unit was not asked in writing to submit its views on the PB reply to P.H., your covering note to the copy of the PB reply sent to Breeze was specially addressed to us and was not in the nature of a circular to all U.S. Dems.

Secondly, the Das ^{Unit} was not asked - even orally - to submit the minutes of its discussion, the views of individual comrades, for or against, as we had been. That this is so is clear from the fact that the Unit had decided to send only its resolution on the question and not the minutes of its discussion also though they had been kept.

We never objected to your asking units to express themselves on the issue. What we objected to - and still do - is the manner in which you framed your note to us. Even if it had been a circular to all Dems it would have been objectionable. It is much worse when it is sent specially to one Unit.

Greeting,

Breeze Unit

Breeze Unit

Sept. 8, 1950

Please let me know whether you have sent to Fort a copy of your letter to me dated Aug. 30, entitled "On Discriminatory Treatment and 'Loyalty Test' Methods", In that case I want to send a copy of my reply to you to them also.

Greetings,

CCM

CEM

30.3.53

Copy to PB
and to PHQ

ON DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT
AND "LOYALTY TEST" METHODS

When you sent us a copy of the PB's reply to the PHQ General Body's resolution on the Comrade regarding PC Jaki's Appeal, we demanded that we should discuss the reply and

"Send the minutes of the discussion to the PB through me so that the PB can clearly see what stand each unit and individual comrade takes on this letter and what arguments are advanced by the different comrades for or against the explanation given by the PB"

In your recent "reminder" to us (about which we have already written to you), you have repeated this demand.

It had struck us as soon as we received your first chat that there were signs in the wording of your demand of the Titoite - Ranadive "loyalty test" terror regime. But we were not certain whether our impression was correct.

Today however we have with us irrefutable proof that our suspicions in this regard were justified. For the first time this month we have had an opportunity by accident to meet and discuss with a comrade from another unit - Com. Hamed. From him we learn that you have made NO demand for individual opinions on the PB Reply to the other unit, as you have

(2)

love from our unit.

This fact in a flash reveals the nature of your demands. If you were merely anxious to know the views of the ranks and learn from them, and if it was that which prompted your repeated presumptuous demands for our opinions on the PB reply, then not only would your demand be couched in different language, but you would make the same demand to all ag. units — and not single out our unit, as you have done.

We remember well how the now-dissolved PHQ Committee, working under the orders of your present "assistant", Com. GA, and of yourself, issued mandatory instructions to all comrades to express themselves individually on the Ranaive PB's hateful Document on Bombay Jails — in exactly the same manner as you are once again doing today in regard to the new PB's letter to PHQ. Then also written notes and minutes of discussion were demanded "to enable the PB to judge where each comrade stands". But the implications were obvious, the cold threat of disciplinary action, of losing one's Party Card, if one dared to differ. Accept unconditionally — O.R. face the Tito terror.

It would be a different matter if today you were to request and urge all comrades to send their criticisms of the PB Reply in order to help you and the PB and the Party to come to a unified understanding. But instead you

(3)

order us to submit detailed minutes, in order to know "what stand each unit and individual takes", who is for, who are against" The PB explanation.

The very fact that it is only our unit that is singled out for what we cannot help but note strongly resembles the "loyalty test" methods of the Ranaivelo - Tsirote regime, fills us with the gravest apprehensions.

The Ranaivelo - Tsirote regime singled out those who dared to express the slightest doubt about any of its criminal actions and demanded complete and abject servility from them. The havoc this suppression wrought on the Party is known to all comrades. And the entire Party is determined never again to submit to the old terroristic methods.

We would like to know whether you and your "assistant", Com. GA, have resorted to this method, this discrimination on your own authority — or on instructions from the PB.

We must state that it appears to us that we have been singled out among 49 units, because we dared to state our disapproval of several steps taken by the CC and by you, including our disapproval of your own appointment as CC-in-charge of PAA and of the appointment of Com. GA as your assistant and as a member of the Agri-Prof Committee of the ~~CC~~ CC.

We request you to let us know immediately the reasons for this resort to discriminatory and Tsirote organizational methods — and on whom authority these methods are being persisted in.

(4)

In this connection, it is necessary to point out another significant fact. We have come to know from Com Harun that both you and Com G.A. have had repeated discussions ~~with~~ with his (Harun's) unit on the political line of the CC, on the jobs of the unit etc. during the last months and a half (Each of you has visited their unit twice - in other words you or your representative have had discussions with this unit for considerable periods at least four times).

During the same period, you have consistently refused to come and meet us, despite repeated (at least six or eight) written and verbal requests sent by us, despite your repeated promises to come. To us each time you wrote you were busy and refused to come, although from the technical end it is the easiest thing to arrange for you or your representative or assistant or both of you to come any time to meet us - if necessary, even for only a two or three hour visit.

It was your duty to come and see us and discuss with us ~~with~~ during the last two months, not only because we requested it, not only because you had promised to come, but because as a CC member in charge you were bound to come, particularly in the present period of inner-Party discussions.

Your refusal to come is all the more amazing when it is clear that your coming would have enabled you to meet both Com Harun working on the central organ of the Party (The responsibility of for running which is yours), but also another very important and leading comrade, who we

(5)

know was repeatedly requesting you to meet him and discuss the political line and his jobs with him.

Again the reason for this treatment appears to us to be the same as that which prompted you to demand from us alone whether we are "for" or "against" the PB Reply.

One more we request you, to consider dispassionately the manner in which you have neglected your duties by our unit, and, at least now, make the utmost effort to meet us, ~~to~~ to discuss with us the CC political line, our present and future work, the various problems connected with the safety of the apparatus and our part in it.

We earnestly request you to come and meet us even for a short meeting at your earliest convenience.

Greetings

BREEZE UNIT

We shall within the week let you have, as already promised, our preliminary opinion on the PB Letter. But it should be clearly understood that we are doing this solely because we consider it is our duty to express our opinion in order to participate in the process of coming to a correct and unspiced understanding of the issues raised in the PB Letter.

Copy to PB
and to PHQ

ON DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT
AND "LOYALTY TEST" METHODS

When you sent us a copy of the PB's reply to the PHQ General Body's resolution on the communique regarding PC J. J. Appel, you demanded that we should discuss the reply and

"Send the minutes of the discussion to the PB through me so that the PB can clearly see what stand each unit and individual comrade takes on this letter and what arguments are advanced by the different comrades for or against the explanation given by the PB"

In your recent "reminder" to us (about which we have already written to you), you have repeated this demand.

It had struck us as soon as we received your first chit that there were signs in the wording of your demand of the Titoite - Radevite "loyalty test" terror regime. But we were not certain whether our impression was correct.

Today however we have with us irrefutable proof that our suspicions in this regard were justified. For the first time this month we have had an opportunity by accident to meet and discuss with a comrade from another reg. unit - Com. Hamed. From him we learn that you have made no demand for individual opinions on the PB reply from the other reg. units, as you have

(2)

come from our unit.

This fact in a flash reveals the nature of your demand. If you were merely anxious to know the views of the ranks and learn from them, and if it was that which prompted your repeated presumptory demands for our opinions on the PB reply, then not only would your demand be couched in different language, but you would make the same demand to all ug. units — and not single out our unit, as you have done.

We remember well how the now-dissolved PHQ Committee, working under the orders of your present "assistant", Com. GA, and of yourself, issued mandatory instructions to all comrades to express themselves individually on the Ranadwe PB's hateful Document on Bombay Jails — in exactly the same manner as you are once again doing today in regard to the new PB's letter to PHQ. Then also written notes and minutes of discussion were demanded "to enable the PB to judge where each comrade stands". But the implications were obvious, the cold threat of disciplinary action, of losing one's Party Card, if one dared to differ. Accept unconditionally — D.R. face the Tito terror.

It would be a different matter if today you were to request and urge all comrades to send their criticisms of the PB Reply in order to help you and the PB and the Party to come to a unified understanding. But instead you

(3)

order us to submit detailed minutes, in order to know "what stand each unit and individual takes", who are "for", who are "against" The PB explanation.

The very fact that it is only our unit that is singled out for what we cannot help but note strongly resembles the "loyalty test" methods of the Karadze - Titorte regime, fills us with the gravest apprehensions.

The Karadze - Titorte regime singled out those who dared to express the slightest doubt about any of its criminal actions and demanded complete and abject servility from them. The havoc this suppression wrought on the Party is known to all comrades. And the entire Party is determined never again to submit to the old terroristic methods.

We would like to know whether you and your "assistant" Com. GA, have resorted to this method, this discrimination on your own authority — or on instructions from the PB.

We must state that it appears to us that we have been singled out among UG units, because we dared to state our disapproval of several steps taken by the CC and by you, including our disapproval of your own appointment as cert-in-charge of PAA and of the appointment of Com. GA as your assistant and as a member of the Agst-Prop Committee of the ~~CC~~ CC.

We request you to let us know immediately the reasons for this resort to discriminatory and Titorte organisational methods — and on whose authority these methods are being persisted in.

(4)

In this connection, it is necessary to point out another significant fact. We have come to know from Com. Hamid that both you and Com. G.A. have had repeated discussions ~~with~~ with his (Hamid's) unit on the political line of the CC, on the jobs of the unit etc during the last month and a half (Each of you has visited their unit twice - in other words you or your representative have had discussions with the unit for considerable periods at least FOUR times.)

During the same period, you have consistently refused to come and meet us, despite repeated (at least six or eight) written and verbal requests sent by us, despite your repeated promises to come. To us each time you wrote you were busy and refused to come, although from the technical end it is the easiest thing to arrange for you or your representative and assistant or both of you to come any time to meet us - if necessary, even for only a two or three hour visit.

It was your duty to come and see us and discuss with us ~~us~~ during the last two months, not only because we requested it, not only because you had promised to come, but because as a CC member in charge you were bound to come, particularly in the present period of inter-Party discussions.

Your refusal to come is all the more amazing when it is clear that your coming would have enabled you to meet both comrades working on the central organ of the Party (The responsibility of for running which is yours), but also another very important and leading comrade, who we

(5)

know was repeatedly requesting you to meet him and discuss the political line and his jobs with him.

Again, the reason for this treatment appears to us to be the same as that which prompted you to demand from us alone whether we are "for" or "against" the PB Reply.

Once more we request you to consider dispassionately the manner in which you have neglected your duties by our unit, and, at least now, make the utmost efforts to meet us, ~~to~~ to discuss with us the CC political line, our present and future work, the various problems connected with the safety of the apparatus and our part in it.

We earnestly request you to come and meet us even for a short meeting at your earliest convenience.

Greetings

BREEZE UNIT

We shall within the week let you have, as already promised, our preliminary opinions on the PB Letter. But it should be clearly understood that we are doing this solely because we consider it is our duty to express our opinion in order to participate in the process of coming to a correct and unified understanding of the issues raised in the PB Letter.

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL BODY OF THE PHQ REGARDING PUBLISHING THE
C.C. COMMUNIQUE EXPLAINING THE RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
"P.C. JOSHI'S APPEAL AGAINST EXPULSION."

1. The General Body (GB) of the PHQ decides to postpone the publication of the communique of the Central Committee (CC) "On P.C. Joshi's Appeal Against Expulsion" in CROSSROADS and other Party journals and also decides not to release it to the Press till it has received an answer from the CC or the PB to the present communication of the GB.

2. The GB is strongly of opinion that this Communique of the CC should not be released to the Press as it will very seriously harm the Party.

The GB totally and strongly oppose the method adopted by the CC in deciding the question of P.C. Joshi's readmittance into the Party.

3. In support of the above-mentioned views of the GB, the GB would like to place the following before the CC.

a) During the last two and a half years the Party leadership had followed a Trotskyite-Titoite method of Party organisation. Among the other manifestations of this counter-revolutionary method of Party organisation one of the loudest was the indiscriminate expulsions of Party members who rightly or wrongly had incurred the wrath of certain Party Committees or certain members of a Party Committee. The GB has no doubt that the overwhelming majority of expulsions, suspensions, etc. of the last two and a half years had nothing to do with the Stalinist conception of Party organisation or purification. They were direct result of the gangster methods that Trotskyism-Titoism inevitably generates and did genera te.

b) It was because of this basic fact that the GB in its memorandum to the old CC, which incidentally remains unanswered and unacknowledged to this day, made demands on the CC regarding disciplinary actions taken by the PB, the Provincial and other Party Committees. (This memorandum is not in our hands just now - refer Memorandum). The GB also made the following provisions:

- We must try and get all comrades who had been debarred from taking part in the activities of the Party to participate in the struggle of the Party to evolve a correct political line as the experience of many such comrades would be very useful in shaping a correct policy.

- We must have a Control Commission who would enjoy the confidence of the entire Party or the majority of the ranks and the Control Commission must investigate thoroughly into all the disciplinary actions taken by the different leading Party Committees.

c) In the opinion of the GB the above steps would guarantee that confidence in the Party leadership that it was going to undo all the wrongs would begin to come back, would enable us to mobilise round the Party all that are honest and fighting, would ensure that no undesirable elements exploit the situation for their own purposes. Such was the understanding and it continues to be so in spite of the fact that certain elements who were and continue to be deeply influenced by Trotskyism would try and paint this suggestion as bourgeois liberalism.

4. The GB notes that the re-constituted CC has made the statement that it has squashed many of the disciplinary actions of the old PB and it is reviewing the others. The GB notes that in the case of P.C. Joshi, the CC has not only decided to confirm the decision of the old CC but has taken the additional step to immediately publish it in the Party press without referring the matter to the Control Commission or to the Party Committees and ranks.

5. In the opinion of the GB the Communique released by the CC has totally failed to convince the GB that the CC has acted rightly in the case of P.C. Joshi. Further the laconic communique has filled the GB with grave apprehensions, regarding the outlook of the CC on the question in, particular, and all questions of Party punishments in general.

6. P.C. Joshi's appeal was addressed to the Control Commission against the decision of the old PB and CC. In the opinion of the GB provision of appeal to the Control Commission is kept in the Party constitution precisely because it is visualised that there might be cases when the CC would be unable to inspire the confidence that it has given a correct judgement and the Control Commission which is elected by the Party Congress would be able to judge an appeal against the decision of the CC. Next to the Party Congress, the Control Commission is

the body that is expected to undo if the CC has done any wrong to any member of the Party. The GB fails to understand how the new CC, constituted by the old CC and unanimously elected at that by the old CC can assume the competence of judging an appeal to the Control Commission and can also give a final judgement on the question. The old CC and the new CC could, of course, express themselves before the Control Commission and say what they felt about the appeal of P.C. Joshi and in case they had disagreement with the decision of the Control Commission they were free to place their views before the Congress. But the CC has overstepped its powers and declared the Control Commission appointed by the Party Congress dead and took upon itself the powers of giving a final judgement on the appeal placed before the Control Commission against the decision of the Central Committee and itself. In the opinion of the GB this action of the CC is not only unconstitutional but also unprincipled. Even a CC properly elected by the Party Congress has no right to assume such prerogatives, not to speak of the CC constituted by the old bankrupt CC which is responsible for bringing the Party to a state of ruin.

In so far as it is unconstitutional the GB holds that this decision of the CC is null and void and it further holds that the question of P.C. Joshi's appeal against his expulsion and his readmittance is a question yet to be decided by competent authorities.

7. Further, the GB is shocked beyond words to find that the new CC has not a word to say whether the action taken against Joshi by the old CC was correct or not. It is incredible but it is true that the new CC confines itself merely to state and express itself on the activities of P.C. Joshi after his expulsion. In the opinion of the GB this omission on the part of the new CC is not accidental. This is deliberate and objectively it can have only one meaning and that is that the new CC would not like a discussion on all activities of the old CC, that the new CC would like to screen the old CC. The new CC was, of course, free to hold the opinion that P.C. Joshi should not be admitted to the Party because he has done certain things after he was expelled from the Party, but the new CC should have understood that along with such expression of opinion, Bolshevik honesty, the principle of criticism and self-criticism, demand that it also expresses itself on the action taken against Joshi by the old CC. In the opinion of the GB the significant silence of the new CC on this aspect of the question is ominous and portends great dangers for the Party.

8. The entire communique confines itself to a study of Joshi's activities after his expulsion. The charges against Joshi are that he distorted the Cominform editorial to suit his own reformist politics, he has slandered the Party before the foreign comrades, he has exonerated the Government and its repressive policy, that he has not waited for the verdict of the comrades abroad or the leadership here.

The GB is unable to judge how far these charges are correct for the simple reason that it has not got the statement of P.C. Joshi answering this charge-sheet.

However the GB is of opinion that apart from the fact that Joshi was expelled and was not formally bound by the discipline of the Party, activity of the Party members in this period cannot be judged by the old yardstick. Further, actions of Party members or those expelled or suspended cannot be properly judged except in the background of the activities of the old PB and the old CC in general as also specifically, for obviously the main guilt for the disruption in the Party will have to be borne by the leadership of the Party.

9. P.C. Joshi might be 'guilty' of distorting the Cominform editorial, but if this is an argument to confirm his expulsion what will the Party do with those who suppressed and distorted the Editorial and wrote that document No. 14 of the old PB and those who hailed it?

P.C. Joshi might be 'guilty' of exonerating the Government and its repression but will the new CC not accuse the old PB and the CC for colossal damage to the Party and mass organisations including senseless sacrifice of scores of our comrades' lives?

P.C. Joshi may have 'slandered' the Party leadership before the foreign comrades, but then what about those who slandered Mao and the entire leadership of the world communist movement? Are our leadership to be held in higher esteem than Com. Stalin? What about the ex-GB who wrote an editorial note to Stalin's address to the students of the University of the Workers of the East published in the Crossroads and thereby deliberately distorted Stalin with a

What about those leaders who showed utter contempt for their comrades? P.C. Joshi might be guilty of losing faith in the leadership here and might have started to express his views on his own but then what about those who systematically crushed and destroyed the Party and did the job so well that a repression thousand times more fierce could not do? What about those leaders who showed utter contempt for their comrades in the leadership and the Party ranks, slandered them as cowards, systematically crushed their opinions and thus destroying inner-Party democracy and in many other ways crippled the Party in a manner that repression a thousand times more fierce could not have done?

The GB is of opinion that in accusing and condemning finally on the counts that the new CC has accused and condemned P.C. Joshi, the new CC is resorting to demagoguery, dishonesty, for the GB has no doubt that far worse crimes have been committed by the Party leadership collectively and Party leaders individually.

In the absence of self-critical reports and other data, the GB is not in a position to express itself fully on every individual member of the re-constituted CC. But it knows of the black record of at least one CCM, the CCM in charge of PHQ (e.g. his opinion, expressed when the editorial of the Geminform arrived, that by no stretch of imagination could rich peasants be said to be included in the term 'all peasantry' used by the editorial. There are many other examples). He has been made a member of the new CC also.

10. The GB is convinced that it must raise the demand of a fair and thorough investigation into the affairs of P.C. Joshi and that a thorough investigation to be done by a body of comrades in whom the majority of the Party members have faith. That this investigation must give P.C. Joshi a chance to explain his conduct and that all facts must be placed before the Party with the recommendations of the Investigation Bureau. The GB is of opinion that the CC has wrongly denied P.C. Joshi a fair trial.

The GB rejects the CC's plan that since the Control Commission can only be elected by the Party Congress, the CC had no choice but to decide the issue in the manner in which it has done. Rules and organisational forms in our Party are meant to help the Party's work and must correspond to a given objective situation, and not to be followed dogmatically. In a situation, when the old CC has completely lost the confidence of the Party, when even the new CC has taken steps which fill our minds with grave misgivings and when it has yet to obtain the political confidence of the Party, a decision of the CC itself cannot be final and a Control Commission is even more necessary than in normal times. And if a Party Congress cannot be held then ways and means have to be found to bring it into existence.

The GB suggests the following procedure to be adopted:

i) All documents submitted by P.C. Joshi and others on his case (except those of tech nature or after omitting references to tech matters in documents which contain other material) should be circulated in the Party, along with CC's opinion.

ii) One member of the Control Commission is available, or the other two members, the CC should present a panel of five members, accompanied with a factual record and the CC's opinion about them for election of two out of these five to the Control Commission. Other Committees, cells, etc. should also have a right to nominate candidates.

The CC must make special efforts to hold the election as quickly as possible. Such forms of election should be adopted in various places as quickly as possible. Such forms of election should be adopted in various places as to ensure maximum possible democracy in the quickest possible time.

iii) The opinions of the members of the old Control Commission should also be obtained on cases which come before the Commission. This in practice would mean securing the opinion of only one comrade. This can be done without causing delay, even while the Control Commission is considering any case.

iv) The GB requests the CC to inform the Party full facts about Com. Moitra, the third member of the Commission, why is he out of the Party, was he dropped, or expelled, etc.?

11. The GB condemns the fact that the new CC has not only denied P.C. Joshi a fair trial, it is further showing undue and unwarranted haste in trying to place before the Party a fait accompli by getting its statement published in

the press. It is clear to the GB that after the Communiqué of the CC is published, those who wish to deny a fair trial to P.C. Joshi would utilize the argument that if the CC's verdict is questioned, it will mean a public expression of no confidence in the CC, etc. The GB must categorically state that it can attach no other meaning to the undue haste that the new CC has shown in giving its communiqué.

12. The GB does not consider the case of P.C. Joshi to be meriting any special treatment. The GB may or may not agree with P.C. Joshi's views. The GB is concerned about P.C. Joshi because it concerns a sacred principle of Party organization, the principle of honesty, the principle of fairness to comrades. The GB cannot allow this principle to be smothered particularly in the background of the most dishonest and unscrupulous methods that the Party leadership has pursued in the last two and a half years. The GB is convinced that the entire Party must struggle to establish Stalinist principles of Party organization and Party relationship.

13. The GB is of opinion that the entire question of how P.C. Joshi was treated shortly before the Party Congress, during the Party Congress and after the Party Congress by the then leadership of the Party is a matter that merits thorough investigation by the Party.

The GB has heard reliably that Com. R.P. Dutt believes that P.C. Joshi was fought in the Party by certain comrades in a spirit of factionalism and no efforts were made to correct him. The GB has heard reliably that eminent leaders of the world Communist movement attach great importance to the fact that second-rate from Yugoslavia had exercised a great influence on the leadership of the Party, particularly during the Second Congress of the Party. The GB further learns that Com. S.A. Dange when he met Kardelj, was asked by the latter most minute details of the organizational set-up of the Party, the personnel of the then CC, different trends in the CC, strength of the various strands in the CC, strength of the various trends, etc. The GB has been shocked to hear that an eminent member of the CC had discussed the question of throwing PCJ out of the Party leadership long before the Party Congress with the leading members of the Tito clique. The GB believes that the CC is in possession of these facts.

All these facts together with the resolution of the old PB suspending PCJ indefinitely are sufficient grounds for a detailed examination of the question even if we do not go by the report of the conduct of the two members of the Polit Bureau, Coms. Adhikari and BTR vis-a-vis PCJ as revealed by the self-critical report of Com. Rahim.

The GB is convinced that Party will gain nothing in trying to hush up or cover up many sordid things that are bound to come up in this connection the moment an investigation is begun.

14. The conclusion the GB wishes to point out that the communiqué of the question of PCJ has filled it with great apprehensions.

In this communiqué the CC says that PCJ has distorted the Cominform editorial and holds that out as one of the reasons why he should not be admitted into the Party. First of all, the CC is aware that Party policy is being discussed today and nobody has the final authority in conditions of today except the Party Congress or the majority of the Party members. The CC is not the final authority to judge today who is distorting whom or what. The Cominform editorial is there and every Party member and Party unit has the right to agree or disagree with such an interpretation in the way it understands. But if difference of opinion with a Party unit becomes a sufficient ground to expel a member then what is the meaning of inner-Party democracy discussions?

Surely the CC is aware that there appears to be a difference of interpretation of the Cominform editorial between the one given by the majority of the Yerawada comrades and the one given by the CC. Does it mean that the Yerawada comrades have no right to place their points of view before the Party? Does this mean that they are to be expelled? Surely all talks of inner-Party democracy about which the new CC claims to be concerned appears to be a smoke-screen if this is the meaning of the stand of the CC.

The GB is of emphatic opinion that the Central Committee's communiqué on the Joshi question can be used very effectively by many members and Party units to batter down any views that happen to conflict with the views of particular Party Committee.

The GB is fully aware that two years back it is with the same subject that the old PB began its work of destroying all inner-Party democracy, of imposing a Turkish terror regime ~~fastis~~ on the Party. Further, the GB feels that unjustified disciplinary actions have been taken against scores of comrades by left Sectarians in the last two years. These cases should be reviewed in the new light. It is also clear that the hardened left sectarians and specially those who had a hand in all sorts of unnecessary punishments will try their best not to review these cases. The GB is of the opinion that the CC's short and unconvincing communique on P.C. Joshi will certainly strengthen the hands of left sectarians, many of whom are still in so many key positions places holding the Party apparatus in their hands.

The GB is filled with apprehensions precisely because it has not yet come across any concrete steps that the new CC has taken to ensure Party Democracy, to prove conclusively that the new CC has rejected the wrong and disruptive functioning of the old leadership but on the other hand the GB is already in receipt of documents from the new CC which in its opinion confirms its worst fears.

15. In referring back the question of printing the communique on the question of PCJ, the GB is taking the most momentous step in the inner-Party struggle than any other step that it has so far taken. The GB wishes to assure the CC that the GB is taking this step with the full and complete realisation of the gravity of the step.

The GB hopes that the CC will treat this communication with the greatest care. The GB is compelled to draw the special attention of the CC to this precisely because communications from here have not even been acknowledged by the CC or the General Secretary of the Party.

However, the GB believes that time has come when it must declare its determination that it would raise its voice according to its understanding at each and every point where it thinks it must raise its voice in the interests of the Party.

The GB demands that this resolution of the GB be circulated throughout the Party by the CC.

The GB demands that the CC or the GS acknowledge the receipt of this resolution and gives a prompt answer which also should be circulated.

On the instructions of the CCM-in-Charge regarding re-publication of the legally dangerous and originally deleted para of the CC. Communique on the Political-Organisational changes in CROSSORADS and other Party journals.

The PB in its letter to the GB of the PHQ had stated that the PHQ comrades by deleting a vital para from the CC Communique on political-organisational changes distorted the Party line. The implication was that the PHQ comrades, because they were in political disagreement with the new CC's line, vetoed that part of the Communique which gives out the line.

Political difference was not the reason for the deletion of the para. It was deleted only because the Party lawyer who looks after the legality of our writings specifically warned against printing that para as it might endanger the legal safety of the Party papers and the Press. The PHQ unit has already sent a note to the PB stating the reasons for its deletion in which it is made clear that we took the step of deletion only on legal grounds.

The CCM in his covering note to the PB letter containing instructions to the Unit Secretary to implement the PB directive to re-publish the communique in full, stated that, though he agreed to delete some portion of the para in question at first, after the PB criticism, he thought his consent for deletion was wrong. Therefore he instructed to republish the communique with an apology. He sent us his own draft for publication.

The CCM-in-Charge knew that the para was deleted for legal reasons. This is clear from his original letter in which he asked us specially to consult the lawyer before printing the communique and some legal corrections were made with his full knowledge after consulting the lawyer. In his covering note to the PB letter from what he writes, it is clear that he agreed to delete the para on legal grounds, in the beginning.

We presume that if the PB was in the know of the legal objections and it did not agree with those objections ~~and it did not agree with those objections~~, it would have stated in the letter itself that it had taken into consideration the legal objections and in spite of such objections the statement in full it should go. But PB letter does not state anything about legality. Hence it appears that the PB was not in the know of the reasons for deletion when it wrote the letter to PHQ comrades. Otherwise, such charges as 'distortion', 'revolt against the Centre' etc. cannot be explained.

After the PB letter with the CCM's instruction came, we referred to the CCM on this question. We asked him to state whether he had informed the PB why the para was deleted; ii) if so, whether the PB and he would instruct us to print the same, notwithstanding the consequences that might arise from printing, on the responsibility of the PB and himself; iii) if this is the case, to state categorically so. The CCM's reply to the objections raised by Coms. AKG, SAD & SVG is supposed to have replied to the questions raised by us. At least the CCM assumed so. And on that assumption, he again instructed us to implement the directives. In this reply to Coms. AKG & others, CCM refers only to the fact that PB had before it Com. AKG's sharp criticism of the provocative language of the PB documents. He did not state whether the PB had the legal opinion before it when it wrote the directive. The specific questions raised were avoided.

When the instructions came a second time with the reply to Com. AKG, the Unit again referred it back with lawyer's opinion requesting re-consideration of the PB directive. The same questions mentioned above were repeated in a covering note. As yet, there is no reply though a reminder was sent to it.

Com. Yeshwant who had talks with a ~~rank~~ responsible comrade from P. Centre raised this legal question with him. He informed him the reasons for deleting the para and asked him why the PB is insisting on republishing it when possibility of danger to papers & Press existed. He was replied that the PB did not know the reasons for the deletion, which it thought was done on political grounds. He was also told that the editorial comrades have every right to refer back ~~or delete portions~~ to ensure legal safety.

From these, we cannot but come to following conclusions: Firstly CCM did not inform the PB that the deletion was made because the lawyer objected to printing the para. II) when, after the PHQ unit refer

back the communiqué with specific questions related to legality, the CCM avoided an answer. III) even when three leading comrades warned the CCM against printing the Communiqué, he brushed aside their objections saying that the PB had before it Com. AKG's criticism which according to him implied that PB had taken legal objections into consideration. He even tried to be 'political' in stating reasons for rejection by (mis)quoting PRAVDA's example.

Political difference was not the reason for the deletion of the Communiqué which was tried to be printed. IV) who looks after the safety of the Press, even without the Communiqué. We cannot but come to this conclusion on these grounds for its deletion. Comrade PRAVDA's example.

In an attitude to the safety of the legal apparatus is wrong. We should try our best to preserve all the legal possibilities and expand the possibilities into new spheres. But it is our emphatic opinion that this reckless attempt, however does, it is not a step to facilitate preservation of legality.

This attitude is expressed not only on publication of the CC Communiqué. The CCM writes to the CR comrades to print WITHOUT ANY reservation the greetings to Telangana, Mysen Singh and Lakshmi though these are legally objectionable portions in the greetings. We protest against such a persistence in taking risks in a legally run Party paper. We want to bring this point most emphatically to the notice of the PB. Endangering the safety of our legal apparatus, in our opinion is not in the interests of the Party.

After the PB letter with the CCM's instructions came, we referred to the CCM on this question. We asked him to state whether he had informed the PB why the para was deleted; (ii) if so, whether the PB and he would instruct us to print the same, notwithstanding the consequences that might arise from printing, on the responsibility of the PB and himself; (iii) if this is the case, to state categorically so. The CCM's reply to the objections raised by Coms. AKG, SAD & SVG is supposed to have replied to the questions raised by us. At least the CCM assumed so. And on that assumption, he again instructed us to implement the directives. In this reply to Coms. AKG & others, CCM refers only to the fact that PB had before it Com. AKG's sharp criticism of the provocative language of the PB documents. He did not state whether the PB had the legal opinion before it when it wrote the directive. The specific questions raised were avoided.

When the instructions came a second time with the reply to Com. AKG the Unit again referred it back with lawyer's opinion regarding re-consideration of the PB directive. The same questions mentioned above were repeated in a covering note. As yet, there is no reply though a reminder was sent to it.

Com. Yashwanth who had talks with a xxm responsible comrade from P. Centre raised this legal question with him. He informed him the reasons for deleting the para and asked him why the PB is insisting on republishing it when possibility of danger to papers & Press exists. He was replied that the PB did not know the reasons for the deletion which it brought was done on political grounds. He was also told that the editorial comrades have every right to refer back on deletion.

Com. Yashwanth who had talks with a xxm responsible comrade from P. Centre raised this legal question with him. He informed him the reasons for deleting the para and asked him why the PB is insisting on republishing it when possibility of danger to papers & Press exists. He was replied that the PB did not know the reasons for the deletion which it brought was done on political grounds. He was also told that the editorial comrades have every right to refer back on deletion.

the editorial comrades have every right to refer back on deletion.

No special mention is to be made on Assam, Bihar, C.I. & C.P.

In Bengal, M. Serkar has increased his order by 50, making his standing order at 400.

No comments are necessary on Gujarat, Karnatak, Kerala, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, U.P., Kashmir, Pakistan & Foreign.

In Bombay, PBH has decreased by 60 since some comrades have stopped taking copies and in some cases, copies were duplicated. C.G. Employees have increased their standing order by 25, making the total to 125. All other areas have remained the same.

China Special: We have received further orders from various centres. Total net increase for China Special is 1175 upto 3-4-50, the total agency figure being 7530.

Amongst the highlights is Moni Serkar whose order has increased by 400 nearly. His exact order is 750. New Publishers have increased by 100 and Progs, New Delhi, by 50.

In Bombay, BSU and C.G. Employees have ordered 100 and 200 respectively. Bagwe will take 1000 to 1200 copies.

Printing Order is 9200.

Lin Shao-chi - on the Party -
-o-

Pp 4-5

"The organisational forms & methods of work of the Party are determined by the Party's internal & external conditions and by its political tasks, and must be allowed a certain degree of flexibility. When the Party sets forth new political tasks because of changed circumstances and working conditions, the organisational forms & methods of work have to be changed accordingly; otherwise old organisational forms & old methods of work will hinder the progress of our Party's work & the performance of our political tasks. That our Party is a creative Marxist political Party is due

to the fact that at no time
have we tied ourselves
ideologically or politically to any
dead formulas, or regarded the
organizational forms of our Party,
or any other organizational forms
as law & fast rules that
cannot be altered. We have
been able to improve from
time to time our organizational
forms and our methods of work
in accordance with the
concrete conditions of the
development of the Chinese
revolution and on the basis of
our new political tasks and
our newly-accumulated
experience. Therefore, it is
vitally necessary to amend our
Party constitution under
the fundamental organizational
principle of our Party and by

taking into account the new environment and the new conditions within the Party.

"The Party firmly upholds the inviolability of its fundamental organisational principles. However, it must adapt its organisational forms and methods of work to the circumstances so as to expand the Party's activities and ensure the performance of its political tasks & its unity of action."

X X X

Pp 23-24

"The 'Left' opportunist line in Party-building and Party organisation was manifested in ignoring China's characteristics by some comrades, who mechanically imported foreign experience about Party-

= 4 =

building and turned them into absolute dogmas. They one-sidedly emphasised inner-Party-centralism and inner-Party-struggles. They emphasised "no compromise whatever" and mechanical enforcement of discipline. They discarded inner-Party-democracy and harmony, serious discussions and criticisms on problems, and self-consciousness & initiative on the part of Party members. Within the Party they liked to issue orders and acted arbitrarily like patriarchs. They pursued a policy of obscurantism. They encouraged blind obedience on the part of Party members and carried on merciless inner-Party-struggles.

penalisation. They punished, expelled and purged Party members wholesale. As a result, mechanical discipline and a formalistic order prevailed in the Party & inner-Party life became stagnant. In so doing they might have temporarily created an appearance of inner-Party unity. But such unity was false, superficial, and mechanical. Once the falsity was exposed a state of inner-Party anarchy and ultra-democracy would ensue. Such a line would obviously destroy our Party and turn it into a narrow, lifeless, sectarian faction."

+ + +

Pp. 54-55:

"The tasks, policies & style of work we set forth must all be correct in order to benefit the people otherwise harm will be done to the people's interests. In that case we must earnestly practise self-criticism for prompt rectification. This means we must know how to serve the people & serve them well & not badly. Hence, under no circumstances should we adopt an easy-going attitude toward the people. We must be seriously responsible to them.

"It is also necessary to understand the unity between responsibility to the people & responsibility to the leading bodies of our Party. This

means that our Party members in carrying out the instructions of a leading body or individual leaders of the Party - must be held responsible to such leading body or individual leaders. But it would be wrong to remove responsibility to the Party leadership from responsibility to the people. Only by holding oneself responsible to the people can one say that one has assumed the highest & final responsibility. It must be understood that the interests of the ~~people~~ Party are identical with the interests of the people. Wholeness benefits the people benefits the Party & must be done by every Party member with heart & soul. Liberman

whatever injures the people injures
 the Party - & must be opposed or
 avoided by every Party-member.
 The interests of the people
 are the very interests of the
 Party. The Party has no
 particular interests of its own
 other than the people's interests.
 The maximum good for the
 greatest number of people is
 the highest criterion of all
 the activities of our Party
 members. Any Party-member
 who is responsible to the people
 is also responsible to the Party,
 and he who is irresponsible
 to the people is most irresponsible
 of all to the Party. What must
 be understood is the unity-
 between responsibility - to the
 Party & responsibility - to the
 people. They should be unified

and not separated, or even set against each other.

" When shortcomings or mistakes are discovered in the directives of the leadership or of individual leaders in regard to tasks, policies & style of work, suggestions for correction should be made with a sense of responsibility to the people. It is essential to distinguish between right & wrong, and not to take things easy, otherwise it would mean irresponsibility - both to the people & to the Party."

" The discipline of the Party must be observed & its uniform maintained, because maintenance of such discipline & unif is serving the basic interest of the Chinese people. There must be no undermining of

the discipline or unity of the
 Party on the pretext of
 assuming responsibility to the
 people. Nevertheless, any
 shortcoming or error committed
 by a leading body or
 individual leaders must be
 corrected. It is the duty as
 well as the right of every
 Party member to help in this
 respect, for any such shortcomings
 or errors are disadvantageous
 to the people, hence also to
 the Party. Our Party membership
 sincere self-criticism, a
 critical attitude towards
 one's own errors & those of
 the leadership, and a spirit
 of observing Party discipline, are
 part of the spirit of being
 responsible to the people.

p. 23

"All these rights of the membership must be respected. But it often happens otherwise in practice. For example, some comrades devised various means to prevent the expression at meetings of ideas which were against them. They imposed various restrictions on elections. They forbade Party-members to submit proposals or statements to higher Party-organisations, delayed or withheld the transmission of Party-members' appeals, forbade the criticism of responsible leaders by Party-members at Party-meetings. Some Party-members even met with repulses & blows by communist & bureaucratic elements because of criticism &

self-criticism. These harmful practices must be thoroughly eradicated.

+ + 2

pp 3-84

"While submission by the minority to the majority must be absolutely upheld in our Party, the proper rights of the minority should also be respected. A minority, under the condition that it pledges its submission to majority decisions, is entitled to state its views in opposition to the majority & to cast its dissenting votes at meetings. Party organizations must see to it that the minority shall not be wrong treated or suffer at the hands of the majority. A minority is

entitled to reserve its opinions when it does not choose to give them up, provided it submits to the decisions of the Parly. majority.

"The protection of such fundamental rights of a minority is required by inner-Parly democracy and it is also indispensable. This is because under certain conditions truth may not be on the side of the majority but may lie with the minority. Under ordinary conditions, & when the majority is right & the minority wrong, we grant such a right to the minority to give it a chance to correct its incorrectness in a proper manner."

+ + +

"Democratic centralism within the Party - is a system which unites the leadership of the Party with the broad rank and file of the Party-membership. In other words, it is a system of crystallization from the rank & file of the membership & of persistently carrying it out among the rank & file. It is an expression of the mass line within the Party.

"Some comrades do not understand that centralism of the Party is based on democracy. Consequently, they separate their leadership from inner Party democracy, and from the rank & file of the Party-membership, labelling such a

situation 'centralism'. They think
 that their authority - as leaders
 needs no mandate from the
 Party membership but can be
 seized by themselves. They think
 the leading positions require
 neither election nor the
 confidence of the Party membership
 and the lower Party organisations
 but can be assumed by
 themselves. They think that
 their questions & resolutions
 need not be centralised &
 decided from the rank &
 file upwards but can be
 made arbitrary. They
 stand above the rank & file
 of the Party membership, instead
 of joining with the rank & file.
 They command & control the
 Party, loading it over the Party
 organisations, instead of being

within the organization of the
 Party - & obeying & submitting to
 the control of the Party. "

+ + +

" A crucial factor in broadening
 inner-Party democracy lies in
 the promotion of criticism &
 self-criticism among Party members
 & the cadres. Com. Mao Tse-tung
 stresses self-criticism in his
 report, pointing out that serious
 self-criticism is an outstanding
 feature which distinguishes us
 from other political parties. We
 must develop a positive sense
 of responsibility among our Party
 members & cadres in regard to
 Party policy & Party work, thus
 enabling them to use their
 thinking power, raise problems
 boldly & properly & express their
 views. Those in charge of the

leading bodies of the Party
 at all levels must be the
 first to practice thorough-
 going self-criticism on the
 defects & errors in the
 work carried out under
 their leadership. They must
 set an example to the
 Party membership & the
 masses & be fully prepared
 in their minds to accept
 the criticism from others,
 never becoming impulsive
 & insolent when so con-
 fronted, or resorting to
 suppressive or punitive
 measures. Only in this way can
 the development of inner-
 Party democracy be encouraged.

X X X X

~~1/2 102-103~~

p. 144

"should the disciplined member raise objections to the decision he may request a reconsideration + change of the decision. The Party-organisation concerned should carefully consider his request + re-examine the case. If the disciplined member wants to appeal his case to a higher Party-body, the Party-organisation concerned should help him + should not suppress his appeal."

x x x

p. 145

"As provided in the Party-constitution, the duties of the Control Commission of the Party are to decide on an annual

disciplinary measures against
Party members & to handle
complaints of the Party
membership. The Commission
shall be instituted whenever
it is deemed necessary & possible
by the Central Committee."

- p 197 - Const. ch. VIII -
The central organs of the Party

Article 56: The Central Committee
of the Party may set up a central
control commission & other lower
control commissions when it
seems such to be
necessary.

Art. 57 - The central control
commission shall be elected
by the central committee in
plenary session.

Art 57. The functions &

power of the central & lower
control commissions shall be
to impose or correct disciplinary
measures upon Party-members
& to deal with Party-
members' complaints."

~~SECRET~~ CONCERNING THE REPRINT OF REVIEW OF
COM. KOLAROV'S BOOK.

- Radhey.

** ** *

In the Editorial Committee meeting I took the stand that AT THIS STAGE we should not reprint review of Com. Kolarov's book from the "Lasting Peace" IN PARTY JOURNALS and should on the other hand circulate it among Party ranks in the form of an Information Document in all languages. I still maintain this standpoint.

Before giving my reasons for the above I would like to say a few other things.

Some comrades here have said that to raise an objection under any plea whatsoever is tantamount to suppressing and censoring "Lasting Peace" material. I think that such a 'master' argument is a refusal to even listening the opposite point of view and is nothing short of an attempt to muzzle the fundamental right of every Party Member to gag the person by this "all powerful" weapon. It is like the practice of 11th and 12th Century Mohraden invaders who used to march with thousands of cows in front of their armies so that the opposing Hindu and Rajput forces dare not raise even a finger against them. As Lenin had said: "The basic principle of dialectics is ~~not~~ that there is no such thing as an abstract truth; truth is always concrete."

No one is standing up against the "Lasting Peace" material. It is a question of time and place and of propriety at a particular stage in a given situation. Com. Mao has written in his "New Democracy" that "even in the application of Marxism" there should be no "unconditional" "blind" "subjective" or "mechanical" absorbing of foreign materials. While reprinting from "Lasting Peace" we certainly do not reprint anything and everything. There is some criterion, some basis for picking up or not picking up a particular thing at a particular stage. Correctness of a particular standpoint can also be questioned on a similar basis - but not with the words "sacrilege"!

Another similar argument is, "You are afraid of putting your mistakes before the ranks and the people; you do not have faith in them." Firstly, it can very well be asked as to what part of the ~~material~~ material in question is really "one's own criticism", and secondly self-criticism is not made public at any and every time without one's own having come to a clear understanding about the same. And as for giving it to the ranks, my suggestion is that we should write to PB to issue the "Review of Kolarov's book" as an Information Documents for all PM's.

It is absolutely correct that Party Journals have a very vital role to play in helping the inner-Party discussion that is going on today. But for that very reason great care has to be taken before ~~giving~~ giving a particular bent, direction and guidance to these discussions. It should be particularly so because the Editorial Committee, as we all know and agree is not the competent body to run the Central organs of the Party. Since it is not a limited but an all-Party question, the Editorial Committee should think ten times before taking steps to give a particular mould to the all-India inner-Party discussion. That is why in today's situation the Editorial Committee should, I think, discuss even one ~~objection~~ objection and not refuse to ~~listen~~ listen to it, it should see that things are discussed in cells and if necessary even in GB, and not rush through in the Press when important things are concerned. It does not mean that discussions are to go on endlessly; majority has to decide and that too at the earliest - but not without taking into consideration the objections raised and threshing out the things. Similarly it would be ~~anarchy~~ anarchy of the highest order if the principle is accepted that in such "fundamental" cases individuals can act as they wish regardless of the decision of the majority.

Now, about the reasons for my objection. I am not objecting for reasons of form, i.e. that it has been referred to CC and the reply has not yet been received. But I certainly do not accept that this reference was a crime against Cominform as we were submitting its material ~~for~~ for CC's arbitration. C.C. being the highest Party organ we can certainly refer things to it - particularly so when it is a case of lack of clarity or doubt regarding putting material in the Central Party organs. For example if we ask a Higher Committee whether to reprint a particular work by Lenin or Stalin today, is

it correctly cannot be called crime against Lenin or Stalin in the name of submission for arbitration.

But whether referred to CC or not, I do think that this issue which aroused some doubts here and for which UG Editorial Cell comrades asked for discussion before putting in the Journals - this issue should have been taken to the cells and also to the GB before final decision was taken and then the crisis created.

I shall now give my reasons. My contentions are:

1) Though the article in question deals with Left Sectarianism as well, it is mainly devoted to the criminal activities of a gang - a gang which in the words of Com. Stalin is "a gang lacking principles and ideals, a gang of wreckers, diversionists, intelligence service agents, spies, assassins, a gang of rabid enemies of the working class acting in the pay of the intelligence service of foreign States."

In his report before the 5th Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Com. Dimitrov had said that Left Sectarian leaders, some of whom were "in the service of" foreign enemy agencies "taking advantage of difficult conditions of illegality and supported by under-cover enemy elements within the Comintern's Executive Committee and in some other Communist Parties of that time...succeeded through organised factions in holding a plenum of the C.C. during the Summer of 1929 and in taking over in fact the Party leadership. "Later on at Sofia trial this gang revealed itself as the Bulgarian Kostov branch of Tito agency of foreign imperialism. I do not believe that these things hold good in our case as well. Comrades can well say that no one is suggesting a complete parallel, but it would nevertheless be a fact that OUR reprinting of this article IN THE PARTY JOURNALS IN TODAY'S SITUATION would necessarily elicit parallel. By writing this I am by no means trying to minimise the grimness of the wreckage work done here both in the Party Committees and the mass organisations. To picture Tamildad alone before one's eyes is enough to make one shudder. It is also highly probable that some Titoite agents have wormed their way inside the Party. But I don't think it would be correct to let the conclusion be drawn that Party apparatus here was seized by Kostovs. Li Li San's blind Left Sectarian policy led to the sacrifice of not only hundreds but tens of thousands of lives-- yet he was by no means a predecessor of Kostov.

2) I think that the review of Com. Kolatov's book is a part of the fight that international Communism is waging today against Titoism or Trotskyism. It is true that our Party leadership has been guilty of Trotskyite deviations - of forgetting the distinction between Imperialist countries and the colonies, of forgetting the importance of national element here, of transplanting situations from other countries without any consideration for national characteristics, of skipping over the stages in revolution, of nullifying the role of the peasantry (that too in the colonies!), of refusing to make a distinction within the bourgeoisie, of violating the Leninist understanding of link with the masses, of confusing the consciousness of the vanguard with the consciousness of the class and of the masses, of conceiving revolutionary struggle in an upward straight line, of criminal Left-Sectarian adventurism resulting in a very serious sabotage of the revolutionary struggle, and of repudiation of proletarian internationalism, of liquidating inner-Party Democracy and of decimating the Party and mass organisations. This has been our Trotskyism. But I think that this is qualitatively different from the present stage of Trotskyism of which another name is Titoism. I do not think that our Party leadership has been guilty of Titoite deviation. To my mind this is a right reformist political tendency which springs from bourgeois nationalism. Internally it takes the country back to the bourgeois orbit, tails behind bourgeoisie, encourages rich peasantry and dissolves the Party of the proletariat in the welter of bourgeoisie and other elements which together constitute the "monolithic democratic front". And externally it is rabidly anti-Soviet and a conscious direct agent of the intelligent service of world imperialism. I do not think that this deviation or conscious path of turning the Party into an American Party and of serving the interests of world monopolist bourgeoisie is identical with our deviation and actions. Our Left Sectarian deviation and the Titoite deviation are two opposite deviations. No doubt Titoite

terrorist methods were practised inside the Party, but even then we must not confuse our fight against Left Sectarianism with the fight against Titoism. Present article beginning with the fight against Left Sectarianism passes over to the fight against present day Trotskyism or Titoism - and therein lies its importance for the countries of People's Democracy for which this article has been mainly written.

3) From the above two points I conclude that the main burden of the article is something that becomes qualitatively different from our deviations. That is why I am not in favour of its reprinting IN THE PARTY JOURNALS AT THIS STAGE for it may lead to the drawing of unwarranted conclusions. Are our own crimes not grave enough? I do not hold that heavens would fall if this article is reprinted today; but I do maintain that it would create a certain likelihood of its misuse by the enemies of the Party and even those who have been thrown out of the Party because of their heinous anti-Party crimes will start claiming that they stand vindicated. I am not saying that our comrades should be afraid of this, but why should we ourselves lend a helping hand in creating such a situation - and particularly so when the things referred to in the article are not just ours, but very much more and when it is quite likely that our comrades may be thrown on the defensive and even in temporary perplexity because understanding of our serious mistakes and clarity about the forward line is not yet arrived at, because even documents have not yet reached many places and at some places even things like Jail Document are being studied and admired. I say reprint the article in the Party Journals when our comrades are sufficiently armed ideologically; then the possibility of its misuse would be very much minimised and instead we ourselves would wield it successfully outside the Party.

For these above reasons I hold the view that the view of Com. Kolarov book should not be reprinted IN THE PARTY JOURNALS AT THIS STAGE.

Along with this my suggestion is that we should write to the PB to issue this review to all PM's as an Information Document in all languages. This because even though the review in the main goes much beyond the doings of our blind Left Sectarian leadership, it also deals with left sectarianism and uncovers its ugly face in all its horrors. It shows how the Left Sectarian leaders pursue an anti-Bolshevik course, decimate the Party under the guise of false "Bolshevisation" and "forms", sabotage the revolutionary movement through disastrous "left phraseology" and in the words of Com. Dimitroff are found to be the "best allies" of the Fascist dictatorship. It also shows where - at whose feet these Left Sectarian leaders mixed up with conscious agents of the Imperialist intelligence Service can ultimately lead to. That is why this review would be very helpful to the Party ranks at this stage in the understanding of and the fight against Left Sectarianism.

Hence I am placing my first objection and the second suggestion in regard to the review of Com. Kolarov's book. Argument of delay cannot be a particularly deciding factor here for the same holds good about all documents.

I would mention here that even though I know that the overwhelming majority of comrades here are for putting the review in the Party journals but I am not yet convinced about incorrectness of my position and that is why I am placing my point of view before the comrades.

In the end I would say one thing more. When the ready pages containing review of Com. Kolarov's book were withdrawn from the machine after the majority decision of the Cell Secretaries Unit, some comrades started saying that this is a crime against Cominform. I would only submit that when composed material of Lenin's writings against Revisionism was scrapped not very long back, nobody thought of brandishing the formulation "anti-Lenin crime." I would say that this is a twin of the formulation that raising doubt about the reprint of "Lasting Peace" article at a particular stage is suppression of "Lasting Peace". We have had enough of such formulations and such throttlings! Lenin's famous saying "Marxism is a guide to action" has to be paid heed to not only by those who are said to be dyed-in-the-wool Left Sectarians. And inner-Party democracy is the basis on which Bolshevik criticism is developed Party discipline is strengthened and Party becomes capable of performing its historically destined role.

On PB's Letter to PHQ

We have carefully read the PB's letter to the PHQ comrades, dated July 25, in reply to the General Body's resolution on the CC Communique on P.C. Joshi's expulsion.

1) The PB has made grave charges against the PHQ comrades - of 'open revolt against the Centre', of serious breach of Party discipline, of anarchy, of 'reprehensible distortion of Party policy'. None of these charges, in our opinion, are with any foundation.

The PB in its letter has mixed up two issues - the question of postponing the publication of the CC Communique on P.C. Joshi and the deletion of a para from the CC statement on Party policy. We shall take up the two questions separately.

2) First, the deletion of the para on the "Telengana way". This, as has been pointed out, was done on legal advice & with the approval of the CCM-in-charge.

It is most surprising that the CCM should not have informed the PB of the full facts. It was his duty to get the necessary changes made in the PB's letter before releasing it to the PMA comrades. He did nothing of the sort. Not only that. He has circulated the letter to comrades outside the PMA who are not in the know of correct facts. The letter can, therefore, only serve the anti-Party purpose of discrediting the PMA comrades in the eyes of the members.

We now learn that in view of the legal advice communicated to the PB by the PMA comrades, the PB no longer wants the deleted part to be printed in the Party organs. It is, however, surprising that even now the PB has not thought it fit to withdraw the baseless charge against the PMA comrades "of reprehensible distortion of Party policy" nor has any note been issued, correcting the wrong impression given in PB letter, for circulation to Party members to whom the letter has gone.

We demand that the PB should immediately withdraw the charge, inform the Party members to whom the letter has gone & ask the CCM for an explanation why he allowed wrong facts to be circulated. In honesty to P.H. comrades at least these minimum steps should be taken.

3) In this connection, we wish to record here our emphatic protest at the way the CCM & Sr. Adhikari have been wantonly disregarding all legal precautions necessary for the safety of the Party papers & the press. They have been insisting on the printing of inflammable material in utter disregard of legal opinion. They even produced a quotation from the 'History of the CPSU (B)' in support of their demand that the 'Telengana Way' page be printed!

It is the duty of the P.H. comrades to exercise utmost vigilance to safeguard the loyalty of Party papers for which they are answerable before the entire Party and the international working class movement. A legal paper in the

hands of the Party is a powerful weapon and no one — not even a PBM — has any right to play with its safety.

We would request the PB to clarify its position on this vital question. It should condemn the irresponsible stand of the CCM & Dr. Adhikari. Dr. Adhikari, as is well known, bears the major responsibility for the closing down of so many Party papers last year. He cannot be entrusted with the task of guiding the work of the open agit-prop centre. We urge his immediate-removal.

4) In regard to the CC communique on PCT the PB has raised a number of important questions bearing on a proper understanding of inner-party-democracy and democratic-centralism.

In the first place, it has to be pointed out that the PHO & B had merely decided to postpone the publication of the

of the Communique pending consideration by the PB of certain issues. The PB did not refuse to publish it under any circumstances. And in fact on receipt of the PB's directive, the Communique was published irrespective of the fact whether the majority of the comrades were convinced of the correctness of the ~~PB's~~ directive or not.

Is it violation of Party discipline of democratic centralism for lower units to refer decisions of higher committee for reconsideration? Can such referring back be characterised as a sign of revolt? Quite definitely not. This is what com. Liu Shao Chi has to say in this connection:

"A leading body should allow its lower organisations and membership to set forth their suggestions and questions and to propose revisions to its decisions and instructions, which, when found really to contain mistakes or defects, should be corrected

accordingly. If the lower ranks are wrong, satisfactory explanation should be given to straighten out their ideas, while the wrong practice of taking harsh measures against them should be avoided. If the higher body insists on the execution of a decision or instruction, despite appeal for revision, then it should be carried out and the ranks should cease persisting in their own stent and resistance to the decision."

The PB in regarding the L B's referring back its decision for reconsideration as revolt against Centre is actually itself violating this principle of inner-Party democracy stressed by Liu Shao Chi. It is the duty of every Party unit to look at directives of higher committees critically & to suggest amendments & revisions to them if necessary. The interests of the Party - if it is to be a Party consisting of conscious revolutionaries & not of servile automations - demands this.

Liu Shao Chi has explained that there may be three kinds of approach towards directives from above:

"The first is to carry out only those decisions & instructions of the higher bodies which suit one's taste and disregard others which do not. This is autonomism pure & simple and is reprehensible, whatever may be the pretext. The second is blind mechanical implementation without taking the trouble to see whether or not the particular decisions are applicable or to study the existing circumstances.

This is a blind rather than a serious carrying out of decisions & instructions of a higher body & is consequently also

impermissible. The thing is to study the decisions and instructions on the one hand and the circumstances on the other, to resolutely carry out what is practicable, and to report what is impracticable to the higher body, giving detailed reasons + requesting amendments. This is intelligent and sincere carrying out of decisions and instructions and is the only correct approach. We not only do not oppose but should by all means, encourage this kind of creative activity on the part of a Communist. The Party opposes disregard for discipline and the practice of autonomism, but advocates + encourages initiative on the part of every member in tackling problems + in doing his work independently under the general directions of the Party."

This even in normal conditions - and the situation today is by no means normal - if a responsible unit of the Party, after careful consideration, feels that implementation of a particular directive is likely to harm the interests of the Party, it is its duty to refer it for reconsideration to the higher Committee concerned.

It is the insistence, ~~which is~~ ~~not~~ ~~approach~~, in the name of autonomy, on the second approach, condemned.

by Liu Shao-chi - the stifling of all initiative of the ranks and demanding blind unquestioning obedience of the leadership - which has brought the Party to the verge of liquidation. We expect that now at least the Party will be built or reconstituted on a correct basis.

6) In the present case, other important factors have also to be taken into account. The Party is in the midst of a serious crisis. The new C.C. has not come into office as the result of elections after the hammering out of a new Party line. It has been reconstituted by the old C.C., which was guilty of monstrous crimes, political and organisational, against the movement. The new C.C. has yet to win the confidence of the ranks on the basis of its actual leadership; the political line it has evolved has yet to be accepted by the majority of Party members; it has yet to be endorsed by the international Communist movement.

Further, its decision on P.C.T. was taken on its own without reference to Party Committees & ranks, without all relevant documents and facts being made available to them.

In these circumstances, for the C.C. to demand unquestioning acceptance of its decision is, in fact, the very negation of democratic centralism. The Party Centre can command the confidence of the Party ranks only if it sums up the experience of the Party

= 9 =

only if it expresses and unifies the understanding of the majority of Party members. Centralism divorced from Party rank, from democracy is authoritarianism and bureaucratism of the worst type.

This is what Liu Shao Chi has to say in this connection:

"Democratic centralism within the Party is a system which unites the leadership of the Party with the broad rank and file of the Party membership. In other words, it is a system of crystallization from the rank & file of the membership and of persistently carrying it out among the rank and file. It is an expression of the mass line within the Party.

"Some comrades do not understand that centralism of the Party is based on democracy. Consequently, they separate their leadership from inner Party democracy and from the rank & file of the Party membership labelling such a situation 'centralism'. They think that their authority as leaders needs no mandate from the Party membership but can be seized by themselves. They think their leading positions require neither election nor the confidence of the Party membership & the lower Party organizations but can be assumed by themselves. They think that the directives and resolutions need not be centralized and decided from the rank & file upward but can be

made order thereby." = 10 =

In our opinion the understanding of democratic centralism as manifested by the PB in its letter is at variance with the understanding given by Liu Shao Chi.

7) Coming to the CC's decision to reject P's appeal for placing his case before a Control Commission, the PB maintains that the CC cannot appoint a Control Commission, ~~that a Control Commission~~ and all circumstances can only be elected by a Party Congress. Here the PB is arguing like formalists and dogmatists. It is by no means against Leninist, Stalinist principles of Party organization for the Central Committee to constitute a Control Commission. For instance, the Constitution of the Chinese Communist Party lays down as follows:

"Article 56: The Central Committee of the Party may set up a Central Control Commission and other lower control commissions when it deems such to be necessary.

"Article 57: The Central Control Commission shall be elected by the Central Committee in plenary session.

"The functions and powers of the Central and ~~lower~~ lower Control Commissions shall be to impose or annul disciplinary measures upon

Party members and to deal with Party members' complaints."

Would the PB accuse the Chinese Communist Party too of violating the Lenin-Stalin principles of Party organization? We also know that at least in some of the countries of Peoples' Democracies the central committees of the Party have set up Control Commissions.

8) We are still strongly of the opinion that to restore confidence, to repair the incalculable damage that has been inflicted on the Party organizations by the old PB's gangster methods, it is most essential that a central Control Commission be set up. The G.B. has made very practical suggestions in this regard. Further, two members of the Control Commission elected at the last Party Congress are now out.

We have no special love for P.C.S. or anyone else. But what we demand is that no one should be deprived of his constitutional rights, that every Party expelled Party member be given a fair trial, that the anti-Party methods of the old PB & the ^{old} C.C. be unmasked & castigated, that all the

relevant documents and facts be placed before the Party ranks. Only thus can we undo the past, only thus can the Party learn from its past mistakes, only thus ^{can} the ranks sharpen their vigilance against any anti-Party methods once again rearing their head inside the Party.

9) The PB has justified its rejection of PC's appeal by saying that he has been carrying on disruptive activities. But why couldn't the PB, while placing his appeal before the Control Commission, ask him to desist from making public statements & to wait for the findings of the Commission? If, meanwhile, he continued with his disruptive activities the PB would have been more than justified in taking a final decision on him on its own.

To investigate the Pather-Tambitha defection in Bombay, the CC has appointed a Commission and appealed that mutual recrimination should stop. Pather-Tambitha have also made public statements, have also carried on disruptive activities. How does in their case the setting up of a Commission become possible?

10) The PB says that Joshua's appeal has not been rejected only because of his differences with the existing Party line. But at the same time it is clear that the PB does intend to discriminate against those who do not accept it.

To make the unreserved acceptance of the Party line - a line which is still in the process of formation, the details of which have not yet been embodied in a political resolution - a precondition to membership of the Central Committee & of all committees, Provincial and District, and, in fact, for the holding of any responsible position is to lay the basis for encouraging careerism & opportunism inside the Party, encouraging blind faith and servility.

Nobody says that the Party should cease all activity. There are innumerable immediate and urgent issues which need to be taken up - peace, food, civil liberties, refugees - on none of which the CC has given any guidance. It is amazing that the CC expects implementation of a line on the basis of a sketchy outline in the Party letter - the only document so far available to the majority of the ranks.

When the old line has gone wrong on every issue, is it conceivable that the work of the Party can be switched on to a new basis without a proper & exhaustive review of the past

= 14 =

mistakes, without a detailed working out of the new line in all its implications? But as for the CC has not released even the political revolution to the ranks - three months after its reconstitution, ~~and~~ ^{seven} months after the 'Lening Peace' editorial.

If the work of the Party at present is at a standstill - whose fault is it in the main? The CC has not given any concrete guidance on any issue.

Take, for example, the collection of signatures to the Stockholm Peace Appeal. There have been no detailed instructions from the CC, no organizational preparations. In the tasks set before the Provincial Committees the peace campaign does not figure at all. The Central Committee of every Party has met specially to plan out the peace campaign, especially the collection of signatures to the Stockholm Appeal. But our CC has dismissed it in a couple of lines which only reveal its failure to realize the key significance of the campaign - even after American aggression in Korea the CC has not woken up to its tasks.

The W.P.Y.'s sharp criticism of the peace campaign in India is an indictment of the whole political understanding of the CC, its utter failure to give concrete lead on immediate and vital issues.

The Party is without any slogan on every front, it has not defined its stand on any issue of today the

The demand "⁼¹⁵⁼ put the question straight
on an armed basis" cannot by itself
be called the Party line. How, under
what circumstances, with what slogans -
all these have facts to be explained.

We are not here arguing for or
against the C.C.'s line but from what
we have stated above is it not
obvious that it is difficult for any
Party member ~~to accept the~~ who takes
his work seriously to accept the
reluctant line of the C.C. unreservedly?

Even in normal circumstances,
when the Party line has the support
of the majority of members, the C.I.
Principles of Party organization provide
for the representation of the minority
trent inside the C.C. But the new
C.C. has rigidly kept out all those
who do not accept the Party line
unreservedly. Is this not violation of
Party principle - a violation which,
when a new line is being hammered,
might prove very costly?

The P.B. demands that those who
do not accept the line should stand
aside. We have not heard of any such
"standing aside" inside the Communist
Party.

Liu Shao Chi has laid down the
proper Marxist approach to be adopted
towards the minority:

"While submission by the
minority to the majority must be

=16=
absolutely upheld in our Party, the
proper rights of the minority should
also be respected. A minority, under
the condition that it pledges its
submission to majority decisions,
is entitled to state its views in
opposition to the majority & to cast
its dissenting votes at meetings. Party
organisations must see to it that the
minority shall not be wrongly
treated or suffer at the hands of
the majority. A minority is entitled
to reserve its opinions when it does
not choose to give them up provided
it submits to the decisions of the
majority.

"The protection of such funda-
mental rights of a minority is
required by inner-Party democracy
& it is also indispensable. This is
because under certain conditions
truth may not be on the side of
the majority but may be with
the minority. Under ordinary
conditions, when the majority
is right & the minority wrong,
we grant such a right to the
minority to give it a chance
to correct its incorrect ideas in
a proper manner."

Today we cannot say categorically
that the C's line is acceptable

to the majority inside the Party. In these
circumstances, the CC's insistence that
no other trend except its own be
represented in the leading committee
of the Party is going against the roots
of inner-Party democracy - it is a
clear defiance of CC Principles. This
is not the way to develop the
conscious unity of the ranks, it
will only lead to a bureaucratic
imposition of the new line as a
matter of discipline.

11) ~~the CC's insistence~~ The PB makes
the claim that after the reconstitution
of the ~~new~~ CC "full + free
scope for inner-Party discussion has
now opened up". But so far no
evidence of this is forthcoming.

The Party Forum has yet to
come - and three months have
passed since the new CC took
over. The PB has not yet
circulated any document opposing
the ~~Party~~^{CC} letter to Ranko - we
know many leading comrades
have expressed themselves against
it. The PB has not yet released
the earlier documents the
Pit & B had asked for in its
Memorandum.

The Pit & comrades, 09 + 10.

=18=
have sent various suggestions, criticisms,
etc., in the last few months. The PB
has not expressed itself on any of
them. It is a matter for serious
misgiving that the only communication
the Pto should receive from PB
should be concerning a question of
of discipline. At the first expression
of difference with some decision of
the CC, the ~~Pto~~ PB come down
bearing on the Pto comrades. Can
this create confidence in us that
our views will be considered, that
disagreement with the CC will
not mean threats of punishment, etc.?

12) All Party members are no
doubt self-critically examining their
own part & trying to draw proper
lessons from their earlier wrong
attitude & mistakes. But from the
PB to demand from them that
they throw the searchlight inward,
when the CC & individual CCMS
have yet to ~~produce~~ render satis-
factory accounts to the entire
Party for their crime, when they
have yet to produce a self-
critical review of their functioning
is in our opinion the wrong
end to approach the question
of criticism & self-criticism.
To demand self-criticism

= 19 =

from the ranks before the leaders
have done it can only be construed
as a desire on the latter's part
to escape their own responsibility.
This is how the old P.B. & the
leading Party committees worked.
This pattern must change if the
Party is to come back to correct
Marxist-Leninist rails.

Here is a pertinent quotation
from Liu Shao Chi:

"Those in charge of the leading
bodies of the Party at all levels
must be the first to practise
thorough-going self-criticism on the
defects & errors in the work
carried out under their leadership.
They must set an example to the
Party membership and the cadres &
be fully prepared in their minds
to receive criticism from others, never
becoming impulsive & incontinent
when so confronted or resorting to
suppressive or punitive measures.
Only in this way can the develop-
ment of inner-Party democracy
be encouraged."

The C.C. has decided not to
circulate the self-critical
reports of the C.C.M.s to the
ranks, they are to be given only
to the P.C.s - and this too is
a matter of concession! The

= 20 =

CC has dissolved the PHS committee.
But for every crime of this committee,
political + organisational, aren't
the PBM & the CCM entrusted with
the task of guiding it & only res-
ponsible? Where are their self-
critical reports? What is the
example of self-criticism they
have set before us?

13) We do not know how the
PB comes to the conclusion that
the PHS go "demands of the new
CC that it should deal with
those who misguided the Party
after the Party Congress in the same
manner that they dealt with
Joshi in the past". This, we feel,
is a totally wrong understanding
of the PHS committee's stand.

No one wants to be vindictive,
no one wants a witch-hunt
inside the Party. But we are
certainly concerned at the fact
that while P.C.S. has been denied
his constitutional rights, the old CCs
& PBMs, guilty of Trotskyite-
Titovist misdeeds, are being
put back in leading positions.
The mistakes committed by
them were no ordinary
mistakes. A wrong, hardened
left-section understanding,

= 21 =

Titile - Turkish methods of functioning cannot be overcome overnight. The crimes of some of the PBM & CCMs in our view, are no less serious than for instance, of Li Di son. It was 18 years in Moscow that Li Di son was placed in a leading position in the Chinese Party. How can the old PBM & CCMs be expected to change in a day. They should, of course, be given every opportunity to learn, to remove their outlook. But to place them in leading positions - because they are the best today to accept the new line - is not to serve the interests of the Party. It can only deepen the inner-Party crisis, born the cause of the revolution.

- How is it that Com. you, directly responsible on behalf of the PB for guiding the W. Bureaucracy where left-sectarianism reached its utmost limits, back in the CC, even though Party members in W. Bureaucracy have expressed their lack of confidence in him?

- How is it that Sr. Adhikari, responsible for the closing down of so many Party papers, guilty of suppressing international documents, guilty of distorting Stalin's writings should still be placed in

= 22 =

virtual charge of PHS, and be made a member of the agit-prop committee?

- How is that Com. Robin meant to be BTR in leading the Party to the verge of liquidation be put on the agit-prop committee?

- How is that Com. Kanet, whose political bankruptcy in leading the agit-prop work of which he was in charge for a period is known to all, in whom, so far as we know, the majority of Maharashtra PCMS lack confidence, should be back in the CC, should again be in charge of PHS, should again be in charge of Bombay - Maharashtra?

- How is it that Com. Ahmed, responsible for smothering up the AITUC, who even after the "Loring Piece" editorial stoutly defended the tactical line according to whom 'all the persons' in 2d means excluding the rich persons, be once again a member of the TU faction?

Aren't all these instances of bourgeois nationalism? How can Party members be expected to repose confidence in them?

15 Su i) The PHS comrades committed no crime in referring

1 1 to the PB the CC's decision

in regard to P.C.J. The charge of "open revolt against the Centre" is untenable since on receipt of P.B.'s mandating instructions the Press Communiqué was published in the Party Press.

ii) Not only has the CC the powers to set up a Conduct Commission but it is necessary to do so to restore confidence & to unmask the tit-for-tat methods of the Party functioning adopted by the old PB & CC.

iii) The charge against P.H.s ~~concerns~~ of reprehensible distortion of ~~the~~ ~~situation~~ because of the deletion of a paragraph from the CC statement is based on wrong facts. The deletion was on legal grounds. It is now for the PB to make proper amends to the P.H.s concerned by withdrawing the charge & censuring the CC. It here for not placing the full facts before the PB and circulating the PB letter to concerned outside P.H.s without necessary corrections.

iv) The PB has based its letter on what we consider to be a totally wrong understanding of inner-Party democracy, of democratic centralism. Its understanding can only lead to the reinforcement of

The name of "Centralism" as of old -
of an authoritarian, bureaucratic
regime, stifling independent thinking
& initiative.

We have read none of the important
international documents - such as the
C.I. Thesis on Organization & the
Chen's Report on the Party" - and
we think that it is the P.B.'s
understanding of inner-Party democracy
& democratic centralism which is
at variance with - semi - Stalin
principles of Party organization.

x x

Bevere Unit