

LETTER OF THE CENTRAL SECRETARIAT TO

COM. P. SUNDARAYYA AND OTHER COMRADES, 3 JUNE 1964

We have received with great regret and concern your letter dated May 31, rejecting our earnest appeal for Party unity sent to you on May 29.

We had made this appeal in the light of the new situation in the country following the death of Pandit Nehru. We had underlined the grave dangers which exist today for the country and the urgency for united action by the democratic forces to fight these dangers. It was in this light that our unity appeal was issued.

It is amazing that your reply has not one word to say about the problems facing our people today following the passing away of the Prime Minister. It is evident that your attitude springs from a complete failure to see the

new situation and to suppress old prejudices and factional interests in the light of this new situation, which calls not for a prolongation of polemics and mutual recriminations but for positive steps for Party unity.

Your letter might well have been written before the death of Jawaharlal Nehru. Not only does it omit all mention of this unparalleled event in the nation's life, but the whole spirit of your letter is one which has nothing in common with the desire for Party unity, which is the dominant reaction of thousands of members of our Party, irrespective of their views on other questions.

We do not wish, at this moment, to go into a detailed rebuttal of the points raised by you. It is not necessary for us to point out again how utterly wrong and mistaken is the position taken by you. This is not the moment for the kind of vituperations in which you have indulged. Lip-service to Party unity is not enough. It must be backed by concrete action.

The Secretariat sincerely hoped that the new situation would awaken in you a sense of urgency and you would be prepared, as we were and are, to forget and put aside for the time being the rigid positions which had been taken earlier.

It was in that spirit that we wrote to you on May 29. It was in that spirit that we earnestly hoped you would enable us to place before the National Council a proposal for the immediate cancellation of the suspension resolution against you and other comrades.

We did not, in our letter, say anything which could be interpreted as "dictating terms", as you suggest. All we did say was this: that, in order to be able to place before the coming meeting of the National Council a proposal that the suspension resolution be immediately rescinded, "we would earnestly appeal to you to take the obvious steps of dissolving the rival committees you have set up and declaring your willingness to abide by the decisions of the Party bodies at all levels."

This is what you call "putting the cart before the horse." We are shocked at this attitude taken by you. Surely, the most elementary step for the restoration of Party unity is the dissolution of the rival committees you have established. What unity can there be if the rival committees continue to exist? We are afraid we are unable to appreciate your understanding that dissolution of party committees is the "cart" which must follow the "horse", which is the restoration of Party unity!

Again we appealed to you to declare "your willingness to abide by the decisions of the Party bodies at all levels." Is this also something which must *follow* Party unity? Or is it an essential condition for Party unity and functioning according to all accepted principles of Party functioning?

We are not seeking a united front of two parties. We are seeking the unity of *one* Party. And, therefore, if this Party is to function in a way in which it can carry out the heavy duties which face it today (heavier than ever in the new period), it is an elementary, basic proposition that all members should abide by the decisions of Party bodies.

This is not "dictating terms." This is *not* "putting the cart before the horse." Our appeal to you was made with the utmost good will and sincerity. When we requested the dissolution of party committees and adherence to Party decisions, we did not put forward "terms" or "conditions", but merely underlined the minimum that was essential for Party unity.

You have not merely rejected our appeal. You have put forward demands which go even further than the terms you insisted upon earlier. Instead of moving, as we attempted to do, towards understanding, you have, by raising new issues, declared your determination to frustrate all efforts for unity.

The Report of the Central Control Commission and the Secretariat's report "From Parallel Centre to Rival Party" have already informed Party members of the manner in

which some comrades from amongst you acted to split the Party and prevent it from functioning. The setting up of rival committees, the launching of rival journals, the setting up of rival candidate in the Rajya Sabha elections in Andhra Pradesh—all these were parts of a consistent line pursued by a certain group with a view to establish a rival party, with an ideological standpoint in complete contradiction to that of the Party and the international communist movement.

After the last meeting of the National Council in April 1964, the disruptive and splitting activities have been intensified still further. Open rival committees have been established in several states. Attempts are being made to grab and appropriate Party property. The name of the Party itself is sought to be usurped.

Since the meeting of the National Council in February 1963, the Party leadership has been warning against the disruptive moves aimed at splitting the Party and the open calls for such a split given by the leadership of Communist Parties of China and Indonesia.

It is not the disciplinary actions which began the split, as you would suggest. It was the open formation of parallel committees, rival functioning, spreading of slanders, violation of Party policies and decisions on the part of some comrades amongst you, which is the cause of the present split. All the relevant facts in regard to this, which are already before the Party members, completely refute the false allegations made so brazenly in your letter.

At this moment, what is necessary is that the Party should be able to act with the greatest strength. For this, Party unity is essential. It is also imperative that the leading bodies should be able to take decisions on policy and other matters quickly and with the certainty that these decisions will be implemented.

In your letter you make an astounding proposal. You demand that “the Secretariat, as such, including the posts

of the Chairman and General Secretary, should be abolished” till the Party Congress and that “all the jobs of political and organisational guidance of the Party... will have to be done by the CEC through some mechanism evolved by agreement.”

This proposal means in fact the complete scrapping of all Party bodies and offices, and functioning through an agreed machinery set up by the CEC.

Functioning by agreement is always to be desired. But the creation of conditions in which, in the name of “agreement” there is always a complete deadlock, will not strengthen the Party, but paralyse it and doom it to a slow death.

The National Council was elected by the Party Congress. To argue, as you argue, that it does not command a majority of Party comrades’ confidence and, therefore, it should be put in cold storage, is fantastic.

The National Council majority has a far bigger majority in the Party membership than it has in the Council itself. This is evident from any honest evaluation. We mention this only to counter the utterly false premise on which you seek to base your proposal for the abolition of all Party bodies, and their replacement by an “agreed machinery.”

We regret we are unable to accept this proposal for the paralysing of the Party, for the abandonment of the responsibilities given to the National Council by the Party Congress at Vijayawada.

We have again and again suggested united preparations for the Seventh Party Congress. We invited you to attend even now the meetings of the Drafting Commission. But you have refused to do this. Again, let us repeat, it is not enough to talk of united preparations for the Party Congress; it is necessary to show by your actions your sincere desire for such united work.

We would, however, not like to give up all hope of a positive response to our appeal, merely because of the tone of your letter and your rejection of our appeal.

We have every confidence that the situation in the country which you can see unfolding before you will convince at least those amongst you who sincerely desire that our Party should be able to serve our people well at this juncture.

S. A. DANGE