
RESOLUTION ON SPLITTERS

**AND OTHER DOCUMENTS OF THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA**

*New Delhi
April 10-15, 1964*

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

RESOLUTION ON SPLITTERS

AND OTHER DOCUMENTS OF
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF INDIA

NEW DELHI

APRIL 10-15, 1964

Published: April 1964

Price: Fifty Paise

Printed by D. P. Sinha at New Age Printing Press, Rani Jhansi Road,
New Delhi, for the Communist Party of India, 7/4 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.

CONTENTS

Expose the conspiracy of disruptors and splitters: Defend the unity and sacred honour of the Party	1
On disruptive and anti-Party activities	11
From parallel centre to rival party	16
Central Control Commission report to the National Council	32
APPENDIX	
Statement of the 32 members of the National Council who walked out on April 11, 1964	78

INTRODUCTION

In this booklet are published important documents of the recent meeting of the National Council of the Communist Party of India (Delhi, April 10 to 15, 1964) relating to the splitting activities inside our Party.

The resolution adopted by the National Council in this regard is given in full, together with, as an appendix, the Statement of the 32 comrades who walked out of the meeting.

We are also giving in this pamphlet, the draft resolution adopted by the Central Executive Committee at its meeting on April 9 as a recommendation to the National Council in regard to splitting activities of certain comrades. After the walk out by 32 comrades and their public call to Party members to renounce the Party, the National Council decided not to discuss this resolution separately, but adopted the composite resolution on the Statement of the 32 comrades. The main parts of the CEC draft were taken into consideration in the drafts of the National Council resolution.

This pamphlet also contains the report of the Central Secretariat on the splitting activities as well as the full text of the report of the Central Control Commission on the issues referred to it by the National Council.

New Delhi
April 28, 1964

SECRETARIAT

Expose the Conspiracy of Disruptors and Splitters

Defend the Unity and Sacred Honour of the Party

(Resolution adopted by the National Council on April 15, '64)

THIRTY-TWO members of the National Council, having walked out of its meeting on April 11, 1964, have issued a press statement amounting to a manifesto and programme of action. The National Council of the Communist Party of India has considered this document of the "Left" minority group and found it to be a catalogue of falsehoods, distortions and anti-Party slanders, meant to justify the splitting tactics and disruptive activities of its authors. By their walk-out and their subsequent stand as revealed in their statement, these 32 comrades have put themselves outside the pale of the Party. They have forfeited their rights as members of the Communist Party of India.

The seceders have openly declared war upon the National Council, upon the Secretariat and the Chairman of the Party in the name of "struggle against the factional activities" of "S. A. Dange and his group."

In this connection, it is well to remember certain hard facts of the past and present.

Firstly, this is not the first occasion in the Party's history when this same "Left" group has resorted to the anti-Party tactic of blackmail through threatened walk-outs and split. The most glaring example of this was seen at the Vijayawada Party Congress of 1961, where, finding themselves in a minority, these "Left" leaders and their followers threatened to walk out of the Congress unless they were given more

representation than they could legitimately claim on the new National Council. They did not hesitate to precipitate a crisis in the presence of delegations from several fraternal Communist Parties.

Secondly, the National Council would be failing in its duty if it did not expose the latest disruptive actions of the "Left"-sectarian group in their proper international context, i.e., not as an isolated event, not as a coincidence, but as an integral part of a worldwide move to divide and split as many Communist Parties in the world as possible. As is well known, splits by minority groups have been deliberately planned and carried through in recent days in the Communist Parties of Belgium, Great Britain, Australia, Ceylon, Peru and other countries. Disruption on an international scale and naked interference in the internal affairs of brother Parties, have become the self-proclaimed aim of the present leadership of the Communist Party of China.

During the last 16 months, the Central Executive Committee and the National Council had also to take cognisance of the open attacks on our Party by the leaderships of the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of Indonesia. Early last year (February 1963), the National Council adopted a resolution denouncing the leadership of the Communist Party of China for attempting to interfere in the internal affairs of our Party through open calls issued by it through articles in the *Hongqui* (Red Flag) and *Peking People's Daily*, as also through the Peking Radio.

The pamphlet called *A Mirror for Revisionists* in which our Party was attacked as the "Dange clique" and as an agency of the imperialists and the Indian big bourgeoisie and landlords, was answered in the pamphlet written by the Chairman of the Party *Neither Revisionism nor Dogmatism Is Our Guide*.

The leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia stooped to the low level of characterising the leadership of our Party as "spies" and calling for the disruption of the Communist Party of India by elements which it considered to be "genuine

Marxist-Leninists." All this was denounced in a resolution of our Central Executive Committee.

The *Hongqui* and *People's Daily* editorials of February 4, 1964 have issued an undisguised call for splitting our Party.

The activities and behaviour of the dogmatist, sectarian group in our Party have run parallel to the attacks on the Communist Party of India by the leadership of the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of Indonesia.

It is against this background that the National Council has to judge the latest acts of the leaders of the disruptionists in the Party.

The 32, who have walked out to place themselves outside the Party, claim that the National Council majority advocates and practises the "general political, tactical line of Congress-Communist unity", which amounts to gross reformism and which, according to them, was defeated by their efforts at the Vijayawada Party Congress. This is a blatant distortion of truth.

No general line of Congress-Communist unity was ever advocated at Vijayawada. As is well known, the real struggle at the 6th Party Congress was for the correct line which was eventually adopted—the line of building the National Democratic Front, of unity with democratic elements inside and outside the Congress, on common issues, against Right reaction, together with struggle against the anti-democratic policies of the Congress.

It is not the National Council which has violated the Party Congress decisions since 1961, as falsely alleged by the disruptors; it is the latter who have stuck doggedly to their "Left"-sectarian line which was defeated at Vijayawada—a line of total opposition to the Congress, which leads to unprincipled alliances and understandings with reactionary, communal and separatist forces such as the Muslim League, the DMK, Swatantra Party, Akalis, etc., in the name of fighting the Congress.

According to the seceders, the majority in the National Council against them was the fortuitous result of the "crisis" of October-November 1962, the declaration of Emergency and

the arrests of a large number of comrades. There could not be a greater denial of truth than this.

The "crisis" referred to so diplomatically by the "Left" leaders was, of course, the crisis caused by the Chinese aggression. When the National Council met in November 1962 to denounce this aggression and to declare its unequivocal stand for national defence, not a single arrest had been made. The National Council resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority after thorough discussion and debate when these seceders were present and when none of them had been arrested. How then could it be claimed or insinuated that the majority was not a genuine one?

Yet another gross distortion in the statement of the "Left" seceders refers to the alleged rejection by the National Council of their proposals for "the organisation of inner-Party discussion" and for "creation of necessary conditions in which a Party Congress can be convened". This, according to them, has prevented their participation and cooperation in the solving of inner-Party problems.

This presumably refers to the discussions which took place in the National Council meeting of October 1963, on a document by Comrade Basavapunniah and 16 others entitled "The Threatening Disruption and Split of the Party—How to Avert the Disaster?" This document, which was circulated in clandestine fashion outside the National Council also, was replied to by Comrade Dange on behalf of the Secretariat which later published both the documents.

In that meeting itself, the Council agreed to open discussions on all the controversial questions, to prepare for the Party Congress, and to associate with this work nominees of the minority group.

The National Council agreed to postpone the Party Congress, though it was overdue, until after the comrades in jail were released.

The CEC at its meeting in January 1964, adopted a resolution setting up suitable machinery to resolve genuine disputes regarding Party membership and allowing late enrolment in areas

where membership campaign had not been held due to large-scale arrests.

The CEC elected a Commission to prepare documents for the Party Congress in which were included Comrades M. Basavapunniah, E. M. S. Namboodiripad, Jyoti Basu and P. Ramamurti. When the Commission meetings were called, these comrades boycotted them and, later on, organised their rival conference.

Why were these offers rejected by the "Left"? What more could they want? Today they pose themselves as champions of Party unity who have been forced out of the Party by the "undemocratic" practices of the majority. But the truth of the matter is that they were all along determined to flout the basic principles of Party organisation and the authority and discipline of the National Council and to continue their activities as a rival party within the Party. The only position which could satisfy them was one in which the elected majority would agree to accept the status of a minority, while they, the actual minority, could dictate terms as though they were the majority. The National Council refused to surrender to such outrageous demands.

The "Left" leaders complain that the National Council and some State Councils have used their majority to carry out vindictive disciplinary actions against them.

The truth is that the National Council and these State Councils can, on the contrary, be charged with showing excessive leniency to persons who, while sheltering under the cover of their Party membership cards and their reputation as Party leaders, have been systematically wrecking the Party from within, repeatedly violating every single principle of Party organisation and discipline, throwing all accepted Party norms and forms to the winds and running full-fledged rival party centres from Delhi and several states. This has been conclusively established by the Central Control Commission in its latest report submitted to the National Council.

In the face of such conscious, planned and coldblooded wrecking activity, the only disciplinary action taken so far

against any leading member of this group has been the public censure of Comrade A. K. Gopalan in last October! The National Council has erred, if at all, on the side of leniency by any standards. The disruptors have taken full advantage of it to further intensify their anti-Party activities to an unparalleled extent.

Knowing that they cannot justify their ideological, political or organisational stand (in fact, they admit that they have serious ideological differences among themselves which have been subordinated to a common factional interest), the "Left" leaders have produced the diversionary provocation of the alleged "Dange letters" and are counting on cheap sensationalism to serve as a smokescreen for their nefarious anti-Party game.

The National Council has heard the available evidence and held that not even a *prima facie* case has been made out for the genuineness of the letters. It has repudiated the slanderous accusation that Comrade Dange was or is a British agent. Even then, in order to carry out a more thorough probe, it has appointed an inquiry committee of seven National Council members.

But why did not these "Left" leaders who proclaim from the housetops that they are convinced of the genuineness of the letters produce their evidence, if any, before the National Council? Why did they walk out? Why did they not return even after Comrade Dange declined to take the chair during discussion of this subject? And why do they now repeat the demand for an "agreed inquiry committee" when their representatives have already announced to the world that the genuineness of the letters is beyond doubt?

They did not have the decency even to raise the issue in the CEC or the National Council before rushing to the press. None but the worst enemies of the Party could ever indulge in such shocking activity and that, too, in collusion with the pro-American weekly *Current*.

The "Left" leaders have now publicly announced their future course of action. It amounts, in short, to organising an open

revolt by Party members and units against the National Council and against the accepted political line of the Party, and to preparing for the organisation of their own all-India congress which they have the temerity to call the "7th Congress of the Communist Party of India". They have decided to circulate their own documents and to convene a meeting of "representatives of Party members from all over India" after two months.

These and other decisions have been adopted in the seceders' conference which has been in session, as they admit in their own statement, from April 2 to 9 in Delhi. Draft "Programmes" and other documents have been issued to and discussed by Party members specially invited to this conference from various states and districts. The press has been briefed every day.

Clearly a rival party—all but the formal signboard—has been openly set up. And yet its organisers put forward so-called "proposals" for the National Council to accept as the price of their cooperation, even at this last moment. This is nothing but a last desperate attempt to dictate terms to the majority.

The National Council wishes to make it clear that it is always ready and anxious to explore all avenues for restoration of Party unity at any stage. But how can unity be restored as long as the seceders do not agree unconditionally to scrap their rival and parallel party centres and to accept unhesitatingly the authority of the National Council?

It has to be emphasised that these desperate anti-Party activities have been resorted to in the background of the rising wave of mass struggles in India on economic and democratic issues, a wave in which the Party has been playing a glorious and most prominent role.

For the first time in the history of our Party, an all-India mass movement has been unleashed against the monopolists and the anti-people forces of the Congress Government. This movement which began with the Great Petition campaign and the Great September March last year, is entering the next stage of preparations for an all-India General Strike.

It is precisely at this moment that the seceders have come out with their open split.

The disruption unleashed by this group inside the Party has, therefore, to be strongly condemned for the immense damage it has done, not only to the Party but also to the entire working class and popular democratic movement in the country. It has brought grist to the mill of the reactionaries and the vested interests—internal as well as foreign. Such a crime cannot be forgiven.

The National Council charges Comrades M. Basavapunniah, P. Sundarayya, P. Ramamurti, A. K. Gopalan, Harekrishna Konar, Promode Dasgupta and Harkishen Singh Surjeet for being the main organisers of this unprecedented disruption inside the Party and for taking the lead in forming a rival party. A detailed report prepared by the Secretariat on the activities led by these seven comrades was given to them in the meeting of the CEC, which adopted a resolution recommending to the National Council that they be expelled, on the basis of their record. Refusing to answer any of the charges made against them, these comrades walked out.

The National Council, having studied the charges against these comrades, is of the opinion that these comrades merit expulsion from the Party.

In the National Council meeting, even while the question of the agenda was under discussion and a compromise proposal was actually being moved by Comrade Bhupesh Gupta, these seven comrades, together with 25 others walked out of the meeting, without waiting for any decisions.

These 32 comrades subsequently issued their press statement of April 14, 1964.

While announcing a rival programme of action and calling a rival party congress, these 32 comrades still speak of holding talks with the National Council for unity.

In these circumstances, the National Council, for the time being, does not take the action of expulsion recommended by the CEC against these seven. The National Council instead resolves that these seven comrades viz., Comrades M. Basavapunniah, P. Sundarayya, P. Ramamurti, A. K. Gopalan, Harekrishna Konar, Promode Dasgupta and Harkishen Singh Surjeet,

together with the remaining 25 comrades who are signatories to the joint statement of April 14, 1964, namely Comrades T. Nagi Reddy, D. Venkateswara Rao, G. Bapanayya, C. H. Kanaran, V. S. Achuthanandan, Jyoti Basu, N. Sankariah, D. S. Tapiala, Sheo Kumar Misra, Mohan Punamia, M. Hanumantha Rao, N. Prasada Rao, E. M. S. Namboodiripad, A. V. Kunhambu, E. K. Nayanar, E. K. Imbichibava, Muzaffar Ahmad, Abdul Halim, Saroj Mukherjee, M. R. Venkataraman, K. Ramani, Jagjit Singh Lyalpur, Dr. Bhag Singh, R. N. Upadhyaya and R. P. Saraf be suspended with immediate effect from Party membership under Article XXIX, Section 5, of the Party Constitution for their part in the anti-Party activities of the group as a whole.

They are removed forthwith from all positions in the Party organisation which they may be holding, and during the period of their suspension, they shall not have the right to participate in any Party meetings or exercise any authority on behalf of the Party.

The National Council directs them to show cause by the next meeting of the National Council why more severe disciplinary action should not be taken against them.

The National Council draws the attention of these comrades to the fact that it is still not too late for them to retrace their steps from the path of split and disruption. The National Council warns them that if they persist in their present ways, it will be compelled to impose on them the highest penalty provided by the Party Constitution.

The Communist Party of India is facing the gravest crisis in its history—a crisis which is the reflection of the international conspiracy of disruption and direct creation of a group of hardened dogmatic, “Left”-sectarian and adventurist leaders within our Party. History will never forgive them for their crime of splitting the Party which tens of thousands of heroic revolutionaries and selfless workers have built up at the cost of their lives and untold sacrifices, a Party which is the hope of the toiling millions of India.

The National Council calls upon all Party members and

Party units to rally round the banner of the Party, defend its unity and honour and exercise maximum vigilance against the forces of disruption and disunity.

The National Council is fully alive to the danger that the attack of the splitters on the Party is likely to be accompanied by similar attacks on the unity of the trade unions and other democratic mass organisations. This attack, too, must be resisted tooth and nail for, if the disruptors succeed in their game of setting up rival unions, rival kisan sabhas, etc., it will be a grave blow to the unity of the toilers in their struggles against class oppression and exploitation and for better conditions of life and democratic rights. Such disruption will only bring grist to the mill of the monopolists and reactionaries in every walk of life, enabling them to divide and suppress the struggles of the working people, deprive them of all their gains and crush their fighting mass organisations.

The National Council declares that the Communist Party of India, the revolutionary Party of the Indian working class and of all the toilers in town and countryside, will remain united to fight the battles of the toiling and democratic masses of India. The Party has been built by the sweat and blood of millions of our countrymen. Their sacrifices and devotion cannot go in vain. The banner of the Party will be victorious!

On Disruptive and Anti-Party Activities

(Draft Resolution adopted by the Central Executive Committee on April 9, 1964 for submission to the National Council)

The disruptive and anti-Party activities of the leaders of the dogmatist and sectarian group inside the Party have recently reached the stage of the open formation of a *de facto* rival party with an alternative programme.

This is a development of the gravest concern and a challenge to the basic unity and political policies of the entire Party. As such, it calls for firm and drastic action.

This dogmatist and sectarian group, far from making a serious and sincere effort to assimilate and execute Party policies, as laid down by the National Council from session to session, or trying to resolve their differences within the framework of the Party, have continued to defy Party directives and have stepped up their disruption, organising parallel party activities and parallel bodies, leading up to the convening of an all-India conference held in Delhi in the first week of April 1964, which is nothing else than the formation of a rival party.

In the interest of the unity of the Party, and also for giving the erring comrades sufficient time to reorientate their views, the CEC and the National Council, till now, dealt with them with the utmost leniency consistent with the bare minimum of Party discipline. The National Council took formal cognisance of their disruptive activities in its session of June 1963. Warnings were given. Appeals were made. These proved of no avail.

Later, the National Council sanctioned certain disciplinary measures in West Bengal and publicly censured Comrade A. K. Gopalan for a grave breach of Party discipline, which he subsequently continued to justify in a defiant spirit.

The activities of the dogmatist and disruptionist leaders

have continued and grown throughout 1963 and 1964. Instructions and circulars have been sent out by them from their rival all-India centre. Documents have been surreptitiously circulated by them among Party members. Factional meetings of Party members from top to bottom have been continually held in various states. In Andhra, rival party offices have been openly established. Rowdy scenes have been enacted in Party General Body meetings. Rival weeklies, viz., *Janasakti* in Andhra, *Lok Lehar* in Punjab, *Chinta* in Kerala, *Desh Hitaishi* in West Bengal, *Teekkadir* in Tamilnad have been started.

Public speeches have been delivered and written messages to papers published by some of the leaders of the disruptionists attacking the policy of the Party as revisionist and trailing behind the bourgeoisie. The mass campaigns of the Party and trade unions have been ridiculed and belittled. Disruptive and provocative activities have been carried out in mass organisations and mass struggles. Throughout this period, the disruptionist leaders have made the Chairman of the Party the main target of attack.

The CEC and the National Council have, through formally adopted resolutions and documents, informed the Party ranks of a number of these activities from time to time.

During the last 16 months, the CEC and the National Council had also to take cognisance of the open attacks on our Party by the leadership of the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of Indonesia. Early last year (February 1963) the National Council adopted a resolution denouncing the Communist Party of China for attempting to interfere in the internal affairs of our Party through open calls issued by it through articles in the *Hongqui* (Red Flag) and *Peking People's Daily*, as also through the Peking Radio.

The pamphlet called "A Mirror for Revisionists", in which our Party was attacked as the "Dange clique" and as an agency of the imperialists and the Indian big bourgeoisie and landlords, was replied to through a pamphlet written by the Chairman of the Party.

The leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia stooped

to the low level of characterising the leadership of our Party as "spies" and calling for the disruption of the Communist Party of India by elements that it considered to be "genuine Marxist-Leninists". All this was denounced in a resolution of our CEC.

The *Hongqui* and *People's Daily* editorials of February 4, 1964 have issued an undisguised call for splitting our Party.

The activities and behaviour of the dogmatist, sectarian group in our Party have run parallel to the attacks on the Communist Party of India by the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of Indonesia.

It is in this entire context that the National Council has to judge the latest acts of the leaders of the disruptionists in the Party.

The last meeting of the CEC elected a Drafting Commission for preparing documents for the ensuing Party Congress. Comrades Basavapunniah and P. Ramamurti were elected to this Commission. While they refused to cooperate with it or attend its meetings, they prepared a draft programme of their own, which they discussed and adopted in a separate conference and even distributed copies of it to the bourgeois press without waiting for the meeting of the National Council. Such a step is unheard of in the history of any Communist Party.

The leaders of the dogmatist faction in the CEC, Comrades Basavapunniah, P. Sundarayya, P. Ramamurti, A. K. Gopalan, Harekrishna Konar, Promode Dasgupta, and Harkishen Singh Surjeet have convened an all-India gathering of the supporters of their political and organisational line, including members of state and district councils from various states which was held in Delhi in the first week of April 1964. Their alternative programme was discussed and adopted at this conference. Authorised press briefings and interviews have been given by the leaders of this conference almost daily. No Communist Party has ever tolerated the organisation of such a conference for adopting a rival programme.

The leaders of the group very recently set up Comrade Hanumantha Rao for the Rajya Sabha elections from Andhra

against the official Party candidate put up by the Andhra Pradesh Council. There is no precedent for such an act in the history of the Party.

And to climax this entire activity, the leadership of the dogmatist faction has, together with one of the worst pro-imperialist reactionary journals in India, the *Current*, attacked the Chairman of the Party as a British agent on the basis of certain letters alleged to have been written by him, which the Central Secretariat has denounced as a forgery. They did not have the decency even to raise the issue in the CEC or the National Council before rushing to the press. None but the worst enemies of the Party could ever indulge in such shocking activity.

It has to be emphasised that these desperate anti-Party activities have been resorted to in the background of the rising wave of mass struggles in India on economic and democratic issues, a wave in which the Party has been playing a glorious and most prominent role.

The disruption unleashed by this group inside the Party has, therefore, to be strongly condemned for the immense damage it has done, not only to the Party but also to the entire working class and popular democratic movement in the country. It has brought grist to the mill of the reactionaries and the vested interests—internal as well as foreign. Such a crime cannot be forgiven.

The National Council charges Comrades M. Basavapunniah, P. Sundarayya, P. Ramamurti, A. K. Gopalan, Harekrishna Konar, Promode Dasgupta and Harkishen Singh Surjeet for being the main organisers of this unprecedented disruption inside the Party and for taking the lead in forming a rival party. The National Council resolves to expel them from the Party membership for these grave offences.

The National Council calls upon all Party Members and Party units to rally round the banner of the Party, defend its unity and honour and exercise maximum vigilance against the forces of disruption and disunity.

The National Council declares that the Communist Party of India, the revolutionary Party of the Indian working class and of all the toilers in town and countryside, shall remain united despite the attacks of the disruptors and forge ahead as the champion of the toiling and democratic people of India. The Party has been built by the sweat and blood of millions of our countrymen. Their sacrifices and devotion cannot go in vain. The banner of the Party shall be victorious!

From Parallel Centre to Rival Party

(A report made by the Secretariat to the CEC on April 9, 1964
on the latest phase of the splitting activities inside the
Communist Party of India)

The conference of leading Party members from all over the country which has been meeting in Delhi since April 2 was convened by Comrades M. Basavapunniah, A. K. Gopalan, P. Ramamurti, P. Sundarayya, H. S. Surjeet, Harekrishna Kumar, Promode Dasgupta and others with a view to establish formally and openly a new "Communist Party" of "genuine Marxist-Leninists."

The parallel centre, the shadow "central committee" and shadow "state committees" were no longer enough to meet the needs of the splitters: an open separate "party" was necessary to challenge the credentials of the Communist Party of India at the coming World Conference of Communist Parties.

The same haste to establish a "party" has been evidenced in several other countries; the dogmatist and sectarian groups, owing allegiance to the ideological positions of the Chinese leaders, have been busy transforming themselves rapidly from groups and factions into rival "parties" in a number of countries during the last few months.

Inside the Communist Party of India there have been sharp differences and even factional groupings at times during the last several years. But these differences took on an entirely new character after the adoption of the National Council resolution of November 1962 denouncing the Chinese aggression. From that moment onwards, the leaders of international dogmatism made the Communist Party of India its special target, and took all possible measures to split and disrupt it.

The splitting activities which are now taking place inside

our Party are of a totally different character from the factional activities which were carried out in the previous periods. The previous factional activities were *inside* our Party; the splitters today insist on the setting up of a rival party.

An open call for split was contained in the notorious article "Mirror for Revisionists" published by the Chinese leaders in March 1963, and circulated in millions of copies all over the world with all the resources which the Chinese leaders possess.

The call for the formation of a "separate Communist Party" in India was made still more explicit in the notorious "Seventh Comment on the CPSU Open Letter", issued by the Chinese leaders on February 4. This is what the Chinese leaders said:

The renegade clique headed by Dange has betrayed Marxism-Leninism.

This clique has usurped the leadership of the Indian Communist Party.

It is following the Nehru Government's policy of hiring itself to US imperialism.

As their renegade features are revealed, Dange and company meet increasing opposition and resistance from the broad rank and file of the Indian Communist Party. More and more Indian Communists have come to see clearly that Dange and company are the bane of the Indian Communist Party and the Indian nation. They are now struggling to rehabilitate the Party's glorious and militant revolutionary tradition. They are the genuine representatives and the hope of the Indian proletariat and the Indian people.

Justifying their support to the splitters of Communist Parties, this document declared:

In our opinion, it is simply a proletarian internationalist obligation which it is our duty to discharge.

Commending their followers in various countries, the document speaks of "many Marxist-Leninists, both inside and outside the Indian, Italian, French, US and other Communist

Parties," and declares its support to them. "They deserve the respect, sympathy and support of all people fighting for the victory of communism throughout the world."

The February 4 article was the culmination of a long series of statements made by the Chinese leaders and their chief lieutenants in support of the splitting of the CPI.

The most brazen of these was the speech of the Chairman of the Communist Party of Indonesia, which our last CEC meeting in January branded as "an unashamed call to set up another Communist Party", an "open call for disruption". Comrade Aidit had said:

Can the Dange clique that already act as spies for Nehru... still be called the general staff of the Indian proletariat?

It depends entirely on the firm unanimity and unity of genuine Marxist-Leninists in India as to when the vacuum of leadership, the vacuum in the vanguard, the vacuum in the general staff of the Indian proletariat, will come to an end. But Indonesian Communists are fully convinced that a time will come when the Indian proletariat will definitely obtain a correct vanguard or general staff; the ranks of the genuine Marxist-Leninists are sufficiently strong in India.

How terrible it would be for the international Communist movement today if there were no resistance to the revisionists, how dreadful it would be if all Communists were shouting the slogan "Long Live Dange and Nehru!"

If these circles, magazines and new parties are really a correction to the old, revisionist Party, if they really and truly hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism that has been thrown aside by the old Party, then they must be given a good reception by Marxist-Leninists in all countries.

The call to fill the "vacuum" was unmistakable. The formation of a new party depends, according to Aidit, "on the firm unanimity and unity of genuine Marxist-Leninists in India."

*

*

*

The present Conference convened by Basavapunniah and others is being held to create that very "unanimity" and "unity" of which Aidit spoke. That is why it is discussing a separate programme for its rival party, separate notes on the ideological issue, organisational and political reports—all that is necessary for the foundation conference of a new party. This conference has been preceded by similar conferences in various states.

The foundation conference was preceded by a clear open admission of the plan to found a new party given in the speech of Comrade Sundarayya at the Silver Jubilee Celebration of the Ghadar Party at Jullundur on April 1. The Punjabi organ of Comrade Sundarayya's supporters, *Lok Lehar* itself reports Comrade Sundarayya saying in this speech that:

Time has come when all patriots and revolutionaries should be gathered together and such a party founded that can lead the popular struggles to success and achieve the aims that were before those who founded the freedom movement in India." (*Lok Lehar*, April 4.)

Sundarayya earlier in his press conference at Hyderabad said: "There are now two Communist Parties. Ours is the Marxist Party." (*Indian Express*, March 28.)

This foundation conference must be seen in the background of a number of recent actions by the conference sponsors, which are part and parcel of the new line of open split, the new period during which the splitters have decided on an international plane, that all the adherents of their ideological positions must move ahead from parallel centres, groups, rival papers, etc., to open rival parties.

It is necessary to catalogue some of these recent splitting activities, which are qualitatively different from those in the previous period, in that they no longer conceal the intention to split and set up a rival party.

1. ANDHRA — Rival Candidate in Rajya Sabha Election: Perhaps the most deliberate and obvious action, carried out to proclaim the split, was the setting up of a rival candidate to

the Party candidate in the Rajya Sabha elections from Andhra Pradesh. This action had no other meaning than to announce that a new "party" had been formed.

Comrade Sundarayya in his press conference at Hyderabad on March 27 openly stated in his formal prepared statement:

It is a well known fact that the Communist movement in India is today split into two—ideologically, politically and organisationally—and that this conflict over the Rajya Sabha seat is but only a feature of that situation.

Sundarayya openly proclaims in the following words that he and his group will not accept or abide by the decisions of the Party:

The decisions taken by this Rightist faction in the name of the majority are in fact the decisions of this faction, but not those of the Party.

This has no other meaning than that he will not abide by any decision taken by majority to which he does not agree.

The last paragraph of Comrade Sundarayya's prepared statement is an appeal to Party members and supporters to "*help rebuilding the Communist Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.*"

These are the same words as those used by splitters in all other parties in the recent period. They are an open, formal call for the building of a new party.

The detailed sordid story of the Rajya Sabha elections in Andhra Pradesh is contained in the Andhra Pradesh Party Secretary's statement. Of special significance is the report of Comrade Sundarayya's reference to the decisions of "*our central committee*" in his talks with Comrades Kadiyal Gopal Rao and B. Yella Reddy.

The rival party is already functioning, it takes its own decisions, it has its own "central committee" which selects its candidates and all this is admitted by the leader of the group himself.

2. ANDHRA — *Splitting of Mass Organisations:*

Andhra Pradesh has also seen the open splitting of mass organisations of youth, students, etc. The full story of this open activity is contained in reports by the Andhra Party Secretary.

3. PUNJAB — *Defiance of Party Directives:*

The brazen defiance of Party directives in Punjab by Comrade Surjeet and others, their refusal to hand over Party cash and records, etc., are a further indication of the decision to defy the Party and challenge its directives.

Factional activities, the starting of a separate journal *Lok Lehar*, a separate publishing house and rival centre and preparations on a state-wide scale for split have accompanied the defiance of the Party.

4. WEST BENGAL — *Decision to Unseat Bhupesh Gupta:*

Certain leaders of the West Bengal State Executive on the decision of the rival "central committee" refused to abide by the Party Centre's instruction to re-elect Comrade Bhupesh Gupta to the Rajya Sabha from West Bengal. They doggedly opposed his candidature and voted against him in the PEC. They even threatened to see that MLAs under their influence would not vote for him when by a majority of one the PEC selected Bhupesh as our candidate.

Fortunately, the decision of the rival "central committee" was reversed by the time of the election and all voted for Comrade Bhupesh. But the episode revealed fully the extent to which the disruptionists' activities have gone.

5. WEST BENGAL — *Defiance of Centre's Directives:*

The same group of leaders of the West Bengal State Executive Committee have deliberately violated all directives of the CEC. They have virtually restored to their positions those comrades against whom severe disciplinary action was taken and confirmed by the Party Centre. They have "restored" in the 24-Parganas a Committee which had been suspended and re-

organised with the approval of the Party Centre. They have deliberately refused to carry out the CEC directives to condemn the "PCZ Circular" and to take steps to prevent the defiance of the National Council.

On the contrary, these leaders of the State Executive are themselves carrying on a campaign of vilification against the National Council. They have refused to translate and circulate the resolutions and documents of the last meeting of the CEC and, instead, they have circulated through the Party apparatus the "document" of ten CEC members which slanders the Party leadership.

They have issued a Party letter criticising the Central leadership, alleging that it is responsible for stopping the publication of the daily *Swadhinata*.

This group of West Bengal leaders is openly campaigning in general body meetings against the decisions of the National Council. A report of a meeting of the Hooghly DC addressed by Comrade Harekrishna Konar has been submitted to the Centre which reveals the lengths to which defiance of the Party's authority can go.

This group is also setting up its own parallel committees at all levels—of comrades who support its dogmatic positions and splitting activities.

6. *Opposition to Mass Movements:*

The role of several leading supporters of the disruptionists during the National Campaign of the Toilers has been one of virtual sabotage. At all stages, they have scoffed at the campaign and attempted to prevent its success. Only when they saw the mass response to the campaign did some of them reluctantly join it.

In Andhra Pradesh, the huge kisan satyagraha was opposed and sought to be sabotaged by the leaders of the splitters.

In Kerala also, the three-day hunger strike of the National Campaign was sought to be reduced to one day in some districts.

Details regarding these activities of sabotage of mass movements are contained in various state reports.

7. *KERALA — Public Campaign against Party Leadership:*

The Kerala State Council has had to criticise severely the public attacks on the Party Centre, accusations of penetration of spies, etc., made by Comrades A. K. Gopalan through the Malayalam press.

8. *Open Advocacy of Rival Political Line*

There are several instances of the most dangerous advocacy of political positions at total variance with the Party line; among the most recent are the open advocacy by Comrade A. K. Gopalan of an electoral alliance with the Muslim League; and negotiations by Comrade Sundarayya and others with the Swatantra Party for an alliance in the Rajya Sabha elections.

9. *TAMILNAD:*

In Tamilnad, a rival party within the Party has already been functioning in all respects except in name, under the guidance of Comrade P. Ramamurti and Comrade A. K. Gopalan. Rival papers, rival general body meetings of selected comrades conducted quite openly by Comrade Ramamurti, rival "shadow" committees meeting openly, rival party committees set up to function openly as in Coimbatore town, public denunciation, from the open platform and in the Press of the State Council leadership as well as of accepted Party policies, sabotage of the Party's municipal election campaign, incitement to physical clashes as in Coimbatore—such have been the manifestations of their policy in Tamilnad.

The State Council meeting of March 25-29 nailed down the above splitting activities in the organisational report which was carried by an overwhelming majority. The answer of Comrade Ramamurti and his group was to counter-charge the State Council (which had been elected at the Special Conference which had been convened by the old PC itself) as a "revisionist clique", as the Tamilnad branch of the "Dange clique" and

then walk out of the State Council meeting. This "charge-sheet report" of theirs was rejected by the State Council by an overwhelming majority.

Individual charge-sheets had been given by the PEC to Comrades Ramamurti, Sankaraiah and Chintan on their splitting activities. But without answering these charge-sheets, the group walked out of the State Council meeting.

The Coimbatore District Council of the Party has passed a resolution recommending expulsion of Comrade Ramani for his splitting activities.

10. *Rival Weeklies, Campaign against the Party and its Policies*

The chain of rival papers started by the leaders of the splitters' faction has now become the propagator of slander against the Party and active campaigner for the ideological positions of the dogmatists.

During the last one year they have brought out five weeklies: Bengali *Desh Hitaishi*, Telugu *Janasakti*, Tamil *Teekkadir*, Malayalam *Chinta* and Punjabi *Lok Lehar*.

The latest in their series of rival papers is the Punjabi *Lok Lehar* which has published messages from Comrades P. Sundarayya, Gopalan and Muzaffar Ahmad. These messages are further admissions of the split the authors have already carried out. The open admission of the purpose of the rival chain of papers is additional proof of the formation of the rival party.

In his message, Comrade Sundarayya writes: "It (*Lok Lehar*) will undoubtedly help the Communist and other progressive forces in the Punjab in taking a correct stand in the great debate in the international Communist movement. Revisionism has been the main danger in the Communist movement in India for the last many years . . . the dominant leadership has taken the Party to the position of becoming the tail of the bourgeois Congress Government."

This message of Comrade Sundarayya published in the *Lok Lehar* brings out the purpose and character of the chain of rival papers run by these comrades. The purpose is to fight

the past and present line of the Party and its present leadership which, according to them, is "revisionist".

In the face of this open challenge to the past and present policies of the Party and its leadership, their pretensions to accept the Vijayawada line of the Party stand unmasked. *Secondly*, in the name of "taking a correct stand in the great debate in the international Communist movement" what they really advocate is the alternative ideological positions and general line of the Chinese leaders which our Party led by its National Council has rejected as dogmatist, "Left"-sectarian, chauvinist and disruptive.

A perusal of the pages of these rival papers leaves no doubt that what they have been propagating is an alternative line to our National Council line in relation to our national-political situation as well as the ideological dispute in the international Communist movement.

Had they any intention of remaining inside the Party, then they should have fought for their line inside the Party. But they have embarked on a different course, a course of open split of the Party. It is in pursuance of this splitting course that they are running these rival papers in defiance of the resolutions of State Councils like those of Punjab and Tamilnad to stop the publication of these papers.

The Climax

The climax to these splitting activities has come with the so-called "Dange letters".

Having found that the correct ideological, political and organisational line of the National Council is rallying more and more people, more and more members and supporters of the Party, while they themselves are becoming more and more isolated, the splitters concentrated on a campaign of slander and abuse against the leadership, specially the Chairman. This campaign was carried on in collusion with the worst enemies of the Communist movement in India.

For the last several months, they worked with the help of certain pro-China and pro-American elements in order to

collect "explosive" material to prove the Chinese slanders that the Chairman of the Party, Comrade Dange, is a "renegade" and "hireling" of imperialism. This is their deep-laid conspiracy to disrupt and split the Party for which they had been feverishly working for the last 18 months. The alleged letters of Comrade Dange were seized upon by them as a convenient weapon to fight their last-ditch battle of disruption and split.

First, they circulated these alleged documents some three months ago among their supporters. Then they tried to have them published in the press. But no paper except the avowed pro-US anti-Communist rag *Current* published them. The Secretariat discussed these letters with Comrade Dange, obtained from him his categorical denial, and issued its statement on March 13, denouncing the letters as forged and planted.

On March 26, Comrades Basavapunniah and Surjeet called a press conference at Comrade Gopalan's residence and publicly asserted that these documents are 'genuine' and demanded the exit of Comrade Dange from the leadership. A press hand-out to this effect was issued under the signatures of Comrades Basavapunniah and Ramamurti.

On March 27, Comrades Sundarayya and Nagi Reddy held a similar press conference at Hyderabad and made a public declaration to the same effect.

The third day, on March 28, Comrades Promode Dasgupta, Harekrishna Konar and Muzaffar Ahmad issued a press statement in the same vein, followed by Comrade Gopalan's press statement on March 29.

These press conference and statements mark a new stage in their wrecking and splitting activities—the stage of planning and organising an open revolt against the Party under the spurious cover of the letters, alleged to have been written by Comrade Dange in 1924 offering his services to the British Government. On the strength of these "letters", Comrade Basavapunniah, Sundarayya and others publicly slandered Comrade Dange as a British spy. They needed the "testimony" of these forged and planted letters to "prove" what the Chinese and Indonesian leaders have been propagating for so long that

Comrade Dange, the Chairman of the CPI, is a "renegade", "spy" and "hireling".

If one takes into consideration the dates of these press conferences and statements, then it becomes obvious that the whole thing was planned. How else can it be explained that for four continuous days, one after another, they fired the salvos of their slanders against Chairman Dange? The fact that these press conferences and statements were pre-planned is further corroborated by Comrade Ramamurti who admitted to the Tamilnad Provincial Executive Committee that the decision to hold the press conference had been taken 12 days before, i.e., on March 14.

Comrade Basavapunniah has asserted the genuineness of these letters on the strength of his "personal verification" by going to the National Archives and examining them. But what about Comrades Ramamurti, Surjeet, Sundarayya, Gopalan, Konar, Promode Dasgupta and Muzaffar Ahmad? They could not claim at the time of these press conferences the argument of "personal verification" which Basavapunniah claimed. Of course, some of them have now (April 7) "examined" the "letters" for one hour, and unanimously convened a press conference to proclaim the letters "genuine" once again!

Comrade Basavapunniah admitted in his press conference that these letters were in his possession for the last three months. Had he any concern for the prestige and integrity of the Party, he should have placed them before the January meeting of the CEC. But he did not do so. He concealed them from the CEC and instead circulated them among his followers and collaborators. The mask of his Party honesty and integrity gets exposed when he conceals them from the CEC on the one hand and circulates them among his followers and collaborators, even before what he claims was "personal verification" of the "genuineness" of the letters.

The manner in which Comrade Sundarayya and others have held a press conference on April 7 on the eve of the CEC and National Council meetings, to declare their conviction after an hour's "study" of the "genuineness" of the letters without

waiting to place these "findings" before the Party, is also clear evidence of their intention to split at all costs.

Comrade Basavapunniah justified his rushing to the press and publishing a statement slandering the Chairman of the Party as "British spy" on the ground that the Secretariat issued a public statement contradicting the *Current* story and denouncing the letters as forged and planted. Perhaps Comrade Sundarayya and others will plead the same justification. They cannot resort to this justification so long as they are inside the Party.

If they had any intention to stay inside the Party and to fight for its "correction" and "purification", then they should have contacted the Secretariat, discussed with it and demanded the convening of the CEC and NC meetings. They did nothing of that sort. The holding of the press conference even after the convening of the CEC and NC meetings is still more reprehensible.

The daily press conferences by Comrade Basavapunniah after each day of the foundation conference of his new party have enabled all Communists and our entire people to understand that the splitters are now playing their last card, before launching their separate party.

Suslov Report

The panic and consternation of the seceders after the publication of the Suslov Report is understandable. They have sought desperately to make out that their anti-Party splitting activities in India have no connection with the activities of the splitters on an international scale. The Suslov Report throws a searchlight on the pattern of split which is being followed in so many countries of the world.

Suslov says the Chinese leaders "are out to discredit at all costs all the genuinely Marxist-Leninist Parties, which enjoy well-earned respect in the world Communist movement and among the masses."

The Indian working people will never forgive those, who at this critical moment, when the Party was engaged in the

biggest mass campaign in its history, embracing millions of toilers—sought to smear and discredit the Party's leadership in open alliance with the organs of US imperialism and the monopolists. It is no accident that Birla's *Hindustan Times* had published two editorials in support of the dogmatists against the Party leadership and Comrade Dange personally. It is again no accident that Goenka's *Indian Express* had become the main vehicle of the daily splitting campaign of slander and abuse.

Suslov has rightly pointed out that "The height of the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders is their recruitment of adherents in the ranks of fraternal Parties and the formation of factional groups composed of these, which they are trying to make their main weapon in the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist Parties."

The Suslov Report also announces the proposal to convene a new conference of the world's Communist Parties.

The open split, planned and carried out by the adherents of the dogmatist ideological positions inside our Party falls into place in the world context. It was inevitable that Comrade Basavapunniah should have fulminated in one of his daily press conferences against Comrade Suslov and the CPSU along lines which are identical with those of the splitters all over the world.

Stage by Stage to Open Split

As far back as June 1963, the National Council had discussed the problem of the "parallel party centre" and had asked the Central Control Commission to investigate into the matter and submit its report to the National Council for necessary action. The April meeting of the National Council was expected to receive this report of the Central Control Commission and discuss it.

But events have moved fast over the months since June 1963.

The question of Party unity was again discussed at the meeting of the National Council in October 1963. The organisers of the parallel centre, through the document of 17, sought

to blackmail the Party into agreeing to permit them to continue and intensify the splitting activities in the name of "unity".

At that time, Comrade Dange, on behalf of the Secretariat, replied to this document and urged them to stop their disruptive activities and asked them certain specific questions. He asked:

Do they and will they disown unequivocally the slander propagated by the CPC that the Communist Party of India (of which these comrades are themselves members) is no longer a Communist Party but is merely a clique?

Do they and will they disown unequivocally and condemn those who made the statement that it is the present leadership and its adherents, who handed over lists of Party members to Government for arrest and that it is this leadership which is responsible for the arrests?

Do they accept the authority and discipline of the National Council and the Party organs, irrespective of their differences with it?

Do they agree to abide by the ideological-political resolutions of the National Council until they are changed by the Party Congress?

Do they and will they denounce the call for organising separately the so-called "pure" as apart from the "impure" Communists inside and outside the Party, which, in effect, is nothing but a call to split the Party and is given by the CPC, since its differences with the international Communist movement and was addressed to those in India also?

Do they agree to stop the chain of papers that have recently appeared as rival to the Party papers and preach a line contrary to that of the Party?

Far from doing this, the splitters continued their disruptive activities intensifying them with every day—till the stage has been reached today when they have created a separate party with its own rival committees at all levels, its own headquarters, its own leadership.

Unity of the Party

The Party leadership has attempted throughout this period to act with tolerance and patience, in the face of slander and abuse, and open defiance of Party discipline. In the hope that the disruptive group would mend its ways, every effort was made to preserve the Party's unity. No severe disciplinary actions were taken. Every attempt was made to meet the viewpoint of those who differed with the Party leadership.

There is only one way now to defend and strengthen the unity of the international Communist movement, and that is, as Comrade Suslov has said, to fight the wrong policies and disruptive actions of the Chinese leadership and its followers. The main danger to the unity of the international Communist Parties of the world is constituted by these policies and activities of the Chinese leadership.

The Communist Party of India can no longer remain a silent spectator of the activities of disruption and split being carried out inside our Party. These activities are threatening the entire future of our Party; they are weakening and blowing up the mass movement; they are disastrous for the cause of the Indian working class. It has become incumbent on the Party leadership to act decisively against those who have already virtually split the Party and seceded from it, but seek to keep a foot inside the Party's councils and committees, with a view to sabotage our work and create confusion and further disruption.

The Party leadership must take effective steps to defend the unity and integrity of the Party and its basic political and organisational principles.

Central Control Commission Report to the National Council

INTRODUCTION

The National Council of the CPI in two of its resolutions adopted at its meeting of June 26 to July 2, 1963, asked the Central Control Commission to:

- I. Investigate the activities of the parallel centre and recommend disciplinary actions against those members and units responsible for its existence and functioning;
- II. Report on the charges and counter-charges made in the papers referred to the National Council at its meeting of June 26 to July 2.

By another resolution adopted at its meeting of October 14 to 19, the National Council asked the Control Commission to:

- III. Investigate further into the reports of Com. Sundarayya's speeches at the general body meetings at Katur and other places bearing in mind any other speeches whose reports Com. Rajashekhar Reddy and Com. P. Sundarayya might like to file.

We have made the investigations and are submitting this report on our findings.

There being no precedent within the CPI for an inquiry of this nature, we had to set some standards for our guidance and work out our own procedure. The Resolution on Organization adopted at the Hyderabad meeting of the NC in August, 1962, and the organizational principles so forcefully restated therein gave us a perspective and showed us the direction along which to proceed.

That Resolution stated amongst other things:

It would be idle to hope that the Party will be able to combat incorrect political trends and work out a correct

political line if those who consider themselves to be fighting for correct policies disregard the principles of Party organization and discipline. On the other hand correct principles of Party organization cannot be enforced and discipline maintained if those who are fighting for the disciplined functioning of the Party do not carry on a principled struggle against incorrect political trends.

Furthermore, neither can the struggle be waged against incorrect political trends, nor will the enforcement of correct norms of Party organization and discipline be successful, unless the entire Party is moved into vigorous practical action in the direction of developing and strengthening the mass movement and of building the Party.

In other words, continuous and sustained mass activity, serious and principled discussion of all the ideological and political problems facing the Party and the struggle for the strict observance of the norms and principles of Party organization should all be combined.

Above all the principle of the minority submitting itself to the majority once the discussion is over and the issue clinched should be strictly and loyally carried out. The tendency to take the issues that have been discussed and clinched even after the decision is taken should be firmly combated.

At our first meeting in Delhi on July 26, 1963, we decided to visit some centres in different states from where activities of a disruptive nature had been reported, or from where some information could be obtained. We decided to gather first-hand information by inviting comrades—irrespective of their political or ideological opinion—to meet us, and we informed the Party Committees concerned well-in-advance of our programme. We met the available members of the Secretariat and CEC in Delhi first and regarding charges and counter-charges we decided to meet them at a later stage after we had some more material on the points concerned.

Between August and December 1963, we visited the states of Madras, Kerala, Andhra, Bombay, West Bengal, Bihar and

Uttar Pradesh. Comrades from Punjab and other places met us in Delhi. In all about 450 comrades have been interviewed by us and many more have sent us their statements in writing.

In the course of our enquiry a large number of comrades, irrespective of political or ideological differences, cooperated with us but some comrades including some members of the CEC refused us their cooperation. We could not accept the suggestion made to us during the course of our enquiry that observers from 'both sides' should be present at the sittings of the Commission so that they could lead evidence and be allowed to cross examine.

Two members of the Central Control Commission were unable to join us in this work. Com. U. Ramam was under detention and when he was released in August, 1963, he was seriously ill. He wrote to our Chairman that he hoped to be able to join us within a month when he would be better but when two of us met him at Elluru in the 2nd week of November, he expressed his inability to join us as he was still undergoing medical treatment.

Comrade Abdul Halim was also in prison and was released from detention only by the end of November 1963. When two of us met him in Calcutta after his release, he told us that due to illness he had been asked to take complete rest by his medical adviser and would not be able to join us even for our investigation at Calcutta.

During the enquiry Comrades raised several issues and placed before us a number of instances relating to wrong methods of Party functioning, but we have not found it possible to deal with all of them in our report. We have endeavoured as far as possible to keep within the terms of our enquiry.

ACTIVITIES OF THE PARALLEL CENTRE

The Border events of October-November 1962, confronted the Party with an unprecedented situation. Political tension and anti-Communist fervour in the country had reached the high-

est peak; the ruling party and all the reactionary parties were trying to queer the pitch against our Party. Mob frenzy was roused and directed against the Party in many places, offices were attacked in different centres, including the Party's Central Office which was set on fire. Different political and ideological trends within the Party had also got aggravated. It was in such a situation that the NC met from October 31 to November 2, 1962, to discuss the situation and decide on the line of action. After heated discussion and sharp cleavages of opinion the Resolution of November 1, 1962, was adopted by a substantial majority.

The vast majority of Party units and comrades in different parts of the country took immediate steps to implement the resolution. They campaigned actively and effectively on the slogans given in the resolution which evoked good response from the mass of the people. But there was another side to this picture.

Immediately following the adoption of the November 1 resolution by the NC, some members of the CEC of 'like-mindedness on political and ideological issues' met separately in Delhi and decided on a political and organizational line of action entirely different from that of the NC. They characterised the NC as "thoroughly right revisionist and so bitterly anti-China that it would not take any initiative which does not have the approval of the Government of India." They considered it to be "a life and death struggle to expose these tactics and overthrow this leadership." They decided that "there was no more scope for continuing inner-Party discussions."

They estimated that "Indian dependence on imperialism both economic and military would grow; that there would be a rapid shift to the Right; Nehru government would abandon its non-alignment, there would be no democracy, semi-fascist and fascist conditions would be created and the Congress Government would stand revealed as a stooge of imperialism." In such a situation it was visualised, that there would be no possibility of the Party functioning legally, so they "laid

stress on semi-legal and illegal functioning for the future; the form of organization and manner of functioning in the states to be determined by the conditions obtaining in each state." From this it can be seen that this outlook was at complete variance with that of the resolution adopted by the National Council.

To work out this political and organizational line and to see to its implementation, an all-India directing centre was set up. Comrades Gopalan and Ramdas were in charge of this centre and Comrades Surjeet, Ramamurti and Sundarayya moved to the states organising the necessary apparatus to carry out this decision.

This all-India parallel centre within the CPI has been functioning from the first week of November, 1962, from Delhi with subsidiary centres in some of the states. The circulars, reviews and reports issued from these centres clearly reveal the parallel nature of the activities pursued by them.

The directives of the all-India centre were implemented in West Bengal almost without delay. Comrade Promode Dasgupta met selected comrades separately and gave them instructions. Papers and records, typewriters and other equipments were removed from the State Council Office. At least one member of the State Executive, some members of the office staff, and some comrades in the district went underground. No immediate steps were taken to explain the NC Resolution to the Party ranks or the masses outside. When supporters of the NC attempted such explanations there was stiff resistance. When the West Bengal State Council met on November 13, it did not endorse the NC Resolution but decided to implement it without discussion. The full text of the NC resolution was not published even in the *Swadhinata*, the Party daily. On the contrary the alternate draft resolution of Com. P. Ramamurti which had been rejected by the NC, was widely distributed and popularised. Com. Ramamurti was moving about in Calcutta at that time.

The same thing happened in Punjab. Papers and records were removed from the State Council office and some senior

comrades including Comrade Surjeet moved about in a semi-legal manner evidently to organise underground functioning.

When the State Executive Committee of the Punjab met in the 2nd week of November, it did not endorse the NC resolution but formally decided to implement it. No immediate steps were taken to explain the resolution to the Party ranks and the masses outside.

Meanwhile, the Chinese offensive on the border took on massive proportions. National emergency was proclaimed on November 21, Defence of India Rules were promulgated and prominent leaders and workers of our Party were arrested and detained in hundreds all over the country.

Anti-Communist frenzy was whipped up by parties of reaction and attacks on Party offices, attempts to break up our meetings continued in many parts of the country, particularly in West Bengal. The Chinese decided to withdraw their forces unilaterally on November 21, but the political tension in the country did not subside for some time to come.

Period Between December 1962 and April 1963

In this period, under emergency conditions, the activities of the parallel centre were mostly secret and underground. The main effort was to propagate the political and organizational line decided at their Delhi meeting and to consolidate their bases in the different states. Circulars were issued attacking the NC leadership and asking the Party comrades to repudiate its authority. Hindi Circular No. 1 issued from this centre stated for example:

This revisionist clique has given up the path of international proletarianism and taken to blind nationalism and betrayal of the revolutionary masses and working class. The living example of this is the so-called patriotic resolution of November 1 of the National Council.

The parallel centre distributed a large volume of literature on the India-China border issue. The Chinese standpoint as explained in "More on Nehru's Philosophy" (published in the

Chinese Press in October, 1962). "A Mirror for Revisionists"—*People's Daily*, March 9, 1963, and several other articles from the foreign press were widely popularised. Some of the articles and pamphlets in English and Indian languages—typed, cyclo-styled and hand-written, have come into our possession. Important among these are:

- R. P. Dutt's Notes in *Labour Monthly*, December 1962
- Letter of Premier Chou En-lai to Heads of Afro-Asian States
- Background facts about India-China Border
- "Why Does Nehru Refuse to Negotiate?"—*People's Daily* Editorial of December 7, 1961
- "Let the People Ponder"—pamphlet in Bengali by 'Satyanweshi'

To give an idea of the contents of these articles and pamphlets we are giving a few extracts in Appendix 1.

Extracts from the first and last portions of Comrade Namboodiripad's document "Revisionism and Dogmatism in the CPI" distributed to NC members at the February meeting were extensively made use of by the parallel centre to strengthen its propaganda. Translations of the extracts in different languages have come into our possession.

It should be noted that the portions thus circulated had been totally repudiated by the NC when it discussed the document in the February meeting.

The activities of the parallel centre were most pronounced in West Bengal in this period.

Several members of the staff of the *Swadhinata* resigned simultaneously and refused to cooperate in implementing the NC line. The authority of the new State Secretariat set up to fill the void caused by the arrests and detention of the leaders was not accepted. All attempts made to explain the NC policy were resisted.

Attempts were also made to see that the *Swadhinata* stopped publication. When the press printing the paper was

sealed by the creditors, the West Bengal Secretariat tried to print it in another Party press, this press refused to undertake the work. When arrangements were finally made to bring out the paper, the printer and publisher informed the Magistrate that he had ceased to be the printer and publisher.

When the press was seized the article "Dushammod" was published in the *Swadhinata*. It was correct to inform the public about the seizure of the Party property but references to details of inner-Party financial transactions and to comrades who were in jail ought to have been omitted.

The general body meeting organised in the Muslim Institute Hall in Calcutta in January 1963, which was to have been addressed by Comrades Dange and Namboodiripad was blatantly broken up. Questions prepared and cyclostyled beforehand attacking Comrade Dange and the NC were widely distributed at the meeting.

After the treatment meted out to the Chairman and the General Secretary, the situation deteriorated in West Bengal. The National Council at its meeting in February decided to take over the work of the Secretariat and appointed a Provincial Organizing Committee with Comrades Bhupesh Gupta and Govindan Nair to guide it on behalf of the National Council.

But the underground would have none of it and it came with fresh instructions in a circular issued in the name of PCZ in March, 1963. These are categorical in many respects. It states:

Units and comrades should be told to pay no heed, to the NC Resolution on the Bengal Party which is illegal and preposterous. Units should work as if there is no such resolution. We should recognise no reorganisation of any unit by the so-called POC or the NC Secretariat.

Our MLAs also should pay no heed to S-L (Bhowani Sen-Somnath Lahiri) factions' order regarding levy.

Press and literature shop comrades should be told to remain firm, and foil the game of S-L faction aided by Bhupesh to

capture these organisations. They should be bluntly told that the press and literature shops are under nobody except the directors.

Subsequent events prove that the instructions were carried out by and large by the opponents of the National Council line.

The parallel centre devoted attention to forestall and prevent the holding of the Special Conference organised by the Punjab State Council in March 1963. An Urdu circular issued by the Delhi centre in this connection, severely attacked the National Council and the State Council leadership and gave detailed instructions as to what the Party members must do to defeat the holding of the Conference. The Urdu Circular states :

The present leadership has renounced the proletarian standpoint. Now it wants our Party to trail behind the Government and Congress The task of struggle against the class enemy has been placed on our shoulders when our leaders are not with us Genuine Marxists all over the country hope you will defeat the disruptionists if they succeed in holding the Conference teach them such a lesson which they will never forget.

A covering letter which was sent along with the Urdu circular to Punjab comrades refers to some ideological material already sent to them and says :

We still do not know what has been done with the ideological and other material supplied. In all the states it has been circulated and comrades are discussing it.

This clearly goes to establish the connection between the all-India and the state centres.

In Andhra Pradesh several members of the staff of *Visala-andhra* Party daily resigned simultaneously and actively engaged themselves in propagating against the State Council leadership. The state leadership took immediate steps to stem the disruption that was sought to be created.

No explanatory campaign on the NC Resolution was

organised in those districts where those opposed to the NC were in a majority.

In other states also the parallel centre had established contacts. Literature on the border issue and against the NC leadership was systematically disseminated in all the states.

In this period the demarcation between comrades supporting and opposing the NC line had become quite sharp inside the various jails. Quite obviously the opponents of the NC were continuing along the line taken at the first meeting of the parallel centre in Delhi in the first week of November. Joint general body meetings and inner-Party discussions were eschewed in the jails and it was as if the two groups lived in two separate camps.

Period from April 1963 to August 1963

In this period when emergency conditions had been relaxed the activities of the parallel centre came more into the open.

A review of the situation is made by the parallel centre immediately after the meeting of the CEC in Delhi from April 13-16, 1963. This review sharply criticises the resolutions adopted by the CEC on current by-elections and on the Colombo proposals and unreservedly supports the stand taken jointly by Comrades Namboodiripad and Gopalan at that meeting. The review has used most vitriolic epithets against the National Council leadership. The operative part of the review runs thus :

Wherever we are in a position to unleash activity by ourselves we should start it. Where we are not in such a position and where we can mobilise Party ranks to put pressure on the leadership to force them to take up such campaigns it should be our job to do this... In the campaigns launched by the present leadership we should be the most active so as to win over more and more of the Party ranks to our side and isolate the present leaders.

Following these directives from the parallel centre Comrade Gopalan undertook extensive tours of the states of Bengal,

Andhra, Madras and Kerala. Excepting for the tour in few districts of Andhra Pradesh, all these tours were arranged by the parallel centre and not by the State Councils or district councils concerned.

In Bengal, in the 2nd week of May and later in July 1963, Comrade Gopalan visited Calcutta, Burdwan, Serampur, Nai Hatti; in the third and fourth weeks of May he toured different districts of Andhra Pradesh. In the month of June and the 3rd week of July Comrade Gopalan visited many centres in Madras state.

In many of these places Comrade Gopalan addressed public meetings and also sectional general body meetings. In the public meetings he did not explain to the public the line of the NC but confined himself to attacking the anti-people's policies of the Nehru government. It is not possible to believe that in the general body meetings either, he explained the policy of the NC.

It is in this period that four language weeklies started coming out in different states as organs of the parallel centre. These are:

- Janasakti*—Telugu weekly, published from Vijayawada from June 1963
- Teekkadir*—Tamil weekly, from Madras, started in June 1963
- Chinta*—Malayalam weekly, from Kozhikode, started in August 1963
- Desh Hitaishi*—Bengali weekly, from Calcutta, from August 1963.

Com. Gopalan during his tour of the states was in close touch with the comrades who were responsible for bringing out these papers. For example, in Bengal he toured with Comrades Niren Ghosh and Mohit Maitra, in Andhra Pradesh he was in close contact with Com. D. V. Subba Rao and others who resigned from the *Visalaandhra*, in Madras he toured with Comrades Appu and Sholai and in Kerala he was in close contact with Coms. Chaitunni and E. K. Namboodiri. And

in the face of these activities of his which he was consciously carrying out to coordinate the activities of the parallel centre—his statement later makes amusing reading when he says—“The so-called parallel centre is only in the imagination of certain comrades in the leadership who are losing balance of mind.”

Comrade Ramdas who was working part time in the All-India Kisan Sabha office began to work full time for the parallel centre during this period. He visited several of the states actively helping in the bringing out some of the language weeklies referred to above and meeting comrades released from jail on parole or brought to the court in connection with their cases.

It is in evidence before us that in Delhi Comrade Ramdas had discussed with a comrade from Bangalore on the possibility of starting an Urdu weekly. When he was in Lucknow to meet the detained comrades brought to the High Court for the hearing of their cases he had discussed with some comrades there regarding the possibility of starting a Hindi weekly.

It is clear that these tours and discussions had nothing to do with the All-India Kisan Sabha, and that he has been doing all this in furtherance of the objects of the parallel centre.

In pursuance of the directives of the parallel centre that comrades should take part in mass activities, several Party Committees and comrades got active in the state of West Bengal. Plans and preparatory meetings for the starting of a committee for political prisoners' release and mass issues were actively taken in hand. It was under the auspices of this committee that later in September, the democratic convention at Calcutta had been organised and several rallies and demonstrations were held in Calcutta and the districts.

The point to be noted is that all these rallies and demonstrations were organised as rival to those organised by the POC and the democratic convention was to continue to function as a rival to the POC.

Comrade Gopalan participated in the democratic convention in Calcutta against the clear directives of the NC and the

subject has already been dealt with in the NC at its meeting of October, 1963.

In the April-August period there have been many mass campaigns and strikes initiated by the NC, State Councils and trade unions. The campaigns for release of detenus, the by-election campaigns, for increased DA and the Bombay Bandh strike against the rising prices, kisan and bus satyagraha in Kerala, food satyagraha and demonstrations in Calcutta and preparations for the Great March to Delhi—all this took place in this period.

Special mention must be made here at attempts to sabotage the signature campaign in Bengal and to some extent in Andhra. But it failed.

It is true that a small section of comrades were severely critical of the forms adopted for the above struggles, some remained indifferent, but the fact cannot be disputed that the vast majority of the comrades—irrespective of inner-Party differences—actively participated in these campaigns and struggles in the best Party spirit.

This healthy and positive aspect of the inner-Party situation during this period ought not to be lost sight of.

In the international sphere also things began to take on a more apprehensive turn. Ideological differences in the world Communist movement came into open and various documents—theoretical and polemical—started coming out. Some of this ideological material has been published by the Party Publishing House but the parallel centre had taken in hand its multiplication and circulation in different states not for the purpose of controlled and principled inner-Party discussion but for consolidation of its alternative platform. Some of the documents which we found to have been circulated are:

—“Unity of International Working Class against Common Enemy”—Editorial of *Red Flag* in Malayalam.

—“Whence the Differences—Reply to Thorez” in English and Telugu.

—“More on Difference between Togliatti and Us” in English, Telugu and Malayalam.

—“On Seventieth Birthday of Stalin”—Speech by Mikoyan in Telugu.

—“The Split in the Socialist Camp”—*New York Monthly Review*.

The Bengali pamphlet *The Present Situation and Policy of the Communist Party* consisting of 64 printed pages and written by “Kautilya” is a complete thesis elaborating the ideological-political line of the alternative platform and laying down the tactical line with detailed organisational steps for its implementation. Another Bengali pamphlet of 36-pages written by Prithvi Raj and published in May 1963, is a draft political resolution, evidently meant for discussion by those who were pursuing their alternative line.

A study of the decisions taken by the CPI from time to time on national and international questions and the views put across in the documents mentioned above, clearly establish the alternative nature of this ideological platform. We are giving a few extracts in Appendix 2.

Scurrilous attacks on Comrade Dange’s leadership and open calls to “genuine Marxists” to revolt against this leadership repeatedly broadcast by the Chinese press and radio have been aggravating factors in our inner-Party situation. Taking the cue from these open calls to revolt certain wrong and erroneous slogans on Party organisation and discipline have been widely propagated among the ranks of the Party. Some of these slogans are:

—Discipline of Party committees can be accepted on mass campaigns but not on ideological and political issues.

—Today’s minority will be tomorrow’s majority, hence majority decisions can be discounted.

—Ideal is the aim, unity the means. What is the good of means if aim is not achieved.

—There is not a single party, only two factions, and, therefore, there is no Party line to be accepted.

It is necessary that Party members be seriously warned and alerted against these disruptive slogans.

Period from September 1963

From September onwards the activities of the parallel centre come very much into the open. Comrades detained in Andhra Pradesh and Madras, some of whom had attended the earlier meeting in Delhi on November 1, were released in August. The all-India parallel centre was augmented by the inclusion of some of these leading comrades.

This re-inforced centre reviews developments since November 1962 and finds that many of their earlier assessments had gone wrong. They reassess the situation thus:

India's dependence on imperialism both economic and military has grown but yet it would be grievously wrong to characterise it as a stooge. . . . There has been a shift to the right . . . but it would be unreal to state that democracy is totally abandoned or semi-fascist or fascist conditions have been created.

Their earlier formulation that there was no more scope for continuing inner-Party discussions was revised. Now the formulation was: "There are certain possibilities for open legal work and some scope for inner-Party discussion."

The earlier directive that Party members need not renew membership was revised. The call was given that members should seek renewal of their membership and also enlist militants to the Party.

In the light of changed conditions they shifted the emphasis from "illegal and semi-legal" to "legal and semi-legal" work. But their characterisation of the National Council as thoroughly Right revisionist remained unchanged. The review states:

We are facing a life and death crisis . . . the supreme task of all of us is to fight and defeat the extreme Right which has got hold of the Party organisation and is using it to implement a Right revisionist line. . . . If differences and

disunity rise amongst ourselves, it will seriously weaken the struggle against the Right.

The authors of the review are deeply disturbed over the serious differences that have arisen amongst the "Left" ranks outside and inside jails, specially in West Bengal and they offer their services to the Bengal comrades to seek a way out of these difficulties and find a solution so that they would jointly fight the Right more effectively.

Basing themselves on the formulation that some legal possibilities for work still existed, they put forward some proposals for resuming inner-Party discussions on all issues of "ideological, programmatic and correct tactics". (These proposals were later submitted in a modified form in the name of 17 members at the NC meeting of October 1963.)

The writers of the review are, however, quite categorical about continuing their activities and state:

Even as we put forward these proposals . . . we continue our present work at the different levels to consolidate and expand the Left. Forms for this to be determined depending on the actual situation from place to place. Papers which are being run by Party members and enjoy the support and sympathy of the Left should continue.

And the activities of the parallel centre at "different levels" have continued along the lines laid down in the September review. This is seen in their setting up of open rival committees in 24-Parganas, and Nellore in Andhra Pradesh.

The committee for political prisoners' release and mass issues originally set up as an *ad hoc* body under whose auspices the democratic convention was held at Calcutta in September 1963, was not dissolved after the convention. It continued to function as an organisation rival to the Bengal POC. Rallies and demonstrations were held under its auspices giving slogans often in conflict with those given by the POC. At least two members of the CEC actively participated in the second democratic

convention held in Calcutta last December against the directives of the National Council not to associate with this body.

Comrade Sundarayya after his release in September had been addressing a very large number of general body meetings in different centres in Andhra Pradesh giving a political, organisational line of the parallel centre. Comrade Sundarayya has taken inner-Party differences to the Party ranks without the approval of the State Council and not on the basis of any written report or document.

Comrade Gopalan has also been going about addressing general body meetings in Bombay and other places giving the same political and organisational line as followed by the parallel centre.

Group meetings of Party workers not in agreement with the National Council were being organised in different parts of the country and leaders of the parallel centre were actively propagating their own line. Reports of these group discussions often find a place in the daily press.

We have not considered it necessary to go into the details of these open activities organised by the parallel centre.

In the foregoing paragraphs we have briefly related some of the activities of the parallel centre which have come to our notice in the course of our investigation. *We are convinced that comrades associated with the parallel centre by these activities of theirs have undermined the authority of the National Council, violated Party discipline, gone against the fundamental principles of controlled and principled inner-Party discussion.*

I. They have violated Article XVII of the Party Constitution which lays down:

1. The National Council shall be the highest authority of the Party between two all-India Party Congresses.
2. It is responsible for enforcing the Party Constitution, for carrying out political line and decisions adopted by the Party Congress.
3. The National Council shall represent the Party as a whole and be responsible for directing the entire

work of the Party. The National Council shall have the right to take decisions with full authority on any question facing the Party.

II. They have gone against the resolution on Party organisation adopted at Hyderabad which among other things stated: "... Above all the principle of the minority submitting itself to the majority once the discussion is over and the issue clinched, should be strictly and loyally carried out."

III. They have also gone against the principle of controlled and organised inner-Party discussions laid down in Article XXXI of the Party Constitution:

2. Inner-Party discussions shall be organised:
 - a) Where over an important question of Party policy, there is not sufficient firm majority inside the National Council or in the State or the Provincial Council.
 - b) When an inner-Party discussion on an all-India scale is demanded by a number of State or Provincial organisations representing the same proportion of the total membership of the State or Province concerned.
 - c) Inner-Party discussion shall be conducted under the guidance of the National or the State or Provincial Council which shall formulate the issues under discussion. The Party Committee which guides the discussion shall lay down the manner in which the discussion shall be conducted.

ON CHARGES AND COUNTER-CHARGES

I. We now come to the second part of our investigation. In the papers referred to us by the NC along with the resolution on charges and counter-charges there are complaints against Comrade A. K. Gopalan. These are as follows:

- i) From the *Note on Parallel Party Centre* by M. N.

Govindan Nair and Yogindra Sharma, we have the following:

Comrade Gopalan, President of the AIKS, has been moving in various states and secretly meeting with such comrades who have engaged in the campaign of slander and vilification against the NC.

ii) In the *Note of the Andhra PC Secretariat on Gopalan's Tour of Andhra*, it is said:

Behind the back of the Andhra PC he arranged through an Andhra MP tour programme.... he used his tours to stir up factional activity and build up factional contacts.... he contacted those people who are running a parallel party centre and also those people who were expelled from the Party.

iii) The *Note on Factional Activities Being Organised in Tamilnad*, submitted by Manali Kandaswamy, Parvathi Krishnan and N. K. Krishnan, states:

Comrade Gopalan utilised the occasion of his tour in Tamilnad to whip up factional activity against the NC resolution and the Party leadership.... He is reported to have addressed secret general body meetings of some Party comrades in Madras city where he attacked the NC resolution.

Comrade Gopalan has not come before us. In a letter to us dated December 31, 1963, he states:

I have decided that my meeting you as suggested by you cannot serve any purpose. Moreover, whatever I have to say has been said in my notes to the NC and CEC on various occasions.

Comrade Gopalan had submitted his replies to the NC refuting the charges against him. In reply to the *Note on Parallel Party Centre* by Govindan Nair and Yogindra Sharma he states:

This so-called parallel centre exists only in the imagination of certain comrades in the leadership who are losing their

balance of mind seeing the opposition in the Party ranks to their political line. I know it for a fact that many people in many states have received these 'documents' by post. How am I concerned with it? How does it prove the existence of a parallel centre? I would not put it beyond some of these leaders that they would manufacture circulars and letters in an attempt to discredit some of us further.

This Note says there is an active parallel centre and as so-called evidence it mentions certain reports from West Bengal, a circular supposed to have been found in Punjab, the circulation of certain literature and the fabrication that I have been meeting comrades secretly in some states.

The slander of a parallel party centre is meant to be a weapon to frighten the ranks and rouse them against those who stand by the decisions of the Party Congress.

In an earlier part of our report we have referred to numerous circulars, documents and pamphlets typed, cyclostyled and printed in different languages and distributed to "like-minded comrades" which go to establish that a parallel centre exists and functions inside the Party. In the face of this Comrade Gopalan's contention that the parallel centre exists only in the imagination of some members of the leadership, is absolutely untenable and without any basis.

Comrade Gopalan undertook an extensive tour of the states of Bengal, Andhra, Madras and Kerala.

Excepting for the tour in some districts of Andhra Pradesh these tours were not arranged by the state or district councils concerned. Apart from addressing public meetings at different centres Comrade Gopalan met likeminded comrades in groups and general body meetings.

In Bengal Comrade Gopalan was in close touch with Comrades Niren Ghosh, Mohit Maitra. He was in contact with some comrades who had resigned from *Swadhinata* and who had started the publication of *Desh Hitaishi*. In Andhra Pradesh Comrade Gopalan was in contact with Comrade D. V. Subba

Rao and others who had resigned from *Visalaandhra* and who brought out the Telugu weekly *Janasakti*. In Madras Comrade Gopalan was in close contact with Comrades Appu, Solai and others who started the publication of *Teekkadir*, Tamil weekly, and in the state of Kerala he was in contact with Comrades Chatunni and E. K. Namboodiri who brought out the Malayalam weekly *Chinta*.

These new language weeklies are the organs of the alternative platform.

We have mentioned earlier that a number of circulars, pamphlets, etc., were distributed in various states. The opinions, political formulations, and allegations found in some of these find reflection in the notes submitted by Comrade Gopalan in reply to charges against him.

All these facts lead us to the definite conclusion that Comrade Gopalan has been most actively connected with the organisation and functioning of the parallel centre.

Comrade Gopalan's participation in the Calcutta democratic convention has already been dealt with by the National Council. His interview to the *Kerala Kaumudi* was discussed in the Kerala State Council.

II. *The Note on Parallel Centre* by Comrades Govindan Nair and Yogindra Sharma states:

There are strong reasons to believe that the AIKS has been turned into a factional party centre. . . . The AIKS centre has been virtually closed down and its cadres and resources are being employed in the activities of the parallel centre.

We do not want to go into the activities of the AIKS. It would not be correct to mix up these with the political activities at the residence of Comrade Gopalan, nor is there anything before us to suggest that the resources of AIKS—whatever they were—have been used to furthering the activities of the parallel centre.

III. The Note of Comrades Govindan Nair and Yogindra Sharma refers to the mysterious manner in which Comrade Jagjit

Singh Layalpuri, General Secretary of the AIKS, left this country without any knowledge of the Party Centre, immediately after the November National Council meeting and stayed abroad since then.

It is a fact that Comrade Layalpuri left India on the invitation of the International Conference of Agricultural and Forestry Workers immediately after the NC meeting. We do not consider there was anything mysterious about the manner of his going. He returned to India in December 1963. We do not know of his activities abroad.

IV. The Note of Comrades Govindan Nair and Yogindra Sharma contains this passage:

It is reported that Comrade P. C. Joshi is going to bring out a paper of his own. It is also reported that he has been contacting Party comrades and tapping Party resources throughout the country to harness them in the service of his venture. Over and above he has started issuing circulars directly to Party units.

Comrade Joshi himself has not issued any circulars relating to the publication of Marxist monthly *Indian Path*. But a circular was issued in the name of Sri Garg to which Comrade Joshi states he was a party. This fairly long circulars stated:

After the closure of *New Age Monthly*, there is no organ left for the expression of Marxist opinion. The need for a theoretical-political journal taking its stand upon the foundations of Marxism-Leninism but finding principled basis for unity with progressive nationalism and help build the national democratic front, is obvious.

Normally it is the prerogative of the higher committees of the Party to bring out journals and interpret current events from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism. According to this circular some individual comrades take this task upon themselves. The propriety of members of leading committees undertaking such tasks without the sanction of their units and in collaboration with "Marxist intellectuals inside the Communist

Party and outside" is very much to be questioned.

The action of Comrade Joshi in writing without the sanction of the CEC to Party comrades seeking support for the venture was improper. There is very little to substantiate the charge that he tapped the Party resources to seek support for his proposal.

The correct course for Comrade Joshi before he decided to associate himself with this venture and for the Secretariat members when they came to know of it would have been to take up the issue for discussion in the CEC. Such discussion would have also very much helped in clarifying whether the declared objectives of the journal were in conformity with the accepted policy of the Party.

Since the *Indian Path* was never started, this issue is only of academic importance now.

V. In the Note of Comrades Govindan Nair and Yogindra Sharma there is the following statement:

These two documents "Mirror for Revisionists" and "Revisionism and Dogmatism inside the CPI" became the ideological-organisational platform of the parallel party centre. A comparison of the circulars issued by the parallel party centre with the two documents mentioned above lead to this conclusion.

Comrade Namboodiripad has taken this to be a charge against him, but we do not think there is any suggestion in this statement that he was responsible for distribution of his document. It is undoubtedly a fact that in the first instance excerpts from Comrade Namboodiripad's report on revisionism and dogmatism running to about 7-typed pages were multiplied and sent from the parallel centre at Delhi for distribution in different states with a covering letter which stated *inter alia*:

The whole document is of great importance and should be carefully studied when it reaches you. Since that will take some time as the NC has decided against circulating the documents, we are sending you two extracts—one dealing

with Comrade Namboodiripad's approach to dogmatism and revisionism in our Party and the second dealing with the present situation in the Party which should be made known to as wide a circle of comrades as possible.

The fact that the NC had by a specific resolution repudiated the opinions expressed and charges made by Comrade Namboodiripad in these parts of his report on dogmatism and revisionism is ignored by the distributors.

VI. Among the papers circulated in the June-July 1963 meeting of National Council is a letter from Comrade Damodaran in which he refers to an article by Comrade E. M. S. Namboodiripad on "Ideological Struggle and Development of Cadre" published in the annual number of the Malayalam journal *Deshabhimani*, and says:

In that article he has openly exhorted the Party members to revolt against and overthrow the present leadership of the Party.

We have seen the article of Comrade Namboodiripad and we did not get the impression that it is a call for revolt against the leadership.

On Counter-Charges

The counter-charges referred to us find their place mostly in the reply notes of Comrade Gopalan submitted to the National Council. Having made these counter-charges Comrade Gopalan has refused to substantiate them with fuller particulars. Many things mentioned in these notes against the 'leadership' and against 'certain leaders' are of a very vague and general nature, touching on political opinions and we are not going into them. Below we deal with what in our opinion are specific charges made by Comrade Gopalan.

I. In his reply to Comrades Govindan Nair and Y. Sharma, Comrade Gopalan says: "A report about this Note appeared in the *Amrit Bazar Patrika* of June 22, 1963, when the Note

had not been circulated even to CEC members."

We have seen the report in *Amrit Bazar Patrika* of June 22. The incorrect and cursory nature of the report indicates that the writer could not be in possession of the text of the Note. Loose talk by a Party member when briefing could be the source of the writer's information.

We asked the Secretariat members concerned about this report appearing in *Amrit Bazar Patrika*. They were positive that they had not talked about the report to any press correspondent.

Comrade Yogindra Sharma informed us that a few days previous to the meeting of the CEC which was to consider this note he had occasion in the course of talk to mention about this note in a casual manner to Comrade Somnath Lahiri, a member of the NC who was then in Delhi. Comrade Lahiri categorically denies having made any mention of this note to any press correspondents or anybody else.

We have not been able to locate the exact source of the leakage.

Comrade Yogi speaking to a non-member of his unit about a note before it was even circulated to the unit was wrong.

II. In the same Note Comrade Gopalan says:

It is my humble submission that if the two Secretariat members wanted to raise this question, they should have discussed it in the Secretariat and CEC in my presence, heard what I had to say and on that basis taken whatever decisions were necessary.

The Secretariat functions as a collective team (with individual responsibility, of course) and the proper and correct procedure is that political and organisational reports and proposals must come before the CEC from the Secretariat and not individual members thereof.

Scant attention paid to function the form has been one of the grave defects of our Party organisation and the earlier this is rectified the better for the Party.

The Note of Comrades Govindan Nair and Y. Sharma raised

some important points and made reference to more than one individual member of their unit (the CEC) and, therefore, it was all the more reason why it should have been first discussed in the CEC.

We find that the Note was first circulated to the CEC members before the meeting and that it was included in the agenda for discussion at the CEC. But the CEC when it met passed on the whole thing to the NC for consideration. But we do not see how Comrade Gopalan can make a complaint of it against the two members of the Secretariat that this Note was not discussed in the CEC in his presence since the CEC did not take it up at all.

The fact is that Secretariat members had seen to it that the Note was included in the agenda for discussion in the CEC. Comrade Gopalan must himself have received a copy of the Note before the meeting. He could have raised the issue and insisted on a discussion at the CEC or at the NC. But he did not do so.

III. Some other passages in reply note of Comrade Gopalan touching on the Chairman Comrade Dange and General Secretary Comrade Namboodiripad are:

When after the Secretariat meeting in mid-October the General Secretary was briefing the press, the Chairman walked in and openly contradicted him—two days later, while the General Secretary was still at the Headquarters, the Chairman issued a long explanatory statement to the press without consulting the General Secretary.

The facts so far as we have been able to gather regarding this are briefly as follows:

The Central Secretariat met in the 3rd week of October 1962, discussed the situation arising out of the Chinese offensive on the border, and adopted a resolution on October 17.

Immediately after the meeting, Comrade Namboodiripad, the General Secretary, met the pressmen waiting outside, explained the resolution to them and replied to their questions. The

Chairman Comrade Dange who happened to go into the room also replied to the questions pressed upon by him by the correspondents. Emphasis differed in the interpretations given by the General Secretary and the Chairman mainly on the point whether the Chinese had actually violated our border, whether the statement of the Government of India on the question and the Chinese denial thereof could be taken on par. This difference was very much played up by the daily papers next morning.

Three members of the Secretariat—Dr. Z. A. Ahmad, Yogindra Sharma and Govindan Nair got deeply agitated over the press reports and interpretations given to the resolution. They approached the General Secretary and wanted him to issue a clarification. He did not agree. They met and prepared a statement in clarification of the General Secretary's interpretation. With this statement they again approached the General Secretary and wanted him to issue it. But the General Secretary refused to do so without calling a full meeting of the Secretariat again.

Comrade Bhupesh Gupta, the other Secretariat member in Delhi, agreed with the General Secretary that the clarification need not be issued.

The Chairman, Comrade Dange, who had left for Bombay on the 17th evening returned to Delhi on the 19th and some of the members who had wanted the clarification to be issued met him on his return. The Chairman issued a clarification statement that evening itself without consulting the General Secretary.

The Secretariat at that time was a composite one. The resolution adopted by the Secretariat on the admittedly important issue was adopted by a majority. Quite obviously, the understanding of the General Secretary and the Chairman on some points in the resolution had differed. The meeting with the press correspondents on the 17th evening was proof of that. In such situations who should be the official spokesman of the Party was a question on which no clear cut decision had

been taken either in the CEC or the National Council. The concept of the composite Secretariat implied that the Chairman and the General Secretary should act in consultation; and when they differed, the majority opinion of the unit must prevail.

The prevailing tension and temper in the country was an important factor in the situation. A sense of urgency had gripped everybody. The majority of the Secretariat members present in Delhi made their views quite clear to the General Secretary on his interpretation of the resolution. But the General Secretary refused to accept and act on the majority viewpoint.

The action of the Chairman in issuing the statement on 19th evening was in line with the majority viewpoint but it was an omission that he did not consult the General Secretary nor call a meeting of the available members of the Secretariat and consider the situation.

The functioning of forms even if it meant some delay is of prime importance in such situations.

The worst of it is that patient and persistent efforts were not continued after the incident to resolve the differences and restore working agreement.

IV. Later on in the same note of Comrade Gopalan it is stated :

To my knowledge Comrade Namboodiripad was not allowed to function properly either as a General Secretary or the Editor of *New Age*, and after his resignation came the slander campaign against him.

At the meeting of the National Council on February 12, 1963, Comrade Namboodiripad explained the reasons why he was resigning the Secretaryship of the Party and the editorship of *New Age*. It was after hearing him and a discussion on the subject that the NC decided to accept his resignation. The same meeting of the NC considered separately the remarks and allegations against the Chairman and some members of the Secretariat and the majority of the NC by Comrade Namboodiripad in his document "Revisionism and Dogmatism inside the CPI" and adopted the following resolution :

Comrade E. M. S. Namboodiripad has submitted to the National Council a 122-page document entitled "Revisionism and Dogmatism in the CPI". So far as the problems of ideology and of revisionist and dogmatic mistakes raised in this document are concerned, they should be referred, along with other documents on similar problems to a commission formed by the National Council.

The National Council, however, takes cognizance of certain wrong remarks made by Comrade Namboodiripad in his note under the sub-heading "Anti-Party Approach" (pp. 115-122 of the note).

Firstly, his document makes a statement about the National Council to the effect that the 'atmosphere prevailing' at the October-November meeting of the NC was 'hysterical' and that this made any free and frank exchange of views impossible.

Secondly, it charges the supporters of the National Council resolution (p. 71) of denouncing 'those who disagreed with them as traitors' (p. 121) and states that this 'amounted to giving an alibi to the Communist-baiters like the Jan Sangh and the PSP, as well as the Government to launch their attack on the Party.'

Thirdly, it maligns the whole Party when it states that 'when the Government arrested Party functionaries and detained them, our Party did not vigorously protest against it' (p. 119). It makes unfounded allegations against the majority in the NC when it states that 'they did not react at all when the Government struck the first blow in Maharashtra' (p. 120) and that this 'emboldened' the Government to 'launch the countrywide attack on November 21.' It further states that up to this day, there has been no lead given for a real mass campaign 'to force the Government to retrace its steps.'

Fourthly, it says, that 'the incorrect alien class ideological-political line and the disruptive organisational methods adopted by the sponsors of the NC resolution have inevitably led to the slow disintegration of the Party and now threaten

even to split the Party.' This amounts to throwing the blame for disrupting and splitting the Party on the shoulders of the National Council.

The National Council is of the opinion that all these and such other remarks of Comrade E. M. S. Namboodiripad are allegations against the National Council, against the majority supporting the November 1 resolution and against the Chairman of the Party.

The National Council would have ignored such remarks but for the fact that they emanate from one holding the position of the General Secretary of the Party. His remarks amount to an expression of censure of the National Council, the highest body of the Party, elected by the Party Congress.

It is indeed surprising that while levelling such serious charges against the National Council, Comrade Namboodiripad has no word of condemnation or even of disapproval in the body of the document about the conduct of those comrades who are reported to be doggedly opposing the implementation of the National Council resolution though in his speech at this meeting of the National Council he has stated the latter comrades who are doing it are doing disservice to the Party.

The National Council repudiates and rejects these charges as unfounded and unwarranted.

The National Council having already expressed itself on these questions, we do not feel called upon to go into them. V. In his note Comrade Gopalan says that "The Chairman of the Party went abroad, had discussions with leaders of fraternal Parties, came back and before even calling a CEC meeting, reported to the Prime Minister on his trip and discussions according to the press reports." Comrade Dange has denied this. There is also nothing in the evidence before us to substantiate this charge.

Comrade Gopalan says further that the Chairman did not fully report to the Party on the discussions with fraternal Parties. The members of the CEC and the National Council were free to ask questions and elicit information from the

Chairman following his reports to these bodies. No instance of the Chairman withholding essential information has been brought to our notice, nor is there any evidence to say that Comrade Gopalan tried to get information and that it was withheld.

VI. Comrade Gopalan makes a charge against Comrade Govindan Nair quoting from a book *Reporting India* by Taya Zinkin, wherein she refers to some uncomplimentary remarks made by Govindan Nair against Gopalan.

We have gone through the book and have seen the remark referred to by Comrade Gopalan. We have also seen a similar remark in the same book made by Comrade Gopalan against Prof. Mundasserry.

We do not place credence on either of these statements by this reactionary pro-imperialist scribe. Her book abounds in scurrilous scandals about many leaders of public opinion in India. The pity is that Comrade Gopalan should have chosen to cite this scribe against his own colleague.

VII. Comrade Gopalan in his reply note refers to some reports appearing in the *Link* and some other papers about discussions in the Secretariat and the CEC and says: "It had been this deliberate leaking out of reports to the press that has been responsible for disruption in the Party."

In almost all places which we have visited during the course of our enquiry comrades irrespective of "Right", "Centre" or "Left" views have referred to those leakages and disclosures of inner-Party discussion in the bourgeois press and expressed gravest concern.

There is no denying the fact that these leakages have come to be one of the most disruptive factors in our political and inner-Party life.

Our top leaders cannot escape the responsibility for this state of affairs. Some of them indulge in loose talk, speak about inner-Party affairs to people outside their unit and outside the Party. When an instance comes to light of such careless behaviour, it is not taken up and thrashed out in the unit.

Loose talk, political briefing and casual and anarchic function-

ing of the Party apparatus can all lead to and have in some cases led to, leakages in the bourgeois press, but it would be wrong to conclude that all these leakages can be traced to these sources.

There are other possibilities which require to be examined. The *Link* for example has been publishing, sometimes with meticulous details, accounts of the proceedings of the CEC and the NC. What takes place in the Secretariat also gets published in it occasionally. Of course, the *Link* publishes these reports with its own political bias. But other reports have also been appearing in the *Link* from time to time.

In its issue dated December 5, 1963, the *Link* published details of a closed door meeting in a private residence in Delhi which was attended by a few leaders of the 'Left' point of view.

The *Link* also published details of what took place at the meeting of the EC of the Bengal State Council on March 12, 1964. Most obviously these reports cannot be traced to members holding a particular school of thought in the Secretariat and the Executive.

Not only *Link* but other papers have published such reports. In the *Thought*, a pro-American weekly from Delhi, and in the *Organiser*, organ of the Jan Sangh, have appeared extensive extracts from inner-Party documents circulated only to the members of the CEC and NC. This applies not only to papers in India. The *New York Times* front paged portions from Com. E. M. S. Namboodiripad's document 'Revisionism and Dogmatism inside the CPI' long before it was published by the Party in India.

We mention these facts to stress that a far wider ground has to be covered in locating the exact source of these leakages. It is known that the Intelligence Department of the Central and State Governments in India and the intelligence rings of pro-imperialist agencies operating in India, employ all sorts of people and use all manner of tactics and devices to ferret out inner-Party information. The activities of these agencies underline the necessity that the whole Party be alerted and put on guard against them.

VIII. Comrade Gopalan in his note says: "It is a fact that in the recent period some comrades have been surreptitiously trying to change the political line adopted by the 6th Party Congress at Vijayawada and to bring through the backdoor the same policies which were rejected at Vijayawada."

We are of the definite opinion that organised defiance of the existing leadership and consolidation of the alternative platform constitute the biggest threat to Party unity today. But this does not complete the picture.

Some leaders of the Party and some units claiming to implement the Party line go far beyond the accepted Party decisions in their writings and speeches and take the Party into uncharted directions. Each such instance taken in isolation may appear to be of little consequence but in the totality they have the effect of undermining Party discipline, breeding doubts about the bona fides of the existing leadership and retarding Party unification.

In the period immediately following the NC meeting of November 1962, more than one leader has been reported in the press to have spoken offering 'full and unqualified' support to the policy of the Prime Minister.

This is certainly not a correct statement of the Party's position. As a matter of fact, many steps taken by the government in the name of defence have been opposed by the Party, e.g., CDS, several taxation measures, foreign military missions, indiscriminate use of DIR and so on. The plea that a public speaker cannot weigh and limit his utterances when making a speech does not meet the point. In difficult conditions prevailing in the country, a Party leader explaining Party policy must be all the more careful and exact.

Several comrades have taken objection to some headlines, news items and editorials in the *Swadhinata*, *Visalaandhra*, Tamil *Janasakti*, and the three Malayalam journals *Deshabhimani*, *Janayugam* and *Navayugam* on the ground that in important respects they misrepresent Party positions. In some such headlines and editorials China is depicted as expansionist, land grabber, etc., in others the impression is created that the

Party stands for all out support to the Congress government.

We understand that the Andhra Pradesh and Tamilnad Executive Committees have adopted certain measures to pull up and correct the comrades responsible for the above. In the case of others also adequate check up is called for.

COM. SUNDARAYYA'S SPEECH AT KATUR AND OTHER PLACES

At the CEC meeting on September 13, Com. Rajashekhar, Secretary of the Andhra Pradesh Council, referred to certain speeches made by Com. P. Sundarayya at general body meetings at Katur and other places in Andhra Pradesh. He read out passages from a report of Com. P. Sundarayya's speech at Katur on September 5, 1963, and complained that in that speech Com. P. Sundarayya had, (i) threatened to split the Party; (ii) undermined the authority of the NC, which he held to be an unrepresentative body and whose authority he was not prepared to accept; (iii) and spoke against the line of the Party as laid down in the resolution of the Sixth Party Congress and of the NC from time to time, on the national and international questions.

Com. P. Sundarayya was not present at that meeting of the CEC. At the following meeting of the CEC on October 13, 1963, Com. P. Sundarayya denied the correctness of the report of his speech as had been given by Comrade Rajashekhar. He stated:

It is difficult just now to give a full account of my speech in general bodies of Party members and close sympathisers which lasted for 5-6 hours wherein I explained the differences which continue to exist in the Party and in the international Communist movement for the last several years.

It is a dirty lie to say that I have threatened to split the Party.

The question was taken up at the NC meeting of October 14-19. After hearing Com. Sundarayya and after a discussion

on the subject the NC adopted its resolution which stated inter-alia:

Since two CEC members, namely Coms. Rajeswar Rao and Rajashekhar Reddy affirm that Com. Sundarayya threatened to split the Party and questioned the authority of the NC and denigrated it with arguments, and since Com. P. Sundarayya denies these statements, the Central Control Commission is requested to visit Andhra and find out which of the statements is correct. . . .

The Central Control Commission is requested to investigate further into the question, also bearing in mind the reports of the two speeches mentioned above and also any other speeches whose reports Com. Rajashekhar Reddy and Com. P. Sundarayya might like to file and report to the next meeting of the National Council.

We visited Andhra Pradesh from November 5-7, 1963. As Com. Sundarayya informed us that he would not be available till November 9, we stayed on at Hyderabad till the 11th and postponed our visit to Katur to the 13th. But Com. Sundarayya could not be ready with his version of the Katur speech even by then. We had to go to Katur without his version.

At Katur on November 13 about 15 members of the local Party committee met us. They had all attended the general body meeting and listened to Com. P. Sundarayya's speech.

The Telugu report was prepared by Shastry, Secretary of the Kistna District Committee of the Party, who had attended and taken down notes of the general body meeting at Katur. (It was the English translation of the notes that Com. Rajashekhar had submitted to the CEC meeting.) This report was read out in full to those present. Later on portion by portion of the report was read out to them and they were specifically asked if what was stated was in substance a correct report or not. All of them agreed that the points mentioned in the report were substantially correct except in one particular.

As reported by Shastry, Com. Sundarayya had stated: "You may question me whether it is proper on my part to talk

against the resolutions passed by Party Committees. Why am I defying the basic principles? When you have defied the basic principles and betrayed the cause of Communism then there is no other alternative except to revolt. Up to November 1962 we abided by the majority resolutions but now that majority has relinquished Communism. That is why I could not tolerate this and I am revolting openly. Let them take disciplinary action and expel me from the Communist Party. We shall then set up a new Party. People will then judge which Party is sincere."

The Katur comrades were definite that Com. Sundarayya's speech did not convey this impression to them. He had not said that he would start another Party. In fact, he had said that differences must be discussed amongst the ranks in the Party and taken to the Party Congress; this could not be so if he wanted to split the Party.

A member of the NC also happened to be present in Katur general body meeting. We met him at Hyderabad on the 9th and showed him the report of the speech as given by Com. Shastry. He told us that the report though brief had correctly reported Com. Sundarayya except on one point. This member told us he did not remember Com. Sundarayya having said that he would start another Party.

There is no need for our going through reports of Sundarayya's speeches at other meetings because the Andhra Secretariat members themselves say in their statement to the CEC: "In subsequent general body meetings he has refrained from speaking about starting an alternative Party though he has been repeating all the other points."

It is difficult for anyone listening to five or six hours long speech to remember or note down the exact words used by the speaker on a given point. Com. Anjaneya Shastry when questioned by us maintained that what was stated in the report was actually what Com. Sundarayya had said. But the Katur comrades are categorical that he did not make such a statement. We hold that the charge against Com. Sundarayya

that he threatened to split the Party is not conclusively proved by the speech as reported by Com. Shastry.

The second charge against Com. Sundarayya which we are asked to examine is that he undermined the authority of the NC which he held to be unrepresentative body and whose authority he was not prepared to accept.

Com. Sundarayya sent us his version of the speech after we left Andhra and we received it at Delhi on November 24, 1963. Along with this report he sent a covering letter in which he stated: "I am enclosing the copy of my speech delivered at Katur and other general body meetings... this is broadly a correct version of my speeches in general bodies."

In his prepared speech, referring to the composition of the NC he says:

How is the NC composed? When these differences had not become acute, when we were all working together, to exchange our mutual experiences and develop the movement, we decided to give every provincial unit a minimum of 2-members in NC. That is how Delhi with 450 members got two seats, West Bengal with 18,000 members got only 10 seats, while our state with 23,000 membership got 17 seats. West Bengal with a glorious record of struggles from 1952-62 got 10 seats only. Compare this with our record of practically no large scale mass struggles during this whole period. When we talk of majority and minority, all these factors have to be considered. While on mass problems it is possible to accept majority decisions of the NC, it cannot apply for ideological and fundamental political differences.

Com. Rajashekhar Reddy and C. Rajeswara Rao asked: Will you abide by majority decision. We said: We never dispute that principle. But, when ideological differences are there in the Party such differences cannot be decided in small committees, but only in Party conferences and Party congress. While majority decisions on problems facing people shall be implemented.

The above passages indicate sufficiently the attitude and stand-

point of Com. Sundarayya with respect to the NC and its decisions. It is clear that he does not accept the authority of the NC in respect to decisions which do not suit him.

Com. Sundarayya has chosen his own way and his own convenience as against that laid down in the Party Constitution to take his differences with the NC to the ranks. He says that: "Political-ideological differences cannot be decided in small committees, but only in Party conferences and Party Congresses. While on mass problems it is possible to accept the majority decisions of the NC, it cannot apply for ideological and fundamental political differences."

How mass problems are demarcated from political-ideological questions is not made clear. We have no doubt in our mind that the views expressed by Com. Sundarayya about the NC and the method he has adopted of carrying inner-Party differences to the ranks are thoroughly disruptive of Party organisation.

The third point against Com. Sundarayya is that he has spoken against the line of the Party, as laid down in the resolutions of the Sixth Party Congress and of the NC from time to time on the national and international questions.

Below we are giving a few extracts from the same prepared speech of Com. Sundarayya where he has expressed himself on various national and international questions:

With reference to the attitude of the Party towards the Government Com. Sundarayya says:

We were all agreed both in 1951 and 1956 and at Vijayawada Congress that the Congress Government is a government of landlords and the bourgeoisie led by the bourgeoisie. But again the question is which section of the bourgeoisie is leading the government. According to Comrade Ajoy Ghosh's speech in Palghat and according to the Vijaywada speech it is not only one section of the capitalist class but the class as a whole—big, middle, national and reactionary. In this it is the bourgeoisie, naturally the big bourgeoisie, which is influencing the policies of the Government." (p. I-c)

The Political Resolution adopted at Vijayawada states concerning the Government:

The basic policies of the Nehru government remain as before national bourgeois policies—both in the external and internal sphere.

And in his speech at Vijayawada Comrade Ajoy Ghosh stated (p. 14):

Palghat gave us a new and richer understanding. The dual role of the national bourgeoisie was brought out clearly.... Has that contradiction vanished? Has it subsided? Our answer to this question is 'No, it has not.' It has sharpened. Further as the result of the sharpening of contradictions between imperialism and the entire people, including the national bourgeoisie, our national independence rests today on a firmer economic foundation than before.

Regarding the foreign policy of the present government Com. Sundarayya has stated thus in his report:

A correct characterisation would be our foreign policy is tuned to suit the interests of the Indian ruling class, that is capitalist-landlord government—is one of play between two camps. (p. II)

From 1947-53, it leaned towards imperialist camp. Since 1953 up to 1958, its policy was pro-socialist camp. From 1958 onwards, it leaned towards imperialist camp again. In practice Nehru government kept its class interests in view and changed its foreign policy once in favour of imperialist camp and at another time towards socialist camp. It played between the two camps. (p. 6)

Regarding this question the Vijayawada Political Resolution states:

The whole purpose of these pressures, these slogans and arguments is to bring about a reactionary modification of our foreign policy—a modification which imperialists desire and have been striving for several years.

By and large, these pressures have been resisted.... The interest of nation demand a continuation of the present foreign policy. Nehru, who is the main architect of this policy, has shown no inclination to abandon it. India stands in the camp of peace and anti-colonialism, against war and for disarmament.

These passages from Com. Sundarayya's speech establish the alternative nature of the ideological and political line he has been propagating in his address at the various general body meetings.

Regarding such topics as the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, on Cuba, on the Test Ban Treaty also Com. Sundarayya's formulations are not in line with the stand taken by the Party in its various resolutions and statements.

CONCLUSIONS

Our investigation covered the period from November 1962 to November 1963, and we have given our findings on that basis earlier in the report.

The existence and functioning of an all-India parallel centre and its subsidiaries in the states has been established beyond doubt and some of the comrades actively associated with the parallel centre have been mentioned by name in the course of our report.

These comrades have consciously undermined the authority of the National Council, have grossly violated Party forms and discipline, have deliberately propagated an alternative platform within the Party and outside and they have thrown to the winds all principles of organised and controlled inner-Party discussion. We should have no hesitation in suggesting strong disciplinary measures against them. But developments subsequent to the period of our investigation are so serious and abnormal, that the whole question has to be viewed in a larger context.

Things unheard of in the annals of the Party are taking place within the Party now. Comrades M. Basavapunniah, Ramamurti and Surjeet from Delhi have come out openly in

the bourgeois press against the Chairman of the Party on the basis of a letter alleged to have been written by the Chairman from jail 40 years ago, the genuineness of which has yet to be gone into. Comrades P. Sundarayya and Nagi Reddy from Hyderabad and Muzaffar Ahmad, Promode Dasgupta and H. K. Konar from Calcutta have rushed to the press on the same issue. But without waiting for, or demanding the calling of an urgent meeting of the CEC and the National Council for considering the issue, they have unleashed a most vicious campaign of disruption of the Party and character assassination of the Chairman and the leaders of the Party. In doing so these comrades have flouted all the accepted norms of Party constitution and discipline.

Not only that. The NC at its meeting in October last had decided to convene the Party Congress in October this year and had appointed Commissions to draft reports on the basis of which to hold organised and principled inner-Party discussions. The comrades running the parallel centre have refused to cooperate in the work of these Commissions. On the contrary they have prepared their own draft reports and are organising separate group discussions on those documents in different parts of the country.

The copy of a report prepared by them leaked out in a section of the press, and was later officially released by them to the press correspondents.

In Andhra Pradesh, for the Rajya Sabha election a candidate was put up to oppose the official Party candidate. The rival candidate's name proposed by Com. Sundarayya who is the leader of the Communist Opposition in the Andhra Legislative Assembly. There have been other instances of gross violation of Party forms and discipline during this period.

In the normal course Party members guilty of such conduct deserve to be expelled from the Party. Now that the National Council is meeting in an emergency session to consider the entire conduct of the comrades concerned, we leave it to the National Council to take, after considering the whole question, such firm and necessary decisions as are in conformity with

the integrity and prestige of the Party and which in view of the wide political and ideological issues now arisen, will ultimately lead to restoring the solidarity and the unity of the CPI.

S. V. GHATE, Chairman
HAJRAH BEGUM
P. NARAYANAN NAIR

April 8, 1964

APPENDIX I

EXTRACTS FROM CHINESE DOCUMENTS

On the Border Question:

"Why Does Nehru Refuse to Negotiate?" *People's Daily* Editorial, December 7, 1961: But ever since the end of 1958, particularly after the outbreak of the rebellion in China's Tibet region, the Indian side has acted differently from what it did in the past, provoking one incident after another in a deliberate attempt to aggravate the boundary dispute. . . . Hence it is obvious that the truth about the anti-Chinese campaign in India. . . should not be sought in the boundary question but in the needs of the domestic and foreign policies of India's ruling circles. The current anti-Chinese campaign in India was launched following Nehru's visit to the US. This is no accident either. . . thus it appears that anti-Chinese campaign grows in direct proportion to the amount of US aid. In fact the foreign policy pursued by the Indian ruling clique in recent years has received increasingly open approval and praise from Washington. Events over the past years have shown that the Indian ruling class whips up anti-Chinese campaign whenever it is required by its domestic and foreign policies.

Extracts from World Press Opinion:

The point is. . . why only by the Indian Government is there a threat to unleash war? The answer lies partly in India, but above all in Washington. . . India desperately needs credit, to help advance her economy. While intruding Indian troops are launching massive general attack on Chinese frontier guards in Tibet and Sinkiang, US imperialism has

come out into the open to support and encourage the Indian reactionaries... the US Secretary of State Dean Rusk has assured Nehru's daughter, Indira Gandhi recently of US support for Indian attacks.

More on Nehru's Philosophy:

With any country, a given foreign policy is necessarily the continuation of a given domestic policy. Like its domestic policy the foreign policy of the Nehru government reflects its reactionary class nature... With the changes in India's domestic situation and in the international situation in recent years, Nehru's foreign policy has leaned more markedly towards imperialism... Thus it can be seen that the policy of 'nonalignment' publicised by Nehru has obviously become more and more a facade behind which he is actually carrying out a policy of opposing the national revolutionary movement of various countries, opposing socialism and serving imperialism. After India's proclamation of independence, the Indian circles headed by Nehru inherited and have tried to their best to preserve the bequests of the British colonialist rulers, they have become increasingly brazen in carrying out their chauvinistic and expansionist policy... We must examine the class nature of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords represented by Nehru, whose interests are closely connected with those of the imperialists, we must examine the needs of the Indian reactionary ruling circles, represented by Nehru in domestic and international politics.

Mirror for Revisionists:

In the past twelve months, the revisionist clique headed by Dange have seized the leadership of the Communist Party of India by taking advantage of the large scale campaign launched by the ruling groups of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords against China, against Communism, and against the Indian people. They have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, betrayed the revolutionary cause of the Indian proletariat and the Indian people and embarked on the road of national chauvinism and class capitulation, thus creating complete chaos in the Indian Communist Party... They are defending devotedly the dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords and have cast to the winds the cause of Indian proletariat and the Indian people. They are giving unconditional support to the Nehru government in its policy of hiring itself to US imperialism and have totally abandoned the task of fighting imperialism. They are trampling under foot the friendship of the Chinese and Indian people.

EXTRACTS FROM INDIAN DOCUMENTS

Let the People Ponder: Bengali pamphlet by Satyanweshi.

Fifteen years of Congress rule has resulted in the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, deteriorating economic conditions of the people, increased taxes and prices, unemployment, crisis in medium and small industries. This scared the big bourgeoisie who to divert attention started inter-state and communal troubles. There was large scale infiltration of

foreign capital British and American; the imperialists wanted to safeguard their capital and stem tide of socialism in Asia. Indira Gandhi had high level talks and understanding with Dean Rusk on eve of border clashes.

Long Live Marxism-Leninism: Hindi Circular

This revisionist clique is engaged in imperialist conspiracy of attacking China governed by the great people's revolutionary government which can never be aggressor... This revisionist clique has given up the path of international proletarianism and taken to blind nationalism and betrayed the revolutionary masses and working class. The living example of this is the so-called patriotic resolution of November 1... In the situation of India-China border conflict the big bourgeoisie and the feudal ruling clique had organised a large scale offensive against China, against Communists and against the people.

APPENDIX II

SOME EXTRACTS FROM BENGALI PAMPHLET BY KAUTILLYA

On Border Question

The so-called majority of the central leadership of the CPI at present declared their support to the statement and programme of the ruling circles of India and have abused Chinese Communist Party and Government as "aggressors", "expansionists", "party of defection from Marxism" etc. But what is to be noted is that the main slogan of the "bourgeoisie" is nationalism. That is the basis of their appeal to the people. The official leadership of the Communist Party has tried to strengthen this appeal. As a result the working class has been faced with a confusing situation, because the basis of class politics is internationalism. The revolutionary tactics and strategy of the working class at every stage in the national revolution is to unite with revolutionary allies and friendly classes, while maintaining international working class unity and unity of international communism. When the working class party deviates from this, they become tails of the bourgeoisie and become victims of bourgeois nationalism.

The Indian Government and Its Economic Policy

The government formed through the transfer of power is a government led by the big bourgeoisie. Actually the public sector is a clever ingenious tactics for exploiting the people. Nationalism serves the interests of the capitalists and it is not a step towards socialist arrangement or socialism. Through nationalisation, powerful bourgeois circles can increase the state exchequer and get the opportunity to utilise it for their interests through state budget and exchange. Moreover nationalisation is carried out to help distressed bourgeoisie. Nationalisation of industries in a bourgeois

state took place in different times in history. Such nationalisation strengthens bourgeois state power which is used to destroy the strength of the revolutionary masses and their organisation.

Criticism of Party Policy

It really means that on the whole support was given both to the economic and political policies of the government. Along with this, attack was against other reactionary forces and emphasis was laid on attempts at moving the policy of the government to a more progressive direction beneficial to the people. And the Party landed itself into the position of choosing the Kerala way as its aim and of accepting the policy of attaining power through elections. Constitution of the Party was made electionwise. Programme of class struggle was really given up. The Party actually became transformed into a left parliamentary party. The policy of social democracy thus formally made its appearance at Amritsar. The Vijayawada conference surreptitiously brought into the Party the policy of the National Government pursued by the British Labour Party... Vijayawada Congress thus led the Party to the position of a tail behind the bourgeoisie. The National Council Resolution in February 1963 reminds us of the Menshevik resolution on the eve of October revolution. As a consequence of the Vijayawada Congress, the policy of militant nationalism was eschewed by the Party and it thus became transformed into a (bourgeois) nationalist Party. It also succeeded in isolating the Party from the working people. All types of ideologies found their way inside the Party at that time. This is the logical culmination of the policy pursued by the Party during the last few years. Starting from Madurai, the policy gradually shifted towards Right opportunism until at Vijayawada it abandons internationalism and takes up national chauvinism. The National Council resolution destroyed the Marxist basis of the Party. The attitude of the Party in respect of mass movement has been: To keep movement isolated and not to broaden it. To start struggle spontaneously at one place and then leaving it alone, without solidarity movement. To give less emphasis on class basis of movement. To try to finish all movement by 'march to assemblies' and end by courting arrest and individual satyagraha. To give up attitude of struggle for the working class and take up attitude of cooperation with capitalists and the government in matters like production increase etc.

Future Tasks:

The main aim of the party at present is to build a democratic front. In general the basis is laid down for the front in 1951 programme. The democratic front should be a joint front of workers, peasants, working intellectuals, middle class and national bourgeoisie. To rectify Party organisation it is necessary not to give leading positions or positions of responsibility to revisionists. To arrange for removal of persons in responsible positions who had been systematically pursuing a revisionist policy. To change the editorial board or start a new Party paper. To start weekly or fortnightly papers and initiate ideological discussion. Main

necessity at present is to build the Party on a new foundation after liquidating revisionism completely from it and to recast the entire Party which cannot serve the present purpose, specially as the revisionists are controlling higher organs of the Party, it has become a serious obstacle to the dissemination of new ideas and new consciousness. Fundamental changes are absolutely necessary. Old policy has to be completely changed and the Party organised on the basis of a clear-cut policy. This will not be possible by any opportunist method. Any attempt to proceed by compromising with revisionists will help counter-revolutionaries and the Party will fail to give the leadership to the people in future. It is necessary to have revolutionary programme and its complementary organisation and a revolutionary leadership. There has always been a trend of political opportunism which in the name of middle course takes shelter inside the Party. People with that outlook are political supporters of revisionists and on issues like the role of Nehru, character of the Government and government plans are either supporters or very near the Dange group's outlook. But they are opposed to the Dange group on organisational issues. Such leaders or persons will cleverly resist the new changes and will create various kinds of illusions. This must clearly be understood that it is not possible to solve the political problem of the Party by patch work or in a factional manner or by opportunist unity of different factions. The time has come to build up a new organisation and a new leadership with a clear and a Bolshevik outlook, with revolutionary Marxism as the ideal.

EXTRACTS FROM THE DRAFT RESOLUTION BY PRITHVIRAJ

On India-China Conflict

The majority of the National Council of the CPI under the leadership of Comrade Dange completely surrendered to militant nationalism and gave full support to every step taken by the government of India. Not only did they not try to find the correct path from proletarian viewpoint by reviewing the whole situation on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, they did not even make the slightest attempt to differentiate themselves from the leaders of monopoly capital.

Cooperation with imperialism and internal reaction is the inevitable outcome of the class character of monopoly capitalists. The impression that this situation has been created by the Chinese adventurism is to confuse effect for the cause.

Character of the Indian Government

The policy of the Indian government is a reflection of the class character of Nehru. The present government cannot be considered as representative of the entire bourgeois class.

The Indian government is a dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords. The policy pursued by the Indian government only fulfils the interests of the monopoly capitalists and the rajas and maharajas. The interests of the small and medium capitalists are also sacrificed. Growth of monopoly capital is the main outstanding feature of the post-independent

period. State sector instead of being used to curb the power of the monopolists in the interests of the people, is used to in the interests of the monopolists against the people.

Future Tasks

Although the present phase of our struggle is anti-imperialist anti-feudal, the main resistance will come from the monopolist bourgeoisie because they have the state power in their hands... It is not possible to carry on anti-feudal, anti-imperialist struggles through this government. This task can be fulfilled by a People's Democratic Government, established after liquidating the present government and removal of the dictatorship of big bourgeoisie and landlords and capture power under the leadership of the proletariat... The entire national bourgeoisie including the monopolists will not be inside the anti-imperialist front.

APPENDIX

Statement of the 32 Members of the National Council Who Walked Out on April 11, 1964

We, the members of the National Council who walked out of the meeting on April 11, have been exchanging our views on how to carry forward the struggle against the anti-Party factional activities being carried on by the Secretariat headed by S. A. Dange.

This exchange of views revealed the fact that we are united not only against the factionalism and anti-Party organisational methods resorted to by them, but also against their political line of tailing behind the bourgeoisie through general united front with the Congress.

It may be mentioned in this connection that three years ago, at the Sixth Congress held at Vijayawada, the line of Congress-Communist unity as the general political tactical line of the Party was advanced.

This, however, was stoutly opposed by the Congress in the resolution which was finally adopted. The comrades who had championed that nakedly reformist political line had to accept defeat at the Congress.

They, however, tried to push that line in their practical activities even after the Party Congress.

The crisis which arose in the country in October-November 1962, the declaration of Emergency and the arrests of a large number of comrades became a God-send for the champions of this line of class-collaboration who, under the new circumstances, got a majority in the National Council.

They used this opportunity to launch a political and organisational offensive against those who resisted the reformist line of Congress-Communist unity.

This, naturally, roused the indignation of ordinary Party members. Larger and larger numbers of them began to express their protest against it.

But, far from seeing the gap that was forming between the mass of Party members and themselves, the leaders of the National Council and their supporters at lower levels began to use the weapon of disciplinary measures against those who protested against their activities.

Furthermore, they adopted the most reprehensible tactics of denouncing those who opposed the reformist line of general united front with the Congress as followers of the Peking line, thus joining the chorus of rabid anti-Communism.

It was as a part of this tactics that they raised the bogey of "anti-Party groups" functioning at various levels and disrupting the unity of the Party.

We have been trying to put a stop to this. We, of course, had our own differences concerning the estimation of the economic and political situation in the country as well as in our approach to the problem of how to offer resistance to the reformist politics and factional organisational methods of the Secretariat headed by Dange.

Despite these differences, however, we were united in our understanding that the inner-Party problem posed under the circumstances can be solved only through an appeal to the Party membership as a whole, culminating in the convening of a Party Congress.

We, therefore, made several proposals for the organisation of inner-Party discussion, for the creation of the necessary conditions in which a Party Congress can be convened and for the postponement of all other inner-Party organisational questions till the Congress is convened and takes appropriate decisions.

The Secretariat and the majority of the National Council however refused to help this process. They, on the other hand, insisted on so using their majority in the National Council and in various State Councils to prevent the expression of the *genuine* will of the majority of the Party members.

They refused to have an agreed method of scrutinising the membership with the result that a large number of members have been denied their right of participation in pre-Congress discussions and in the conferences which would culminate in the Party Congress.

Above all, they started the process of taking disciplinary actions against some of the most effective opponents of their line with a view to prevent them from participating in the pre-Congress discussions and from getting elected as delegates to the Congress.

The proposal of expulsion of seven members of the Central Executive Committee which they broadcast to the press even before the National Council had met was only the culmination of these efforts and at preventing the convening of a genuine Party Congress.

This had been preceded by disbanding the elected West Bengal Council and imposing an illegal Provincial Organising Committee; by holding an illegal conference in Punjab and replacing the properly elected leadership; by expulsions and other forms of disciplinary action against several Party members, including members of the National Council and Central Executive Committee in Tamilnad and Punjab and threats of similar action in several other provinces.

As a matter of fact, the period that intervened between the public censure administered to Comrade A. K. Gopalan in October last and the proposed expulsion of seven CEC members at the recent meeting of the National Council, witnessed a spate of disciplinary actions all over the country.

It is also no secret that the entire machinery at the disposal of Dange's followers has been kept ready for large scale expulsions after the National Council meeting.

It was against this background that the existence of the incriminating letter, alleged to have been written by Dange in 1924 was publicly revealed in the columns of the *Current*. This too was used by the Secretariat in order to carry on a campaign against those in the Party who oppose their political-organisational line.

The members of the Secretariat, even without visiting the Archives, declared the letters as 'forged' and even joined the *Current* in its assertion that it was the "Left" in the Communist Party that had helped in the revelation of the story.

When this attack on them was answered by some leaders of the CPI by a public statement that according to them the letters are genuine, the Secretariat went to the extent of calling them "neo-Trotskyites" and "splitters."

The responsibility for initiating the public controversy around the Dange letters therefore rests squarely on the Secretariat.

A review of this whole controversy would show to any impartial observer that the Secretariat and its supporters have become so factional that they are prepared to renounce every norm enjoined upon the Communist Party. For, the existence of the letters in the National Archives is not in dispute. The only basis on which it had been declared "forged" is the assertion of Dange.

Under these circumstances, the normal practice in the Communist Party would demand of its leadership that Dange is removed from all responsible posts pending the enquiry. However, considering the present inner-Party situation we suggested that he should first be asked to vacate the chair when the two leading bodies of the Party—the CEC and the National Council—consider the question.

Even this was stoutly resisted by Dange and his followers. It is obvious that they are prepared to renounce all principles if their observance weakens their faction. It was against this that we protested when we walked out.

Having reviewed the situation for two days, we have now come to the unanimous conclusion that our struggle against this factional approach of the followers of Dange is an integral part of our struggle against their anti-Party factional method of preparing for and convening the Party Congress as well as against the reformist political line.

Our call to the majority of the Party members and units to repudiate Dange and his group is therefore a call to repudiate

the reformist political line of general united front with the Congress, to repudiate the line of factional preparation for a fake Party Congress, to repudiate their efforts at white-washing the suspicious conduct of Dange in relation to his alleged letters whose existence in the National Archives is not in dispute.

We do have our differences among ourselves.

Even among the comrades of the "Left", who met here from the 2nd to the 9th April, there are differences on ideological questions. They however are united on the draft programme which they have provisionally accepted.

Comrade E. M. S. Namboodiripad who did not participate in these meetings and who had written his own document covering the ideological and political questions, differs on certain questions of the draft programme.

Despite these differences, however, we are all agreed on the necessity to resist the reformist political line, the anti-Party factional organisational methods and the shameless effort to whitewash Dange's alleged conduct in having offered his services to the British.

We are conscious that unity on this alone would not be a sufficient basis for real unity of will and action. We therefore propose to have further exchange of views on the ideological and political questions that divide us. We propose to associate the entire Party membership in these discussions.

With this idea in view, we have decided to circulate among Party members and sympathisers the following documents: (i) The Draft Programme which was provisionally accepted by the meeting of the "Left" comrades; (ii) Comrade EMS's Draft on the Party Programme; (iii) the Draft on ideological questions prepared by Comrade M. Basavapunniah and others; (iv) another draft on the above prepared by Comrade Jyoti Basu and others.

We may subsequently circulate EMS's critique on the first as well as the critique of Comrade EMS's draft by the other comrades.

We are confident that these discussions and the active political and mass work we propose to carry on jointly will

enable us to rally the large mass of Party members and sympathisers not only in offering effective resistance to the policies and practices of Dange and his followers, but also to make the necessary political and organisational preparations for convening the Seventh Congress of the Party.

We however want to add that, if even at this stage the Dange group renounces its anti-Party organisational methods and creates, in consultation with us, the machinery that ensures full and unfettered inner-Party discussions and representation to all genuine members, we would be prepared to give our support and cooperation for its success.

It is obvious that if they are honest about the unity of the Party about which they talk so loud when resorting to disciplinary actions, they would have to recognise that, divided as the Party is from top to bottom, the success of a Party Congress depends on agreement between the various sections in the National Council on at least the machinery which will conduct inner-Party discussions and prepare for the Party Congress. It was their resistance to this reasonable stand of ours that led to this crisis.

We therefore appeal to all those comrades in the National Council and outside, who are pained at the developments which took place at the recent meeting of the National Council, to put their weight in favour of the following proposals which we are making:

1. The enquiry regarding the Dange letters should be conducted through a machinery created by agreement between them and us.

We would like to take this opportunity to repudiate the charge made by Dange that any of us is opposed to examination by experts. We are of opinion that the enquiry should be thorough, it should be conducted by a body which certainly utilises the services of experts but which consists of persons who are competent of examination of all aspects of the case. We also insist that the personnel of the enquiry body and the methods of the enquiry should not be dictated by Dange

and his followers but acceptable to all sections in the National Council.

2. The question of the so-called "disruptive and splitting activities" should be dealt with more comprehensively and in a thorough manner.

The Dange group should realise that they are very much in the dock. This being so, all disciplinary actions arising out of the so-called "disruptive and splitting activities" should be held over till the inner-Party discussion which culminates in the Party Congress is over. All disciplinary actions taken on this count during the last year and a half should be immediately cancelled.

3. Arrangements should be made for a fresh scrutiny of Party membership in those cases where disputes have arisen in relation to it. And all those members who were in the lists at the time of Vijayawada Party Congress should be allowed to renew their membership.

4. A commission with agreed personnel should be appointed to examine the documents that have already been prepared by us and the documents that may be prepared by other comrades and to decide whether any of them can form the basis of inner-Party discussion, and, if not, how one document or more documents can be prepared for the same.

It is also obvious that, if the above steps are to be taken, then the method of functioning the Party Centre, running the Party organs, etc., will have to be reviewed and necessary changes made in them.

In making the above proposals, we have not much hope that the Secretariat and its followers would accept them. Their whole conduct during the last year-and-a-half has shown that they would stoop to anything in their resistance to the observance of democratic practices in the functioning of the Party.

We are nevertheless offering the above proposals with the hope that those who are earnest about the unity of the Party would ponder over them and force the Secretariat and its followers to accept them. We are sure that all those who are

genuinely interested in the unity of the Party would agree with us that only through the acceptance and implementation of the above proposals can the inner-Party democracy be assured and split in the Party averted.

While thus appealing to all sincere advocates of Party unity to force the Secretariat and its supporters to reverse their present policies and practices, we wish to declare that, if the Secretariat and its supporters persist in their attitude, we will have to appeal to the entire Party membership to join us in convening the Seventh Congress which will be a Congress of struggle against reformism, factionalism and renunciation of revolutionary traditions, which are the characteristics of S. A. Dange and his group.

We have decided to organise an inner-Party and mass campaign on the above lines. We have decided that we will convene a meeting of the representatives of Party members from all over India after two months in order to review our activities during this period and to chalk out further programmes.

We are confident that increasingly vast masses of Party members lend their support to us in these endeavours and thus contribute to the emergence of a still stronger Communist Party of India, which has been built up by great sacrifices of innumerable martyrs and glorious struggles of our people and uphold the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. P. SUNDARAYYA | 12. E. K. NAYANAR |
| 2. M. BASAVAPUNNIAH | 13. V. S. ACHUTHANANDAN |
| 3. T. NAGI REDDY | 14. E. K. IMBICHABA |
| 4. M. HANUMANTHA RAO | 15. PROMODE DASGUPTA |
| 5. VENKATESWARA RAO | 16. MUZAFFAR AHMAD |
| 6. N. PRASADA RAO | 17. JYOTI BASU |
| 7. G. BAPANAYYA | 18. ABDUL HALIM |
| 8. E.M.S. NAMBOODIRIPAD | 19. H. K. KONAR |
| 9. A. K. GOPALAN | 20. SAROJ MUKERJEE |
| 10. A. V. KUNHAMBU | 21. P. RAMAMURTI |
| 11. C. H. KANARAN | 22. M. R. VENKATARAMAN |

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| 23. N. SANKARIAH | 28. BHAG SINGH |
| 24. K. RAMANI | 29. SHEO KUMAR MISRA |
| 25. H. S. SURJEET | 30. R. N. UPADHYAYA |
| 26. JAGJIT SINGH LYALPURI | 31. MOHAN PUNAMIYA |
| 27. D. S. TAPIALA | 32. R. P. SARAFF. |