

The History of the CPI (ML) from 1969-1972- An Evaluation

- KANU SANYAL

Before entering into any discussion on the topic-‘Evaluation of the history of the CPI (ML) from 1969-1972’, a few words regarding its perspective are needed.

The topic is one of the four major differences that cropped up at the co-ordination stage of Unity talks between two erstwhile organizations CPI (ML) and CPI (ML) Red Flag.

The co-ordination committee noted down the differences and after a protracted discussion arrived at the unanimous decision to resolve these differences through democratic process.

And the two CR groups made the bold decision to merge into a single party CPI (ML) even with these major differences- to carry forward the task of unity of CRs with whom unity is possible.

Accordingly Unity Conference at Vijayawada was held in January 2005-and the conference took the decision to resolve these differences through inner party debate based on democratic centralism within a specific period of time. **Here it is to be made clear that the Unity Conference adopted the name CPI (ML) for the unified party but rejected in its entirety the politics and ideology of the CPI (ML) formed in 1969- a party that was communist in name but anarchist and terrorist in practice.**

The Unity Conference in Vijayawada was a unique one as it stepped forward with courage to sort out the areas of differences and find out ways and means to unite the CR forces into a single party.

In the process the central committee as per decision of the Unity Conference has taken up for discussion some basic differing views related to our evaluation of the history of the CPI (ML) from 1969-1972 through our inner party organ ‘The Guide’.

Needless to say, it is a very arduous and complicated task. It requires time and patience for serious study of immense materials. Moreover, we must not forget that



our party is a continuation of the past communist movement—specially communist movement of our country has already covered a long period of time since 1921. It has a glorious past of struggles crimsoned with the blood of martyrs and it also encountered many twists and turns. In this context it is to be remembered that already two history books are before us, one written by CPI and the other by CPI (M). It should be read carefully, critically and analytically. There are lot of controversies on a number of issues faced by Indian revolution. Com. D.V.Rao also wrote a precious document on Telengana agrarian revolution. These aspects of history can not be ignored.

True, our conference limited the scope and time for evaluation from 1969 to 1972. In spite of this fact, we can not avoid the background reality of the problem, it should be borne in mind that the then historical development and contemporary aspects of history are inter-related to many facts of which some are in documented forms and others are not—particularly the period beginning with Naxalbari Movement in 1967 to the formation of CPI (ML) in 1969.

In this perspective, if we want to do justice to our debate we can not but touch upon the historical background of the period covering up CPI-CPI (M) and Naxalbari Struggle.

After the defeat of Nazism and Japanese militarism, country witnessed, several mass struggles and upsurges against British imperialism for full independence of our country. There were many issues including the conspiracies of the British imperialist involving freedom movement. And the Indian political situation became very critical. But imperialism could come to a compromise with the Congress, the party of comprador bourgeois and landlord class and with the Muslim league. And India was partitioned and transfer of power took place. It was a result of compromise between imperialism and Indian ruling classes.

The then Communist Party leadership proved their bankruptcy in the matter of intervention in national affairs is beyond doubt. They proved themselves as arch revisionist and reformist. They consciously avoided to understand (a) anti-imperialist stage of the struggle for full independence of the country. (b) attitude and the role of the big comprador and landlord class, the mainstay of imperialism, (c) the nationality questions and religion, (d) the importance and necessity of building up proletarian leadership of the Communist party, (e) caste problem in India and importance of the peasant questions, agrarian revolution and the state power. These issues were never resolved in the party and as a result the party drowned itself in the morass of revisionism and practiced reformism and total opportunism. As a result the party was engulfed in utter confusion, and chaos, and finally the party was forced to take the decision to break with revisionist politics in

the last part of 1947 and decided to hold its 2nd Congress in 1948. The 2nd Congress of the party in Calcutta adopted the programme of People's Democratic Revolution with agrarian revolution as its axis. But seeds of differences on the question of the stage of the revolution persisted inside the party. Com. B.T.Ranadive leadership could deviate the party from People's Democratic Revolution to Socialist Revolution. The situation inside the party during this period was contradictory and complex.

The central committee was deviating to the stage of socialist revolution while in the south the anti feudal struggle against Nizam reached the phase of agrarian revolution in the Telangana region under the leadership of the party in the South. The leadership in the South gave correct orientation about the stage of the revolution as People's Democratic and raised the correct slogan of agrarian revolution. But the then general secretary B.T.Ranadive leadership in the party vehemently opposed the line and even vilely attacked the Chinese Party as petty bourgeois. But the struggle in Telangana region was advancing and reached a crucial phase confronting the military intervention by the Indian Government in 1948-49. It should be remembered that this was the first correct application of Mao Tse Tung thought in the Indian context. It can be presumed what a peculiar and cumbrous situation persisted inside the party during that period. On the one hand the then CC under the leadership of B.T.Ranadive gave the slogan of Socialist Revolution and on the other hand agrarian revolution in the people's democratic stage was being practised in the Telangana region. Due to the wrong slogan of socialist revolution and along with its utter left adventurist course of actions the party faced immense loss of cadres and the organisation was thrown into total chaos and disarray. The party deviated once again. It is in the knowledge of the party members that due to the intervention by the Cominform through its Organ – 'For a lasting peace for peoples' 'Democracy' the ultra left adventurist policies of the party could be checked and halted.

Thus while debating the party history it should be kept in mind that neither the CPI (ML) formed in 1969 was the forerunner of the armed agrarian struggle in the Indian context nor it was the first application of Mao Tse Tung Thought. Such a wrong conception is still persisting among the communist revolutionary ranks.

The impact of these disastrous and erroneous policies of the B.T. Ranadive period could not be erased. Hundreds of brilliant cadres left the party and the correct path followed by the Telangana leadership was so easily forgotten. This could happen due to ignorance about Marxist theory as well practice on all India level. The leaders led glorious struggles in general but they cared less and less about Marxist theory barring the comrades of South. Lack of understanding of Marxism, petty bourgeois character of the party, absence of creating proletarian leadership in the party and

monolithic understanding of the organisation became a hurdle to carry on the inner party debate through to the end. Here it should also be remembered another important factor in the Indian context that the comrades could not rebel at that period due to the existence of single International Communist movement.

The aftermath is much more confusing. A delegation of four was sent to Moscow and after their return a Programme and a Statement of policy were issued before the party. But the rank and file were kept in the dark about the talks in Moscow. Despite its weaknesses the new Party Programme, clearly stated the stage of the Indian revolution as People's Democratic with agrarian revolution as its axis. But this newly adopted programme was never put to practice. On the contrary, taking cue from the 'Statement of Policy', the Telangana Struggle was withdrawn and arms were surrendered. This shows that the then party Leadership perhaps came to an understanding with the ruling class. Subsequently party declared its participation in election in 1952. Thus the party deviated from the strategic concept of agrarian revolution to the strategic concept of parliamentary path. It was never debated inside the party whether participation in election is tactical or a strategic understanding. During this period, the victory of Chinese Revolution in 1949 brought about changes in International situations, awakening in national liberation movements and newer world relations. The party leadership on the plea of changed situation kept the Programme under suspension. Thereafter the party never adopted any new programme and the party was run on the basis of political resolutions and this continued till 1964.

The decades of fifties and sixties were very crucial in the lives of Communists both Internationally and nationally. After the demise of Com. Stalin there took place some significant developments in International Communist movement—such as the 22nd Congress of CPSU de-Stalinisation and 12 parties document of 1957.

In the context, three peace policies on behalf of the CPSU i.e., peaceful co-existence, peaceful competition and peaceful transformation and 81 parties document of 1960 evoked serious debate and brought about split in the International Communist movement on the question of the attitude towards imperialism and world peace and national liberation struggles. The 14th June' 63 letter by the Chinese Communist Party and July letter of CPSU concerning war and world peace and national liberation struggle and subsequent raising of voices against revisionism by the Albanian Party of Labour and support from the Rumanian Communist Party virtually put an end to the united International Communist movement. And the International Communist movement split into two camps viz. one led by CPSU and the other led by CPC, Albania & others.

In this environment of International Communist Movement majority of the party members of our country became part and parcel of this ideological debate and took positions against revisionism peddled by CPSU. So it becomes clear that the period between 1950s and 1960s onwards were crucial and in fact the party was at cross roads. The question of People's democratic stage of revolution with agrarian revolution as its axis, the attitude towards Big (Comprador) bourgeoisie and landlord class, attitude towards parliamentary election and above all proletarian leadership of the party—all these were burning political issues and it demanded immediate resolve. The party was virtually divided into two factions viz. National Front and Democratic Front. Just at this period, India-China Border dispute which started in 1959 was turned into Border Clash in 1962. It complicated the whole situation. Who is the aggressor, whether a Socialist country can invade other countries—all these issues were debated inside the party and it acted like a catalyst to carry on the debate and aggravated the situation inside the party including party relationship. Over and above, the Indian Government made the situation more tense by fomenting ultra national chauvinism and a situation of anti-China hysteria was created. Although the party was united outwardly but in reality it was vertically divided into two warring camps pro-China, pro-Soviet and pro-Govt. Thousands of comrades were thrown into prisons dubbing them as anti-nationals. It can be emphatically stressed that, had there been no India-China Border clash and had there been no International dispute even then the party would have faced danger of division. This was the situation when all the political issues were debated inside the party freely and openly. The comrades inside the prison and the comrades outside were divided. Mainly the party was divided on four political lines. Some wanted to carry anti-revisionist struggle but were not ready to fall in line with China on certain ideological issues. Some wanted to carry on anti-revisionist struggle but were against split. Some were apprehensive of anti-revisionist struggle and some were in favour of fully supporting the Chinese line. In this period a document was surreptitiously circulated under the name 'Prithviraj' in (WB) but failed to cut much ice, likewise, it is worthwhile to mention an incident inside the Dum Dum Central Jail where most of the central and state committee members from West Bengal and some important comrades from Calcutta and other districts along with many MLAs were lodged. The highest Committee inside the jail was in a meeting discussing political situation where Com. Charu Mazumdar was present. In this meeting Com. CM proposed that the Chinese Revolution Day on 1st October should be observed inside the jail. It was opposed by all other Comrades, stating uncongenial situation politically. But unrelenting Com. CM walked out of the meeting saying "I am the

member of the CPC of West Bengal Unit”, He even expressed that along with the Darjeeling District Comrades he would observe the same.

Late Com. Pramode Dasgupta raised this issue before the Darjeeling comrades in jail and they did not fall in line with Com. CM. Why is it mentioned here? We are debating the history of CPI (ML) and all the tit bits should be placed before the comrades. The comrades of CPI (ML) know it very well that a slogan was raised by the then CPI (ML) “China’s Chairman is our Chairman.”– Which reverberated throughout the country. Comrades should also know that Com. CM’s utterances inside the jail were the precursors of that slogan. By now, it might have been clear the fussiness and anti-Marxist nature of the slogan.

Another issue arose when announcement of bye-elections at Burdwan and Siliguri in 1963 was made. CM was chosen as the candidate for Siliguri constituency and was entrusted to mobilize and organise revolutionary section opposing CPI’s pro-revisionist and pro govt. policy. He was also told not to keep any contact with CPI and if necessary contest as an independent candidate by rejecting CPI’s symbol. But it was not followed. It is mentioned only to understand the oscillation of Com. CM in taking political decision in that period.

During this perverse situation Dange letter was circulated among the rank and file to mobilize comrades around the then left Party leadership. Simultaneously another move was taken to mobilize the rank emotionally through celebrating the birthday of late Com Muzaffar Ahmed for consolidation of the ranks around left leaders. In this situation a letter was written by Com Basavapunniah asking not to take any hasty step inside the jails. The contents of the letter was never known to the ranks. The leadership came out of jail and started a move for Unity of CPI but failed. A conclave was organized in Tenali by 32 National Council members of CPI where important Comrades of different states also participated which declared formation of a separate organisation. Later on, the 7th Congress was organized in 64 and CPI (M) was formed.

The neo-revisionist leadership as usual played tricks over the rank and gave a good bye to anti imperialist and anti-feudal struggle. They peddled the People’s Democratic Stage of the revolution but agrarian revolution was replaced by fighting for a government through election within the present socio-economic condition of the country. The task of executing the programme for agrarian revolution was in effect given a goodbye. The Dange letter was purposefully circulated among the rank with a view to rousing up passion against the revisionists to distract the attention of Comrades from the ideological and political issues. During the 7th State Conference of West Bengal the Comrades were warned against the impending government attack on the comrades and an atmosphere of suspense was created

projecting the newly formed CPI (M) as a revolutionary party. The political issues were hotly debated in W. Bengal. In spite of the issues like our stand in respect of International Communist Movement, nature and character of the Indian Society and the question of State power and the Parliamentary path over agrarian revolution– all these remained un-resolved. Soon after the 7th State Conference, the Congress Govt. of West Bengal started offensive and many comrades were thrown into prison. During this period Com. CM was suffering from heart ailment, even then he was arrested but was released on medical advice.

Most of the Comrades assembled under the umbrella of CPI (M) and the debate went on unabated. The CPI (M) leadership consciously manipulated the whole organisation in such a way that a good number of comrades were hoodwinked. In the absence of centralized initiative several Marxist-Leninist groups like Dakshin Desh, Chinta (Thought) etc were carrying on ideological and political struggle in and outside the organisation. Taking advantage of India-Pakistan war of 1965 the ruling class started fresh arrest of the party members as they raised their voices against war and campaigned for peace throughout the country. In West Bengal majority of the district committee members were inside the jail and intense debate was continuing centering around the attitude towards Indo-Pak War and visit of some CC members to Moscow on the plea of medical attention etc. In this period even in the absence of party leadership, the food movement took a very militant path throughout W. Bengal. The leaders were released from jail and they tried to de-channelise the militant movement through peace march. So prior to Naxalbari struggle, the entire period was surcharged with political battles and mass movements. It is all the more necessary to go into details about the affairs of Darjeeling district.

CPI (M) AND NAXALABARI STRUGGLE

It would not be out of context to refer that Com. CM was lying in his sick bed due to heart ailments and he was unable to attend the 7th West Bengal Conference and Party Congress. But the important Comrades of the Darjeeling district used to exchange views with him because of their respect for him as he was the senior most comrade in Siliguri and was also associated with Tebhaga movement in Jalpaiguri district. After the arrest of some Comrades of Darjeeling District in the last part of 1964 and others in 1965, they were all lodged in Berhampur Central Jail. It was during this period some news came out in the newspaper about call of armed struggle given by Com. CM. Naturally there was commotion inside and outside the party. The State Committee issued statement condemning it as anti-party. The said documents were smuggled inside the jail and discussed by the Darjeeling Comrades. After their release from jail the Darjeeling comrades specially the District

Committee members from Siliguri held discussion with Com. CM. **The main points of discussion were (a) CPI (M) is a revisionist Party and unmasking them is the main political task (b) the path of the Indian revolution is along the path of China and the immediate task is to start armed struggle (c) to build up secret combat group is the immediate task (d) Combat group will set fire to the houses of the landlords and eliminate the landlords physically (e) collection of guns is another immediate task (f) action mobilizes the masses and not the political propaganda (g) no necessity of mass organization and mass struggles and (h) area wise seizure of political power. These issues were debated strongly. There were agreement on the question of path i.e. armed struggle but disagreement on combat group as imminent or immediate task, and indispensability of mass organization and mass struggles. Political work and actions are not opposed to each other. On the contrary actions will be meaningless if politics is not at command. The political work is the necessary condition for preparation for an armed struggle. Com. CM dis-agreed but it was decided that revisionism is to be fought unitedly. It was also agreed to work separately and learn from practice. It was also decided that Comrades who upheld mass revolutionary line would practise in Siliguri Terai region. And the comrades who upheld the line of action oriented secret combat group negating massline would practice at Chathat area.**

It is worthwhile to mention that during this period a sudden strike took place by the Rly workers in Siliguri on the issue of suspension of some Rly. Workers. Com. CM raised the issue of annihilation of Rly. Manager but the workers disagreed. Because of vigorous impact of the strike the Rly. Authority was compelled to withdraw the suspension notice.

In view of intense and continued debate a convention was organized on May 7, 1967 at village Rambola Jote under Kharibari P.S. Workers-peasants most of whom were rural based party members of Siliguri Sub-division and Darjeeling Hill comrades along with Shadow District Committee members like Jangal Santhal, Souren Bose, Budhdhiman Bantewa, Deepak Biswas, Khokan Majumdar, Keshab Sarkar were present. There was more than 10/14 hrs. of debate and the convention clearly clinched the issue in favour of Massline against the politics of Individual Terror Strategy through voting. **This convention was the harbinger of Naxalbari struggle and from this convention the slogan of capture of land was raised. Along with it 4 other slogans including the slogan of defending the captured land with conventional weapons were given.** Details are in Terai Report. Late Com. Deepak wrote another report captioned as "Lessons of Naxalbari" but it was never circulated and was simply ignored by the district comrades.

Before the identification of Naxalbari struggle as the path of agrarian revolution and especially before the occurrence of 24th May and 25th May incidents 1967– there were innumerable class struggles in the district. These class struggles taught the comrades of Darjeeling district that mass revolutionary struggles would not be possible without fighting neo-revisionism of CPI (M) leadership. The comrades also learnt that without fighting left adventurism mass revolutionary struggles would not succeed. They learnt this from their political and ideological struggles and mass practice.

One more incident concerning Trade Union Front can be cited as an example of the majority of the party members were carrying on anti-revisionist struggle in the Trade Union front. In view of the impending conference of Darjeeling Zila (dist) Chia Kaman Mazdur Union at Chongtong Tea Estate a G.B. meeting of the party members of Hills was held at Com. CM house. It was decided in the G.B. meeting that all the office bearers posts were to be contested to bring the Union under our control.

But Com. CM changed the said decision unilaterally and he sent information to comrades not to waste time for this. As a result the comrades lost their control over the biggest mass organization. There was great influence of the union on the Hills during Naxalbari struggle. But due to loss of control on the Union our comrades were isolated by the revisionists. This was the living experience of the party members of the Hill area. These facts clearly showed that prior to Naxalbari struggle there was intense ideological and political struggle between massline and politics of individual action.

Even after 38 years, there are misgivings and misconceptions among the comrades about the political line of Com. CM. Many comrades think that the political line advocated by Com. CM was adopted after the formation of CPI (ML). But the fact was that Com. CM had been advocating his political line through eight documents since 1965 through to the end. **Com. CM used to say that mass organisation and mass movements were revisionism and armed struggle in words were also revisionist outlook. Com. CM's political line was area wise seizure of power by forming squads (secret, conspiratorial and action oriented) was to be adopted as the immediate political task.**

Another important aspect of the Naxalbari struggle should be mentioned. It is already stated that the major section of comrades gathered under the banner of CPI(M) but many comrades who were carrying on struggles against the neo-revisionist leadership formed several groups to carry on struggles inside and outside the CPI (M). These struggles were carried through periodicals against neo-revisionism and the CPI (M) leadership but no viable centralised leadership against neo-revisionists could come into existence. During this period Com. Charu

Mazumdar also advocated armed struggles in the Darjeeling district against the parliamentary path being peddled by the CPI (M) leadership. Here it should be remembered that there was existence of continuous strong mass base and also existence of continuous class struggles by the peasants and the Tea garden workers in Darjeeling District since 1955 onwards. It would be proper to mention that vast majority of the comrades in Darjeeling District rebelled against CPI and joined CPI(M). Likewise, the vast majority of the party members of CPI (M) of workers and peasant origin rebelled against the neo-revisionist leadership of the CPI (M).

The shadow District Committee within the CPI (M) was carrying on struggles against the neo-revisionist as well as against the left adventurist trends of Com. CM. The point to be emphasised here is that the presence of strong party base along with strong class struggles of the peasants and workers played as a positive factor which contributed to the uprising of Naxalbari. It was this very factor that Com. Charu Mazumdar opposed. Instead he advocated very strongly the line of secret combat group and politics of action. Subsequent developments show that prevailing situation in the Darjeeling district (after the Naxalbari uprising) in which concerned comrades of the movement had to work provided Comrade CM with the opportunity and scope of basking in the reflected glory of the historic uprising of Naxalbari— notwithstanding the fact of his opposition to the politics of Naxalbari movement. Comrade CM exploited the situation. And he used it. He came to the political lime light as the 'main inspiration' behind the historic uprising.

Had there been no Naxalbari struggle Com. CM would have remained as a non-entity. In fact the party cadres who were in the depth of struggle got a clear perspective of the movement in the workers and peasant's conference through a marathon debate between massline and politics of action—squad. The comrades of Darjeeling District steeled themselves from practical struggles i.e. class struggles rather than theoretical struggles against neo-revisionism and left adventurism. The comrades could easily differentiate mass revolutionary activities from action-oriented politics of Com.CM. The comrades could see for themselves that the landlords were fleeing from the rural areas of Siliguri sub-division where mass-line was practised. While at Chathat where CM's line was applied the Jotedars were on the offensive and one of our important comrades Sheikh Subhan Ali (of Chathat area) got killed at his own village. It happened due to absence of political mass base. Again it must be stressed that Com. Sushital Roy Choudhuri, Asit Sen, Parimal Dasgupta and others raised the banner of struggle against neo-revisionism but in the absence of mass base and mass practice, could not gather momentum while situation helped Com. CM to exploit the halo of the glorious Naxalbari Struggle.

Even now many mis-informations and misconceptions about Naxalbari Struggle are prevalent among the Comrades. Nobody but the Siliguri Comrades are responsible for this gap. The Krishak Sangram Sahayak Committee and the Comrades of AICCCR could not dispel the misconceptions because of dearth of knowledge about the activities of Darjeeling district. Again there are such perceptions and view as if the Naxalbari struggle came to the fore due to the eviction of late Com. Bigul Kishan from his land. In fact, for factual and proper assessment one is to go back to the days of peasant movement of 1959. Everybody knows that the then Congress Govt. of West Bengal enacted ceiling on land and consciously kept loopholes to deprive the peasants from land. The Provincial Kishan Council of West Bengal (CPI Period) decided to give a call to stop benami transactions by the landlords within the limits of certain dates i.e. legality. But the Kisan Sabha of Siliguri Committee opposed the move and stressed that if the benami transfers were to be stopped then one should start with the enacted ceiling on the cultivable and non-cultivable land and only the ceiling land under the preview of the enactment should be left out and all the rest beyond the ceiling should be captured. This was opposed by the PKC. In spite of this, Siliguri Kisan Sabha launched the struggle against benami transfers. The Siliguri Comrades were heavily criticised at the WB Party Conference in 1960-61. The struggle was withdrawn officially by Biswanath Mukherjee along with Com. CM. without the consent of discussion with the Siliguri comrades. In spite of official withdrawal, the struggle for land went on unabated. This period was covered by complex situation. Anti China hysteria and division of party created immense political problems and along with it there were attacks on the comrades by the Govt. The comrades were thrown into prison twice; once in the year 1962-64 and again in the year 1964-66. This is the period when widespread attacks continued on the peasants and the tea garden workers and perhaps no district in the country had to face such widespread attacks. Hundreds of workers and peasant leaders were arrested under Defence of India Rules. During this period on the one hand the party comrades had to reorganize the CPI (M) and on going peasant struggle and to look after their problems. On the other hand they had to combat the neo-revisionists and also had to tackle the seeds of left deviation.

Over and above, the struggle against the landlords went on unabated. A peculiar, cumbrous and very complicated struggle had to be carried during the period, most of the comrades had never faced such a situation. There were dearth of intellectual comrades in the rural areas. They mainly relied on their practical experience. In this period, the situation was such either the comrades were to quit or to carry on struggle. In this situation the comrades again started re-capturing of land, specially

against two big landlords and the area virtually became free of landlords. The small landlords and rich peasants gave whole hearted support to us. The peasants snatched guns from the landlords' goondas. It happened in December, 1966. In another area a Tea Planter taking advantage of the absence of the leaders of the movement, thrown out the peasants from more than 100 acres of land and constructed 15 dwelling quarters for the workers of the plantation.

The SKS mobilized more than 2 thousand peasants and workers and demolished all the pucca quarters and took possession of the said land. The land is still now in the possession of the peasants of that area. This incident took place in March 1967. Fight against a military contractor and canteen owner and a big landlord for land was also very important because it created impact on the North Bengal University Students. **Com. CM avoiding the Shadow Committee surreptitiously put forward the Slogan of Boycott of Election in 1967. Com. K.S. was in jail and was released just before 1967 election.**

After the release of Com. Jangal Santhal from Calcutta Jail just a month before 1967 election, this boycott line was fought. Com CM retreated from his position. So during this whole period political struggle and struggle for land were continuing. This fact should also be in the knowledge of the comrades that Com. JS was defeated in the election.

However the congress Ministry was defeated and the UF ministry came to power in 1967 in W.B. Just at this period Iswar Tirkey a Congress MLA tried to evict late Com. Bigul Kishan from his Barga Land in Naxalbari itself. Naturally the anger against the landlords gathered momentum. Our late Com. Jangal Santal led the struggle against the eviction. This attracted the attention of the media because Iswar Trikey was not only a congress MLA but also a former deputy minister.

The neo-revisionists started a vile campaign against the revolutionary section of Comrades that the aim of this movement was to topple the UF Ministry but the facts went against them. At the same breath the left adventurists carried on propaganda that the revolutionary section wanted to keep the struggle within the bounds of militant economism. The reality disproved their claim. By and large the newly formed UF Ministry started sending police forces to set up police camps in rural areas with the tacit understanding of the neo-revisionist leadership. It may be remembered that Ajoy Mukherjee– the leader of Bangla Congress, was the Chief Minister as well as Home Minister at that time, Hundreds of warrants of arrests were issued against the comrades. In the mean time the local UF leaders started talks with the Siliguri comrades but that failed. Thereafter the Land Reforms Minister H. K. Konar wanted to talk to the leaders of the movement. He assured that nobody would be arrested and would be allowed to go back after the talks.

Accordingly, Com. Kanu Sanyal and Com. Souren Bose went to meet and talked with him in a Forest Bungalow at Sukna the gate way to Darjeeling Hills. The L.R. Minister along with Highest Police Officials of West Bengal met them. They demanded surrender of all the comrades wanted by the Police. The delegation put forward questions why the landlords were not arrested against whom many FIRs were already lodged and there was no reply from the officials. Naturally the officials were in difficulty and finally they said that list of the wanted persons would be given within a few days and they were to surrender in batches. **The talks broke down as the delegation refused to surrender. After this the delegation informed the Minister that they were ready to talk on the basis of fixed agendas and the Police Camps were to be withdrawn. The talks finally broke down. When the delegation was ready to leave the place the Minister asked Com. KS to go to a separate room and KS went to talk with the Minister. Minister Konar told Com. KS not to surrender without information from Calcutta Party HQ.** This actually was a surprise to Comrade KS. Com. KS did not reply and left the place with Com. S.B. in a Minister's car towards Siliguri Town. Another surprise was waiting when he met Com. CM. Com. CM told him that KS's mother requested Com. CM that KS should attend the marriage ceremony of his younger brother. Com. CM also suggested that KS could attend the marriage ceremony, KS was surprised because he was a highly wanted person and relaxation was given for few hours to go to his hide-out by the Minister. KS did not reply but left for his rural destination and did not attend the ceremony.

Comrades can understand the complex and critical situation of that period. But the local struggling comrades remained firm in principle but flexible in tactics.

After 8/10 days a large Police force entered a village Bara Jharu (3 Km from Naxalbari) to arrest the comrades. The Police Force had to face strong resistance from the local villagers and the news reached other villages and surrounding tea gardens. Thousands of peasants and workers rushed to the area and a scuffle took place and as a result some Police Officers were injured and Inspector Wangdi was killed. This incident took place on 24th May, 1967. It should be reminded that so long the political propaganda carried on "Stick to land by resisting the landlords and Police." This is the first time that the Police forces were resisted with conventional weapons in hand. This was a qualitative change in the struggle. Struggle for land turned to a higher stage. So, the importance of the 24th May lies here and so Naxalbari Day should be observed on 24th May. On 25th May the women comrades were holding a general meeting by the roadside. 2½ km south of Naxalbari at Prosadu Jote. The SDO along with a Police force came to the spot and halted and at once the women comrades surrounded the Police and tried to disarm them and actually disarmed them as the police were in small number. The

SDO called one of our male comrades and requested him to leave them and the male comrade agreed and asked our women comrades to allow the SDO and Police to go.

The Police left the spot with arms but halted a few yards away and took position and fired upon the women folk and 11 women comrades with a baby got killed. Actually the police took revenge on 25th May. After 24th May this incident exposed the UF Govt. It exposed the UF. Govt. It proved UF Govt. was not to safeguard the rights of the peasants and workers but to safeguard the interest of the land owning class. These two incidents created a great stir throughout West Bengal and length and breath of our country. Hence 25th, became the Martyrs Day and it exposed the sham, and fakeness of Parliamentary path in relation to the question of radical land reform i.e. Agrarian revolution. Hence a remotest place Naxalbari became a turning point in Communist movement. Supporting Naxalbari struggle became the emblem of Communist revolutionary while opposing Naxalbari struggle meant taking the side of bourgeois landlord system and their statuesque. In spite of all vicious attacks by the UF Govt. the Naxalbari struggle continued unabated till September 1967. It is interesting to note that in a GB meeting in Siliguri on 26th May 67 Late Promode Dasgupta, PC, Secretary, was asked what should be CPI(M)'s stand. Late Com. Dasgupta answered using Great Marx's famous words regarding Paris Commune. Marx warned the Paris workers that time was not still matured but when the workers were on the street, the workers should stubbornly carry it forward. But as soon as Late Com. Dasgupta reached Calcutta, he criticized the Naxalbari struggle as the machination of CIA.

NAXALBARI STRUGGLE and visit to China including talks with Mao Tse Tung, Naxalbari-o-Krishak Sangram Sahayak Samiti and AICCCR :

A few more events are to be mentioned in connection with Naxalbari struggle. The period between July and September 1967 was very crucial for Naxalbari struggle. Repeated encirclement by the police and para-military forces took place in this period. The repeated announcement of surrender and the sudden arrest of Com. Jangal Santal created problems for the leadership. As a matter of fact Com. Khokan Majumdar, Jangal Santal and Babulal Viswakarmakar took shelter in a peasant hut. The area was favorable due to existence of bushes, a small jungle and nearby tea plantation area. It is heard that when the police were trying to encircle the area at that very moment Com. KM suggested to leave the shelter one after another. And he left first. He got through. But Com. Jangal Santal and Com. Babulal Viswakarmakar were arrested a little away from the hut. This caused a great damage because the Govt. made wide propaganda about this arrest. Along with it the fire arms that were collected during the period became unworkable because of

dearth of ammunition. After this the encirclement became so frequent and fierce in the villages that the comrades were forced to shift their shelters two or three times a day. After a few days the situation became so worse that it became impossible for the comrades to stay in the plains to Terai areas. As a result due to extreme exhaustions the comrades needed respite and had to take temporary shelter in Dinajpur area. This was the period when comrades discussed how to make contact with People's Republic of China. The Four comrades probed through East Pakistan to establish contact with P.R.C. but failed. The next move was made through Nepal.

The four comrades were Comrade Dipak Biswas, Khudan Mallick, Khokan Majumdar and Kanu Sanyal. They stayed in for nearly three months in China and returned to Kathmandu on 25th December 1967. The comrades studied Mao Tse Tung Thought in China. Here among important aspects only one can be mentioned. The comrades had the rare opportunity to meet Com. Mao Tse Tung, Com. Chou En Lai; Com. Kang Sheng, Com. Liu Ning Yee and Commander in Chief for 45 minutes including translation. The Comrades were introduced to these leaders and Com. Mao asked name, education and about the journey of ours. The gist of the talks : He asked about the purpose of the visit. We answered that we came there to learn Mao Tse Tung Thought. Com. Mao Tse Tung told us that the CPC supported Naxalbari struggle because the experience of struggle in China was similar to Naxalbari. Then he remarked "Have you read Hunan Report" and we nodded. 'How many guns you have with you. And what types of guns are these?' further asked. We replied 21 guns and there were single and double barrel guns. Com. Mao continued, "In the beginning we had 120 or a little more guns and a plenty of muzzle loader guns. If you persist in struggle you will get guns from the enemy. What do you think?". We replied in the affirmative. Com. Mao asked, 'do you know about India-China War?' The delegation acknowledged the fact and mentioned repression on comrades and the people by the Govt. (Among the four Com. K.S. was in the prison). He discussed the border dispute.

Then Mao changed the topic. He said, "Soviet Union is trying to convene an International Conference but they will fail to organize this". He further said: "By this they are putting the noose around their neck and one end of the noose is in the hands of the world people who are to pull the noose and they will collapse". For a while he talked to Com. Chou En Lai and told the delegation that "Soviet Union has changed into Social Imperialism". Com. Mao told that Cultural Revolution was meant for only China and not for other countries. After a pause he enquired 'How was the study?' He immediately said : 'whatever you learnt in China, forget it and act according to the situation of your country'. He enquired about the return journey. Com. KS told about Com. CM's sickness and his travel to China. Mao again said,

“Don’t use the Embassy frequently. Embassy is an open office. The friendly country will be angry with us. We have staked in Burma and Indonesia. So don’t use it frequently.” Com. Mao talked to Com. Chou En Lai and the talks ended. After the talks a photograph was taken with all including Com. Mao. Bidding good bye Com. Mao walked a few steps with us and the meeting with Com. Mao ended.

When we were coming back from the meeting chamber of Mao we asked Com. Liu Ning Yee about Soviet social imperialism and he told us, ‘this is the first time Com. Mao told before a foreign delegation about Soviet social imperialism.’ After further enquiry Com. Liu Ning Yee explained “Social imperialism is Socialism in words and imperialism in deeds of Soviet union.” All these experiences about our visit to China was reported to Com. CM. Neither the AICCCR comrades nor the CPI (ML) comrades were even posted about this visit. But it was propagated inside the CPI (ML) as if Com. CM was the first to declare that soviet union degenerated to social imperialism. This was done by a coterie to create cult of CM.

It is already mentioned that the delegation returned to Kathmandu on 25th December’ 67 and from there the group reached Siliguri on 28th December’ 67 and stayed in a shelter with the help of Dipak in Siliguri. Thereafter Com. CM was contacted for further change of shelter. In response Com. CM sent information that KS could arrange shelter and sent a car for searching for a shelter in the village. After 7 days Com. KS again contacted Com. CM and met him at his house. A detailed report was placed before Com. CM about the visit in PRC. At first KS informed Com. CM that they met chairman Mao Tse Tung. At once Com. CM became emotional and exclaimed, didn’t you weep at the sight of Com. Mao?’ KS told him that he was bewildered but didn’t weep. It took two hours to report about the talks with Com. Mao Tse Tung. KS also reported about certain important events of Cultural Revolution. KS made his observation regarding Cultural Revolution. KS told that he didn’t like certain things like the Chinese comrades used to ask the delegation to read quotation before eating, before boarding an aeroplane or before going to a new place. KS informed CM that he didn’t like because quotations from Chairman Mao was not the Bible. Com. CM became furious with KS and told him that it should be religiously followed but KS disagreed with him. He was very furious. Here it is to be stressed, that KS and other three comrades came to know about the formation of AICCCR in China itself. So it was expected that members of the AICCCR and Comrades of Naxalbari Struggle should know this event. Neither the members of AICCCR discussed this important event nor it was mentioned in any writings about Naxalbari Struggle. This delegation met Chairman Mao and was the first who were related to the Naxalbari Struggle, it is not even mentioned in Com. Asit Sen’s book ‘An approach to

Naxalbari', who elaborately wrote other things about Naxalbari struggle. Perhaps Com. Asit Sen was never informed by Com. Charu Mazumdar about the visit to China by the delegation. After his release from jail on 9th April' 69, KS met Com. CM and he informed KS that the members of AICCCR wanted to see him but KS refused. There was a prolonged discussion among Com. CM, Com. Souren Bose and KS. After this Com. Souren Bose and KS attended the last meeting of AICCCR. Let us come to the point that Com. SB & KS attended the last meeting of AICCCR. While going to attend AICCCR meeting KS informed Com. SB that it was decided during submission of Terai Report to Com. Sushital Roy Chowdhury that there would be a GB in Darjeeling district for finalization of the Terai report. Com. SB agreed to the proposal. But while returning from Calcutta Com. SB said there was no necessity to hold the GB because 'Spring Thunder Over India' had already broadcasted from Peking Radio. KS disagreed with Com. SB because there was another report on Naxalbari. Unfortunately discussion never took place. Subsequently the situation totally chaged after the formation of CPI (ML) in 1969.

It was not in the knowledge of Com. SB or KS that the formation of the Party would be decided in the same meeting and the Co-ordination committee would be dissolved. A Political Resolution was placed before the meeting and a resolution on party organization was also placed. The resolution on party organization exclusively said "We must assimilate the teaching of Com. Lin Piao which has also been confirmed in our recent Sonapet Struggle." "Guerrilla Warfare is the only way to mobilize and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy". "The coming period will be a period of fast developing guerilla struggle throughout the vast expanse of our country and the party is called upon to conduct and lead them confidently. Therefore the party should concentrate, in the main, on developing guerilla form of armed struggle and not waste time and its energies on holding open mass meeting and forming Kisan Sabhas in old style." So it is clear that party was formed on the above basis which rejected politics of mass approach towards mass struggle, mass organization and mass armed struggle. To make it clear, here the guerilla struggle meant formation of secret and conspiratorial squads to attack land lords. This line of understanding advocated by Com CM was his old line before Naxalbari Struggle and the party formed in 1969 on the basis of anarchism, terrorism and it was devoid of working class and peasantry.

Beginning of contacts with Comrade C.M. from out side West Bengal through Naxalbari-O-Krishak Sangram Sahayak Samity :

It is already narrated about Naxalbari Struggle exhaustively. For reference only it is again necessary to mention about China visit. KS reported the matter to Com. CM

about PRC visit. But after a long period of time it was found that Com. CM had never reported to the comrades of AICCCR about the visit to China. Everybody in the district knew that thereafter a delegation of eight also visited China which consisted of Com. Anil Mukherjee, Souren Bose, Kadamlal Mallick, Manilal Singh, Dulal Mondal, Pabitra Sengupta, Sukumar Roy and Santi Pal. Even many comrades do not know that Com. Krishna Bhakta Sharma was the first comrade who visited PRC on foot. There is no written report before the comrades about these three visit in PRC. Had this been reported, it would have been easier for the comrades outside Darjeeling to understand the movement. Among these delegations the second visit (comprising KS and others) was very important as Com. Mao and Com. Chou En Lai and others leaders of CPC met the delegation.

While writing history of AICCCR and CPI (ML) these issues are very important. Why the comrades specially Com. Sushital Roy Chowdhury and Asit Sen were kept in the dark about the visit? These two Comrades were trying to build up AICCCR by moving different parts of the country. Why Com. CM did not report this matter to AICCCR. We may not conclude anything from these but one important aspect remains clear that the issue of political line could have been debated, in view of talks with Com. Mao.

Another important aspect is that the third delegation returned in separate batches to the country after staying 6 months in China. It is strange that Com. Pabitra, Sukumar and Kadamlal returned to India and directly went to the house of Com. CM for shelter. Among these three Com. Kadamlal was the most wanted person in the eyes of the police. But Com. CM took the matter of shelter very callously and asked them to stay in one of the comrades' house in Siliguri town. It was night and they were arrested on that night on the road by the police. This is really an enigma. Anil Mukherjee was an important leader associated with Com. CM from CPI to CPI (M) in Jalpaiguri but his inclusion in KSSS or AICCCR was never done. Why? These are very pertinent issues. It was also strange that nobody from the struggling area of the Darjeeling district was included either in the KSSS or W.B. coordination of AICCCR barring CM. These are undocumented but important facts which the comrades should know while debating the party history.

During the period of 1968 Com. CM came in contact with AP comrades through the Calcutta Comrades. The first meeting was held in Visakhapatnam and thereafter at Guttikonda billam. He personally enunciated his political line beyond West Bengal for the first time. These are all undocumented but a part of history. Another historic fact is to be noted that just before the commencement of the meeting of coordination committee (AICCCR), Com. SN Singh threw a newspaper "Search Light" before CM and exclaimed "I have brought a head for you". Everybody

present in the meeting read the news of killing of a landlord in Bihar. These are all undocumented but part of history. Com. Nagbhusan Patnaik after hearing the speech of CM at Visakhapatnam declared his wishes to join the movement and went for action.

It is already stated that different groups were carrying on ideological and political struggles against the neo-revisionist trends. After the 24th May and 25th May incidents neo-revisionists started taking organizational steps against comrades like Com. Sushital Roy Chowdhury, Com. Saroj Dutta, Com. Niranjan Bose, Com. Parimal Dasgupta etc and KSSS. Com. Kunnikal Narayan was the first to contact from outside West Bengal as the knowledge goes. He talked with the comrades of Calcutta and wanted to meet directly the comrades of Naxalbari area. But that never took place. After these, the comrades of UP, Bihar etc contacted Calcutta comrades. The AICCCR declaration charted out four point tasks – (1) Develop and coordinate revolutionary struggle of Naxalbari under the leadership of working class. (2) Develop militant struggle of working class and other toiling people and orient this towards Agrarian Revolution. (3) Wage uncompromising struggle against revisionism and neo-revisionism and popularise Mao Tse Tung Thought. (4) Undertake preparation for a revolutionary programme and a tactical line, basing on analysis of concrete situation of India in the light of Mao Tse Tung Thought. These were positive steps. After this the Second declaration of AICCCR on May 14th 1968 was an advancement towards the organizational consolidation of revolutionaries but controversies were not resolved. In respect of certain ideological and political issues such as “Capitalist-Imperialist system is heading towards final collapse”. Again the resolution stated “Present era is the era of Chairman Mao Tse Tung”. As far as the era question was concerned it was internationally accepted that the era is Imperialism and proletarian revolution. The seeds of left deviation was hidden here. But inspite of these trends very correct and positive step was adopted. Thus the second resolution itself declared “the enemies of the Indian people can be overthrown not by the conspiratorial method but only by pursuing a massline”.

Although the resolution enunciated massline but Com. CM advocated his line of annihilation of class enemies which was itself practised in Sompeta Taluk, in Andhra Pradesh in 1968. This showed that line of annihilation of class enemies was in vogue even before the formation of CPI (ML).

There was another resolution of AICCCR on Election on 14th May 1968. It stated “So comrades our call is : ‘Down with Elections’, we call upon all the revolutionaries and revolutionary masses to raise the slogan, “Boycott this election” The main issue here was whether boycott” is a strategic or tactical issue and that was not resolved. Subsequently Comrade Nagi Reddy raised the question of validity or efficacy of

adopting a line of strategical boycott. In spite of this he agreed to join AICCCR and Comrade 'Nagi Reddy resigned from MLA ship. While introducing the political and organizational report in the Party Congress, Charu Mazumdar said "On the question of boycotting elections Nagi Reddy said "Yes we accept it but it should be restricted to a certain area at a certain period. We will participate in elections where there is no struggle". "This is Nagi Reddy's line. This is centrism. We have fought against it and thrown Nagi Reddy out of our organization".

The Naxalbari Peasants and workers struggle gravitated the revolutionaries of our country to carry on struggle against the revisionists and neo-revisionists. The formation of AICCCR created the situation to build up an organisational structure of the revolutionaries and for the preparation to put forward a revolutionary programme and tactical line to carry on militant struggle of the workers and peasants and there after to build up a Communist party based on M-L-M. thought. Experience showed there was an ample opportunity to unify the Comrades on the platform of AICCCR. This became a possibility because the image of Naxalbari struggle was behind Comrade C.M. as he was the lone representative from our area in the AICCCR. This unification could not succeed due to absence of flexibility in organizational approach and surreptitiously foisting the political line of Comrade CM which was defeated in Naxalbari area. For this the comrades of AICCCR could not be blamed because they were not posted with struggles and developments of Naxalbari movement.

Because the struggle between two lines in Darjeeling District never came to light at any stage before the AICCCR. The reasons behind it were that first the concerned Comrades of Naxalbari movements were not associated with the formation of AICCCR and secondly it was a well thought out plan of CM not to bring to the fore the struggle of two lines before the commencement of Naxalbari Struggle and the defeat of his line at Rambola Jote. Many Comrades and eminent personalities came forward in support of Naxalbari struggle but the AICCCR could not mobilize them to carry forward the task of building up a real alternative. Promode Sengupta, Satyananda Bhattacharya, Parimal Dasgupta were all thrown out in the name of differences. It is all the more a glaring example that Asit Sen who took a major lead to mobilize and organise the AICCCR throughout the country was not included in AICCCR and even he was thrown out on the eve of Plenum and they came out of CPI (ML). Comrades of Andhra Pradesh rebelled against CPI (M) in Burdwan Plenum and they came out of CPI (M) and formed APCCCR. The Telangana leaders like D.V.Rao, Chandrapulla Reddy and eminent leaders like Nagi Reddy expressed their reservations regarding certain political issues, and talks went on with the AICCCR. They decided to join AICCCR with these reservations and Com. Nagi Reddy

resigned from his MLA ship and from the post of opposition leader in A.P. assembly. But AICCCR contacted separately some youngster comrades like Panchadi Krishnamurthy, Tejeshwar Rao etc. and also contacted one medical student Venkatratnam of Guntur who was selected as convener of AP committee and used them against APCCCR. Here it should be remembered that Venkatratnam became the main Govt. approver during Parvatipuram conspiracy case in the 70s.

The AICCCR under the leadership of Com. CM played tricks of factionalism against APCCCR. Here it should be remembered that section of Comrades in AP came out of the CPI (M) under the leadership of DV Rao, C.P. Reddy and Nagi Reddy. Thus AICCCR sealed the path of unity and created disunity among the revolutionaries.

Again the AICCCR consciously created rift and failed to unite the largest of revolutionaries on the platform of AICCCR and thus the cause of unity was jeopardized. In a nut shell the AICCCR failed to build up unity of CRs and to act as unified centre of communist revolutionaries to build up party of the Communist Revolutionaries i.e. the party of Proletariat. These facts showed again that neither the rejection of Massline and Mass Revolutionary any armed struggle by CM or his line of annihilation of class enemy was post CPI (ML) developments. These lines of CM were there before the formation of CPI (ML).

Even the slogan of boycott of elections (by CM) was given during Naxalbari struggle in 1967 and it was fought tooth and nail. And Comrades worked with massline to develop struggle.

It should be understood that the First Declaration of AICCCR correctly depicted but seeds of left adventurism started from second declaration and the slippery path of deviation towards left deviation went on fast.

Formation of CPI (ML) and Aftermath

On 9th April, 1969 the UF Government declared amnesty to release all the political prisoners from jail. The UF released KS first and he reached Siliguri and met Com. CM first at his house. To avoid repetition, briefly it should be mentioned that **Comrades Keshab Sarkar, Khokan Majumdar and KS decided inside jail on 8th April night that so long one-sided stress was given to fight revisionism only but from now on CM's adventurist trend/ line should also be fought.**

There it was also discussed that after the release of all the comrades from jail a convention should be organised to discuss Naxalbari struggle in detail to finalise the Terai Report.

After the arrival of KS in Siliguri the situation moved very fast. There were talks with CM and Com. CM tried to clarify those issues. In the midst of the talk Com. S.B. came and joined. It is already told that Com. CM told KS that co-ordination

members wanted to see him and at this K.S. became angry and rejected the matter. After prolonged talks of 2 hours Com. SB agreed to go to Calcutta and requested KS to agree. Com. CM even at this stage did not say what was the agenda of the meeting i.e. there was no indication about the formation of the party.

After reaching Calcutta Com. SB and KS attended the meeting of the AICCCR in the third week of April, 1969. Most of the Comrades present in the meeting were unknown to KS barring some W. Bengal Comrades. KS saw a Comrade throw a newspaper in which there was a news of killing of a landlord. KS found most of the comrades were following Com. CM and due to KS's introversive nature he kept mum. The political-organizational report was placed and passed and also the formation of the party though it was done on 27th April, 1969, it was decided to change the date to 22nd April as it is coinciding with Comrade Lenin's birthday. Com. Srinarayan Tewari, Robi Das and one from Assam opposed the formation of the party CPI(ML) and demanded to continue the co-ordination stage for a further period to mobilise and unify the revolutionaries in the platform. The resolution of forming the CPI (ML) was placed, 3 comrades opposed and by majority the resolution was passed. K.S. only asked why Asit Sen was not present at the meeting. Com. Saroj Dutta replied that he was not a member of AICCCR-the highest committee and KS. kept mum. KS, SB and others voted for the resolution. KS was in underground for a long period of time and was in jail and he was not in a position to make out his mind about the entire proceedings. Thereafter a Central Organizing committee of eleven was formed with 1. Com. CM 2. Sushital Roy Chowdhury 3. Shiv Kumar Mishra, 4. Saroj Dutta 5. S.N. Singh, 6. R.P Shroff, 7. KS, 8. Panchadi Krishna murthy, 9. Chowdhury Tejeshwar Rao, 10. L. Appu, 11. S. Bose.

So, the CPI (ML) and the C.O.C was formed on the basis of resolution. **After the formation of the party the issue of declaration of the party was also discussed in the meeting. It was proposed that KS should declare the formation of the CPI (ML) in Calcutta Maidan. But it was opposed stubbornly by KS and he proposed that CM should declare the party. But inspite of his protest it was foisted upon him and it was decided that KS should address the rally. Comrades said that a written speech would be read by KS at the rally. This was drafted by Com. Saroj Dutta and Souren Bose It did not mean that KS is disowning responsibility. He is owning up it as his speech. But why it is raised now?** Subsequently during the period of Jail life from 1970 to 1979 KS came to know that had there been no speech by KS. it would have been difficult for CM to muster his position in CPI (ML). For many other groups who were outside CPI (ML)-were not ready to join CPI (ML). The speech read by KS helped CM to rope in other revolutionaries and groups outside the newly formed CPI (ML). For many other groups who were outside CPI (ML)-were not ready to join CPI

(ML). The speech read by KS helped CM to rope in other revolutionaries and groups outside the newly formed CPI (ML). This showed that neither the AICCCR could unify the revolutionaries under its banner nor the formation of CPI (ML) could unify the revolutionaries.

Now the saddest part of history was that the COC met only once to discuss the Party Congress and its agendas. A party declared itself as the communist party but there was not an iota of Democratic Centralism. Everything was decided by Com. CM in consultation with an inner coterie. After the formation, the events moved forward as fast as possible. There were attacks by Govt. and other reactionary forces made after the formation and declaration of the party and the COC met only once. The COC's meeting decided to hold the party congress in 1970 in Calcutta. The Party Congress was held on 15th & 16th May 1970. Delegates from ten states attended the Party Congress. These were West Bengal, Bihar, UP, Assam, Tripura, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Punjab and Kashmir. Com. Sushital Ray Chowdhury, Saroj Dutta and KS were elected as the Presidium. The most significant issue was Com. Ramnarayan Upadhyay from UP. opposed the whole political line of CPI (ML) placed before the Congress. Here it should be mentioned that Com. Shivkumar Mishra was the Secretary of UP but the political line of COC was rejected by the UP-SOC in the state conference. Com. S.N. Singh from Bihar member of the CC was entrusted to give reply supporting the COC line. The most debatable part of the Congress was Com. Ashim Chatterjee's speech which raised the issue of Personal Authority of CM over the party. Com. A Chatterjee said. "if the entire COC goes against the authority of Com. CM-he would be on the side of Com. CM". In this context Com. SRC read out the relevant portion of the quotation from Mao Tse Tung that lowest Committee is under the higher committee, Minority is under the majority, individual is under the party and the whole party is under the Central Committee and entire party is under the Party Congress.

Com. S.N. Singh also opposed the personal authority issue. In the course of hot discussion KS as member of the Presidium asked CM if this debate would continue before him and that it should be intervened and stopped. Then Com. CM requested the Comrades to put an end to the discussion. Another significant issue was that K.S. did not speak a single sentence on the political line in the congress. Actually these questions were raised during the party congress but could not be resolved. Inner party situation was very tense and majority of the comrades did not dare to open their mind. The party congress adopted the program and political and organizational resolutions. Thus the party congress ended.

It is already stated that a great opportunity arose during the AICCCR period itself. But it was not allowed to become a united platform of CRs. It is also seen some

comrades did join but later on left as they demanded to continue the process of co-ordination further so that broad unity could be achieved. The fact showed that the comrades who wholeheartedly supported CM Party was formed only with those. Some Comrades claimed that the formation of the party was timely and correct. It did not tally with the facts and rather facts disprove it.

Now let us take up the political issues. Some comrades say the issues of left deviation, adventurism started only after the formation of the party. This is also refuted earlier through facts. Now the quotation from the Organizational Report dated 22nd April 1969 of CPI (ML): It shows that the party manifested not only left deviation but actually took the path of terrorism and anarchism as the ideological basis. The resolution said "Guerilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy". It shows that the path manifested not actually it only left deviation but look the path of terrorism and anarchism as the ideological basis. The resolution said "Guerilla warfare is the only way to mobilise and apply the whole strength of the people against the enemy". It showed that the CPI (ML) from the very beginning rejected massline. The resolution further states categorically, "Therefore the party should concentrate, in the main, in developing guerilla forms of armed struggle and not waste time and its energies in holding open mass meetings and forming Kisan Sabhas in the old style."

Another startling fact of 1968 could be shown that by waving the banner of Mao Tse Tung Thought, the CPI (ML) actually followed Lin Piao. We are quoting from the resolution "We must assimilate the teaching of Comrade Lin Piao, which has also been confirmed in our recent struggle. It is wrongly entered as Sonapet and it should be Sompeta of AP.

The appeal about the two resolutions of AICCCR was sent to all the state level co-ordination committees. These state co-ordination committees were to change themselves into state organizing committees of CPI (ML). But as soon as the two resolutions reached state co-ordination they started to raise criticism on some political aspects of the two resolutions. Formerly it was asked to send their opinions within two months but suddenly it was changed and was asked to send within three weeks and was asked to accept it totally without any reservation. Naturally dissention and division started within state co-ordination, Dist. Co-ordination. etc. Comrades started heavy criticism about the time question. So the formation of party did not help unity but from the beginning many revolutionaries started leaving the coordination also. It is in this situation KS's written speech in Calcutta Maidan on 1st May 1969 helped Com. CM immensely to rope in revolutionaries and groups outside the CPI (ML) and consolidate his position.

During formation of the party CPI (ML) the Organizational Resolution of CPI (ML) wrote "This party will be a party of armed struggle-etc". Com Mao Tse Tung in the article introducing 'the Communist' wrote "when our party handles the question of revolutionary armed struggle correctly, it moves a step forward in its consolidation and Bolshevisation; but when it handles the question incorrectly, it moves a step backward. Thus for eighteen years the building and bolshevisation of the party have been closely linked with the political line, with the correct and incorrect handling of the questions of the united front and armed struggle."

This showed how the CPI (ML) understood Mao Tse Tung thought. Here it must be understood that the political line of the party has a deeper and broader understanding. But again we quote from the Organizational Resolution "Guerilla warfare is the only way"-etc. This is related to the incident of Sompeta Taluk of 1968 long before the formation of the party. Massline, mass approach was totally negated. We are debating here that the CPI (ML) deviated after the formation of the party. This is a glaring example that this line of annihilation was in vogue even before the formation of the party. So the comrades who are claiming that the line of annihilation was adopted only after the formation of the CPI (ML) are totally wrong as the claim is baseless. The party congress of CPI (ML) degenerated to the extent of declaring that one who had not dipped his hand in the blood of class enemies-is not a communist. This is completely a terroristic understanding. Although the CPI (ML) advocated Mao Tse Tung thought in its resolution and other writings but in reality they opposed it. It is already narrated that Com. Mao had talks with the 2nd delegation. This report was kept a secret to AICCCR comrades and the report submitted by the fourth delegation to Com. CM was consciously suppressed from the then CC and the general members of CPI (ML). The 4th delegation report is popularly known as suggestions from the CPC. What conclusion could be drawn from this fact? This was done to hoodwink the members of AICCCR as well as CPI (ML) members-even after the Party Congress.

After the Party Congress Com. CM could muster his personal leadership over the party and started with the understanding of infallibility. In all the time whoever raised any political issues and questioned the efficacy of his main political line of annihilation of class enemies-that Comrade was either thrown out or annihilated. The Comrades of Bihar started criticizing the line of Com. CM as left adventurist. As a result the Bihar State Committee was expelled from CPI (ML). Com. S.N. Singh, Com. Gurubox Singh, Com. Mohinder Singh all demanded the meeting of the CC but was never convened. This ended in the formation of a separate organization CPI (ML) led by S.N Singh on 7th November, 1971. Later on it was known as PCC CPI (ML). Sushital Roy Choudhury through his writing "Problems and Crisis of Indian Revolution" tried

to raise the questions mildly about the efficacy of the political line and tried to pose the correct position by quoting from Mao Tse Tung. Everybody knows that Com. SRC was heckled in front of CM and subsequently he died as a result of this heckling. This happened despite the two sets of suggestions were with Charu Mazumdar and the suggestions by the CPC justified S.R. Chowdhury.

In the aforesaid pages regarding Naxalbari struggle it was mentioned in detail that Com. CM was advocating his line even before the days of Naxalbari struggle, thereafter it was carried forward through the 2nd resolution of AICCCR which hastily pushed through CM's line and gradually threw out representatives of comparatively correct line like Nagi Reddy, APCCR, Parimal Dasgupta, Asit Sen and others. Finally CM could establish his line through the formation of CPI (ML) which unmasked his Terrorist and Anarchist line in place of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung thought. Thus CPI (ML) was in name a communist party but in deeds was a Terrorist Party opposed to Marxism.

Self Criticism

Before dealing with the issue of self criticism of mine i.e. Kanu Sanyal it is very important to touch upon some crucial developments of the period between 1962 to 1967. The political, organisational and related agrarian struggles of the period were so complex that it becomes very difficult to have a comprehensive view of it by the outsiders. The CPI party was split and virtually was working separately. Com. Charu Majumdar, Souren Bose and Kanu Sanyal along with many other comrades were under detention in 1962. Com. CM was released from the jail in with many other comrades were under detention in 1962. Com. CM was released from the jail in 1963 for contesting election and afterwards Com. SB and KS were released last in 1964. Com. Khokan Mazumdar was not arrested in 1962 perhaps due to his connection with the rightist elements of CPI. In the last part of 1964 KS was again arrested and released in 1966 June. Com. Khokan was arrested in 1965 September and released in 1966 June. But KS and Jangal Santal were again arrested in the last part of 1966 and Jangal was released just before the Assembly election. KS was released only a few days before the election. It is already stated that the agrarian struggle was continuing and under the situation the comrades went underground. Comrades may remember that a shadow committee was formed within the CPI (M) but the committee did not function properly and as the struggle gained momentum the role of the shadow committee withered away and only the individual consultations were going on as and when necessary.

As Com. CM was ill, he remained open throughout the period of 1967-68 excepting a week of detention in 1968. In this complex situation Com. CM became the only spokesman on behalf of the comrades who were spearheading the

movement and were in UG. I am not using the word usurping but due to the extraordinary situation Com. CM got the opportunity to have a free play and started sending directions to UG Comrades which on many occasions created several problems and sometimes his instruction went against the concrete situation. This is the time when Com. CM took advantage of his position which elevated him to the position of “Knows everything” and others were slighted. The police onslaught was day by day becoming bad to worse. We had guns but no ammunitions. KS time and again pressurized for arrangements of ammunition to encounter the police but ammunitions were never procured. Com. CM was telling to kill the landlords who had already vacated the villages. The entire Siliguri Taluk was divided into four police regions and police were carrying on their policy of encircling us. With the guns becoming totally unworkable due to dearth of ammunition the military situation went against the UG Comrades and politically a vacuum was created due to absence of centralized political leadership in the struggle area. The situation was totally unfavorable for the comrades and even maintaining hideouts became impossible and out of question. The entire organisation was paralysed and even reading, writing or documentation were out of question. And this caused absence of documentation. Whether this reality should be taken seriously into their estimation or not that is for comrades to decide. But the fact remains that the reality could not be denied or over-ruled.

The article “More about Naxalbari” was written in Vishakhapatnam jail in 1972 before the demise of Com. CM and he was under arrest and naturally Com. CM did not know it. Obviously, many questions would arise in the minds of the Comrades. In spite of knowing many issues why KS did not oppose Com. CM from the beginning that is from the period of formation of CPI (ML) in 1969 and rather remained mute. This is wholly legitimate doubt for the Comrades. Marxism– Leninism is a science, and it must be followed honestly from the beginning to the end while analysing political developments of a period of time.

To put the history in a straight and honest way, we must have a Marxist understanding of the whole episode of Naxalbari struggle. AICCCR and formation of CPI (ML) vis-a-vis the role of Com. CM. Every comrade knows about the LIN PIAO affair in CPC and when it happened. To understand the situation it will not be unfair and out of context if there is mentioning of Com. Chou En Lai’s explanation regarding Lin Piao’s affair in the history of CPC during its 10th Congress.

Com. Chou En Lai explained that Lin Piao had a process of development and unfolding himself and the CPC had also a process of development of understating and knowing him. This is purely dialectical process of dealing with the matter.

Likewise Com. CM had a process of development and unfolding himself in the history of CPI (ML) and KS had also a process of development in knowing Com. CM.

Mao Tse Tung thought teaches us that in human society activity in production develops step by step from a lower to a higher level and consequently Man's knowledge, whether of nature or of society, also develops step by step from a lower to a higher level, that is from the shallow one to the deeper one from one sided to many sides." This phenomenon in regard to Com. CM can be understood if we try to grasp it. In spite of knowing tit-bits regarding Com. CM. Why KS kept mum and went on supporting by keeping silent can be construed as absolutely personality issue. Com. CM was a class mate of KS's elder brother. More over Com. CM joined communist movement long before KS and also one of the leaders of the Glorious Tebhaga movement in 1946. Many a story regarding Tebhaga movement, his role in the movement were widespread. This led to create some sort of legend and unconditional acceptance of Com. CM which created a sort of personality cult. KS personally know that Com. CM gave up his land title as a landlord in favour of the peasants during the movement against Benami land in 1959. Moreover Com. CM had a great quality to pose the problems of class struggle in a concrete way. So, KS confidence on Com. CM was not unfounded. At the same breath having the landlord class origin Com. CM had some sort of impatience and impulsiveness in dealing with political matters. KS was working with him under his guidance since 1952 and there developed a feeling of leader and led. This created hindrance on many a occasion. In spite of this, KS opposed Com. CM on many occasions during CPI days. He also criticized him on many occasions. Com. CM during that period had another good quality to accept his guilt and make self-criticism. Com. CM raised the issue of agrarian revolution and armed struggle in Darjeeling District. But during the later part of 1967 he developed some sort of haughtiness and slowly developed commanding attitude in political and organisational matters. The presence of some younger comrades around him helped develop this situation They began to praise him like anything. KS opposed Com. CM vehemently his line of annihilation till 1967. But these younger Comrades who had less education of Marxism and mass struggle supported him very strongly. And for this Com CM developed in him a sense of infallibility. And once he was out of Siliguri this sense of infallibility increased further because of the presence of a new type of political coterie in AICCCR and later on in CPI (ML). Com. CM raised the slogan of annihilation line and posed the matter in his own way. Here we should remember that laws of motion in human activity specially in the matter of class struggle can not be halted at will if not struggled vehemently. The ground around Com CM was fertile with the help of new

comrades, the coterie and petty bourgeoisie class. Although KS tried to oppose CM during Naxalbari struggle he however could not maintain his position afterwards.

The line of annihilation of class enemies secretly and conspiratorially was enunciated by Com. CM and so he is mainly and wholly responsible and for this he can not be absolved. His line was defeated during Naxalbari struggle but KS also failed to carry on the struggle against this line in a sustained way. KS suffered from anti Marxist ideas of leader and led. KS opposed Com CM on many political junctures but in the wider panorama KS took a most non Marxist and anti-Marxist stand during the formation of CPI (ML) visa-vis the role of Com. CM. Although CM's line failed and was defeated in Naxalbari struggle in 1967; but when KS found most of the Comrades of other states were supporting Com. CM and the line of annihilation was already in application in wider panorama KS took the position of 'Let me wait and see' at this stage. This showed that KS had actually shunned Marxism and yielded to empiricism and practised worst form of liberalism. KS's silence in 1969 during the formation of the party as well as his silence during the party congress in 1970 were taken as mute support for CM's line. So KS is equally responsible for the anti Marxist line practised by the CPI (ML). So, KS cannot absolve himself from the wrong line. KS comes of a petty bourgeois class under the influence of feudal practice and his introvert nature of being non assertive in political matters in that period helped Com. CM in propagating his anarchist and terrorist line. Why these things happened. KS thinks that his non Marxist approach was due to various factors- frequent going to jail and coming out from 1959 to 1969, long UG life, 100 days hunger strike in jail and above all confusion about long standing Comrades and frequent changes and separation in comradely camps. All these things together led to the development of some sort of proneness to liberalist approach. Another problem was that KS as District Cadre had less confidence on himself and felt that he would not be able to gather much support behind him and for his introvert nature (psychic) he allowed himself to think 'let it go'. This is pure and simple bourgeois approach relying on empiricism. KS owns up his responsibility but it must not be forgotten that Com CM was the propounder of this line since 1965 and he could not avoid primary responsibility for anarchist and terrorist line. It should be remembered that terrorism is also armed struggle basing on Bourgeois Philosophy that heroes are the makers of history. Marxist philosophy teaches us- People and People alone are the makers of History. After the vast and painful experience KS stands by Marxism.