

Alternative Note of D.V.Rao (CCM, then CPI(M)) in Burdwan Plenum, Presented by C.P.Reddy

We are bringing out the *Draft on the Ideological issues in the International Communist Movement* submitted by leading comrades from Andhra as an alternative to the official draft prepared by the Ranadive-Sundarayya-Namboodiripad clique. When the official draft was published in different languages, openly sold and made available even to non-party men long before its formal adoption by that rigged body called the Central Committee Plenum of the CPI(M), when all the resources of the party were utilized to circulate, explain and defend it, the neo-revisionist chieftains of the party saw to it that all voice of dissent, including that of Andhra comrades, was completely muffled. So this bunch of counter-revolutionaries, the mission of whose lives is to prostitute Marxism in the interest of their masters, violated all party forms, as they usually do, refused to circulate the alternative draft even among party members and used all party organs to attack viciously the stand of the Andhra comrades on certain issues after suppressing the *Draft* itself. This was the kind of “thoroughgoing discussion on these differences” they organized! To push through their revisionist, counter-revolutionary political ideological line, these sham “Marxists” relied, as ever before, on utterly bureaucratic and unscrupulous organizational methods.

We are publishing the *Draft* not because we are in complete agreement with it, but because a large number of comrades want to know the ideological stand of the Andhra comrades. It should be pointed out at the very outset that we do not agree to certain formulations in the Draft. Here we do not intend to enter into an elaborate discussion on it or to dilate on our points of agreement, but we consider it necessary to state some of our differences frankly to achieve closer unity with all anti-revisionist fighters.

First, the characterization of the Seventh Congress of the CPI-later called CPI(M)-betrays a very wrong understanding of the Congress itself as well as of the character and role of the neo-revisionist clique. Far from laying “the basis for

our break" with revisionism, far from serving as "the beginning of the consolidation of our Party", the Calcutta Congress proved to be a crafty manoeuvre of a bunch of revisionists—more wily than the Dangeites—to utilize the just anger and hatred of the rank and file comrades for the Dangeite traitors for their own factional advantage. It was also used as a manoeuvre to subvert the anti-revisionist struggle by diverting the attention of the comrades to the notorious Dange letters and by shelving the ideological discussion. The Programme that was adopted was a clever attempt on the part of a section of Indian revisionists to drag the party into the mitt of revisionism and make it serve as a tool of Indian reaction, US imperialism and Soviet neo-colonialism.

The Naxalbari peasant struggle tore the mask off them. Madurai completed this process of unmasking. A Marxist-Leninist should not cherish the illusion of "improving" the programme (replete with revisionist formulations) further and "evolving, a correct tactical line for the accomplishment of the Indian revolution through "patient and dispassionate discussions inside our party", "Patient and dispassionate discussions with whom?" The May 14 *Declaration* of the All-India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries has categorically stated :

"Revisionists of all hues—the Dange renegades as well as the now-revisionist clique—have proved to be the lackeys of US imperialism, Soviet neo-colonialism and domestic reactionaries and are, beyond dispute, enemies of the Indian people,the neo-revisionists, like the Dange renegades, have joined the counter-revolutionary camp and, while paying tip-service to Marxism-Leninism, are engaged in actively sabotaging the agrarian revolution that is breaking out."

And experience must have told the Andhra comrades that such "patient and dispassionate discussions inside our Party" are not permitted by the eco-revisionist agents of the reactionary ruling classes.

Secondly, the section on "Forms of Transition to Socialism" betrays a somewhat confused understanding. The Andhra comrades rightly point out :

"Attitude to violent proletarian revolution, attitude to the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the watershed between Marxism-Leninism and all forms of revisionism, between all proletarian revolutionaries and all renegades from the proletariat."

But, at the same time, they write :

While preparing for a peaceful development, the Marxist-Leninist Party must fully prepare for a non-peaceful development. But we should never over-emphasise the chances of peaceful development as that will only reduce the revolutionary consciousness of the people." (Italics ours).

Such a statement—a statement that speaks of “preparing on a peaceful development”—may confirm to the stand the CPC adopted until 1960 for the sake of unity with the CPSU, the leaders of which had not fully revealed themselves till then. CPC pointed out (*Origin and Development of Differences to International Communist Movement*, 1963):

“Despite these changes, the formulation in the Declaration Moscow Declaration of 1957 on the question of the transition from Capitalism to Socialism was still unsatisfactory. We finally conceded the point only out of consideration of the CPSU that the formulation should show some connection with that of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.”

Again, “It is, of course, necessary to add that after the faders of the CPSU agreed to drop their erroneous propositions and accepted the correct propositions of other Parties (at the 1960 Conference of 81 Parties), the CPC and some other fraternal parties also made certain concessions.” The concessions the CPC made, were, for instance, on the questions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism. Today, any talk about the chances of peaceful development in country like India is a failure to recognize that we are now living in a period of revolutionary upsurge, when armed struggles are raging in various countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, when revolutionary upheavals are taking place even imperialist countries like the USA and France. Even in India itself, the brave peasants of Naxalbari have already lighted the spark of armed struggle. In every such country the reactionary ruling classes and their revisionist lackeys are trying hard to stem the tide of revolutionary struggles by diverting them along the futile parliamentary path. So any illusion about parliamentarism, any idea of “working in Parliament to achieve certain democratic reforms” is bound to help counter-revolution.