

Rebuff the Rebels, uphold Party Unity*

**Joint statement of P. Sundarayya and
M. Basavapunnaiiah on behalf of the
Polit Bureau of CPI(M)**

The following is the next of the statement issued by Comrades P. Sundarayya, General Secretary, and M. Basavapunnaiiah, member of the Polit Bureau, on behalf of the Polit Bureau of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) in Vijayawada on June 16, 1968:

The Press statement issued by Nagi Reddy Pulla Reddy, Kolla Venkaiah and D. Venkateswara Rao on June 15, 1968, after levelling a series of wild and slanderous accusations against the CPI(M) and its central leadership, ends up thus: "We call upon all the Party members to rise in revolt against this neo-revisionist line of the P.B. leadership..." and "to pass resolutions demanding of the P.B. leadership to withdraw the P.B. Open Letter, withdraw its organizational decisions..., restore the old P.C. and Secretariat and demand a Party Congress to decide the ideological line of the Party".

This strange, infantile and disruptive revolt staged by these four State Committee members against our Party, no doubt, does not come as a surprise either to our Central Committee or the public at large, who have been closely following the developments in Andhra during the last six months. This statement calling for a revolt against the Party, we know, will be received with glee by the enemies of our

*Published in "PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY", Calcutta, June 30, 1968. This is in reply to the statement of the Rebels covered under Item No. 31 of this volume. Document under Item No. 29 of this Volume may also be connected with it.

Party, while creating sorrow and indignation among all the loyal and honest Party members and well-wishers of the Party.

Why start this scurrilous revolt? What are the political, ideological and organizational reason trotted out in justification of this disruptive move?

The entire grievance against the Party and its central leadership, in short, boils down to the following : “Having adopted a pro-Soviet and anti-China ideological document, the P.B. leadership has adopted most undemocratic methods to get through its resolutions”—this alleged “pro-Soviet and anti-China ideological document” of the Burdwan Central Plenum advocating “a completely revisionist line both on the national and international issues”. The Central Plenum held at Burdwan “was not an elected Plenum but a nominated Plenum” and the delegates “from Kerala, Bengal and certain other provinces were merely nominated delegations”. Hence, in defence of a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist political ideological line against the ‘completely revisionist’ and ‘neo-revisionist’ line and in defence of inner-Party democracy against the most undemocratic methods of the Central Committee, a call for revolt against the Party and its leadership is justified.

We have to state, at the outset, that the content of the entire statement is out and out politically shallow, ideologically bankrupt and organizationally adventurist and it is a disruptive document.

Nagi Reddy and the three others who spearhead the opposition to and revolt against the Party and assert that the political-ideological line of the Party is ‘completely revisionist’ and ‘neo-revisionist’ have miserably failed in their statement to point out one single ideological political issue on which our Party has revised the basic tenets of Marxism Leninism. And yet, they embolden themselves to slander the Party’s political line as neo-revisionist. Is it not the height of irresponsibility and a naked demonstration of political bankruptcy to charge the Party with the grave crime of neo

revisionism without spelling out even a single fact to substantiate the charge? To indulge in such wild and filthy accusations against the political line of the Party does not speak of their political ideological maturity which they proclaim from housetops, but only demonstrates their Left infantilism and naked factionalism.

They arrogantly assert that the Party's ideological document is "a pro-Soviet and anti-China document". One can understand the criticism if it is discussed whether the document stands foursquare on Marxist Leninist theory and practice. But to examine it from the point of whether it is pro-Soviet or pro-China, or anti-Soviet or anti-China is not becoming of any Communist, let alone those who claim to be Marxist-Leninist theoreticians. We will have to remind these rebels that no Communist can remain a Communist if he were to degenerate into either anti-Soviet or anti-China maniac, since both these countries are socialist countries, irrespective of the revisionist or Left-sectarian mistakes that are being committed by the present leaders of these parties and states.

It is a pity that these people have worked themselves up into anti-Soviet positions under the bogus plea of a crusade against revisionism, and demand that the Party toe their bankrupt line. Better they are frankly told once again that our Party cannot oblige them and reduce itself to being either pro-Soviet or anti-Soviet or pro-China or anti-China and that our Party wishes to strictly adhere to Marxism-Leninism and pursue the path of socialism without deviating from it. Is it not ridiculous for these gentlemen to demand that the Party adopt a line of anti Sovietism, and when they are rejected, turn round against Party and malign it as following an anti-China line?

Since the statement of Nagi Reddy and others makes much of the ideological draft of the Central Committee, its preparation, circulation, etc., we deem it necessary to place certain facts which reveal the utter hollowness of their charges.

First of all, the ideological draft which was adopted by

the Burdwan Plenum was first prepared by the Polit Bureau in the month of June 1967 and was sent to all State Committees for criticism and suggestions for its improvement. The P.B. also had sent copies of the same to all members of the Central Committee and asked them either to send their criticism and suggestions, if they had any, or to produce a draft of their own in case they fundamentally disagree with it.

It is pertinent to note that not a single State Committee, at that stage, had expressed either any fundamental disagreement or submitted any alternative draft but had, by and large, accepted the draft and acclaimed it as satisfactory. Similarly, not one member of the C.C., including D. Venkateswara Rao who now joins the company of Nagi Reddy, had expressed any fundamental disagreement at that stage, nor come forth with any alternative draft before the C.C., according to the suggestion of the P.B.

It is still more interesting to note that D. Venkateswara Rao, despite his opposition to certain formulations and moving amendments to the document in the Madurai C.C. meeting, voted in support of the document, but wrote to the C.C. a month later saying that he was withdrawing his support to the C.C.'s draft. It was in the next C.C. meeting held at Calicut between October 30 and November 4, 1967 that D. Venkateswara Rao submitted his alternative draft and demanded its circulation.

The C.C. considered the issue and rejected the demand, since it could not muster the minimum strength among the CCMs required under the Party's Constitution. But at the Burdwan Central Plenum, the three alternative critical drafts, by D. Venkateswara Rao, Nagi Reddy and Pulla Reddy and Kolla Venkaiah, respectively were circulated to all the delegates and full opportunity was provided to them to express their views and freely and frankly participate in the discussions and decisions.

Is it not silly in face of these facts to come forth now with the baseless accusation that the P.B. denied the

opportunity for democratic discussions and violated inner - Party democracy? Why did they participate in the Central Plenum and its discussions if they honestly believed that it was a fake body, packed with some nominated proteges of the C.C. and P.B.? Did they discover its fake character after their political and ideological line was pinned down as petty-bourgeois revolutionism and Left adventurism and trounced and defeated by an overwhelming majority? We leave it to the people to draw their own conclusions.

The manner and method of constituting a Central Plenum have not been left vague to be arbitrarily decided by the C.C. or P.B., the Party's Constitution lays down a precise procedure. The Central Committee basing itself strictly on these constitutional provisions, decided the procedure as early as in August 1967, at the C.C. meeting at Madurai. The C.C. resolution specifically gave authority to the State Committees as to the manner and method of conducting the discussions and whether to hold District and State Plenums or adopt any other appropriate procedure to elect the delegates to the Central Plenum. Not one, literally not one voice of opposition was raised to this decision of the C.C. at any stage, till the Left-adventurist line was routed at the Central Plenum. May we ask these pseudo-champions of inner Party democracy as to what they were doing during all the period between August C.C. and the Central Plenum with the decision of the C.C. regarding the constitution of the Plenum and why now they are shouting hoarse against the Plenum with the lying propaganda that it was a nominated body?

Above all, it is astounding to hear from these rebels the dirtiest lie that "the delegates from Kerala, Bengal and certain other States were merely nominated delegations". They are informed enough and are fully aware of the fact that in Kerala there was a regular State Conference conducted with the specific permission of the C.C. and it was this conference, after a five day session, that unanimously authorized the newly-elected State Committee to elect the delegates to the Central Plenum. Similarly these opponents of the Party

line know that in Bengal the widest democratic discussions were organized, and 11,000 party members had participated in the discussions, that extended District Committee meetings were held for the discussion of the ideological draft, and finally the State Committee had unanimously elected the delegation. Not one complaint, literally not one, has been heard from either Kerala or Bengal till today on this score. And yet, Nagi Reddy and his accomplices in Andhra have the impudence to slander the Kerala and West Bengal delegations as nominated delegations. May be, they want to confuse the uninformed and ignorant around them by such tricks, as they have tried to do with their bankrupt political line.

The statement of the rebels seeks to spread another lying propaganda that the C.C. and P.B. have already taken disciplinary actions against or forced "the majority party members in Orissa, U.P., Bihar, Kashmir and certain important sections in Bengal", to leave the Party. Our C.C. or P.B. has so far not taken any disciplinary action on anyone for his or her different ideological political viewpoint and whatever actions have been taken were taken only when the concerned members came out openly in defiance of the Party and its elementary discipline.

The truth is that in Orissa out of a 800 on the Party rolls some 150 had left the Party. In U.P. out of a total of 3,600 members nearly a half revolted and left the Party under the leadership of one former CCM. In Bihar out of a total of 1,600 on the rolls only 150 people left the Party. In Jammu and Kashmir the total membership does not exceed 500, the adventurist leaders of the State Committee have announced their severence with our Party, and we have yet to ascertain the actual position of the members. In the whole of North India, excluding Punjab, our Party's strength in the different States does not exceed a total of 8,000. Out of that if two or three thousand are misled into a revolt against the Party by leaders like Nagi Reddy, does it substantiate the cheap propaganda that a majority of members of the CPI(M) are in

revolt against the C.C. and P.B.? This again is aimed to give false hopes to their following in Andhra.

Nagi Reddy and his rebellious colleagues complain with a sense of injured innocence that "the P.B. Open Letter accuses us with advocating an immediate armed revolt which the people of Andhra know is a white lie". We will have to point out firstly, that for reasons obvious, our Party Letter does not charge them with what they allege, and presents their political case as objectively and truthfully as their alternative documents put it.

Secondly, may we ask these comrades as to why they were fretting and fuming against the C.C. and P.B. for warning against the adventurist bragging of armed struggle and liberation base by the leaders of Naxalbari, even as early as May and June 1967? What is the sense of raising the slogan 'Naxalbari way is our way' in Party and mass gatherings? What is the political meaning of the slogans raised in illegal leaflets and pamphlets like "Bhagat Singh's way is our way" and "Che Guevara way is our way"? Let us tell these people frankly that we are not naive either to be taken in by talk of armed struggle, immediate or in the remote future, nor afraid of these aims. What we are concerned with is their anti Party, Left-adventurist propaganda and their incitement of petty-bourgeois revolutionism among the militant and impatient young Party members. Our fight against them is the fight against an anti-Marxist and extreme Left-sectarian political line, and its organizational counterpart, the defiance of the Party discipline and call for revolt against the Party.

The P.B., as well as the Andhra State Committee, has shown extreme patience and tolerance towards the factional activities of Nagi Reddy and others, with the hope that they would be able to see their folly, if time was allowed, and the issue discussed dispassionately. But every concession shown by the C.C. and P.B. is construed as its weakness and step by step, they have organized a party within the party to implement their anti-Party line.

When the C.C. and State Committee confront them with

the charge of anti-Party factional activities, they realize that their game is up and decide to stage an open revolt. That is what their Press Statement reveals. The persistence in indiscipline and factional activities for months in spite of repeated appeals to desist from them, and the final open revolt staged by these four leaders leave no option before the C.C. and P.B. except to summarily expel them from the Party.

The P.B. appeals to all Party members and sympathizers to fight this disruption and rise to defend the Party, its political-ideological line, organizational unity. It also draws the attention of all Party members to the fact that all reactionaries in the country are concentrating fire on our Party, they rightly see in it the real, political, class, revolutionary force. To allow this game of reaction to disrupt and destroy our Party, from whatever quarter it comes and under whatever garb it appears, is highly injurious to the cause we all dearly cherish and for which our people have shed their blood. The P.B. calls upon the State and District Committees to sternly deal with the rebels and uphold the Party, and its political line with honour and pride.