IRABOT DAY OBSERVATION
How do we carry forward the democratic movement in Manipur towards development, peace and unity!

The meaning of nationalism is not to annex another country by destroying the nationalism of others. True nationalism cannot be the toy of imperialism. True nationalism is self-determination; it cannot be an obstruction to the self-determination of a country. Excerpt from Irabot’s Capitalism

Dear friends,

30 September has been widely recognised and observed as IRABOT DAY in Manipur to commemorate the birthday of comrade Hijam Irabot (30 September 1896–26 September 1951).

Comrade Irabot, who had a humble origin as a destitute orphan, was a leading figure of the social reform movement and political agitations in Manipur in the 1930s and 1940s. He was not lured by the prospect of royal prerogatives and official facilities including the prestigious post of membership to the Sadar Panchayat Court that were being offered to him for having married a princess. He resigned from a government job and fought against the various forms of oppression under feudalism and British colonial rule. He endeavoured towards the promotion of cultural identity, sports, literature and journalism. He was instrumental in the formation of reform organizations, students’ federation, peasant union, women’s organization and progressive party. By 1943 he was a confirmed communist and during his six years political exile till late 1946 he was politically active in parts of Assam. He was elected to the Manipur Assembly in 1948. Because of the extensive popular support for him, he was considered a threat to the ruling class who subsequently declared him a terrorist on 21 September 1948 before the formal inauguration of the Assembly. He went underground, carried out an armed struggle and died in the jungle in 1951. Comrade Irabot spearheaded the movement to establish a Manipur that would be free from subjugation, oppression and exploitation. In the decades after 1951, Irabot’s revolutionary line has not been encouraged nor his ideology adequately studied or promoted; although his works in the reform movement, anti-colonial struggle and democratic movement had been widely honoured and commemorated. Irabot is being appropriated and observed by various sections of population and institutions in their own ways. It is surprising to note that apart from other reactionary forces, this year the Red Shield Division of the Indian Army has joined Irabot Day Celebration. However, there has been a lull, if not complete discontinuation, of the revolutionary initiatives that Irabot had taken up. The discontinuation is not an indication of the absence of the material premise for the revolutionary movement to carry on in Manipur. The discontinuation is largely the combined result of the deliberate refraining from adopting the ideological framework of historical materialism to comprehensively address the conditions of Manipur, widespread ideological disillusionment generated by the left wing revisionists and the extensive counter-revolutionary works carried out by the right-wing opportunists.
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The subsequent emergence of several liberation organisations would fully explain that since the time of Irabot until today the colonial oppression remains. However, most of the militant organisations remained ideologically inclined towards right-wing nationalism; they have adopted a racial approach to construing nationhood that has been gradually perverted into chauvinism and the perpetuation of communalism, largely uncritical of the political economy, and indifferent to the scientific interpretation on the national question in the colonial and semi-colonial conditions. To add further complication to the situation, several militant organisations using the cloak of revolution have been carrying out forced extortion from the common people, human rights violations and individual terrorism, thereby making the people confused between what is revolutionary and reactionary activity. In the overall scenario, as a result of the absence of a uniting progressive ideology and common political line among the oppressed peoples, the ruling class could play without restraint on the sensational issues of communalism, territorial questions, various forms of repressive and terror tactics, and other divisive tactics to promote sectarianism among the population and to divert attention away from the genuine democratic questions. The political process, therefore, remains anarchical and confusing to many and the revolution is delayed.

Against this backdrop, Manipur Students’ Association Delhi is organising a programme on 30 September not only to commemorate the achievement of comrade Irabot and his political works, but also to have discussion focusing on the prevailing conditions in Manipur. We expect to have a discussion to carry forward the movement towards development, peace and unity in Manipur and beyond. We, therefore, invite you to kindly attend the programme and share your perspective. Your kind presence is highly solicited.

Manipur Students’ Association Delhi
30 September 2012

**IRAWAT SINGH OF MANIPUR**

**Nikhil Chakravarti**

About this time, in 1924, Irawat had his first contact with the national movement. He attended a huge meeting in Calcutta just after Mahatma’s release. Here it was that he found a purpose in life and pledged himself to serve his people.

Meanwhile, he was appointed a Magistrate by the ruler of Manipur. Ignorant in law and jurisprudence, he worked hard to learn them, and he was always anxious to reform them so that the inequalities might be eliminated. At the same time, remembering his hard days at school, he devoted himself to the spread of education in Manipur. Primary schools began to spring up all over the hills despite the unsympathetic attitude of many of the state officials. High Schools too were opened in Imphal.

Realising that an organisation uniting all the Manipuris was necessary for large-scale reforms in the State, Irawat took the initiative in forming the Nikhil Manipur Mahasabha with the clear aims of striving for national unity, and social uplift. The Mahasabha drew the patronage of the Raja. At the third session of the organisation held at Mandalay in Burma, Irawat was sent by the Raja to preside on his behalf and he was elected a Vice-President.

The wave of State People’s movement in 1936–38 touched the shores of distant Manipur as well, and the Nikhil Manipur Mahasabha moved forward from a purely social welfare organisation to a political movement with demands for
reforms. The organisation built under the patronage of the Raja turned into a liberal body, in the ensuing tug of war between the loyalists and reformists, the reformists won and Irawat was elected President by an overwhelming majority. But the reformist character of the movement soon gave way to more radical mass demands.

Irawat and his group carried on a campaign for reforms and collected mass signatures of thousands of Manipuris demanding responsible government.

**Fight For Food**

With the outbreak of the War in 1939, Manipur State’s People’s movement got in touch with the Congress in Assam mainly through the initiative of Irawat. The growing economic crisis hit the people and the prices went up. Big monopolists and rice-mill owners started grabbing all the stocks of paddy, and the poor Manipuris were threatened with famine. The Nikhil Manipur Mahasabha demanded the control of the rice-monopolists then. But this was ignored by the authorities.

This led to the starting of mass satyagraha by heroic Manipuri women. Military police charged them, resulting in injury… Irawat rushed back from Silchar where he was then organising the Manipuris in co-operation with the Congress.

Satyagraha found the Nikhil Manipur Mahasabha shaky and it backed realising the great significance of the movement not only welcomed it but formed the Praja Mandal with a more radical programme.

Repression, however, could neither break the Praja Mandal nor cow down the Satyagraha; and the authorities had to climb down and ban the export of paddy. This victory consolidated the Praja Mandal but its leader was clamped down in jail with three years’ R.I.

Inside jail, Irawat came in touch with the communist prisoners, and by studying Marxism grasped the full significance of the working-class and peasants’ movements in the battle for freedom.

With the onward march of Fascism, he could not keep quiet and when the Japs reached the borders of Assam he gave out the call for defence of the Motherland against the aggressor. But he was not released until the expiry of the full term of his sentence in March, 1943.

**Under The Red Flag**

On his release, not only did he at once join the Kisan Sabha, but attended the First Congress of the Communist Party as an invited visitor in June, 1943.

It was on the floor of the historic session, moved by the strength and patriotism that stands under the Red Flag, that he made known the memorable decision to join the Party and serve his people.

Meanwhile, Irawat applied for entry into Manipur, and pledged to raise a guerilla band of 25,000 from among his people to fight the Japs. Under his inspiring leadership, the Praja Mandal came out with a stirring call for the defence of Manipur.

**Repression Helps The Japs**

But the wooden-headed bureaucracy learns nothing and forgets nothing. Today, not only is Irawat banned from entering Manipur, but in course of his rousing patriotic campaign among the Manipuris in Cachar, ten of his co-workers were arrested and when I was in Assam, a report came that a warrant was issued for Irawat’s arrest!

This senseless vendetta of the bureaucracy helps, not certainly the Allied soldier at the front, but the Japs and their agents who give out that repression hounds Irawat and his band, because they have gone over to the Japs. The burrah sahibs in the Shillong Secretariat will never realise that Irawat among his own people can rouse such patriotism as will outshine half a dozen military victories.

But the true patriot does not whimper nor loses heart. ‘with folded arms and bended knees’, as he puts it in his message, this hero of Manipur appeals to leaders all over India to unite to save the country. It is UP to us to respond to this mighty call of patriotism.

**APPENDIX – I**

**Irawat’s Application for Party Membership**

I greet this first Congress of the great Communist Party of India on behalf of the six and half lacs of Manipuri people of whom five and half lacs live in the Manipur State in Assam – bordering on Burma – and the rest in Surma Valley districts.

I was almost at the border of Manipur when the news of the Session of this great Congress reached me. I travelled eighteen hundred miles to greet this first Congress of the Communist Party of India on behalf of the Manipuri people. Pray accept their Red Salute....

Comrades, our great and ancient country faces the outrages of the Jap marauders. My homeland has been severely hit by Jap machine guns and bombs. Imphal has been bombed time and again. On the 20th of April bombing took a heavy toll of my compatriots. Only very good military reasons prevent me from disclosing the number.

**TO RAISE THE BITTEREST HATRED OF OUR PEOPLE AGAINST THESE PESTS OF HUMANITY IS THE SACRED DUTY OF ALL PATRIOTS, TO RESIST THEM WITH ALL THE FORCE AT OUR DISPOSAL IS THE PRIMARY PATRIOTIC TASK TODAY.**

I have been refused entry into Manipur. What can I do now except work amongst my own people in the Surma Valley, rousing them against the Japs, isolating the fifth columnist from them?

Comrades, I have applied for membership of the great Communist Party of India and I shall consider it a revolutionary privilege if I am accepted as a member. I pledge my whole time and energy for the work of the Party – for implementing the patriotic policy of the Party in action.

(File photo of a mass rally under the leadership of Irobat. Source: Kangla Group)
The above message was conveyed by Comrade Irawat Singh, on behalf of the people of Manipur at the 1st Congress of the Communist Party of India held at Bombay from May 23 to June 1, 1943. He was a special invitee at the Congress. This is a reproduction of the article entitled ‘People’s Leader of Bombed Manipur Applies for Revolutionary Privilege of Party Membership’, published in the ‘People’s War’ Vol. I, No. 49, June 13, 1943. Mr. P. C. Joshi edited the ‘People’s War’ on behalf of the Communist Party of India.

Source: Irawat, Sentinel of the East, Irawat Centre for Marxist Studies, Imphal, 1988, pp.131-140.

Footnotes
1 The article ‘Irawat Singh of Manipur’ written by Nikhil Chakravarty is reproduced from the ‘People’s War’ Vol. II, No. 45, May 7, 1944. The ‘People’s War’ was an organ of the then CPI.
2 World War II.
3 The full paragraph ‘But Manipur thus does not lack in traditions – Vabruvahan, the legendary king of Manipur is famous in the Mahabharata as having defeated Arjuna. And this tradition was reinforced in modern times when in the 19th Century, British forces entered cattle before them. So that the Manipuris would not kill them, for they found it hard to face the Manipuri army in open combat’ is deleted.
4 Hijam Irawat Singh was born at Imphal on September 30, 1896. His father was Hijam Ibungohal Singh and mother – Chongtham Chanu Thambalinganbi. Irawat married Khomdonsana, niece of Churachand Maharajah, King of Manipur. He died on the 26th September, 1951 at Tangbo, Burma.
5 Nikhil Manipur Mahasabha: Founded on May 30, 1934 as Nikhil Hindu Manipuri Mahasabha, its aim was to unify the Manipuris inside and outside Manipur based upon the Hindu religion and to reform the society in social, cultural, economic and educational fields.
6 Nikhil Manipur Mahasabha: Founded on May 30, 1934 as Nikhil Hindu Manipuri Mahasabha, its aim was to unify the Manipuris inside and outside Manipur based upon the Hindu religion and to reform the society in social, cultural, economic and educational fields.
7 World War II.
8 The movement is known as ‘Nupi Lal’ (Women’s War in Manipur). The major event of the movement took place on December 12, 1939.
9 Irawat was arrested on the 9th January, 1940 on the charge of sedition and detained in Imphal Jail and then transferred to Sylhet Jail. He was released on March 20, 1943 from Sylhet Jail.
10 The first Congress of CPI was held at Bombay from the 23rd May to the 1st June, 1943. The 2nd Congress of CPI was held at Calcutta from February 28 to March 6, 1948.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE VIOLENCE IN MARUTI SUZUKI?

After an eerie silence of almost nine months, confrontation between the workers and management once again flared up in Maruti Suzuki’s Manesar plant (near Delhi), which had witnessed a series of strikes last year. In a fresh bout of confrontation on the 19th July 2012, the workers again rose against the arbitrariness of the management, leading to a bloody clash between them, in which the General Manager (Human Resources) was killed when fire broke in one portion of the plant and as per the company’s official statement, 100 employees were seriously injured. But no one knows, neither cared to find out how many workers were hurt or injured.

According to various reports that appeared in the media, the incident occurred after a worker was abused by the shop-floor supervisor who used a derogatory casteist remark against him. Subsequently the management also suspended the same worker Jiya Lal from work. This act of the supervisor was protested by the fellow workers, and a scuffle broke between them.

The worker’s got agitated when the management deferred its decision to reinstate Jiya Lal till next day. To quell any workers demand, MSIL (Maruti Suzuki India Ltd.) has institutionalised the practise of calling in armed goons (popularly referred to as bouncers). This tactic of theirs proved very effective in derailing last years strike and preventing any worker from airing their grievance openly. So as expected the goons were called; who on their arrival immediately closed the gates of the factory premises and started physically assaulting the workers inside the plant with sharp weapons and arms. The workers retaliated in self defence and a scuffle started, which led to some people being injured and the GM, being killed when he was engulfed in the fire that had broken in one part of the premise.

The MSIL management which for past couple of years have come to symbolise the true face of ‘corporate governance’ and also representing multi national capital, came into full swing. The Manesar plant was locked out and the entire incident was portrayed as another criminal act of the workers. The company issued a communiqué blaming the workers responsible for the entire melee and terming them as vandals and murderers.

The Haryana government that has always acted as the extended arm of capital was quickly to deploy its senior police officer. The Director General of Police (Haryana) R. S Dalal, came to the scene of violence on the 19th July and vowed to take strict action against the culprit. ‘We are going to take stern action against the guilty,’ he told reporters, adding nothing can justify this kind of violence. So without any investigation or enquiry conducted with one stroke the final judgement was pronounced. The workers of the plant are guilty. And then it was time for action. Normally the police force who are always seen as shirking from their duty and are notorious for dragging a case for years may decades, swung into action. By the end of the day, around 100 workers were arrested and sent to judicial custody. Having been slapped with various charges; including rioting with weapons, murder, attempt to murder, unlawful assembly, assault and
trespass. A cursory look at these charges suggests the malafide intention of the administration. How can a worker who was in the plant be charged with unlawful assembly or trespass? The ‘hunt’ for the still absconding workers continues and with the swiftness that the Haryana police has shown it will be a matter of few days before all the ‘culprits’ are nabbed and put behind the bars. Though it is still not clear whether the death occurred due to inhaling of fumes as a result of fire or due to burning.

The corporate media true to its allegiance to the capital left no stone unturned to portray the workers and the trade union as villains out to derail the country’s ‘stupendous’ progress. Day in and day out both the print and electronic media painted the entire story as an act of vandalism and murder by the workers of the plant supported by the leftist trade unions, who want to bring back the old militancy in the peaceful industrial development of the country. The government went a step ahead and claimed that Maoists have infiltrated the trade unions in the region and are out to destroy the industries. It, as per the newspapers report, has asked the Intelligence Bureau to start investigating the role of Maoist influenced trade unions in the region. Thus in coming days we will witness further harassing of the trade union leaders particularly of the radical left, who would now be termed as Maoists and thus becoming an easy prey of the management to quell any workers organising. Indian McCarthyism has started.

Whatever the public relations department of the companies or the media — that has itself become a PR vehicle of the capitalist’s — say or write, the simmering discontent that has been brewing among the working class in the entire country cannot be brushed aside.

The anger at shop floor — even though the workers are on the defensive owing to the weakening of traditional trade unions and the changing character of industrial employment — is growing and the more neo-liberal policies are implemented the antagonism between the working class and capital will intensify. The workers are feeling the pressure of the decline of real wages which have declined continuously for the last 15 years. The companies to circumvent the labour laws resorted to a contractual work force; who are paid well below the minimum wage norm with no security like Provident Fund, Gratuity etc. and job assurance. The policy of hire and fire, contractualisation, casualisation has become the norm to run a factory. This helps the owners to extract more profits while having to dole out a minimum in terms of wage and benefits. The government and labour department are well aware of these but turn a blind eye or actively connive with the capitalists so as to attract the mantra known as Foreign Direct Investment, much to the chagrin of the common masses and particularly the working class. It would be worth noting that in Haryana it is almost impossible to get an independent trade union registered, and without registration a person trying to organise the workers has no locus standi in the eyes of law. This phenomenon of deliberate weakening trade unions and the trend of contractualisation, of the work force particularly in the traditional industrial segment needs to be discussed seriously by the trade unions and activists so that a way out can be formulated. With an overtly pro-capitalist administration, capitalisation of trade unions of the parliamentary left and a hopelessly fragmented radical left, it seems that the workers would have to bear the brunt of the onslaught of capitalism for some more time.

But then, is not the birth of new order fraught with pain?

**Revolutionary Democracy**

NEPAL: NO CONSENSUS, AGREED! Despite resumption of talks to find out political consensus, there is no sign of political uncertainty shortening.

After breaking three months of silence, leaders of the country’s three major parties sat together and discussed the ways out of the political impasse. However, the outcome remained the same as all of them agreed to hold the meeting next week to find the elusive political consensus.

Given the recent statements and actions of political forces, there will neither be a fresh election nor the revival of the Constituent Assembly. The formation of a national consensus government by replacing the incumbent prime minister is still a far cry. After taking part in Non-Aligned Movement Summit in Tehran and meeting with Indian counterpart Dr. Manmohan Singh, prime minister Baburam Bhattarai’s confidence has gone up. “I am not against politics of consensus but it should help to settle contentious issues in constitution.”

However, other leaders consider three party meeting was a big achievement. “We have agreed to work in an environment of political consensus to end the present political deadlock. There is no other way than the political consensus to move ahead in the process of consensus making,” said Nepali Congress leader Ramchandra Paudel.

From Paudel to Maoist leader Prachanda and CPN-UML leader Ishwor Pokharel, all of them agreed that political consensus is a must in the present context. However, they have their own terms and conditions for political consensus.

UCPN-Maoist leader Prachanda proposed that the political consensus is possible only after the agreement on thorny issues like singe identity based ethnic federalism, presidential form of government and such other issues. He also proposed for referendum if it is required. “There is no hesitation in our party to form a national consensus government, revival of Constituent Assembly or fresh elections, if the two parties come with a clear stand on thorny constitutional issues.”

Nepali Congress and CPN-UML hold the view that resignation of prime minister is the first step to find political consensus. “Everything is possible once the national consensus government is formed replacing the present government led by Baburam Bhattarai,” said Sushil Koirala. “We don’t have any objection to revive the CA or contest the elections after formation of national consensus government.”

The conclusion of the meeting of three major political parties did not survive a day. While returning from Tehran, prime minister Bhattarai made it clear that there
is no question for resignation as long as there is a clear cut agenda for constitution writing. “I don’t want to stick to power for long. However, I will resign only after there is consensus,” said Bhattarai.

As politics is game of competitiveness, no body understands how leaders of political parties find consensus. Until the consensus is found, prime minister Bhattarai knows there is no replacement for him.

**By Keshab Poudel**

*Source: [http://www.spotlightnepal.com/Politics.aspx](http://www.spotlightnepal.com/Politics.aspx)*

---

**TURKEY: 69 TRADE UNION LEADERS TO BE TRIED FOR ‘TERRORISM’**

In partnership with International Trade Union Confederation, which represents 175 million workers in 153 countries and territories and has 308 national affiliates, and the following global union federations: ET, ITF, PSI and IUF.

On 4 October, 69 leaders from Turkey’s public sector union KESK, will stand trial on terrorism charges for merely engaging in trade union work. This is part of a clear strategy from the authorities to bring the union to its knees. While judicial harassment of unions, and in particular of KESK and its affiliates, has become endemic in Turkey over the past year or so, the court case against KESK has been dragging on for years. The evidence held against those who stand trial is at best flimsy: participation in trade union events and activities (of which photos and videos are being kept on file as "proof"), attending demonstrations or press conferences, participating in strikes, printouts of anonymous reports, illegally tapped phone calls that merely concern trade union-related issues etc... Of all 69 leaders of KESK who stand trial on 4 October, none has ever been involved in any action related to or resulting in any violence whatsoever. The ITUC, ETUC, EI, EPSU and others in the international labour movement are very concerned that they will be sent to prison as terrorists merely because they stand up for the rights of Turkish public sector workers, including those belonging to minority groups.

*Source: [http://www.labourstartcampaigns.net](http://www.labourstartcampaigns.net)*

---

**PAKISTAN RAILWAY WORKSHOPS WITHOUT GAS FOR OVER 2 MONTHS**

DESPITE over 10 days of token hunger strike, Pakistan Railways (PR) has not been able to restore supply of gas to its workshops which has been disconnected for over two and a half months now.

The Pakistan Railways owes close to Rs1,250 million to the SNGPL as it very conveniently kept procrastinating the payment of bills. After resisting disconnection for a long while, the SNGPL finally had to disconnect gas to the PR’s workshops.

The gas supply to the steel shops of the railways has been disconnected for over one and a half years now and the PR management has not shown any intent to revive it yet. The gas supply to the carriage shops continued till the SNGPL disconnected it too in the last week of July.

Although the PR management should have been the prime party, taking the initiative to restore it, it was the Railways Worker Union (workshop Establishment) that took the initiative while the management chose to shirk.

The carriages workshops had around 4,500 employees who have been sitting idle for almost three months now. The disconnection of gas supply has put to halt the production of train-brakes, springs and other important parts which can jeopardize not only rail operations but passenger safety as well.

The employees of these workshops work on meager salaries and make their ends meet through the heat allowances and overtime. Inactivity at the workshops has slashed around Rs6,000—Rs8,000 from their monthly earnings which has brought their homes to the brink of financial collapse.

The employees have tried their best to convince the PR management over the gravity of the issue through protest demonstrations and token sit-ins over the past month, demanding speedy restoration of gas supply and resumption of work.

On September 17, the Railways Worker Union (workshop Establishment) decided to go on token hunger-strike everyday followed by a protest.

The PR management finally decided to take up the issue and held meetings with the SNGPL officials who agreed to restore supplies over a payment of Rs 45 million. The railways promised the Union that it would pay Rs5 million everyday till the minimum payable is reached. However, the promise was not kept as from September 17 till now the PR has only paid one installment of Rs5 million. The strike of employees of carriage shops has entered its 11th day.

The PR spokesperson while commenting on the issue said that financial constraints are the only reason it had not been able to keep its promise. He said that this matter was high on PR’s priority and would be addressed as soon as possible.

**Railways Worker Union (Workshop Establishment) Vice-President Shaukat Ali Chaudhry, however, argued that the PR was taking the easy way out and was avoiding payment of the SNGPL by buying the parts from open market which they could produce at half the price in their own workshops.**


**Note:** Pakistan Mazdoor Mahaz is leading this movement as all the office bearers of Pakistan Railway Workers Union belong to PMM.

---

**A COMMENT ON “A PATHETIC DEFENCE OF STALINIST REPRESSIONS”**

One can understand the pain in the heart of die-hard Khrushchevite, Anil Rajimwale, while reviewing the book Khrushchev Lied. The pain is very genuine and inevitable because for some people it is extremely difficult to digest the truth. Since 20th Party Congress they have been deceived by anti-Marxist leadership of CPSU and their blood brother CPI regarding the truth in Soviet Union.

This time the truth was revealed by American Marxist scholar comrade Grover Furr. He has done exemplary research and attempted to publish facts
hitherto unknown to the world. He discovered all the lies perpetrated by Khrushchev during the so called Secret speech during the 20th Party congress of CPSU.

This congress is regarded as the “Black Congress” in the history of International Communist Movement, as Khrushchev and his clique were successful in launching coup-d’état and overthrew socialism in the land of the first successful proletariat revolution. Khrushchev distorted the Marxist-Leninist teachings and presented to the world number of so-called “new theses”, i.e. “the peaceful co-existence between two systems”, “peaceful competitions between two system”, “peaceful transition identified with the parliamentary road”. After all in the “secret report “On the Cult of the Individual and its consequences”, that blackened the glorious road pursued by the Bolshevik Party since the death of Lenin. During the period Socialism was consolidated in Soviet Union under Dictatorship of Proletariat that defeated and eradicated the menace called fascism from the face of earth and liberated vast majority of human kind from capitalistic tyranny with the creation of the socialist camp after Second world war.

Comrade Anil Rajimwale in his whole political life has stuck to the lies propagated by Khrushchev and later Gorbachev regarding Stalin and has never moved beyond that. He has not only closed his eyes and seems oblivious about the criticism of Party of Labour of Albania under Comrade Enver Hoxha and later by the Chinese Party on the 20th Party Congress but also about the recent acknowledgement made by the Communist Party of Russian Federation on the achievement of Stalin. This is the high time for all communists to once again do a serious discussion by referring to the documents republished from the Archives by Revolutionary Democracy (India), Direct Democracy (Communist) Party and even by the overtly Trotskyite site Marxist Internet Archive, and then make correct assessment of the work and life of J.V.Stalin and the fundamental changes that occurred in the Soviet Union and the international communist movement, after the disastrous 20th CPSU congress.

Note: The above is a a short comment on the review of Grover Furr’s Book Khrushchev Lied by Anil Rajimwale, written by comrade Manbhanjan. Anil Rajimwale, the leader of Communist Party of India and one of the party’s leading theoretician has published a review of Grover Furr’s Book Khrushchev Lied, in the pro CPI and pro Congress magazine Mainstream Weekly, titled A Pathetic Defence of Stalinist Repressions. The link to Rajimwale’s review is http://www.mainstreamweekly.net/article3616.html

Source: http://otheraspect.wordpress.com/2012/08/12/a-comment-on-a-pathetic-defence-of-stalinist-repressions/

MESSAGE TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION OF SHAHEED BHAGAT SINGH

Dear Comrades and Friends,

On the 105th Birthday of Shaheed Bhagat Singh, revolutionary greetings to all workers, peasants, women, youth and progressive intelligentsia of Pakistan. Our heartiest congratulations, to all the delegates and members of the Bhagat Singh Memorial Committee for organizing this important event to commemorate the Birthday of Shaheed-e-Azam Bhagat Singh, a great visionary and practioner of revolutionary struggle against British imperialism during our common freedom struggle.

Bhagat Singh was born at village Banga, District Layallpur (Presently Faisalabad in Pakistan) in the year 1907. He studied at Lahore and started his political struggle from the very soil of the city of Lahore. His martyrdom was also in Lahore on 23rdMarch 1931. Lahore remained an important centre for his revolutionary activities. So today’s celebration in Lahore is an appropriate historical event.

The organizers and the members present in the celebration are creating a milestone for the continuing anti-imperialist struggle in the South Asian region. This initiative, which has been conceived jointly by Pakistani and Indian comrades, who are working for the rights and dignity of the most marginalized sections, in this poorest region of the World. We strongly believe that today’s event will usher in a new political era in our common struggle against international capital and its agents operating in the region. Unfortunately the Indian delegation could not be physically present due to non clearance of visa formalities by the Pakistan Government. But we are very much present there with you in mind and spirit. We are committed to continue this process of uniting the radical and progressive forces of South Asian region against the onslaught of international capitalism and their illegal occupation in our space with all sincerity and vigor.

Let us celebrate this glorious day with the hope to build up new South Asian People’s democratic nations by driving out the imperialist forces; Bhagat Singh, Faiz Ahmed Faiz, Habib Jalib, Hali Panipati, Sohan Singh Josh, Sukhdev, Rajguru, Asfaqulla, Bismil, Bhagawati Charan Vohra, Batukeshwar Dutt, Jatin Das, Kartar Singh Sarabha are our common heritage. They are still living in the memory of our common struggle for independence from British Colonialism and native reactionary forces. They are the symbols of our common struggle and heritage. Thus the celebration of the lives of our heroes is very much a part of our political and cultural struggle for emancipation of the toiling masses of the region.

A detailed article on the Bhagat Singh political struggle has already been sent to you all. We would again like to congratulate you all for taking this historic initiative to build up a strong worker, peasant movement against imperialist and feudal forces in South Asia.

Inquilab Zindabad

Roma, Ashok Choudhoury, Sanjay Garg and Kiranjeet Sandhu (Nephew of Bhagat Singh)

(On behalf of Indian Delegation)
The CPI after the Transfer of Power in 1947

At the time of the transfer of power in India in 1947 the Communist Party of India had traversed a complex history. The scattered communist groups inside the country had been united under the banner of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Party in November, 1925. But this party constituted a broad left formation rather than a disciplined communist organisation. The single Communist Party was unified at the end of 1933 and began to make itself felt within the working class and as a political force in the country as an anti-imperialist force. The mounting strength of the CPI in the trade unions and the peasantry in these years led to its being banned in 1934. Despite this setback by the run-up to the Second World War the party struck deep roots in the working class particularly amongst jute, textile and railway workers. The party began legal once again in 1942 and rapidly increased its membership from four thousand members in that year to sixteen thousand in 1943 in which year the CPI was able to hold its First Congress. In these years when the CPI was headed by P.C. Joshi and expanded rapidly were also ones in which the party was mired in controversy. During the Quit India movement of 1942 the CPI became isolated from the freedom movement headed by the Congress Party for its closeness to the colonial power in the period of People’s War. The CPI feared for the survival of the Soviet Union which was allied at the time with Britain and the USA. On the issue of the formation of Pakistan, as advocated by the Muslim League, the Adhikari theses of the CPI ‘On Pakistan and National Unity,’ on the basis that India was a multinational state, came to the understanding that the resolution for Pakistan was a demand of the nationalities of the Muslim persuasion. Even though CPI support for Pakistan was dropped in April, 1946 it nevertheless inflamed nationalist and communal opinion.

In mapping the contours of the communist movement in India after 1947 we highlight the successive changes in political programme, the political and tactical line starting from the pro-Nehru period of P.C. Joshi, the insurrectionary stance of B.T.Ranadive after the Second Congress of the CPI in 1948, the momentary adoption of the ‘Andhra line’ founded on an understanding of the experiences of the Chinese revolution in 1950 under the leadership of Rajeshwara Rao. The Ranadive and Rao lines had crushed and shattered the CPI and compelled it to seek the advice of the CPSU (b) to find a way out of the morass it found itself in. After the discussions of the CPI leadership with Stalin in February and March 1951 the party under the leadership now of Ajoy Ghosh adopted a number of cardinal open documents on the party programme, on policy matters, on elections and a closed statement on the tactical line. These materials were produced in the period of ‘High Stalinism’ and were prescribed for some years. Long after they were sidelined after the death of Stalin they continued to haunt the communist movement for several decades. After the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, and in its spirit, the rule of the united left government in Kerala of 1957-9 provided a new model of governance in which significant land reforms could be enacted benefiting hundreds of thousands of peasants while retaining a formal adherence to the people’s democratic revolution which was to be implemented in an unspecified distant future. It was a matter of interest that the CPI and the CPI (M) were able establish themselves as a major political force in Kerala and West Bengal for decades not on the basis of the party policy of ‘land to the tiller’ but on the implementation of the land reform programme adopted by the Congress Party which was the only way for peaceful and orderly development, going through the present phase of national freedom, advancing, through unity and according to the degree of preparedness of the people, towards a socialist India.

That some non-Soviet communist forces agreed with the CPI view as may be seen in the writings of the British communist leader Rajani Palme Dutt and the observations of Georgi Dimitrov. In his visit to India in 1946 Dutt had advocated unity of understanding and agreement of the Congress Party and the international communist movement which was the only way for peaceful and orderly development, going through the present phase of national freedom, advancing, through unity and according to the degree of preparedness of the people, towards a socialist India. In the journal Labour Monthly that he edited Dutt continued to support this approach in the following year. In June 1947 while noting the negative aspects of the Mountbatten plan he insisted it was a signal advance and a retreat for imperialism. In terms similar to the CPI, whom he did not assail for failing to condemn the Congress acceptance of the British plan, he urged co-operation between the CPI and the Congress for achieving democratic advance, full independence, land reform, nationalisation and planned industrial development. As is evident from the discussion with S.A.Dange in July 21st 1947, Dimitrov, too, favoured co-operation between the CPI and the Congress Party in the period shortly before the transfer of power. The Bulgarian leader asked Dange his attitude to Nehru and was informed that though he,
Nehru, was against the CPI, the party supported him. Dimitrov suggested that an alliance be established with Nehru against British imperialism which would include communists, socialists and others supporting the Congress leader. This would enable the CPI to eschew that sectarianism which would isolate it. It was the opinion of Dange that few wanted such a broad united front because of hostility to the workers and peasants. But the line of reasoning given by Dimitrov was not a universal view amongst communist leaders outside India as the transcript of the discussions of Dange with Zhdanov held in Moscow in September in the same year do not suggest any such recommendations.

This trend towards the joint work of the CPI and the Congress which is evident in the CPI of 1946-47 was to be soon rejected by the CPI and the CPSU (b) but it re-emerged in the post-Stalin period. Khrushchev's views on linking up with Nehru are well-known. But this strategy was more widely accepted at the international level for this path was also supported by the Communist Party of China. In his autobiography, the leader of the Telengana partisan warfare, P. Sundarayya pointed out: 'In 1956-57, both the Soviet and the Chinese comrades advised us to forge a united alliance and go slow against the Nehru government. That way people can be mobilised without the party being seen as anti-Nehru, but if Nehru does not agree to an alliance it would be at his own peril, the Chinese suggested.'

However the Soviet Union in 1947 took a harder view of Indian realities. After the war the Soviet economist E. Varga had expressed the view that during the war: 'some of the colonies grew very strong economically; some colonial countries became financially independent of Britain and themselves became creditors of her'. On this basis Varga drew the conclusion that this signified a deep change in relations between the metropolis and the colonies: between Britain and India, the latter benefited. The war then, Varga continued, changed the political character of these colonies. As a result of the economic development of the colonies the position of the native bourgeoisie was strengthened. The views of Varga were contested by other Soviet economists at the joint conference of the Political Economy Section of the Institute of Economics and the Faculty of Political Economy of Moscow State University which was held in May, 1947. They denied that the colonial character of India had fundamentally altered as metropolitan investment dominated the economy and characterised the line of Varga as upholding the 'decolonisation' theses which had been long considered as being 'social-democratic'. A special session of the USSR Academy of Sciences held in June 1947 further confirmed the harsh characterisation of the Indian bourgeoisie and the Congress Party leadership by leading Soviet Indologists such as Dyakov and Balabaushевич. They argued that Indian capital and the Congress had gone over to the camp of reaction and imperialism. At the joint conference of the Institute of Economics and the Pacific Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR held in 1949, V.M. Maslennikov held that the CPI was:

'not free from the reformist influence which left its mark on the policy of the Party in the period of the Second World War. The Mountbatten Plan for the partitioning of India and the granting of Dominion status to India and Pakistan which was nothing but a deal between British imperialism and the Indian bourgeois top strata, a new form of the economic and political dependence of these Dominions on British imperialism, was evaluated by the former leadership of the Communist Party of India as some kind of 'step forward' and not as a new form of attack of British imperialism on the Indian people. After the partition of India into two Dominions the leadership of the Communist Party took the decision to support the bourgeois Nehru Government and decided on the "expediency" of forming a united national front from Gandhi to the Communists.'

Within a few months after 1947 the pro-Nehru understanding of the CPI under P.C. Joshi was replaced by the internecine line under B.T. Ranadive. The 1947 December Plenum of the CPI marked this change and presaged the emergence of the new radical leadership at the Second Congress of the CPI held in February-March 1948. It was now argued that the Mountbatten Award had not led to real but only fake independence with the form of subordination changing but not the substance. The award indicated not the retreat of imperialism but its 'cunning counter-offensive'. At the Second Congress Ranadive in his Report on Reformist Deviation roundly condemned the stands of P.C. Joshi in its positive evaluation of the Mountbatten award as an advance, its advocacy of a united front between the government and the people, ignoring the compromising role of the Congress Party which effectively tied the working class and the CPI to a policy of cooperation with the national bourgeoisie. However the Ranadive leadership went far beyond a critique of the reformism of P.C. Joshi. Heavily under the influence of the Yugoslav party the CPI leaned towards effecting a socialist revolution. The Yugoslavs in the course of their partisan warfare had felt little need to ally with other anti-Nazi forces such as those of Draza Mihailovic who were hostile to the partisans headed by Tito. After the war they gave an interpretation to the notion of people's democratic revolution such as to make it almost synonymous with the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist revolution. There was no substantial bourgeoisie in the anti-fascist or people's front in Yugoslavia, but, anomalously, the kulaks were thoroughly mollified, and included in the People's Front. Nevertheless, as Stalin pointed out in a letter to Mao, there were political parties apart from the Communist Party inside the People's Front in Yugoslavia. The democratic revolutions, Kardelj argued, was intertwined with socialist revolution and this thesis was enthusiastically adopted by the leadership of the CPI though it still maintained the strategy of people's democratic revolution at a formal level. The CPI, considered Ranadive, had to unite the working class, the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie and the progressive intelligentsia in its anti-capitalist strategy. No section of the bourgeoisie, large or middle, was incorporated into the strategy of the CPI. The repudiation of reformism was emphasised by support for the agrarian insurrection in Telengana which was directed against the Nizam of Hyderabad. At the time and later this whole line was dubbed as 'Trotskyite-Titoist' for its turn towards socialist revolution in what was still considered a basically colonial country.
Matters did not rest there. Ranadive formulated a perspective of fomenting revolution based on a general strike and widespread peasant jacqueries. In what became a parody of the strategy of the Bolshevik revolution it became clear the party did not have the wherewithal to organise the working class or the peasantry let alone to launch on an attempt to seize power. While Bolshevik strategy enjoined that it must be the masses of working people which must be the initiators of 'revolutionary violence' the Ranadive tactic was to indulge in individual terrorism by the party cadres. Attempts were made to begin an all-India railway strike through the All-India Railway Federation, but after the settlement by the socialist leadership with the government, the Ranadive group went ahead alone without any success. This tactic was tried again with a similar result. Only in the CPI-dominated trade unions was some degree of success actually registered in strike actions.²² But for the most part, as was pointed out in the party polemics at the time, individual terrorism was the order of the day. This may be considered as a recidivist throwback to the tactics of the national-revolutionary groups in Bengal and elsewhere who utilised terrorism before independence rather than as the tactics deployed by mass communist parties.

Opposition was bound to develop to this adventurism and it came from the Bombay trade unions led by S.A. Dange, CPI leaders such as Ajoy Ghosh, the disgraced 'rightist', P.C. Joshi, who carried out a vigorous international campaign against the 'Titoism' of the Ranadive line.²³ In India polemics began against the application of (in fact in a distorted form) of the Bolshevik strategy of October 1917 in Russia by the Andhra communists which in turn was based on an imagined understanding of the strategies of the Communist Party of China before 1949. At an international level the CPGB, the Cominform and the CPSU (b) entered the fray.²⁴

The highly polarised polemics between Ranadive and the Andhra communists reveal major conflicts developing from highly problematical interpretations of the Russian and Chinese revolutions.

The Andhra communist critique of Ranadive had a certain political force because of its connections with the partisan struggles in Telengana where an agrarian revolt was in full operation between 1948 and 1950 directed against the despotic regime of the Nizam of Hyderabad. Some 3000 villages in an area with a total population of five million were controlled by people's power where land was distributed among the peasantry and a partisan army functioned.²⁵ While this model could not be significantly replicated in the capitalistically more developed Andhra region the Andhra communists were inspired by the new democracy strategy of the CPC which had been predicated on the alliance between the Chinese communists and the Kuomintang during the anti-Japanese resistance. By April 1948 the CPC itself had had switched to the strategy of establishing a people's democratic state in consonance with the prevalent international understanding that people's democratic revolution was appropriate not only in central and south-eastern Europe and Asia but also in the advanced metropolitan countries such as the United States and Britain.²⁶ In this new context the advocacy of near-socialist strategies by Kardelj or Ranadive was radically out of line.

The Andhra letter of June 1948 demanded the application of the theory of 'New Democracy' as had been adumbrated by Mao in 1940 on the grounds that Indian realities were closer to the conditions of China rather than those of Russia. It argued that the CPI should unite the working class and the entire peasantry which was to conduct partisan warfare as an immediate task.²⁷ This was a full-frontal assault on the prescriptions of Ranadive on socialist revolution founded on working class insurrections and general strikes. In his broadsides against the Andhra line Ranadive argued that socialist revolution was more suitable for India as the country had achieved a high degree of capitalist development. In the rural sector this development meant that feudalism was no longer powerful and so that it was impermissible to unite with the rich peasant class for a democratic revolution. The views projected by Ranadive bore a striking resemblance to those of M.N. Roy, Bukharin and Trotsky in the late 1920s. These had been categorised as 'decolonisation' theory in the Comintern in 1928 for arguing that that independent capitalist development could successfully take place under conditions of imperialism without a revolutionary rupture and the establishment of a revolutionary-democratic regime.²⁸ Ranadive found the advocacy of the inclusion of the rich peasants in the revolutionary alliance to be an example of rank reformism by the Andhra committee. Then Ranadive did an extraordinary thing. He extended the scope of the critique of the Andhra line to Mao himself whom he considered as the fon est origo of the 'deviations' which were a danger to his own understanding.²⁹ He continued to uphold the Telengana struggle but this itself rapidly began to disintegrate as Indian troops entered Hyderabad state and proceeded to confront the armed peasantry. The debacle in Hyderabad state impacted on the Andhra committee for its line was rapidly transformed into one with elements of individual terrorism not much different from the Ranadive line itself.³⁰

Paradoxically, the Andhra committee prospered even as the Telengana struggle was driven into a corner by the Indian 'police action'. Indian communist opposition to the politics of Ranadive, the pressure of the Cominform and also of the CPSU (b) culminated in the January 1950 Cominform editorial which projected the Chinese path for India. In no way was this to be understood as support for a replication of the specific features of the Chinese revolution but it stressed only the aspect of the necessity of agrarian revolution in India.³¹ It was a slap in the face for Ranadive and his thesis of immediate armed struggle for socialist revolution in India. The Ranadive group was compelled to retreat. By May 1950 the Andhra committee was able to assume leadership of the CPI and secured the general secretariaship for Rajeshwara Rao.³² But this group had profoundly misunderstood the implications of the Cominform editorial as it proceeded to advocate the inception of armed revolution throughout the country on the Telengana example. As had earlier occurred with the opposition to Ranadive sections of the CPI leadership now stood up to Rajeshwara Rao. P.C. Joshi stated that conditions were not ripe for immediate armed revolution in India and posited the necessity of a return to the policies he had proposed in 1946–47. S.A. Dange, who had an important trade union base in Bombay, publicly opposed the policy of immediate armed revolt. Ajoy Ghosh and S.V. Ghate, too, came out against the policies of the
Rao line which effectively formed a second, though formally different, adventurist line.35

The continued crisis of the Indian communist movement was sought to be resolved by a letter from the CPGB in late 1950 which argued that the CPI had misunderstood the Cominform editorial of January 1950 to mean that the immediate task of the party was to inaugurate armed struggle. The CPGB rejected the policies of Rajeshwara Rao and outlined a political perspective which was not fundamentally dissimilar to that which had been elaborated by R.P.Dutt in 1946-47.36 While Rajeshwara Rao held on to the leadership of the CPI the crisis wracking the party continued unabated. In these circumstances the party requested the CPSU (b) to intervene to determine a path forward. Accordingly leading members of the CPI representing different currents in the party, minus the P.C. Joshi and B.T.Ranadive groups, had meetings with the CPSU (b) leadership in Moscow in February and March 1951.

In the meetings with the Soviet party leadership, particularly Stalin, the key questions of the programme and path to be adopted in the Indian revolution were thrashed out. Stalin saw the stage of revolution in India to be a part of the people’s democratic revolution at its first stage. This was an anti-feudal agrarian revolution where the property of the national bourgeoisie was left untouched. It was analogous to the path adopted by China. Stalin rejected the understanding that India stood before the socialist revolution. This he considered to be a ‘very dangerous thesis’ which had been upheld by Ranadive and which had prompted the Cominform editorial of January 1950 which indicated that India was on the Chinese road. A later phase of the people’s democratic revolution was the second socialist stage which already had been embarked upon in the countries of eastern Europe in which the national bourgeoisie was expropriated. The sharp blade of the Indian democratic revolution had to be directed at English imperialism which continued to dominate India. There was no need to take on the United States as an additional enemy. In the rural sector the entire peasantry, including the kulaks, needed to be mobilised against the feudal lords. As regards the top sections of the Indian national bourgeoisie Stalin considered that although they were having an alliance with imperialism they had a vested interest in achieving the full independence of the country as well as building up the domestic market by the complete end of feudalism. There was no need to push the Indian bourgeoisie on to the side of the English.

Stalin launched into a devastating critique of the understanding of the CPI on partisan warfare before its proponents in Andhra and Telengana who wished to extend it to the whole of India. He rejected the understanding of the party that partisan warfare in the rural areas alone could secure the victory of the revolution in India. ‘Armed struggle’ was required which embraced the combination of the general strikes and uprisings of the workers alongside the partisan war of the peasants. In China matters had been different. The CPC had not practiced ‘armed struggle’ in the peculiar circumstances of China but ‘armed revolution’ which signified the existence of partisan warfare together with the participation of an army of liberation. When it was compelled to break with the Kuomintang the CPC had its own armed forces. This had become the basis of partisan war but it had suffered from the weakness that it had to establish itself in the forests and mountains far from the railways and the towns. It was a grievous necessity that the CPC had to be separated from the working class. Moreover the partisan regions were prone to encirclement and blockade by the forces of Chiang Kai-shek. It was only after the Chinese communists moved into Manchuria that, because they had a friendly Soviet rear, they no longer had to fear encirclement, and could think of going on to the offensive against the Kuomintang troops. Stalin noted that India had no stable rear such as that which had been available to the CPC. While India would have liberated regions and possibly also a liberation army in the absence of a stable rear partisan war could not by itself be successful and so it was necessary to have revolutionary actions by the working class.

Intensive work was necessary to win over the majority of the working class, prepare strikes of the workers and of the railwaymen, and form workers’ detachments in the towns.35

On the specifics of the situation in Telengana, Stalin opined that it was inaccurate to assert that civil war prevailed in India. While land had been seized in Telengana it did not mean that partisan warfare was main form of struggle in the country. Stalin held that Telengana was the beginning of the opening of the struggle but it was not the main form of the struggle from which India was yet far off. In his handwritten notes on a letter received from Rajeshwara Rao dated 14th February 1951 where the CPI leader asked whether partisan war needed to be withdrawn in Telengana and Tripura Stalin commented: ‘No, if the people want continue the partisan struggle’. At the same time Stalin stressed the need for the peasantry to learn to struggle on lowering lease rents, lowering the share of the harvest paid to the landlord and so on. A weak party such as the CPI should not at once speak of armed struggle as serious difficulties would arise.36

Given the history of the CPI under the leadership of both Ranadive and Rao the remarks of Stalin on the question of individual terror were very instructive. Stalin noted the inclination of Indian communists to the side of individual terror against the enemy. Yet he countered the statement of Ajoy Ghosh and S.A. Dange in their letter to Stalin dated 14th February 1951 which suggested that communists were opposed to all types of terrorism. Stalin noted that they were in favour of the terrorist actions of the masses but against the terror actions of individual revolutionaries and persons acting outside the movement behind the back of the masses. In the discussion of 9th February 1951 on the same question Stalin stated that individual terror was such if the masses did not engage in the actions. If the masses were passive spectators then a division was created between the heroes and the masses which had been the characteristic of the Socialist Revolutionaries in Russia.37

To be continued...
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