

APPENDIX

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We do have our differences among ourselves.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

23. N. SANKARIAH
24. K. RAMANI
25. H. S. SURJEET
26. JAGJIT SINGH LYALPURI
27. D. S. TAPIALA

28. BHAG SINGH
29. SHEO KUMAR MISRA
30. R. N. UPADHYAYA
31. MOHAN PUNAMIYA
32. R. P. SARAFF.