

## The Co-ordination Committee of the Revolutionaries of C.P.I.(M)—Its Nature and Object

Last November, a number of comrades of some States met in Calcutta and decided to form an All India Co-ordination Committee of the revolutionaries in the C.P.I.(M). A provisional Committee, which consisted of some members present at the first sitting, was formed and it set before it the basic aim of consolidating all the revolutionaries in India and of going ahead, step by step, towards the formation of a revolutionary party. There was not much secrecy about this sitting and the Co-ordination Committee formed here circulated quite publicly a Declaration at the end of the sitting.

Notwithstanding the quite open nature of this sitting, the bourgeois newspapers lost no time in concocting imaginary and fantastic news about it. The bourgeois press was then full of stories, e.g., a third Communist Party and its Polit Bureau have been formed in Calcutta, the Polit Bureau has been sitting for seven days, so on and so forth. It is difficult to say how the general readers were disturbed by these news; but they surely disturbed the revolutionary comrades. Failing to understand the real nature and significance of the sitting, the genuine revolutionary workers were filled with suspicion whether some people were again arbitrarily trying to foist a leadership on the revolutionaries. The revolutionary comrades of India have seen enough and been deceived enough. So, their suspicions were quite justified. However, in many group sittings held on the demand of the revolutionary comrades, efforts have been made to explain the formation of the Co-ordination Committee and its basic aims. In consequence, confusions and doubts have largely been dispelled. But it is impossible through these small group-sittings, to consolidate and contact the innumerable revolutionaries who have either

come forward or have been still coming forward. So, it appears that confusions, doubts and questions have been still persisting among many comrades. The Co-ordination Committee, therefore, feels it necessary to place before all revolutionary activists how it views the problem of building up a revolutionary party.

Before we say anything on this, we quote the relevant extract from the Declaration of the Co-ordination Committee. This extract reads :

“Comrades must have noted that revolutionary peasant struggles are now breaking out or going to break out in various parts of the country. It is an imperative revolutionary duty on our part as the vanguard of the working class to develop and lead these struggles as far as possible. With that end in view, all revolutionary elements inside and outside the party working rather in isolation to-day in different parts of the country and on different fronts of mass struggle must co-ordinate their activities and unite their forces to build up a revolutionary party guided by Marxism-Leninism, the Thought of Mao Tse-tung.”

In the quoted extract one can find that the problem of party-building has not been made vague by indiscriminate wording. There was none in the Co-ordination Committee who had even the ghost of an idea that a party had been formed in the Calcutta sitting; rather the sitting put some concrete suggestions about some urgent and imperative tasks the accomplishment of which is necessary for the formation of a revolutionary party. The first thing to be done for the formation of such a party is not merely the co-ordination and unification of the revolutionary comrades but the co-ordination and unification of their activities and their forces. This is the idea that has been emphasised in the Declaration. The Declaration, of course, does not mean by revolutionary comrades those who only mouth revolutionary phrases. According to the Declaration, revolutionary comrades are those who have been participating in various fields of people's struggles. The most important thing is that such wording

in the Declaration is not fortuitous. In fact, it is the profound understanding of the scientific method of forming a revolutionary party that has prompted the use of such language. This understanding has most powerfully been expressed in the Declaration where it says : “As the vanguard of the working class, it is our imperative revolutionary task to lead and unfold peasant struggles everywhere in the country.” The Declaration on the one hand, states that to carry out this task well a revolutionary party based on Marxism-Leninism and enriched by Mao Tse-tung's thought, must be formed; on the other hand, it emphasises clearly that this task of party-building is only possible through the co-ordination of revolutionary activities and consolidation of revolutionary forces. So far as the inter-relation between revolutionary activity and a revolutionary party is concerned, the Declaration has, in this way, sought to uphold this scientific idea that in the life of a revolutionary the authority is revolution itself, and not the revolutionary party. This means that the completion of the revolution is the ultimate aim and the revolutionary party is the indispensable organisational means to this end. Without a staunch revolutionary party, revolution cannot be brought to a successful consummation. That is why, there is the urge for forming a revolutionary party. A party is formed not for the sake of formation, but for the completion of the revolution, and, if it is so, then we have to acknowledge this hard reality that the birth and growth of a genuinely revolutionary party is possible only through the storm and stress of sharp revolutionary class struggles. Such a revolutionary party can never come into being merely through an ideological revolt or struggle. Even ideological struggles, divorced from revolutionary class struggles, are no struggles at all. They are reduced to mere phrase-mongering. The above extract from the Declaration has sought to emphasise the relation between revolution and the struggle for the formation of a revolutionary party.

Quite naturally the authors of the Declaration proceeded from this understanding when they met for the first time.

Consequently, they studiously avoided the mechanical process of convening a conference of the revolutionary comrades and forming a revolutionary party therefrom. Instead, they laid the entire stress on organising revolutionary struggles in every sphere and on the fundamental task of co-ordinating them. But such struggles can never be organised and carried on continuously if they do not synchronise with uncompromising struggles against all types of revisionist ideas and practice. So the Declaration gave a call for ideological struggle and called upon all to disseminate Mao Tse-tung's thought, Marxism-Leninism of our times, among the masses. Thus, according to the Declaration, the fundamental basis of unity of the revolutionary comrades is Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought, Marxism-Leninism of the present era. Naturally the Declaration fully disregards the slightest possibility of unity with those who profess to be Marxist-Leninists but are not ready to accept Mao Tse-tung's thought. Because, refusal to accept Mao Tse-tung's thought to-day amounts to the rejection of Marxism-Leninism itself.

If there is a correct analysis of the Declaration of the All India Co-ordination Committee, then this truth will inevitably come out that the scientific idea that should guide the formation of a truly revolutionary party did not escape the cautious notice of the comrades who assembled in Calcutta. It is this caution that led them to avoid any mechanical solution of party-formation.

According to the definition given in the Communist Manifesto, the communists are the most advanced and resolute section of the working class. By way of explaining this, it has been said that a communist is one who remains firm in the frontline of the battle and who, having mastered the course of social development, successfully turns the course of history to its ultimate goal. That is why, Lenin calls the Communist Party the highest form of class organisation. Obviously, such a vanguard can never be formed without revolutionary class struggles which, again, can never be carried

forward without a revolutionary theory. It means that a revolutionary theory becomes worthy of acceptance only when it shapes itself in the midst of struggle. In other words, a revolutionary theory comes into existence through revolutionary activities and its correctness is tested when it is applied to the field of revolutionary struggle. Such is the inseparable link between revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice. It is, of course, true that some of the fundamental principles of revolutionary theory have already proved themselves correct through the process of their repeated application in the course of history. They need not be tested anew. We can accept them as ready weapons. But this acceptance does not mean confining oneself to the mere acknowledgement of them. The test of a revolutionary is not whether he accepts them or not. The test of one's revolutionary mettle is whether one is trying to translate these theories into practice by applying them to the concrete conditions. It is thus seen that one cannot claim to be a real revolutionary without taking part in struggle, let alone enriching the revolutionary theory. Although a revolutionary is born in the course of his successful participation in class struggles at a certain stage, his revolutionary character does not fully develop at the very inception. Because, the true revolutionary at a certain stage of class struggle may, turn a deserter of the revolutionary camp at a more acute stage of class struggle or be a victim of dangerous deviations. So, the revolutionary character, too, like everything else, follows an evolutionary course through severe class struggle. Being tempered in the fire of class struggle, it is possible for one, only at a certain stage of development, to be transformed into a true revolutionary. Revolutionary authority, too, is thus created in the process of unceasing class struggle. Any effort to form a revolutionary party ignoring this stern reality is bound to degenerate and be artificial and mechanical. It is for this reason that the Co-ordination Committee has laid all stress mainly on the organising and sharpening of class struggle at all levels. In the process of this continuous struggle alone, the revolutionary party will be born and, following an

evolutionary course, it will, at a certain stage, attain all the quality of a true revolutionary party. It is by no means possible to organise or develop class struggles by the isolated efforts of individuals or groups, nor is it possible for a well-organised revolutionary party, claiming revolutionary authority, to grow except through the process of struggle. Under the circumstances, the comrades who attended the Calcutta sitting took the only natural course left open to them for overcoming these difficulties. They gave a call to integrate and co-ordinate all revolutionary activities at different levels. It is needless to explain to any revolutionary that such integration demands voluntary submission to some sort of minimum discipline. As a basis of this unity, they have put forward such tasks as are acceptable to all revolutionaries at the initial stage. These tasks are: organisation of class struggles at all levels, particularly the Naxalbari type of struggle in the countryside and, along with that, uncompromising ideological struggle against all brands of revisionist ideas and the extensive propagation of the thought of Mao Tse-tung. It has already been said that without a revolutionary party, revolution can never be successfully accomplished. It is for this reason that all attention has been drawn to the task of building up a revolutionary party. Again a revolutionary party cannot have a sound footing without revolutionary strategy and tactics. So, the Declaration could not but refer to the task of framing documents regarding strategy and tactics. It is to be noted that nowhere in the Declaration is there any hint that a party has been formed and its programme formulated and that revolutionaries are asked to stand by them. Rather, the framers of the Declaration have appealed to the revolutionary activists to close their ranks and co-ordinate the class struggles so that a real advance may be made towards the formation of a party and framing of a programme necessary for it, guided by the scientific principle that the foundation of a revolutionary party is laid through the process of revolutionary struggles; the comrades of the Co-ordination Committee did not hastily form a party. On the same ground, they could not accept this

attitude that a committee representing various groups who have been waging ideological struggles would serve the purpose of such a party. The Co-ordination Committee also did not lose sight of this hard fact that the revolutionaries, either as individuals or as groups, are, more or less, contaminated by petty bourgeois ideas and are victims of revisionist thinking and habits. Since the communist movement for the last forty years has been, in the main, revisionist and since it has passed through many petty bourgeois deviations, it is needless to say that all comrades are, to some extent weighed down by these perverted ideas and practices. Mere repudiation of revisionist leadership or the desire to follow revolutionary politics will not automatically make one fool-proof against revisionism. So, it will be the height of petty bourgeois mentality to think that although some comrades are burdened by revisionism, others are completely free from it. Besides, there are sharp differences on political questions among these groups. So, the proposition that the problem of party-building can be solved by the creation of a centre, consisting of the representatives of different groups, is without any substance. For, difference of opinion is not confined to a few groups alone. There are innumerable comrades who belong to no groups and yet have come forward to take part in revolutionary politics. These comrades have their own differences and we can never ignore them. The fact is that a large number of rank and file comrades, guided by no leadership, had been waging sharp ideological struggles since 1962, and it was in 1964 when the party was formally split that they consolidated themselves in the CPI (M). The urge to consolidate the revolutionary forces led them to consolidate themselves. It is not a fact that these comrades veered round the thirty-two persons of the old leadership because they had accepted them as true revolutionaries. Since no alternative leadership or authority had emerged from the rank and file comrades at that time, innumerable revolutionary comrades gathered round a section of the old leadership, which had broken away from the undivided party, as these comrades found in it a suitable ground to stand upon at the initial stage. Quite

naturally all these forces were consolidated at the Seventh Congress. But even after the Congress, inner-party struggle went on as before. The mighty revolutionary force that we see today is the culmination of ceaseless ideological struggle that has been going on since 1962. This force is no accidental by-product, nor is it the creation of the fostering care of one or more groups. It is true that after the Party Congress many individual comrades and groups had been earning the displeasure of the leadership and some of them had to come out of the party openly. In inner-party struggles, some comrades gradually began to put up an open fight against the leadership; but no group ever thought of open revolt and mobilised its strength for the purpose. Though the revolutionary forces had been gathering strength through inner-party struggle, it had been after all, a very slow process. Then came the Naxalbari peasant struggle which unleashed, on a wide scale, a mighty force that over-shadowed all sorts of group efforts. The party leadership was tested anew not on the basis of the political thesis of this or that group, but in the context of Naxalbari peasant struggles. This led to the widening and deepening of the ideological struggle. In the light of these events, the proposal that the problem of party-building can be solved by the creation of a centre, representing various groups, is absolutely inadmissible. In that case, something would have been imposed on the revolutionaries. The question may now arise: if a centre, representing different groups, is not fit to impose its decision, is it permissible for a single group to do that? Certainly not. That is why, the Co-ordination Committee did never assume the role of a group and for that very reason did not evolve any formula for uniting with other groups. The emergence of a mighty revolutionary force, in the wake of the Naxalbari struggle, opened the eyes of many comrades and this led them to think that these forces must be consolidated; but as there was no party to do that, it was through class struggles that this consolidation must be effected. Out of this consideration some comrades met in Calcutta and formed a Co-ordination Committee. Their object was to take the initiative of placing before the revolutionary comrades

a proposal that a revolutionary party can only be built up by grasping revolutionary politics and sharpening class struggles. Besides, Naxalbari event, there was another which made this meeting possible. As a sequel to the Deshabitaishi incident, the Deshabrati came into existence.\* The unprincipled political attack launched by the neo-revisionist leadership against the organisers of the Deshabrati had its opposite effect. Comrades of different states started contacting the office of the Deshabrati. Under the impact of Naxalbari struggles, the comrades had been groping for revolutionary politics. These contacts paved the way for the Calcutta meeting in November. To say that the November sitting was organised by a particular group or that they had formed a party, is a mere travesty of the truth. The comrades of the Co-ordination Committee have done only this that they have taken the initiative of leading the class struggles and uniting the comrades who take part in them. This initiative is an indispensable prerequisite to party-building. The Co-ordination Committee is only an initiative-taking body and any one, taking a similar initiative, will have equal right in it. That is why, the members of this committee did not deem it necessary to convene a representative conference with great fanfare. The comrades of the Co-ordination Committee are fully aware that, if what has happened in Naxalbari is repeated in several other areas, the question of party-building will not remain confined to the whims and caprices of a few comrades. That is why, the Co-ordination Committee has laid the utmost stress on organising struggles. This is the real nature of the Co-ordination Committee and this is how it views the question of party building.

\* This refers to the coup d'etat by the neo-revisionists for ousting the revolutionary comrades from the editorial board of the Deshabitaishi, the weekly organ of the C. P. I. (M) in Bengali. In consequence, the revolutionaries in the C. P. I. (M) brought out the Deshabrati, their weekly organ in Bengali.