

Basavapunnaiiah's Laborious Intellectual Exercise

Attempt To Assure Soviet Leaders that CPI (M) is Pro-Soviet revisionist Leadership

Anyone going through the article that has been published in the People's Democracy dated 16th Dec. 1973, under the heading "Indo-Soviet Agreements and the CPI(M)", written by Mr. Basavapunnaiiah, a well-known leader of the CPI(M), would wonder what might be the real purpose of the said article?

It may superficially appear as if Mr. Basavapunnaiiah in his article has attempted to give reply to charges labelled against the CPI(M) by the CPI that the former is anti-Soviet and is following a policy pretending equi-distance between the Soviet Union and the Socialist China. But, is it really so? Or is it an attempt, that under the pretext of replying to the CPI, Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has actually made to assure the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union that whatever the CPI might say against them, the CPI(M) is not at all anti-Soviet revisionist leadership?

Let us examine if such an idea is a product of one's wishful thinking or based on objective ground. For this purpose let us at first see what might be the reasons that have led the CPI to label the charges against the CPI(M) as stated above.

Like us, along with others, the CPI knows that recently CPI(M) leaders, one after another have visited the Soviet Union.

It also knows that a journal published on behalf of the GDR was being printed in the Ganashakti Press i.e., the press owned by the CPI (M). Like us, along with others, the CPI must have noted that one no longer finds outbursts against Soviet revisionism in the pages of the organs and other publications of the CPI(M) which one most often used to come across in the past. Rather, in place of criticism against the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union one is increasingly noticing praise of the role of the said revisionist leadership even on issues which are not only looked upon with suspicion by the resurgent nationalist countries of Asia and Africa but also at times strongly condemned by the freedom-loving people all over the world. A glaring example among many such issues is the shameful humiliating cease-fire resolution on the recent West Asian conflict that was jointly engineered by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union along with the U.S imperialists and imposed on the fighting Arab people tantamounting to a betrayal of their cause.

Like us, along with others, the CPI must have also noted that for sometimes past, the CPI(M) leadership while, on

the one hand, are praising the Soviet revisionist leadership on and often even on trifling issues, on the other, contrary to their previous attitude towards the CPC, are more and more reflecting an attitude of bitter criticism towards the CPC and the Socialist China in their gestures and deportments. Again, in the wake of understanding with the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union the CPI(M) is trying to be closer to the CPI for a better mutual understanding and with this end in view, the CPI(M), instead of calling the CPI any more as 'Dangeite revisionist' has began to term it simply as 'Right CPI.'

Moreover, like us, along with others, the CPI must have also noted that for sometimes past, the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union on their part are also showing an attitude of softness towards the CPI(M). The CPI can easily understand that the advice given to it by Mr. Brezhnev during his last visit to our country, to come to a closer understanding with the CPI(M) is an outcome of this soft attitude that is being at present expressed by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union towards the CPI(M).

Now, like us along with others, the CPI also understands very well that all these facts and incidents clearly show that attempts are being made by both the CPI(M)

leadership and the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union to come to a closer understanding behind the screen.

Now, for obvious reasons, the CPI, being apprehensive of the fact that any sort of relation developing between the CPI(M) and the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union might jeopardise its own interest, has actively engaged at impairing the growth of the same. To fulfil this desired objective, the CPI has attempted to mislead the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union by trying to depict the CPI(M) before them as anti-Soviet revisionist leadership.

This is quite understandable and any sensible man can easily follow the meaning of it.

Now, if Mr. Basavapunnaiiah would not have desired to assure the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union that they were not anti-Soviet revisionist leadership and, more over, if he would have meant to maintain at least on word for word's sake, their once announced old position that the CPI(M) would fight against modern revisionism and particularly the revisionism practised by the Soviet revisionist leadership then he could have stated in his reply to the CPI that, 'what is wrong in one's becoming anti-Soviet revisionist leadership? The CPI(M) leadership were always against revisionism and anti-Soviet revisionist leadership which they are still now.' But Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has not uttered anything like this. On the contrary, it would clearly appear that the CPI(M) leader has become perturbed at the possibility of their growing relation with the Soviet revisionist leadership being impaired by the CPI's attempt, and with a view to frustrate this attempt has promptly come forward to denounce the charge labelled against them by the CPI that they are anti-Soviet revisionist leadership.

The CPI(M) leader, in his reply to the CPI has virtually assured the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union that they are not anti-Soviet revisionist leadership though sometimes they have to

criticise the said leadership on certain issues. In no case this proves that the CPI(M) is going against the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union. For, they have to do this for preserving their so called 'revolutionary image' among their cadres which they expect of their revisionist friends of the Soviet Union to understand. Moreover, in his argument, Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has pathetically tried to impress upon the Soviet revisionist leadership that when they even criticise them, do they not do it in a fraternal tone like a close ally or friend? Do the Soviet revisionist leadership not observe that they are far, far more critical of the CPC?

To any critical reader it would therefore appear that on the plea of replying to the charges labelled against them by the CPI, Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has in reality tried to assure the Soviet revisionist leadership that whatever the CPI might clamour against them, they are really pro-Soviet revisionist leadership. But this has not been an easy task for him. For, apprehending lest their so called 'revolutionary image' would become tarnished if his real motive becomes exposed to their cadres, Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has to take recourse to a subtle way of assuring the Soviet revisionist leadership through which he assumes they can escape the danger of being exposed to their own cadres. In fact, being guided by this deep rooted objective, Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has to perform a laborious intellectual exercise through two and half pages which has taken the form of the present article under examination, though how far he has succeeded in his job is anybody's guess. No doubt, it is due to the low standard of ideological and political make-up of their cadres that Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has dared to launch such a futile attempt. For, any cadre of a revolutionary party, with adequate political and ideological education could have easily grasped the inner motives that have led Mr. Basavapunnaiiah to perform such an unsuccessful exercise.

We would like to raise some pertinent questions before the CPI(M) leadership including the author of the article under review. When the CPI(M) emerged as a separate party from the united CPI, its very emergence was sought to be justified by making the pledge that it would have to fight against modern revisionism and particularly the revisionism practised by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union—a trend that, after being once developed in the past as the main danger to the world Communist movement, has now become the worst enemy against the healthy growth of the international Communist movement.

But, do the CPI(M) leadership still consider modern revisionism, the floodgate of which has been opened up by the Soviet revisionist leadership, at least as the main danger if not the main enemy before the international Communist movement which they openly stated in the past at the time of the formation of their party from the united CPI? Do they still pledge to fight against modern revisionism, the rotten enemy of the international Communist movement which they pledged to do in the past during the formation of the CPI(M) out of the split in the united CPI? Moreover, and perhaps one of the most crucial issues is, do they still consider the present leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet state as arch revisionists? If not, then how can they justify the existence of the CPI(M) any more as a party separate from the CPI other than for preserving the group interests of the leaders, as because all other points of its difference with the CPI relate only to tactical questions? We hope the rank and file of the party would seriously ponder over the matter.

We have had to raise these questions, because for sometimes past, along with others, we too have been observing that the CPI(M) is trying to be closer to the Soviet revisionist leadership and that too, in a very surreptitious manner. (Contd. to Page Three)

CPI(M) Leadership Eulogise Treaty Designed to Realise the Interest of Soviet Revisionist Leadership

(Contd. from Page 2)

tious way at the very back of their own rank and file, supporters and the masses.

Apart from the facts and incidents that we have already mentioned, the manner in which Mr. Basavapunnaiyah has given rather unqualified support to Indo-Soviet economic agreements, Indo-Soviet treaty and eulogised Soviet aid, has also revealed without any doubt that with days passing on, they are gradually becoming more and more inclined towards the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union. In this regard, Mr. Basavapunnaiyah has quoted the relevant portions of the Polit Bureau resolution of the CPI(M) where the Soviet aid, economic co-operation with the Soviet Union and Indo-Soviet treaty have been highly praised for fulfilling our CPI(M) friends' wishful thinking that they 'have helped in lessening the dependence of our country on U. S. imperialism'. Now, so far as the Indo-Soviet treaty is concerned, we would like to refer to our former issue (Prolet. era 15th Sept, 1971) where we have thoroughly analysed the said treaty in detail and placed our considered views on the same. For the present, with a view to place our main observations on the said treaty vis-a-vis the view point of our CPI(M) friends that we have already stated above before our critical readers, we would like to quote certain relevant portions from our earlier issue that has been referred to above. 'It is important to note here that at a time when China is attempting to normalise her relationship with all countries including India ... This treaty was concluded with hot haste by the Soviet Union taking advantage of India's complete dependence on her due to Bangladesh issue. So, in the background of prevailing hostility between the Soviet Union and China, such an apprehension can not be ruled out that this treaty, particularly the Clause X of this treaty may be aimed at frustrating the necessary move required from the side of India Government to

restore our old friendship with China.

A question still haunts the minds of conscientious public why the Soviet Union particularly chosen this time in signing this treaty and hastily concluded it containing certain clauses which may be interpreted as an attempt to bind India closely with her against China, now a hostile country of the Soviet Union taking advantage of India's difficulty on Bangladesh issue. Where as it was expected of the Soviet Union carrying a long revolutionary tradition as socialist state to take a patient, real, energetic and objective approach towards restoration of normal relationship with China, thereby cementing unity of of the socialist camp, the Soviet Union on the contrary is obstructing China's sincere effort to develop friendly relationship with all countries which is clearly evident from their recent hectic diplomatic move precisely designed for that purpose.... Soviet Union was worriedly and anxiously, noticing for sometime, the growing symptoms of India's eagerness to restore normal relationship with China.

Precisely under this background one is likely to presume that the Soviet Union has particularly chosen this moment for signing treaty with such a haste with the sole motive of binding India closely with her against China when India is in a difficult situation and completely dependent on Soviet Union's help for Bangladesh issue... If it is seen that in the course of time it becomes possible to have a rapprochement between the Soviet Union and China... then this particular clause of the treaty will have practically no bearing on India in playing her full independent role.... But if such a situation does not occur in the near future and the hostile attitude of the Soviet Union against China still continues then whatever small benefit the Indian side might have accrued out of this treaty in respect of Bangladesh issue... this treaty in the long run in course of 20 years, will virtually

subjugate Indian interests and this particular clause will definitely act as a brake on our attempts to normalise relationship and restore old friendship with China'.

So our question is, how can anyone, other than the choir boys of the Soviet revisionist leadership eulogise such a treaty which was solely designed to realise the interest of the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union to extend their spheres of influence and to bind India along with her against China, with a view to frustrating any attempt on former's part to restore her old friendship with China, by observing that this 'have helped in lessening the dependence of our country on US imperialism'? Is it not an wishful thinking on the part of the CPI(M) leadership if they still consider the leadership of the party and state of Soviet Union as revisionists? Of course, the position would fundamentally change if the CPI(M) leadership no more consider the Soviet leadership as revisionists. We hope the rank and file of the CPI(M) will think over this pertinent question.

Now, let us concentrate our attention on the issue of the aid given to India by the Soviet revisionist leadership and the economic co-operation in which the said revisionist leadership have entered with India.

It is known to all that on the questions of giving aid to, entering into economic co-operation, or making treaty with any under developed or developing capitalist country, the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist leadership of any socialist country is to be guided by the primary and basic objective of intensifying the contradiction of those countries with imperialism, to make them free from the influence of the imperialist powers as far as possible, with a view to gradually weakening the world imperialist chain and thereby ultimately create conditions in favour of world revolutionary movements. Again, no wonder that the ruling capitalist class of the countries receiving the aid would naturally try to utilise the aid to consolidate and strengthen capitalism in their respective countries, which

even a layman understands. Any effort on their part even to utilise the aid for lessening their dependence on foreign imperialism would only be aimed at fulfilling their own natural aspiration of developing themselves into imperialist powers. Such attempts, only to a certain extent can be contended by organising vigorous and mighty left and democratic movements in those countries. But, in order to completely frustrate the attempts of the ruling bourgeoisie once for all, a fundamental transformation of the society is necessary. This can only be achieved by overthrowing the bourgeoisie from power and establishing socialism. But, still one should welcome the aid provided the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist leadership of the socialist country, being fully conscious of the primary and basic objective of the aid that we have earlier elaborated, extend the aid to the underdeveloped and developing capitalist countries to fulfil the aspirations of the people for the development and progress of their countries. Though how much this aid would be utilised by the ruling bourgeoisie against the interest of the people, or to what extent, this would be really utilised for fulfilling the people's aspiration for developing their countries, would mainly depend upon how far the class-conscious workers of the aid receiving countries could correctly handle and resolve the problems and contradictions, relating to the aid programmes of the socialist countries in manners conducive to the growth of the revolutionary movements in those countries. Now a pertinent question is, the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union, who from the role they have repeatedly played in the important international events that have happened since the twentieth party congress of the CPSU till to day, like the Vietnam war, Cuban crisis, Nixon-Brezhnev summit, West-Asian conflict etc, have clearly revealed that they have reached the ultimate stage of pervasion in the game and tactics of revisionism, and are hand-in-glove with the U. S imperialists to

enter into nefarious agreement for mutually extending their spheres of influence—can they fulfil the desired objectives of the socialist aid programme that we have earlier elaborated? No Marxist-Leninist can ever believe that.

At present, when it is being glaringly testified that the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union are in collusion with the U. S imperialists for mutually extending their spheres of hegemony any aid given, or a treaty made by the said revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union, with a view to fulfilling our CPI(M) friends' wishful thinking of 'lessening the dependence of our country on the U. S imperialists' is, on the one hand, actually an attempt on the part of the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union to increase their spheres of influence and on the other, to restrain as far as possible any attempts on the part of the ruling bourgeoisie of our country to normalise relationship and restore old friendship with the Socialist China. Any true Marxist-Leninist can easily see to it in spite of the fact that Mr. Basavapunnaiyah is trying to make us believe otherwise.

Even if the CPI(M) leadership do not agree with our observation that in the present situation the supply of aid to different countries is actually an attempt on the part of the Soviet revisionist leadership to increase their spheres of influence, still we hope that they would agree with what we earlier stated in regard to the primary and basic objective of the aid given by the Socialist countries to others. But what is most curiously lacking in the observations made by Mr. Basavapunnaiyah, is a critical examination of the character of the aid given by the present Soviet revisionist leadership in the background of the fulfillment of these objectives. Not only that Mr. Basavapunnaiyah has refrained from making any such critical examination; over and above the manner in which the CPI(M) leadership have

(Contd. to Page 6)

CPI(M) While Rendering Support to Soviet Revisionist Leadership Directs Unprincipled Criticism to CPC

(Contd. from Page 3)

highly praised to the superlative degree the Indo-Soviet treaty and the aid given by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union through their observation that they 'have helped in lessening the dependence of our country on the U. S. imperialists' has glaringly revealed their growing inclination to the Soviet revisionist leadership. However, from all these things one should not conclude that the CPI(M) leaders have completely refrained from criticising the Soviet revisionist leadership any more. It is a fact that they no more call them revisionists. They even unequivocally lend support to those activities of the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union which are condemned by the freedom loving people all over the world. But, apprehending lest their motive may become exposed they still make certain ostentatious criticism against the Soviet revisionist leadership. In fact, in the present article too, Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has made some criticisms of this sort. For obvious reasons, these criticisms made in a very very mild tone are fraternal in nature.

But, side by side along with this sort of attitude that is being expressed by the CPI(M) leadership towards the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union, for sometimes past, it is being observed that the said leadership have been gradually revealing an attitude of intensive unprincipled criticism towards the CPC and the Socialist China—a criticism that is not based on even a single fact and correct understanding of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. In this regard, we would like to quote a relevant portion from an article by Mr. Sundarayya, the General Secretary of the CPI(M) (People's Democracy 23.12.73.), where he has bracketed the CPC and the Socialist China with the Jansangh, Congress(O) etc, for their alleged anti-Soviet position and stated, 'It is unfortunate that the Socialist China, its press

and Radio (the Chinese Communist party and the Chinese Government) carried away by its sharp conflicts with the Soviet Government and Soviet Communist party (not even a single word is mentioned about the revisionist character of the leadership!—writer), have been attacking Indo-Soviet economic relations from the same angle as that of the Jansangh, Congress (O) and other reactionary forces in our country.' We would have appreciated if Mr. Sundarayya, before making such rotten false allegation against the Socialist China and the CPC would have placed an analysis in support of his observation. But we are constrained to note that any such attempt is lacking on his part.

Moreover, the CPI(M) leadership claim themselves to be Marxist-Leninist. But, any Marxist-Leninist knows it well that situation may arise when a particular issue may face opposition or suffer criticism from both the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist viewpoint and the right reactionary angle. For that reason, no other than fools and idiots can equate them alleging that they possess identical angularities in views. So, any sensible man might conclude that Mr. Sundarayya, though he claims himself to be a Marxist-Leninist, has in reality behaved like a simpleton who equates the angularity of the revolutionary viewpoint at par with that of the reactionary view on the plea, that both have opposed a particular issue, without judging at all which has opposed it from what view point and for what underlying reasons.

A growing tendency of directing unprincipled criticism towards the CPC and Socialist China has also been reflected by Mr. Basavapunnaiiah in his observation that the CPC showed opportunistic distortions of some basic ideological and political questions. Here Mr. Basavapunnaiiah too, has failed to establish his contention and the political resolution adopted by the CPI(M) in the Ninth Congress,

that he has referred to in his support had been thoroughly and critically analysed by us before, when we clearly showed that the charges labelled against the CPC by the CPI(M) in regard to the allegation made against the CPC for basic distortions in the ideological and political field do not stand on a correct analysis on the anvil of Marxism-Leninism.

In fact, the CPI(M) leadership have taken recourse to some nasty tactics. When their main objective is to lend unequivocal support to even those activities of the Soviet revisionist leadership that have been condemned by the freedom loving people all over the world, they in a very formal tone observe that they also support the Socialist China and the CPC even though they never attempt to appreciate or appraise the fact that at present it is the CPC which in the main is reflecting the correct revolutionary line against modern revisionism, the floodgate of which has been opened up by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union. Again, when their main motive is to criticise the Socialist China and the CPC even in an unprincipled manner and on a totally false premise, they express in an inaudible feeble tone that they do not agree with some of the observations of the Soviet leadership. By this manner, the CPI(M) leadership are trying to show that they are pursuing a policy of equi-distance both from the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union and the CPC, for while they support both the Soviet revisionist leadership and the CPC, they are at the same time critical of both of them on some of their observations and activities. A queer position indeed!

Any right thinking man may ask them, how can one equally support the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union practising modern revisionism and the CPC which in the main is reflecting the correct revolutionary line against modern revisionism? Again, any one may not agree with many observations of the CPC;

may not support many activities of the CPC. But, without even ascertaining the validity of one's contentions regarding those observations and activities of the CPC, what one would like to ask is, how can any one under any circumstance equate one's criticism of the CPC which in the main is at present reflecting the correct revolutionary line, at par with his criticism of the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union practising worst possible type of revisionism? But, this is exactly what the CPI(M) leaders are doing at present. Does this not tantamount to a crime, particularly for people claiming as Marxist-Leninists? This clearly shows, what direction the CPI(M) leadership are actually moving in. We think this is very important to note and all fighting people including even the rank and file of the CPI(M) should take note of it.

In fact, solely with the view to shielding their revisionist character, to covering up their growing inclination to and understanding with the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union, the CPI(M) leadership are engaged at posing themselves to be pursuing a policy of equi-distance from the Soviet revisionist leadership and the CPC, while in actuality they are advancing in a surreptitious way towards the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union.

More over, Mr. Basavapunnaiiah in his article has not only attempted to cover up their growing inclination towards the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union by posing themselves to be pursuing a policy of equi-distance from both the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union and the CPC but also tried in vain to establish the same on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism through a ludicrous intellectual exercise. He has stated, 'It is no secret that our pro-Sovietism and our pro-Chinesism is born out of our fundamental loyalty to the cause of Marxism-Leninism and to the cause of Socialism and Communism;' We of course never have come

across and do not know if any real Marxist-Leninist has ever come across through such terminology like 'pro-Sovietism' and 'pro-Chinesism' in Marxism-Leninism. We will appreciate if Mr. Basavapunnaiiah can help us in this regard.

A real communist, being a proletarian internationalist, as a co-fighter in the international Communist movement would feel ideological identity, in spite of difference on any issue, if there is any, with fraternal Communist parties of different countries, all fighting for the common cause of social progress, emancipation and world revolution. For obvious reasons, he will feel sympathy for and obligation to the world socialist system in general. But what has it to do with one's becoming inclined towards the arch revisionist leadership of a party, like the CPI(M) which in the name of its so called 'pro-Sovietism' is, in reality advancing towards the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union? Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has tried to gloss over this fundamental question under the pretext of rendering support to all including even the arch revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union.

It is one thing to feel obligation to a socialist state and a Communist party but it is completely different thing to sacrifice oneself at the feet of the revisionist leadership of the party in the name of rendering support to the socialist state and the Communist party, which we doubt if Mr. Basavapunnaiiah's intellectual ability is up to the mark to understand.

Again, Mr. Basavapunnaiiah has stated that, 'The CPI(M) is decidedly pro-USSR and pro-Peoples' Republic Of China since these two are the big socialist states of the World Socialist system' We would like to ask, 'Mr. Basavapunnaiiah, what attitude would you have shown to these states had these been small states of the socialist system? What would be ones attitude to any small state of the world socialist system? Does the size of a socialist state, big or small has any relevancy in the question of

(Contd. to page 7)

Once More an Anti-People Railway Budget

That Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, her party and her colleagues in the Central Ministry are very very pro-people—spend sleepless nights for the betterment of the lives of the toiling people is glaringly revealed in the Railway budget placed on 27th February in the Lok-Sabha by the compassionate Minister of Railways. Kind-hearted and sympathetic as he is, he has assured us that he has carefully scanned the budget and prepared it in such a fashion that it will not affect the daily life of the toiling people of our country. Very very kind of him indeed!

We are moved by his kindness when we find that a meagre (!) 136'38 crores of rupees have been decided to be collected extra on and from the following heads:

(i) From III class passengers with an increase of 5 paise to 8 rupees per ticket total rupees 35 crores.

(ii) From increased fare of Air-conditioned and first class coaches rupees 4'4 crores.

(iii) From increased rate of freight on carriage of coal rupees 39'33 crores.

(iv) From increased rate of freight on carriage of other commodities rupees 44'89 crores.

The railway authority have assured us that due to this extra levy of 136'38 crores, the price structure of commodities will only be affected by a meagre 10%. We are, of course, delighted! Not very much, is it not? When we are already shouldering a 26% rise, can we not shoulder another 10% extra? The big bosses of the society, air-conditioned and first class coach passengers, are shouldering 4'4 crores! The Minister of railways was very very apologetic about this burden on the big bosses! Of course he should be!!

But it is our sad experience that never the Government estimate of probable price rise tallies with the actual rise in the market. Due to profiteering, the market-price always remains at a few times higher level than the price estimated by Government.

The traders have already started to say that they will not pay this increased freight from their own pocket. Naturally, prices will go up.

Can we demand of the traders to curtail their profit? It will be sheer injustice to them!

The Minister of railways have been very sympathetic on us and have not enhanced the freight on the carriage of food-grains because any rise in cost of food-grains will cause great hardship on the people! What is it? Foolishness or humour? If it is foolishness we are constrained to say that such a talent should not be wasted in such a place. If it is humour then he should be better placed as a manager in a slaughter house.

When according to the railway authority the wholesale price-index will go up by 10% due to the enhanced rate of railway freight, how is it that the price of food-grains will remain static, even if the cost of carriage of food-grains remain static, is best known to the Minister of Railways. Even a simpleton will understand that with the enhancement of the cost of commodities required for farming as well as subsistence of farmers, the cost of production of foodgrains will go up automatically. As a retrospective effect the price of food-grains will go up. Over and above, this will come the profiteering of the Jotedars hoarders and monopolists. Of course we should not be surprised at such wisdom shown by the Minister! Mau-passant, the great French writer, once said that to be a Minister one needs not acquire common sense even the ability of tall-talks and flattery will be considered fit for the position.

We may recall the economic review placed in the

To Cover up Inclination to Soviet Revisionist Leadership—CPI(M) Leadership Pose to be Equi-Distant from Soviet Revisionist Leadership and CPC

(Contd. from page 6)

one feeling obligation and sympathy to the socialist state?' Any man having a knowledge of ABC of Marxism-Leninism can easily understand that what Mr. Basavapunniah has contended can only evolve out of an utterly muddle-headed brain. Moreover, by stating like this, Mr. Basavapunniah has confirmed that after so many attempts still now he could not free himself from their old mental make up of mechanically dittoing a big Communist party or socialist state. Over and above, we think it smacks of big party chauvinism in the reverse order. The same vice which is still being practised by the CPI(M) leadership, on the one hand drives a party fallen victim to it, to show big brotherly attitude to the smaller fraternal parties and try to even forcibly dominate over them and on the other, in the reverse order, directs the said party not only to yield but also to sacrifice its self to another party bigger than it.

It is our experience that these sorts of terminology like 'pro-Sovietism' and 'pro-Chinesism' are used in our country by party or parties with the nomenclature of Communist party like the CPI, CPI(M) and CPI(ML), who have totally failed to grasp the real significance of the dialectical relation that exists between the fraternal Communist parties of different countries no matter whether big or small and in the name of rendering allegiance to the international Communist movement they blindly and mechanically follow the big

Lok-Sabha on 25th. Feb. in which it was unequivocally declared that the Government resolves to fight and diminish the last year's record rise of price-index. There is a contradiction in the railway budget?

Communist parties of other countries, this or that and at times express their identity as 'pro-Soviet' or 'pro-Chinese.'

The CPI(M) which at present, with a view to covering up its gradually growing inclination towards the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union is attempting to pose itself to be both pro-Soviet revisionist leadership and pro-CPC, immediately after its formation out of the split in the united CPI, mechanically and blindly dittoed the line of the CPC for sometime, just only to get recognition from the same and thereby strengthen the party by drawing the militant section of the cadre of the united CPI in its favour. Circumstances including the fact that the Soviet revisionist leadership gave recognition to the CPI, led it to attempt to be closer to the CPC.

At this stage the CPI(M) was highly critical of the leadership of the Communist party and the state of Soviet Union and the leaders of the party never even touched water before bitterly criticising them as utter revisionists. But, after the split in the CPI(M), when the newly formed CPI(ML) which attracted the militant section of the rank and file of the CPI(M) to its side, attempted to be closer to the CPC, the CPI(M), with a view to finding a new ally in the international field, once even tried to be closer to the Rumanian communist party,—a party whose leadership are more right in the direction of revisionism, than the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union.

Now, at present in the changed situation, after being confident that the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union would give due recognition to their growing allegiance to the said leadership, the CPI(M) leadership are becoming

gradually more inclined towards the Soviet revisionist leadership.

Of course, they are at liberty to render allegiance to any revisionist leadership of any Communist party, even if the party too has become revisionist, and we have nothing to say against it. On the contrary, we are rather happy to note that by this, they are gradually exposing their revisionist character before the masses. But, for what any right thinking man would accuse them is the fact that with a view to covering up their revisionist character and conceal their growing inclination to the Soviet revisionist leadership from the the people, they have taken recourse to fraud and deceit.

Finally, we would like to conclude that at present, the CPI(M) leadership are trying to cover up their growing allegiance to the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union by posing themselves to be pursuing a policy of equi-distance from the CPC and the Soviet revisionist leadership. But, if the leaders succeed in bringing a change through propaganda by surreptitious methods, in the mental make up of the rank and file of the party that once was tuned high with revolutionary phrases by the same leaders being guided by political exigencies and pragmatic considerations, then we would not be astonished if in near future we find the CPI(M) leadership, like the CPI to openly let loose their antagonistic attitude towards the CPC and the Socialist China (the ground of which they are utmost trying to prepare among their rank and file) and ultimately completely identify themselves with the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union.