

**REVOLUTIONARY LIFE
IS THE
MOST HONOURABLE ONE**

SHIBDAS GHOSH

Socialist Unity Centre of India (Communist)

Revolutionary Life is the Most Honourable One — Shibdas Ghosh

May, 2023

Published by : Provash Ghosh
General Secretary
SUCI (Communist)
48, Lenin Sarani, Kolkata - 700013
Phone : (033) 2249-1828, 2265-3234

Printed by : Ganadabi Printers & Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
52B, Indian Mirror Street
Kolkata - 700013

Pirce : 40/-

Publisher's Note

A school of politics for the leaders and workers of the party was held in 1974 under the auspices of the Calcutta District Committee of our party at Mahajati Sadan auditorium .

On some important queries from the comrades Comrade Shibdas Ghosh the great Marxist thinker and Founder General Secretary of the party conducted the school.

To edit and publish the tape recorded discussion in his absence however hard and laborious may be, we have at last published it in original Bengali in 2022.

Now the english translation is being published. If any error or inadequacy is there in translation the responsibility lies with us.

May, 2023
SUCI (C) Office
48, Lenin Sarani,
Kolkata - 700013

With Greetings
Provash Ghosh



Revolutionary Life is the Most Honourable One

I have been requested by Kolkata district committee to address and conduct a 4-day school of politics. I have come to know that there are many new faces among the participants of this school. I deem it fit that the object of this school should be attainment of higher communist character so that our cadres are able to perform their role in organizing and leading the masses in a better way. In previous occasions we were used to start the discussions with the fundamental principles, theories and the tenets of the philosophy of Marxism in a lucid way, so that these could be understood even by the laymen and then to proceed to pick up the socio-economic-political issues and subsequently the matters pertaining to national-international situation and finally to discuss on the organizational problems. But this time I would like to hold the discussion in a different manner. The comrades from their past experience know that, in some schools we lay stress on the philosophical questions; in some cases we put more emphasis on the aspects of socio-economic issues. Similarly, on some other occasions we attach a great amount of importance to the discussion on international political situation. So the comrades may have an impression that this time also I may follow this usual course. But this time, as my discussion would rest on the specific questions, I am afraid, that many comrades may find it difficult to comprehend the subject matters fully. But while dealing with the specific questions I shall try to answer by linking them with dialectical materialism or with the basic tenets of Marxism as much as possible. But I feel, that too would be

mostly insufficient. As a result the new comrades or those, who have been recently connected with the party, and even some old comrades who are not so acquainted with the basic concepts of Marxism and the party's line of thinking and outlook and are yet to learn about communist ethics appropriately, may feel some trouble to grasp what will be discussed here. Again some new comrades, who have come with a desire to hear discussion on theories, philosophies and on various other problems, may feel disheartened. Still then I welcome the intention of the leaders who have organized this school at this hour. Through browsing the questions asked by the comrades, it is understood, that these are speaking for themselves the immaturity of the comrades. We know that the other parties speak of the higher ideological standard of the cadres of the SUCI. Yes, in comparison to other parties our cadres are developed. But it is like, as the adage goes, every dog is a lion at home. So here we are—giants among the pygmies. The workers of the other parties have not an iota of theoretical knowledge as regards to philosophy; they are least concerned with ideas and thoughts and principles. They are only practising the politics of slogan-mongering and boisterous showmanship. That is why, it is quite natural that, the people belonging to other parties or the general public, who come across the workers of these political parties around them and at the same time come into contact with the workers of our party, tend to think that the cadres of our party are highly conscious and advanced. But I know that this relatively high standard of our party comrades does not match at all with what it should be. The level of consciousness of the comrades which has been reflected through their questions clearly indicates it. Anyone else may have been deceived by these questions, but I am not the person to be deceived. There is no reason that I should be deceived. Whatever the people may say, we can easily understand that the level of consciousness of our party workers is not so good. Yet, there are some questions which are really

important, whereas some others are absolutely silly. In spite of that I welcome these silly questions, because these are reflecting a burning urge of the comrades. They want to get rid and be relieved of whatever problems they are being confronted with. They want to resolve the problems standing in front of them and have asked these questions out of this burning urge. So they do not want any purposeless academic and theoretical discussion.

The questions asked by the comrades have essentially come from their urge to know how to develop our organizations. That means, they want to know how to build up our party in such a way, so that we can provide leadership to the mass struggles and mass movements in the nearest future. They want to know how to develop the party very fast and from this perspective they have unhesitatingly presented the questions before the party pointing to all sorts of weaknesses and limitations, which they think are vitiating our party. It seems that the rank and file workers of the party want to be freed from these weaknesses and wish to acquire strength and ability to undertake the tasks before them. This very aspect of these questions—no matter how silly these may appear—is a very good indication; it is most praiseworthy and promising. So I welcome it.

I have said this simply because it happens to come to my ear what the comrades discuss among themselves in various places and in the party offices. Often they do it in my presence also. I have come to know that the minds of the comrades get full with pride at the compliments of the public. It is, however, quite natural. Yes, it is true that the people, in general, say that the sacrifices of the workers of the SUCI can by no means be compared to anything. Their honesty is also incomparable. They are not upstarts like the workers of the other parties. Nor they are slogan-mongers and roisterers. They are conscious and their ideological standard is very high. Comrades are used to flying high when they are showered with praises from the

general public.

**Our concern should be how much we can serve
our country according to her need**

I only like to say here, that yes, in comparison to the standard of the cadres of other parties, our comrades are certainly advanced, but at the same time I do feel that the standard they have achieved is not adequate and effective. We cannot only remain contented with finding that compared to those slogan-mongering frivolous political workers how much dedicated, honest and conscious we are. Our concern should be how much we are able to act in accordance with the need of the country. In the present social scenario, we see deep-rooted frustration in the mind of the people on the one hand and utmost distrust of the people towards the different political parties on the other, and so it is incumbent upon us to restore self-confidence in the mind of the people rapidly by dispelling their feeling of despondency through constantly pursuing them with the help of our party education, mode of talking, style of work and knowledge. The people should be made to understand that there is no reason for frustration. Moreover, where does frustration lead us to? Despondency would invite nothing but ruin. And ruin will not spare you. Element of peril will not spare you. If we are to make the people aware of all these things we are to explain them the necessity of our party and the necessity of strengthening it as well as why the questions of emancipation of the people, success of revolutionary movements and success and failure of left movements are inextricably involved with the questions of gaining strength and acquiring ability of leading the people objectively by our party. But so far as the standard of ability, knowledge and political initiative, which are required by a political leadership to make the people understand all these things are concerned, our workers are significantly deficient of

attaining such political consciousness, power of reasoning and argumentation.

Now in the existing situation the majority of the members of the CPI (M) have turned to be opportunists; their only concern is how to bag some jobs or make some money. On the other side, the youths of the Congress Party are also following the same track. In the midst of all this, the cadres of our party are dedicated, who are not needed to be paid. Rather, he who can afford pay from his own pocket to do party works. And those who are employed donate their whole income to the party. Nobody comes to join our party for the lure of a job. And our party is the only party which consists of such type of cadres. So unlike the other parties we may feel proud of it. People's appreciation of our party is also on the rise. Because the public are not blind, they obviously appraise all the parties. When they observe the behaviours of the cadres of two different parties in the public places they cannot but compare the cadres of one party with those of the other. Judging from the perspectives of decency, taste, modesty, education and culture, self-sacrifice, and capacity for hard work our cadres appear to have excelled the workers of the other parties. But will this public appreciation alone be enough?

In this context another point is required to be discussed. There is a question, where one comrade has pointed out that we have become so good that all of our party workers keep company only with the good boys and girls. The people also think that this is a party of goodies. But the majority of the youth of our country, who are dare-devils, are misguided due to the politics of rabble-rousing, wrong leadership and opportunist political movements. These youths have unknowingly got involved in various activities of incivility. But these are the youths, who undoubtedly constitute the bulk of the youth force. But why are we not able to influence these dare-devils and roisterers, whom the public sometimes call

goons or loafers? Why cannot we stir their blood? One comrade has asked this question. It is a very important question to ponder over. It is not the fact that, only the goody-goody boys will accomplish the revolution in India. History does not speak that. Again, since the ideology of our party is sublime, most of the good boys, in particular, accept it. But many of them lack the requisite strength of working actively among the masses with political initiative shouldering all sorts of hazards and braving sheer unfavourable conditions. These dare-devil youths are treading on the wrong path; maybe, they are involved in rowdiness, maybe they only do harm themselves. Maybe, they do not even have the sense that, through their own activities they are not only causing harm to the youth force itself, but are damaging the country's interest also. Yet they have ability to work. They can reach the people and swing into action in no time. They can work with that very politics which knows no discipline. But many of these so called good boys, who speak of noble ideology and who have been attracted to us only because of nobility of our ideology, are bereft of efficiency in penetrating into the masses in any situation and taking initiative to organize various groups of people from among the masses to lead them into action. It is quite natural that a party, if it is based on real communist ideology must have its appeal on the good boys and girls. If a party has no appeal on the good people and the best elements of the youths of the society; if the ideology, working style, and lives of the leaders and the cadres of that party do not attract the good and honest people, then that party would not be able to do any good to the country, even if they could mobilize thousands and thousands of people and cadres behind them. With the increase of strength of our party, the influence of this rabble rousing and stunt-all political parties will also wane. So it is an acid test. It is true, that honest people and youths get attracted to our party. They may or may not be of much use, but should be considered

to be an asset. But we must have to enroll activists in large numbers from all walks of life who are efficient and deserving.

Justice cannot be established without strength

Now let us begin with one of the questions asked here. Such a question is: I realize that no problem will be solved without revolution, I realize that revolution is the only path to emancipation, yet, why I cannot fully submit and dedicate myself heart and soul to the task of revolutionary activities. Similarly there is another question which mentions: We really understand ours is the only revolutionary party and this is the only correct path of salvation and we know till this party does not acquire the required strength to lead the people objectively this stunt-all and carrier seeking politics will continue as it is, whether in the name of either leftist or rightist politics, or by unfurling the flag of communism or revolution. Domineering of either of the two sides will continue and the people will get nothing except a big zero. This vicious cycle of politics is going on undeterred, no matter whether the Congress comes in power or the so called communists. Musing over how to change the situation our party workers have arrived at the opinion that, if our party comes to the helm of the mass struggles, then the mass movements will turn to the right direction, the character and outlook of the movements will also take proper turn. If the leadership of these mass movements is actually rested in our hands, the political forces and political movements may assume a new dimension. In the realm of idea there are many areas where we have been able to provide our leadership. What we are preaching is correct; what we are interpreting is true and for that matter, whether one accepts it or not, we have been, in reality, able to establish our leadership in the sphere of ideas and thought. Those activists, who do feel it, should also understand that adequate organizational strength is required to get it recognized by the people fully. The people

are prone to judge by strength. There is a famous saying of Stalin in this regard. In an address to the workers he said: You are living in a world surrounded by capitalism where thousands of well intended sermons, just talks of morality, honest and well reasoned pronouncements would get lost. None would lend an ear and accept it, as the tendency to abide by the edicts of justice has been lost in this world. Here people easily bow down to injustices meted to one, ungrudgingly accepts, if is supported by might. So if you wish to proclaim the victory of just, only declaration and pronouncement of right path is not the way. You are to muster the necessary strength to establish the truth, treading the correct path. As the capitalists, exploiters and even commoners also very easily understand the language of strength. Though, to make people understand, the revolutionaries should not apply force. We are to use the language of reason and just, theory and argument. But if you fail to muster strength you will not be able to defeat your enemy and compel him to hear you. In spite of myriad sensible talk, rule of unjust will continue unabated, so long you do not possess the requisite strength.

While answering the question of the said worker I wanted to emphasize that we feel that unless our party comes to the fore and provide leadership India will not be emancipated. We can understand it mostly by studying the prevailing situation. Today the external environment is not as much unfavourable, or as much tough for us to work, as it was in the earlier days. Now the external environment, that is, the obstacles to carry out party works among the masses are not so insurmountable as before. The people now like to hear us. The comrade, whom I am answering, wants to say that the impact of the appeal of our party on the people has grown considerably. The people are especially watching our party without considering whether we are big or small. A little bit of examination will show that even those who speak ill of us nurture a sort of respect for

our party in the core of their hearts. Our comrades feel it, too. This question further observes that, at present the situation is favourable for us to a great extent. Favourable, but in what sense? It suggests that compared to before, the situation is favourable now. But this favourable situation does not signify that with the start of our activities the people will readily continue to join our party en masse. The favourable situation means that the unsurpassable hurdles which we had to face earlier to go to the masses and to convey our messages to them, have, to some extent, undergone a change. At first the CPI, then the CPI (M) and sometime later the Naxalites, were privileged to enjoy the credit as communist parties in our society and that was one of the main adversities for us. But with the passing time their goodwill has been tarnished to a great extent. Now they have become largely discredited. Talks like—they have become fully exhausted, people have become completely disillusioned etc—do exhibit nothing but lopsided thinking. Today they have been exposed considerably. But by that the comrades should not think that they have been fully exposed. No, it is not correct. But it is true that the credit which they were used to enjoy earlier has become diluted now. Previously the people doubtlessly considered them as communists and believed that they are the genuine revolutionaries and so they would be able to accomplish the revolution. The firmness of that belief which existed before in the society is no more so strong. The people are now raising questions against the CPI-CPI (M)-Naxalites. A fairly good section of the people, if not the majority of the people, but a good section and a large section of the masses are now indeed doubtful not only about the CPI-CPI (M), but also about the Naxalites. Again some people think that they are totally on wrong path and nothing tangible would come from them. Naturally, being disillusioned, people are now turning to us. Again at the same time they are also apprehensive of our

efficacy—how long you will take to deliver. Will you ever succeed? Yours is too small a party! However, we have faith on you, but are not sure whether you will be successful. We don't know how long it will take. Perhaps, we will turn into ghosts of the dead by then. It does not come into sight when you will be able to acquire the requisite strength and bring about revolution. A section of the people has already started to think in this way. At the same time there are others who think somewhat differently. Their arguments are as follows: We are glad to see what you are doing; your party is the only genuine party, we have judged all other parties and found it is only your party which is on the right track. But, look gentlemen, nothing will happen; nothing can happen in this country. As we see, the people, as a whole, have become degenerated. Now, all these reflections of the common people do not at all indicate ominous signs. But after persistent efforts to win someone, when a cadre of our party hears a comment like nothing positive would happen in our country, at once he comes to the conclusion that the person is a damn short of understanding. That very comrade thinks this much and nothing beyond. He only thinks that, as a result of his long discussion when that person has been convinced that nothing will be accomplished by the CPI (M), then why should he not at once make a positive gesture and say, 'Come on, Comrade, I join hands with you from right now'. But alas! The man in question did not say something like this. On the contrary, he commented he had seen many things on the earth and went on, despite whatever we might say or do, nothing would happen; in fact it was not to be happened. The moment our comrade heard this, he became utterly disappointed. He thought what a pity! Even after so much effort to convince, this man was in no mood to buzz an inch. Then, being perplexed the comrade started to implore, 'Please, please, listen to me'. And the person whom he was pleading with, was going on replying, "What more shall I listen?

For how many days are you in politics? I have gained so much age. I have seen a lot, I have seen so many parties and have already observed all those parties'. But that comrade could not comprehend that, the concerned person who, just two days back did not even want to talk so much with him, now talked on a number of issues. It should have been noticed that, he said, inter alia, that he had become disillusioned with these old parties. And he had also aired by implication, whether he believed it or not, he was being soft towards the SUCI from the depth of his heart, though till now he could not repose faith on us that we would be able to make a breakthrough.

Anti SUCI common front of the anti- revolutionary parties

Now these two things which came out from his comments indicate a single valuable point. It asks: work with patience, start fieldwork staying at a particular area, keep mixing with the people and develop the habit of going to the masses, and you will get result. It is indicative that, even the man who gives you such an answer is thinking about us. Perhaps after 2 or 5 years, owing to the impacts of waves of events and movements, a large section of those people, who are speaking today in this manner, may turn to be our strong supporters, if not active workers, provided we do not fail to maintain relations with them, we keep on nursing them and do not lose our confidence. They are certainly taking steps towards that direction. But the method, which they want to follow to go ahead, undergoes conflicts between varied actions and reactions evolving out of prevailing situation. This results in developing mental complexes, which are manifested in them in various forms. One differs from others in their way of expressions. But what are the common things that come out from the conversations with them? You have had long discussions with them—but have you found any strong malice in them towards the SUCI during the

discussions? No, you have not. Then what have you got instead? You could have noticed it, if you had that eye to see. What is the environment in which we are in? The cadres of all the parties know that in spite of SUCI being a small party, a discussion is going round in the political circles out of curiosity about us. People do observe that every party is engaged in conflict and rivalry with each other in organizational and political arenas, which sometimes even triggers to violent clashes. Yet they become united in a common front as soon as the question of SUCI comes in. It is, as though, every one of them sees in SUCI the weapon of death for all of them by intuition and by instinct. They can feel it by their class instinct. That is why you will find that CPI and CPI (M) while squabbling with each other start to harp on the same tune as soon as anything about SUCI comes before them. Sometimes conflict arises between RSP and CPI (M). Since long they have been going together, though some conflicts are now arising between them. At present RSP has joined with SUCI to fight against CPIM, but if to ever deal with SUCI separately, they become more vocal and no less vocal than CPIM against SUCI. Similarly, it is also true with Forward Bloc. Once in a meeting considering a lot about the prevailing situation carefully, I kept mum. It was almost coming out of my mouth that it is really strange wherever you hear of SUCI all of you flare up. What does it prove? This malice against SUCI proves one thing clearly that they feel, such a roguish, or a wicked party like SUCI has never so far been born in India or in the world. It appears to be most mischievous party, for; it is not like Congress or any bourgeois or fascist party. It is a party which is most devilish. They are the worst enemy of the human civilization. So, in spite of differences about the concept of human civilization among themselves and working separately in different groups, they oppose SUCI in a single voice out of concern for human civilization. Or else, the SUCI tolls death knell for all these

parties as the only revolutionary force, which makes all the anti-revolutionary parties frightened. That's why they come in a common front against SUCI to corner it, so that SUCI cannot come to the fore.

Just look at the newspaper Barons of our country. The newspaper owners and the monopolists make leaders in our country. They can even turn a monkey to a leader of the country by continuously carrying out propagandas with too much ballyhoo. A complete monkey whatsoever, but they can make him a leader. These papers publish the photographs, the sermons and the speeches of these leaders. They even publish when and where any such leader sneezes, they publish everything he says, no matter how foolishly. But whatever he says must be printed in bold letters. And reading it in newspapers and hearing it on the radio the general public assume that he must be a powerful famous leader. Thus the people of the country without knowing or realizing anything, by simply going through newspapers and radio, consider that he is a big leader and how funny, a leader is manufactured in this way! This is a bourgeois stratagem to make leaders through newspapers. A little observation will make it clear. Not before long DSO held an All India Students Conference in Cuttack. CPIM and others also held conferences at about the same time. The CPIM poses, as if, they are the main revolutionary opposition of Congress. In other words, they try to posit that they are the oppositional force to Congress and not only that, they, alone, represent the anti-Congressism. These papers, if on some rare occasions, publish some portions of speeches delivered by our leaders, the CPIM raises a hue and cry. There and then, they begin to shout, since these newspapers are controlled by the capitalists, they cannot but publish the news of the SUCI. We don't even think that these papers will give us any publicity. But the papers of Odisha could not ignore the reality and were compelled to give publicity of the news of

the Conference covering three-column pictures under three-column banner heads. On the first day, the Amritabazar Patrika reluctantly tried to publish the news in single column at the back page or in two lines at the interior page. But, afterwards, finding the atmosphere agog with excitement they were forced to give coverage of it by giving two-column news in their Odisha edition. But their Calcutta edition blacked it out completely. Earlier Nabakrishna Chowdhury (Gandhite and the 1st Chief Minister of Odisha) jokingly told me aside that don't be misguided by observing the news published here in the Amritabazar, that they had published this news in their editions outside Odisha. Going back to Calcutta you would find no news of it in its Calcutta edition, nor would you find it in its Delhi edition. They published the news only in its Mufassil issue of Odisha, because, all other papers of Odisha had published the news of this meeting. In Cuttack an excitement was running high centring round this meeting. Under the circumstances, they published the news in their Odisha edition, so that their policy of journalism did not get involved in any controversy or trouble. But no newspaper published any news of this conference in its Calcutta edition. This is not the fact that the press in Calcutta does not print the news of such conferences or meetings held outside Calcutta. These papers publish the news of all other parties. If Forward Bloc holds a conference only with a few people or, RSP holds a meeting in a hall with a small audience as paltry as twenty people—they give its publicity. They also give publicity even of an insignificant statement issued by the Politburos of these parties after their meetings. By observing the mammoth gathering of the students, the press in Odisha commented that such a large student's conference has never been organized in Odisha after independence. Three thousand delegates and twenty thousand strong audience attended the open rally and that too in a Mufassil town like Cuttack in Odisha. But the news of this conference did not get any space

in the daily papers of Calcutta. What does it indicate? It simply indicates that they will not write a single line in their newspaper unless they are extremely forced by your performance. They could not totally bypass a large gathering or a movement organized by our party. That is why they were compelled to give news of this conference in Odisha. Similarly they cannot deny such a big meeting held on the 24th April. So they are compelled to write something about such meetings giving space as short as possible and that too somewhere in the corner of the paper, which is required to be found out through meticulous searching. What is their intention? As for the SUCI their intention is to give as little publicity as they are constrained to. But do not help it to grow by giving publicity in the media. This is the policy of the owning class, of the monopolists. But look at their attitude towards the CPI(M). The Statesman, the organ of the veteran monopolists has been giving publicity to CPIM as much as they can in order to create an alternative to Congress. If you browse through the Statesman, you will find that there is no news of CPI(M) missing—whether it pertains to an individual statement or a small meeting even held in a remote place or an event where CPM is just a token partner, and thus by publishing such news in detail the Statesman is continuously backing CPI(M). The monopolists are observing that, the Swatantra Party could not evolve as a viable opposition to Congress; the Jansangh is not a force to be reckoned with at all India level; CPI has sided with the Congress, the SP is now a broken party. As against this the CPI(M) is an established party in Bengal, Kerala and Tripura and so the Statesman and other groups of newspapers are continuously backing the CPI(M) in their sustained effort to bring it to the fore as the opposition party alternative to the Congress. It is true that the press creates leaders. It is also true that they do not give us any publicity. In spite of that our party is making progress and will continue to make progress with the

strength of our ideology.

Let us now take up other questions. One has asked a question that we know that there is no emancipation without revolution, even then why we cannot dedicate ourselves fully to the work of the party. Another one has asked that we know, nobody will help our party, and in the circumstances unless our strength is increased, whatever struggles are made by the workers, the peasants, the youth and students, all will be thrashed again and again to fall headlong, no fundamental change will occur, nor the character of the left movement will be altered and the revolution will remain a far cry. We know all these things. Still then we cannot work with necessary initiative. He actually wants to know why he cannot work accordingly. Here there is many a failing in the understanding of the comrades. Why I cannot work can be a question of an individual, but it cannot be an organizational one. Indeed, an individual question has an individual answer and studying the particular problem of that very individual we can discuss on it. But my question is, whether the concerned individual comrade or comrades, who have put this question, understand the objective situation perfectly. As for example, the comrades report that the people make a good impression on our party and the environment is also favourable now. But when they fail to carry out any programme of work successfully, they come and report that the people are recalcitrant. In spite of our repeated efforts, nobody likes to understand, not even to hear. These are all contradictory things. But when there is no programme of work they say that the environment is favourable now, the public has good impression of us and the people like to hear us. But as he is asked to explain why he could not accomplish the task, he answers that the people do not like to hear anything. So, what does it indicate if understood correctly? It indicates that a mind to listen to us has already been developed among the people, but they are

still in the transitional phase and has not yet reached the stage to respond decisively. The people are to some extent disillusioned with these parties. And their old attachment with them has waned considerably. Some sort of mental bend of mind conducive to feeling attraction towards us has developed among the people, but they are not yet ready to take political decision to come forward immediately to get fully involved in the activities of our party. As a result, a number of our comrades, who in their desperate attempts to get some quick positive result from the people in any form insist them to donate a little amount, or buy some of our party literatures or a particular party publication, do not receive the desired response, or cannot make the people understand properly, or fail to make them act according to our expectation, instantly draw the conclusion that these people are tough nuts to get convinced. They fail to analyze this phenomenon. We are getting two aspects in this. One is the question of ability of an individual comrade and the other is the question of the existing level of the mentality of the people. Between the two, if the efficiency of the comrades increases tremendously a rapid change can be brought about in the existing level of the people, and if the standard of a comrade, if the level of his ability remains low it will turn the matter more difficult and will take more time. This is the only difference. So where is the scope of frustration to come?

**No emancipation without revolution –
what is the meaning of it**

So, do you really realize it? This is the question which I like to ask those comrades back, who say, “we understand this”. Emancipation will not come without revolution—this is what you always say and hear. But isn’t it that you have taken it at its face value and have understood it superficially? But have you realized it? Do you really understand what it actually

means? Is it possible to understand it only through intellect and reasoning? Do you know that you will only start to realize the real value of it from when you get yourself engaged in mass movements and in taking the responsibility of conducting party activities with right earnest after applying your mind and reasoning? In fact, your true understanding begins to unfold from when you begin to do this. Before that this understanding remains at the level of one's intellectual faculty only for arguing. This is not called realization as such and it varies from man to man. As the level of consciousness, mental make-up and knowledge and education on the one hand, and on the other hand intellectual faculties and experiences of all the workers are not identical, the understanding of the same thing differs for different workers. It may happen that the thing which I understand, another comrade understand it, too. But the nature of understanding of the two will not be one and the same. Surely you know it and those who have put this question also surely admit that the level of understanding of all the comrades cannot be identical. It varies because everyone's mental make-up, training, education and experience are not the same. However, the manner in which the question has been put reflects an element of gross mistake. If this matter was understood properly, the question would have come otherwise. Then the question would have been as follows: how can we improve our present working style? But the question has not come in that vein. It has come in the way that I cannot engage myself fully in the activities of the party, or though we realize that this is the party which will accomplish the task of revolution and it is we, who are to provide the leadership, still then we are not getting the inspiration for working responsibly among the masses. These types of questions indicate that the level of your understanding, which has been acquired through your intellectual ability, is not also good.

What is the real necessity of our life

Now the question is: what is the real necessity of our life? And if you do not realize it your level of understanding will also not be raised to a higher stage. Freedom is the correct realization of necessity. Correct realization of necessity is the correct understanding of the direction of motion determined by the intrinsic laws of motion that governs every mode of motion. I may think that, this or that is necessary for me and I may understand very well why it is necessary. This is not the concept of necessity. It does not mean that I am conscious of the implication of necessity. Freedom is—in the words of Hegel—the recognition of necessity. The Marxists also accept this explanation of freedom given by Hegel. The fundamental concept of Marxism does not differ with it, though there is a difference in the sense that, it should only be understood by freeing it from underlying idealistic philosophical trend of Hegel's thought. That is, however, different subject and needs more extensive discussion which, as of now is not possible. But it should be kept in mind that, achieving freedom means to realize the implication of necessity correctly and act consciously in accordance with it. When I understand the process and begin to struggle in this process consciously, only then it can be said that I am in the struggle for achieving freedom. Until such time my concept of freedom betrays self-deception or pragmatic concept of necessity, to put it simply it is nothing but opportunism. Maybe it is individual opportunism or political opportunism. Pragmatic necessity is altogether different from the necessity which Marxism stipulates. When Marxism speaks of necessity it urges us to study the process and laws of motion inherent in matter and the course of this motion as well. If we can determine correctly the laws of motion which govern the course of development of matter, life and society and also the direction of motion, only then we can attain true scientific

realization of necessity. But we attain freedom in character and action, only when we are able to act and struggle consciously in due process. Only then we actually understand the meaning of freedom. Before that whenever we speak of freedom, we speak of it with our power of intelligence and reasoning. But the real meaning of it remains beyond our comprehension.

From all the discussions on Marxism and dialectical materialism which were held previously you have already come to know that, knowledge is not divorced from action. When knowledge reflects the truth it gains ability to act, it becomes active. That means, only then we can gain true knowledge. If knowledge does not reflect pure truth, it gives birth to ego and scholasticism. It then does harm and becomes a burden to the society. It creates many a danger and hazard. That is why things like scholasticism, pseudo-intellectualism and academic trend are strongly condemned in politics and philosophy. Because, revolutionary politics is the objective process of fulfilling the mission of life. Here there is no place for idealism, nor any for useless act. Scholasticism merely mucks about. Since the unproductive acts induced by pseudo-intellectualism and academic outlook do harms in many ways, all the revolutionaries had to say repeatedly that knowledge and pedantry are not one and the same. Intellectualism and knowledge are not the same. Scholasticism and the true concept of revolution illuminated by the light of knowledge are not same. These are diametrically opposite to each other. These are completely different in class character and in the question of effectiveness as well. Because of it Lenin vehemently opposed the Empiricists. In common parlance the meaning of knowledge is as follows: keeping oneself informed, gift of the grab and critical observation power, which are the main characteristics of the Empiricists. They meticulously probe into so many things, whatever trifle or imperceptible it might be, before interpreting different phenomena. How labourious jobs

these Empiricists do! Yet Lenin had to bitterly criticize these Empiricists. It was because, that stood in the way as a stumbling block to revolutionary idea. The Empiricists stand in the way to true concept and to the process of releasing action on the basis of it; they stand in the way to achieving knowledge that guides to act, the knowledge that helps accelerate change of society, change of matter and, in reality, all sorts of motions (determining the course of events). So, they do more harm than good. When knowledge creates hurdle then it becomes bad knowledge. It is knowledge of course, but bad knowledge; for you know that there are already two different words—good knowledge and bad knowledge. Maybe that you know many things, maybe that you can speak or write well and maybe that you can memorize the writings of Hegel and Marx, maybe that you know what the other stalwarts have said about freedom and can quote lots from them, but in spite of all this, you cannot comprehend the true meaning of freedom and the true import of necessity until and unless you engage yourself in active struggle through the process of your understanding of necessity. And through this struggle your understanding of freedom begins to blossom and brighten. So long you are not in this struggle your understanding remains superficial and contains many errors. Knowing all these things if I say that I cannot work for what I think reasonable and proper and cling onto something which I think as unjust, evil and harmful to me then how can I claim to be a rational being, essential attribute for a man?

Do you really understand this that you cannot fight for your own freedom without fighting for the freedom of others? In many a previous class, I have said to you, how you should realize the real meaning of freedom. If you want to develop yourself, if you have any concern about and desire for the development of the society, if you really want to lead a cultural, ethical, moral and dignified life, and if you have no fallacious understanding of dignity, if you do not think that dignity means

money, dignity means being an ICS officer, or a judge of the High Court, or a minister, or a Chief Minister, or an ambassador, if you do not think that dignity means possessing a car and a mansion and that the people will always flatter you, then your real understanding of the dignified life should signify only one thing in this society. It signifies, if you want to live honourably holding your head high according to the edict of your conscience, then the only way to lead your life in a honourable way is to engage yourself constantly in the struggle of the masses for justice. You can lead a honourable life only by engaging yourself in the struggle against injustice by organizing all sections of the masses in the society. Any path other than this is nothing but the path of self-deception and that is not the path of dignity but of ego. In this society one can earn respect and floral tribute amassing money even by breaking wagons. A man, if he earns money by robbing and looting, is also held in honour. Eventually he becomes MLA or MP by the strength of money. Thereafter he becomes a minister and begins to preach sermons. So, if he is satisfied with this false sense of dignity why should he bother with freedom?

What is dignity in real sense

Some may think that I shall become a doctor and that will be an honorable way to lead a life. But it will not be so, if you become a doctor. Because, if a doctor wants to lead a noble life by upholding the ethics of medical science he will have to die of starvation. He will not be able to establish a practice and to earn reputation and will not have a handsome income. Nobody will back him. He will be considered as a mad man. His way of life, his sense of morality and medical ethics will always be in conflicts in every sphere of life. Eventually he will turn to be a big failure. If he would care a fig for medical ethics, or broadly speaking if a scientist or an engineer or a chemist or a student of physics would not care for ethics of science in

general, and would turn himself a servitor, a service-holder and sell his conscience to Tata or Birla or to a farm or to government for money, then, yes, he could earn a fabulous amount of money and reputation. Am I right? In that case, he may think, 'No, no, I have not earned money and fame by breaking wagon or having stakes in horse-racing or by organizing a gang of goons. I have earned these by practicing medicine honestly and not by cheating'. But does he know that he has not earned fame only by practising medicine? While practising he has also taken the path of servitude and flattery. As an engineer you have also followed the path of servitude and flattery. You have bowed down before injustice and digested all the misdeeds done by the worst enemies of human civilization by keeping mum. You have sold your knowledge to them and only by this you have earned money. Does it mean dignity of life? The party of Siddhartha Roy* is running after this sort of dignity, while the other parties follow suit. There are two types of people in the world. One type of people runs after false sense of dignity. And there are others, to whom dignity means a completely different thing. They think that they should abide by what their pricking conscience wants to say; they think where there is real progress, there lays the advancement of society. And that advancement is involved in freeing the individual from narrow-mindedness, weakness, greed and fear and in conducting resolute struggle for that in a dignified manner. Its purpose is to emancipate the society from exploitative system, to bring about social change. And through bringing about this change of society one will change oneself and open up the road to one's own development.

The total environment of the society is full of superstitions. After all I am a human being, a social being. With my consciousness and good sense I cannot keep my cool in this

* The then Congress chief minister of West Bengal

antagonistic environment of home and outside, of the society or of my working place. Because I am to live by establishing relation with the production of the society and there is only two ways to live. One is to revolt against this situation, to protest, to struggle against this wrong and to live one's head holding high even going without food during this struggle. The other is, being educated and bearing the pride of this education to choose servitude and to sell your conscience at long last, to advocate for vilely serving this production system and injustice on the pretext of this or that. On the other hand, he, who begins to advance through waging struggle against this situation, learns to realize the essence of Marxism-Leninism. He will then have nothing to aspire for himself.

There is another thing which is also to be understood in this context. Is it so that the bond of love and affection exists only within the confinements of our families in this society? With acquiring knowledge if someone could really understand the concept of freedom then he could have realized that he has hearty relation with the crores of people. If I cannot proceed along the path of truth, as a few members of my family will shed tears, does it mean that I give recognition to love and affection? No, love and affection are completely different from weakness. Love and affection never tell one to be weak. It is cowardice which makes a man weak. Love and affection have no antagonism with revolution. So, why shall I fall prey to weakness if love and affection tend to make me weak? Why shall I be weak or why shall I barter away my conscience, or why shall I leave the path of truth due to love and affection? If someone does not muddle up all these things such questions cannot crop up in his mind. Moreover, why should one be confused with such questions? He, who does not understand these questions clearly, gets himself into a muddle. The new workers of our party after hearing all these things may start to think where shall they go or where shall they stay. What does it

mean? They cannot find any place to stay among those millions and millions of people. It means that they have not learnt to work with the masses. That is why I say that, knowledge only becomes the guide to action when the true knowledge of freedom takes me in the first place to the masses to organize them, induce me to build party organization. That means I live in the party, I live with the masses and among the masses. There is no contradiction here. I learn to think about everything—availability of food, my living, my weal and woe—in terms of this understanding. As a result a group of workers break their old relationship to build a new relationship. Relations with a small number of members of my family have been severed, but so what? A warm hearty relationship with a large number of people has been developed instead, which is more profound, more affectionate and more emotional. This is the life of a revolutionary. If one can grasp it, he will have no room in his mind to nurture with these questions.

Real meaning and character of knowledge

Just hearing all these things from me you cannot understand anything unless you do not understand in the first place that knowledge is a guide to action. You have to grasp its real implication day by day, bit by bit and there is no other alternative to it. If you have not yet started it or from the very moment you initiate the process, you begin to think about immediate result you will not be able to understand even one jot of it. Have you come here to taste the fruit of success? No, you have come owing to your pricking conscience. It is your philosophy of life. This is the true manifestation of knowledge. At the start no revolutionary thinks in this way that he will win. He begins with a passionate will of winning. But he does not possess any such wrong idea that I have begun to work only to be victorious. On the other hand, he does not also think that if he fails to succeed, his initiative that he once began

to do something will have no meaning. He knows that, he has no other course to follow but to start the work. He also knows that every revolutionary has to face thousand and one failures while treading this path of revolution. And because of this, revolution wins one day. Mao Ze Dong has said this thing in the following manner: 'everywhere all the revolutionary struggles start with failure, again meet failure, again meet failure, and ultimately wins victory'. This is the course of revolution. Nowhere in the world has revolution started with victory. I am working with the masses for two or four years, trying continuously to make them understand, and doing whatnot, but in spite of that I cannot recruit any one. Then I start thinking what is the use of all these. Nothing can be done here. But have you asked yourself what will you achieve by going back to home, when nothing happens here? How it is that standing on the ground of revolution you are asking when nothing is happening in spite of my tremendous effort, then what is the future? Are you dead? You have not yet died. Then why are you going back to home stealthily being apprehensive of future, or marry silently being confused about victory of revolution? But how is that you are not questioning what you will achieve by going back to home? It is true that nothing tangible I can do here, but how blessed I would be by retiring? Better speak out openly that you have become the victim of strong sexual urge. Speak it straight if you think that you cannot go without food, cannot bear the agony of not getting a job. Have you asked this question to yourself? You must have got answer if you asked yourself straight in this way. You do not need to come so far to me for the answer. You would get answer instantly. This is a simple question. When you are not getting any result from working among the masses you begin to think that nothing will happen and lose your heart. Maybe you have lost your zeal, but are you sitting idle for that? No, you have immediately started to wear out the soles of your shoe to manage a job.

There is no dearth of enthusiasm for it. It is not that you are doing nothing. You have simply become engaged at your home. Why? Coming back to home conspicuously you are not telling that you do not like to live in the family. But it should have been otherwise. What does it mean that you do not like to stay among the people? That means you have not realized clearly that 'recognition of necessity is freedom'. I have failed to realize the real meaning of the necessity as I am not conscious of it. Or I am not a man of the type who devotes himself to a work on the appeal of conscience, ethics and reasoning. Whatever fanciful ideas or conflicting thoughts might have occurred to me, I do my work according to the dictum of my conscience, and with the power of my intellect and sense of reasoning. I do not do anything unreasonable. Many an unreasonable idea or unwarranted desire may arise in my mind, but it is imperative that I cannot work under the pressure of such thought or on the demand of my desire. It can be done by a man, who is devoid of principles, who does not abide by what his conscience asks him to do and who is not guided by reasoning. Can he be called a man? What do we call a man in other words? We call him rational being, i.e. an animal with rationality. So, I am simply an animal minus rationality. I wear garments made of terylene, wear necktie, I sing songs, I watch movies, I am used to writing poems in English, I work in Government office, or I have already written a few books. But do these ensure that virtually I cannot act as animal? The major factor which determines if I am virtually a man or animal is whether I am guided by the edicts of conscience, logic and principles or not. There is no other yardstick. Is there any other yardstick that can determine whether I am a man or animal? If I act by impulse, if my intellectual faculties do not guide me, then I am identical with an animal in all respects. How can I then claim to be a man? The man is different from the animal in this particular area that he is capable of thinking and he has

intellectual faculties. Moreover, by developing ideals, ethics, morality and strategy with the help of his power of thinking and intelligence he fights against the hostile environment and nature. The man has created this civilization in order to fight against the forces of nature, to control them and to utilize them in favour of human progress as well. While treading this path man has given birth to morality, principles, ideology and values. If I am not able to accomplish these things, how can I be called a man? This is the basic question.

I can be shot dead but cannot be bought

Now, look here. Those who are sitting beside me, my colleagues, know many things of the past. My own experience is, when we started to build the party we had no money, no following, no room to stay, nobody knew us, in a word, we had nothing. This apart what was our age at that time? I was then quite a young man in early youth, who was saying that there had been no revolutionary party in India and so a party was to be formed. Having gone through the logic of our sayings many admitted that this should be done, since there was rationale behind the idea. Nevertheless, they said, 'It is nothing but lunatic. Do you think that it is easy to form a new party? There are so many big parties here, but in spite of their largeness they are struggling to keep going on, they are splitting and facing great many difficulties. On this background how do you fare when nobody knows you, nobody recognizes you; no renowned leaders are there with you, no press publicity is behind you'. As soon as we tried to say something they would jeer us, laugh at us and tell us in the dialect of the East Bengal (now Bangladesh) that, 'See how mad has become these young fools!' Would these kids form a party out of nothing? It was quite impossible. It could not be. Was it so simple to form a party? Those were nothing but an idle dream and it would never come to fruition. They used to say, 'Yes, we do admit

that what you are saying is correct, but all will go in vain'. I did not immediately entered into much argument with them. I only replied them back, 'Yes, I agree'. Then while admitting straightway I added, 'All Right, I understand nothing will come at the end, I cannot do anything. Then please advise what to do. Shall I indulge in servility? Shall I act as a lackey? Am I to sell out my conscience? Am I to do in contrast to what I have realized? I cannot'. My point was clear. Those, who could strive, might come with me and those who could not should leave. Because if I die starving in the street, I shall die with honour raising my head high. Even on the day when I would die of starvation in the street I could protest against any wrong, I could slap on the face of a wrong-doer, if needed. My hands would not tremble a bit. Because, I can be shot dead, but I cannot be bought. What else I can do? I can by no means be a tout. I got into troubles, because I had understood all this. But my grandmother had not any problem, nor had my father and mother. This was because, they had married off their children, grand children and great grand children, enjoyed family lives, worshipped gods and goddess, visited the temple of goddess Kali and paid obeisance again and again; above all, my father spent the fag end of his life thinking that the chariot from heaven would smoothly descend down at any moment to take him and reaching in heaven he would be waiting for us there. See, how comfortably they were placed. But it was impossible for me to lead a life like this as I had understood the meaning of the word man. I had realized what the human values are. I had realized what dignity means. Since the time I had been born in this country I realized what my duties should be as a man. I had come to know, 'Nobody of us will live unless the present society of India is not changed altogether. I will not stay alive, and at the same time my conscience, morality, culture, character and every other thing shall not remain alive. If I try to build a happy family, evil elements will

enter into my family and spoil my beloved son. There is no guarantee whether he will turn into a fan of a film star or enroll his name in a gang of wagon breakers. It is impossible to predict how he will come out in future. Someone whom I build with all my heart may one day leave me betraying. He or she will not care anything for money. So if I want to extricate love and affection, morality and sense of responsibility from this mire, if I am to elevate a man, even myself, if I am to build characters of my loved ones, if I am to open up the avenue of development to them, there is no other way but to struggle for it.' Anyway, I have realized this thing and who should I blame for why I have learnt to think this way. Can I split my hairs for how and why I have realized these things? I cannot even argue with others that why you have not realized these things like me. I chanced to have realized this and this has put me in so many troubles. Now only two roads are open before me. Either you degrade yourself, sell your conscience, or engage yourself in the struggle for change. History will speak whether I shall win or face defeat. But I know the truth that unless a new party—a real revolutionary party is formed in India the emancipation of the people will not come in spite of sacrifices of thousands of lives and shedding bloods by millions of youth and all this will go astray. So a real revolutionary party equipped with correct ideology is needed.

So what I am to do? If I am not able to form a party or if I see that formation of a real revolutionary party is mostly uncertain, then shall I compromise with my conscience to join the CPI? Or shall I rectify the CPI? In that case, I would naturally think that it was the CPI which was a real revolutionary party; it was the right party, though it was going with some erroneous thinking, but that could be rectified. But I didn't think that way. I was convinced that it could never be corrected and transformed into a genuine Communist Party. And with every passing day, the stench of this rotting party

would continue to emit. However, 30 years back no rotten smell came out of this party. But even those 30 years back, I could understand that as the days would go by this stench would be felt palpably. This party could not be rectified, since no any other class party could be transformed into a working class party. From my understanding of the formation of a working class party, its methodology and thought process I had no doubt that the CPI was a party of the petty bourgeoisie. It was simply going on by the name of a Communist Party and so it would only bring about ruination. The party would be able to draw the people towards it owing to their respect, admiration and hope for communism, but at long last the party would malign communism in the eyes of the people by their misdeeds and thereby would undermine Marxism itself. So, it would not do. It would be wrong if you rely on this party and think that you will achieve revolution by reforming it. As for myself I think it a wrong way. I resolutely think that there is no second way other than revolution to achieve emancipation. But revolution will not happen automatically. For revolution, the revolutionary ideology, theory, strategy and programme along with a revolutionary party is required to be there as a commander to lead. Then who will undertake the responsibility of forming this party? The responsibility should come upon him who realizes the necessity. I cannot have any resentment against anyone for why this idea dawned upon me as the outcome of the conflicts of ideas which were going on in this class divided society. How could I be angry with others for it? So, I asked them only one question. "Please tell what is to be done. Yes, I understand that it is not possible. Does it mean that I am to play the role of a bootlicker? Just I cannot do that. It is not possible for me. I know that I may die of starvation. I know that even nobody will care that a man is going to die of starvation. But what shall I do? I would think that it was my inability. One may be ashamed of one's inability, but the shamelessness in selling out

one's conscience is altogether a different thing". It is true that I failed, but I never lowered my head before any wrong. I fought my level best, but failed. I may just die going without food and without doing anything remarkable. But nothing can go waste in this world. All the revolutionaries know that a revolutionary sometimes just dies of starvation without doing anything except expounding to the groups of people here and there, that without a revolutionary ideology and party nothing can be achieved. This does not go in vain, it cannot go in vain.

Understanding the theory of revolution starts with undertaking the task of organizing the masses

So, from these questions, which have been placed by you, it appears that you have not understood these things in this way. If you had understood these properly, you would not have asked these questions whining about them continuously. This is not even a complex theoretical matter. The questions should have been based mainly on theory, strategy and tactics. Naturally, the questions ought to have come in this way: since I want to fight staying among the masses, so how I can develop the strategy and tactics of this struggle and how I can sharpen the method of this struggle. In that case, the subject of theoretical discussion should be how to prepare myself more and more as a sharp sword. So, how can the question 'why I cannot work properly' be a matter of theoretical discussion? It may at best be a personal psychological problem of an individual. Sometimes it happens that without having a clear conception of revolution, a person likes many things about revolution. It is also useful. I should say to them that it is good that you like us and support us, which has also an immense value. You have supported our party and that, too, has a great value. But a revolutionary worker, who likes to be a revolutionary, should not put his question in this way. He should at once understand, "From the moment I jump into the works

with the masses and organize them with the knowledge what I have understood so far and stay with them for twenty four hours, I only begin to realize revolutionary theory”.

So I think that you understand what I am answering. While answering I feel that this point, this particular aspect has not been understood theoretically, politically and philosophically as it should have been. At the same time it is also true that, this understanding does not end in one's life time. What you have understood today does not remain static at any point. When I understood this dialectical materialism forty or thirty years back, I understood its three fundamental principles. At that time I understood that this world is full of matter and everything is composed of matter. And being governed by the materialistic laws this material world is moving, changing and developing. I understood that there is no existence of God or super natural entity. Forty or thirty years back I understood these things in respect of contemporary situation. I set to work with the level of understanding, which I had at the time. At the time I thought confidently that I had understood the three fundamental principles of dialectics and still now I think that I understand these principles. Is that level of understanding still standing on the same position? No, of course not. That is why, if you really engage yourself, on the basis of what you have understood today, to lead the struggle for emancipation of the people, to conduct party activities, and if it is your life, if not sole but principal life at the beginning, will your level of understanding remain static at a single point?

I like to explain some other things to you in order to develop a comprehensive idea as to revolution. It cannot be considered as wrong if, by responding to the appeal of revolution, I cannot discharge the minor responsibilities to my family or cannot fulfill my duties to my beloved ones. It should be kept in mind that if I refuse to respond to a responsibility in the interest of my personal interest or need without fulfilling any duty to the society,

then it is wrong. But while responding to a greater human or social cause if I cannot fulfill my duties evolved out of petty personal interests or love and affection then it cannot be termed as wrong. There is nothing to be confused over it. It is not a matter of resolving through repeated discussions. It is to be realized with one's life. Can it be realized through mere discussions? The principal basis of it is to engage yourself in active struggle of the masses for justice against injustice and constantly move with the masses and staying among the masses. This is the basic thing. Another important thing you have to keep in your mind is that remaining among the masses does not mean that you should remain as one of the crowd. Moreover, you should not be there to carry out routine works only. While staying with the people you should have to be endowed with political objective, capacity of taking leading role and creative mind. Then your level of understanding will be constantly developing. Again, there are different types of work. On the one hand there are thousand and one types of work of revolution and on the other hand there are thousand and one types of party chore. Any of these works if viewed in isolation may seem to be insignificant. But at the same time it should also be kept in mind that without that particular work the gigantic task of revolution cannot be fulfilled and also revolution cannot be accomplished, too. But when we look at that particular work in isolation, it may appear as a trifle, which may well be skipped. Therefore, every work is important. Again importance of any work is required to be determined in consideration of space time and situation. To judge the importance of a work also poses a problem. This problem is required to be resolved. It can be resolved perfectly if the cadres have the political initiative and creative faculty. Sometimes it is noticed, that two programmes are thrown simultaneously—one from the party directly and the other from a mass front. At once a conflict arises between the party programme and frontal programme. However, in some other occasion it is found that

the comrades thoroughly lack initiative and creativity. So, when contradiction between two routine programmes ensues, in spite of belonging to the same party two party executives cannot help each other. Both of them stick to their points rigidly and fight against each other, as if two bulls are fighting, although both of them are responsible comrades. But seeing them to fight it seems that they are not comrades; none of them will budge an inch from their grounds. One of them is saying that it is an important party work; it should be done first; while the other is arguing mass organizations are meant for the party, if it ceases to exist, the party organization itself will be weak. The party leader replies, let the mass organization go to hell, party stands first. Because, Comrade GS has said that everything is secondary to the interest of the party. How simple! As a result none of these two comrades neither can convince, nor can accept anyone, though they know that everything is secondary to the interest of the party. Both of them think that ultimately the interest of the party itself is being hurt. What is the result of it? They feel uncomfortable. No one can at all agree with anyone. Such bull fights occur mainly between the two executive heads. Why such thing happens? The main weak link in this happening is, as soon as an executive faces a problem arisen before him, he does not try to understand the nature of the problem prior to making a statement on it as to what he actually wants, what instruction he gave earlier and why that was not executed. Further, he should try to understand the problem that has arisen with the question raised by the other side. Ultimately, when the leaders of the party and the front come to an agreement following fierce debate, the party worker who came to them with his problem is found to have lost all his enthusiasm and emotion by then. That means, they made the problem unnecessarily official by not resolving it in proper time with due importance. Is it so that no discussion is allowed unless it is official? A problem has arisen; If the two executives could have solved the problem non-officially then the question

of so much debate would not have arisen. How to solve it—this is the question. Isn't it? It is not always necessary to bring it to the level of official discussion. In these cases, the less official discussion, the better. Holding official discussion for any matter indicates that they poorly lack the elastic and creative mind which is essential for mutual understanding and ability to approach a problem. If the leaders are to resolve even the minor problems through official discussion or committee discussion, what does it indicate? Does it prove that the leaders feel concern for solving the problems? You will understand the mind of the others well, if you try to understand them creatively in accordance with your ability.

You are to keep in mind that there are two areas of party activities—one exclusively consists of day-to-day routine work of the party and the other consists of the work of mass fronts. Here I often observe erroneous putting, such as, I am in party work and he is in frontal work. Every mass organization has some programmes of its own. Similarly the party has some routine works. But both are party works. Both the areas of activities are under overall leadership of the party and overall responsibility also belongs to the party. If the party executives who are working within the fronts and those who are working within the party do not forget that both the responsibilities are party responsibilities, things would have been much easier. A party executive may think, it is party work and so it is his duty to execute it. Similarly, another executive, who is in charge of a front, may think it is frontal work and so it is his duty to handle it. He also understands it in this way—since I am bearing the responsibility of the front in the interest of the party, it is incumbent upon me to take care of all frontal programmes. He does not understand that all party and frontal activities are under overall control and leadership of the party and activities in both areas are party works. But as their areas of activities are different, the party and the fronts have to take some different

programmes. Conflicts between these different areas of activities arise regularly. If the executives resolve these things smoothly, execution of programmes is faster on the one hand and unnecessary dumping is avoided on the other. Some problems are there which cannot be resolved without holding committee meeting. So committees must meet to resolve such problems. But it is seen that differences of opinion or problems in mutual understanding occur every day on trifling matters. It is normal that contradictions arise between the party and the front around carrying out day-to-day works of each. But to resolve each and every problem if it is needed to put it in the committee, then you have to call committee meeting every day! Again it is not possible to call committee meeting every day; there are other assignments to attend. Naturally, those things remain unresolved. And because of keeping these petty problems unreconciled, the performance of the organization gets impeded. Suppose, a difference of opinion occurs in a certain case. The party executive does not agree, but the concerned front wants to do it. Then, will the committee has to sit for resolving the matter? And if the committee cannot sit at once, it will remain pending for another seven days. Committee meeting will be held after seven days, and till such time no action can be taken. To eliminate these things, general tendency to policymaking should be, any policy matter must be solved in committee meeting through discussions, and no such case can be settled bypassing the committee. But while performing day-to-day works many problems come up many times. Without waiting for settling these problems at the committee level, these are to be solved by discussing directly with the concerned authority even by making an impromptu official appointment, if needed. Let us see where we stand, if we mentally observe a course of activities. As for example, suppose a problem arises, which is not deserved to be discussed in the committee meeting. Still you feel that it would be better if you talk with the District

Secretary or the PC Secretary or the Unit In-charge. Otherwise, you may not be free from doubt that pricks you. Opinion of the higher leader should be taken. When asked, whether it is District Secretary, or Unit In-charge, or PC Secretary, at once starts to browse his note book. Consulting his note book he finds that he cannot give time today, as for tomorrow he has so many assignments and day after tomorrow, no, it is not possible. However, he may lend time on next Tuesday. Official appointment was then fixed on next Tuesday. He will get into the problem on the day of appointment and then take up the issue. That means your problem will remain unattended for so many days. I wonder how all these barren thoughts like holding official sitting or committee meeting on these trifling matters which are not related with policymaking come to one's brain. At the very moment the question is raised about the usefulness of committees. It has never been said that all decisions will be taken officially bypassing committee meeting. My main concern is that no work should be kept pending. Do you understand it? At the time when a matter comes to me for immediate settlement I begin to go through thousand and one appointments. But in spite of thousand and one appointments, I move about, I go to different places, cut a few jokes with others in between my appointments, talk with my acquaintances and inquire about someone's health. Isn't it? During this free time can I not hear the problem of the said comrade and help him to resolve it? Or, should I make it an official discussion instead?

No routine work, but creative work is needed

It is to be kept in mind that nothing can be realized by mere memorizing. Habit of memorizing also begets other complications. As for example, the party teaches us that to judge a comrade we should first observe his qualities and then

come to our own shortcomings. Where does one land, if one tries to understand this teaching by memorizing only? A comrade knows, while criticizing another comrade, he should start either from the qualities of the other or from his own shortcomings. So he begins to say that, 'Comrade, I have so and so faults. I know that you have so and so qualities. So, you see that, I start from your qualities and ask you right now that you should admit what I say, as at the very beginning I have spoken of your qualities and of my faults'. The reason of being so mechanical is, the executives have not equipped the comrades working under them ideologically and ethically; they have failed to provide them with the thorough understanding of how to organize the masses remaining among them organizationally and acquire the necessary ability to conduct that struggle properly.

In spite of being surrounded by millions of people, the party cadre who is only involved in the routine works and cannot create works by himself, begins to think where to go and what to do. On the other hand, he, who is a very powerful creative cadre and knows how to create works constantly, can create works the moment he finds a group of people around him and starts to mix with them. He needs not to think over it again and again. Because, he always remains with the masses and among the masses. If a party cadre, without advertising what is the aim and mission of his life or without asserting that he is a political worker, remains among the masses as a revolutionary, not as a rollicking companion, if he only mixes with them and continue to mix with them maintaining the qualities of his character, if he does not leave them and remains with them even in the event that they are reluctant to mix with him, he learns at the same time to create thousand and one forms of works in the process. Thus, if a worker does not learn to create works and lacks creative faculty, it will one day give birth to frustration and disappointment in his mind. Because, he

is engaged only in routine works, and not in creative works; he is not trying to conduct movements of the people or has not yet emerged as a leader of the masses. He cannot create such a situation anywhere that a group of youth or students, or a group of slum dwellers or mill workers or rural peasants think him and accept him as their genuine leader, an emotional leader; not only that, the people even rush to him whether he can go to them or not. So a feeling of despondency engulfs him. Moreover, the ability of creating this situation is the eligibility criterion for being a member of the party. Do you know that in the constitution of a communist party, a member of the party is called the leader of the masses? A person, who understands communism, may subscribe a party organ, come in the meeting when called and if asked, may sell party organs and collect donation for the party fund for whole day, writes and pastes posters for whole day and night. But these are nothing but routine works. Even the general volunteers sometimes do these things. Can one acquire eligibility and quality for membership of the party only by that? Minimum eligibility criterion of the membership for anyone is that, he has been able to place himself as the leader of the people, leader of the masses. And leader of the people means that he is the leader of a group of people belonging to any walk of life, whom he guides, which maybe the youth of his neighbourhood, the slum dwellers, the employees of the office where he works or the members of his Union, workers and peasants. I am not speaking of the leader, who is a statutory leader, that is, the leader in the sense that he is a party man and functions as the in-charge of the party in that area. I am speaking of the leader, who is the ideological and emotional leader to the people, who is the leader accepted respectfully by the people from the core of their heart. They respect his higher leaders more than him, but they also obey and respect him, and there is a role of his leadership in various matters in their spheres of activities and life. They cannot but

come to him. They cannot but seek his advice. That means, 'I have become the leader of a group of the masses.' I want to point out that the workers of the party should earn the eligibility for membership being the leaders of the masses. Thereafter they would be the leaders within the party.

This leader within the party also represents the official leadership. That is the minimum most, which is necessary. This cannot be disregarded. But the ideal form of leadership is that, I am the leader not because I hold office, not because that everybody obeys me for that. Since I hold office everybody is bound to obey me, but the question is whether everybody respect and obey me or not even if I don't hold it. They obey me for my ability; they obey me for my superiority. They love me; they obey me because I have the relation of love, affection and emotion with them. This is the authentic position of every leader. This apart any other position of leadership is mechanical. And all sorts of trouble stem from here.

Life without problem is an illusion – a non-Marxist thought

Problems are much less, where position of leader is emotional. But that does not mean that problems will never arise. This is unreal, unscientific and non-Marxist thought. Life without problems is not possible. Life is replete with problems; political movements are full of problems. All the revolutionaries know that thinking of life without problem is unreal, a flight of fancy, to sink into ignorance. The people approach problems in two ways. The approach of the revolutionaries is how to resolve problems, how to proceed through solving problems. This is how the revolutionaries think. The revolutionaries do not think that, since there are problems we are helpless, what else can be done in face of problems. They do not get perplexed in the midst of problem. They seek the way to how to fight the problems and how to resolve them. Another set of people are

there who in the face of problems get perturbed and confused. They at once try to find out the way to escape. That means they cite the problems as the plea of inaction. But those, who are conscious and revolutionaries, put the problems with a view to find out how, in which way and by applying which weapon these can be solved. So their initiative increases in face of problems. Their determination and activities become more intense as they face problems. Their struggle as well as their effort becomes more unidirectional. Thus from this perspective there are two different classes among the people.

The methodical approach of all the revolutionaries to problems is as follows: this was the problem and I did all these things to fight it. Therefore, to the revolutionaries it is—the more the problem, the more the vigilance. On the contrary, to the non-revolutionaries it is—the more the problem, the more the frustration, and the more the tendency to escape. These two types of approach always remain there. If the people possess scientific knowledge and ideas, they can understand that there is no movement without problems. Every course of movement advances through turns and twists. Without this movement nothing can exist. The more one realizes the intrinsic nature of the problems, the more one is able to visualize the means to solve them. He, who has more political initiative in his possession and at his command and is creative by nature, can conduct the struggle for resolving the problems in a much better way.

It should also be noted that, in spite of having these two qualities there is no guarantee that all problems can always be resolved. These problems may ultimately be resolved. But a problem may not be solved at any time. When a problem cannot be solved with all of our efforts, we should have to find out where the limitation lies. We should realize that under the circumstances we could not fight it more effectively in view of our resources and capacity. So, if we fail, it will not generate frustration. It is not correct that we can do everything if we try

earnestly. We must know that, it is not correct that, any situation can be influenced by our efforts only. This is because; there are many more factors, many unseen factors in the society, which exert influence over these problems. It is not true that, we alone determine the destiny of everything. But whenever I fail, I begin to rationalize that I could not do it because despite my efforts I cannot solve all problems as there are many factors beyond my control, which influence an event and immediately pass the blame and onus to those imaginary factors. No, this is unwarranted. Before coming into conclusion, it should be seriously pondered over whether I have done all possible things to solve the problem, which should have been done from my side according to my knowledge, creativity and initiative. If I find that, even after putting together all these, the problem could not be solved, only then the question of other factors should be cited. Then it will be easy to understand that these are the factors which are working here. Notwithstanding scientifically correct endeavour from our end, failure maybe inevitable if our power of efforts is comparatively weak than that of other factors, if our total resource and strength are found to be deficient to meet the challenge of the hostile environment, although we have no limitation so far as our ability, strength, individual initiative and knowledge are concerned,.

And for that, in the revolutionary movement failures often visit at the initial stage in spite of analyzing the situation correctly, fighting correctly and waging struggle correctly. As the failure occurs, soon we should have to review it to examine if there was any fault of ours with regard to our line, tactics and attempts. If it was not so, the failure was the objective limitation. So, even when the revolutionary course starts correctly, it repeatedly meets failure as its impact at the initial stage remains very negligible in comparison with the antagonistic surroundings and opposing forces. But every failure at every stage pinpoints one after another in details –

what was the weakness and where it lay, and where, how and in what way the reactionaries were strong. Thus through every failure the revolutionary struggle gets enriched with knowledge and thereby it keeps on treading the path of continuously perfecting the style of work, style of activity and style of struggle; thus the revolutionary struggle continues to acquire strength and ultimately the revolution becomes victorious.

So, what do we see? Now let me ask the question from the opposite side. I should think, do I feel that I dare to become a revolutionary? Revolutionary in the sense that, not only I feel emotional identification with revolution, but also I am an activist not as a pseudo-intellectual. Pseudo-intellectuals have ruined themselves in this way. They have also considered themselves as revolutionaries. However, there are two categories—non-activist revolutionary and activist revolutionary. Those, who belong to the first category, think themselves as revolutionaries, but they are averse to work and do nothing. They simply argue that it is not possible for all to do all things; but no matter what happens, we, are revolutionaries, since we understand revolution. And there is other group of genuine revolutionaries, who are powerful, strong and responsible. They are activists. As for the first category, I call them pseudo intellectuals, who are attracted to revolutionary ideas and thought and are fond of revolutionary ideology, but cannot become revolutionaries. They are deceiving themselves by acting falsely. I say that this false behaviour does harm. It has no necessity. You have failed and it has certainly caused some irreparable damage. But in addition to that, by playing falsehood you are causing further damage. If you would have thought in this way that, one should be a revolutionary, revolution is necessary, but I could not be a revolutionary. But I should, as much as I can, help and support those, who have become revolutionaries and if I at least do not do that, I cannot fulfill my obligation to the revolution, which I claimed to have understood. If you would have thought in this

way, you could have served more and helped more. By this you could have been modest and one day it could have been possible in your life, what you cannot achieve today. One day you really may have turned into a revolutionary. But due to the practice of falsehood you have shut the door of becoming a revolutionary. Because you have cooked up an easy argument that some people can do and some others cannot. You have made a choice for yourself to decide that you are in the group of non-doers and so you shall never try to perform. But this is wrong.

**Nobody can be a revolutionary with
the help of intellect only**

Nobody can be a revolutionary with the help of intellectual faculty only. Intelligence and emotion, intelligence and heart, intelligence and ethics and culture must go together to mingle into one in one's whole life. He, who fails to bring all this together, cannot be a revolutionary. Moreover, after being a revolutionary one has to go through many stages in one's life. These are the stages enriched with experience and knowledge attained through carrying out struggles along the path of revolution. This is actually the part of the process of attaining the stage of a revolutionary. I am acting consciously on the process of revolution. That means, I am actively engaged in the struggle of the masses, for justice against injustice. Even the educated people will accept the superiority of a conscious cadre, notwithstanding his want of much knowledge and understanding, because, he has taken the responsibility of the party with the resolve to launch any struggle for revolution. If the comrades of these two categories accept each other from their two different positions, only then the activities can be conducted in a disciplined manner. So, the comrade who, despite knowing that nothing can be achieved without revolution has placed the question in this way that, I cannot do all these things is ignorant of the basic aspects of becoming a

revolutionary, which I have said. He should have these questions before him in clear terms, which do not contain so many problems of complex theories and complicated things deserved to be discussed. The point is: I have to state straight whether I can do it or not. I have to say, I shall get it clear if there is any problem in my understanding.

There are many comrades, who are too much emotional. Initially when they come to the party, come with a fresh mind after understanding that something is to be done and I should do something. But they do not know that the road ahead is full of turmoil jerks and jolts. So, they tend to think illusively that the people will respond to them with great zeal as soon as they start working among them. And in the event of non-receipt of expected response frustration develops. Actually, as you start working, you need to augment your standard of understanding gradually. It is not the matter of much importance, that I am engaged in works. What is important is whether I have been able to become a true leader of a certain section of the people—the section of the people which depends on me. Whatever pain, sorrow, distress or difficulties I may have, I have no way out but to work for them in order to hold my dignity and honour in tact before them. Otherwise I will have to bend my head in shame. I have been accepted by them in this way: I have induced them to leave their homes; I have inspired them by talking lots about ideals and brought them in this struggle. They always look up to me in any problem. Creating such a condition serves as a guarantee to save you from frustration.

It is the common experience that the comrades are found full of emotion at the initial stage and the intensity of the emotion gradually evaporates afterwards. Is it much difficult to understand? This emotion tends to lack because, at first when a comrade comes to join the work, he comes with a shallow imagination and romantic emotional feeling. Subsequently he begins to get frustrated in face of hard reality. If he cannot

continuously fortify his power of struggle, his emotion will be on the ebb. As for him there are two aspects of this power of struggle—one is his organizational skill, his tenacity to remain among the masses and ability to organize the people and to lead them and the other is his ability to continuously raise his standard of ideological understanding and consciousness. If he cannot simultaneously boost these two things his emotion must be going to decline. It is not true that everyone's spirit ebbs away. If it was so, it would have been a matter of deliberation. But now- a-days it is observed that the spirit of the most of the comrades ebbing away. However, there are some comrades, may be less in number, whose revolutionary spirit does not ebb, but becomes sharpened. How can it happen? The answer will be available if you search it here, in their lives. There are, of course, a few workers, who had started party works with great zeal and gradually developed their consciousness more, made their vision more clear, improved their efficiency and initiative and heightened their determination more, by continuing their struggle for long despite being severely hurt amidst many crises and complex situations faced by the party. It is true that there are several comrades in our party like them. But the majority of our comrades are sinking. But that small number of comrades—whom I already referred to, and whose confidence has not ebbed away—being inspired by a new sense of awareness even during the time when they were fighting and began to receive a blow from the hard reality as soon as they set their feet in the arena of battle, tried on the one hand to rebuild themselves anew quickly from the perspectives of political consciousness, philosophical understanding and moulding ethical, cultural and moral mental make-up and on the other hand tried to remain with and among the masses, conduct mass movements, identify their lives with those of the masses and become their genuine leaders. They simultaneously undertook these two tasks most vigorously. On the contrary, a

group of other workers indeed came to work with great deal of enthusiasm, but got themselves involved only in routine works, they could never become the leader of the public by organizing them. They are suffering from frustration and loss of enthusiasm due to this inability on their part. Not only that, they also could not undertake along with it the task of demolishing the elements of expectations remained lurking in the ideological cultural structure of mind and rebuilding them anew according to revolutionary need. They simply espoused the revolution superficially by applying their intelligence and laboured energetically for certain days plunging into the work like a storm. After working some days they found that, their hard works notwithstanding, nothing had been achieved. Their enthusiasm began to dwindle forthwith. There is no any mysterious theory in this that I am to give answer. He, who will come to join this revolutionary struggle, should at the same time have to know that, it is a tough struggle, it has ups and downs, actions and reactions and many hazards. Life is synonymous with this struggle. May what come—failure or success, this is the life in which lies the way of living an honourable life. Apart from this, whatever you may say under whatever pretext, is nothing but the way to deception. This should be realized first.

Secondly, only by dint of your will and honesty you shall not be able to survive as a revolutionary. However strong will, honesty and sacrificing mind I may have today, if I am to survive this long arduous struggle within its action and interaction I have to change my pattern of political consciousness and character through this (intense) struggle. Along with it, in the limited area of my work place I should elevate myself to the position of a true leader of a section of the people, no matter how small it may be.

Another trend lies hidden in a particular trend

How many types of confusion are there! Moreover, there is confusion within confusion. As you assess that people are

now completely disillusioned with the Congress and capitalism; the people are thinking that capitalism is to be overthrown and revolutionary change is to be ushered in; they are thinking that these cannot be accomplished without struggle; nothing will be achieved by the Congress. Being thrashed over and over again, the people, in general, may jump into the anti-Congress movement as they did in the past. As it happened in West Bengal at the time of the United Front, the people jumped into the movement en bloc against the Congress. The attitude of the people was that they did not want to hear anything, let the Congress be defeated in the first place. The nitty-gritty of the political line would be determined afterwards, but the Congress should be defeated first. Eventually that happened what they had wanted. But what did we achieve? True, that the confusion that prevailed among the people about the possibility of overthrowing the Congress was removed, but there was other confusion hidden in it. That very confusion was as follows. Nothing could be achieved by simply driving out the Congress. The Congress was needed to have been ousted in such a way and by such a party so that the ills (causes) for which we wanted to drive out the Congress were removed. Overthrowing the Congress was something in common with overthrowing the British. Drive out the British first, then the other things will be sorted out. Of course, during the freedom movement this question struck at the minds of some people. Bira Kishore Das, national poet of Odisha, during the period of that freedom movement composed a song—a strikingly excellent song. If you do not listen to it, cannot understand how beautiful it is. Even at that time he said that ‘you see that the tide of the freedom movement is rushing like flood water. Do you drink that muddy water without examining it thoroughly?’ You would be deceived if you drink it. The black leeches would be saddled in Delhi’s power to exploit you in place of the whites; exploitation of the whites would be replaced by the exploitation

of the blacks. What would be the benefit of the workers and peasants? So, you should not accept this freedom movement blindly, which is coming like a tidal wave. That's why he said that all the emperors and kings, the riches and Zamindars had been out in the street donning Khaddar, uttering sweet words and wearing strings of beads like the self-deniers. The song is really beautiful:

Raja zamidar dhoniro sahuakar/ tyaga mala pindhi holani
bahar/ tangko modhuro bocono/enhko dekhi bhulibo ki?

The song says: "The kings, Zamindars, rich, usurers and traders have come out wearing strings of beads as the sign of abnegation, putting on Khaddar (hand weaved cotton garments) and with sweet phrases on their lips. Will you, the workers and peasants be deceived by their outfits? If you are deceived, the black leeches are about to suck your blood in place of whites.

So, one confusion is hidden in other confusion. At first, one confusion arises. Then a particular trend develops within it and another one develops immediately to fight against this trend. This latter trend also gives rise to some pernicious tendencies while fighting the former one vehemently. But when we conduct the overall fight against the major trend, the minor trends go out of our sight. What if we are oblivious to these tendencies? Those bad tendencies which are still hidden within it come to the surface to pose problems. The people become confounded—we fought so hard to overthrow this wicked force, but what a pity that those, we have brought in, have turned into rouses. The people at once begin to think that he who gets the power misuses it. So, nobody can be trusted. You have just seen how seriously we fought, you have seen how much they talked tall of revolution, what a big fuss they made, and see the CPIM, who are used to waving Red Flag, have also come to power. They became ministers, but what have we gained? These people have not even thought once that when

they were engaged in the struggle against Congress they remained oblivious to another trend of opportunism, which was lurked in anti-Congressism while making attempt to drive it out. Who were to be blamed for this failure—you or they? It was you, who was supposed to understand this. And the political parties were also supposed to make you understand.

A conscious political party can visualize all these eventualities in advance. But due to want of necessary strength and position it may not be possible for it to make the people conscious of the anticipated incidents. If a party is unable to view the consequences of an incident beforehand, then it can no way be treated as a worthy political party, let alone a real revolutionary party. A genuine revolutionary party is that, which can correctly foresee the incidents going to happen in future and make the people conscious of them. As for example, in the past we told many things and perceived clearly the events which occurred. But we could not make the people hear what we had said and perceived. The moment we tried to make the people hear all this they would drown us by shouting loudly. Similarly, as soon as we tried to explain to the people what should have been the purpose of the common people to take part in the struggle for emancipation during freedom movement, the Congress leaders, the great espousers and leaders of freedom movement used to suppress us by raising hullabaloo. In contrast, those who wanted to say these things were too insignificant to raise their voice. Again, those who had some strength did not want to say. They did not want to say even by waving Red Flag. So, any voice, if raised anywhere was hushed up. We are not even in the know, nor the people of Bengal, nor the scholars as to how loudly Bira Kishore Das raised the issue and warned the workers and peasants. His voice was no doubt got suppressed, but his evaluation was correct. Those, who can see, will sure to get it know one day, as it is recorded in history. Das was not

blind, he could visualize it. Just like this, if we have spoken the truth history will subsequently keep in its record what we once said. In the latter days it will come to the notice of the people and they will realize.

So, it is seen that correct evaluation may not always yield positive result. We presented our views, but with no result. Why did it not work? Simply because, we had no adequate strength. This is for what Stalin spoke of acquiring adequate strength. Media is a power. During the period of United Front if we could disseminate our correct views among the people through the media, the politics of West Bengal as well as the politics of leftism might have been saved from the debacle. We not only failed to save the situation, but were projected maliciously before the masses as stooges of the Congress. Because, those who were backed by the media, conducted campaigns against us along this particular line. At the time, it was not possible for us to make the people hear anything. The media did not bother to carry the information about who said what and instead of that continually focused on them who had the support of the press and were in the glare of publicity. Among the stories brought out by the media there are some truth, some half-truth, and some lies cooked up by them. Thus they are confounding the people about everything by concocting events.

However, I was speaking that, within a particular tendency there remains another tendency hidden in it. So, the tendency of opposing the Congress alone which is overall progressive –has also another tendency hidden in it. But the other tendencies, which are hidden in the whole gamut of the main tendency, are as dangerous as the Congress. In the circumstances, if the people are not made aware of these tendencies during the united movement against the Congress, those who are in opposition now will also behave like the Congress and mar the effectiveness of the anti-Congress movement. After ascending power, they, too, will cause the

same troubles to the people in different name, in different way and with different phraseology.

A revolutionary worker should struggle to change himself at the very beginning

Now I come back to the question on which I started to discuss. Some workers, who once came to the party with a new vigour, gradually lose their enthusiasm and ultimately become the victims of frustration. Revolutionaries of the former days used to speak in different language. As you see Sun Yat-sen to say or find in “*Pather Dabi*”, a novel written by Saratchandra—the less is the power of enduring despondency, the farther is the road to revolution. They were indoctrinated with the ideal of petty bourgeois revolution; so, they had no problem to pronounce it in this way. Usually, a good number of such golden boys are available in all countries. At the time when consciousness and desire of emancipation dawn on the society, such kind of boys crowd together in large numbers; there is no dearth of young people coming in handsome numbers. The leaders of the ideal of petty bourgeois revolutionists think that these people alone can do something achievable. So they believe, those alone can be used to achieve the goal, who are burnt into pure gold to face any odd situation and the rest will come of no use. But we speak in different vein. We are to show why this frustration comes. We are to teach our workers how to fight frustration. We cannot sidetrack the issue only by saying that those, who cannot fight frustration, stay away from this path. We, rather, show them which one is the right direction and ask them to judge for themselves what they should do—which way they should follow and which one they should not. This is the reason for frustration and you get frustrated for this. You have come here with a dream, but have not seen the real world. While you are facing the objective reality, your dream is going to shatter. But if you want to translate your dream into a

reality you should have to develop your knowledge and raise your standard of understanding in face of the objective condition. You should also have to change your mental make-up. And you must have to do this before frustration does not overpower you. As I remember in this context, that long ago, when the first group of the party workers was in the making, some party cadres were being built up, some study classes were being held, a good number of sharp young people, who had the prospects of building bright careers, started to attend these classes, I used to tell those young people: See, now we are full of energy, we can now go on without food, we can fight. We have come to know that irrespective of success or failure this is the only way to live like a human being. We will fight, but don't forget that the situation will always remain the same. The situation will not be the same as we grow old. It will not be the same owing to many other reasons, unless we can prepare ourselves quickly as long as we are in our prime of energy during our struggle through all the actions and reactions. In what way can you prepare yourselves? Change yourself lock, stock and barrel from the point of culture, ethics, and morality. At the same time sharpen your knowledge in such a way that, it will not let you fall prey to ignorance. It will in no circumstances let you vacillate. The knowledge is the most powerful strength and weapon as well. Try to attain the true knowledge so that your subconscious mind does not get the opportunity to rationalize with your evil propensities and lowliness; so that you can correctly grasp how your depraved mentality tries to goad you under the garb of reason. If you attain this knowledge you shall be able to declare—I will not tolerate it—on the basis of your understanding. So, this is the high time to prepare yourselves.

Another point is that, you should sever the links which we have with the society, with our families or with the question of building careers. To speak precisely, suppose, you have earned

Master Degree, you have stood first class first in the examination. In spite of being first class first you have left your home (to work for the people). But my point is: What is the necessity of it? What is the need of being first class first? You just need to be a true revolutionary. So just cut the tag of the first class first degree. To make them revolutionaries I say to them—snip off this tail with a pair of scissors. This is the bond. But what sort of bond is this? If you fall prey to frustration, you will find that this bond has already prepared a nice road for you to retreat, to run back. The moment you want, you will get an appointment as a professor in the University of Calcutta. Otherwise, you may be able to manage a post of teacher in any school or college or any post in the Government Service. Or, if you have passed Engineering course, you will get a lucrative job in any firm. I think you surely understand that you need not to have a first class first degree to gain knowledge. It is not even necessary to explore any branch of science. If you read the writings of various revolutionaries, even if you go through the writings of this ‘arrant fool’ like me, you will realize it to some extent. You will have no problem. If you make a serious effort to pursue knowledge, you will have no problem to wander through any branch of knowledge and education. So, don’t speak rubbish that, you need academic degree to acquire knowledge. But it may be required for acquiring job. However, at present we do not even need to get such jobs. At present you need to be a revolutionary. And to be a revolutionary, do not keep any road open so that you can escape. As you have realized it sever the tie with your past life and do it voluntarily,

**Either the revolutionaries influence their
families, or take leave**

Change yourself in such a way that you cannot go back even if your heart longs. If you cannot cut off your past links, you have kept your family life as it is; you have passed the

M.A. examination and also earned a foreign degree in a well calculated move and along with it have kept the line of trade and commerce open for you, and at the same time you are doing works for revolution. That means whenever you feel discomfort with the party works, you immediately start to turn back to your old life. As we see, Soumen Thakur is involved in politics and is very happily engaged in pursuit of cultural activities. Had he donated everything he had—inherited properties from the Thakur Family, his wife's properties, his business and mills and even his residential house—for the cause of revolution and then moved as a pauper to any slum or any commune or any mess to live with his party workers, he could not live with so much pleasure. Had it been possible for him to lead a lavish life of a cultured litterateur, if he had no money and if he had not kept such a background ready? What if he could not develop the Revolutionary Communist Party? But there was no problem for him to spend life smoothly by preaching Rabindranath and giving lectures. He did it all through his life. He was a revolutionary, but kept the way to escape open and thus from the very beginning trod the path of deception. You knew that there is nothing greater than revolution, moreover, you were not an ordinary revolutionary, who only supported revolution. You dared to be the leader of the revolution, symbolical expression of the revolution like Lenin. You were the leader of the party; you were to lead the party. Why did you not submit unhesitatingly everything, you had—personal properties, career and all others—to your party for the cause of revolution? Why were you afraid of? Would I have to live on begging at long last, if revolution was not successful? This was your apprehension, wasn't it? 'If revolution is successful, it is welcome. Then I shall lead it, there would have no problem if I am to deliver speeches or go to jail. But what would be the situation, if revolution fails? Indeed! That would be real predicament. That is why; let the other

option keep open. If revolution is not accomplished, there will be at least a provision for living a well-nigh decent life by pursuing cultural activities.’ This mode of deception is reflected in the deceptive lifestyle of these leaders through maintaining privacy of their personal lives and properties differently from their party lives. They maintain a privacy which does not conform to the revolutionary life. Here is my objection. I have no concern as to how they live. They do not try to influence their families, for which I like to raise my objections. Because of this, revolutionary movement as well as communist movement is so weak in India. If you go through the lives of the revolutionaries, you will find that either they influenced their family members, or inevitably got involved in painful conflicts with their families. They had no option but to choose either of the two. Either they influenced their family members in favour of revolution—succeeded to make them followers of revolution by any means, or had to part with their families. They had to enter into conflicts with their families, but did not invent any instrument of compromise or co-existence.

But what is the life of these giant communist (!) leaders of India? They are preaching sermons to the youth, outside their families, that there is no higher mission than becoming a revolutionary and in the same vein they are advising their own daughters for not mixing with the youth of the party, as it may spoil their career. Again, they tell the youth of the party that becoming a communist is the greatest achievement. On the other hand each of these leaders is afraid that, who knows, his daughter will not fall in love with an ill-bred young man living in slum and marry him. In that case, as a communist leader he cannot question why she has married a slum-dweller. What a big nagging problem! So, it is better to tell her daughter that, you should at first finish your academic study as the time has not yet ripe for joining party politics. When you will be matured enough you will join the party. Thereafter as soon as your

daughter comes to age, you marry off your daughter considering every aspect carefully. As the marriage ceremony of your daughter is over you feel relieved. These leaders also arrange for the education of their sons putting them up in convent schools or do something like that, and at the same time give lectures before the masses. This has become a trend on the part of the leadership. Yes, there are few exceptions in these parties also. But, the exception is not the matter of discussion here. Why then on this backdrop various fraudulent activities in the name of communist ideology will not be found among the workers and the people of the country?

Every Marxist definitely knows and every theoretician should know very well that the emotional aspect of a man greatly influences human culture and character. The contents culled through intelligence do not influence human character, until a man doesn't assimilate them into his character at the highest emotional level of finer feelings. Otherwise, those remain furnished outside in the surface level. So, you can at best use what you have acquired through intellectual faculty for writing books, deliver lectures and making discussions, but those will not influence your character. However conversant I may be with the tenets of sublime thoughts, these influence me to change my life only when these things deeply penetrate into my mind as the elements of emotional feeling saturated with subtle human qualities and thereby bring about changes in me. Thus the emotional vehicle is very powerful. Love and affection, emotional attachments, sensitivity—all these are very important and noble feelings. As these things make a man great and help him to be noble on the one hand, so, on the other hand those things also degenerate and downgrade him. These can lead a man to heaven, but these also can take him to the hell if he makes blind steps without judging the situation. Every wise man is supposed to know that this is the only way. Therefore, it means, through interactions with different persons having

different relationships with me defined by friendship or any emotional attachment, or sexual relation, or any of love and affection, my all those ideas and thought about revolutionary culture, finer emotional taste and ethics will devolve on other one by overstepping his intelligence. In fact, intelligence is not needed in this case. To make an appeal to the intelligence of the people we deliberate, give them to understand and give books to read. But through the interaction with the others, through dialogue, through the exchange of sweet emotional feelings, my sense of finer human qualities, my mental bend, my moral values and culture will influence them; or if it is not so, then knowingly or unknowingly, whether I admit intellectually or not, the perception, values, mentality, idea of love and affection and sense of beauty fraught with degraded culture produced by the decaying society, which blend as impurities into the character and conception of ethics and morality of the persons with whom I have personal relations, whoever they maybe, my wife, my brothers and sisters, and any other else, will influence me. So, either I shall influence them or they will influence me. It is impossible that no one will influence anyone. Besides, in the event that none of us can influence each other simply signifies that both of us fight shy of a struggle or a conflict. Just think of the situation, where between the two persons there is a congenial relation, also there are emotional bond, feeling of touchiness, huff and puff and good understanding, but none of them influence any one. Is it science? It means that, the idea, someone cannot influence me since I cannot influence him or her, is not true. Rather it means, since I cannot influence him or her, he or she must influences me. How does it happen? In a crude sense, it may remain outside my perception but in critical observation it will come to light that it involves in influencing my intellectual faculty. That is why, in many an occasion we fail to understand why one in spite of immense academic qualifications and thousand times powerful knowledge cannot turn to be as

sharp as it is expected. This is the reason for that. Very commonly we observe that one, who has no paucity of spirit of renunciation, dedication, methodical approach and sense of discipline, who is diligent in conducting conscious mental activities, whose intellectual level is not below the average standard and to be precise who is not wanting of any quality or standard basing on which one can elevate oneself to any higher standard, in spite of all this cannot develop critical observation. Actually, in essence he has harmed himself by this. Roughly speaking he could prevent the harm but could not prevent his thought process from being degraded. He could not prevent it as he failed to grasp where and why his intellectual puzzle had been created. It is that puzzle, which has created a tremendous impediment to develop his cultural and ethical standard within his intellectual faculty and intellectual ability. However, it is not true that, I shall never be led to my downfall, since I have struggled, stayed among the masses and remained in revolutionary activities all through my life. Again, in case of one's downfall, the Marxists usually put up this single logic: No man is infallible. Everyone may fall. Even Liu-shao-chi fell. So is there anything in it to wonder about? But have you ever thought why one falls in spite of remaining involved in revolutionary movement throughout his life? Trotsky was engaged in revolutionary movement for a long time, similarly Bukharin, Liu-shao-chi and others like them were also involved in revolutionary activities for long. It cannot be said that they were ever insincere in their revolutionary struggle. They fought seriously, attained the top-ranking positions of the party, always felt concern for the party, racked their heads for revolutionary struggles, carried out struggles from the front for all intents and purposes and yet their downfall came. Why? Was it an accident? Did some unknown factors come from outside and ruined them? It is sheer mysticism. They did not care for some harmful things. As a result pernicious effects began to

accumulate gradually and the whole thing came to the fore at any opportune moment. Thus, once a revolutionary turns to a revisionist – perverted in thought, condemned and dirty. The ardent fighter of Marxism of one day turns to be a disciple of a god man (like Sain Baba). Thus many workers of the Communist and the Socialist parties are seen today to become disciples of Sain Baba. It is told that sacred ashes come out from his hands, nose and eyes. And the so-called communists are becoming his followers!

Party cannot make one a revolutionary

Now I am again going to discuss on the questions, which I have already dealt with in the beginning, as some clarifications have been sought by the comrades. This very phenomenon—that the comrades asks for clarifications— indicates at what stage the level of consciousness of the most of our comrades rests. I would want to emphasize, that our comrades may have many qualities, their ideological standard may be at somewhat higher stage, but the point to be judged is: at what level lies the ability, consciousness, and energy of our comrades in the sense of handling the problems concerned with organizational and political issues, which arise before us while going to organize the political movement, conduct struggle, expand the party and take a leading role in the mass movements. The moot question is whether we are able to confront the problems arisen before us. On hearing this one comrade may at once ask that the party and the leaders should also have the responsibility to develop the ability of the comrades. Yes, that is true, which is why many cadres are being built in the party. But the party cannot build you up as a revolutionary, in fact, cannot make anyone a revolutionary. By providing guidance and advice the party can only help him, who strives to become a revolutionary, to grow his political consciousness, to build his character according to the necessity and to improve his working style continuously

through working, cultivating political ideology and holding discussions constantly remaining among the masses. The party may guide, advise and do whatever it can to help a party worker develop, but in spite of that he will not develop, if he does not identify himself with the revolutionary activities and go into the masses getting him involved intensively in carrying out revolutionary struggle. Some workers are seen to have become identified with the party while struggling continuously remaining with the masses. Again in many a case it is also seen that a comrade is fighting remaining among the masses and taking their side, but ultimately he cannot identify himself with the party. In this situation nothing is gained despite fighting for the masses staying among them. They fight for some days and then get isolated from the people. It does not mean to remain among the people and to become one of them or to become the leader of them. As one comrade has asked what is the meaning of becoming a leader of the masses. To become a leader of the masses means that the people will get me among them to play the role of the leader in every question of politics, character, ability, and planning. I shall not leave them in any eventuality, even if they want to avoid me. There is a proverb in Hindi that says, "I want to let the Kambli (blanket) go, but it is not leaving me." It is tightly clinging to me. Maybe they are a group of ten or some workers of a small factory or a few peasants of a village or a group of public, youth or workers of your neighbourhood, with whom not only you have friendship but have emotional attachment, who needs you in all of their works and consider you as their own man. Again at the same time they feel you superior to them. At the beginning they sometimes criticized me and even jeered at me, but could not deny my influence over them as I did not let them to deny. As and when I became a true leader of them I began to earn love and respect from them. Since then they stopped criticizing and taunting me. Moreover, they also started to obey me. This stage of being jeered and criticized

was the stage of my struggle for becoming their leader. This was the transitional phase, which I had to pass during my struggle for becoming a leader. The revolutionary cadres should have this outlook towards the masses and I want to stress that attainment of such a position is called leadership.

So we see that the works, which our workers are generally given to do are routine works. They only do what the leaders asked them to do, and do not create works by themselves. This is in spite of the fact that the leaders and the party exhort the cadres for 24 hours that they have to create works by themselves. The party cannot create work for any cadre. Here lies the intrinsic quality of each cadre. This characteristic feature of a cadre is reflected in the phenomenon that, going beyond whatever work is assigned to him by the party, he is creating many more works with/among (pl. check which one will be appropriate with or among) the people living around him. On the other hand another feature is there. Some comrades think, 'the party is not assigning me works, so I am not doing anything'. So, the works, which are done by the cadres, are mostly routine works or works as asked by the party to do. These are not the works created on their own. He, who does not create works, loses most of the pleasure of doing works. At the initial stage, he works with enthusiasm and pleasure collectively with others. But again it is seen that this emotion is lost when he is asked to work alone. Let us look at the point raised by the comrades that, at the beginning they work very enthusiastically. But have you ever thought that why a cadre, who starts to perform with great zeal along with a team of comrades, if taken out from his team and deputed to work alone at a place where there are no friends and party workers, where the party is not in a flourishing state or has hardly any organizational work, will run away from there within two days? It is seen that a cadre loses enthusiasm after a certain time even while working with the people, friends and party workers, but

he takes only a few days, or at best one month to lose his spirit if he is sent to an isolated vacant place. What does it mean? This means that he does not feel the urge to grasp political education and political ideology as it ought to have been at the time when he joins the party. He takes it by and large in a superficial way; he joins the party just in response to an appeal; youthful energy; romanticism, some utopian concepts and imagination play together to induce him, whereas perception about practical world is yet to grow in him. But with the gain of knowledge the concept of revolution becomes clearer. This is a hard struggle. Conflicts, failures and successes are there in this struggle. His life consists of all these things, here lies his satisfaction. Realization of this pleasure of life and its other aspects begin to grow bit by bit in his mind. For that reason the comrade, who cannot make himself a revolutionary at the initial stage of his energetic involvement in the party and who does not make himself accustomed to creative works, who does not try to or cannot occupy the position of a leader of the people by creating necessary works through his own efforts, faces such problems and suffers from the ebb. There is no way to select any such homoeopathic remedy, so that the energy of none of them, who once started to work enthusiastically, will ebb away. No, at least I do not have any knowledge about such medicine. When and whether one will ebb away depends upon, in the main, one's own initiative. If he would have an iota of awareness about how precious is the time during which he is full in vigour and energy, he should have utilized the time most carefully. How will he utilize the time? He will prepare himself politically, culturally, morally and ethically to be equipped to direct the organization and establish him as the leader of the people. If he delays to do it, if he suffers from dilly dallying attitude, if he just remains engaged in doing routine works conspicuously in a group of comrades and thus somehow gets through the day's work, if he always wastes time in negligence,

then when his years begin to grow, his energy begins to wane, but his consciousness and mental make-up are not matured, and his ability to develop the feeling of unity with the party and the people is not in such a state that, he cannot save his revolutionary life by fighting from within against the mentality of the present-day society, against many filthy feelings gathered from this society and degradation to an abject position of inferiority and selfishness, which tend to make him self-centred and eventually when he lags behind due to many reasons—be it attraction to sexual life, attraction to make one's own family, or anything else, or be it squabbles among themselves, tendency to lead a luxurious life, or inability to bear hardship, all these things, which come from the society.

Relation between man and man is production relation

This basic proposition of Marxism is to be understood to realize this matter. Marxism teaches us, in this society where we live as social beings, the relation between man and man is production relation. Many people and even many scholars think that this proposition of Marxism is not correct. They raise the question: can the relation between parents and their children be production relation? These fools think that the production relation means only economic relation. No, it is not correct. When Marxism speaks of production relation it does not speak of an economic relation merely. Because, when Marxism speaks of production relation it speaks of two aspects of production relation. One aspect is material production and the other is spiritual production. Human production consists of two parts—one produces the needs of our practical life, which is called material production; and the other produces the food of mind, which is called spiritual production. All these intellectual creations—art, literature, culture, ideas, morality and ethics, religion, tradition, ideology and revolutionism—are the result of spiritual production. All these things are human creations.

Therefore, we see that the man in face of dire need of survival while battling with the Nature in the practical field, has produced these two kinds of production—material production and spiritual production at the same time. He has made both these productions for his personal consumption on the one hand and on the other hand for the development of his own, for the development of individual and society, for the development of the civilization and the advancement of the society. So, production is the result of human activities, where spiritual production is the result of the activities of human mind and material production is the combined effect of physical and mental activities.

Anyway, Marxism teaches us a valuable lesson that the society has emerged in the process of production. In order to survive, human being had to produce different materials collectively and in the process had to enter into relationships with each other. That was why we established society and became social beings. Otherwise we would have had no difference with animals. We are not social being simply because we live together. If it would have been so, then ants could have been deemed as social being. Do we call the ant a social being? Elephants also live in a herd and by that they do not become social beings. We are not called social beings because we live together. In order to survive we are together engaged in production by fighting against nature, and while producing together through this conscious struggle against nature we build up production system and in this process of developing production system we have become social beings.

So human being cannot be solely isolated from the production system and process of production in any given time and at any stage of history. If we think that, in spite of living as a social being man has no relation with the production system, then what kind of relation he is having with each other? He may be capable or incapable, he may understand partially or

discover the half truth or even the whole truth, but this production relation does not depend on whether he understands it or not. It is independent of his understanding. He cannot but establish some sort of relation with existing production system. That is why I ask, "What is the honorable way of leading our life?" Someone may think that, 'I shall lead an honourable life, I do not muddle with anybody's personal affairs, I do not and shall not exploit or coerce anybody, and I shall only stick to medical practice or to the profession of a teacher.' Can it be ever possible? It is not and cannot be possible. Do I know that in the medical profession it is impossible for me to take a single step forward without deceiving others? So, these are not the way of leading an honourable life. Again, I can utilize all these in the welfare of human society. Professional job of a teacher is teaching, that of a doctor is giving treatment, and that of an engineer is applying technology. But their jobs can be utilized for the progress of the society if these are harnessed by freeing them from humiliation in a way conducive to the advancement of revolutionary struggle. If they can do this, only then they can live honourably. Otherwise, regardless of his wishes, consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, he serves the exploitative system, profit making motive of the society. In order to make the people apolitical, they want to keep going uninterruptedly the social attitude and varied forms of social concepts consisting with the social setup and mental makeup of the existing society. As the bourgeoisie directly oppose the struggle, only through which this society can be changed, this capitalist system can be transformed, this juggernaut can be removed, revolutionary change of this society can be brought out and progress can be ushered in, similarly they also use various subterfuges to oppose it. So the bourgeoisie by not speaking a single word about politics are inculcating those ideas, bringing in those outlooks, creating those concepts of morality and ethics, are introducing those philanthropic ideas of

social welfare which can block the path to revolution by diverting the public mind for doing social good to the philanthropic institutions like Ramakrishna Mission or to any Missionary instead of revolution. Likewise, they want that the mentality of doctors, engineers and teachers remains confined to mere social work and liberal outlook, so as to desist them from treading the revolutionary path. Where it is possible to attack social revolution directly dubbing it as an evil, they are doing it, where it is not feasible to prevent the people from taking revolutionary path by maligning social revolution, they are saying to serve the people is also a noble work. If you cannot do this, you can do that. That means their main object is to keep the people anyhow and as far as possible outside the revolutionary activities, through which the society will change, by devising any stratagem, and by mouthing any principle, ideology or theory. So, they eulogizes the theory, 'I shall serve the people, help cremate dead bodies, provide food to the destitute, if I had had a good income, I would have at least serve a handful of food to the poor people of a village, which are no less important works.' Yes, these are all great works. We the revolutionaries also do these things to save the people in distress, but do in the way conducive to the revolutionary struggle and not counterpoising it and not viewing it as a movement parallel to the revolutionary struggle. That is why, sometimes the revolutionaries are to also undertake the tasks of relief works and they do it from this point of view. Besides, there are many, who organize sports, library or gyms. a group of young men are found to build up their bodies in these gyms and come out strong. But what purpose does it serve? Some well-known mafia gangster recruits them immediately to his gang. Similarly when the ruling parties of our country find that these young people have been strong and their chests have grown satisfactorily by doing physical exercises, they come down to the field and lure all these youth to join their parties

with pelf and perks. So, success in body building yields nothing. The real object of building up the youth strong and healthy is to prepare them to take part in revolutionary struggle. But they invent different ways to distract the youth from the path of revolution to whatever extent possible. May it be pursuit of social welfare through working in a missionary organization like the Ramakrishna Mission, may it be establishing schools at different places, may it be showing philanthropic attitude, may it be giving land to the landless etc. etc. Some people may think, although I cannot do anything else, I can at least do some charity for the benefit of the poor people, provide medical service to the poor where they are dying without treatment. So I am doing this. But you have not ever thought, why you are thinking that you cannot do anything other than this. Could a man like you, who possesses so much power of sacrifice, not have engaged himself in the works helpful to the revolutionary movement had his vision been clear? No, you have assumed that doing charity is a noble job. Yes, it is a great job. To stay with the poor in this way, to lend a patient ear to them and to help them—all these no doubt would be a noble service if you could educate them that you should be united to form a revolutionary party to bring about a revolutionary change of this society. While providing food to the poor and serving the people if you would educate the people and form an organization among the people then it would have been a real service. Then it would not confound the people, but would become conducive and beneficial to the revolution. So, in this society, whether we like it or not, we cannot live without entering into production relation. Regardless of our liking or disliking, if we are influenced by everything which exists in this society to serve the interests of the exploiting class, such as our style of living, concepts of morality and ethics and the ideas and thought which we nourish within ourselves, and if we also begin to accept these things without attempting to bring about a

change in the society, then knowingly or unknowingly we in reality back the interest of capitalism. So, I do compromise here. I do not feel in this way that the salary which I am getting from the owner or from my master is not being received by me from slavish mentality. I know that I am deprived. I know that I am being exploited. I know that I am deceived as my legitimate dues are being appropriated by means of various tricks. So, I am engaged in putting an end to this exploitation. If I do not engage myself in this struggle then I am an unconscious worker, who even being a worker, even being exploited is acting as an instrument in maintaining and strengthening the capitalist system. It is not the correct understanding that a worker does not serve the capitalist system, because he is being exploited as a worker. Only a class conscious worker, who, understands the character of this exploitation and to get rid of this exploitation engage himself in building revolutionary working class organization and developing revolutionary workers movement is free from this slavish mentality. That worker is free from humiliation as he is, in reality, engaged in the struggle for abolition of capitalist system. He does not serve capitalism. He serves the movement for social progress. So he is really class conscious.

So when I am to establish a relation with this production system, then what should be the mode of establishing this relation? Should I establish this relationship in such a mode and should my mentality and relationship remain in such a state that I shall only be taking from the society but in return I should not devote myself to the struggle for revolutionary transformation of the society? Then what does it indicate? It indicates that, I am strengthening the hands of those, who want to resist change of the society, who are being benefitted most from this existing social system, who want by any means to halt revolutionary upsurge and the struggles conducive to it by disseminating falsehood in various ways, and by framing up deceptive political

and philosophical theories and confounding concepts of ethics and morality. Maybe, I have not joined hands with them. Maybe, I bitterly criticize them in several issues. But actually I am a philanthropist. This sort of philanthropism in reality serves the interest of the bourgeoisie. Maybe, that I am blaming the Congress, or delivering speeches censuring the capitalists vehemently and right after that I am advising the people to serve the people and build character. But why should we serve the people and build our character? Whom to serve and what for? We must serve the people to show them the way to their survival, not to kill them. Give them education. But education for what? To become a slave? To earn money unscrupulously? Or to help increase the profit of the owner in exchange for having a good trouser made of teryline and a home to live with a wife? To make myself a sex slave? Or shall I educate myself to acquire knowledge to dismantle this capitalist society and free every man from exploitation? So real education for what? For emancipation, to facilitate and accelerate the struggle for revolution. Shall I serve my master for a paltry return what he deems fit to give me in consideration of my merit, just like a master gives to his slave or a man gives to his pet Alsatian. Is education for that? Yes, we must have to educate the people. We stand for educating the masses, but education for what? Give them education so that they can earn true knowledge, can realize where the real problems of their lives lie and can grasp that they practically help survive this system of slavery under the garb of various reasons if they do not get involved in the struggle for changing the production relation with which they are connected. If someone does not directly help the revolutionary movement, then he should have to show through scientific discussions that revolutionary transformation or radical change and progress cannot be brought about by revolution, nor exploitation can be abolished. If one is able to establish this then question of revolution does not arise. Then one is to proceed along the road

through which leads to the possible solution. But can you show the way out, when crisis after crisis will appear, recession will start to threaten, uncertainty of life centring round the objective condition will be escalating and its reflection will create crisis in the field of morality and ethics, uncertainty will haunt in your ideas and concepts and your thought process, moral and family values will be rotted from within? This is the situation, which we call all-out crisis. And this all-out crisis indicates that it is not possible for this social system to progress any further. It needs a radical change and the path of revolution is the only alternative to get rid of these problems. So this change cannot be brought forth without revolution. Anything else is nothing but the path of deception and the path of serving the bourgeoisie.

So it turns out that, under this circumstance we cannot live in this society without entering into a relation with the production system. The relation between man and man develops for the purpose of production and for that we are social being. All the ideas of human relations based on love, affection and fondness between the different men have emerged for the purpose of production. So, production relation does not mean economic relation. Why do the two of us come close together? When two persons come close, it means two ideas come together; two different human entities come together. But what does make the two come together? They come together to produce, to create—both materially and spiritually. This is the objective necessity behind mutual relation among the people.

On the one side of the society, where we live, there is the owning class who owns the means of production which is being operated from the outlook of fulfilling their motive of profit and interest. On the other side, the majority of the people, who are compelled to remain tied up with the instrument of production system for their livelihood, belong to the exploited class. The society is made up with the owning class on the one side and the exploited class on the other. The relation between these two

classes is determined by the class struggle between them. According to Marxism everything—the ideas and thought of a man, his mental faculties, morality, mental makeup, want and desire—is influenced by this class struggle.

Those among us, who have come forward to work in a revolutionary party by understanding all this with the help of intelligence, who have understood that for the progress and development of every person of the society and the country as a whole, we must have to accomplish social revolution, have devoted themselves voluntarily to the struggle for emancipation from this capitalist exploitation. The struggle for opening the path of development of the society and individuals, to liberate the families and even to protect our human feelings of love-affection-fondness and make them more beautiful cannot be successful if we fail to get ourselves involved in the anti-capitalist revolutionary movement. The question of emancipation and advancement of all of ours; the question of social development and all-out welfare of the society is intimately linked with the struggle for emancipation from capitalist exploitation according to the inviolable law of history whether we want it or not. Realizing this we have become the followers of workers' revolution and for that matter, of socialist revolution; we have hold aloft the banner of the party of the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism and communism to organize and build up the struggle for anti-capitalist revolution. According to Lenin, the emancipation of the society is synonymous with the emancipation of the workers, who are being exploited. The worker, who becomes aware of this, can alone give birth to a new civilization by demolishing the old one. But the workers, who being victims of superstitions, illiteracy, ignorance, narrow mindedness, and various capitalist rotten ideas, are working for the owners with mentality of servitude cannot accomplish this task. That is why Marxism-Leninism teaches us that, the revolutionary consciousness does not grow automatically in him,

only because he is a worker's son and is exploited. This consciousness is to be carried into the workers from outside. Who carries it into them?

The owners and the workers are constantly in conflicts. In the field of economy the antagonistic contradiction between labour and capital, between growing productive force and existing production relation gives birth to the idea of social revolution in social consciousness in the realm of spiritual production. This idea is not ethereal. It gets personified in the minds of some educated persons of the society immediately. These educated persons, in whatever condition they may live, can understand and feel that they are humiliated and exploited. They can feel that their conscience and sense of humanity is being trampled; the manhood that dwells within them does not get the chance to develop normally with honour. In order to realize this, one should have the knowledge of philosophy, science, history and economics and at the same time they should have to be declassed. These are the people, who will carry this idea of revolution into the working class. This is the teaching of Lenin. In this way the aspiration for emancipation and revolution strikes these people. As it strikes, they at once take it as a social movement. In this way the socialist movement or what we call revolutionary movement is born.

One aspect of this movement is to fight constantly against injustice and wrong-doings occurring every day and also to fight for the demands concerned with the problems of our day-to-day life and to carry social and revolutionary consciousness to the working class through these movements. Marxism-Leninism further teaches us, 'Go to the workers not to acquire their mentality of servitude; not to acquire the obscurantist ideas; not to get victim of the servile attitude, sense of humiliation, rustic habits, prejudices, the influence of bourgeois thought and individualism, which exist in the minds of the workers, but to make them communists, to raise their

consciousness to the level of communist consciousness'. The moment this happens, 'you and they' will combine to release a tremendous power which will accomplish social revolution and bring about social change.

So, whether we notice it or not, this class antagonism and class struggle within the society is continuously influencing our daily habits, behaviour, principles, moral taste and values, mental pattern and course of thinking without our knowledge and letting us perceive it intellectually. The comrades should keep it in mind that the working class party is placed in this situation. This intensive class battle, which is going on in the society also influences everybody, because no one exists as a separate entity outside the environment of this class struggle. Someone may think that, as soon as he forms a working class party and the members of the party understand Marxism-Leninism and the ideology of working class, he will eventually become immune to the influence of class struggle and become completely free from the influence of the social environment. But this is a utopia. What we call the influence of the social environment will also work side by side. This bourgeois society is dominantly influenced by the interest of the capitalists or the bourgeoisie. So, all the ideas which are coming continuously to this society from the sense of moral and ethical values nurtured in the families and family relations and also taught in the educational institutions, from the sense of duty of the teachers and from other sources, are, in the main, the ideas and thought of bourgeois class. These bourgeois concepts try continuously to spread their influence on the workers of the working class party. So, this is nothing but an illusion that, one will never be influenced by bourgeois ideas, since one has become a member of the working class party, has accepted the revolutionary ideology and is engaged in revolutionary struggle, sacrifices many things, fights and goes to jail now and then. The cadres of a revolutionary party should always and every moment

remain alert and appraise whether any particular bend of his mind, any element of thinking and feeling are being influenced by the ideas of bourgeois class or by the interest of the working class evolved out of their aspiration to emancipation. He should judge every thought from this perspective at the time when it grows within him. Because, he is to keep it in his mind that the impact of ongoing class struggle continuously tries to make an impact on the lives of the cadres and leaders.

Two aspects of class struggle

Class struggle has two aspects. One is: according to variation of strengths both the workers' movement and the revolutionary movement try to influence the people of the society with the ideas evolved out of these movements. The other aspect is just opposite to it. The bourgeoisie, too, according to its variation of strength and particularly as the ruling class, always attempts to confuse the mode of thinking of the revolutionary workers with the help of the extant rules and regulations, sense of discipline, obligation towards family and moral values prevalent in the bourgeois society. So, the revolutionary workers should always keep it in mind that at the time when they are only busy with discussing on the demands of the workers, and on the slogans and theories of revolution, when they are verily engaged with great zeal in mass struggle, then in their un-alert position the prevailing bourgeois thoughts are trying to infiltrate into them in extremely surreptitious way in various ways and in multifarious forms sometimes directly, sometimes in the form of frustration, or confusion, or any other complex form. These rotten bourgeois ideas infiltrate into me and eat into me from within and want to eat up my revolutionary fervour and main characteristic feature with which I once started. Because, the bourgeois class enemies with their class instinct can very well judge their opposing working class and realize how conscious are the workers in a given situation

as well as what is their main weak point when they are not conscious of the situation. They are well possessed with the class instinct. They know where to strike fatally. Equally, those workers among the working class, who are (class) conscious, who are the most advanced cadres also know well where and how to twist and hit the bourgeoisies to curb their influence and thereby extricate the people from their clutches and rouse them to respond human appeal. This is the challenge before the revolutionaries; this is the training and this is for which we struggle. Again it is not that, we are struggling only to learn this, we are also fighting, studying, discussing, entering into various arguments and blending our experiences in our effort to learn many more relevant things.

Beauty has no value without non-beauty

Keep it in mind that the revolutionary battle is strewn with thorny problems. There are many painful incidents, there are many things of our liking and disliking and yet the road to revolution is the right path for you. You should understand it in this way. If you assume that in this path of revolution, there are no thorns, no contradictions, no conflicts, no inconveniences, no wrongs and injustices then you are mistaken. But you cannot abandon this path and return to the routine life on the plea that there are wrongs and injustices. In that case, you will indulge in an injustice worse than that, which is not at all a way out. That will be the road to servitude to capitalism. You can fight for correcting errors, faults and injustices coming in the way of revolutionary battle. You are deemed to struggle within this framework. You have no reasons to think that road to revolution is very easy and straight. No, it is not so. It is not easy, nor straight; nor even pleasant and comfortable. But it is in no way unpleasant whatsoever. You should realize one fundamental proposition of dialectical materialism. That the words like beautiful and pleasant will have no meaning, if we think that only

beauty will prevail. Then the beauty will lose all its charm. What is ugly and unpleasant constantly appears by the side of beauty to kill it. And that is why beauty is so precious; that is why man yearns so much for beauty. If there were beauty only, nobody would have cared for it. So, whenever you speak of beauty, you should not forget that, it does not reflect any revolutionary consciousness, if you think that there is only beauty in revolutionary movement and nothing unbeautiful. It is not the sign of consciousness about any movement, nor, it is true understanding of anything else. So, in revolution, a constant struggle is there between beauty and non-beauty, justice and injustice, good and bad, fair and unfair. Otherwise there would not have anything to call fair or unfair. The concept of propriety does not remain same at all ages and all times. Similarly the concepts of justice and injustice do not remain same at all ages and all times. Even the nature of injustice is not the same at all ages and at all societies. So, in revolutionary movement the concept of injustice or anything, which is thought to be an instance of injustice, is much better than many concepts of justice dominant in capitalist system. It is to be kept in mind always. But, what is considered as injustice in the yardstick of justice accepted in the revolutionary movement will also try again and again to obstruct the path of justice. But how much or less it will be able to obstruct and how less hazardous it will be, is contingent upon three factors, which are, the magnitude of efficiency of the leadership, alertness of the cadres and their integrity. But revolutionary movement does not go by this utopian idea that any act of injustice would never happen there. He, who loses his head at the sight of any incident of injustice and go on thinking what will happen then, will never understand the nitty-gritty of revolutionary movement. Yes, if you see that any leader has committed mistake in dealing with some case, or some leader has done wrong, or that step has not been taken correctly, you should strongly raise the point within the party, point out the

matter and fight. But you cannot do that going against principles or in violation of discipline and codes and conduct of the party regarding criticism and self-criticism, since it has been developed in consideration of overall interest of the party. We have formulated some principles, ideas and codes of criticism and self-criticism in the perspective of overall sense of interest of advancement of the party and revolutionary movements. So, whenever someone finds something wrong, mistakes and fault in the perspective of these codes of conduct, he must point it out forcefully. Let mistakes happen and you should not be afraid of that. I should speak out what I understand as correct, even it is wrongly understood or if it has arisen in my mind in a wrong way. What I expect from you that you should not speak aimlessly, should not speak in indisciplined manner and should not violate the codes and conduct with regard to criticism and self-criticism, which have been adopted taking into consideration of overall interest of the party. I shall be happy if you at least do this. Rather, I shall be unhappy if you do not speak it out of fear. I expect all the executives and the leaders should also think in this way. However, it is a separate issue whether all leaders are able to tackle all the problems correctly at all times. But none can oppose me conceptually on this score. You may think that the conduct of this comrade or that leader is inconsistent with the principles of the party, but the moment it appears to you, you should verify it first through exchanging your views with the party. As for myself, if any question arises in my mind regarding any comrade, I talk with that comrade in the first place; try to understand whether I am wrong about him. This is because my assumption may not be correct always, though it may be correct sometimes. Sometimes it may so happen that what I have seen in my own eyes turns to be wrong. If you have really understood science, and have realized dialectical materialism even fractionally, you should have known that there are many slips between your assumption and observation. So, at first I am to

be sure about that. The proper mind of a revolutionary should be, when something strikes him—there is no wrong that it strikes him—he should ascertain before taking any impression, whether what he has observed and what he has presumed are consistent with each other. The whole episode may turn to something which he has not thought of or heard or known before. Now after knowing and hearing the thing, if he sees that his assumption is right he should at once speak it out. But the point which I am trying to drive into you is that, I should take care that, if I even presume what I thought before has come out to be true, I should raise it and fight for it, but I should not think or reflect any such idea that when such things are happening, what the future is. It reflects utter ignorance of mine. What sort of ignorance is this? I presume that there is no trouble, no problem and no injustice anywhere in revolutionary movement.

**What is meant by one's failure in doing works for
revolution under the pressure of practical life**

When we talk about wrong done by others we generally talk about the main trend and feature of it. We do not discuss on an isolated incident. This apart on what point do we discuss at the time? We discuss on whether the party is fighting against the trend that brings about wrong-doings and degeneration. Because, the force, which is incessantly working within the social environment to bring about moral degeneration among the party cadres and into the character of the party leadership, is tremendous in magnitude. That force is striking leaders and cadres again and again. You say that you cannot work due to the impact of practical life. You say this as a result of the influence of the objective social condition of the society and life which you call impact of life. What does it mean? This means that this is the attack of the bourgeois society on the working class movement. Do you not understand it? But when you say that, you cannot work due to the impact of practical life, you

say it just euphemistically. In reality, one of the features of the conspiracy of bourgeois society and its attack on the workers movement is to make you weak and devastated by creating pressure on you and to break your mental strength in the process. This happens repeatedly. Then why do you speak of the impact of practical life? Rather you should speak of resisting this attack of the bourgeoisie. In fact, you do not think it the attack of the bourgeois class. The impact of bourgeois ideology resulting from the attack of the bourgeoisie on class struggle as well as the influence of the conspiracy of bourgeois society is now bearing down on you. If you were alert, you would have realised that it is a conspiracy which wants to overpower you. We understand many things, but not in this way. Therefore, it indicates that your understanding rests on the surface level and does not go into depth. That is why I said, it is not possible to acquire Marxism just by understanding it through intellect or by parroting some sentences from the books of Marxism. We can understand the underlying import of the deceit practised by the capitalists, if we can only assimilate it (Marxism) through our heart, blood and flesh. We do not need help from outside to understand it. In a class divided society my mentality or any of my ideas cannot be free from class interest and class motive. Even sexual feelings are not out of it, about which one may apparently think that it is nothing but a tendency of procreation, mere a physical attraction and so how it is related with bourgeois class interest? Sexual urge was there even when bourgeoisie did not appear in the society. Sexual urge is natural also among the animals. So how the bourgeois class interest comes in here? Yes, class interest works very much in sexual desire of human being. Sex is not free from private property mental complex. And for that there is fight for the freedom of sex and love. You will have to fight to free our entire mental faculty and production from private property curves. When we shall be able to abolish private property, (the

fundamentals of) the mental make-up, pattern of sexual desire, curve and behaviour of sex impulse, emotion, love, fondness, aversion, concepts of morality and ethics, developed within the mental structure built on the premises of private property, which we call superstructure or spiritual production will not at once go away. This means, the spiritual production, that is, the mental pattern and the elements of mentality which have been grown on the basis of private property in the spiritual world of the mankind will not be abolished with the abolition of the material condition of private property. Or in other words, our mental make-up and all the elements within our mental complex, which exists in the superstructure, will not be abolished immediately at the initial stage of the material condition, which is created when the society based on private property complex establishes socialism through revolution. One thing is to be understood here that, so long the antagonism, jealousy and competitive mentality, which exist among us with respect to production and distribution will not be abolished, classless and stateless society cannot be set up. But with the destruction of old social system, the edifice of the mental structure and pattern, which has been built in the superstructure or in the spiritual world, on the basis of private property will not be destroyed fully with all of its ramifications. It will be very late to happen, its hangover will linger on the superstructure; many a hangover of the old superstructure will remain in the new superstructure, which will grow in the latter days. Those, who does not realise this thing deeply, will not be able to understand that in spite of successful completion of socialist revolution and capture of power by the working class, how the different aspects of bourgeois mentality can worm into the working class revolution and working class state and endanger them, make the leadership revisionist and drag them away from the path of revolution by eating into the vitals of a communist party from within. So this is a ceaseless struggle.

We do not take into account all these things. If we judge all these things very well, we can understand that we have come to accomplish revolution not for anyone, but for all. But you should not take it just as words for word's sake. We are for all but we are for nobody ultimately. It means that we are for the people, for the mankind. It means that I am not for Dick or John. I am concerned with mankind; I am concerned with the people and their struggle. I know revolution is a reality and the question of emancipation and development of mankind is entangled with it. Thus I am a conscious man and so I cannot but act consciously into that process. Otherwise, I will be held guilty to my conscience, I will be held guilty to the bar of humanity. I have come to revolutionary struggle for this. Isn't it?

Revolutionary party is not a charitable institution

Another thing may dawn in one's mind, though not in the form of a question, which is—look, how well that comrade is living or how better placed those leaders are, but I hardly have a square meal. Yes, the leaders as well as all the cadres should help a comrade in distress as much as possible. This is a natural sense of moral obligation of the collective. This alertness and wisdom should be there in all party workers. This is important and every comrade should take a note of it. My condition is not so well. So what? Why should I have regret about it? Did I come to the revolutionary movement with the hope that others would take care of me or I came voluntarily as I had understood that the road to salvation of my own is merged with the revolutionary struggle? So, if I see any drawback like lack of alertness or mean mindedness to appear in the revolutionary movement, then there is no alternative but to fight against it within the periphery of the revolutionary struggle. If my attitude is not conscious, such thought will come to my mind. As for example, let us think of the situation that, a worker fallen in trouble is thinking that neither the other workers, nor the leaders

are looking after him. No, it is a wrong posing of the question. It reflects that he has not grasped the revolution well and also not understood why he joined revolutionary movement. His attitude should be like this that the problem from which he is suffering, solely belong to him. We shall try to help all the workers. But this attitude implies that we should help all the workers to be revolutionaries. This means, all of us have not become revolutionaries to look after the problems of the family lives of all comrades. My mental makeup should be that I am to fight my own personal problems. Rather, in the event that anyone comes to help me I should tell him, of course, if I am a conscious worker, that no, I don't need it, I can withstand it. Give help to other comrades. See, that comrade is weak and unable to fight. So help him, as I am not in need of your help. Don't waste your energy; I don't need your help. This should be my real attitude. The attitude of other comrades of the party should be that if they find any neighbouring comrade in downtrodden condition they should think how to help him. This is the proper outlook. If anyone does not do it, it indicates that he lacks in alertness and wisdom. Similarly, if any comrade thinks that, since nobody helped him or looked after him, so what is the use of staying in the party. In that case, it proves that his understanding of this fundamental question is in a real muddle. Is it so that I joined the revolutionary party only because that there would be someone to look after me? In fact, he has developed a wrong approach in the recess of his mind. That wrong approach consists in the fact that he has assumed that the maximum number of comrades will come from economically backward and destitute families and only a handful will come from comparatively better off families. If the people from the latter group join the party, we feel glad only because they help us monetarily. I should not think that as I am starving, why he should also not starve with me. What is this? It is nothing but a worse competitive business mentality of the

bourgeoisie. Is it the mentality of a revolutionary cadre? Those comrades will help us in our revolutionary activities and this is what I want heart and soul. Rather, I should try to enhance his attraction towards the party. And at the same time I shall try to attract him towards me by my greatness, broadness and selflessness, so that one day he becomes a revolutionary cadre like me. Why I shall hurt him constantly when he is doing something? Why should I think that either he serve the party sacrificing everything like me or leave? How the party will be benefited by that? How is it that, I have not even utilized whatever help he is providing the party? No class conscious cadre can think in this way. The comrade has forgotten another thing that, there will no longer exist anything to call a party, if the party is meant for helping the financially weak comrades. It will be transformed into a society of help, a charitable institution. And no charitable institution can run without monetary help from the capitalists. It cannot run without financial support lent by the owning class, or CIA or America. We have not joined the party to transform a revolutionary party into a charitable society. All the cadres have come here voluntarily to become a revolutionary worker, to accomplish revolution. The attitude of all the comrades should be that each of us will help the party. Wastage of party resources may be a point of discussion in the party. But I cannot make it a point of discussion mentioning (my grievance) that I am in trouble, on the contrary my point of discussion should be the wastage of party resources, if any, in the sense of making plans and programmes of the party and fulfilling the aggregate interest of the party as well. If this norm is not followed my outlook will remain affected with a dangerous ulcer. I criticize the party from the perspective of my personal interest; I criticize because I am aggrieved, not that, though I am not aggrieved and not in any trouble, yet I criticize some points which I feel necessary to do for the interest of the progress of the party. But I am not saying

in this way. So, even a right point loses its efficacy, if I utter it out of grievance, since I raise the point, not because it is right, but because I am aggrieved. If I was not aggrieved, the right point raised by me would not have been overruled. Sometimes an aggrieved cadre raises a right point only to be rejected. But the leaders should entertain the point if it is found to be right, even if it is raised by someone from his offended position. But at the same time it is to be pointed out to that comrade that, he has no right to raise the point, as he raised the point not because it was wrong, rather he raised it because he was offended. So you analyse yourself. But you have brought before the party a truth which might not have dawned on you if you were not offended. However, we entertain it as it will also come to our use. But this is the obligation of ours. Because, if anyone, even our enemy cites our any fault or shortcoming from any point of view, and even if it is cited with the motive of animosity, if it contains some elements of truth, we shall not discard it on the plea that it has been said by our enemy. We should on the one hand alert our comrades pointing out what has been said by our enemy with their feeling of enmity, and on the other hand we should discuss the matter very seriously, if there is even a grain of truth.

Now I like to come to another point. Many say with utter frustration, we did our best, but ultimately found that nothing good can be done here in our country. We left our home and hearth, fought many a fight and sang many mass songs with harmoniums hanging around our neck. Thereafter we realized that nothing would happen in spite of all of our efforts. The old guards of the CPI, the stalwarts of the CPI(M) controlled IPTA, and the heads of the cultural movements often say, ‘Look my dear, you are doing all these things under the predominance of youth, but mind it that nothing will come out at the end.’ So they advise, “Follow the path trod by the wise men. We have sung many songs by playing many accompanying musical instruments.

What have we got in return?" It seems that they joined revolutionary struggle for achieving something which should be worth it. First mistake they committed is that they joined revolutionary struggle to gain something. As they could not shine, they are now after making their career in organizing professional dramas, Hindi films or anything like that. Because they want to pull off something substantial for them. I like to say what is the need to join revolutionary movement for this? I am unable to make any head or tail of this. Have we joined the revolution for any personal benefit? If not, then the question of looking after me is a false question. The right attitude of everybody in this regard should be that, why should I ask the party to think of my personal problems, rather if I to ask the party to think of anything, I shall make the party think of other problems. I shall make the party to ponder over the problems regarding politics and organization. Why should I make my personal problem as an organizational problem and make the party to think over it? And why should I pester the party with it? My line of thinking would be that I should make the party deliberate on how to develop mass movements, how to make the party march forward, how to better the campaigns of programme, how to enhance the initiative of political activities and how to spread the party works in how many ways. I know whatsoever, that the help of the party leadership is required to solve the problems of the weak comrades. But in that case, those comrades should not have any confusion at any moment that these are organizational problems. They should always think that these are their personal problems. They shall try to resolve those problems by seeking advice and guidance from the experienced leaders and cadres. And all the comrades should do it, such as the students take help from their teachers, the patients take help from the doctors for recovery from diseases, and the different people take help from different cross sections of people. Thus help from the leaders of the party should be asked in the similar way. But why they will

deem personal problems as organizational problems? This mode of thinking is wrong as they have messed up the very concept of revolution.

The concept of leadership of a revolutionary party

There is another thing which works within some comrades in a peculiar way and which is seen even within some leading comrades. The leaders and the cadres, who are party conscious, who have minimum knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, and who have even the faintest idea of working style and method of a working class party, are to keep in mind that the concepts of party leadership and party cadres are built on the premises of the ideological and organizational leadership of the party. It stands on the ground of the leadership of the mass movements. It does not depend on becoming MLAs, MPs or Ministers. I see a bizarre complex prevails within some comrades in this respect. Sometimes in election politics we field or are compelled to field a candidate who is dashing and pushing or has mass appeal. But later it is turned out that he has not acquired even the minimum standard of a member of a working class party. Sometimes we are constrained to nominate someone like him as a candidate in the election. Sometimes he may win the election and the moment he wins, he becomes a leader in the eyes of the people. He becomes a more powerful leader before the people than many important workers of the party. But does that mean that he has attained the quality of a true leader? He emerges as a leader of the people not being a leading staff of the party. This happens because the people think in this way owing to their backwardness. Whether a cadre really holds the leading position or not depends on how much organizational responsibility he bears and what role he plays in the field of ideological movement and party leadership. These are the two criteria for determining who the genuine leader is,

and whom we recognize as the leader. On the other hand, he, who is accepted as a leader by the people, whose name is published in the newspapers, should also be judged by the yardstick that to what extent he plays the leading role within the party. New comrades often mix up the concepts about whether one is a leading comrade, or is an ordinary worker or is much lower in standard than another efficient cadre of the concerned area. As a result of their confusion about these things they cannot understand why the man, whom he supposes as the leader or whom he expects to lead the people, does not perform a single task, which is to be done by the recognized leaders of the party. The said MLA also sees the other leading comrades of the party before his eyes. In spite of that if he thinks, "I am an MLA, I am so powerful, I have the ability of doing these or those things, but I am not awarded the position of a leader, whereas, that person, although he has no ability, is not dashing and pushing while treating the masses, and cannot mobilize the people like me, is entrusted with the responsibility of leadership. Is it the proper judgment?" What if, he is at once asked have you been able to abide by all the norms required to be followed to become a leader of the working class party? Have you been able to change your outlook as regards to your property, family and children? Have you been able to submit happily everything you have to the party, which is necessary for a revolutionary worker? No, you could not. But on the question of asserting yourself as a leader, you feel that you are eligible. Again, when you are asked about your behaviour you are arguing that you have not yet attained that standard. If it be so, that you have not attained that standard, then you are supposed to have the minimum modesty to accept that you have not yet earned the quality of becoming a leader. Then why will you fight for going to be a leader? You have not yet acquired that quality, so that you can be awarded leadership. Only he, who passed these tests, has been qualified for being a

leader. Why don't you have the mentality to work under his leadership? You want to be a revolutionary, don't you? If you do not possess this quality how you can be a revolutionary? Then you put a bad argument that this should be considered as your weakness, since you are a newcomer and has not yet been educated adequately. So, how it is that you nourish the ambition of occupying the position of a leader, though you are not sufficiently educated. Actually, it is nothing but the impact of existing class struggle, this is the result of the influence of this class struggle acting continuously on our mental structure patterned by the social environment. So the Tenth congress of the Chinese communist party has reminded that so long class struggle is there in the society, the bourgeoisie will continue to spread their thought and ideas even after commission of socialist revolution, in order to destroy the party, to pollute the cadres and to ruin the leaders from inside. In other words, this indicates that class struggle gets influenced by it. Therefore, so long class struggle is there in the society these problems will also come continually from different sides to create confusions in different areas.

So in every moment, I am to judge my every mental trait to ascertain which class idea it reflects, whether it helps strengthen the workers movement, integrity, unity and discipline of the party, or whether it weakens party leadership, party organization, politics of the party and workers movement behind various confusing questions and arguments. The questions which provoke me to stay away from the path of revolution are to be understood as the impact of bourgeois ideas on the bourgeois society and on the class struggle. It implies that these are the outcome of the attack of the bourgeois class on the working class and working class movement. I have become victim of this attack made on the working class movement as I have distanced myself from the working class movement and in turn I have made the working

class movement weak to that extent. I am not only keeping myself away from the workers movement, but also by advancing my arguments as to why I am doing this, I am broadening the road for those numerous weak comrades, who are being completely baffled by the conspiracy of the bourgeoisie, to keep themselves away. On the other hand, if I fight and win, the defeat does not mean that the conspiracy of the bourgeoisie fails in my case alone, it also help many other comrades to fight for defeating the bourgeois attacks. So, it is not that, I alone come out as victorious; I also provide strength to many others to become victorious. The problems are to be approached from this perspective.

Revolution is to be understood throughout one's life

So, if we analyse the questions, which have been placed here, we see that all these questions point to the basic theme that, the Revolution needs to be realized continuously. This realization does not ripe only through discussions, reading books or entering into arguments. We should have to understand well that, whatever discussions as regards to revolution or theory of revolution may we hold, that does not impart us correct understanding about revolution, course of revolutionary movements and its complex dialectical relation with us. Because, each of us exists as a separate entity. When we are in the midst of revolutionary struggle, contradictions arise between the realms of our own mental make-up, nature, feelings of advantages and disadvantages, ideas and concepts and the environment of our own in which we live, on the one hand and those of the necessity of revolutionary movement, the necessity of maintaining cohesion within revolutionary movements and the necessity of taking initiatives to advance the revolutionary movements continuously, on the other hand. What is the nature of these contradictions and why do they arise? These things arise due to the following reason. When these traits of the opposing mentality appears in

the revolutionary movements, we fail to understand that these traits are the product of bourgeois thought, which are working within me in different forms due to failure to determine the true nature of these traits. Only by studying books and engaging in discussions, we shall not be able to determine its character. So, after completion of Long March, Mao- Zedong dealt with a very valuable topic regarding organisational problems in his Yenan speech. At that time the Communist Party of China was a very powerful party. It was on the verge of final victory after winning many revolutionary battles. During that time a class was held with the party executives, leaders, military generals and captains. In that class he says that, we cannot realise revolution adequately by trying to understand Marxism merely through reading books on Marxism-Leninism, or through debates and discourses or through pursuing different theories. This cannot provide us with a comprehensive knowledge of Marxism. By this he wants to mean the knowledge which is decisive and action oriented for all purposes, which is why this knowledge protects us from all sorts of dangers. So, you should remember that, there are many comrades, who are able to understand which one is bourgeois prejudice, or petit- bourgeois prejudice, or weakness and can fight directly against all these attacks of the bourgeois society and bourgeois ideas. Those who cannot understand these are plagued with different problems. But what's about those, who are indulging in these confusing thoughts that—I am weak, what shall I do in face of unforeseen attacks and various kinds of impact of life all alone if all of you do not help and look after me? They are the victims of what I say clandestine attacks of the bourgeoisie for their ignorance.

I have already said why we have chosen this path. Just take my instance. Initially I joined Anushilon Samity during the freedom movement of our country. With bombs and pistol at my hand I was indoctrinated to politics. I associated myself with the Anushilon Samity with a view to liberate the country; to free

the country. But those, by whom I was inducted, subsequently went off the political movements, nobody knows where. I witnessed before my eyes how low those people sunk, who had once inspired me with ideology to leave home and hearth, parents and family; those who had imbibed me by the call to trifle my prospects of education, career and everything, and whom I considered as great men according to my power of cognition, which I had at that age. But did it do harm us? Though, it did harm many. Those who followed them blindly, that means who thought in this way—what even our parents discreetly shows—just see, how the man, whom you followed leaving everything, has made his career and comfortably living with his family, see how the other person is making lots of money. My father used to say me, “There are so many people in politics, but I have not seen any strange man like you in politics. Look at those people. They are working in the Congress, or working in this or that party. But, how is it that if one joins politics, one will have to desert home, family and everything, will have no responsibilities for parents, wife and children? What sort of politics is this? We see all other parties—the communists, socialists, forward blocks, they all have their homes, families and incomes. But I have seen no any odd person like you in politics.” He used to ask, wherefrom I got this idea. I answered him that it was my stupidity; it was a curse on me. What else could I say to him? Thus we see that these are the factors which make one weak. Maybe, he, who brought me in this struggle, is not in politics now. Now if I feel distraught at this, it will mean, as if, I was a revolutionary for the sake of him. He, who thinks in this way, invites the danger. If he, who brought me into the struggle and showed the right path—whoever he maybe—makes retreat, then why should I follow suit, when I have got to know truth through him, and realised this is the right path for me, understood that this is the only path of living an honourable life? Was it not true that I

searched someone from whom I could find the truth and proper path to pursue it? Anyone can lead me to the road of truth and thereafter may abandon the road. But what logic is this that, since he has turned into a renegade, we shall also turn into renegades en masse? If he, who brought me into politics, becomes a thief, is it any logic that I, too, shall become a thief? Is being in politics bad? Is it wrong that I am involved in this struggle? Is the ideology which I am pursuing is wrong? If the ideology which I am following is wrong, it should be rejected at once. But If it is the path of truth, if it is the path of humanity, if it is the path to attain dignity and awareness and is the only path to human emancipation then let those, who after guiding me to this road has now left, go to hell. In this circumstance why should I be inactive because they have become inactive? Why shall I abandon the truth? This is the elementary concept of every revolutionary.

That is why, I told that when we say that we are in politics for all, it does not mean that we are in it particularly for John or Dick. Masses are there, common people are there and the question of their emancipation is also there and naturally that deserves our participation in that struggle for emancipation. So we see all the great revolutionaries to have expressed it in this following language: our struggle will end only when our bodies will cease to exist. That means it is not before we shall breathe our last, and shall be cremated. The Fascists, who had dared to frighten the revolutionaries with the fear of death, heard that firm voice of the revolutionaries. Julius Fuchik retorted back, 'don't scare me with the fear of death. You people hear it. The moment I had become a revolutionary, I purchased the ticket for my journey to death.' We are not unconscious element. We do not consider death inglorious. We only think it inglorious to die like a dog or a sub-human being. We are struggling for justice and if I am to die in the hands of a goon for this, it will not be a humiliation to me; rather it will be an honour to me.

So how you dare to intimidate me? Those, who will murder the revolutionaries today being misguided, if they possess an iota of conscience, will suffer from sense of self-reproach and the sense of guilt will burn them from inside for the crime they committed. It may not be today, but it will sure to happen tomorrow or day after tomorrow. Even if they do not suffer from within, their children and grandchildren will suffer. Why I shall be afraid then? That was why, so loud was the voice of Fuchik, and so the other revolutionaries. If you can point out my mistake, I shall correct it, if you can show error in my judgement, I shall amend it, if you can show that my path is wrong, I shall abandon it. But no amount of threat will yield any result, as I have already booked a ticket for death. Now I am ready to die at any moment. Should I be then adventurous to stick out my neck to be slain on the plea that I am ready to die? No, I have many things to do. I shall strive to live, as long as I can, and work for revolution staying alive. While serving the cause of revolution, if death comes in spite of my best efforts, let it come. My effort to remain alive lies in my pursuit of revolutionary struggle and I shall not try to live being isolated from this struggle. Still then, if death comes during performing my revolutionary duties, I shall court it. In that case I shall die with honour. So, all the revolutionaries say that they are not afraid to die. But we are only afraid of dying like a dog; we are afraid of dying begging, whining and to court an unmanly death. So, do not die the death of a dog or a cat, do not die cowardly by complaining and disgracing yourself. Fight to breakthrough, struggle and die after that. So, there is only one surest way to keep your head high, that is to engage yourself in the struggle of the masses for justice against all sorts of injustice and exploitation for bringing about a revolutionary transformation of the present day exploitative system. This is our task and if death comes in course of performing our tasks that is an honourable death. Death is honourable even when we die going without

food while struggling continuously for bringing about revolutionary change of the society and emancipation for the mankind.

In the beginning when the idea of communism was making its way into this country there was very strange and funny concepts about it. Pulin Das, the founder of our Anushilon Samity, used to say, 'different persons have different likings. Suppose when you wish to eat prawn, I am wishing to take ruhi. So, how there will be communism? All are not supposed to eat ruhi together, there must be some who want to eat prawn. We laughed hearing these things. He was an old man, yet he had such grotesque idea about communism.

Now let us come to the questions placed by the comrades. The main point raised in these questions is somewhat like this—standard and style of living of all the comrades will be same. Such an idea is simply unrealistic fantasy. One aspect of these questions is objective realistic and the other is unobjective. The standard of education and level of intelligence of all comrades are not the same; position and effectiveness of all of them in political movements are also not the same, which is why, the standard of living of different comrade is apparently seen to be different depending on different role played by each in these movements. A comrade, say a leader, may be placed in a better condition either due to his efficiency or his position in the organisation. Since he is a leader he sits in a certain type of office, lives in a certain type of residence, he visits certain specific places, the public accord him with some special respect, many of his friends affectionately present him decent dresses, he travels by motor car, he is received cordially in different places and thus he automatically gets a chance to live a sort of comfortable life. He has got the chance to live this kind of life according to importance and performance. But the pertinent question is how the concerned comrade will view this life. it is to be seen, if that comrade is

getting addicted to these conditions, if the vices are developing within him from his attraction to this mode of life, if he feels annoyed and inconvenienced in absence of these things, or if he can adjust with any situation smilingly, if feeling of want does not develop within him or better to say, he does not let it grow in his mind. But contrary to this, if these evil traits develop within him, it is to be stated that he has become the victim of greed. This is to be watched that he does not become a victim of all this, he does not become a victim of a certain condition of life. Suppose a comrade is deputed at a certain place to work in a secret service mission and is provided with a high condition of living for that. Naturally, it is not to be known to the rank and file comrades. In that case, it is the party which makes arrangements of a highly affluent and comfortable living condition for him, providing him with suitable garments, and a flat in some posh area. The moment I find him to live in this comfortable condition, it appears to me, why the comrade should live in this condition. Is this the way of judging anything? No comrade should evaluate anything in this way on which I discussed previously in many an occasion. Wherefrom does this question come—how comfortably he lives, whereas I live in such a wretched condition? To answer this question I made too many discussions on the ideal of renunciation, which ushers in serious consequences. It gives birth to so many tendencies and vulgar concepts. These are in reality bourgeois concepts. That is why I have said that, when the revolutionaries go without food, when they are compelled to starve and live in jungles, when they have to suffer from want of clothes and have to live on leaves of trees, even then they do not think that they are sacrificing so much for the people and the country. If such thought worms into anyone's mind, that undoubtedly means that he is influenced by the ideal of renunciation. For, he knows that this is the dignified life, which he has accepted by his own volition despite whatever unfavourable situation he is now in at

this phase of his struggle. In his realisation revolutionary life is lofty, beautiful and joyful. To the bottom of his heart if he does not feel attraction to so-called means of comforts and happiness, such as, home, nice-looking dress, beautiful residential flat, property and wealth and if he does not also think them as the conditions of more decent and better life than revolutionary life, which he claims to have given up, then why should he take it as a sacrifice? In this context you should go through what I have said in the book 'Why SUCI is the Only Communist Party of India' wherein I compared it with moving to live in a royal palace abandoning a dingy hut. In that case does the person who leaves that hut think that he has made a great sacrifice? So, a genuine revolutionary considers the so called comfortable and luxurious life is humiliating, loathsome, wretched, dirty and disgraceful. So he has voluntarily chosen this struggling life. In this struggle he has everything—pleasure, sorrow and grief. But it is a magnificent life. If you leave a filthy life, which is called a life of comforts and happiness by the commonplace people, to accept the greater life of a revolutionary, then how it is that you begin to think that you are sacrificing a lot whenever you face some physical constraints or difficulties in getting food and lodging. What have you given up? Then it means that you consider hearth and home, property, etc., more precious than revolution. And if you do not regard that humiliated and sterile life more precious why would you think that you have made a great sacrifice by leaving it behind? This is one of your principal confusions.

The second confusion is: ideal of renunciation begets the desire to get something in return. It begets the cynicism—I sacrificed so much, but what have I got in return? So you see, the congress leaders and even many old Gandhite leaders, communist leaders and the leaders of the national freedom movement vent an idea, since they once sacrificed lots for the country, they now deserve to get something in return. Some

want money, while others crave for power and position. Even some run for legacy. This attitude to renunciation gives rise to desiring mind that wants return. And another section of them, who does not want anything, you will find such people among the Gandhaites, who does not run after power and position, or money, but continues to sacrifice everything with a religious mind, only because of this mental approach to sacrifice, loses all faith in human efforts when they meet with failures and cannot achieve what they have expected. They begin to think nothing will be gained despite all efforts. Thus they become the victims of frustration. They lose all their confidence in human endeavours, forward motion (of the society) and the movement for social progress. None of these anyway come to our help. These are all variants of bourgeois class thought and ideas.

Path to revolution is full of thorns, but joyful

First of all, we must have to understand that in this thorny path of revolution there are plenty of sorrows and pains, but still it is joyful. While treading along the road to revolution the revolutionaries bleed with sorrows and sufferings, but to them the orbit and the ambience of revolution is full of joy. I have already told that absolute happiness is something of a type, which is lacklustre, dull and meaningless. There is nothing to enjoy in it. But in the midst of sorrows and sufferings the dominant character of the revolutionary environment and the feeling which it exudes is blissful. There is turmoil in this life; but in spite of that it is a noble and honourable life. Does this feeling of joy that we feel in this life, develop around the sense of duty alone? If we do not find it in the form of pleasure and dignity, all struggles will end before long under the pressure of duty. You will be bored soon and will not be able to go further. Sense of duty is the starting point and thereafter, it is to be administered to blood and flesh to blend with the sap of life and to be taken it joyfully. This is how we view our life. Is there anything else in the life of a

revolutionary? Since the revolutionaries take the life in this way, their morale cannot be destroyed. They can be beaten or shot at, but cannot be bought. So, we see in history that revolution always and everywhere becomes victorious. It always wins, because it is undefeatable and decisive. You are to view the thing in this way.

Political competence of the party cadres should be increased

Quality of political discourses is to be improved in every sphere of the party. Only if the political ideas and thought are presented before the public in the language understandable to them, then it can influence the public mind effectively. To achieve this, your deliberation should be twofold. In the first place, you are to regularly reiterate and re-discuss the matters already known to you. Suppose I understand a theory which is nice, beautiful and correct. Once I understand it I may think what is the necessity of recapitulating it over and again? No, we should not think in this way. Because of twofold necessity we have to discuss those things again and again among ourselves. Firstly, to find out if there is anything more to learn from it other than what we have already learnt. Secondly, we may have understood the subject sufficiently well at the first time, nevertheless it is essential to examine if it is necessary to improve our previous understanding to make more exhaustive. As far as my knowledge goes, all the comrades of our party do not do it. But if our party comrades ignore the task, their power of judgement as to what we call political competence will not be sharp as it should be. As for example, the CPI is carrying out its propaganda in a particular line, similarly, the CPI(M) is conducting its propaganda along its own political line. On this background I must have to uphold the fact by any means that how they are deceiving the people by pursuing their political lines, how they are suppressing one particular truth by

which false statement, how they are suppressing the real issues by playing the sentiment of the masses and by what tricks. Unless we can acquire the ability to understand the truth clearly and then highlight it properly these pseudo revolutionaries will continue to befool the people. And for that you are to understand your own political line well *vis-a-vis* what the other parties are saying and then you are to get those things clarified by sitting together with the leadership or by discussing among yourselves. You should also remember that it may not be always feasible to avail the leadership in private. So, you should make your understanding clear through discussions among yourselves. You are to continuously improve your perception about the political lines of the others as well as your own. You should not spend your time only in association with the other comrades, except as much as it is absolutely necessary, and for the rest of time you are to remain in touch with the maximum creative work. I must not spend my leisure pointlessly in any unwanted place. I shall try to remain in the party association. After completing my work, whatever time I get to take rest should better be spent with some friends in a party association. A revolutionary is not benefitted by taking rest comfortably in isolation. He is benefitted in crowd. Many live in commune or party centre, but often fail to establish an emotional link with the basic concepts of commune or centre life. They live together; sometimes they perhaps get involved in discussions, even in arguments, do household chores together, yet they live in their own individual ways. Everyone should live collectively with others like a living organism; otherwise we cannot examine our general character as well as its different traits and with many other things; also it does not come to the notice where our deficiencies lie. Significance of living together whether it is in a commune, or a party centre or an party office, is that many things appear before us, many points come to our notice, many things are put into examination and we are to face

many a conflict. So this is the necessity of living together.

**Along with character political acumen and
competence are needed**

But on which I want to emphasise is that today we should not clamour for character only. Along with it appropriate political education is also necessary. The slogan should be: you must politically equip yourself so that you can speak properly in articulate form, can expose the contention of the opponent correctly, can perceive their tricks and point out them to the people. You should prepare yourselves politically in this way. So, I want to add this additional slogan. If we do not strive to accomplish this task right now, the characters which have already been built up and which are yet to build up will not acquire the requisite strength, which was possible to happen in the early days. For, in those days the emotion and character of a comrade got the chance to develop in a small circle of comrades under the direct attention of the leadership day and night. But now-a-days the movements and activities of the comrades are not the same as these were in those days. So, how will they get that character and keep that character alive? That is why, character cannot be built up in that way, however much you may speak of character. To build up character you are to be engaged in today's battle by equipping yourself politically. Today's battle is not confined to maintain association, not to carry on propagandas or discussions, but to lead the masses. Today's battle is to go to the masses and to build the organisation at the mass level and then to take the party organisation to the lower level. So, how can I maintain my character, if I cannot make myself competent to take the organisation to the mass level? I have wanted just to point it out that all of us are to be up to the mark. We shall not bother about it, whether we are more conscious than the workers of the other parties. To build up newer and newer organisations,

to show the path to the people amid confusions, not to let your vision be blurred by the impacts of frustrations and confusions coming in thousands and to make the others understand the right things in right way, to remain well conversant with all relevant matters, to keep abreast of correct information and facts, to be in the know what is happening all around and to equip politically with working ability and efficiency—these are the things which are to be developed among you. Along with character building of the cadres, if we do not lay maximum emphasis upon these things, then the character itself, on which we are raising so many hue and cries, cannot be saved at last long—this is what I want to say.

What is sexual desire

Here is a question, which is of different nature and I am going to discuss on that. The question is—what is tendency of procreation or sexual desire? At a certain age men and women feel a biological motor action, an impulse, a nervous sensation following which some emotional movements occur. It happens both to man and animal. But, since man is not animal, he thinks, he mulls. So, all these emotions are connected with his spiritual and mental characteristic features. In the case of humans any physiological impulse, whatever it maybe—sex or physical pain or hunger or anything else—does not exist independent of man's definite frame of mind and ideals. These two can no way be separated from each other. In the external feature, sexual characteristics of female body are different from those in male. From the perspective of these basic characteristics one is called female body and the other is male body. For some specific reasons human being is identified as male or female. But all female bodies are not the same in all respects; all women are also apparently not the same in look, or in characteristics of physical structure. Still all the female bodies possess some basic structural characteristics, which is why they have been

categorised as women. Similarly those, who we call male, are apparently different in look, but same in basic structural characteristics. Is there anything else? But we do not feel sex attraction between man and woman in our childhood. When human body develops to a certain stage, we begin to be specially conscious of it and start to feel its pressure on us. We also begin to feel its necessity. But is it so that the animals also feel it in the same way as we feel it? No. The animal cannot create this motor action and this excitement leading to physical act only by contemplating it. But man can create sexual excitement by dreaming and thinking even without having the object of sex before him; he can also get involved in sex acts, though in a pervaded way. The animal cannot contemplate on sex and thereby cannot rouse sex impulse or urge for sex act, nor can they restrain it. But human being by dint of his power of thinking can stimulate or restrain the process of sexual actions and reactions. So we see that sex impulse and sex acts are there in both animals and humans but those are separate in their characteristics. In the case of human being, it is related with human idea, so it is also connected with his thought, morality and culture. Excluding and denying it altogether, and without taking into consideration of any impact of it, sexual habits of man cannot be developed, nor have ever developed. So, with the change of moral values, culture and livelihood of man, his sexual trends and habits have undergone major improvements. Though, its fundamental form—I know what you will insinuate to—the sexual intercourse remains the same, which is equally true for animals and human being as well. But, with the time the art of consummation of sex has been developed much; it has intermingled with imagination and has been embellished with finer human feelings. So, the very presence of sex object cannot make a man victim of sex impulse. It may also generate hate and aversion. But an animal do not have such feelings. The animal in a particular season

feels sexual urge as such and tries to make advances in the very presence of sex object i.e. opposite sex. Does it happen in the case of humans? Once in a seminar on culture a renowned intellectual was very much offended at my speech. He did not like the particular terms such as struggle, class struggle and class outlook. He said many things expressing his views whether songs on jasmine flower can be sung in the field of battle, and then entered into an argument with me. I told him that there is no such thing as eternal, but he objected to it. I asked him, "Will you then please say what is eternal in your view?" He began to fumble this or that words just like which is peculiar to this class of intellectuals, you know. You will find any notebook, especially the Modern Book of Knowledge, contains very short discourses on almost every topic in two or three lines. A group of people take care to purchase these books to keep them in their libraries. They occasionally browse these books and think that they have become master of all subjects. So, once he spoke of Einstein's theory of relativity, although he knew nothing about it, only because he had to say something. Then he began to search wildly what he should say and ultimately came with what he wanted to find—why, tendency of procreation, it is a basic instinct, indeed! He initiated the discussion on the subject of pleasure, but gradually shifted to the topic of tendency of procreation. I had asked him about whose pleasure he was talking? The pleasure of snake or frog? You were presumably speaking of the pleasure of man. Then what was the nature of this pleasure? Being cornered by this question he came up with the doctrine of tendency of procreation to save the situation. I replied, "Yes, this tendency of procreation is there. But you do not know, this procreation has gone through how many changes." When the organism was in jelly form, the procreation was inherent in it and it was used to divide itself. At that time sex organs were not formed in organisms and so what you now call the form of intercourse in

sex did not appear at the time. Yet the phenomenon of procreation was there. A jelly-like organism first divided itself into two and then the process of dividing each part continued to reproduce the organism. At that stage the necessary structure for sexual intercourse, of which you were talking, meaning intercourse between male and female of a given organism had not developed, but procreation was there. I told him how it is that being a teacher you did not know it. Again there are different tendencies within procreation. Think of an uneducated man. He has a certain kind of tendency of procreation. Similarly, you are a refined educated man and you, too, have some kind of tendency of procreation. Do you think that these two tendencies are alike? You will at once say, no, how it could be! But in consideration of the form both apparently seems to be the same. Both the forms appear to be almost same. But are they really identical? One acts in a very fine artistic way, while the other acts with a rough attitude of lust. One's action is animalistic in nature and the other's is very sophisticated and emotional. Thus, there occur so many differences like this. Why these differences occur? In all these cases this sexual emotion and acts are apparently similar; the objective material base is also similar, but mental make-up, taste and culture differ from man to man, which is why the sense of sexual desire and satisfaction, attractions and repulsions are not the same for all. In a situation when one feels sexual attraction, another one may feel repulsion and his sexual urge recoils into him. But it does not happen with an animal. So we see here that, man's biological motor action or biological feeling as we call it, has a link with his mental composition, ideal, taste, education and culture, which influence each other reciprocally. Man's education and culture have influenced him a lot to change and pattern the basic form of sex-oriented acts and its style. It does not exist now in bestial form.

Class thinking reflects in style of sex and sexual relation

Correct realisation of this thing will lead us to understand that sexual urge of man has a relation with his thinking, culture and moral values. If we can understand this relation between the two we shall also understand, that when thinking in a class divided society is class thinking and reflects class mentality, then choice, style and every other thing related with sex are also induced in accordance with class thought and class influence. That means where sex is self-centred and self-absorbed, and does not care for education and morality, does not care for culture and dignity, there a man reduces himself to a sex slave. It teaches him to bow down his head before unjust demands for sex. I bow down my head before injustice since I have to knock to the door of my wife for sex; since I have to obey her capricious order, 'you cannot be in politics' just as I have to meet her demand that cooking oil should be bought immediately. Whatever noble appeal of elemental quality of humanism may have been there in politics, some people defies this appeal to surrender to these ignoble demands of sex. It reflects one kind of class character. On the other side there are another group of people. Their sexual attraction and emotion to their wives dry up instantly, if their wives ever insist them to do such ignoble things. He, who belongs to this category, loses attraction towards her immediately and thinks to renounce the relation. This reflects another kind of class character. Here we see the two types of properties of sex curve. What does it prove? It decisively proves that this is the impact of production relation on sex. This is to be understood in various ways. In one occasion, my wife is insisting me on paying heed to her unwarranted demands taking the advantage of sexual relation and I am submitting to her. In other occasion, someone does not let her wife place any unjust demand as there is sexual relation between them, or her wife cannot even think of making

any immoderate demand since she has sexual attraction to him or love him. She feels that her beloved husband is committed to a noble cause and so his sexual life should be conducive to fulfilling that noble cause; otherwise it would be an abominable and ignoble act. So, the phenomenon of attraction and repulsion varies in this way. We are to understand that the sense of personal property of this bourgeois society is also influencing the concept and feeling of sex where mean-mindedness, rivalry and baseness of mind prevail; where indulgence is given to low instincts centring on sex and these things are accepted as reasonable. Where sex is the devout worshipper of beauty; where it is conducive to cooperating and helping each other in the revolutionary movement and instilling broadness in this struggle, there it is influenced by the revolutionary thinking and ethical concept of the working class movement for emancipation. You should remember that, the relation between husband and wife is not free from the influence of production relation and class thought. Where on the plea of sex or love man forgets his obligation and ideal and searches the excuse for it, there he becomes a sex-slave. Has he become a sex-slave according to the law of sex? No. The law of sex equally works for an ordinary man and for a revolutionary as well. But the revolutionary has not become a sex slave; rather sex has made his revolutionary life brighter by sticking to his resolve. Where sex had not played that role he renounced it. He could not accept it. So, Lenin said, can all the men drink water from drains to quench thirst? No, they cannot. However, there are some who even drink drain water, if feel thirsty. They do not have any choice; nothing like the question of their taste or hygiene can prevent them from drinking that water. Another group even being extremely thirsty cannot drink drain water. No, they will not. Similarly there are differences in case of satiating sex-hunger. In one case, one wants to have it by any means and in another case one shrinks. Here we

find the impact of idea over sex impulse and in class divided society the action of idea is always the action of class ideas.

**Affection, feelings, love and weakness
are not one and the same**

I have already told you one thing in this context and I don't know whether you have noted it or not. Take the feelings and emotion, which are created centering on sex. These emotional feelings first emerge in the level of mind and then pass into the level of esthetic, which does not happen within animals. In this context I remind you, which I stated earlier, that tenderness, emotional feelings, love, affection and attachments all these are not bad, nor are these even harmful, provided we can differentiate how weakness remains intermingled with these feelings. Many a time we mistake weakness for fondness. We cannot act going against our ideal for the sake of fondness; it is also not supposed to be devoid of ideal by the insistence of affection, nor can we give up our ideology, similar to the religious persons, who did not ever give up their religion. The revolutionaries, too, did not abandon the revolution. A revolutionary may at best feel sad if his beloved one does not accompany him. He may feel a temporary pang of grief. But he knows that this pain is temporary, it will burn up in flames of revolution and in course of revolution new colleagues and lovable persons will soon come in numbers to wipe off his all grief. Human mind is always changing; man's emotion, feelings, love and affection all are in the state of flux. To become victim of weakness on the plea of love and affection does not stand to reason. When the man forgets his main duty and obligation, when he forgets his allegiance to revolution on the excuse of the responsibilities to be borne by him on the basis of love and emotional attraction, it is to be understood that the class influence and impact of class thinking is working in these

feelings and reactions. Otherwise why shall I forget the main object of my life and ideology for the sake of my feelings and emotion? Why the thought of rationalizing my deviation from ideology will come to my mind? Rather the thought contrary to it ought to have come. Is it that all these feelings, emotion, love and affection are to oppose the revolution? No, all these are necessary to help the revolution. My pleasure is necessary to become a revolutionary and so my happiness. What is the meaning of happiness if it induces to be inhuman? Is it happiness by any standard? What is the use of such happiness for me? So, as a rational man if we deliberate on all these things we shall understand how class thinking, class mentality, class ideas and prejudices works in our sexual urge and sexual acts. I had discussed earlier in more details in this regard. The senior comrades listened to that discussion. The new comrades will come to know about it when this discourse will be published in the form of a book.

We should understand the theoretical aspects of United Front politics

Now I shall discuss on the questions with regard to united front politics. First of all, what is united front and what is the theoretical conception of it to the Marxists-Leninists? Why has the question of united front been raised time and again in the revolutionary movements of every country? The proletarian united front, the peoples' democratic front, national front, anti-imperialist peoples' front – all these are reflecting the ideas of united front though the words are different. By hearing the words you understand that all nomenclatures do not mean the same kind of United Front or do not indicate the same stage in the process of a particular United Front. Each one indicates a particular condition of a particular stage of a united front. Then what is the theoretical aspect of the united front? The theoretical aspect of it is that, no united front emerges only because a

political party wants it. United Front is the reflection of the process of an objective movement in a particular situation. It is the reflection of the level of consciousness of the people and their objective condition of life. The principle of unity and struggle of the opposites exists in every movement and for that matter in any anti-government movement and United Front is a form of it. Today no political party can deny, at least not fully, the grievances and dissatisfactions of the people which are growing in the existing social system. Each among the different parties in opposition to the government wants to explain to the people about the cause of their miseries and sufferings from its own class angularity and wants to make protest against these in a way, so that its class interest does not suffer. From outside it seems that these parties are fighting fiercely. The common people also feel that as they are fighting to redress their sufferings, obviously they are their friends. In reality, these parties disguise themselves as the friends of the people, but they are not actually so. Again no party can run without the people and so every political party is compelled to go with the people. The parties who are anti-people by nature also more with the masses and highlight the demands of the people. Even a few of them talk a bit of revolution and progress, and also go to the extent to utter revolutionary ideology. Camouflaging as the friends of the people these parties confound the people to keep going on the path of anti-revolution and discard the path of revolution. In the Marxist vocabulary we call them the forces of compromise, pseudo revolutionaries, who act as forces of compromise between labour and capital. By mouthing the phrases of Marxism-Leninism and revolution, these parties keep the people confined in some false and fake struggles to hold them back from revolutionary path and line. Sometimes these parties even carry out the day-to-day movements of the people in highly attacking and fake militant style to impress people that this is the way to revolution and revolution will be

achieved in this way. The people are fighting under the leadership of these parties. But, fighting through raising slogans and forming trade unions to achieve the economic demands does not mean that political power is developing among the people. The people are raising slogans against the owners—‘Down with capitalism’, ‘Overthrow this social system’, ‘Long live revolution’ and likes, but that will not bring out revolutionary consciousness among the people. So, the very consciousness about the owning class and the society, which the working class derives from the experience of their daily life, is required to be changed. Revolution is necessary—it is just a superficial conception. This conception is not developed on the basis of clear cut base political line and so political power of the masses does never grow out of this. It does not develop automatically also. While the working class is fighting against the owners or the government, a type of consciousness develops among them—that owners are enemy, the government is their friend, this government is aiding the owners. Again being confused by the election politics or any other political situation those very workers every now and then assemble under the banner of trade unions controlled by the ruling party. What does it indicate? It indicates that this is backwardness; this is not a developed class consciousness. This is not the political revolutionary consciousness at all and it cannot emerge in this way. Until and unless a revolutionary party and revolutionary politics emerge through socialist movement this class consciousness will not and cannot grow. That is why Lenin said that socialism comes from without, not from within. True revolutionary consciousness is brought to the workers through the political struggle of the workers, undertaken by a revolutionary party. Only then the workers can understand that in spite of whatever struggle they might have done on the demands of extension of democratic rights or fulfillment of any amount of demand and how many battles they

might have won, these cannot bring to an end of the owner-worker relationship. In this situation, he, who is a worker, will remain as a worker and he will not be emancipated. If he wants to bring about his emancipation, he is to understand that the consciousness of class struggle based on only the movements against the owners on the demands of the workers is not the revolutionary consciousness. So long the consciousness of class struggle does not reach the stage of understanding that the dictatorship of proletariat should be established by overthrowing the bourgeois state and the necessary strength for creating own political power of the workers should be achieved, it does not transform into the Marxist conception of class struggle or revolutionary consciousness.

Then what is the scientific process of dispelling the prevailing confusion of the masses? The student wing of the Congress also raises slogan against capitalism. They shout 'down with capitalism'. The CPIM, CPI, *Naxals*, RSP shout 'down with monopoly capitalism'. Even the Workers Party and the RCPI, the appendages of CPI(M), also raise slogans, 'long live socialist revolution' and 'down with capitalism'. Then where the thing stands? How will the revolutionary party establish the real leadership within the workers and the masses? Again, this task must have to be accomplished by the revolutionary party; otherwise a united force of the workers' movement will not be developed. The first condition of scientific method of achieving this is to mobilise all the people into united struggle and to fight together. Without united struggle this consciousness will not grow. Therefore, if there is no other way but to conduct struggle to develop this consciousness, then there would be no alternative but to assemble all the people into a united struggle. Within the united struggle every party tries to pursue its own political line and the revolutionary party, too, tries to follow its revolutionary line.

Owing to the impact of delusive politics and low standard of the consciousness of the people, even those among the masses, who are influenced by the philanthropists, assemble in this united struggle. You have also seen that how highly the people pay respect even to a man like missionaries. The people think that how great are these missionaries, they are working for the common people and the masses start to follow them frantically. And that missionary spells their doom. It is a pity that the common people could not even guess the intention of that man. The sole object of the persons like him is to divert the people's mind from the real issue and for that to give them some relief or to do some social work.

**To put an end to capitalism,
social democracy is to be defeated**

So, you see that the masses are divided into small groups by the influence of different forces, and particularly by those parties camouflaging as revolutionaries, the base political line and the political character of which are not revolutionary. You have also understood by analysing their activities that, ultimately they do not want to lead the people to revolution; on the contrary they want to divert the outburst and the fervour of the people, which are found in the movement, to reap benefits in elections. At the beginning the people are influenced by these parties owing to their lack of consciousness. So I want to remind you a famous saying of Stalin. He said, 'to put an end to capitalism it is necessary to put an end to social democratism.' Why did he say such thing about social democratism? When the consciousness regarding the struggle against capitalism begins to dawn on the mass mind, it does not take long for the people to get rid of the illusion about the pro-capitalist parties. But the most dangerous forces are those, who pose as anti-capitalist, wave red banners aloft, speak of social democracy, communism, class struggle, and the interest of the

workers and raise slogans against the owners. They constitute the force of compromise; they are pseudo revolutionary social democratic force. If they cannot be defeated the revolutionary movement cannot go ahead. The people should be made understand, unless the masses are not disillusioned with these forces and are not brought outside the influence of their leadership, unless correct revolutionary party and real political power of the workers are not developed, there will be no revolution. That is why it has been said, that it is unscientific way of thinking that revolution can be made victorious finally and the leadership of the correct political party can be established, until you cannot give defeat to all shades of social democratism meaning pseudo revolutionism. You may work among the masses, but mere working will not do. In your work there are turns and twist, success and failure. We can conduct struggles, but that does not mean that we could always solve the problems of the masses. Do we achieve victory in every struggle? No, the truth is rather opposite. They attack mortally on the revolutionary party. At the beginning, the revolutionaries have to face failure. But the workers of the revolutionary party gather strength amidst failure; the mass differentiate one party from the other by appraising how each of the parties fights, what slogans each of them raises, and how the workers of each of the parties behave within the movement. It, indeed, influences the overall situation. You may not get immediate result, but remember that your strength and efficiency grow through this process.

Now I want to speak another thing to you. From the inception of our party we have been emphasizing on building up of revolutionary character. The first and foremost duty of the communists is to build up the revolutionary character. In the course of building up this new party in this country, we especially acquired some experiences. We observed, behind building up the communist movement or the CPI Party in India

there were the contributions of many people, who at the beginning came forward for the sake of revolution and ideology with honesty and ambition to fight and with the spirit of sacrifice, which we call the spirit of renunciation in the parlance of the common man or even in the sense of bourgeois ideal. Soumendranath Tagore tried to build up the RCPI and behind him there were also lots of self-sacrifices and contributions of many honest and good people. There was also a man like M N Roy. I had not found anyone at that time in Indian politics parallel to him. All others are pigmies in comparison to him. All of them, who are now giving leadership in the political struggle, no matter whether they are from the Congress or the Leftist parties or any other party, are master (!) of all subjects. What are they doing except rabble rousing and hoodwinking the masses? Of course, they are doing something else. They are finding the way how to survive through contrivance, chicanery, diplomacy and triviality, which we call evil politics. It is better not to mention about their knowledge, education and wisdom, which they have hardly any. But in those old days, there were so many leaders, who were engaged in politics not to pursue the policy of cheating, as we see today. As humans their characters had a strong base. Irrespective of being in bourgeois politics or in opposition their standard of education, knowledge, and intellectual ability was sufficiently high. Both the compromising Congress politics and the opposing uncompromising bourgeois politics created great men. But M. N. Roy was an exception, he was really a scholar. He strode across every branches of epistemology and was a very erudite man. He had profound experiences in international communist movement. The intellectuals of India, even an intellectual like Jawaharlal was also once strongly attracted to him. These are all talks about the past and a major section of the people of our country is now unaware of all these things. A man like him made an attempt to form a party. But even he could not form

any party in this country. However, the party he formed finally turned into a failure. Not only that, the most of the people belonging to this party eventually became either the agents of CIA or career seekers. The rest joined in different services in different places. Thus all of them turned into pseudo intellectuals. None of them became a revolutionary, though he was so great an intellectual and at one time his life was really like a revolutionary. He ran away from India to escape gallows and held an important position in the Communist International. But not to speak of any great revolutionary, he could not even build an ordinary revolutionary. At least I did not see any. Rather I saw to grow a bunch of people, who were ego-centric and full of vanity. Apart from that, some scholarly and selfish type of persons having individualistic trend were produced. It seemed to me peculiar and made me think that so many boys and girls had left their homes and families ignoring the tears of their parents to build up this Communist Party and tried to build up this party with their lives, but we found in the latter days that those very people became utter opportunists, who had no principle, no dictum, no decorum and no ideology in their lives. This turn of events made us deeply ponder over the matter. It continued to occur to us from the very beginning, if we really intend to pursue a noble ideology what sort of vehicle of delivery it should be to deliver it to us. It occurred to us that, even for a noble ideology if the vehicle to carry it to the people is not the right one, if the necessary characters competent to translate that ideology in the concrete situation, to give it an objective shape and to make it effective do not emerge; if the perfect characters of revolution with regard to all aspects of determination, outlook and conception are not built up; if not all the workers, but at least the leading ones and if not all the leaders, but at least the minimum majority of them do not achieve communist characters premised on necessary qualities conducive to communist character by applying

Marxism-Leninism in life through struggle, that ideology must have to end in failure, since, the noble ideology which we accept through reason does not penetrate into the depths of our heart mixed with flesh, blood and emotion if we cannot ultimately develop our character according to the need of revolution. It only rests on the surface of our mind just to talk about it superficially. It destroys the living soul or essence of a great revolutionary ideology. This was the issue which made us think gravely.

So, from these experiences we came to realize that correct ideology, path and political analysis alone were not enough to build up a genuine revolutionary party. In order to take steps towards this, an all out movement incorporating all political, economical, cultural, ethical and moral aspects should be initiated; an all out socialist movement covering all aspects of life should be started first. If we go by the idea that, only our political analysis will be in accordance with class outlook, and when we talk on education, it does not have class outlook, or when we discuss on family relations, love, affection and tenderness, or when we face any sex-related problem, we do not judge them from class angularity; similarly when we face any situation involving mutual relations, friendship or any emotional factor we do not handle them with class outlook, then whatever else a party is formed, the party is not a revolutionary party. All these things are nothing but the impact of class struggle. So, the very class outlook by which these things are influenced, by the very class relation by which these things are influenced, must act on these things. Doesn't it? If one thinks that Marxism is only necessary to give lectures and conduct movements or to incite the people in the field of politics and in the field of culture I can become followers of Rabindranath, Goethe or Bernard Shaw, then those, who think in this way, too, cannot accomplish revolution. In that case, revolutionary movement will crumble down mid-way. By revolutionary theory, as I understand, Lenin

never meant determining the political and economic theories and the stage of revolution only, though he did not say it in clear terms. So, the socialist movement covering all aspects of life is to be released. That is why; we have given so much stress on morality, ethics and character-building.

Where lies the strength of the party in the midst of hostile environment

The comrades should understand another point. It is an offence and unfair, if you do not understand correctly where our strength lies in the midst of hostile environment. You must understand one thing. As it is not fair to overestimate oneself, so it is also unfair to underestimate. As it is wrong and unjust to show your own strength exaggeratedly, so it is equally improper to belittle your own strength. As a result our work gets somewhat hampered and also distracted. So we need to understand well where our strength lies.

When we started to build up our party, what was our standing then? We had nothing, no any renowned leader, no money, no social backing or any source within the social high-ups. At the time we did not have any well-off person among us, nor could we find out any such sympathizer. We did not then get even a small group of people, who could give fat donations to the party. At the time the category of our party workers and even the supporters was like this—the most common men and ordinary young people coming from middle class as well as from workers and peasants families and among them there were a few, who somehow made living by doing jobs. This was the resource with which we started our party works. We were then in a state of living hand to mouth. So, from the very inception of our party, our party workers, even those handful of educated party workers having B.A. or M.A degree or some teachers and professors who joined the party being attracted to our party ideology, had to roam about tirelessly from one street to another

for the whole day with donation boxes in hands to collect funds from the public and we had to meet our expenses in this way. All the political parties tried to corner us. They used to taunt us by saying, if '*chamchika*' (pipistrelle, a small-sized species of bat) was a bird, then SUC also could be called a party. So they did not feel any need to talk with us and also did not want us in the united front. Today, if we find some leaders in our party, if we have some name and fame or if we enjoy some prestige, it has not been created by the bourgeois press. That has been created through organizing peoples' movements by shedding blood drop by drop, untiring struggle of our workers and the contributions from some ideological movements and struggles in different spheres in our country. The bourgeoisies and the press did not do it for us. Nobody allowed us to join any platform. The other small parties managed to get this or that platform either by acting as the appendages of the CPI and the CPI(M) or by flattering them and used these platforms to produce leaders. No leader of this party has been created in this way. Nobody from our party has become leader at the mercy of these big parties. We fought together with these parties, but did not flatter them or offer our slavery to them and for this they had grudge on us. They vented an air, as if, they would see how a small party like us could be so audacious! In spite of all these, if some leaders are created in our party it has been possible through our hard efforts and bloodshed. So, this is to be understood what is the basis on which this party is gaining strength, which has no international backing and which could not usurp the credit of the international communist movement. All credits and fruits of the communist movement, whatever proportion of it had reached this country, were utilized by The Communist Party of India. It was an additional difficulty for us. At first we had to convince the people that the correct path was the path of communism and Marxism-Leninism and it was the only correct path to revolution. We had to explain that, the movement of emancipation of the

people of India as well as the working class movement of India was the part of the international communist movement. Instant came the question, "Why do then the Russian and Chinese communist parties not recognize you? If you are correct, then why does the Communist Party of China not recognize you as the Communist Party? Why does the Communist Party of Russia recognize the CPI?" Just see the problem; then we were to answer all these questions. Thereafter when they were made to understand these, they further posed the question, "Well, you know that, a Communist Party already exists here, no matter whether it makes mistakes or not or whether it has other limitations or not. So if communism is the right path, it is better to work with this party by reforming and rectifying it." Then we had to explain again why it was not a Communist Party though it was so by name; we had to show why and in what sense it was not a Communist Party in spite of the fact that the International Communist Camp had recognized it as a Communist Party. We had to further split hairs to show from various angles why CPI was a petty bourgeois party and in what sense. In the next step we had to again make them understand that a petty bourgeoisie party could never be transformed to a working class party through the process of reform and rectification. We had to recruit cadres one by one after answering all these questions. We had to recruit cadres in our party not like the way the CPI or CPI(M) had to. Since the people took those parties granted as communist parties, they joined these parties as soon as they were attracted to communism or were inspired by Vietnam War. Our party did not grow in this way. We had to fight against how many adverse situations and how much hostile environment to advance inch by inch. Many comrades do not find answer when they are confronted with the question that it has been twenty years, but why we could not make any development. In face of this question I answered them mockingly, "You are all Marxists-Leninists, but I see, even after gaining knowledge on dialectical

materialism you have not acquired the ability of judging a situation even in the way *Sri Krishna* judged a situation in the story of *The Mahabharata*. Have you gone through the episode of the battle between Vishma and Arjuna at Kurukshetra stated in *The Mahabharata*? If you did not, let me narrate it. During the war once being reprimanded by Duryodhana when Vishma really began to fight a heroic battle against the Pandavas and Arjuna, Arjuna could not stand before the flocks of arrows shot by Vishma and was utterly shattered. This made Arjuna extremely furious and he shot an arrow with a tremendous speed towards Vishma which pushed the chariot of Vishma back to a distance of, say 5 to 10 cubits. It was an insult to Vishma. He at once brought the chariot to the right position and responded Arjuna with a fiercely powerful arrow and that pushed the chariot of Arjuna back to a distance of half a cubit to one. Both the chariots looked alike and those were apparently of the same weight. Having observed the incident, Krishna, (who was driving the chariot of Arjuna) forgot all pains and hardships and exclaimed with clapping, 'Well done, Vishma, well done. No powerful man like you has ever come in the world, nor will it come in future'. Arjuna then said to Krishna, 'You are my companion, you are my friend and also the friend of the Pandavas, you are the charioteer of my chariot, yet, you didn't praise me when I drove back the chariot of grandpa Vishma to 5 cubits. You didn't praise my heroism or my strength. But as he had only pushed my chariot to half a cubit you paid grandpa Vishma with compliments, such as there was no hero and powerful man like him in the world. You are pious and righteous. Despite that what sort of judgement is this?' Krishna said: couldn't you understand it? Arjun replied, no, he could not. However, the moot question is to understand how to judge an event in a correct way. In this case the reality was as follows. Hanuman, the son of the god of air was sitting on the top of Arjuna's chariot exerting all the pressure of air. That means, though Vishma's chariot looked exactly similar to

Arjuna's chariot, the latter was much heavier than that of former, since Hanuman was sitting on the top of it with the enormous weight of air. Apart from this, Krishna himself was there, though he outwardly appeared like an ordinary man. But, in the Mahabharata, Krishna is the incarnation of *Narayana* or *Vishvambhara*. *Vishvambhara* means he, who contains the power and weight of the entire universe within him. That *Vishvambhara* himself was sitting on the chariot of Arjuna as Krishna with all the power and weight of the universe. As a result, though the two chariots apparently looked the same, in reality they were different, because both the air pressure and the total weight of the universe were acting on the chariot of Arjuna. Vishma drove such a one chariot back half a cubit. To teach a lesson to Arjuna, Krishna told Hanuman to leave the chariot and he also changed himself to the commonplace Krishna from the *avatar* of *Vishvambhara*. Meanwhile, Vishma shot an arrow again. As soon as he shot the arrow, Arjuna's chariot began to revolve round heaven, earth and hell, and Arjuna embracing the arm of the chariot started shouting, "Save, save." Krishna then appeared and said, "Come on my friend. Do you now understand why I applauded Vishma?" The character of Krishna in Mahabharata is not of a Marxist or a dialectical materialist, but you, who are raising this question as to why there has been no development even after twenty years, are lacking even that degree of wisdom, which Krishna had to judge an event.

After independence there was the Congress on one side and the Communist Party on the other. Moreover, all these parties—the Socialist Party, the RSP and the Forward Bloc were also much big. The Socialist Party, being big notwithstanding, started to split up. Even, the Communist Party began to degenerate and now it has been split into three parts. Again they are going to be more fragmented. Apart from the Socialist Party, you also see that, the RSP, the Forward Bloc and the other similar parties have reached what a miserable state while suffering

from continual degeneration. And at that time we were trying to form a party with a handful of inexperienced workers. In fact, we were supposed to have been thrown apart by the storm. The Communist Party, which we thought not to be a genuine one and for which we were trying to build up a separate party, was enjoying international backing, whereas we had no such backing. On the other hand, we had no experienced workers, no renowned leaders at all-India level, no press publicity, though we had the pressure of the collective outrage and opposition from all these parties. In the midst of it, this party went on gathering strength steadily and has reached here where it stands today. Can you imagine what a colossal strength it was? Could it be an unexceptional strength? Where lies the strength of this party? It could originate because of correctness of our ideology and path. But can we say that no mistake has ever been committed? Is it so, that everything is right here, or all the leaders and cadres always behave rightly? No, we cannot make all these claims. But we are vigilant and are trying ceaselessly to eliminate these traits. However, you should remember that you should not confuse the main point by these discussions. The main point is – what was that indomitable strength on the basis of which the party has reached this position today going against a strong anti-current in a completely hostile environment. This strength stemmed from the core of the party formed by the fundamental principles of correct ideology and from the fighting spirit of a few determined workers, who had a substantial standard of revolutionary character, who had a strong resolve to fight in any situation, who did not bow down, who were free from all prejudices and were always ready to confront any adverse situation. And the defects that exist and are causing immediate difficulties to go ahead with our tasks are being removed as soon as possible. But by highlighting these defects if you do not give due importance to this basic strength of our party or try to weaken this very strength, or try to mislead the people without

giving them the exact idea of the situation, and if you at the same time raise oblique questions or discuss on them in a way that creates resentments, that will be unfair. By that I am doing harm to myself and to this movement as well. By this I am not saying to close your eyes to the flaws, rather saying that not only keep looking at them but also fight. But fight in a correct way. Do not indulge in wrong thinking. Don't let the truth be suppressed, present this truth correctly to the people that, whereas all those big parties are going to decay, this is the only party, which is growing slowly but steadily in spite of many difficulties. Try to learn from it – then you will be able to understand how solid the foundation is, on which the correctness of our ideology stands. This is not a party created by money, this party is not an illusion fancied by some leaders; on the contrary it is the party, which is being created everyday at every workplace with the drops of blood of the leaders and workers. So, I would say that those among you, who cannot see its power and those among the people of the country, who do not learn to see it, are the ones who will be deceived. Because stupidity deserves punishment. 'What happened should have to be happened'—this was what Saratbabu said with profound grief at the death of Chittaranjan Das. At the time all the revolutionaries rushed to him weeping: 'Sharatda', how it happened? Deshbandhu will no more return from Darjeeling, he is dead. Saratchandra said, 'you deserve it, why are you crying? Aren't you, who drove him away by insulting him? This is how the fool is punished. The fools of the country where the people are so blunt, where the political workers are so stupid that they don't know how to respect whom and how to value whom, get their punishment in this way. Why are you crying now?' Saratchandra replied in this way as he was also a great man.

This is exactly the same here. Our soul concern is that, we should tell the people - look at the present condition of those parties who are trying to mislead the people. We should

tell them that, those parties are only nurturing their broken estates and saying, ‘see, how big we are, and if we are wrong, why are we big?’ We are to show them, “no matter what you say, you are getting fragmented and you are decaying. You were bigger but are getting smaller now. And our party is growing from small to large. See where you stand today, despite having received help innumerable and having got numerous favourable conditions in support of you. You got the opportunity of becoming an alternative force; you got the international support, got money from abroad, got the opportunity to usurp the achievements of the world communist movement. Nonetheless, you are now a decaying force, you are getting disintegrated. But this party had no means and sources even within the country. Nor, it has ever received any help from outside the country. Still then it is constantly gaining strength and has become your headache. How can you ignore this truth? You do not even realize Krishna’s method of judgment. If you would understand it, your judgement was to find out what was the magnitude of the underlying force which led this party to reach this position.

The party must be transformed into a party of the masses

I have said earlier that since the very day of inception of the party, we have been laying stress on character of the leaders and the workers. Ethical side of the communist character was emphasized without which the foundation of the communist ideology cannot be built. Now I feel that the policy of laying emphasis was correct, but it has been one sided. What we are observing is that many in the party now want to emphasize on it more. But I want to tell you what I am thinking — I say, the emphasis must not be lessened. But today a time has come when we have reached a phase of transition from our previous position. In those early days the party was a propaganda nucleus or a propaganda unit. At the time a

number of party workers were trying only to throw the idea, to campaign for it and to bring about a particular ideal and thought with all they had, even going beyond their might—that was the only task before our workers. But we have now passed that stage. Now we are about to enter into the second phase, when we are not in a position to build only a few local organizations here and there, but in the position of trying to transform our party into a larger mass party through taking initiative for building mass movements and widespread mass organizations. At this point of time, only to remain busy with the question of character is not the thing of much importance. There is another thing of great importance without which we cannot even protect our character. At present if we cannot organize the masses, we cannot protect the boldness of our character at all. What is now important for us is – to increase our political initiative, to remain with the masses, to jump into any mass issue before anyone call us, to be at the forefront on our own initiative with the masses without waiting for whether we have been called or not. Notwithstanding that our workers have character they comparatively lack this ability awfully. Basically it is a weakness. The solution of the three fourth of all of our problems lies in the elimination of this weakness. It needs to develop the ability of our executives to bear the responsibilities of various fields of organization and to earn the ability of providing political and organizational leadership. But is it possible to create such executives only in the study classes? At one time these executives were also created through movements. But at the time these movements were at the level of campaign of propagandas. That was why; these executives could then be created through study classes and associations. But now that kind of ability will not be created through this process only. Now we have to learn in spite of hostile criticism how to remain and work with the people, how to jump into action with initiative, how to work while maintaining our identity,

our character and political ideology. If we fail to learn this, it will not be possible to produce the cadres and executives, which are needed at present to transform the party into a party competent to lead mass struggle. In the mean time, the party has become larger, it has got involved into various types of actions and mass activities and so the general workers have now little or no opportunity to come in contact with that kind of trained or that kind of qualified leaders, as they had in the old procedure. This is point number one. Still a certain number of cadres always come out. But now it is found that those cadres, though they are coming out with fine character, are not equally developed in terms of political initiatives. They are not able to fulfill the immediate requirement of the party. From any point of judgement we shall find that they are dedicated, selfless and their concept of life, their fighting zeal, their ability to sacrifice are in such a state that they can do everything for revolution, but they cannot remain with the public or even they can, they only argue with them, or always preach and try to make them understand and because of being bitterly disgusted by their excesses the ordinary people run away at the very sight of them. As soon as they see any such cadre, they say, "Look, the priest is coming and will soon deliver sermons." Today's young people do not want to hear much. So, we should have to learn what they want, how to mix with them, how and in what way to convince them. We must have to make them convince. But not in this way that, as I have got someone, I do not let him go until I make him understand everything at one go starting from socialism, values of life to communist character, although I find that the fellow is not talking much and keeping on scratching his head. What will happen next is that, seeing me at the corner of the street he will run away, as if, the devil is coming to catch him. And what do I think, when after my sustained efforts to make them convince for two or three days, when I see that no one is coming with me after having so much

discussions? I begin to think with despair that, what's the use of doing all this? What not I have done to make them understand, but here is none worth calling a man, nobody is interested to understand. Rather I like to say, what is the need to explain so much? What you actually need is to live with them, remain with them, and keep yourself upright. They will understand gradually. So, you should be patient and discuss with them as much as they can take. There's an old saying, patience pays. You will get result if you keep it in mind.

Here is another point. If you do not understand this everything will be messed up again. Your realization will also not be accurate. It is untenable that a revolutionary worker will talk like a revolutionary; will chant slogans like a revolutionary, but will behave otherwise. If there is a current in favour of something improper, a revolutionary, even he is alone, stands against the current. His bent of mind should be to go against the tide. Two types of mentality are found among the people. The tendency of the mediocre and commoners is to run with the crowd; to swim with the current. Owing to this all children fall victim to fashion. As a daughter says, these things are not trendy now, her mother at once begins to harp on, no, no, these are old fashioned, these clothes will not do, in these days there is no such fashion in vogue. It is not that only mother tells her daughter about this. The daughter again tries to convince her mother, the father in turn tries to make his son understand and then we see that everybody is saying in the same tune, meaning that, a general current is flowing there. Howsoever intensively they may have been involved in either celebrating various anniversaries like Tagore's birth anniversary or in any social function all of them are floating in the same current. Those are all educated boys and girls—they have had education in schools and colleges—but they never think about what Rabindranath wrote about fashion and style. Saratbabu also wrote many things about this. In each of his stories, he

tried to point out that taste and culture are not external things. Rabindranath clearly stated that fashion and style are not the same thing. Fashion is what man imitates and what is totally devoid of his innovative touch. Fashion comes like a wave of wind, comes like a gust. And in this wind of trend the children become victims to fashion. As everyone wears his hair in a cut like this, dresses like this, so I have to do the same. This is all about fashion, this is nothing but going with the trend of wind. He never thinks that whether he looks like a monkey or not. How strange, that the girls also like this herds of monkeys! I do not understand what kind of girls are they who like monkeys, like bears, but do not like men. I don't understand what type of culture they cultivate. It is called becoming victim of fashion; it is not style. Style bears the signature of one's personality, it does not mean imitation. The air of personality, which reflects in his way of walking, talking, and living, is called his style, whereas fashion is a borrowed thing, an external thing. Those, who have no good foundation of character or no depth of it, fall victims to fashion. Suppose a wave of fashion, whether we intend it or not, has appeared. But its type of cutting is not so bad. For the sake of argument I say that, I see it as not too bad, nor does it go against my culture. But if I see that it has come like a wind and everyone accepts it just like a fashion; then the mental trend of a truly good person needs to be – to go against it. Not that the hell will break loose if we wear clothes like this. It is because that everyone is imitating it, so I protest it. When the craze for imitating will cease, when running after the trend will stop, then even I may say that there will be no harm in wearing garments designed in this way. The harm that these copycats do is that they help the craze for imitating enter into every family. Will the people remain upright at this? Will there have any remnant of originality in a man, who goes on copying only? As such, the Tenth Congress of the communist Party of China has told that there

exist two types of man. Some people say a current of trend is flowing here; I shall not go with it. I shall judge it carefully before acting. If any current comes, my general mental faculty, my bent of mind and my way of response to it should be—I shall try to go against it. Again, this does not mean, if a correct and nice tide comes, I should oppose that tide. No, this is not correct. If we are confused, we shall not be able to accept any good thing. In the Tenth Congress it has been said to denote a general faculty, although this has not been clearly spelt in their putting. So, it may seem that it has been stated irrespective of condition. If we see that the tide is good, useful and in favour of the revolution, shall I oppose it? Of course, not. The Chinese party did not even want to say that. The Tenth Congress stated that, ‘to go against the current is a Marxist-Leninist principle’. It is not the Marxist-Leninist principle alone. In all ages, the mental trend and the bent of mind of all great men, who are worthy of human being, have always been to go against the current. There are two classes of people—one class makes copy and the other creates. Among the two groups of the people one gives something to the society and the other only take from the society. Both these groups exist in the society. The mental trend and bent of mind of the very group of the people, who always gives something to society, is to go against the current. Not to be a victim of the current. The Tenth Congress has said this thing nicely. Do not take it from that, since going against the tide is the Marxist-Leninist principle, I should not go with it even if a tide of revolution comes or a tide of struggle comes. No, it does not reflect the state of correct understanding. Even in a revolutionary tide, people come in rows, go down to fight, many people give their lives and many become leaders from among them. If the party that leads at the time, does not fight the blindness at each stage, cannot educate the masses, then even after revolution is victorious, it will subsequently face many difficulties owing to

the blindness and various tendencies and trends, which remain lurking in the overwhelming tidal waves of revolution. Though, there is nothing to be afraid of it. The correct revolutionary leadership is that, which becomes alert in time and can apprehend these tendencies in advance.

A Communist Party has to make many revolutions

A Communist Party has to make a series of revolutions. As one particular revolution succeeds, it again has to undertake the programme of another revolution. Following the success of the second revolution, it has to go for another one. And it will continue until it reaches the classless society, which means until each and every member of the society becomes communist revolutionary and in the process the Party itself will not disappear till such time. At that level, neither the state nor the party will exist. So, every class-conscious Marxist knows that, the meaning that he is serving, trying to strengthen and asking everyone to abide by the discipline of his party is to widen the path of withering away the party from human history and society. This is the real understanding of the theory of negation of negation. Nothing can be negated by force. You cannot destroy any objective thing, nor can you create it. When a particular revolution in progress reaches its nodal point at a certain stage of its development, it disappears from the arena. In this way, a law, which is in operation in a given condition, disappears to give way to a new law. In this way, class struggle abolishes through the process of development of society and of class struggle.

But class struggle can never be done away with by denying, condemning and abusing without understanding the laws of class struggle. If you can influence the process of development of class struggle and can accelerate its objective way of development, then only class struggle will disappear from the society in course of its development and not before

it. Taking the path of centralism when the state reaches its highest stage, only then, the state will disappear. Class and class struggle are inextricably linked with the state. We know that the state is an instrument of class rule. State has appeared as an instrument in the hands of the dominant class to rule and exploit the other classes. The state has not fallen from the sky, nor has God created it. So only those theoreticians of history as well as politicians, who do not know the history of origin of state, can talk about the Absolute Theory of State. Those, who know the history at what time, under what conditions and why the state originated, and through what process the state was armed, know that the existence of the state is closely and inseparably linked with the existence of class struggle. It is impossible that class struggle disappears while the state exists. If one goes, the other will go. That is, the state will cease to exist at the very moment when the antagonistic contradiction centring on production and distribution of production between man and man will be transformed into a non-antagonistic contradiction. A revolutionary party will not disappear from the society as a communist party or a working class party as long as it does not reach that position by directing the social revolution. Party politics is not the result of one's willingness or unwillingness, but a reflection of a particular stage of development of the class struggle in an objective condition. Therefore, the principle of negation of negation means extinction in course of development. There is no creation without destruction. When we are continuously engaged in building the party, it entails that, we are, in fact, in the process of eliminating party politics. When we are continuously making efforts to strengthen the party, it implies that we are continuously accelerating the process of eliminating party politics. Strengthening class struggle means that I am taking part in the process of abolishing class struggle from the

society. This is the actual meaning and significance of negation of negation, one of the principles of dialectical materialism in its true meaning and significance.

Anyway, I was compelled to say a few words about theory in the midst of my discussion, because, your understanding would remain superficial, if you do not realize these things well. At the beginning of the formation of the party, our main goal was to build up a revolutionary party in India, and for that the first condition was to go on recruiting cadres individually. And now SUCI is a full-fledged party; a party with substantial strength, which has thousands of workers, many supporters and many areas of activities, not only in one state, but in eight to ten states. Today, SUCI is no longer an unknown party to the people of India. There is no room of confusion for those people, who are aware of ideals, philosophy and politics. But there was a time when it was difficult for them to understand whether the Socialist Unity Center was communist or socialist. And today even the adversaries do not get confused as to the character of the party. From Congress to Socialist and RSS, everybody knows that it is a Marxist-Leninist party. Not only that, in their language it is a hard-line Marxist-Leninist party. However, I am neither hard-liner, nor pliant—we are what we are. They think we are a Party which is a Marxist hardliner, meaning extremist. The situation has reached here because our party is now active at different mass levels. For example, in West Bengal we have not only District Committees of the Party, but also Area Committees at the level of Police Station, Local Committees and even Gram Sabha Committees (rural committees). So, if we cannot accomplish the task which has now appeared before us, we will not be able to assert our leadership in the mass struggles. Therefore, it is not that, the work which we started in the beginning is to be abandoned now; rather in addition to that we have to attend the task,

which has come now. And in comparison between the two the present one is more important to us, which we cannot avoid now. Despite so many false campaigns of propagandas against us, if our cadres can present our political analyses before the public perfectly, it is seen that the people are accepting those things. What we need is that we should be able to understand which party is creating confusion in what way, and being aware of it we should be able to discern which point is to be explained in what way and then speak about it in a way so that the public can easily understand. Besides, we need to be well-informed about what others are saying and also about our own views very well. The comrades should have to learn these things distinctively. We understand our views superficially. We feel that these are right, but cannot put into words correctly. Most of the comrades, whenever they try to explain, mix up the things. Anyone can drive me from one point to another with a little effort. As I start to explain a certain point, some wily persons carry me away from my ground by raising a few irrelevant points. I do not know how to conduct and control the discussion. I must acquire the skill of making arguments in the way so that I can bring anyone, even if he wants to lead me astray, to the ground where I want to bring him by proceeding carefully from all sides. And what is needed for this? I need to know the views of my party in such a way that I can reproduce it in my own language. I should meticulously read the contents, which has been nicely articulated, explained and substantiated with arguments, so that I can realize and reproduce them accordingly. We have to inculcate them again and again so that we can master them well. It cannot be denied that we are taking the party to the people and we are working among them. But only by shouting the slogan, "Go to the Masses", we cannot accomplish all our tasks and learn everything; nor can we assert our task that the leadership is

asserting now, no matter how ardently we wish it. No, no one will listen to you despite delivering a thousand good speeches. We should remember what Stalin said—if you do not have strength, nobody will hear you. That is why, we require strength. If we have no strength, if we have no effective control over the masses, if we do not control the powerful mass organizations, if the effective party committees do not function in different areas up to village level or factory level irrespective of whether there is any union under our control or not, we cannot be heard. A committee does not mean that it consists of some workers, who do nothing, do not know what to do, do not know how to create their daily works, do not buy the party organs for themselves, do not discuss over it and cannot make any propaganda on their own. Is it an active party body? Thus an active party body should consist of those, who with their own initiative carry on campaigns for the party in a planned way, hold classes, discuss among themselves, read party literatures by themselves and induce others to read, on the basis of the understanding of the dynamic nature of trade union activities and struggles jump actively into these struggles ahead of others and try to take the lead, make arrangements to organize study circles regularly and try to avail any of the leaders for conduction and even if no one is available they sit by themselves and discuss, and thus remain continuously involved among themselves in discussing and cultivating the literatures and approach of their own party along with the views of different parties. Such party committees should be formed in the factories. Therefore, at present our task is to build party committees at the factory level, to build party committees at the local level, and to build committees down to the village level in the Peasant Front. Not only committees at the level of police station areas, but also regional committees and village council committees must be built and the efficient workers must be found out to work

in every committee. True that we are at present controlling some organizations, a section of masses is also behind us, but it is the time to transform our organization, which is now, in the main, of a propaganda nucleus character to an organization competent to conduct mass battles.

**Today we need innumerable
qualified political activists and leaders**

If that is to be done, we need innumerable numbers of executives and qualified political workers. This massive number of effective workers, organizers and executive heads cannot be built by the previous method. A few may be built. This is the first thing. And the second thing is that, even if they are built following the previous method exclusively, but they do not engage in remoulding and restyling their method of working styles and habits, and cannot work according to today's necessity by taking effective initiative in the process of building this organization through mass action, then the developed characters, which were developed once, may also face the danger of being eaten away and will sure to be eaten away. So what do we need? Among those sitting in this hall full to the capacity, only a handful of comrades including leaders will be found who are fit to act according to the need of the present situation; they should have to remould themselves at one stroke. Here, neither a leader nor a leading comrade can be spared.

One more thing I shall tell you. That is, you have devoted your life for the cause of revolution, for the cause of a noble mission. So, if your urge, discipline and method of character do not lack, if you can save at least a small amount out of your daily expenditure in spite of whatever wants you may have, and if each of two or three thousand comrades like you donate fifty or hundred rupees to the party per year, then a few lacs of rupees may come easily to the party fund.

Perhaps you have a desire, it cannot be said that you do not feel the need of it, but your habits are non-serious and your life lacks attitude and method, so much so, that you are not able to realize what needs to be done first and what needs to be done later. If the fund of the party can be raised in this way, a big financial problem of the party is solved. And if you can do that, it will be possible to release many cadres.

But it is this style of work and habit, on which I wanted to emphasize. Many good and decent comrades, who have culturally advanced a lot in terms of revolutionary character, should also remould themselves a little more in accordance with this new need. On the other hand, for the new recruits no slackness will be allowed to build their revolutionary character which is our main foundation. Because this is our basic quality for which the people feel attraction towards us, this is the area where we are supreme to all. Our cadres do not study seriously by underlining the important portions of the texts, they just read casually. Many of the comrades leave a book by reading once. They do not read again and again and discuss repeatedly among themselves. As they do not discuss among themselves, the power of critical observation does not develop within them. It may be kept in mind that so many things are there to understand in which I am reading. And if there is none, still I should try to improve the understanding of its contents from various sides. Both these are necessary. One is that, there were many things in it that I could not grasp before and there might have been many precious things, which would not have come to my notice if I did not go through it again and again. The second point is, unless you study it repeatedly, you will not be able to make some improvements of the contents, if required. As a result, reading will just remain for reading only and it will come of no use, unless we realize deeply the purpose of reading and what I actually want from it.

Two different concepts and outlooks on the question of election

It seems necessary to some extent to discuss on whether it is essential to go to Parliament or not. Sometimes this issue haunts the comrades. Now this is the question whether there is any utility of parliamentary battles at present. How to judge this utility? If it has any utilization from the perspectives of combining legal-illegal movements, exhausting democratic movements and mobilizing the masses, then we are to judge in what style it is to be utilized. You must have to go there, but if you cannot utilize it in that style, you will be carried, you will end up as an agent of the bourgeoisie. If we accept the parliamentary phase of struggle as an auxiliary struggle to build up extra-parliamentary battles, illegal battles and revolutionary movement, we should do whatever we can while in opposition, but what should we do if we become the majority, when the preparation for revolution is yet to complete. One option is that I should go to parliament as long as illusion prevails among the masses. Until then I am entrusted with the responsibility to disillusion people. And if there is no illusion and if the preparation for the revolution appears to be feasible, then why should I go for election? In that case I should not go to the parliamentary election at all. Conduction of extra-parliamentary movements is out of the question when the time of revolution comes or when there is no parliamentary illusion among the masses. And when the people are not prepared for revolutionary struggle and illusion with the elections exist in the democratic setup, then the revolutionary party has to go to the parliament. This is what Lenin said. But what will you do if you attain the position of majority? However, during Lenin's time nowhere in the world arose the situation like this. It was first seen in India, then in Chile. But both in India and Chile the pseudo-communists, as they had no correct outlook, erred and

deserted the correct policy of participating in the parliamentary struggles. Thus they turned themselves into opportunists in their bid to sit in the Parliament. Does it mean that all those who will go there will be opportunists? Correct appraisal cannot be done if we judge everything flatly without making any distinction. Actually attempting to utilize the parliamentary struggle in furtherance of the revolutionary struggle, you must know how to differentiate it. That is the whole question. Nowhere Lenin said that in any circumstances communists cannot go to governmental power. It was not viewed by Lenin. In fact, it was not viewed as it was not practicable at the time. We did not view that either. After India had won independence, the first ever government of the opposition Communist Party was formed in Kerala. Theretofore, it was not in anyone's view that any such opposition party could form a government. It was not viewed objectively by many. So, there arose no question theoretically as to how to run a government in this circumstance. But now this question begins to come and we should have to provide the answer. For that reason, how do you know what should be the strategy for utilizing the parliamentary weapon in various ways in the revolutionary struggle in order to eliminate the parliamentary illusion? Now this question has come on the background of the objective condition. Both pseudo-revolutionaries and revolutionaries are going to parliament, both of them are saying that they will use parliament; but what slogans each of them is raising, what demands each of them is putting up, in what style each of them is asking to run the government, and how each of them approach to police, attempt to control the police, approach to class struggle and mass movement are all the subjects of deliberation to determine what will be the attempt of the revolutionaries in the event of conflicts with the vested class while running the government. But what happens in case of the public is that, the common public at large, who do not

have revolutionary consciousness, even after hearing all this, think that we (the revolutionaries) always find fault with everything. In spite of lot of persuasions, the illusion that has been created in public mind owing to getting used to the democratic setup does not dispel easily. Liberal democracy is a formidable weapon against revolution. It is dangerous. It preaches what is the necessity of revolution? Form the government as you like. If a government wants, it can change everything, it can change the laws, the constitution, the existing structure (or working procedure) of the army; it can also change the existing structure of the police. So, what is the need of such bloody revolution? Immediately the people think, yes, what is the necessity of taking so much trouble; it can easily happen in other way. This false concept runs deep among the intellectuals and the common people as well. The people cannot be freed from this concept only by criticizing against it. We get the greatest chance of showing the falsity of this concept, if for some reason a government is formed. In that case the task of the revolutionaries should be: behave in a way so that you can prove that you are the best elements in respects of knowledge, learning, intellect and character. You will have to prove that you do not take a single penny as bribe, do not waste government money in the name of requirements of the party, do not practise nepotism, so that the people cannot get any chance to find fault with you from any side. In reality these are the causes which create confusion among the people that these people are corrupt, they are bad and dishonest and for which the country does not prosper. Still now honesty holds a high value in public conception. Anyway, no matter whether honesty is held in esteem or not, you should run the government without leaving any flaw. Consult with the public, try to introduce and implement good plans according to the law. And at the same time continue carrying on political propaganda to explain what the difference between the government and the state is; why the

state cannot be changed by promulgating laws, what is the limitation and where it lies, what is the difference between law and human perspective. These should be brought to people's conception, and an urge to change the law should also be created. By creating social urge and depending on it we should try to change the law in such and such areas, where the capitalist system will be shaken at its root. If this continues, there will invariably be resistance from the central government, the vested interests, the police and the owning class. They will make huge hullabaloo. You have to show the people that you could hardly do anything good for them, although you took good plans, made efforts, did not take a single penny from anyone and you were honest, efficient and prudent. Not only you would have to say that nothing happened, but also you have to show that the vested class obstructed all the good plans. Then in that circumstances the Left Government and the people will fight together against the vested class and the central government. They will fight for advancing democratic struggle.

The CPI government in Kerala did not do this. Having joined the government in West Bengal in 1967 we proclaimed first of all, "Police shall not intervene into the legitimate democratic mass movement". As soon as we had declared this after joining the government, that very one declaration caused an uproar in the press of all the countries starting from France, America to Japan and of the lands of Europe. It shook them off terribly. They were also to deal with these very workers in their respective countries. The Labor Party of Britain was ruffled up. They, too, had to deal with these workers in their country and they were afraid, lest these workers would demand the following day that, the police must not intervene into their democratic movements. Moreover, it must also be declared that anything legal could not be necessarily humane. You are in the government, but does it mean that you are entitled to behave inhumanly on the plea of law? No, you can't do this.

According to the urge and aspiration of the people, the law should be thoroughly changed, if necessary. This very idea is dangerous to the vested interests. What did the other parties including the CPI (M) do here in West Bengal? They shrewdly started to say that they had not declared this policy; it was done by the SUCI. The policy that, the police would not interfere in gherao movements was nothing but the extremism of the SUCI. Again, when they saw the appreciation of this policy among the public, they found themselves in a tight corner and retracting their words began to say that, it was they who adopted this policy. CPM started taking credit of this under the garb that the home minister was of their party. So, it may be noted, I warned at the Conference of Engineering Workers that, it was a powerful weapon with which the government and the masses would combinedly struggle in a balanced way without giving any scope to bourgeoisie. No scope to the bourgeoisie, no scope to the capitalists and no scope to the police and the judiciary will be given. But they would handle this conflict with the purpose that the people could clearly visualize everything. If the people can be convinced of this, the people will be on the side of the leftist government. As a result of it if conflict comes from the side of the vested classes, let the central government overthrow the state government. People will stand by the state government and by that it will be transformed into a revolutionary government fighting against the bourgeois government. Has anybody said that without revolution, all changes will come with the change of the government through elections? But if we behave in an irresponsible way without taking the responsibility of forming the government, then the whole purpose of participating in the parliamentary politics is gone, falling flat. The question will be raised, why did you then fight in the parliamentary elections? You are an irresponsible party, you don't want to take responsibility, and you just want to raise hue and cry being in

the opposition. Can that party ever lead the masses? When you have got the chance, will you let it go? Is it an act of a responsible party? We must cogitate over some reforms and welfare measures. These measures should be conducive to the growth of the revolutionary movement, which will be appreciated by the people, whereas the central government, administration and all organs of the state will oppose them. This opposition will bring the left government closer to the people and class struggle will take a further step forward. Lenin did not write about this eventuality in any of his books. And since he did not put it in writing, we should not do anything new! In that case if we are to follow Lenin to the letter we should have to go back to the condition of Russia under the rule of Tsars. Otherwise, it is not possible to apply the theory of Lenin. And we shall not be able to reach to that stage by any means. Lenin's party was an underground party. Therefore, we should not take any advantage of an open party, since we will sink into opportunism if we avail of the opportunity of an open party! So even if I have the opportunity of working in the open party, I should not take the opportunity of an open party and donning the cloak of disguise adopt many aliases such as Somesh today, Gomesh tomorrow or Paresh day after tomorrow and keep on talking nonsense—hush! Don't talk now, we are underground party, I shall meet you on the bank of the river Ganges at sharp twelve at night! All these are silly affairs. How can they lead the masses? Revolution is not so easy. Revolution is not a childish affair. In order to fight this sort of childishness, Lenin had to write the book named "Left Wing Communism an Infantile Disorder."

Marxism-Leninism is a method of judging things, it is a science. The intellectual stalwarts, who had discussed on various aspects of Marxism, did not have the scope of observing many things. If they would observe these things, they could have resolved these problems. But it cannot be denied

that they handed over to us the very science to resolve these problems. There is no doubt that they handed over to us the art of science as to how to resolve problems, what will be the class outlook to approach problems and how you will apply this science so that you can throw light on problems. The science of Leninism is in our disposal. But in his books Lenin could not provide the solution of the problems, which would arise if you own majority in elections and confronted the crises and contradictions resulted from it, because Lenin did not face such a situation. The Marxists, who will face such situation, will have to provide the necessary solution. It is the duty of theirs. The only crime of our party is that, our party alone can claim with pride that we did not by copying books to try to show any simple solution in this situation or began to talk incoherently in face of contradictions. Those of you, who are participating in the elections, also cannot give answer to this question. Either you have become a part of bourgeois politics or you are preaching against joining the government. You have come out as the majority in the elections and yet you are saying that you will not form the government! Then why did you seek votes in the elections? Now the public has given you votes and made you majority, but you are saying that you will not form the government! I believe that the party like this is not at all competent to organize revolution.

In this class divided society, everything is to be approached from the class point of view. There cannot be any single approach on any matter. With regard to any subject there can have no common interest or approach for all. So, it is also true for election. In a class divided society when election rushes in, it is associated with two class angularities—one is bourgeois class angularity and the other is revolutionary proletarian class angularity. You are to realize this particular aspect correctly. I may sincerely desire revolution, but it will not come immediately. It cannot be accomplished until the revolutionary condition both

politically and organizationally is created. Suppose, under this circumstances we participated in the parliamentary elections and became majority in the legislative house. How is it that after being majority if we said that we should not form the government? Then why did you beg votes of the people in order to fight for them knowing fully well that was a bourgeoisie parliamentary system? In the circumstances should we not handle it? Or should we be scared of our own shadows, as Lenin put it in this way? "Oh no, I'll not go there. If I go I'll be rotted away. Let the people think as they like, I shall remain puritan." Should we think in this way or accept the challenge? Yes, we must accept the challenge. The people think as such that if our party joins the government, it can do lot of things for them. But we shall at least get the opportunity to show the people that, we can hardly do anything for them in this bourgeois parliamentary system even by joining the government. The difference between a revolutionary party and a pseudorevolutionary party will come to light through our art of demonstrating this. Thus it will be clear that we have taken the correct stand in this situation. It is not enough that we for ourselves understand that we are following the correct revolutionary line and we are the genuine revolutionary party, the people should be made understand as well. Who will make them understand? This is also your responsibility.

You should remember that we have 5 to 10 times more party comrades spread over the country than the number of comrades present in this hall (Mahajati Sadan- Kolkata). Again in West Bengal, 4 times of those comrades, who are attending this class from this state, cannot attend this class. It would also not be possible to accommodate all of them here. It means that, if each of this great number of party comrades keeps on working by utilizing own creative sense ideologically, politically and consciously, the party can really meet the challenge. No matter whether the party gives directives or not, do not wait

for any directive from above. You should act as you understand. Maybe that you commit mistakes while acting on your own, only your mental attitude should be as follows, that you do not defend yourself for the mistakes. On the other hand you should not sit idle for the fear of committing mistake. Act constantly according to your own planning and within a few years you will be able to achieve a commendable strength in the arena of Indian politics. We had to go through a great deal of toil for the last 16 years to come to this stage. Now you see how the total number of comrades has increased. I ask each of the whole contingent of comrades: Do not keep yourselves enclosed in limited areas. Come out and carry the politics of our party into the masses on your own initiatives and mobilize the people in different organizations. If each of you performs this task on your own initiative and idea, in no time the party as well as you will gain so much strength that you will reach the position to earn admiration of all.

In this context, I want to mention one more thing. You have now a number of party organs. I have found a strange thing that, when the party acts from above to raise a campaign, sale of the organs increases. But you are not thinking continuously that it is absolutely obligatory for every comrade to keep party organs with him. Apart from the allotted quota by the unit every comrade must keep one copy each individually. It has twofold utility. One is that, he can read it often; he will get the chance to read it in his leisure time by taking it out from his bag even while travelling by bus or train. The other one is that, he will always have that single copy with him even after all the copies sold out, for which he will be able to read out the relevant portions from it to an available group of 5 or 10 people or discuss with them whenever it is necessary. So, the quota for a unit should be the sum total of the number of copies required for each of the comrade of the unit together with the number of the copies, which we can sell to the public,

make push selling among the people and create subscribers. Time to time we undertake such move to create subscribers. It means that the leadership gives a directive from above and we immediately set out to approach door to door to make subscribers. Of course, through this process the number of subscribers as well as circulation of our papers increases to a degree. So, it must be followed time to time. But every day we are engaged in thousand and one types of works, which means that I constantly work within the masses, move with the people and campaign in the midst of them, so if I keep papers in my bag I can continuously push my party papers to the people. Immediate after selling the party organs the comrades of the respective unit level as well as the district leaders at the district level should find out the quantum of the increased sale. They must not entertain or encourage a discussion or an argument in favour of reducing sale. Their task is to find out what are the difficulties in selling papers, why these cannot be sold, why these papers are remained unsold and what are the reasons of remaining these papers unsold in some particular areas and thereby to eliminate these problems. Where instructions or circulars fail, the leaders will go there themselves and eliminate those factors with their personal initiative so that not a single paper remains unsold. Another important point is that those, who work in the different walks of the public, should take initiative to hold discussions with the people with regard to an issue of our organ or a party literature, as the case maybe. Collective reading is an organization. I am not speaking of the collective reading among the party comrades only. You know that we now publish a number of party literatures in Bengali, Hindi, English. Hence, I am also speaking that those comrades, who work within the workers or within the peasants in the rural areas, should arrange for sittings with the workers and peasants—many of whom are uneducated—once in a week. Where classes are held on the basis of question and answer

should continue as it is; but arrangements should be made for making the participants of the classes read beforehand our organs, the literatures and the books, which have been published currently. One of the comrades will read out and all the comrades will participate in discussions on the matters what is being read. It should be held in a systematic way. It is the most essential task. When we sit together, we should see that whether all of us have read the paper meticulously, and whether we have had any discussion on it. If it is not done we should do it in the first place. During discussions so many points will come. We shall enter into debates. This is the primary condition of association. If we can do this, I believe, circulation of our paper will be doubled. In every occasion we are to push our papers for sale and then to see whether the people are discussing on the paper among themselves. If they do not, you should sincerely try to learn the art how such discussions can be initiated. It is not so important whether you can do it immediately or not. But the important thing is that the point is nurtured by you for twenty four hours. Wherever you go, despite your several assignments you do not forget to enquire about whether your party organ and especially that particular issue in which that important article was published has reached there, and if reached whether the concerned people read it or not. Also you should enquire about whether those who have gone through these articles have read them aloud before the others. There is supposedly no problem to keep it in your mind while doing other works, since it does not come into contradictions with your other assignments. So the argument, that you cannot remember it, since you have so many programmes to attend, is not sustainable. Failure to remember it while executing any programme indicates the lack of my political alertness, purposiveness and political initiative. The leading organizers, leaders to important cadres and even ordinary members, if they can truly grasp the present situation,

can fulfill this purpose. Note it very carefully.

Comrades, you should act and act the best you can, and should also equip yourselves

Let me deal with another thing. The comrades have developed a habit of listening only. Whenever you hear any important matter in a class or in some other place, containing a new point or a new way of putting or expression, which you think worth remembering or you need to understand it better, note it down at once in a note book bringing it out from your sling bag—which is always supposed to have with you. Make it a habit. You are used to listening only as you think that you will make it clear afterwards. But it is no longer done. Or, it may happen that you get it learnt, but in spite of making some points clear this very defect persists methodically. As a result there remain many things in which you lack attention. So make it a habit. I should take notes of it in writing and should be mastering these things in my mind. Whenever I am alone, I shall be reciting them repeatedly in my mind and whenever I get the chance I shall discuss on these things with others. In this way, every day we have to improve our style of talking, method of reasoning and way of arguing. Though I am a wage-earner, I must have to study by burning candles even after bone-breaking toil. Because, I am a revolutionary, I must have to acquire knowledge. I am a conscious worker. I must have to learn through hard labour. You are a cadre; you should keep on watching the mood of the public continuously while tackling them. You should learn to make out when one can be made understand or hear. But do not always speak to them, as if you are preaching. Rather, stay with them and the way of remaining with them should be like a revolutionary. That means while staying with them you should not be swayed by the current of their culture and become a bird of the same feather. Do not turn to be just one of their associates. Remain with them within

the ambience of their association maintaining your own characteristic features and character. That will be enough. This alone will induce those people to change gradually and also help grow your influence over them. In this way each and every comrade should do something or other devoting maximum time in his sphere of work and so far the applicant members are concerned, they should devote at least two hours a day for it. If every comrade contemplates to include the following tasks in his daily works that he will conduct political classes with the public in any one particular place of work, maybe it is in a club or a slum or with the workers in a union office or anywhere else and will give association with the people or discuss on various matters with them or explain any topic published in 'Ganadabi' (Bengali Organ of the Party), and works for at least two hours a day—though the whole timers and good cadres should work for whole day instead of working for two days—then within a few years, you will be able to fulfill the challenge you are going to take up. Movements after movements are coming up and going away. As fast as you can spread your party to all levels of the people by strengthening it sufficiently, so fast you will be able to develop organic connection with the people from the upper level to the lower level at the time of providing leadership in the struggle of protest when it comes up. In that situation we can lead the masses to the correct direction. So it is absolutely necessary to develop the process. For long the CPI, CPI(M) and even the Naxals succeeded to create a great deal of confusions among the youth or in the society and for that the people used to incline to them as communists. But now a great deal of fissure has been developed in the faith of the people on them. Moreover, out of much negativity there happened one positive thing, which is, the idea is gaining ground that it is not the name that makes a communist. As for example, there are now many who do not consider the CPI as the communist party. Similarly, the Naxalites, too, are not being

recognized as communists by many. But in those days, when we started our journey the people would believe firmly that a communist party could not be a communist party without the name. Could it be ever possible that the party which went by the name of communist party was not a genuine communist party? Moreover an irrefutable argument was there that if a Communist Party had International recognition it was definitely a communist party and it could not be pseudo one. The edge of that argument has also lost its sharpness to a great deal by now. The third point is that the present situation is very much favourable for us. It has been already established that the SUCI is a communist party, a Marxist-Leninist party. Rather the overall campaign which is carried out by the enemies, the masses and those who are in opposition, are in the main, is that we are Marxists, but ultra-communists. Even your enemies cannot say that you are not a communist party, a Marxist-Leninist party. In order to prevent their rank and file from being attracted to our party, these parties propagate that it is not a communist party. But they know and understand well what we are and here lies their fear. Because, the people are also getting attracted towards us. All the sections of the public outside the party consider that your party is a communist party. Not only that, but also the enemies, the bourgeoisie and the others think that you are Marxists-Leninists. Considering all these factors together the situation has now become far more excellent than that of those old days, with which I compared the battle fought by *Vishma*, when we had to proceed bit by bit by pushing a formidable juggernaut and when we had to advance through fighting against a severely strong current. The extent to which the CPM has been discredited, the extent to which the CPI has been discredited and the extent to which the confusion in the mind of the people has been cleared that a party may not be a correct party only because the International leadership recognizes it, to that extent the path through which our politics

can penetrate has become excellent. This does not mean that we are not facing obstacles now. If we think that the people would rush to us as soon as we begin to work and persuade them, it is not correct, it is an illusion. Still now we are to fight many a confusion. We are to endure many a jolt. But those stumbling blocks of the past have now reduced to some extent and for that it is an excellent situation for us. A lot of damage has been done due to shortcomings of the world communist movements, failings of the leadership in the ideological sphere and behaviours of the Communist Parties. Yet the main trend of the world is in favour of revolution. It seems that the fire of revolution is smoldering everywhere. It is waiting for correct leadership and development of real political force within the masses. And this responsibility of accomplishing this task in India has been bestowed on our party. We cannot deny it. We must accept this challenge. Every comrade should have to create the necessary mental strength within him to accept this challenge. Let your concern for political initiative always keep in mind. Do not wait for instructions from above. Do not be afraid of taking initiative lest you commit mistake. Rather, if you commit a mistake and the leaders rebuke you for that do not be afraid. I am still alive, come rushing to me in case of any inconvenience. Grasp the politics of the party thoroughly and prepare yourself in all respects. Do not spoil other's initiative by idle discussions without doing any work. Discourage him at once who is doing this, no matter if he is a leader. Criticize if there is ground for criticism, but do it while performing your tasks. If you work more and criticize more, there is no objection for this. But criticizing without doing anything is tantamount to crossing one's limit of right. It is not proper. Do not fall into that trap. Every one of you should perform, perform to the best of your level and equip yourself. Go through the books on Marxism-Leninism, at the same time master the process how the party asks you to grasp the tenets of

Marxism-Leninism, how the party explains these things, how it speaks of applying them and how it has analysed them in different spheres.

Keep it in mind that in the correct revolutionary approach, there are tussles, justice and injustice, faults and errors. But in spite of these mistakes and errors, justice and injustice, faults and shortcomings this revolutionary current is, in the main, the surest way to lead an honorable life. So I cannot let me get isolated from this, otherwise I shall no longer have anything to count on. If you continue to do your own works in this way, the future is with you. Then I shall tell you only one thing, let the backbiters cast as much aspersions on you as they like, be it the CPI(M), or the Congress or anyone else. I, however, end my speech with the words of C.V. Raman: Let the dog bark, the caravan will march ahead. You will also march forward. They may shout frantically, but cannot stop you. In addition to it the third factor is that the people are also observing you and consider you as Marxist-Leninist, but diehard ones. They only doubt about whether you are able to provide leadership and whether you have that strength. If you take 10 years to accomplish this, revolution will wait for 10 years. If you can complete it in 5 years instead of 10 years, and if the crisis of this nature persists and continues, the revolution in India will break out within this 5 years. With this, I end today.

Long Live Revolution
Long Live SUCI
