

# Bourgeois election alliances: Certain experiences from Past History

**What** is the attitude of the Communist Revolutionaries towards elections? Can the Communist Revolutionaries have election alliances with opposition ruling class parties or the revisionist and the neo-revisionists? What is the relation between election work and Agrarian Revolution? These questions have come before the Communist Revolutionaries for discussions. It is true there are serious differences among them on all these questions. They are related to ideological conceptions, political assessments and tactics of struggle and practice.

Certain organisations of Communist Revolutionaries publicly say that they are still boycotting elections as a principle. Participation in elections is a question of tactics. When the revolutionary movement is on the upsurge, elections are boycotted. When the revolutionary movement is in the retreat, depending on the consciousness of the people and the movement, one should participate in the elections. These are Lenin's principles. But these comrades have nothing [to do with this ideology. They think that boycott of elections represents leftism. They wrongly think that this 'left' pose is useful for revolutionary struggle

But they are not able even to implement their slogan of boycott of elections in practice. At the village level, their cadres, ranks and sympathisers are actively participating in the elections and that too in all elections.

It is significant to note that some of these elements are having links with groups inside the Congress and support such groups which they think are favourable to them. They even secretly propagate in support of the Congress (1). Boycott of elections in the day time, but participating during the night time—this is the wonderful practice of some of them.

Formal declaration of boycott of election by their leadership but participation in the elections by their cadres and ranks at the lower levels—this is their practice. This is nothing but the degeneration of the slogan of boycott of elections.

There are other organisations of Communist Revolutionaries. These organisations are going to the other extreme. They contest certain seats.

In all other seats they are supporting opposition ruling class parties, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists. They claim to be doing this to defeat the Congress (1) in power, in the name of defeating Indira's autocracy or Indira's fascism or in the name of building the anti-fascist front.

Our Party opposes both these trends and resists them. We have decided to participate in the elections taking into consideration the consciousness of the people, and the level of the people's movement. But our Party has laid down the general principles for such participation. Extensive propagation of revolutionary politics among the people, political consolidation of existing people's movements, extension of the movement to new areas, organising the people for new struggles after the elections—these are the general principles guiding our participation in the elections.

We have clearly stated that our participation in the elections should not create any illusions among the people about the existing big-bourgeois big-landlord constitution. On the other hand, it should help the people to realise the necessity of Agrarian Revolution. We should tell the people that elections under the present Constitution will not bring any benefits to the people and that New Democratic Revolution is the only Path of Liberation for our people.

We have decided to participate in the elections on the basis of our own strength. We have decided not to have any election alliances either with the opposition ruling class parties, or with the revisionists and neo-revisionists. We will have election alliances only with those who support the New Democratic Revolution. Where we do not contest, we do not support either the opposition section of the ruling class parties or the CPI-CPM combine.

These are the general principles guiding our participation in the elections—direct and indirect.

Of course one has to analyse the ideological, political and tactical questions about the election alliances with the opposition section of the ruling classes or the CPI-CPM combine.

But first let us see the experiences of such election alliances from our past history in India, particularly from the experience in Andhra.

## **Betrayal of the Heroic Telengana struggle (1946-51)**

### **Entry into Parliamentary elections**

In India, the Heroic Telengana Struggle (1946-51) was the first struggle for Agrarian Revolution. At that time, the Nehru government sent its army to crush this struggle. With this, the leadership of the united Communist Party betrayed the Telengana struggle, laid down arms and decided to participate in the elections.

But the ranks of the Telengana struggle refused to lay down their arms and give up the struggle. Both the revisionists and neo-revisionists had to invent many lies to convince them to lay down their arms. They even utilised the name of the great Stalin for this dirty purpose. Finally they resorted to the last weapon—deception. They said :

We laid down arms only temporarily. We will preserve the arms secretly. Our participation in the elections is only temporary. Now our forces are weakened. Let us gather some strength by participating in the elections and then take up arms again. So we participate in the elections, as a preparation for taking up arms again.

Only with such promises could the leadership force the fighters, the rank and file of the Telengana struggle to lay down their arms and take to the path of parliamentarism.

It is true that the 'Pandavas' preserved their arms secretly for one year. But after that one year, Pandavas took up their arms again, waged war against Kauravas and won back their kingdom.

But our Pandavas—the revisionists and the neo revisionists, followed a different path. They did not go into secret hiding. What they entered were only the open parliamentary institutions, what they practiced was only parliamentary tactics the path of bourgeois election alliances, winning seats and then power, that is, through elections. They have developed this as an 'art'. They have gained experience in this 'art'. They have forgotten the arms, which they say they have preserved secretly. They have become worshippers of the parliamentary path and created 'theories' of peaceful transition.

How did the revisionists and the neo-revisionists degenerate from the path of armed struggle to the path of parliamentarism? How did they change from secret Party life to mere legalism? How did they change from the path of Agrarian Revolution to the path of bourgeois election alliances?

This transformation did not come in a single day but happened step by step. First they started attacking the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism itself. They began to say that some Marxist-Leninist tenets have become outdated. In the name of utilising the contradictions of the ruling classes they began the search of the 'good' and 'bad' in the Congress and began to call all those on friendly terms with the leaders as 'progressives' and began forming united front with them.

With this, the revisionists and the neo-revisionists abandoned the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principle of exposing the anti-people's character of all the ruling classes and their parties before the people. In practice the policy of uniting with the opposition section of the ruling

classes for election purposes began to be adopted. The slogan of united front with the opposition section of the ruling classes began to come into operation.

Marxism-Leninism is based on class struggle. The revisionists and the neo-revisionists abandoned this very principle itself. Under the pretext of united front with the middle and rich peasants, the struggle for the demands of the agricultural labourers was abandoned. The policy of agitating only on those demands of the agricultural labourers to which the middle and rich peasants agreed to, was put into practice.

It is time we should unite the agricultural labourers, the poor peasants, the middle and rich peasants against the landlords at the village level. For this, we must fight against the feudal exploitation, whoever practices it. For this we must fight for the demands of the agricultural labourers and poor peasants. At the same time, we must fight the demands of the middle and rich peasants. In this process we should build the united front with the middle and rich peasants against the landlords. The leadership betrayed this; their line helped only the landlords.

With the era of Khrushchev in the Soviet Union, the policy of peaceful transition was increasingly propagated in India, the policy that the present system of exploitation could be changed peacefully came to the forefront.

Of course, all these changes did not take place in a single day, but only gradually, step by step. One should carefully study this step by step transformation.

### **Abandonment of class struggle**

In 1952 elections, the communists, both in Telengana and Andhra regions, won big victories. In both the areas the communists emerged as the biggest political force.

The revisionists and the neo-revisionists utilised the high prestige of heroic struggle of 1946-51, the sacrifices of the people, and the fighting heroes into their electoral gains. But in both the regions, the Congress, with the help of the 'independents' was able to retain its power.

With these electoral gains, the leadership began to propagate new theories. In Andhra today, tomorrow Kerala, then West Bengal and step by step capture of power through elections—began to be increasingly propagated among the ranks. Some openly did this, some began 'blissfully' to dream of such changes.

Between 1951-56 the Party worked under the guidance of 1951 Programme which has characterised our country as a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country with fake independence and bogus democracy. It

said that only Revolution could liberate our people. This remained on paper. In practice, this was betrayed.

At that time, it was undivided Madras State. Barren speech-making in the Assemblies and Parliament, public meetings, and exaggeration of our role in those institutions—became the general pattern of Party work.

In this period, discussions which have ideological importance took place.

First : Some senior comrades said that we are abandoning anti land-lord struggles at the village level, the struggle for waste lands, the struggles for agricultural labourers and demands of the poor peasants and giving more importance to our work in the Assemblies and Parliament. This was wrong. We must take the first task as the major task.

But in the course of the discussions, all these good points were relegated to the background. How to retain present Assembly and parliament seats we have already won? How to win new seats? The discussions centered around this.

Not only that. A new conception was brought in. It was said that it was wrong to fight only for the demands of the agricultural labourers. They cautioned that such a policy would alienate the middle and rich peasants from the Party. They cautioned the Party that the demands of the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants have to be settled peacefully.

These elements began to say that we should not only agitate for the demands of the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants, but our mass organisations should take the responsibility of making these sections do their work properly.

With this the call was given to the mass organisations that they should see that the agricultural labourers should work for 7-8 hours completely in the fields. With this, the hateful method of beating the drums signalling the agricultural labourers as to when they should start from their homes for work in the fields and when they should leave the fields for home, was started both in the mornings and the evenings.

Naturally this gladdened the hearts of the landlords in the villages. They were glad that these *communists* were working as their agents among the agricultural labourers. They began lavishly praising these *communists* and these *communists* were carried away by praises from the landlord elements. They began to defend their service to the landlords in the name of *united front* with the middle and rich peasants. In practice, the 'united front' never came into existence as a result of such tactics. Only it helped the landlords. With this, the leadership began to make friendship with the small landlords and rich peasants to get more votes and seats.

We must unite the agricultural labourers, poor, middle and rich peasants. What are their problems? How to co-ordinate these struggles? How to build united front against the landlords? These were never discussed. No programme was given for this. But the line of the leadership helped the landlords only.

Second: In 1952 elections the Congress had been severely defeated in the Circar districts. The Communists won greater number of seats in these districts. Because of this, the Congress leadership began rousing the regional passions of the people of one area against the people in another area—Rayalaseema against the Circar districts.

The aim of the Congress leadership was to divert the attention of the people from their class struggles and anti landlord struggles. For this, they began rousing the passions of the people of one area against the people of another area. For this they raised slogans like Kurnool as the capital the new Andhra state, the slogan of Krishna - Pennar Project, the high level canal of Thungabhadra to be constructed first, establishing Tirupathi University etc. to rouse Rayalaseema people against Circar districts.

It is the duty of the communists to defeat this conspiracy. But this could only be defeated by organising the exploited classes of all areas against the landlords and advance the revolutionary movement.

But the leadership of the united Communist Party did not adopt such a course. The attitude of the leadership on all the questions raised above, in practice only helped the Congress in diverting the attention of the people from the path of class struggles and anti-landlord struggles. This main failure of this period is to be noted.

Take one more example. Whose duty is it to repair the irrigation canals? It is the responsibility of the government. To agitate among the people and organise and force the government to implement these tasks, is the task of the communists. But what was the attitude of the leadership of the united communist movement with regard to repairs to the Krishna canals? They themselves began to dig the canals, to repair them. They mobilised the party ranks to do this job. They took photos of leaders participating in this manual labour and published in the Party organs. Of course this will show the 'love' of the Party for the interests of the people. But will work of such reformist nature rouse the class consciousness of the people? They were only hiding the abandonment of class struggle behind these reformist works.

## **1955 elections in Andhra—wrong lessons**

Whatever it be, the struggle for power between the various Congress groups was useful for the united Communist Party leadership. The Prakasam ministry was defeated. Elections were again held for the Andhra

**Assembly.** The leadership of the united Communist Party announced an election manifesto for capture of power through the elections. But it fought the elections on the basis of its own strength.

Even by then, the struggle of the Heroic Telengana Struggle (1946-51) was still fresh in the minds of the people. So agricultural labourers, the poor peasants came forward in support of the Party in that elections on a big scale. The Congress leaders united all its groups and all landlords' groups to retain power. It spent lavishly on arrack and toddy to purchase votes. Where the landlords were stronger, they suppressed the voice of the poorer sections. They did not allow the poorer sections to vote, if they were suspected of having sympathies for the Communist Party.

With such dirty methods, the Congress won in that elections. The united Communist Party was decisively defeated. But the leadership refused to take proper lessons from this defeat. It took wrong lessons. In the period between 1952-55, with election illusions dominating the minds of the leadership, by and large, it has abandoned the path of class struggle and the anti-landlord struggle as its main task to advance the Agrarian Revolution. In the districts, when such issues were taken, it was due to the initiative of the district leadership. Even then, they did not go beyond the legal, economic and general political agitational level. The main work of the Party during this period was work in the Assemblies and Parliament, deputations to govt. offices, petitions to the govt. etc. Because of this, we failed to politically consolidate the enthusiasm of the masses shown in 1952 elections. We could not win the masses behind the Congress. In addition, in 1955 elections the Congress could penetrate our ranks and purchase votes. Thus we could see that because of our concentration on such issues like Capital, or regional issues; instead of concentrating on anti-landlord struggles and class struggles—this has resulted in the weakening of the revolutionary movement in Andhra. The leadership of the united Communist Party refused to take this lesson.

—By 1955, our movement in Andhra has been forced to depend more on the general political sympathies of the masses. In the name of overcoming this weakness, the leadership at all levels adopted the method of big public meetings and rallies. The leadership deluded itself into thinking that all people who attended those meetings would vote for the Party. With this, house to house and group propaganda work was abandoned. Propaganda through jeeps and mikes became the main feature. Above all, propaganda with the help of the cine artists dominated the election campaign. With such election propaganda, the Party failed to get any additional votes. The result was only debts running into lakhs of rupees for the District Committees and Provincial Committee, becoming an unbearable burden. The Party leadership failed to take proper lessons from this. This continued to be the main practice in the subsequent elections too.

Above all these things, was it correct on the part of the communists to try to come to power through elections? Will elections held under the present Constitution meant to preserve the present system of exploitation, bring about any basic changes in the conditions of the people? None in the leadership dared to discuss this basic question. We were terribly afraid even to raise such questions at that time.

Instead of putting these fundamental questions, and find true answers, it was decided that our defeat was due to lack of united front with other bourgeois parties. In addition, it was declared that it was wrong on the part of the Party to have included the programme of 'land to the tiller' in the election manifesto, which according to them, resulted in driving the middle and rich peasants into the lap of the landlords.

One should remember that these very wrong lessons formed the basis for bourgeois election alliances of the later period.

### **Shameful methods for the liquidation of the Party**

With the defeat of the Party in these elections, some leaders in the united communist movement lost hopes for the future. They began advising their close followers and sympathisers to look after their own family affairs. They advised their followers like this: "We have tried to capture power through the Telengana armed struggle. But we failed. This time we have tried for the same through the elections. Now also we have failed. Now there is no question of our coming to power in the near future. It is better now to look after your own family affairs. You sell the small plots of lands in Krishna and Guntur districts and go to new project areas in backward districts, where you can purchase land cheaply and can improve the lot of your families". In actual practice, what they tried to do was the virtual liquidation of the Party in the most shameful manner.

Some persons took the cue from this. Hundreds of cadres from Party ranks from Krishna and Guntur districts were encouraged to migrate. In a planned way, they were all rehabilitated on the banks of Godavari river in Khammam and Warangal districts, along the K.C. canal and the High level and Low level canals of Tungabhadra. They purchased lands of the girijans and poor peasants cheaply. Now they have become rich. Actually some of them had become the landlords and village-bureaucrats exploiting the local people. When one remembers the sacrifices of some of these persons in the earlier struggles and their new role as exploiters, one gets disgusted. They are standing examples of the degeneration of the policies of the leadership of the united Communist Party.

### **United Front with dissident Congressmen**

We have already seen how the leadership of the united Communist Party refused to draw proper lessons from the electoral defeat in 1955.



We have already seen how they drew the wrong lesson that the defeat was primarily due to absence of election alliances with the bourgeois groups.

This same process took another shape in the Telengana region. In order to deceive the people, the Congress government brought forward an Act for the 'protection' of Tenancy Rights of the peasants. The leadership of the Party lost no time in hailing it.

As a result of this Act, actually all the lands seized by the peasants during the heroic struggle were dragged to the courts, where the peasants lost greater part of these lands, because they had no land records in their favour. Only in those villages, where the peasants had strength in their mass organisations, they could retain some of these lands by compromising with the landlords. In the greater part of the Telengana area, the peasants lost majority of the lands seized during the Telengana struggle. Landlords were once again established in the villages of Telengana. The gains of the Heroic Telengana were lost one after the other. The leadership of united communist movement was satisfied with the Parliamentary work and deputations to the bureaucratic officials.

Thus, with the Parliamentary work, with Agrarian Revolution as aim class struggles have been abandoned by and large. The Party work was confined largely to legal, economic struggles and general political agitations. By 1957 Assembly and Parliament elections, the class basis and the support of the people been very much weakened. As in the past, the Party could not win seats on the basis of its own strength. With this, the hunt for the bourgeois 'friends' began.

But at this time, still there was no clear-cut bourgeois opposition to the Congress in Andhra. Factional struggles inside the Congress have started. A part of the Party leadership began to see 'progressives' within the Congress. These were the days when the Second Five Year Plan was launched. A part of the leadership began to see 'progressiveness' in this plan. These were the days of peaceful transition theories emanating from the Soviet Union with the rise of Khrushchev to power there.

In this political background, the process of befriending the dissident Congressmen by the leadership of the united Communist Party started. The process of having united front with those Congress men, who did not get Congress tickets, and 'independents' started. The arguments of the leadership in defence of such a line were strange to say the least !

We cannot win a seat in any particular constituency on our own strength. Our votes in another constituency are not sufficient to win a seat. Let us barter our votes in such constituencies with dissident Congressmen or 'independents' to take their votes in the other constituency in return and win these seats and thus strengthen ourselves in the Assemblies.

**Do anything—but win the seat. That was the only motto! From this, the policy of united front with Congress dissidents became the policy of united Communist Party, from top to bottom, to be applied from the village panchayats to the Parliament. Thus the class struggle and the class issues were relegated into the background, weakening the anti-landlord struggles.**

### **United Front with 'Progressives' inside the Congress.**

Having taken to this policy, it did not stop there. It took its inevitable course. With the Second Five year Plan, the Soviet leadership, with its revisionist theories, began to enter India on a big scale. Condemnation of the great Stalin and praises for Nehru started. Defence of the 'progressive policies of Nehru, became the official line of the Party to advance towards socialism. The leadership of the united Communist Party took up this 'sacred' task of defending 'Nehru's progressivism'.

In the background of this new theory, the then Party in West Bengal made a united front with Ajoy Kumar Mukherjee, began supporting the Akalis under the leadership of Fateh Singh, began supporting Congress against the DMK in Madras. In Andhra, it took to worse forms. Let's look at a few examples.

There was a contest for Chief Ministership between Burgula Rama Krishna Rao and Venkata Ranga Reddy among the Congress legislators. The leadership of the Party immediately announced that Burgula Rama-Krishna Rao was a representative of the small landlords and he should be supported. Here one should remember it was the Congress legislators who were to elect their Chief Minister. So the support of the Party was only in the streets.

When the present Andhra State was formed, there was a contest for Chief Ministership between Sanjeeva Reddy and Gopala Reddy, the two Congress leaders. The leadership of the united Communist Party immediately announced that Sanjeeva Reddy was the representative of smaller landlords and that Gopal Reddy was the representative of the bigger landlords and they supported Sanjeeva Reddy. Where? In the streets and in the Party official organs. Whom did they really help? Only to bury the concept of class struggle and take to the path of class collaboration.

It did not stop with this. When there was a contest between the Congress and the Swathantra Party candidate Ranga, the Party leadership openly supported the Congress candidate as against the candidate of the Swathantra Party since the Congress was considered to be progressive. But unfortunately for them Ranga subsequently joined the Congress itself.

By 1962, the policy of class collaboration became more open; A proposal came before the State Committee that the united Party should publish the list of Congress candidates whom the Party would

support. Of course it was rejected. But it was this conception that led later to the CPI's support to the Indira Congress govt. and its emergency rule.

This policy of finding the 'progressives' inside the Congress played havoc with the District Committees leading to splits among them, each faction supporting one set of Congress groups in the district. For instance, in Khammam district, a section in the District Committee supported one section of Congress led by the notorious Vengal Rao, while the other section supported the another section of Congress men led by Siddha Reddy.

This policy did not materially change even with the formation of the CPM. It was only said that the Party should support the non-official Congress. Opposition to the Congress became united front with opposition section of the ruling parties. For instance, the Muslim League in Kerala became 'progressive' if it tied itself with the CPM. And the same Muslim League became 'reactionary' if it links with the Congress.

Now both the revisionists and the neo-revisionists have taken up this concept. It is this policy that has now become the policy of building the *Left and Democratic Front* propogated now by both of them. Its sole aim is united front with the opposition section of the ruling classes. That is why both of them are running after the Janata, Lok Dal, Akali Dal, DMK and .AIDMK etc., all in the name of opposing the authoritarianism of Indira Gandhi !

Both the rovisionists and the neo-revisionists have long abgo aandoned the path of class struggle and resistance struggle. Step by step they were wedded to the path of parliamentarism. Winning of seats and capturing state ministries became their sole aim. Defence of these ministries has now become their sole concern. For this, they should win the sympathy of Indira Gandhi in the Centre. That is why both of them are now praising the 'non-aligned' and 'anti-imperialist' policies of Indira Gandhi to the skies. Now they have changed from fake opposition to critical support. They have paved the way from praising Nehru to praising Indira Gandhi. This is the culmination of their policies of class collaboration.

We should note the gradual change of the revisionists and the neo-revisionists from the position of Telengana armed struggle to the present path of parliamentarism.

Having betrayed the Telengana struggle, during 1952-55, the united Communist Party, by and large, participated in the election on its own strength. With the participation in elections, work in the Assemblies: legal, economic and general political agitations and deputations to bureaucratic officials became the main work of the Party. Class struggles were by and large abandoned. They later changed to united front with Congress dissidents and 'independents'. Later it became united front with the

'progressives' inside the Congress itself and support to Nehru's progressivism. Then it changed to support to India Congress rule and its Emergency rule by the CPI. Now 'left and democratic front' i.e., united front with all opposition sections of the ruling classes, and critical support to Indira Gandhi has now become the policy of the CPI and CPM.

### **Panchayat Raj—factional politics in the villages**

We have seen above, how, after 1952 elections, the leadership of the united Communist Party abandoned class struggles and took to the path of class collaboration. The heinous features of this policy can be clearly seen in the programme of these parties in the villages.

In 1956, Nehru introduced Village Panchayat Raj. With this, the Samitis to be formed of the Presidents of the village Panchayats, and Zilla Parishads to be formed out of the Samithis came into practice. This was an effort on the part of the Congress govt. to keep the landlords in power from the village level to the Zilla Parishad level. To win power in these bodies became the sole aim of the CPI and CPM. The policies of class collaboration pursued by the CPI-CPM leadership helped their followers to acquire dominant positions in these bodies, particularly in the village Panchayats and Samithis in certain places.

By that time itself, all class struggles and anti-landlord struggles have been by and large abandoned at the village levels. During the first elections under the Panchayat Raj system, it was clear that it was difficult to acquire dominant position in these bodies merely by depending on the general sympathy of the people.

In order to win in these elections, the policy of united front with the landlord groups and Congress groups was initiated by the CPI-CPM leadership.

The revisionists and neo-revisionists began to adopt immoral methods being implemented by the Congress landlords. Purchasing of votes, use of arrack and toddy to get the poor people's votes, keeping unwilling or suspected voters under restrictions, getting votes through various pressure tactics, special camps for village Presidents under strict watch, taking the unwilling village Presidents and keeping them in confinement against their will—all immoral methods of the Congress landlords were adopted by the CPI-CPM leadership to win power in these bodies.

In some places these immoral methods were implemented by the CPI CPM leadership in co-operation with the Congress groups themselves.

—Large sums of money are necessary to win the elections in Panchayats, Samithis and Zilla Parishads. To get this money, the CPI leadership converted these institutions into instruments for corruption. Thus the

leaders of the CPI and CPM at the village level become arrack contractors and road contractors and became the worst corrupt bureaucrats in the villages.

—In this way, the cadres of the CPI and CPM, emerged as various types of contractors, as exploiters, as new landlords and bureaucrats in the villages.

Now a situation has arisen where, in the villages under the domination of CPI and CPM, the people have no civil rights. Other parties opposed to them have no right to hold public meetings, no right to distribute their pamphlets or put up wall-posters. These are the democratic rights for the people in the villages under their domination.

This is the culmination of the policies of class collaboration being pursued by the CPI and CPM.

## **Basic Lessons**

What are the basic lessons one has to learn from the politics of Parliamentarism being pursued by the CPI-CPM leadership ?

—When one abandons the class struggle and the resistance struggle, he is bound to take to the Path of Parliamentarism, whether he likes it or not. There is no other alternative.

—The policies of bourgeois election alliances, in whatever garb, are bound to lead to the policy of class collaboration, weaken and finally destroy the resistance struggle.

In 1952, the united Communist Party participated in the elections on the basis of its own strength. With the success in these elections, the leaders began to propagate the concept of achieving power through elections. With this they abandoned class struggles step by step, slipped into the policy of election alliances with the ruling class parties. The organisations of Communist Revolutionaries should take proper lessons from this sordid history of parliamentarism of the CPI-CPM.

We have the least doubt in saying that the politics of certain organisations and groups of Communist Revolutionaries are very dangerous to the revolutionary movement in the country. The slogans like 'anti-authoritarian front', 'anti-autocratic front', front against Indira's dictatorship, that the struggle against Indira's fascism is a transitional phase, that during this phase of struggle we should fight only for democratic rights—all these wrong slogans are bound to lead the working class Party into bourgeois election alliances and united front with the ruling class parties and destroy the resistance struggle. Our Party is determinedly opposed to all such policies.

15-7-1982

*(This article was published in July-August '82, Road to Liberation.)*