NOTES

CHAPTER I:

1. In the opinion of S N Mazumdar the IPRP was founded by Dr. Bhupendra Nath Dutta and Bankim Mukherjee with the members of Atmasakti Group in 1930. (Mazumdar, 1979: 208) But Amitava Chandra in a detailed essay tries to show that the party was formed on the basis of Marxist ideology in 1931 by different revolutionary groups of Hooghly district through a conference held for the purpose. According to his opinion, Dutta & Mukherjee might have taught them regarding the futility of ‘terrorist path’ and imbied them with the communist ideology. But, in no case, they were to be treated as the founders of the IPRP. (Chandra, 1992: 131-133)

CHAPTER III

1. MN Roy while in India worked under the leadership of Jugantar activist Baghajatin, so terming MN Roy as 'Anushilan Man' by Pramanik, 1984: 244, appears to be incorrect.

2. S N Mazumdar writes that Upendranath Banerjee’s articles made important contributions to the process of national revolutionaries’ transition to communism. However, the person who played an important role in reorienting the national revolutionaries’ ideas towards Marxism through his powerful writings, at the fog end of his life, not only deviated from the Marxist ideology but became the President of Hindu Mahasabha, Bengal in 1949 till his death in 1950.(Sengupta, S, 1994: 68)


4. The RSP literature as available presently is totally silent about its pre-Independent days TU activities. Much of the history is, therefore, remained unknown even today.

5. A veteran trade-union leader Achintya Sinha informed about the date of formation of UTUC as 01/05/1949 and also about its first office bearers.

6. Nirban Basu (Basu, 1992: 98) stated that Workers’ League ‘died a natural death’ after 1944. However, our study shows that Nepal Bhattacharyya was a constituent of SUCI in 1946 when that was formed as a ‘platform of action’ and later on, he activated Workers and Peasants’
League which remained operative even in 1950s. SUCI, Bolshevik Party and the League observed Lenin’s birthday on January 21, 1951 in a public meeting and these three parties also worked sometime as a ‘left group’. (Ganadab: 01/02/1951)

7. Like RSP, the SUCI later day literature also conspicuously silent about the activities either in trade union front or in peasants’ front in the initial phase of party formation. One possible cause might be that both the parties and their founding organisers had to face extreme hardship during the time. They actually had no permanent shelter to stay in night. So, in spite of their efforts they were unable to keep records of those activities on the day to day basis for the posterity. Further, they were all habituated in working underground without keeping any record. This mind set of the converted revolutionaries may also be responsible for the poor or no maintenance of records. This has been the main problem in building a correct understanding of their work in the labour front or, for that matter, in any front.

8. Information received on the basis of personal interview with Nalini Pramanik (presently 88 years old), a peasants’ leader who participated in the Tebhaga Movement.

CHAPTER IV:

1. M N Roy was formally expelled from the Comintern. The resolution to expel him runs as follows:

   In accordance with the Resolution of the 10th Plenum of the ECCI (on the international situation and the tasks of the Communist International, Para 9) and the decision of the Presidium of ECCI of 19 December 1928 according to which adherents of the Brandler organisation cannot be members of Communist International, the Presidium of the ECCI declares that Roy, by contributing to the Brandler press and by supporting Brandler organisation has placed himself outside the ranks of the Communist International and is to be considered expelled from the Communist International. (Imprecor, Vol 9, No. 69. 13 December, 1929, 1440 quoted in Adhikari, 1982: 426)

CHAPTER V

1. The official literature published by RSP in no place mentioned the dates when in the month of May 1946 the First All India Convention of Delhi was held. It’s only Jogesh Chattopadhyay who
specifically stated the dates and we are accepting this. Even, the Documents of the RSP published in 2001 are also silent about the dates though it mentioned the dates of Second All National Party Conference of RSPI held in Muzaffarpur from 11-13 May 1947.

2. Tridib Chaudhuri writes (1985) & supported by Buddhadeva Bhattacharyya (1982) and Murari Mohan Saha (2001) that the 1938 document was adopted by the Central Committee of the Party (Anushilan-cum-HSRA Marxists). Now the fact is that the revolutionaries were released mostly in the middle of 1938. (Naren Das, 1983) The said document was approved by the ‘central committee’. The questions naturally come to mind: 1) when & where this cc was formed? 2) who were the members of this cc? 3) how these members were selected/elected? 4) were the leaders of Anushilan and HSRA treated as the cc members? 5) RSP/ RSPI (ML) were formed in March 1940. The name was not thought of in 1938. So, why this document is declared as: The Thesis and Platform of Action of the RSPI (M-L)?

The RSP documents or memoirs by its leaders are totally silent about the matter. Even talk with RSP ideologues like Makhan Paul or Buddhadeva Bhattacharyya produced no information on this issue. The present researcher has also failed to trace any document of the said decision. So, the above questions remain unanswered still now.

3. Trailokyanath Chakraborty (Maharaj) stated that he was released on May 13, 1946 from the Dumdum Central Jail where as the Delhi Convention was held from 11-13 May that year. (Chakraborty, T, 1981: 237)

Nirmal Roychowdhury writes that the founding members of RSP like Maharaj, Rabi Sen, Pratul Ganguli, Tridib Chowdhury, Naren Das, Charu Roy etc. were released from the jail almost after two weeks of holding the Delhi Conference. This had surely dissatisfied those leaders. (Roychowdhury, 1395 BS: 147)

4. Makhan Paul writes that the *War Thesis* was adopted in the Ramgarh meeting itself. (Paul, M, 2009: 16) So herein also disagreement noticed on the exact place of adoption of the *War Thesis*. 
CHAPTER VI

1. However in a Blog, *Banglar Drishyapat* tries to show that no reference of any such type of students’ movement could found in any book/article written on the students’ movement of Dhaka of that period. (Source: https://banglardrishyapat.wordpress.com/ August 15, 2018) No such incidence of student movement in Dhaka in 1940 is also mentioned in the book by Hannan, M entitled *The History of Student Movement in Bangladesh: 1830-71*.

2. The present author failed to find records of any such case in the West Bengal State Archives.

3. The essential pre-requisites for forming a genuine communist party have further been enriched by Shibdas Ghosh in the book entitled *Why SUCI is the only Genuine Communist Party in India* as follows:

   First, those who have taken the lead in forming the party would have to lay the foundation of ideological centralism first among themselves through a socialist movement based on dialectical materialism covering all aspects, including the minutest details, of their personal lives.

   Secondly, it is always to be borne in mind that the struggle for developing a concrete concept of collective leadership is, in essence, the primary struggle to build up a communist party. For this, unless ideological centralism, that is to say, one process of thinking, uniformity of thinking, oneness in approach, singleness of purpose has been developed the concrete conception and personified expression of collective leadership within the party cannot be made possible at all. And unless this condition is fulfilled, it is to be understood, the time has not yet come to give a final organizational shape to the party. For, if finalisation of the formal structure of the party is attempted before that, the party will invariably be mechanically centralised instead of being democratically centralised and, in course of its development, will surely give birth to formal and bureaucratic leadership in place of collective leadership.

Thirdly, through a relentless and painstaking struggle a band of professional revolutionaries is to be developed from among the leaders and cadres who have taken up the cause of formation of a revolutionary working class party. ............in the Marxist terminology, a 'professional revolutionary' does never mean a paid whole-time worker. Professional revolutionaries are those
who constitute the most advanced section of the militant and conscious proletariat who, through a socialist movement, not merely in economic-political fields but in all aspects of life, have been able to embrace Marxism Leninism, that is the revolutionary ideology of the proletariat, in such a manner that they are capable of engaging themselves constantly in the very many complex battles of the revolutionary life --gladly, unwaveringly and without any reservation --rising above all their personal considerations, needs and difficulties and who can unhesitatingly and happily submit everything personal to the party in the interest of revolution. If the leadership of the party, at different levels, is constituted from among such professional revolutionaries, then only can a party acquire the character of a real communist party. Only when all these three conditions are fulfilled, can the formal constitutional shape be given to a real communist party through a congress. And without fulfilling these three primary conditions, a formal constitutional shape to a real working class party should never be given. (Ghosh, S, 1992: 207-209-Italics added)

4. One very interesting thing to note here is that the present writer failed so far to come across any RSP literature dealing with the issues raised by SUCI. They admitted the existence of those issues verbally while interviewing them, but no written document could be traced. Even in a 1970 pamphlet Tridib Chaudhuri writes: ‘The information about their (SUC and Forward Bloc) theoretical points of view has, however, been rather scanty in the documents at hand’. (Chaudhuri, 1970: 40) Similarly, the SUCI literature of the later years not mentioned any words about the RSP except in their First National and International Theses adopted in 1948. It’s very difficult to retrieve proper history of the events under discussion because of lack of authenticated written documents.

Another interesting observation made by Makhan Paul in his interview with this researcher is that prior to first All India Convention of RSP in Delhi a membership drive was undertaken. Shibdas Ghosh, a RSP activist then, was given general membership of the party instead of active membership. Paul further told: ‘Shibdas Ghosh was then working as an insurance agent. He was not a whole time worker of the RSP. As Shibdas Ghosh was not accorded the active membership of the RSP, he, along with his followers, left the party to form the SUCI though at that stage they did not have any fundamental difference on political issues with the RSP.’
However, available documents like memoirs etc. written by other revolutionaries do not subscribe this narration of Makhan pal, particularly regarding the cause of denial of party membership. Since all documents substantiate the fact without any doubt that Shibdas Ghosh was actively involved at that period in political activities in underground, the identity as an insurance agent might had been used for disguising himself from police surveillance, if at all the story is true.

Nirmal Roychowdhury also writes that this parting away was not due to the basis of any ‘fundamental political-ideological difference’. The then leadership of the party (RSP) had no mentality to work with all and tolerance to different viewpoints. (Roychowdhury, 1395 BS: 158)

5. The information given by Rathin Sen could not be verified from any other source because the revolutionaries interviewed could not recollect properly the names of the members of the PEC except the name of Shibdas Ghosh.

6. Ganadabi: 10/08/1994: Excerpts from the speech of Nihar Mukherjee. English translation has been given in the main text.
7. A number of leading members of the SUCI who were involved in the process of building the party were expelled from the party within very short time of its first convention. To cite further examples of this kind of expulsion, the name of Nirmal Roychowdhury can be mentioned. He was one of the well-known students’ leaders of Bengal just before independence. He was associated with the SUCI and became the Paikpara (Kolkata) unit in charge of the party on 18/08/1949. But, within two months’ time through a central committee decision he was expelled from the party along with Promod Singha Roy and Ajit Basu. (Ganadabi: 15/10/1949)