CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The national revolutionary movement, generally known as ‘terrorism’, constituted one of the most significant aspects in the history of the Indian freedom movement. Imbued by the spirit of unrelenting fight against British imperialism, the national revolutionaries of India tried to set before the people of the country a bright example of personal courage and heroic self-sacrifice, and thereby wanted to instill a mood of defiance in the minds of the people in the face of colonial repression.

For many, the national revolutionaries represented the uncompromising trend of Indian freedom movement in terms of both their willingness and activities for complete national freedom and people’s liberation from imperialist exploitation, by arousing revolutionary upsurge. But this was not the dominant trend of the national freedom struggle. The reformist and compromising section of the Indian National Congress (INC) which was compromising both with imperialism and feudalism and thereby, playing the role of ‘reformist oppositional’ was the predominant trend during the entire freedom movement. The revolutionary trend in the Indian freedom movement of the twentieth century was most ably represented by the Anushilan Samiti, the Jugantar Federation, the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association - HSRA (formerly Hindustan Republican Association - HRA) and such other revolutionary parties and groups, and finally, by Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose and the Indian National Army (INA).

For the purpose of the present study, let us confine the term ‘national revolutionism’ following Gopal Halder, ‘to describe a pattern of activity pursued for a prolonged period of thirty years, from 1904 to 1934’. (Halder, 2002: 195; Habib, S. Irfan, 2017: 2) Basing themselves on the methods and examples of the revolutionary movements and secret societies of the West, the national revolutionaries, during the period 1904-1934, were involved ‘in organisation of secret societies, anti-imperialist indoctrination of their members, physical and moral training, collection of fire-arms, collection of fund by dacoities, assassination by bombs and fire-arms of enemies and traitors’. However, in spite of near unanimity among the writers on national revolutionary movement as to the methods and aims of the revolutionaries, there have been marked differences among them over the issue of choice of a proper term for denoting the same movement.

In Britain, the term ‘terrorist’ or ‘terrorism’ was popularized by British administrators who worked in India, for instance, Tegart’s speech at Royal Empire Society, London on November 1 1932 and
subsequent publication of 'Terrorism in India' pointed to a particular type of picture of revolutionaries of India, specially of Bengal. (Tegart, 1933/1983) Leaving aside this British-sponsored label of 'terrorism', a term generally used in a derogatory sense, the revolutionary nationalist movement in India may be termed as, inter alia:

(a) ‘Revolutionary Terrorism’ (Gopal Halder, Bipan Chandra, David M. Laushey, Tanika Sarker, Bidyut Chakraborty, etc.):

(b) ‘Revolutionary Nationalism’ (Tridib Chaudhury, Santimoy Roy, etc.):

(c) ‘Petty-bourgeois Revolutionism’ (B.K.Sinha, the accused Communist Party members in the Meerut Conspiracy case, Tridib Chaudhury, Shibdas Ghosh, Nihar Mukherjee, M.A. Persits, etc.):

and


(e) ‘Regional Nationalism’ (David M. Laushey)

However for avoiding any semantic confusion we may employ the term ‘national revolutionism’ for describing the uncompromising revolutionary trend of the Indian freedom struggle. The movement can be termed so because the struggle initiated by the uncompromising freedom fighters was basically a national liberation movement with a revolutionary content. As has been analysed by many, it was revolutionary in content because the revolutionaries were dreaming of a free India where the eighteenth century humanist ideology of democratic revolutions of Europe emphasizing the principles of liberty, equality, fraternity, tolerance and secularism would be able to establish itself firmly in the Indian body politic.

As history has unfolded in later years, national revolutionism failed to reach its logical culmination. The revolutionaries came to the realisation that their achievements had been disproportionately small compared to their sacrifices. As a result, by the thirties of the 20th century, a large number of national revolutionaries started feeling that their ‘exclusively petty bourgeois movement ... had reached its climax’. It could not develop further. So, the national revolutionaries started engaging themselves in
search for a new ideology and programme which they expected would help them in rectifying faults and errors, if any, in their line of struggle pursued so long. This search ultimately culminated in most of the revolutionaries accepting Marxism. Incidentally, though the Communist Party of India (CPI) was founded in India in 1925 as the first organised Marxist party of the country, Marxism as an idea had come to India much earlier, mainly through the efforts of the Indian revolutionaries abroad. And with the passage of time, by the thirties of the last century, it gained strong ground in Indian mass psyche. As a result, distinct swing towards Marxism was noticed clearly in many of the Indian national revolutionaries and a form of transition from national revolutionism to Marxism was discernible.

However, just the conversion to Marxism was not an end in itself. The assigned task for the national revolutionaries who did accept Marxism, now, was to find out a suitable strategy supported by proper theoretical analysis for revolutionary preparations in India for which Marxism offered an alternative paradigm. This, however, in the process, gave birth to not one or two, but a number of leftist-Marxist political parties in the Indian soil.

**ORIGIN OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM:**

The Indian nationalist movement was a continuous process starting from small scale local resistance to an all India movement. During the years following the Great Uprising of 1857, it also traversed from a ‘policy of appeasement’ towards the British rulers to a movement of the people of India. During this period which spanned almost ninety years from 1858 (Queen’s Proclamation) to 1947 (achievement of Independence), the participants of the nationalist struggle followed variety of strategies, tactics and mode of involving masses of different strata against British rule. These may be classified into four broad categories: (Abbas, Kumar, Alam, 2011: 69)

a) Ideological Critique of the British colonial rule  
b) Strategy of legal-constitutional advancement  
c) Radical & revolutionary activities  
d) Mass mobilisation

The nationalist struggle was carried out not only at the political level but also at the ideological-cultural level. The British rulers looked upon the Indian culture & education contumaciously and always tried to impose the view that they are superior race engaged in a civilizational mission in India. Whatever be the truth of this assertion, their over-enthusiasm made many of the then Indian intellectuals hostile against
them. Considering the few century old history of long heritage of civilization and culture of this subcontinent, the then Indian intellectuals became very aggrieved against English rulers’ contemptuous attitude towards the Indians. They initiated an ideological battle against the British claim of superiority. Again, the nationalist movement tried a combination of constitutional and mass mobilisation strategies. Constitutional methods of putting demands on the colonial government were an important strategy of the Indian National Congress during its formative years and also in the next century. Similarly, under the leadership of the Indian National Congress, the strategy of huge mass mobilisation became one of the strongest methods against the colonial rulers. The mass participation in anti-British protest movement could be seen even in 1905 in Bengal against the proposal of partition when the INC was not at all thinking about mass involvement. But after the Swadeshi movement up to the Quit India Movement, the country had seen a number of mass upsurges though not continuously. However, the Radical & Revolutionary activities as an important strategy of national movement are of great relevance for the present work. The attack by Chapekar Brothers on Rand in Pune in 1897 may be treated as first such event of radical activities. But it was Bengal which saw the upsurge of radical and revolutionary activities mostly from 1904 to 1934.

The year 1934 saw the termination of explicit national revolutionary politics, particularly in Bengal and the United Provinces. After 1934, no act of violence had been perpetrated which indicates that the national revolutionaries, by that time, had lost their attraction in the politics of ‘terrorism’. In the meantime, as the colonial repression went on unabated, most of the revolutionary activists belonging to different revolutionary parties and groups were under detention. About 2500 men and dozens of women were imprisoned in different jails and detention camps in the main lands. About 400 prisoners from all over India were imprisoned at Andaman Cellular Jail. (Halder, 2002, 221) It was during these detention years that the national revolutionaries found time for reviewing their strategies and tactics followed for the last thirty years on the issue whether it was possible to achieve complete independence and people’s liberation through strategies and tactics hitherto followed. For some national revolutionaries, at least, Marxism offered the most plausible solution to their problem.

Most of the revolutionaries who were detained in various places in the mainland were released in 1937-38 (in the case of Andaman detenus, it was 1946). Many of them came out of the jail as staunch supporters of either Gandhism or Marxism, and some of them dropped out of politics altogether. But none of them were in the mood of pursuing the former line of action and reverting to the old ‘terrorist’ path. So, in 1938, the Jugantar and the HSRA were formally dissolved. The Anushilan Samiti, though not
formally dissolved, also ceased to exist as a separate revolutionary party. The national revolutionaries who were still then in politics either joined the political parties already existing at the time or took part in forming new political parties in line with their newly acquired ideological preferences. Thus, ‘terrorism’ per se had become a thing of the past with all the parties.

The national revolutionaries were basically nationalist; therefore, joining the mainstream nationalist politics under the Congress was naturally expected. But, barring a few, most of them did not join the Congress. This phenomenon presents an important problem for understanding as well as investigation in our present work.

Besides the INC during the thirties, there had been the Communist Party of India (CPI-1925) and the Communist League (CL)-1934 (Laushey, 1975: 112), both of which claimed themselves as the real Marxist parties. Further, in the then political milieu, there were also the Roy Group - the followers of M.N.Roy-1931 (Laushey, 1975: 111, Roy, D, 1989: 9), The Labour Party -1932 (Laushey, 1979: 113) and the Congress Socialist Party (CSP-1934), all of which had some kind of Marxist leanings.

The national revolutionaries who accepted Marxism as the guiding principle in their unaccomplished national freedom struggle, however, failed to organise themselves into a single unified Marxist party. Rather, they remained disunited as earlier. Whether the differences in understanding and realisation of the basic postulates of Marxism or the clash of personality among the revolutionaries and the resulting sectarianism were the real causes behind the disunity among these adherents of Marxism and subsequent formation of a good number of leftist-Marxist parties, also present a set of problems for investigation in the present study.

The revolutionaries who formed the ‘Communist Consolidation’ in different jails joined the CPI after their release. Another group of Marxists comprising members both from the Anushilan Samiti and the HSRA, instead of joining the CPI, started working with the CSP as a separate group since 1938, though the venture proved to be a short lived one. Simultaneously, a rapid change in the political scenario, particularly in Bengal, was taking place. The Communist League became the Revolutionary Communist Party of India (RCPI) in 1942 under the leadership of Soumyendranath Tagore. The Roy Group became the League of Radical Congressmen in 1939, and sometime later, 1940, took the name of Radical Democratic Party (RDP). The Labour Party established its underground wing in the name of Bolshevik Party of India (BPI) in 1939. Dutt Mazumdar, the actual founder of Labour Party, developed differences
with the large number of the members of the party executive committee over his insistence of adopting ‘anti-war’ line and was suspended from the party in December 1942. But an undaunted Dutt Mazumdar while in the process of reorganizing the party was arrested in the same month only to be released in November 1945. The Labour Party was almost dead by that time and he joined the Congress and in 1946 won the Barrackpore labour seat election on a Congress ticket. That was the formal death of the Labour Party. The other section of the party continued their activities in the name of Bolshevik Party of India. (Basu, N, 1992: 93-94)

Another important leftist party of the time was the Forward Bloc (FB) founded by Subhash Chandra Bose in 1940. The rank of the party was swelled by the joining of the national revolutionaries belonging to Bengal Volunteers, Sree Sangha, Dipali Sangha, Benu Group, other revolutionary groups and a number of leading Jugantar activists.

Two political parties, however, were formed exclusively by the national revolutionaries turned Marxists, belonging to Anushilan & HSRA as Marxist parties. These parties are the Revolutionary Socialist Party (RSP-1940) and the Socialist Unity Centre of India (SUCI-1946/1948). The Democratic Vanguards (DV) was also formed in 1943 by some of the ex-Jugantar revolutionaries turned Marxists not as a political party but as a vanguard under the leadership of Jibanlal Chatterjee. The DV, formed out of a ‘large block’ of Radical Democrats who resented M N Roy’s pro-British policies, declared that it would take initiative in building a true party ‘when the time was ripe’. (Laushay, 1975: 132) ‘It is not a party. It will have an organisation for the efficient and systematic execution of its work thus contributing its maximum to the cause while eliminating all wastage and over-lapping.’ (Democratic Vanguards, 1943) The Democratic Vanguards later became the Workers Party of India in 1960.

It is also to be acknowledged that a number of Marxist groups were also formed before by some revolutionaries who broke away from different national revolutionary parties and groups. They wanted to work among the workers, peasants and the youths on the basis of communist ideology. These were Young Comrades’ League (1928) - the first organisation to have shifted from national revolutionism to Marxism, the Indian Proletarian Revolutionary Party or Gananayaka Party (1931), Jessore- Khulna Youth Association (formed in 1926 but formally accepted Marxism in 1931); Samyaraj Party, Communist Party of Bengal (1930). All of these parties later on merged with the CPI before World War II. (Majumdar, 1979: 163-168, 208-212; Chandra, 1992: 89-159) As all these parties joined the CPI and accepted the policies of the CPI adopted during the time, transition of these parties are not within the purview of our
study. We are concerned with those parties and groups only who accepted Marxism but, at the same time, rejected the Comintern/CPI policies on the nature and characterization of India’s national liberation movement.

The RSP originated in 1940 through the efforts of a number of ‘Anushilan Marxists′ and the HSRA activists who did not join the CPI upon their release from the jails. As these groups of Marxists had differences with those of the CPI on many counts, including the role of the Comintern in a colonial country and the characterisation of the INC-led freedom movement, they preferred to work rather with the CSP for providing an ‘alternative to the official Communist line’. However, very shortly, these Anushilan and the HSRA Marxists severed their relationship with the CSP and formed their own party known as RSP.

Again, a group of younger Anushilanites who were associated with the process of formation of the RSP as a separate Marxist party soon started expressing their reservations by way of publishing political pamphlets relating to the organisational structure and the process of formation of the party, as well as its main ideological planks vis-à-vis the role of Stalin as a living authority of international communist movement and the Comintern. As these differences of opinion could not be resolved within the organisational framework of the RSP, this group of Marxists, ‘both in continuity of the struggle within RSP and after a break with it’ evolved a ‘Platform of Action with a party content’ in 1946 with some other like-minded groups and then, in 1948, founded the SUCI (renamed as SUCI-Communist since 2009), as a political party.

The present researcher intends to study the differences of opinion between these RSP and the SUCI on the issue of conferring and acknowledging the leading role to the Comintern in guiding the national revolutionary movements in colonies? And also, what were the reactions of the RSP leadership towards the activities of the SUCI organisers, when the latter group of people was in the process of forming their ‘Platform of Action’ by severing organisational ties with the RSP?

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROPOSED STUDY:**

The present study does not intend to repeat what is already found in the existing literature, but to supplement it and, therefore, restricts its scope to study the processes of formation of the two political parties, viz. the RSP and the SUCI. The brief overview of existing literature below indicates that there has been very little or no work at all on the process of origins of these two parties owing to the conversion
from national revolutionism to Marxism. Further, since the Kolkata Congress session of 1928, the revolutionaries of Bengal stood solidly behind Subhash Chandra. Barring the unfortunate dissension among the revolutionaries over the issue of conflict between Subhash and J M Sengupta, the revolutionaries all over the country supported each and every move of Subhash in his bid to follow a parallel line of action in opposition to Gandhi-led movement. This continued till 1939 Tripuri Congress after which Subhash formed Forward Bloc. But, even then national revolutionaries turned Marxists were part of the Subhash-led left consolidation committee (LCC). They also supported wholeheartedly the INA and took the leading role during Quit India Movement and anti-INA Trial Movement, particularly in Bengal. A large section of Anushilan and HSRA revolutionaries were associated in the process of formation of RSP and SUCI. Therefore, without a detailed study of the activities of these revolutionary organisations who were associated with these two parties, correct reading of various facets of India freedom movement could not be understood properly. In this backdrop, the present work can modestly claim to be possibly the first work of its kind. The present study has been able to consult some documents (some of which are annexed as appendices with this dissertation) concerning the ideological positions of the RSP and the SUCI, which are not previously attended properly. These documents of the RSP and the SUCI throw a better light on the process of transition towards Marxism as well as on the ideological currents which led to split and fragmentation of revolutionaries into multiple political parties and groups. Therefore, it is fondly expected that the completion of the present work would certainly add some new dimensions to the existing storehouse of information on an important aspect of the Indian national revolutionary movement as well as post-independent left movement.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PRESENT STUDY:

The broad and general purpose of the present study, as has been already indicated, is to investigate and explore the causes behind the conversion from national revolutionism to Marxism and consequent formation of multiple leftist-Marxist political parties in India with the common purpose of establishing scientific socialism on the basis of the Marxist notion of historical development and revolution.

Within the ambit of this general purpose, the primary objective of the present work would be to analyse the forces and factors leading to the formation of the Revolutionary Socialist Party (RSP) and the Socialist Unity Centre of India (SUCI). In doing so, the study seeks to investigate the problems relating to the growth of a number of Marxist political parties in India, including those of RSP and SUCI, on the basis of

(a) the socio-economic formations of the then India, (b) the process of development of petty-
bourgeois vis-à-vis proletarian class consciousness among the Indian national revolutionaries, and (c) the diverse socio-economic backgrounds of the revolutionaries.

As a logical corollary to the primary objective stated above, the proposed study will seek to fulfill the following specific objectives.

First, proper attention is to be given on the analysis of the ideological differences among the national revolutionaries centering round their concepts of nationalism vis-à-vis internationalism, their attitude towards armed rebellion vis-à-vis mass revolution etc.

Secondly, the proposed study will also seek to undertake a detailed analysis of such phenomena as:

(a) the influence of the foreign Communist Parties and Comintern on the national revolutionaries;

(b) influence of individuals inducted to communist doctrine abroad;

(c) patterns of ideological debates among the revolutionaries during the prison days, particularly in the mid-thirties of the present century and various influencing factors including workers and peasants movement;

(d) the degree of exposure to Marxism before and after the detention;

(e) the experience of direct participation in the mass movement;

(f) the despair among the revolutionaries and masses over the compromising attitude towards imperialism on the part of the Indian National Congress led by Mahatma Gandhi; and

(g) the growing tension in the urban-industrial areas on the basis of the class-based trade union movement.

Thirdly, by the late forties, the process of conversion from national revolutionism to either nationalist mainstream or Marxism had more or less been completed. A number of leftist-Marxist political parties including the RSP and the SUCI came into existence in the process. In our present exercise, therefore, the mutual differences between the RSP and the SUCI concerning their attitude towards stages of Indian
revolution, the process of formation of a Marxist party, the role of Comintern in colonial countries etc., more particularly, the ideological position and circumstances leading to the formation of RSP and SUCI would also be given adequate attention.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

On the basis of the primary and subsidiary objectives delineated above, the present study will seek to find exhaustive and comprehensive answers to certain specific questions and issues, of an illustrative nature, related to the general theme. The research questions may be outlined as follows:

1. What were the patterns of interaction between Marxism/ Marxist parties and national revolutionism before the national revolutionaries’ conversion to Marxism? And further, what was the attitude of the Indian national revolutionaries towards Marxism in the wake of the Russian Revolution of 1917?

2. What was the impact of the growing trade-union and peasant movements in remoulding and reshaping the ideas of ‘national revolutionaries’? Why did some of the national revolutionaries accept Marxism, while, at the same time, some of their revolutionary friends joined the nationalist mainstream?

3. Why did the colleagues of the same revolutionary parties and groups e.g. revolutionaries belonging to the Anushilan Samiti, Jugantar or HSRA etc. part with one another at the penultimate stage of the national liberation movement and far from uniting into a single Marxist party prefer to remain disunited either by joining or forming different leftist and Marxist political parties?

4. What were the positive and negative influences of the Comintern, first, in the process of transition to Marxism and then, in the origins of a number of Marxists political parties in India? In more concrete terms, why did a number of adherents of Marxism of the Anushilan Party and the HSRA, instead of joining the CPI, prefer to work with the Congress Socialist Party (CSP) by forming a group of their own named as ‘Anushilan Marxists’?

5. Why did most of the Anushilan Marxists and the HSRA activists working inside the CSP come out of the same and form a new Marxist party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, in 1940? Again,
why did a group of workers of the RSP come out of the RSP and form, first the ‘Platform of Action’ in 1946 and then, the Socialist Unity Centre of India as an independent Marxist political party in 1948? Further, What were the basic differences between the perceptions of the RSP and the SUCI on the interpretation of the basic postulates of Marxism relating to (a) the process of the formation of a Marxist political party, (b) the class correlation of forces and stages of revolution, (c) the character of newly-achieved independence and (d) role of the Comintern etc.?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHOD OF STUDY:

The central focus of the present exercise is on transition from national revolutionary politics in Bengal during first few decades of the twentieth century to a pre-dominantly Marxist ideology in the decade of 1940s. After 1938, some of the national revolutionaries joined mainstream nationalist politics and a large majority of them went over Marxism. Among those who embraced Marxism, some either joined or formed different Marxist political parties. Why so? The answer is searched with reference to formation of, first, the RSP and subsequently, the SUCI by national revolutionaries. The analysis focuses on ideological differences as such behaviours.

The exercise, actually, attempts to connect ideological position (different interpretations of Marxism) and choice of a political party. This is a question of political motivation and, in that sense, group-psychology. It, therefore, involves a question which cannot be answered with the aid of standard methods of research methodology comprising hypothesis testing, primary data collection through rigorous interview method, some kind of quantification through statistical analysis of relations among variables, case study method and so on. The present work, therefore, relies more on theoretical framework used mainly for normative elements/choices.

As a result of limitation of behavioural research methodology in addressing the issues concerning normative preferences like choice of ideology which is concern of the present study, the theoretical framework is derived from a critical perspective. The present study is concerned with ideological preference; and both Karl Marx and Mannheim connect ideologies with social structure. Marx in his famous passage of A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (Marx: 1859) and also in other writings placed ideology in the realm of super-structure, conditioned by economic base. By implication, knowledge of ideology demands knowledge of economic base. Similarly, Karl Mannheim in his Ideology
and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge (Mannheim: 2015) argues that thought is a cultural product and speaks of existential or social determination of cultural objects. In Mannheim’s scheme, analysis of ideology or ideological preference demands analysis of existential factors of ideology; because prevailing pattern of social life produces mental life corresponding to that social life.

In the light of such expositions of ideology, C. Wright Mills in his treatise The Marxists (Mills, C Wright: 2012) argues that the study of any ideological position requires the analysis of the historical context of both the ideology and its adherents. With reference to the above framework, the present study attempts at addressing the issue of transition towards Marxism on the part of national revolutionaries by placing them in the historical context of national movement and the background history of the leadership of the RSP and the SUCI. The framework, therefore, emphasises contextual analysis of ideological positions.

In addition, the present work also is premised upon the idea that social trust or what Robert Putnam in his book Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy (Putnam: 1993) calls social capital, also plays an important role in determination of political choices and efficiency. Putnam argues that presence of horizontal linkages among individuals and groups in voluntary associations improve political performance of the government. Similarly, the present work assumes that social trust generated by associations like Anushilan Samiti or Jugantar was one of the conditions which shaped ideological preferences of the RSP and the SUCI. The framework, therefore, approaches the whole issue of transition in its historical and sociological context.

The scope and objectives of the proposed project, therefore, clearly suggest the application of historical-analytical method with an insight into the process of dialectical development of class-consciousness, favouring the working class and growth of revolutionary politics. The above method, however, is to be supplemented by:

(a) analysis of the content of the primary and archival documents pertaining to the present project, and

(b) extensive interview with the living personalities of the erstwhile national revolutionary parties who were converted to Marxism during the pre-Independence period, not on the basis of structured or even open-ended questionnaire, but rather as an informal and extended face-
to-face conversation for obtaining purposeful insight into this phenomenon (unstructured open-ended interviews).

**SOURCES OF DATA:**

There is by now a significant number of books and articles dealing with the national revolutionaries’ transition to Marxism, though the discussions in most of these works relating to the present project are very brief and ignore the totality of socio-economic conditions. Most of these studies deal with the problem in isolation and, therefore, appeared to be unrealistic and abstract. However, in conducting the present study, main emphasis is to be given on the collection and analysis of data from the primary sources. The following are the primary sources to be used in this proposed work:

(a) The files of the Home Department, Political Section and Government of India preserved in the National Archives;

(b) Government reports pertaining to national revolutionary movements kept in different State Archives;

(c) Memoirs and other published accounts of the national revolutionaries-turned-Marxists;

(d) Policy documents, pamphlets, leaflets, etc. published by both the national revolutionary parties, groups and the leftist-Marxist political parties;

(e) Interview with the living personalities of the pre-Independence national revolutionary and leftist-Marxist parties;

(f) History-sheets of the national revolutionaries’ available in different archives and libraries.

**BRIEF REVIEW OF LITERATURE:**

There have been several commendable efforts to explain the national revolutionary movement in colonial India and the later day shift from national revolutionism to Marxism. Publications include both of general and specific nature:

(a) The books dealing with the general nature of the national revolutionary movement *per se.*
(b) The publications concerning the growth of working class movements as well as growth of leftist/communist movements and parties in India and the interactions of these movements and parties with the nationalist parties and the ideas of the time;

(c) The books, monographs, memories, articles etc. dealing with the process of transition from national revolutionism to either nationalist mainstream or leftism-Marxism;

(d) The publications involving more specifically the issues relating to the origins of the RSP and the SUCI.

Under the first category of the above classificatory scheme may be mentioned, at the beginning, Nimai Pramanik’s (1984) Gandhi and the Indian National Revolutionaries which analyses the complex patterns of interaction between Gandhi and the Indian national revolutionaries during the period 1919-1940 and national revolutionaries’ subsequent transition to left or right-wing politics.

In Colonialism, Class and Nation- the Confrontation in Bombay Around 1930, G K Lieten (1984) traces the growth of movements of the working class in Bombay why they failed in establishing its hegemony over the independence movement. The book also makes a detailed examination of the developments within the organisations of the working class and a reinterpretation of the role of the communists in the period 1928-1932.

In his Russian Revolution and the Indian Patriots, Panchanan Saha (1987) tries to bring out how the leaders, activists and intellectuals of the national movement drew inspiration from the events and developments in the (erstwhile) Soviet Union. It also attempts to present the impact of the Russian Revolution on the growth of the peasants’ and workers’ movements in India.

Jibantara Halder (1989) in his Bharater Swadhinata Sangrame Anushilan Samitir Bhumika (in Bengali) attempts to discuss, in brief, the role and contribution of the Anushilan activists in the freedom movement of India.

Leonard A. Gordon (1990) in his biographical work Brothers Against the Raj-A Biography of Sarat & Subhas Chandra Bose analyses in details the process of the growth of nationalist consciousness among the two brothers and how they became the most iconic leaders of left-oriented nationalists and how Subhas posed a challenge against the Gandhian leadership. The all out support Subhas received from the
national revolutionaries from every part of India and how he became the leader of these revolutionaries for waging a battle against the British Raj in the penultimate phase of Indian national struggle has also been discussed in this work.

Bidyut Chakrabarty’s (1990) *Subhas Chandra Bose and Middle Class Radicalism-A Study in Indian Nationalism, 1928-1940* attempts a detailed study of his role as a major political leader within Indian nationalism. It also looks at Subhas’s politics in the late twenties and thirties of the twentieth century, when, with Nehru, he tried to represent radicalism and militancy in mainstream politics. Finally, the author tries to trace the origin of middle-class radicalism and what were its inherent contradictions.

Dalia Roy’s (1990) *The Bengal Revolutionaries and Freedom Movement*, while tracing the historical background of the national revolutionary movement in Bengal, also attempts to analyse the political, religious, socio-economic and educational ideas of Bengal revolutionaries during the period 1902-1919.

Hirendranath Chakraborty (1992) in his *Political Protest in Bengal Boycott and Terrorism 1905-1918* gives an account about the organisational structures and activities of the various revolutionary parties and groups of the then India which originated in the wake of the partition of Bengal in 1905.

Nirban Basu (1992) in his book *The Political Parties & the Labour Politics 1937-47 with special reference to Bengal* tries to analyse the question of relationship between nationalist political movement and industrial working class movement, particularly in Bengal. The author also attempts at examining how the various political parties and groups including the CPI and other non-conformist left groups looked at the problems of labour and actually executed these, and secondly, how the workers themselves responded to the call of the political parties.

Amitava Chandra’s (1992) *Abhikata Banglay Communist Andolan: Suchana Parba*, (In Bengali) traces the origin of communist movement in Bengal in the thirties of the twentieth century including CPI and a number of other leftist parties. Further, the transition from national revolutionary politics to communism has also been traced by the author in this book but confined only to parties which are non-existent presently. Objectives of his discussion were limited and, therefore, not complete & exhaustive.

Santimoy Roy (1993) in his *The Revolutionary Nationalist Movement - Its Contribution to India’s Freedom struggle* covers the period from 1900 to 1934 and seeks to make an evaluation of the national revolutionary movement in the overall perspective of the Indian freedom struggle.
Narahari Kaviraj’s (1999) *Swadhinatar Sangrame Bangla* (in Bengali) is a collection of essays where the author tries to prove that ‘bourgeoisie nationalist movement’ and peasant uprisings are not contradictory to each other but complementary to anti-imperialist struggle though they are not identical in nature. This work also discusses the more revolutionary trends in post-world war II India and the role of CPI in the Indian freedom movement.

Dipesh Chakrabarty (2000) in his pioneering work *Rethinking Working-Class History: Bengal 1890-1940* examines in detail the history of a specific labour force- the jute-mill workers of Bengal under British rule as, according to the author, these workers constitute an important section of the Indian working class. In this study, the author comes to the conclusion, *inter alia*, that in India the working class and peasant movements could not give up their fragmentation along the lines of religion, language, ethnicity etc. The author, further, argues that the history of the working class movements in India showed that the religious, ethnic, caste loyalties etc. were much stronger than their class loyalties. In a sense, the sectarian beliefs of the workers could not be surpassed by class loyalties which also could be observed in the activities and ideas of the Indian national revolutionaries.


Ashoke Kumar Mukhopadhyay in his edited work *‘Terrorism’- A Colonial Construct* (2009) presents select British Home Department Intelligence Reports on Indian Nationalist Revolutionary Activities, 1907-1936 and in the introduction traces the origins and development of national revolutionary movements in India with a brief description of revolutionary activities in various phases from 1897.

Amalendu De edited volume titled as *Anushilan Samitir Itihas* (2013) (In Bengali) contains five informative articles on the history of Anushilan Samiti including the role played by the women cadres in the Samiti. The activities of Anushilan have been discussed in three phases: 1902-1910, 1910-1914 and 1914-1934 in three different articles. But the uniqueness of this volume is that it contains a list of the activities of the Anushilan revolutionaries undertaken after 1934. The list is prepared on the basis of archival documents has been provided as appendices. This is a very important document pertaining to
the Anushilan activities undertaken after most of the leaders and workers were arrested. As per this list, the last case pertaining to the Anushilan revolutionaries was that of a case dated 12/13 January 1936. This chronological history of Anushilan up to its last action is very much relevant for our present discussion.

_Bengal Marxism: Early Discourses and Debates_ by Anuradha Roy (2014) discusses and debates on Marxist theory in Bengal from about the time of November Revolution of 1917 till Indian independence. The author also describes the various perceptions of revolution among the Bengal Marxists who believed that revolution would take place in the realm of culture.

Chandan Basu’s (2015) _Radical Ideology and ‘Controlled’ Politics: CPI and the History of West Bengal 1947-1964_ discuss, _inter alia_, Leninist and Mao’s conception of party formation and also Communism in Indian perspective.

Arun Chandra Guha (n.d.) in his auto-biographical monograph, _Aurobindo and Jugantar_, tries to depict the history of _Jugantar_ Party from its inception to its formal dissolution tries to depict the history of _Jugantar_ Party from its inception to its formal dissolution in 1938 and the role played by Aurobindo in providing the necessary ideological foundations of revolutionary politics.

Autobiographical writings of revolutionaries like those of Bhupendrakumar Dutt (First Ed 1953) Trailokyanath Chakroborty (First Ed 1375-BS), Hemchandra Kanungo (First Ed 1928), Pratul Chandra Ganguly (1976), Satish Pakrashi, Jadugopal Mukherjee, Jogesh Chandra Chatterjee (1977), Sachindranath Sanyal, Nalini Kishore Guha (First Ed 1330- BS), Gopal Halder (1958), S.N. Mazumdar (1979), Narayan Banerjee, Nalini Das (1974) etc., also provide very useful information about the growth and sustenance of national revolutionary movement and the cross-currents of thinking among the revolutionaries on the issue of whether to continue their old political line of ‘terrorism’ and armed action or to accept Marxism as guiding ideology in the penultimate phase of freedom movement.

Gopal Halder’s (1958) article entitling ‘Revolutionary Terrorism’ in _Studies in the Bengal Renaissance_ (ed. A.C.Gupta) attempts to present a number of specific reasons behind the dissolution of the then national revolutionary parties and the gradual acceptance of Marxist ideology by a good number of activists of these parties and groups.
Under the second category of our classification of literature, we may mention, at first, Gautam Chattopadhyay’s (1967) pioneering publication *Rus Biplob O Banglar Mukti Andolan* (in Bengali) which traces the impact of November Revolution of 1917 on the national liberation movement in Bengal and how a great number of national revolutionaries became attracted and converted to Marxism during the period.

In his *Leftist Movements in India: 1917-1947*, Satyabrata Rai Chowdhuri (1977) makes an attempt to present a comprehensive account of the leftist movements in India during the period of freedom struggle and also to describe the manner in which they interacted with the mainstream of the Indian national movement. The work also tries to discover the elements that contributed to the emergence of the pre-Independence leftist movements in India, the factors that moulded them, the part they played in India’s freedom movement, their characteristics, temper and outlook etc.

Sobhanlal Datta Gupta’s (1980) *Comintern, India and the Colonial Question, 1920-37* explores the Comintern’s policy towards India in the twenties and thirties for identifying the problems and characters of the Communist movement in this country. It also stresses the point how India played an especially important role in the Comintern’s work out of the colonial question and how in India the colonial question had grown particularly complex because Indian nationalist bourgeoisie’s ‘vacillating role’ in the national liberation struggle.

Nandini Gooptu (2001) in her research work *The Politics of the Urban Poor in Early Twentieth-Century India* focuses on the role of the poor in caste, religious and nationalist politics and tries to show that how they emerged as a major social and political factor in South Asia during the interwar period. The author also explores their central importance in the economy through a discussion of the patterns of urbanization, migration and employment and the development of a casual, informal labour market. She draws her empirical data from towns in Uttar Pradesh like Benares & Kanpur. The author further tries to show the process of cultural transformation among the poor and their construction of social identities by concentrating on their modes of political action and perceptions. This book attempts to take us to an understanding of urban social history and nationalist movement of India.

Debnarayan Modak (2006) in *Dynamics of National Question in India—The Communist Approach (1942-64)* examines the CPI’s attempt to develop an alternative understanding of the national question as early as in 1940s by characterising India as a ‘multi-national’ entity and how due to a number of miscalculations coupled with ‘mechanical’ application of the Marxist principle of the right of self-determination of nations and ‘blind adherence’ to the experiences of the USSR were ‘construed’ merely as the support for the Muslim League’s demand for Pakistan. So the author concludes that it caused enough harm to the growth of communism, in general, during the pre-independence period.

D N Gupta’s (2008) *Communism and Nationalism in Colonial India: 1939-45* claims to make an in-depth study of the CPI’s approach towards Indian national movement and British colonialism from 1939 to 1945. It also attempts to analyse points of views with regard to why the CPI failed to expose what it termed as the ‘betrayal’ of the ‘bourgeoisie nationalist’ leadership and why it was not able to establish its ‘hegemony’ over the Indian freedom movement to transform the ‘bourgeoisie democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.’

Arun Ghosh’s (Compiler) *Janayuddha Deshbhag o Bharater Communist Party Dalil Sangraha in Bengali* *Vol I (1942-44), Vol II (1945-1946), Vol III (1946), Vol IV (1946-47)* (published respectively in 2009, 2010, 2011) help in gaining information based on primary sources the turmoiling situation of the time through which the country and the CPI was passing.

In his 2006 and subsequently, enlarged edition in 2011, publication *Comintern and the Destiny of Communism in India 1919-1943- Dialectics of Real and a Possible History* Sobhanlal Datta Gupta tries to assert that the rigid disciplinary control of Comintern over the national communist parties ensured through the enforcement of 21 conditions adopted in the Second Comintern Congress, 1920 constituted the precondition for a party to be recognized by the Comintern made it imperative for the communist parties to accept its decisions as unconditionally binding on them and the destinies of the parties thus came to be inseparably linked with shifts in the policies of the Comintern. So, the author concludes that these preconditions ‘prefigured’ the destiny of communist parties in different parts of the world including Indian communist party.

*The Comintern and the East-Strategy and Tactics* by A.Reznikov (1984) throws light, in the main, on the patterns of interaction between the Comintern and the CPI during the twenties and the thirties of the last century.
Sashi Bairathi’s (1987) *Communism and Nationalism in India* attempts to investigate into the complicated course of relationship between these two movements for identifying the historical forces and processes those acted as connecting link between communism and nationalism.

Tapan Kumar Banerjee (1992) in his work *Concept of the Party: From Marx to Gramsci* attempts to delineate a common thread in the midst of divergence among the Marxist thinkers and to search for consistency in the theory of the Marxist party. The author also discusses divergent and shifting positions of Marx and the classical Marxists centering round issues like the origin of revolutionary consciousness, class-party relationship, place of democracy within the party, position and role of the party in the stage of dictatorship of the proletariat and the like.

Sanjoy Seth’s (1995) *Marxist Theory and Nationalist Politics: The case of Colonial India* throws light on Marxism’s ‘engagement’ with nationalism in the Indian context. This work tries to examine how those committed to the socialist project, conceived and imagined through Marxist categories, came to cast their gaze beyond Europe: how they came to regard nationalism as the essential feature of the non-Western world; the ways in which the relation between their own project and the nationalist one came to be conceived in the context of colonial India; and the profound consequences of this encounter for Marxist theory and for communist movements in India and elsewhere in the colonies.

Lakshman Rai (1995) in his PhD dissertation *Soviet Policy towards Anti-colonial Movement in Asia: a case study of Comintern and India, 1919-1943* tries to tread upon the areas of Soviet foreign policy which was directly guided and dictated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. During the period of this research work, i.e., 1 919-1 943, the institution of Soviet foreign policy was hardly in making owing to which, the author argues, one could find no difference between the government and party. In this study the author tries to investigate the roots of Soviet policy towards anticolonial movement in Asia with a special case of Communist International and India.

Norberto Steinmayr (September 2000) in a revealing and sensational article *Stalin and the Comintern* examines Stalin's relationship with the Third Communist International. He argues that after a period of militant involvement, ‘Stalin was prevented from active leadership, and excluded from effective influence, since the late twenties’ in the affairs of Comintern. So, Steinmayr argues, Stalin cannot therefore be held accountable for the ‘revisionist distortions’ related to sectarian ultra-left tactics and then unprincipled united fronts. Such a political "isolation" around Stalin as a "prisoner" in the Kremlin
was equally reflected within the CPSU (B) after the war. ‘Having confined him to "harmless" activities such as writing on linguistics and economics, concealed revisionists orchestrated his death before being able to betray the working class and fully restore capitalism in the Soviet Union’. Breaking a long established tradition, at the 19th Party Congress in 1952 the CC report was not presented by its general secretary, Stalin, but by Georgi Malenkov. Not the slightest trace of proletarian internationalism appears in Malenkov’s report. But in contrast, it was Stalin that, in a short speech to the Congress, highly praised the communist parties of the various countries and the newly created people's democracies by characterising them as the new "'shock brigades' of the world-wide revolutionary and workers' movement." The author further writes that ‘this was also Stalin's last public address, a revolutionary call from an outstanding leader who consistently fought for socialism and communism, and against revisionism, throughout his life and in the most difficult circumstances.’

Amitava Chandra (2003) in his PhD work *The Communist Party and Movement in Bengal 1930 to 1947- A Case Study of Three districts Calcutta Howrah and Murshidabad* tries to show that nationalism, meaning thereby bourgeois nationalism, emerged as the counter hegemonic force in colonial India and the CPI failed to understand properly the potentialities of nationalism as a counter hegemonic force. Thus the CPI was always confused, according to the author, as to how it would convincingly address the issue of nationalism in colonial India. Furthermore, the CPI could not also properly understand and address the Gandhi phenomenon. This hegemonic potentiality and prowess of Gandhi remained beyond the reach of the understanding of the CPI. Thus the CPI could not properly counter the hegemonic influence of Gandhi, which was expected from it. The failure to make an authentic, innovative and serious understanding of the objective socio-political reality of India with all the intricacies, complexities and complications of colonial India, which was intimately associated with the ‘mechanical application of the Comintern line in India’, prevented the CPI from emerging as the hegemonic force and also from providing the 'alternative leadership' to the national liberation movement. Overemphasis upon only the class struggle and class issues and negligence of the non-class issues like the communal issues or caste issues or gender issues and so on having their own autonomy and independence, also further blurred the vision of the CPI. As a result of this blurred vision, the author concludes, the CPI and the communist movement in India had to suffer. A mechanical understanding of the relationship of the non-class issues vs. the class issues, implying thereby the consideration of all the non-class issues as the direct derivative of the class issues without having their autonomy and independence, and also a mechanical understanding of the objective socio-economic-political reality of India undoubtedly weakened the
communist movement in India during the late colonial period and adversely affected the CPI, which could never acquire the position where from it could provide the 'alternative leadership' to the national liberation struggle against the British colonial rule, the author asserts.

In his study, *Marxist Parties of West Bengal- in Opposition and in Government* (1947-2001) Sudhir Ray (2007) discusses, *inter alia*, the growth, philosophy, organisational pattern, cadre policy, day to day politics of CPI, CPI(M), CPI(ML), Socialist Party, Forward Bloc, RSP, SUC etc. in the forties of the last century.

Grover Furr (2011) in his treatise *Khrushchev Lied* challenges the existing historiography of the Russia under Stalin in 1930s and raises issues and questions on Nikita Khrushchev’s 1956 ‘Secret Speech’ in the 20th party congress of the CPSU. He also tries to prove that ‘not a single one of Khrushchev’s “revelations” is true!’ This particular works helps us in our study on the interactions among Comintern, Indian lefts and revolutionary converts and Stalin’s leadership in the international communist movement.

Bhagwan S Josh (uploaded in Shodhganga in 2013) in his PhD work *Left and the Indian national movement,* 1934-41 tries to provide a historical perspective for understanding the left-wing movements in India before 1947. He attempts to answer the question: How does one explain the failure of the communists, rather, the failure of the entire left-wing to be a hegemonic force within the national movement? The lack of widespread influence of the left and its inability to provide alternative politics is sometimes explained by the fact that the left was a small force. But this kind of explanation itself gives birth to some other questions: Why did the left remain a small force throughout the anti-imperialist struggle? Why did its growth remain stunted? How does one explain the success of the Gandhi-led national movement in mobilising millions of Indian people? At the same time, how does one explain the failure of the Congress movement to be transformed into a people’s party under left-wing hegemony? These questions have been tried to be examined ‘within a single totality’ in this dissertation.

*Banglay Bamera* (in Bengali) by Anjan Basu (2018) tries to portray the evolution of Indian Communist movement from 1920 to 2011 through various phases and the process of development of number of Marxist political parties in India mostly from his personal experiences as a journalist.

The pioneering work under the *third* category of publications is David M. Laushey’s (1975) Bengal *Terrorism and the Marxist Left* which while dealing with the whole gamut of national revolutionary
movement emphasised particularly on the mutual interaction between the ‘Bengal terrorism and the Marxist left’. It also gave emphasis on the process of transition to Marxism and confined its scope up to the year 1942. The author tried to portray further the national revolutionary movement by Bengali youths as an aspect of ‘regional nationalism’ of India.

Satyendra Narayan Mazumdar, in his 1979 Publication, *In Search of a Revolutionary Ideology and Revolutionary Programme*, discussed the process of transition from ‘national revolutionary terrorism to Communism’ primarily with respect to the Andaman detainees of the thirties and the process of formation of ‘Communist Consolidation’ there and their subsequent joining the CPI after release. He was a national revolutionary and an intellectual as well. So, his discourse contains detailed exposition of revolutionaries’ strengths and weaknesses keeping them in the then particular spatio-temporal context. In trying to emotionally uphold the novelty of national revolutionary activities, his work may sometimes appear to have given a one-sided view to the readers.

*Revolutionaries of India in Soviet Russia - Mainsprings of Communist Movement in the East* by M.A. Persits (1983) provides an insight into the emigration of Indian national revolutionaries to the former Soviet Union and depicts the process of these émigré revolutionaries’ transition to Marxism there. The book claims to have featured a great many previously unpublished documents. How the Oriental émigrés played an important role in the development of communist parties in the Asian countries bordering on Russia have also been tried to be highlighted in this work.

Bejoy Kumar Sinha’s (2nd Ed.1988) *In Andamans - the Indian Bastille* gives a first—hand account of the political evolution in the life of the Andaman prisoners in the late thirties and their subsequent switch over to Marxist ideology.

Sudhansu Dasgupta’s (2nd Ed. 1994) memoir entitling *Andaman Jail Theke Communist Partyte* (in Bengali) traces the background as well as the actual transition of the number of ‘Revolt Group’ activists to the CPI while they were under detention in the Andamans.

Tarapada Lahiri’s (1979) article ‘The Eventful Decade: 1920-29’ in *Freedom Struggle and Anushilan Samiti Volume One* edited by Buddhadeva Bhattacharyya throws much light on the revolutionary activities of the period and the beginning of the process of conversion from national revolutionism to Marxism.
Naren Das (1983), a veteran revolutionary and a theoretician of Anushilan Samiti in his autobiographical writing *Biplabi Andolaner Jiggsha*. (In Bengali) reveals the unknown history of interactions between Gandhi and the national revolutionaries and, also, the process of transition of the Anushilan members to Marxism. The role played by the author in writing the first manifesto of the RSP in the Deoli Detention Camp in 1936 and his subsequent meeting with other big leaders of the Anushilan Party in the Presidency Jail in support of this draft has also been discussed in this work. The author’s dis-engagement with RSP in the later years has been stated here.


Saumya Sengupta (2011) in his doctoral thesis published as *Revolutionary Terrorism in Colonial India: Banaras* attempts to analyse the role of Sachindra Nath Sanyal in the national revolutionary movement in Northern India and, more particularly, in Banaras. The work also contains a chapter on interaction between the Bengal revolutionaries and the Marxist left in UP in which the author tries to examine David Laushey’s perception and judgement on the left movement in the pre-independent period.


For the *fourth* category of publications consulted for the present work, first come the books, articles, etc. dealing exclusively with the origins of the RSP. All of these are, however, more or less, in the nature of party pamphlets. We may cite a few among these: Tribid Chaudhuri’s a) *RSP’r Katha* (n.d.) (in Bengali), b) *The Swing Back* (1950), c) *Why RSP* (1970), d) *Four and Half Decades of RSP* (1985), Makhan Paul’s *Jatiya Ganatantra, Janaganatantra, Krishibiplab Banam Biplabi Samajtantra* (1984) (in Bengali) Buddhadeva Bhattacharyya’s *Origins of the RSP - From National Revolutionary Politics to Non-Conformist Marxism* (1982) Biplab Siddhanta’s *Bharatiya Biplabi Manaser Marxjadi Rupantar: RSP’s Othishasik Prayojaniyata* (1990) (in Bengali), Ananda Kumar Gangopadhyay’s *Itihase RSP* (2010) (in Bengali) and Murari Mohan Saha’s(ed.) *Documents of the Revolutionary socialist Party(Vols. I-2001 & II 2003), Our
Stand and Our Differences (n.d.-RSPI BPC publication), RSP Ki Chay (in Bengali) (n.d.-RSPI BPC publication), On Russo-German War (1946- RSPI BPC publication) etc.


The above survey of literature show that there is enough scope for a full-fledged, in-depth research work on how the RSP and the SUCI have come into existence through the chequered process of conversion from national revolutionism to communism as no work has yet been attempted to study the process of origin of these two parties on the basis of an objective and dispassionate study of materials, and therefore, the present study seeks to make this effort for bridging a research-gap in an important segment of the late colonial freedom movement of India.
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