

Irfan Waheed Usmani\*

## **Definition of the “Left” and the problematic of fixing / determining the typologies of “Leftist Parties” in Pakistan**

### **Abstract**

*This paper seeks to explore the meaning of the term “Left” by problematizing its various conceptualizations. It further attempts to determine the typologies of the Leftist parties by keeping the problematic of definition, under consideration. The underlying motive of this endeavor, is to narrow down the focus of this debate, to the phenomenon of Leftist movement in Pakistan, so as to arrive at its more reflexive understanding during 1947-71, by defining Left in Pakistan as well as determining its typologies in context of the socio politics realities of the country. This paper is divided into four sections. The first deals with various definitions of the term “Left”. It problematizes this concept by making use of modern historians’ approach of “interpretation of conflict through conflicts in interpretations.” The second part focuses on the typologies. It implicates two important issues: (i) analysis of factors affecting the typologies; and (ii) two broad schemes of typologies discussed by James C. Docherty<sup>1</sup> and Stefano Bartolini<sup>2</sup>, in their works. The third section narrows down the focus of debate to India, as it deals with the definition, and a brief survey of the typologies of Leftist parties in India during the second half of the twentieth century. The fourth addresses the problematic of definition of Left and typologies of Leftist parties and groups in Pakistan.*

Left is a blanket term which defies exact meanings. Originally, in its historical sense, it may be described as a literary spatial term.<sup>3</sup> In this context, this concept was “originally linked to the position within the parliamentary hemicycle.”<sup>4</sup> For instance, according to the seating arrangements of the French Estates General of 1789, “Commoners sat on the left of the King, because the nobles were in the position of honor on his right.”<sup>5</sup> It implies link with the “root sense of left” as pertaining to “hand, that is normally the weaker of the two”.<sup>6</sup> This concept of left suggests that it “has little to do with issues and principles” opines Bartolini.<sup>7</sup> In general parlance the term “Left” denotes a more “liberal orientation” and “Right”... a more conservative position”.<sup>8</sup> If conceptualized in terms of ideological labels, the Left-Right semantics not only reflect “lines of policy division”,<sup>9</sup> but also the “patterns of thought and behaviour, that are embedded profoundly all permanently in human nature.”<sup>10</sup> This context of ontological opposition conveys the “perception of the body politic as broken continuum, as permanently divided by competing attitudes towards social change and political order”.<sup>11</sup> In more general terms the concept of “Left” is “indicative of radical or progressive socialist expression.”<sup>12</sup>

---

\* Dr. Irfan Waheed Usmani, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Govt. College University, Lahore.

These ideological connotations carry strong symbolic content, while alluding towards this aspect, Elizabeth Zechmeister, cites the work of Butler and Strokes, who argue that “voters come to think of themselves as Right or Left very much as a conservative in Brigham or Scotland used to think of himself as a “Unionist” because that is what is party called locally.”<sup>13</sup> The Political Scientists use Left-Right semantics for “elite packaging “to highlight “contextual influence”, which affords us an explicit example of the use of “ideological label as useful heuristic”.<sup>14</sup> They have developed three different models to explicate the ideological connotations of Left-Right political spectrum, which include: (i) Linear Spectrum (ii) Horse shoes spectrum and (iii) two dimensional spectrum.<sup>15</sup> From this debate what we may infer is that, it is quite difficult as well as perplexing, to arrive at a consensual definition of “Left” as “only the origins” of this term seem uncontroversial” opines John Keane.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, the varying connotations of the concept left (wing), over space and time have made its definition even more difficult. Another approach of developing a more profound conceptualization of this term, is to focus on its properties. One may isolate distinctive characteristics of Left as: egalitarianism, support for (organized) working class,<sup>17</sup> liberty, fraternity, progress and reform<sup>18</sup>, support for welfare state, trade union rights, support for right of state’s intervention in economy<sup>19</sup> etc. On the other hand, the rightist political orientation betrays such characteristics, as the support for middle class interests and advocacy of free markets.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, the exponents of Right are usually skeptical of the potentially hazardous consequences of radical social change and appear convinced about “perspective” wisdom of long standing institutional and social practices.”<sup>21</sup> They also believe that individuals should be allowed to make optimal use of their abilities to secure more favorable positions.<sup>22</sup> The most distinguishable feature of Leftist orientation may be described as its emphasis on equality, while referring to the aspect, Italian Marxist scholar Babbio considers the attitude towards equality as dividing line between Left and Right.<sup>23</sup> As the followers of the former believe that “most inequalities are “social and eliminable”, and the latter as “most are natural and unalterable.”<sup>24</sup> The main crux of his argument is that “being part of the Left entails a commitment to equalities, while being part of the right, believing a hierarchy, which is a form of inequality.”<sup>25</sup> The peculiar trait of all these tendencies associated with Left is that, they not only express a “socialist direction and vision” but also “attempt to dispense with a theory of institutions and a theory of political obligations” argues Roger Scruton.<sup>26</sup>

At one level these characteristics may be construed as a convenient tool, of arriving at a better understanding of the phenomenon called “Left”, but on the other hand, these values and characteristics to appear have increasingly blurred, in the wake of onslaught of neo liberal set of values, which have compelled the Leftists to adopt new-revisionist posture, that is exemplified by Left’s “more cautious” attitude about modernity. It appears to be “less magnetized by the myths of scientific technical progress and especially with in its green fringes”,<sup>27</sup> argues John Keane. Its critics like Ilaria Favretto contend that certainly, Right appears more appreciative of “revolutionary or reformist policies based on a deep faith in scientific and economic modernization.”<sup>28</sup> Similarly Left also seems to have generally abandoned the goal of centrally planned economies, as well as the visions of an alternative system, instead it has “fully embraced the principles of

market economy.”<sup>29</sup> Likewise, its attitude towards capitalism, especially in the West, has also undergone an insidious change, now “capitalism is no longer considered a transitory phase, destined to disappear sooner or later and leave the way free for a socialist society. Instead it has become a system of production destined to last in the foreseeable future; a system that can be tampered but not changed.”<sup>30</sup> In this backdrop, even the conceptualization of Left, based on a peculiar set of characteristics cannot be used as a dependable guide for defining Left.

While focusing on the definitions, it would not be out of place, to refer to two other definitions of Left. One involves its conceptualization as an operative category, to “distinguish positions within parties as well as among them.”<sup>31</sup> For instance, “if we describe someone as a Left wing socialist”, it indicates that “he takes extreme positions on issues such as, egalitarianism, support for working class, opposition to hierarchy as well as nationalistic foreign or defence policies etc. Similarly left wing Communism also typifies a specific state of orientation.”<sup>32</sup> Richard Flacks on the other hand, provides an altogether different definition of “Left” which entails functionalist trappings. In his opinion, “An effective left must integrate its policies with the routines of daily life.”<sup>33</sup> He accords much primacy to the involvement of social movement with the everyday activity of the people. He is of the view that “for most of the people, the demands of everyday life are all encompassing”,<sup>34</sup> which implies such activity “tends to cut people off from” what he describes as the, “historical activity” or “the attempt to change the shape of the society.”<sup>35</sup> (Which, any Leftist movement aspires to achieve). Now the problem, according to Flacks is that, such an activity of “making history” is “radically separated from everyday life”.<sup>36</sup> Faced with such a dilemma, nevertheless, the ordinary people also get involved in such activity through “social movement or mass movements”. Their involvement may assume various forms, such as popular movements, political movements, liberation movements and revolutionary movements. Among those, he considers the latter as “the most far-reaching kind of movement.”<sup>37</sup> He goes on to suggest that, “A revolutionary movement seeks to establish a social framework, in which separation between history making and everyday life is broken down, not for a moment but permanently.”<sup>38</sup> Put in simple words, Flacks’ definition entails a functionalist as well as a more idealist notion of Left.

After analyzing more broad definitions of Left, it would be prudent to focus on those definitions, which associate this phenomenon with ideological referents of Marxism and Socialism. One may extract such definitions from the writings of Maxime Rodinson and Geoff Eley. For instance Rodinson argues that, “For me, there is not just one Marxism, but several Marxisms, all with a common core, it is true, but also with many divergences, each version being as legitimate as any other.”<sup>39</sup> If one conceptualizes left by keeping in view Marxism as its defining characteristic, then Rodinson’s reference to several “Marxisms”, leads us to believe in the co-existence of multiple or various “Lefts”. Historically speaking, Rodinson’s assertion is quite valid, for instance one may identify various variants of Marxism such as, Orthodox Marxism, Neo-Marxism and Austro-Marxism, to name only a few. All these contain varieties of Socialist orientations. While referring to those, Rodinson defines “Marxism as a series of neo-marxist totalitarian syntheses, each claiming to be the only legitimate one.”<sup>40</sup> He describes

this “ideological synthesis” as the basis of Marxist movement. These syntheses comprised sociology, an aesthetic and a politics.” In his estimation, this movement once was “unified but is now fragmented”<sup>41</sup>. This conception of the Marxist movement as per Rodinson’s assessments, further corroborate the notion of simultaneous presence of multiple Lefts. Geoff Eley, a distinguished Marxist historian, attaches significance to the existence of “culture of socialism”, which he holds “crucial to the Left’s political presence.”<sup>42</sup> He elaborates the former as a “complex of histories, values and identifications.”<sup>43</sup> He construes the radical and extensive meanings of socialist aspirations, in terms of utopianism, class consciousness, idealism and the culture of militancy, which according to him “takes us inside the skin of socialism.”<sup>44</sup>

When we try to define “Left” in terms of Marxist and Socialist traditions, even this approach creates its own problems of conceptualization, which stem from the problematic of situating Marxism and Socialism, within the Leftist ideology. The opinions of Marxist scholars diverge considerably, on this issue. For instance, like Marxism, the term Socialism also eludes specific definition. Docherty, the author of the *Historical Dictionary of Socialism* describes, variety as an outstanding feature of Socialism.<sup>45</sup> While engaging the opinion of Angelo S. Rappaort, another scholar on Left, he suggests that Rappaort lists forty definition of Socialism.<sup>46</sup> Another problem of associating left with Marxism and Socialism is that, these concept/notions cannot be used interchangeably, while alluding to this aspect; Tony Judt argues that “Marxism and Socialism only parted company as a result of Lenin’s reformatting of the terms of Marxist practices.”<sup>47</sup> In his opinion, this parting of ways occurred on European soil, at various points of time, for instance “the cutoff point varied only according to the context. In Scandinavia it came in the 1930s, in West Germany in the late 1930s, in France and Italy it remains unclear, as to how far it has yet occurred.”<sup>48</sup> Docherty James construes Communism as “revolutionary tradition of Socialism.”<sup>49</sup> Goran Therborn, on the other hand, conceives Socialism in terms of “set of institutions.” As well as set of values”<sup>50</sup>. While referring to respective positions of Marxism, Socialism and Communism in the Leftist Movement, Fredric Jameson, another Marxist scholar, distinguishes among these three distinctive concepts. For instance, he describes Marxism as a “mode of thought”, he construes Socialism as “political and societal aim and vision”, whereas he interprets Communism as a “historical movement.”<sup>51</sup>

The problems of defining Left, under Marxist referents become further compounded, on account of different conceptualizations of Marxism in another context as well. For instance its interpretations vacillate between idea, philosophy, ideology and movement. Tony Judit defines Marxism as “living idea” as well as “politics... and politics at the grass root”, that makes it “so very adoptable to local political and industrial practices and perceptions.”<sup>52</sup> Marxist intellectual Maurice Conforth, while alluding to traditional Marxist parties’ perception of Marxism, describes it as “revolutionary theory of working class.”<sup>53</sup> (Though he does not subscribe, with such an interpretation of Marxism). For Heywood, Marxism entails three connotations, which include: (i) a political force “in form of International Communist movement” (ii) a social philosophy “derived from classic writings of Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels” and (iii) a political ideology, which outlives, the collapse of Communism, and the latter

development "need not be taken as the death of Marxism as a political ideology."<sup>54</sup> Fredric Jameson does not consider Marxism as philosophy but as "unity of theory- practice"<sup>55</sup> His apparently explicit illustration carries its own problems, as he himself acknowledges that "it can be thought as a problematic that is to say, it cannot be identified, riot by specific positions (whether of a political, economic or philosophical type), but rather by the allegiance to a specific complex of problem."<sup>56</sup>

This debate about the definitions of Left does not lead us to arrive at its agreed upon or consensual understanding. Therefore, it is necessary to focus another set of approaches, for the proper comprehension of the phenomenon. This vision underscores a relativistic understating of Leftist movement, in accordance with the specificities of national contexts. It stresses that "the term is entirely relative to the national context and can lead to some one being regarded as dangerously left wing in one country, when he would be seen as centrist or moderately rightwing elsewhere."<sup>57</sup> The frequent use of the terms Left, left of the centre and left wing, besides denoting a variety of things" also suggests their contextual sense of usage, as they connote "a certain flavor of politics."<sup>58</sup> Babbio considers the terms Left and Right, relative to such an extent that he appears to be skeptical about "how long vocabulary of Right and Left would persist in such conditions."<sup>59</sup> Sasson, another scholar on European Left, while alluding to this notion defines Left essentially in the European context, "these (West European social democratic and post-communist) parties are the only Left that is left."<sup>60</sup> While referring to Latin European Left he describe it "what socialism" as "what parties calling themselves socialist do and think".<sup>61</sup> Bartolini, in his work on European Left construes the historical concept of Left as "relational" which "changes over time".<sup>62</sup> He appears to be a firm believer in the relativistic connotation of Left, as he opines that, one should not "attempt to define left independently of the name of its historical actor."<sup>63</sup> While focusing on European context, he avers that "the Left of will be speaking as identified with specific set of ideals and political and social organization, stemming from the Industrial revolution, Socialism."<sup>64</sup>

This relativistic context of Left can also be substantiated through historical evidence as well, a cursory look at the changing notions of Left, since the last one and half century, evidently proves this contention. The Nineteenth Century European Left comprised an "unstable coalition between an emergent working class and middle class anti clerics". Even at that time, it betrayed tensions between middle class radicals and socialist parties, on the issue of popular central over capitalist economy.<sup>65</sup> Till Russian revolution, it had been split into two revival camps (i) the Revolutionary Socialists, who were the followers of Lenin and were known as Bolsheviks and (ii) the Reformists, who were the protagonists of Social Democracy.<sup>66</sup> The revolutionary strand gained ascendancy after the Bolshevik seizure of power, and it remained dominant strand in Leftist ideology till 1950s.

During the same decade, the Orthodox Marxist conception of the Left, had to face with the challenges of newly emerging revisionism, which invariably influenced the various streaks of Leftist thought, in many ways. One may identify at least three such challenges (i) Chinese critique on Soviet Marxist Model (ii) The rise of New Left in Western Europe and America, which was influenced by new interpretations of Marxist writings, which betrayed disillusionment against the

rigidities of orthodox Marxism, as well as dictatorial tendencies of Soviet leadership, in dealing with Socialist bloc; and (iii) Growing distance between Social Democratic parties from Communists, as the former adopted substantially modified Godesberg Programme. Consequently, the democratic socialist tradition, over the period of time gravitated towards the leftist streaks of the tradition of western liberalism.<sup>67</sup> The emergence of last two strands in the leftist thought also signified a quest for a third way, so as to steer a middle path between Communism and Capitalism.<sup>68</sup> This idea remained popular in Western and Latin European Leftist movements, albeit through, different interpretations for an alternative to communism and capitalism, for more than two decades. However with the passage of the time, particularly since, the disintegration of Soviet Union and against the onslaught of neo-liberalism, this concept underwent an insidious transformation. For instance, previously, “the search for a third way was always between communism and capitalist model and is now conceived as something between neo-liberalism and old social democracy” opines Faveretto.<sup>69</sup> He goes on to suggest that “this shift towards the capitalist model sets the neo-revisionisms of the 1990s apart from any previous branch of socialist revisionism.”<sup>70</sup> While, assessing the cumulative impact of this development on socialist ideology, Eley concurs that:

“the old class bounded models of socialist, political action and the traditional idea of the socialist party organized around the movement culture, are now dead. Local socialism growing form residential segregation, spatially distinct industrial concentration, community solidarities, and local government structure specific to a particular period of urban industrial capitalism, with in parliamentary frame work of the constitutional state – have disappeared and with them the historical sociologies of the male manual work.”<sup>71</sup>

In the backdrop of these developments, it is not surprising to find an urge among the Marxist intellectuals to reconstruct socialist history with new perspectives that is “situated in the multiform, micro-political context of the movement” opines Eley.<sup>72</sup> Infact he is not they first scholar, to emphasize this kind of revision, rather this desire finds its manifestation, in the writings of other Marxist intellectuals as well. For instance, Maurcie Conforth challenges the “proprietary rights of Communist parties in formulating Communist theory”. He further argues that the idea that “only the communist party can contribute in pressing and developing Marxist theory in the modern world needs to be called in question.”<sup>73</sup> One finds emphasis on broader conceptualization of Left movement in his writings. For instance his perception of Leftist movement involves “opposition to capitalism and imperialism in a variety of forms and by a variety of people.”<sup>74</sup>

We may infer the following conclusions from the discussion in this section:

- a) The idea of Left should be conceived in broader connotations, not in terms of the doctrines of Orthodox Marxism.
- b) Only the relative understanding of the Leftist movement in context of the specificities of local situation can provide better understanding of its dynamics.

- c) The common denominators of broader definition may include: opposition to imperialism as well as exploitative forms of capitalism; emphasis on equality and the desire for the amelioration of the dispossessed, marginalized and downtrodden segments of society.
- d) One should approach the notion of Left not through the uncritical acceptance of “Marxist formulation” but through historical understanding of these conceptualizations, meaning thereby, one should be mindful of the limitations of Eurocentric conceptualization or definitions of the Left.

## II

The debate concerning the meanings of the Left makes one thing explicitly clear that, given the multiplicity of its trajectories, it is not possible to devise universal criteria of its typologies. This section discusses the two important approaches of the typology or the schemas of typology, one is provided by Docherty and the other is based on re-worked version of Bartolinis’ country wide classification of Left in Europe. These could be quite instrumental in problematizing the debate about typologies. Before explicating this theme, it would be more appropriate to delineate certain factors, which, effected certain changes, through their divisive fallouts, in the categories of Leftist parties, and thus played a pivotal role in structuring their typologies. These include: changes introduced by Lenin in the practice of Communism; Stalins’ insistence on Orthodox Marxism; Sino-Soviet schisms; consolidation of social democracy in Europe; the emergence of New Left; the quest for third way ;and the disintegration of Soviet Union.

Lenins’ interpretations of Marxist teachings and his innovations in Socialist practices decisively shaped the structural appurtenances of the Left. For instance, his notion of vanguard party, went a long way towards transferring the nature and direction of socialist state. He conceived the role of this party not in terms of a mass party; rather it comprised dedicated, committed and ideologically trained revolutionaries, with a capacity to provide ideological leadership.<sup>75</sup> This party was to be organized on the principles of democratic centralism. He reposed more trust in vanguard party than the proletariat. He was skeptical about the role of proletariat on two accounts: (i) He considered them susceptible to “bourgeois ideas and belief” and (ii) He regarded them constitutionally incapable of rising above the “trade union consciousness.”<sup>76</sup> These factors in his estimation were to impose weighty limitations, in realization of revolutionary potential.

Stalins’ insistence on ‘concept of Marxism in a state ‘,his over-centralizing tendencies and totalitarian style of organizing Communist state in Russia and later his handling of the Communist bloc in the Eastern Europe in an authoritarian manner, caused further splits in the Leftist movement. The schisms with in Communist movement ,particularly, the Maoist secession resulted in to further division of the leftist parties into pro- Moscow and pro- China factions Unlike Asia ,where its divisive impact was more conspicuous in structuring the typologies of the Leftist parties ,in Europe it did not affect the typologies in that

manner, nevertheless, it ensued new debates and caused further disillusionment towards Stalinist model of Communism.

The position of social democratic parties became well entrenched in Europe, as well Australia and New Zealand, after World War-II. For instance, they bagged forty one to fifty percent of votes, during the elections held between 1945-47 in Austria, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand.<sup>77</sup> They also managed to come to power, through coalition governments, in the other countries of western and southern Europe. After the World War-II, the cleavages between social democratic and communist parties in Europe<sup>78</sup> became further sharpened and there ensued a tussle between the adherents of two major stands of Leftist thought that is, Communists and Social Democrats. It may be attributed to various factors. For instance the attitude of Western governments was quite hostile to communists, as the former had drawn closer towards US camp. Moreover, forcible merger of Social Democratic parties of Hungary, Romania, Poland Czechoslovakia and East Germany in to Communist parties, in mid and late 1940s<sup>79</sup> further foreclosed all the alternatives of dialogue.

The rise of new left and the quest for the “Third way” among the Leftists in the West, further widened the gulf between revolutionaries and reformists and encouraged the latter to formulate an altogether different strategy to realize the Socialist objectives, which was not to be based on centrality of class or revolution. Moreover, it was not to be aimed at destruction of capitalism, rather directed towards pragmatic solutions, of achieving a more humanized form of capitalism, by bridging the gulf between Capitalism and Communism. The disintegration of Soviet Union and the collapse of Communist bloc in Eastern Europe further weakened the position of revolutionaries and those, who believed in Orthodox Marxism. These developments evoked neo-revisionist responses, which further compelled the adherents of traditional Left to make further adjustments and adaptations in the Leftist ideology, in the midst of global recession of Communism.

Docherty divides Socialist tradition on to three broad categories of typologies, which include: (i) Centralized political power; (ii) Decentralized political power; and (iii) Hybrid political traditions. He further divides, Centralized political power into two variants, such as Marxist and English Socialist. In his opinion, the former comprise nine different categories such as, Leninism (1910 to 1920), Communist Parties (1920 onwards), Stalinism (1930 to 1950), Trotskyism (1930s to onward) Maoism (1950 and 1960). He also includes early forms of socialist ideas, prior to the ascendancy of Bolsheviks in the Centralized political traditions, which fructified in to these forms: French Positivists (1880s), Revisionism (1890). European socialists social democratic parties (1890 onward) and revived democratic parties in Eastern Europe (1989 onwards). He includes Labor parties on Australia UK and New Zealand (1890s onward) in the second variant of Marxist tradition, which he calls English Socialist. He subdivides De-centralized political power, into two subcategories; the Marxist and the non-Marxist. The former comprise New Left of 1960s, whereas the latter consist of, Anarchism (1880), Syndicalism (pre-1914) Anarcho-Syndicalism (1910s). The third category signifies Hybrid political traditions. These include, African and Arab Socialisms of 1950s.<sup>80</sup> It is necessary to qualify, certain caveats of Docherty’s model. For



instance he has not devised this model to explicate the typologies of Leftist parties, rather it underscores, the variants of Socialist traditions. Notwithstanding, this limitation of categorization scheme illustrated in this model, it could prove quiet instrumental in comprehending the typologies of the Leftist parties, as these typologies were shaped under the influences of various trajectories of Leftist ideology as mentioned earlier.

Bartolini, in his work on European Left follows less systematic approach of typologies. His categorization provides us ample idea about how the diverse nature, the typologies of Leftist parties may assume? For instance, his scheme “goes beyond the official socialist or communist parties”, though he concedes that “their inclusion or exclusion may be more controversial.”<sup>81</sup> Nevertheless, he justifies his criteria of inclusion of these apparently unfamiliar typologies, on the basis of their origins as, “splinter groups or wings of the historical socialist and communist organization.”<sup>82</sup> He categories the typologies, according to the countrywide distribution and presence of the Leftist parties.<sup>83</sup> In the next page an attempt has been made, to develop a new table based on data, provided by Bartolini’s, classification of Leftist parties in Europe. This new table provides an explicit criteria of typologies, based on the broad nomenclatures of these parties. It is extracted through the model provided by Bartolini.

Communist Parties	Parties using nomenclature of Democrats	Social Democrats	Socialist Parties	Worker/ Labour Parties	Miscellaneous
(i) Communist Parties (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland UK (ii) Hogland Communists (Sweden) (iii) Kilborn Communists (Sweden)	(i) Democratic Alternative (Finland) (ii) Action for Democratic Progressive (Germany) (iii) National Progressive Democratic (Ireland) (iv) National Progressive Democrats (Ireland) (v) Democratic Progressive (Belgium)	(i) Social Democrats (Austria, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, UK) (ii) Social Democratic League (Netherlands) (iii) Independent Social Democratic (Germany) (iv) Social Democratic and Labor Party (UK)	(i) Socialist Peoples Party (Denmark, Norway) (ii) Left Socialists (Denmark Sweden) (iii) Socialist Socialists (France, Sweden and Italy) (iv) Independent Socialist (France) (v) Reformist Socialists (Netherlands) (vi) Pacifist Socialist Party (Netherlands) (vii) Marxist Leninists Socialists (Norway) (viii) Autonomous Socialists Party (Switzerland) (ix) Worker Socialist Party (Later Belgium Francophone) (x) Democratic Socialist Party (Ireland) (xi) Socialist Labor Party (Ireland) (xii) Socialist Left Party (Norway)	(i) Democratic Progressive Workers Party (UK) (ii) Workers Party (Ireland) (iii) Revolutionary Workers/ Socialists (Belgium) (iv) Labour (Ireland) (v) Independent Labour (Ireland, UK) (vi) Pro-Labour Independent (Ireland) (vii) Socialist Labor Party (Ireland) (ix) Social Democratic Worker Party (Norway) (x) Walloon Workers Party (Belgium) (xi) All power to Workers/ Labour Party (Belgium)	(i) Common Course (Denmark) (ii) SFIO (France) (iii) EFD-PSU/ Extreme Gauche Diver Gauche (France) (iv) PSI (Italy) (v) PSIUP (Italy) (vi) Extreme Left (Italy) (vii) USI (Italy) (viii) PSDI (Italy) (ix) Party Vide Arbeid (Belgium)

### III

This section deals with the definition of Left and typologies of Leftist parties in Indian perspective. As regards the definition is concerned Irfan Habib defines Left as: "Left" in the historiography of the national movement and current political discourse, is essentially the assemblage of all elements as owed allegiance to socialist world outlook."<sup>84</sup> Broadly speaking, there are four major Leftist political parties in India. These include: two Communist parties – the Communist Party of India (Marxist) and the Communist Party of India as well as Revolutionary Socialist Party (RSP) and All India Forward bloc.<sup>85</sup> Major Leftist forces, particularly the first two parties are mainly the outgrowth of CPI of pre partition days, which was founded in 1920s. Over the period of time, it acquired its localized basis among industrial workers and peasant.<sup>86</sup> During the first three decades of its history, it followed the line of Soviet Communist Party. During late 1940s' it led an unsuccessful uprising in Telangana region of Andhra Pradesh. Afterwards it reverted towards parliamentary politics and started contesting elections on regular basis.<sup>87</sup> In 1964, it got split into two parties, the CPI (M) and the original CPI. Of those two faction, CPI (M), Pro-Chinese was more stronger as compared to CPI, which was pro-Moscow. The former underwent splits in 1967 and its more militant elements formed CPI (Marxist-Leninist) or CPI (ML). The latter further splintered into various factions.<sup>88</sup>

Sumanta Banerjee's categorization of Leftist forces in India into four typologies could be quite instrumental in understanding the typologies of Leftist political parties in India. The four categories, identified by Banerjee, include: (i) Parliamentary Left; (ii) various off shoots of the pre-independence nationalist and armed revolutionary groups; (iii) Socialist groups, seeking inspirations from the experiments of Congress socialists led by Jaya Pradkash Narayan and (iv) various groups of Marxists Leninist (known as Naxalites), which believe in political activism through peasant mobilization and peasant struggle. The first category, according to Banerjee forms "the most important component of parliamentary left represented by Communist Party of India (Marxist) CPI (M) and the communist party of India CPI."<sup>89</sup> The second category of Leftist forces, which Banerjee describes as the outgrowth of "pre-independence nationalist and armed revolutionary groups", is mainly concentrated in West Bengal, but it has "pockets of influence" in other parts of India as well. It is represented by parties such as Revolutionary Socialist Party and the Forward Bloc<sup>90</sup>, the Revolutionary Communist Party of India (RCPI) and the Socialist Unity Centre of India (SUCI) The Leftist parties belonging to this category by and large believe in Parliamentary Leftism, moreover, most of these usually support "the first stream" opines Banerjee.<sup>91</sup> Apart from these broader dynamics, there exist considerable differences within these groups. Moreover, their political posturing further exhibits strange political behaviour. For instance, SUCI has been known for its staunch opposition of CPI and CPI(M), it joined the ruling Left front in Bengal as well as became an ally of CPI and CPI(M) in National politics..<sup>92</sup> As regards the third category is concerned, their poetical posturing betrays a much deeper contrast. For instance, as mentioned earlier, the various groups included in third category sought inspiration from Congress Socialist Party. The main objective of the latter was to harmonize the principles of Western democracy and Gandhian thought during the post independence period. These parties have failed to further develop and

popularize such a synthesis. Moreover, these have also been unable to display requisite unity, so as to emerge as viable alternative within left. According to Banerjee, “the socialist groups have changed shape every now and again, merging with one party, breaking away the next moment”.<sup>93</sup> While referring to the examples of this type of political posturing she isolates the example of “tortuous course of their journey from the Praja Socialist Party (PSP) to the Samyukta Socialist Party (SSP), to their eventual partial incorporation in the fold of a polymorphic Janta Dal.”<sup>94</sup> In terms of their influence, these groups may also be categorized as regional Left, as their pockets of influence include” Bihar, UP, Orissa, Karnataka, the Maharustrian trade union belt, and a few other areas.”<sup>95</sup>

The fourth category mainly comprises militant Left, is represented by ‘Naxalites, which may be described as the off shoot of Communist Party of India-Marxist Leninist (CPI (M-L). Banerjee further divides it into three sub-categories that is: (i) underground (ii) over ground and (iii) certain groups, which employ both tactics.<sup>96</sup> Each category includes various factions. The groups falling under the first category, are primarily engaged in armed the struggle in rural areas. The groups such as People’s War Group (PWG) and CPI (ML) Group may be identified as the explicit examples of the practices of this sort of Leftism. These groups, according to Banerjee, “owe inspiration to late Chandra Pulla Reddy in Andhra Pradesh and the Maoist Communist Centre (MCC) and the Party Unity (PU) group in Bihar.”<sup>97</sup> The second subcategory may further be subdivided into two groups. The first comprise the followers of late Satyanaraian Sing, which operates, in the Provincial Central Committee of the CPI (ML) in West Bengal and Behar and the second consists of Organizing Committee of Communist Revolutionaries, led by Kanu Sanyal, which operates in West Bengal.<sup>98</sup> The third category of this Leftist stream is represented by ‘Liberation group of CPI (ML)’ under Vinod Mishra. It exerts clout on some pockets of Bihar. Its political struggle embraces both tactics of peasant armed struggled in rural areas, as well as resort towards open mass demonstration.<sup>99</sup>

This section seeks to develop a definition of Left, in context of the specificities of political realities in Pakistan. Apart from the defining Left,, it would further attempt to categorize the typologies of the Leftist parties. Given the problematic of the definition of “Left” as well as nittygrities of interaction of Socialist movement with the political dynamics of the subcontinent, it would be more appropriate to develop a stipulative<sup>100</sup> and contextual<sup>101</sup> definition of Left. As mentioned in the first section, only relational or relative definition is more appropriate to define such a chequered phenomenon, like the Leftist movement.

In this context, we may define “Left” in Pakistan in broader terms as “It comprises those political elements or political forces (i) who adhered to Marxism in letter and spirit, or those ,which were organized on class line or those for whom any variant of Marxism constituted the main agenda of their manifesto; (ii) Those regional or ethnic parties, which subscribed to the Leftist orientation, in context of anti-establishment, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, pro-democracy and pro-provincial autonomy stances; (iii) Those populist political parties having sizeable presence of Leftists within their ranks, in form of clout of Left wing, as well as Socialist orientation of their programmes; (iv) Those parties who want to harmonize Socialism with Islamic concept of social justice and equality, enshrined in the

notion of *Masawat-e-Muhammadi*<sup>102</sup> In the Islamic Left one include those elements who were influenced by Islamic notions of as practice during Caliphate. The underlying motive of all these orientations with in Pakistan's Left was to strive for the political change, through the organization and mobilization of marginalized dispossessed and downtrodden segments of society. They wanted to create such as egalitarian society, which besides providing equal economic opportunities and social justices could rid the country of the vestiges of imperialism or colonial rule.

Based on this definition we may classify Leftist parties or forces in Pakistan in six categories. These include (i) Traditional Left; (ii) Working Class Parties (iii) Militant Left; (iv) Regional Left (v) Populist Left and (vi) Islamic Left. In the first category one may include parties such as (i) Communist Party of Pakistan, Pakistan Socialist Party, Azad Pakistan Party and Gantantar Dal East Pakistan. In the second category one may include, Krishna Samity East Pakistan, Sindh Hari Committee and Mazdoor Kissan Party. The Militant Left represents a minor streak in the Leftist movement; its influence was limited to certain areas of East Pakistan. It had two streaks, first was non-secessionist. Its exponents believed in the working class organization. It combined both tactics of limited resistance and political organization of peasants. Its second streak was outgrowth of splinter factions of National Awami Party as well as it sought inspiration from the influences of pro-Chinese militant factors of Left in West Bengal. Its emergence was concomitant to the rapidly degenerating political situation, as well as popularization of demands of provincial autonomy. The Regional Left comprised smaller regional parties, with their pockets of influence in East Pakistan, as well as smaller provinces of West Pakistan. The parties such as Peoples Party of Pakistan (founded by G.M. Syed), Red shirts, Durraray Pakthoon, Athaman Gal, fall under this category. Though these parties did not have their origins as Leftist parties, but over the period of time these embraced certain Leftist influences, or the policies of the state forced them to join hands with Leftist forces. Till mid-fifties, most of these groups began to subscribe the broad principles of Leftist vision though organizationally they were not under the control of Communist Party. Later in 1957, with the establishment of National Awami party (NAP), these elements moved further closer towards Leftist identity. National Awami Party proved to be the biggest conglomeration of regional Leftist forces in Pakistan. Right from its very inception, it also enjoyed support of defunct CPP, which since imposition of ban had started pursuing the strategy of developing Leftist carders within the popular parties in Pakistan

Islamic left was inspired, by the influence of Maulana Obaid Ullah Sindhi, his pupils became the carrier of the ideology of Islamic Left. Maulana Ghous Bakhsh Hazarvi and Maulana Abdur Raheem Popalzai may be described among the exponents of Islamic Left. These elements in the traditional Left, who were good practicing Muslims and were inspired by the Islamic notions of equality as practiced during the period of Holy Prophet and the Caliphate, may also be included in the Islamic Left.

These broad typologies though highlight various trajectories of Left in Pakistan, yet they are quite problematic in certain respects. For instance, only the Communist party, Socialist Party of Pakistan, National Awami Party and Mazdoor Kissan Party, conform to the definition of Left, if it is construed in terms of adherence to Marxist, Leninist or Maoist ideologies. Keeping in view this criterion, the placement of populist parties in Left is quite problematic. The position of Left in the Awami League, was not well entrenched in its initial four years, Leftist elements only gained ascendancy from 1954 onwards, in this party. Though over the period of time, the Leftist orientation of this party became further recognized, yet traditional leftist elements remained skeptical of its Leftist credentials. In late 1960s, its demands of provincial autonomy, based on Mujeeb's Six points, acquired more salience in its political activism, as compared to the perusal of other socialist objectives. Similarly Pakistan Peoples Party's categorization as a Socialist party is also quite problematic. For instance the Gankovsky, describes it "more populist" than Socialist.<sup>103</sup> Iqbal Leghari identifies it as "new left". But one may justify their categorization in left on account of following factors: -

- (1) Their manifestos were leftist or socialist. Pakistan Peoples Party was only party, which tried to indigenize the Marxist ideology into the slogan of *Roti Kapra au Makan*
- (2) These parties had sizeable presence of Leftist elements within their ranks, in the form of workers and intellectuals
- (3) Both parties succeeded in mobilizing masses, on the basis of Leftist slogans. In this manner, they outmaneuvered the traditional Leftist parties, in spreading Leftist consciousness.

---

<sup>1</sup> James C. Docherty. *Historical Dictionary of Socialism Historical Dictionaries of Religions, Philosophies and Movement, No.16*. (Lanham: The Scorecrow Press, 1997)

<sup>2</sup> Stefano Bartolini, *The Political Mobilization of the European Left 1860-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

<sup>3</sup> Iain Mclean, Alistair Mcmillan, *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p.305

<sup>4</sup> Bartolini, *The Political Mobilization*, p.10.

<sup>5</sup> Mclean, Mcmillan, *Oxford Concise Dictionary*.p.305.;Rundolph Heimanson in his work argues that this seating procedure was not "paralleled in American Legislative" which means it was not universally followed. Randolph Heimanson, *Dictionary of Political Science and Law*, (New York: Oceana Publication Inc., 1967), p.100.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. Mclean and Mcmillan, further go on to trace its "pejorative association with French and Latin words *guache* and *sinister* respectively.

<sup>7</sup> Bartolini, *The Political Mobilization*, p.10.

<sup>8</sup> Abdul Rashid Moten, El Fathith A. Abdel Salam, *Glossary of Political Science Terms: Islamic and Western*, (Australia: Thompson, 2005), p.84.

<sup>9</sup> Elizabeth Zechmiester, "What's Left and Who's Right": A Q-method Study of Individuals Labels", *Political Behaviour*, Vol. 28, No.2 (Jan. 2000), p.154.

<sup>10</sup> Bartolini, *The Political Mobilization*, p.9.

<sup>11</sup> John Keane, "Democracy and the Idea of the Left" in *Socialism and Democracy* eds. David Mcmillan and Seen Sayers, (Hampshire: Macmillan, 1991), p.6.

- <sup>12</sup> Mclean and Mcmillan, *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*, p.305.
- <sup>13</sup> D. Buttler, D. Strokes, *Political Changes in Britain* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1969) p.260 cited in Zechmeister, “What’s Left and Who’s Right”, p.155.
- <sup>14</sup> Zechmeister, “What’s Left and Who’s Right”, p.155.
- <sup>15</sup> Andrew Heywood, *Politics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Hound Mills: Palgrave, pp.252-253. For diagramic Illustration of these models see (Annexure-I).
- <sup>16</sup> Keane, “Democracy and the idea of the Left”, p.6.
- <sup>17</sup> Mclean and Mcmillan, *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*, p.305.
- <sup>18</sup> Heywood, *Politics*, p.252.
- <sup>19</sup> Frank Bealey, *The Blackwell Dictionary of Political Science: A User’s Guide to its Terms* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), p.187.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>21</sup> Joel Krieger, et.al. *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p.493.
- <sup>22</sup> David Robertson, *A Dictionary of Modern Politics* (London: Europa Publications, 2002), p.277.
- <sup>23</sup> Norberto Babbio, *Destra e Sinistra, Ragion e Significative Di Una Disnzione Policta* (Rome: 1994) a revised and enlarged edition appeared in 1995. It was translated in English as *Left and Right* (Cambridge, 1996), p.66.
- <sup>24</sup> Babbio cited in, Percy Anderson “A sense of the Left” *New Left Review* Number 231: (September) October 1998), p.75.
- <sup>25</sup> Sergio Benvenuto, “Review: Beyond Left and Right” *Telos*, Numbers 98-99 (Winter 1993- Fall 1994), p.259.
- <sup>26</sup> Roger Scruton, *A Dictionary of Political Thought*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Macmillan, 1983), p.304.
- <sup>27</sup> John Keane “Democracy and the idea of the Left”, p.6.
- <sup>28</sup> Ilaria Favretto, *The Long Search for a Third Way: The British Labour Party and the Italian Left Since 1945* (Hound Mills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p.1.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid., pp.1-2.
- <sup>31</sup> Mclean and Mcmillan, *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*, p.305.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>33</sup> Richard Flacks, “Making History Vs. Making Life: Dilemmas of an American Left” in *Towards a History of the New Left: Essay’s from within the Movement* ed. David Myers (Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing Inc, 1989), p.125.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., p.131.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid. p.126.
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid., p.133.
- <sup>38</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>39</sup> Maxime Rodinson, *Marxism and the Muslim World*, trans. Michael Pallis (London: Zed Press, 1979), p.5.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>42</sup> Geoff Eley, “Review Article: Socialism by any other Names: Illusion and Renewal in the History of the West European Left” *New Left Review* Number 277, ( January / February 1998), p.113.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>44</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>45</sup> Docherty, *Historical Dictionary of Socialism*, p.1.
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>47</sup> Tony Judit, *Marxism and the French Left: Studies in Labour and Politics in France, 1830-1981* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p.19.

- 
- <sup>48</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>49</sup> Docherty, *Historical Dictionary of Socialism*, p.63.
- <sup>50</sup> Goran Therborn, "The Limits of Social Democracy Admirableness", *New Left Review*, Number 227, (January / February 1998) p.124.
- <sup>51</sup> Fredric Jameson, "Actually existing Marxism" in *Marxism Beyond Marxism* eds. Saree Makdasi, Cesare Casarino and Rebecca E. Karl (New York: Routledge, 1996) p.14
- <sup>52</sup> Tony Judit, *Marxism and the French Left*, p.1.
- <sup>53</sup> Maurice Conforth, *Communism and Philosophy: Contemporary Dogmas and Revisions of Marxism* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1980) cited by Rajendra Prasad, "Communist Theory and Communist Parties", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 26. Number 13 (March 30, 1991), p.827.
- <sup>54</sup> Heywood, *Politics*, p.53.
- <sup>55</sup> Fredric Jameson, "Actually Existing Marxism", p.19.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>57</sup> David Robertson, ed. *Instant Reference Politics: From Absolutism to Zionism* (London: by Tech Yourself, 2001), p.116.
- <sup>58</sup> Scruton; *A Dictionary of Political Thought*, p.304.
- <sup>59</sup> Perry Anderson, "A sense of the Left", p.81.
- <sup>60</sup> Sasson, *One Hundred years of Socialism: The West European Left in the Twentieth century* (I.B Tauris: London: 1996) pp.776-7, cited in Eley "Socialism by any other names", p.123.
- <sup>61</sup> Eley "Socialism by Any other Names", Ibid.
- <sup>62</sup> Bartolini, *The Political Mobilization*, p.10.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>64</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>65</sup> Krieger, *The Oxford Companion to the Politics of the World*, p.494.
- <sup>66</sup> Heywood, *Politics*, p.51.
- <sup>67</sup> Docherty, *Historical Dictionary of Socialism*, p.12.
- <sup>68</sup> Favretto, *The Long Search for a Third way*, p.1.
- <sup>69</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>70</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>71</sup> Eley, "Socialism by any other Name", p.114.
- <sup>72</sup> Ibid.; p.113.
- <sup>73</sup> Maurice Conforth, *Communism and Philosophy*, cited in Rajendra Prasad, "Communist Theory and Communist Parties", p.827.
- <sup>74</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>75</sup> Heywood, *Politics*, p.55.
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>77</sup> Docherty, *Historical Dictionary of Socialism*, p.12, He attributed their success to their role as progenitor of Welfare State. The social democratic parties of Sweden and New Zealand took lead in this process.
- <sup>78</sup>
- <sup>79</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>80</sup> Ibid. p.10. (For its detail in form of chart see Annexure-II)
- <sup>81</sup> Bartolini, *The Political Mobilization*, p.10.
- <sup>82</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>83</sup> Ibid. pp.573-74 For details Bartolinis table in annexure-III.
- <sup>84</sup> Irfan Habib, "The Left and the National Movement", *Social Scientist*, Vol. 26, No.516 (May-Jun), 1998, p.3.
- <sup>85</sup> Paranjoy Guha Tahir, Shanker Raghuraman, *Divided We Stand: India A Time of Coalitions* (Los Angle: Sage Publications, 2007), p.389.
- <sup>86</sup> Mohendra Prasad and Anil Mishra, *Coalition Politics in India: Problems and Prospects* (New Delhi: Manohar, 2009), p.55.



<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

<sup>89</sup> Sumanta Banerjee, “Naxalbari and the Left Movement in India” in *Social Movement and the State* ed. Ghanshyam Shah (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2002), p.151.

<sup>90</sup> These factions draw inspiration from Subhas Chandra Bose who formed this party in 1940

<sup>91</sup> Banerjee “Naxalbari and the Left”, pp.151-152.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., pp.152-153.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., p.152.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

<sup>100</sup> Dictionary of philosophy, defines stipulative definition as “A declaration of an intention to assign a particular meaning to a new expression, or to assign a new meaning to an existing expression. This is done for the sake of convenience, for instance, in order to have a shorter word to replace more complex phrase... A stipulative definition can be convenient or inconvenient but cannot be correct incorrect.

Thomas Mautrer, ed. *The Penguin Dictionary of Philosophy* (London: Penguin Books, 2000), p.541.

<sup>101</sup> In a contextual definition only the whole statement containing the definiens (meaning of defining expression) can replace the whole statement containing the definendum (expression to be defined) Ibid., p.126.

<sup>102</sup> These groups endeavoured to find a reciprocal space of religion in socialism and viceversa. By doing so they wanted to challenge the obscurantist vision of religion, which uncritically justified the existence of capitalism feudalism in religion and favored status quo.

<sup>103</sup> Hefeez Malik and Gankovsky, *The Encyclopedia of Pakistan* (Karachi: OUP, 2006), P.189.