

Fiasco of Revisionism*

B. T. Ranadive

PART I : REAL FACE OF PROGRAMME AMENDMENTS

The Patna Session of the Indian revisionists throws new light on the ideological fiasco of the leadership and shows how under the pressure of political events, the revisionist leaders had to go back on some of their own formulations and explain away the reactionary crudities of their Programme now that they stood nakedly revealed to their ranks. The leaders, of course, have gone on record saying that everything that they said and did, including what they did not say and did not do, has been proved to be correct and right. The Programme, the policy, the tactics—all are justified and presented to the ranks as great gems of wisdom. And yet if you read through their report, it is plain that in spite of being hundred per cent correct they had to own and acknowledge ‘mistakes’, ‘shortcomings’, ‘vacillations’, etc., on a number of major issues.

If all this was really a process of self-enlightenment, of a genuine understanding, even partial, of the criminal mistakes they had committed, of the utterly treacherous character of the line they had advocated, and the complete betrayal of internationalism by them on two successive occasions, we would have welcomed it. But here is an attempt to put a cloak of respectability on the crimes committed, while graciously condescending to acknowledge a few failings.

*This document was published in the “PEOPLE’S DEMOCRACY”, Calcutta, in seven instalments in its issues dated April 7, 1968, May 12, 1968, May 19, 1968, May 26, 1968, June 2, 1968, June 9, 1968 and June 30, 1968.

Of course, while doing this they first assure their ranks that our Party, the CPI(M), has been doing nothing but piling up mistakes and that it is responsible for many setbacks of the movement. Every occasion is used to create a wall between our Party and their ranks.

Two Successive Betrayals

To take but one instance, the fact that their Hindu communalist line during the Indo-Pak war created a revulsion among wide sections of Muslims who were attracted by our Party's line is put by them in the following words: "But our agitation at times was defective in the sense that we did not sufficiently stress the need for an end to the war and on peaceful methods. The CPM exploited our shortcomings on this score and created an impression among the Muslims as if they were the foremost champions of peace and settlement between the two countries." (*Political Report*, p. 100)

Can any person have any respect for leaders who palm off their crimes on others? For any party which calls itself Marxist-Leninist, here was once again complete betrayal of proletarian internationalism for the second time, with the revisionist leaders going under the banner of the capitalist-landlord clique, and becoming warmongers. It was not just a question of underplaying peace and proletarian solidarity as the revisionists claim. They were outdoing even the Jana Sangh in their national chauvinism and, if we remember it correctly, criticizing the warring Government for not being sufficiently firm and bellicose.

In fact, so overwhelmed were they by national chauvinism that they turned against the hand that had fed them ideologically. They turned against the Soviet leadership, loyalty to whom is their highest test of internationalism. By their own standards they completely repudiated all sense of proletarian internationalism and sank deep into the cesspool of bourgeois nationalism.

Listen to these worthies, now forced to make a confession: "Our weakness was revealed in our lukewarm attitude towards

the Soviet pronouncements and moves which were to lead to the Tashkent talks. In fact we were initially critical of some Soviet statements in connection with the Indo-Pak war. We did not come out forcefully when the proposal for Indo-Pak talks under the Soviet initiative was being first mooted. No wonder that Lal Bahadur Shastri's public statement in support of the Soviet proposal for Indo-Pakistan talk came before that of our Party."

In short, the warring leader of the bourgeoisie, the Prime Minister, proved less bellicose than these worthy gentlemen who pretended to be internationalists. They did not support the Soviet efforts for peace and were prepared to play the American game of setting India and Pakistan at each other's throat.

In 1962, they were prepared to join with the Americans—accept imperialist help—against China; in 1965, they were prepared to play the role of war incendiaries to bring grist to the mill of the imperialists. This time they could not boast of the fig-leaf of Soviet support also.

How they acted as incendiaries and broke the solidarity of the working class of the two countries is revealed by themselves. "We did not pay much attention to the necessity of appealing to the healthy forces in Pakistan [Oh, they have discovered then that even in Pakistan there could be healthy forces—some demarcation from the Jana Sangh!] and East Pakistan. Understandably, our comrades there felt upset and became critical."

Yet even now they justify their policies. But the facts are clear. Their comrades in Pakistan had to attack them for their chauvinism. They are forced to make a belated confession that they failed to realize that there were toilers, exploited classes, in Pakistan. Perhaps no other party in the capitalist world, claiming to be Marxist-Leninist, could boast of two successive betrayals of internationalism in such a short time.

Instead of disowning this anti-revolutionary outlook, this gross betrayal and crossing over to the camp of the

capitalists and landlords, the leadership tries to explain it away.

And when the Muslim masses of our country see these gentlemen in their true colours, and turn with a revulsion from them towards our Party whose courageous advocacy of peace they correctly appreciated, these gentlemen call it exploitation of their shortcomings by our Party. Said just like a bourgeois party. The bourgeoisie does not recognize that the proletariat has a positive role to play, a class line that represents the interests of the downtrodden masses. Everytime the working class party advances its line in opposition to the bankrupt line of the bourgeoisie, everytime the masses respond to it, they decry it as exploitation of the situation or the ignorance of the masses.

The Political Report contains many instances of this approach; it also reveals that the opportunism of some of their formulations became so exposed that the revisionist clique had to amend many of them.

Programme “Modification”

Even the Programme has not escaped modification, because of the rough handling received at the hands of a rapidly developing situation. The first casualty is the revisionist conception or characterization of the Indian state.

Article 46 of the revisionist Programme adopted at their Bombay session stated : “The State in India is the organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole, which upholds and develops capitalism and capitalist relations of production, distribution and exchange in the national economy of India.

“In the formation and exercise of governmental power the big bourgeoisie wields considerable influence.

“The national bourgeoisie compromises with the landlords, admits them in the Ministries and governmental composition especially at the State levels...”

Thus the state is the organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie which upholds and develops capitalist relations.

The big bourgeoisie wields considerable influence only at the governmental level (not at the state level). The landlords are not a class sharing power in the state, but are allowed only admittance into ministerial positions at the State level.

As against this our Party Programme stated : "The present Indian State is the organ of the class rule of the bourgeoisie and landlords, led by the big bourgeoisie who are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital in pursuit of the capitalist path of development."

Here you see the basic difference. The state is the state of the capitalists and landlords. Besides, it is led by the big bourgeoisie increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital. All the elements—the classes wielding power, the leadership of the compromising Big Business—are stated here.

Our Party had attacked the formulation of the revisionists and pointed out that the revisionists were covering the reactionary alliance with the landlords in the state by denying that they shared power with the national bourgeoisie and presenting the present state as anti-feudal; that by denying that it was led by the big bourgeoisie increasingly collaborating with imperialism they were minimizing its anti-popular character as well as capacity to compromise with imperialism and betray national interests. They dubbed all this as sectarianism.

The definition was essential to pursue the policy of compromise with the national bourgeoisie which the revisionist leaders have been pursuing and to divert the attack towards reactionaries and monopolists who were supposed to have no connection with either the government, the state and who were presented as sabotaging the progressive policies of the government and the state.

And now the revisionists are changing their basic formulation. Why? Not, of course, because it is wrong and opportunist, but only because it is liable to be misinterpreted for lack of clarity, etc. And the main reason, of course, is that

our Party is exploiting their weaknesses. Listen to Bhupesh Gupta : "The CPM leadership, for example, has been at pains to prove their charge of 'revisionism' against us by such misinterpretations and distortions. In doing so, they have picked on this or that formulation to serve their purpose, while ignoring the fundamental propositions of our Party Programme".

Bhupesh Gupta assures everybody that the amendments only clarify, they "have not in the least altered anything fundamental in the Programme". This latter claim is, of course, true. With all the amendments the Programme remains as revisionist as it was in 1964.

Amendment and Clarification

Let us, however, see how the amendments clarify.

In his articles in *New Age*, Bhupesh Gupta says : "The article 46 as amended reads as follows: 'The State in India is the organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole in which the big bourgeoisie holds powerful influence. This class rule has strong links with the landlords. These factors give rise to reactionary pulls on the State power.' "

On this change, Bhupesh Gupta comments : "It will be noted that the Party Programme retains its original position that the State is an organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie. It does not accept that the power is shared by the landlords. However, the amendment highlights the relation of the big bourgeoisie to the State power—which is now under the control of the national bourgeoisie as a whole. Although the Programme does not accept the thesis of the CPM Programme [the big bad wolf] that the big bourgeoisie is in the leadership or that the State is a bourgeois-landlord State", it "takes full note of the powerful influence the Big Business exercises in relation to State power as well as the links of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie with the landlords."

This is supposed to be just clarification, to avoid distortion by the CPM. Revisionists always dread truth and they

are here covering their opportunist formulations with a gloss of change.

Now, these gentlemen, in the name of clarification only, are forced to eat some of their words and formulations. Now they are discerning for the first time that the big bourgeoisie is influencing not only the government but the state also. Oh, great discovery, gentlemen! You are getting on, no doubt. We sympathize with you for the mental and intellectual exertion involved in this discovery.

Same Revisionist Understanding

But mark their words: The big bourgeoisie, the Tatas, the Birlas, the big industrial capitalists do not lead the state; they just wield powerful influence on it. They are promoted, no doubt. Formerly they held 'considerable influence' only on the government; now they hold 'powerful influence' over the state (just a matter of clarification, no doubt). But those who own the banks, monopolize the deposits, spread their industrial empires—they are not the real masters of the state. The same revisionist vomit is dished out under the guise of some change, to cheat the ranks. No doubt, the crude formulation that the big bourgeoisie was not in the state anywhere was found to be too bogus. So they have been admitted to the state now.

And, of course, there is not a reference, not a hint that any of this section which controls the state has any links with imperialism. Our Programme states that the state is led by the big bourgeoisie which is increasingly collaborating with imperialism.

It seems from their description that the collaborating and compromising section is out of the state and the state is really led and controlled by anti-imperialists—at best sometimes vacillating sections. As before, this is to give a certificate of anti-imperialism to it and screen its compromising character.

Similarly, our revisionists could no longer conceal the role of the landlords in the state. In the Bombay Congress,

they had humbugged the ranks to believe that the landlords had no share in state power; they had only a few ministerial positions which enabled them to sabotage the progressive land reforms launched under the state of the national bourgeoisie.

The agrarian crisis, the exposure of the land reforms, the famines, the peasant struggles and their brutal suppression, make it impossible to sustain this fable. The formation of non-Congress Ministries also brought to the forefront the stronghold of landlord interests on the state and the bureaucracy and revealed even to the ignorant that this "State of the national bourgeoisie" would not shrink from sabotaging every radical measure benefitting the peasantry at the expense of the vested landed interests. Some change was called for.

Hence now the state of the national bourgeoisie is supposed to have class links with the landlords but the latter do not share power in the state. Once again, giving the state an anti-feudal character, certifying it that it can be an instrument in the struggle for anti-feudal revolution and screening its alliance with the landlords. Only the most servile and trained lackeys of the national big bourgeoisie could fail to see the bourgeois-landlord alliance, whose dire and devastating effects are seen visually in the agrarian crisis and the suppression of the peasantry.

So they formulate: "These factors [the influence of the big bourgeoisie, and the links with the landlords] give rise to reactionary pulls on the State power". The state power—of the national bourgeoisie—is alright. The big bourgeoisie and the landlords only give reactionary pulls in their direction. What is the logical conclusion? Defeat the pulls so that the state is kept on the straight path. Here is not an alliance with the landlords; here is not the leadership of the big bourgeoisie increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital—but just a few reactionary pulls on it. The edge of the struggle against imperialism, feudal survivals, for People's Democracy need not be directed against the state, but against

those exercising reactionary pulls. The conclusion is the same that emerges from their earlier formulations.

The "Trifle" They Forgot

But, of course, things are too hot for our revisionists; so while virtually repeating the formulation about the state and the class leading it, they have to accept by an amendment to the Programme that the alternative path of "National Democracy" cannot be implemented unless the rule of the national bourgeoisie and the capitalist path which it is pursuing are ended. This is a first-rate fiasco for all their theories and what they have been preaching.

For, nowhere in their Programme have they stated that they are out to end the rule of the national bourgeoisie. On the other hand, they talk of defeating reaction, inside and outside the ruling party, of only doing away with the monopoly power of the bourgeoisie, of sharing power with them—all indicating the formation of a coalition Ministry and nothing else.

Now they are compelled to say that there must be an end to the rule of their beloved national bourgeoisie. Though it must pass the comprehension of any person, why after certifying the state to be free from landlord alliance, and the dominance of sections compromising with imperialism, the rule should be overthrown to achieve an anti-feudal, anti-imperialist "national democratic revolution". Logically it should lead to the state being used as an instrument of National Democracy—this is the line in their Programme and this continues today also in spite of this verbal concession to the demand for ending the rule of the national bourgeoisie.

Our Party had repeatedly attacked the revisionists for sidetracking the fight against the state in the name of fighting the forces of reaction; for diverting attention from the state in the name of concentrating only on the monopolies and communal reactionaries. We had stated that these people were not interested in ending the present state. Now, while basically they are sticking to their formulations, under

pressure, they are forced to agree that the rule of the national bourgeoisie must be ended.

So bankrupt was the revisionist Programme that it neither contained a call to end the present state—the National Democratic State was only a call for coalition Government—nor to end the Congress Government. They had drawn a great programme for National Democratic transformation as a step to socialism and all that, but forgot a trifle—the question of state power, the question of ending the rule of the bourgeois-landlord alliance; they even forgot to say that the Congress Government should be replaced by an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal Government, etc. This was not forgetfulness; nor was this a failure to be explicit and clear. It was just their line and attitude to the bourgeois-landlord state.

Article 76 of their Programme only talked about the new path without raising the question of changing the rule of the bourgeoisie. Now our revisionist gentlemen have seen the weakness and just want to ‘clarify’ it. The amendment runs, “This alternative path will mean, first and foremost, the replacement of the Congress or any other form of bourgeois rule by a Government composed of consistently anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly classes and forces capable of and determined to carry out revolutionary changes”, etc.

On this Bhupesh Gupta comments, “Nowhere in our Party Programme had it been expressly stated that the Congress rule must be overthrown and replaced by a democratic Government representing anti-imperialist, etc., forces. This amendment makes clear and explicit what was implicit,” etc. Now these gentlemen have realized that their Programme does not ‘explicitly’ raise the question of change of Government or of state power. Great Marxist-Leninists! It took four years for them to realize this. Great progress!

Thus their basic formulations getting exposed, the bankruptcy revealed before the people, the leaders are forced to manoeuvre, make a few changes, keeping the atrocious framework of the Programme and its revisionist formulations intact.

Demagogy to Hide Opportunism

But these manoeuvrings will yield no results. For so long as the basic line of the Programme stands, the line of betrayal, of desertion to the camp of the bourgeoisie, of rejection of proletarian internationalism, a few phrases do not mean any change in practice. But of this more subsequently.

Meanwhile, we ask these gentlemen one question: Are you serious about any formulation? Your amendment talks about "the replacement of the Congress or any other form of bourgeois rule by a Government composed of *consistently* anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-monopoly classes". Is this your conception of the National Democratic Government or state? Do you include the national bourgeoisie among the consistently anti-imperialist, etc., forces? Article 77 of your Programme says in regard to this class, "...while it strives to eliminate the imperialist grip and the feudal remnants from our economy in its own interests, it vacillates and is inclined to compromise with these elements and pursues anti-people policies". So, the national bourgeoisie has no place in your Government? Or have you now decided that they are consistently anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopoly?

All this shows that it is dangerous to use demagogy where class realities are concerned, and where revolutionary intentions are absent. Marxism-Leninism is a science, and you cannot hide your opportunism by using a few phrases to hide your servility to an alien class.

Do you realize the meaning of a state or government only of consistently anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopoly classes? Even the vaguest memory of Marxian understanding should enable you to realize the class meaning of what you state. But, obviously, you are out to cheat your ranks.

PART II : REBUFF TO THE PROGRAMME

As we have stated, the revisionist leaders have been forced to change the earlier crudities in their programme. After defending their basic erroneous anti-Marxist formulations

for four years, now the leaders are compelled to modify or change them.

They had to eat their words on the question of the leadership of their so-called National Democratic Front. Article 80, paragraph 4, of their Programme says, "In this class alliance the exclusive leadership of the working class is not yet established, though the exclusive leadership of the bourgeoisie no longer exists".

Perhaps no party claiming to be Marxist-Leninist has made such a blatantly servile and class-collaborationist formulation as this Dange group of revisionists has done. Years ago, Lenin had taught that in the era of proletarian revolution, the bourgeoisie becomes incapable of leading the democratic revolution, because the latter, with the full participation of the masses, shows every possibility of growing into a socialist revolution. Hence he developed the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the democratic revolution; this hegemony was to be the guarantee that the democratic revolution would not be betrayed and that it would necessarily grow into a socialist revolution.

Anti-Leninist Concept

Turning against this teaching of Lenin, the revisionist leaders abandoned the idea of proletarian hegemony and openly preached the idea of sharing hegemony with the bourgeoisie in the democratic revolution. The concept of joint leadership of these two classes for the success of the democratic revolution is a totally anti-Leninist concept and in effect leads to the hegemony of the bourgeoisie.

Our Party repeatedly attacked this anti-revolutionary concept and practice following from it. This was, however, the essence of their attack on People's Democracy and state of People's Democracy. They said they did not think that a state led by the working class was called for; all that was necessary was a state under the joint leadership of the capitalists and the working class.

We wrote: "Establishing the People's Democratic state

under the leadership of the working class to complete the democratic revolution and prepare the pre-conditions of socialism, or betraying the democratic revolution by offering the bourgeoisie a share in the leadership in the name of National Democratic state—it is on this that the differences between the Communist Party and the revisionists are centred.”

The author of the joint leadership formula was of course S.A. Dange who had clearly and brazenfacedly spelt it out in one of his documents prior to the Bombay Congress of the revisionists. Dange had not put it negatively as the Programme did but had positively called for joint leadership.

The revisionist leaders defended this notorious formula as concrete application of Marxism-Leninism. But it became indefensible and since it revealed their utter dependence and servility towards the bourgeois class, so now at last they are compelled to change it, give it a different meaning and at the same time pretend as if they were doing nothing more than putting the old idea in just positive terms.

Formula which Boomeranged

The new amendment reads, “The leadership of this alliance belongs to firm anti-imperialist and anti-feudal and anti-monopoly forces.”

Commenting on this, Bhupesh Gupta writes, “The original formulation in the Programme is in negative terms...the amendment now defines the class content and character of the leadership in positive terms.” In reality, what is there common between the old formulation and the new addition? Neither the exclusive leadership of the bourgeoisie nor the exclusive leadership of the proletariat has only one meaning—the leadership is shared between the two. The other anti-imperialist sections nowhere came under the formula.

But now an attempt is made that the positive way of presenting this notorious formula of class collaboration is leadership of all anti-imperialist forces. From sharing of leadership with the bourgeoisie to sharing of leadership with all firm anti-imperialist forces—such is the sweep of their

positive formulation. A leadership forced to abandon its blatantly collaborationist formulation is now falsely asserting that all that it meant was the joint leadership of firm anti-imperialist classes.

However, one thing is clear—the attempt to install the national bourgeoisie in leadership, to ascribe to it more revolutionariness than even the peasantry, has boomeranged. And now the revisionist leaders have to talk about the leadership of all the anti-imperialist classes.

In the first place, see how the leaders are changing their emphasis. In their Bombay Programme, they were blatantly advocating sharing of leadership with the entire national bourgeoisie; they did not distinguish between a firm and vacillating section. Now in his explanation, Bhupesh Gupta says that the other anti-imperialist forces will share the leadership with those sections of the bourgeoisie which remain firm against imperialism, feudalism and monopoly capital.

Gentlemen, have you discovered such sections among the national bourgeoisie that will remain firm against not only imperialism, feudalism but also against monopoly capitalists? But in your own Programme, you declare that the entire national bourgeois class vacillates and is inclined to compromise with imperialists and feudalism and pursues anti-people policies. And yet, determined to put them in the leadership, you discover certain firm sections among the national bourgeoisie.

Old Idea in Modified Form

The correct position is that this class, apart from the monopolist and big bourgeois sections which are directly hostile to the democratic revolution, vacillates all the time and is never firm. It is quite conceivable that sections, while vacillating all the time, while sometimes opposing the revolution, may again come back and remain with the Front—but they are never firm and even on the basis of the criterion applied by the revisionists, they cannot have a place in the leadership; they may be in the alliance; they may be in the Front and the Government but not in the leadership. But by talking

about some firm sections worthy of being in the leadership, the revisionist leaders are again putting the old idea of sharing leadership with the bourgeoisie in a modified form.

Then, how far is it correct to state that the leadership may be shared by the other anti-imperialist forces, anti-monopolist forces, such as the peasantry, revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie, etc.?

In the first place, one must thank the revisionists for remembering the peasantry after four years. A glorious achievement, no doubt. And yet this formulation which once more negates the Leninist concept of hegemony of the proletariat in the democratic revolution in the name of sharing the leadership with the peasantry, is a reactionary formulation worthy only of the modern Mensheviks. It puts the rich peasant, the middle peasant, the city intelligentsia and the petty-bourgeoisie on the same plane as the working class and abandons all class analysis of the forces behind the revolution, the firm and leading forces, the vacillating and weak forces.

If all these sections can be equally anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, etc.—gentlemen, why do you talk of workers' and peasants' alliance? Why do you attach special importance to it? Or is it just a phrase for you and you do not designate thereby the main, the driving forces of the revolution? Why don't you include all other sections when you describe the core of the alliance? Such tricks won't do. When you say that the workers' and peasants' alliance is the core, you have already singled out these forces as the more consistent and uncompromising among all those who may form the Front. You can't escape the conclusion. And, therefore, you cannot justify your opportunist conclusion that the other forces also can share in the leadership.

No Faith in Marxism-Leninism

It is correct to state that the workers' and peasants' alliance is the core of the anti-imperialist front, but it is incorrect to state that anyone except the working class can provide the leadership in the democratic revolution. In the present epoch

of democratic revolutions rapidly growing into socialist revolutions, when in the democratic revolution itself, people have to fight the monopolists, the vacillations of other classes do not disappear. To imagine that their outlook has become so revolutionary that they have ceased to act according to the position of their strata in society is to indulge in non-class petty-bourgeois muddle. This is what Lenin taught and this is what is being deliberately ignored. In this connection, the revisionists and their mentors dare not refer to Lenin because they want to repudiate him.

How the peasantry vacillates to the point of danger even after the achievement of the revolution was seen in Russia after the February Revolution. Lenin described the Soviets as state of the type of the Paris Commune, i.e., a power directly based on revolutionary seizure. He said, "They refuse to recognize the obvious truth that inasmuch as these Soviets, *inasmuch as* they are a power, we have a state of the *type of the Paris Commune*".

"I have emphasized the words, 'inasmuch as', for it is only an incipient power. By direct agreement with the bourgeois provisional Government and by a series of actual concessions, it has itself surrendered and is surrendering its position to the-bourgeoisie". This was due to the fact that the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and even sections of the working class still continued to be swayed by illusions about the bourgeoisie even though they were the real power. These sections are able to develop their full revolutionary potentialities only when they develop confidence in the working class and its Party, otherwise they vacillate.

But the revisionists want to paint the situation as if the democratic revolution can be successfully organized without the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, the leadership of the proletariat and its Party. The proletariat is able to guide just because it has Marxism-Leninism to guide itself, because it is the class in modern society that is vitally interested in the success of the democratic revolution and its growing into socialist revolution.

By negating the hegemony of the proletariat the revisionists negate the working class and its revolutionary science, Marxism-Leninism, and the proletarian Party. And that is but natural—they don't believe in Marxism-Leninism at all.

Slogan of Deception

Thus the common leadership of all anti-imperialist classes is a slogan of deception. It is correct to state the Government will be one of all anti-imperialist classes; but in the actual conduct of the revolution each section does not play an identical role. The workers and peasants form the driving force, the core of the alliance; this itself distinguishes them from the rest; inside the peasantry itself the rich peasant will not play the same role in Indian conditions as the poor peasant or the agricultural worker—much less can he be elevated to the position of leadership in the revolutionary struggle. The ruinous effects of giving him a leading place in the kisan movement for a number of years are there for all to see.

Even though the worker-peasant alliance is the core of the Front, it will be wrong to say that it is the workers and peasants who lead the Front. The leadership again is determined by the position of the class in present society, etc.—it must rest with the working class since if the movement is conducted except on the Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics, it will face serious reverses. To make the peasants and other toiling sections see the correctness of this strategy and tactics, of the partial and ultimate slogans of the present phase—and make them accept in the course of the struggle these as their own experience—in this precisely lies the leadership of the working class. Without this there is no successful revolution, no successful defence of it, nor its growing into a socialist revolution.

Exclusive Indian Contribution

As for the national bourgeoisie, the leadership ascribed to it is an exclusively Indian contribution to the armoury of world

revisionism. No international document of recent times also ever talks about the national bourgeoisie or any of its sections sharing leadership with the working class or the anti-imperialist forces.

Our revisionists in their incautious moments sometimes refer to the 1960 Declaration of 81 Parties. What does that document say on the question of the national bourgeoisie? "This alliance [the alliance of the working class and the peasantry] is called upon to be the basis of a broad national front. *The extent to which the national bourgeoisie participates in the liberation struggle also depends to no small degree upon its strength and stability.*" (Emphasis ours)

Messieurs revisionists, do you *understand* the meaning of the sentence? Even the extent of *participation* of the national bourgeoisie depends on the stability of the workers' and peasants' alliance. Where then is the question of leadership of the national bourgeoisie, sharing leadership with it? The document nowhere mentions even indirectly that the national bourgeoisie is to lead the struggle. It only raises the question of their participation.

And, again, the same document states that even in countries which are dependent, the national bourgeoisie "retains the capacity of participating in the revolutionary struggle against imperialism"—(not successfully leading it). "After winning political independence the people seek solutions to the social problems... As social contradictions grow the national bourgeoisie inclines more and more to compromising with domestic reaction and imperialism". Once more the position is hardly the condition for sharing leadership with them or for installing them in the leadership of the democratic revolution.

You see none but the bankrupt Indian revisionist leaders make such idiotic formulations, like the sharing of leadership with the national bourgeoisie. Its likely participation in anti-imperialist struggle is confused with leadership and the entire class balance is changed to suit the needs of this compromising, vacillating class.

Indefensible Position

Finding that their bogus formulation, the new one, also could not be sustained for any length of time, Bhupesh Gupta has started resorting to prevarication and equivocation. In explanation of the rejection of proletarian hegemony, he makes two statements: "Peasantry and middle classes may not be at a given time under the leadership of either the working class or the national bourgeoisie." Then in bold types, "The thesis that the leadership of the working class is not a precondition of the front does not, however, at all mean that the working class will not play a leading role in organizing the National Democratic Front and the revolutionary movement."

When you blandly state that there will be no proletarian leadership even after the formation of your National Democratic state, you are not talking about preconditions; but you are asserting that even when your national democratic revolution achieves state power, there will be no leadership of the working class. During the entire period of struggle as well as after the formation of your new state there will be no leadership of the working class. Para 4, section 80, of your Programme deals with the *state* in the hands of the National Democratic Front—and you assert that in this alliance which will hold this new state neither the working class nor the bourgeoisie will be the exclusive leaders. Now you assert that all anti-imperialist, etc., forces will lead, and not the working class alone. But you are nowhere talking about or discussing the leadership of the working class or any other class as a precondition of the National Democratic Front.

You know your whole position is indefensible and you now slyly pretend that you object to the leadership of the working class as a precondition to building of the Front. In reality you are in principle opposed to the hegemony of the proletariat in the democratic revolution. If it were a question of opposing it as a precondition to the starting of any activity, front, etc.—there need be no discussion. The leadership is not a readymade affair. It evolves during the actual course of the revolutionary movement through the correct role and

guidance of the proletariat. But this is not what you mean. You insist that during the entire stage of democratic revolution, proletarian hegemony is barred.

Then your statement, "peasantry and middle class may not be at a given time under the leadership of the bourgeoisie or the proletariat". Is this the point you are dealing with in your Programme? You are dealing with a combination of classes, their relationship during the entire period of democratic revolution and you state that the proletariat will not lead the revolutionary forces. Thus it is not a question of what relationship may exist among the revolutionary forces at any given time. You are insisting on a given relationship for the entire period. Now when you casually write about the peasantry not being under the leadership of the working class or the bourgeoisie at any given time, you are just throwing dust in the eyes of your followers. And, besides, it is known that this independence of the peasantry cannot continue for a long time.

In the Company of Mensheviks

No, this is not the point. The point is not whether the peasantry is today under the leadership of the proletariat; the point is certainly not whether proletarian leadership is to be a precondition of anything. The point is what should be the line and understanding of a Party which claims to stand by Marxism-Leninism. Does it consider it necessary that for the guaranteed success of the democratic revolution proletarian leadership is essential and does it work for the consummation of this? Does it put the working class on the same plane as other sections and does it hold any one of these classes might fulfil the role of leadership and share it with the working class? It is here that you give a directly anti-Marxist answer and join the company of the Mensheviks of Lenin's period.

And in spite of this, you are sometimes forced to talk of the leading role of the proletariat in organizing the revolutionary movement—though not, of course, of the role of leadership. The proletariat should fight, sacrifice, do every-

thing but lead—this is your demand. And you promise to the working class a leading position in the alliance—gradually after the coming into existence of the National Democratic state and placing effective state power in the hands of the vacillating classes including the national bourgeoisie.

PART III : OPPORTUNISM ON THE QUESTION OF PEASANTRY AND POLITICAL PARTIES

Bhupesh Gupta in his article unconsciously makes a significant admission. "The question of amending the Party Programme on the question of peasantry in Chapter V was discussed at some length. But it was decided that the question should be more thoroughly studied in view of the extreme complexity of the problem".

Bhupesh Gupta is, of course, silent about the content of the amendment. He has reason to be. Because it threatened to debunk their present revisionist position which does not base itself on a growing differentiation inside the peasantry—a position which our Party has taken in our Programme—a position which is the only consistent application of a Leninist understanding of the problem.

But our revisionists dread nothing more than class analysis and class outlook, and fear nothing more than reliance on the revolutionary sections or their leadership. A hotch-potch analysis which clubs the exploiting and exploited elements in the rural areas politically, which magnifies the importance of the former, suits their reformist politics.

Differentiation Inside Peasantry

Anyone who is serious about a democratic revolution in India cannot avoid such an analysis; anyone who knows that commodity production and capitalist relations are developing in India cannot escape it. But the revisionist leaders are determined not to recognize differentiation inside the peasantry for arriving at a political estimate of the different sections.

What does their Programme say and what was the amendment?

Their agrarian analysis is full of contradictions besides being an attempt to prettify the national bourgeoisie and their Government. After a lot of talk about semi-feudal relations, about survival of semi-feudal land relations and conditions of the poorer strata of the agrarian masses, they blandly write, "statutory semi-feudal landlordism has been abolished in the erstwhile zamindari areas. *The major part of the area under cultivation is within the category of self-operated ownership holdings while the area under lease, which constituted the major area before land reform, is now confined to a small area*". (Emphasis ours)

These words carry only one meaning. The bourgeois-landlord state has virtually abolished feudal land relations—the overwhelmingly large area of land was now in possession of cultivating proprietors. This is not just curbing of semi-feudal relations, this is virtually their abolition. This is how they praise the Government and the national bourgeoisie.

No doubt in complete contradiction to this claim, they also talk about strong survivals of feudalism, of sub-letting and share-cropping—which, according to their own statement, is confined to only a small area—but the main formulation is that the major section of the land is operated by peasant proprietors.

In contrast, our Programme states the abolition of the intermediary rights has been followed by eviction of millions of tenants both legally and illegally or the tenants being forced to purchase the land rights from the landlord. In the ryotwari areas also they have actually led to the eviction and uprooting of millions of peasants from the land. The much-talked-of legislations regarding ceiling on landholdings have been so framed as to enable the big landholders either to preserve their holdings untouched or to split them up through fictitious partition among their family members.

Two Different Understandings

The difference between the two understandings is clear beyond doubt. The revisionists credit the national bourgeoisie

with redistributing land on the basis of private ownership and virtually abolishing feudal land relations. Their subsequent stress on survivals, batai, share-cropping, is just a balancing performance and does not logically follow from their basic understanding. With this understanding, they cannot say that there are strong survivals of feudalism in India.

And that brings them to their next contradiction. They say, "Interpenetration of strong [?] survivals of feudalism and growing capitalist relations of production is the dominant character of socio-economic life in India's countryside". If this has any meaning it means that stratification inside the Indian peasantry is growing apace and it is thoroughly incorrect to talk about an undifferentiated mass of peasantry when discussing the classes behind the current stage of the revolution. It means that the peasantry is being divided into rich, middle and poor peasants—and agricultural workers, and different sections will play a varying role in the revolutionary struggle. It leads straight to the conclusion that the latter two are the firmer sections and basic allies of the working class.

But this is precisely what the revisionist Programme does not accept. In consonance with their basic principle of reducing the role of proletarian and semi-proletarian elements, they put the rich peasant and agricultural labourers on the same plane in relation to the revolutionary struggle. In their Programme they ask, which are the classes that are interested in the national democratic revolution? And when they refer to the peasantry they say "the broad masses of the cultivating peasants including the rich peasants and agricultural workers" are interested. There is no distinction between the various sections—no firm reliance on one section, no mention of the vacillations of the exploiting sections.

In effect this is a plea to base the agrarian movement mainly on the rich peasant, at best the middle peasant, a counterpart of the joint hegemony of the proletariat and bourgeoisie.

Rich Peasant Ideology

So palpably opportunist was the conception in the Programme that an amendment was moved to rectify the wrong understanding. Though there was no attempt to change the erroneous formulation regarding land relations, yet the amendment sought to take into consideration the differentiation inside the peasantry. It described the rich peasant as the rural counterpart of the national bourgeoisie; the middle peasant as a firmer ally than the rich peasant and stated that their party should strike deep roots among the agricultural workers, rely on the poor and middle peasants and unite the entire peasantry. This, however, was too much for the revisionist leaders.

What? Base yourself on the differentiation among the peasantry? Why, that is Left sectarianism. And if you accept the differentiation what will the CPI(M) say? What? Differentiate yourself from the rich peasants? Accept that he has no leading role? Then what will happen to the sharing of leadership with the national bourgeoisie?

What arguments were advanced to meet the new amendment are not known. But it is clear that the discussion was sabotaged under the plea that this was a very complicated problem. To accept differentiation inside the peasantry—once the growth of capitalist relations is accepted—is it so complicated? And to determine the revolutionary role of each section on the basis of its economic position—is it so strange and complicated for those who claim to be Marxist-Leninists? No, the point is the revisionist organization is so honey-combed with rich peasant ideology, with the ideology of the national bourgeoisie, that any class approach is becoming impossible for it.

Thus everything in the Programme remains as before.

Political Parties

And then the revisionist leaders suddenly decided to delete Chapter IX of their Party Programme which deals with their characterization of political parties.

The reason advanced for deletion is their sudden discovery that in a programmatic document, characterizing and describing the various parties is not necessary. The real reason is that their characterization of some of the political parties has proved to be so completely wrong that they had to change it completely; a further reason is that they cannot justify their coalition opportunism with the Jana Sangh—the fascistic communal organization of reaction—without forgetting their characterization of it.

Listen to their characterization of the Dravid Munnetra Kazagam in their Programme: “The Dravid Munnetra Kazagam (DMK) is a party in the South [oh, not in Tamilnad—the South—spoken like a Jana Sanghi], reflecting separatist tendencies, allying itself with the Swatantra Party and the Muslim League on key political questions, but indulging in Left demagogy, is a party that aims to divert and disrupt the democratic movement in the South”. In the political report to the Patna Congress, the DMK is mentioned as a party of democratic opposition—a qualitative change. These chameleons of election began to change their characterization of DMK as elections approached and blamed their Tamilnad unit for sticking to the characterization given in the Programme.

Regarding the Muslim League—which was really active only in Kerala—they wrote, “The Muslim League is reviving its existence as a communal organization”—the last word in condemnation for them in those days. They attacked our Party in Kerala for reaching an understanding for adjustments with the League in the 1965 elections. Their disruptive activities in the service of the Congress were repudiated by the people and they were routed in the elections. Then as the next elections approached they began to sing a different tune discovering the positive virtues of the League.

And as is usual with this dishonest crowd, they began to tell their followers that it is not they, but the League that has changed. They described the fiasco of their farcical analysis in the following words in their political report to the Patna Congress: “On the question of Muslim League both the CEC

and the Kerala leadership, however, pursued a somewhat rigid attitude. It is now seen that on account of its policy changes as well as change in Kerala's political situation the Muslim League there has a positive role to play in advancing the democratic movement in that State." (p. 54)

From a communal organization with whom there can be no truck to an organization which has a role to play in advancing the democratic movement in Kerala—such is the sweeping change in their estimation, not because of a more profound understanding of problems of the minorities but only because of opportunist considerations.

Opportunist Considerations

Regarding the Jana Sangh their Programme says: "The Jana Sangh and the RSS are not only communal, but also aggressively chauvinistic organizations wedded to Hindu revivalism. They foment communal fanaticism against the minority community and organize communal rioting. The RSS is, moreover, organized along para-military lines and with a semi-fascist ideology, committed to violence against all progressive elements." (p. 45)

This characterization also became inconvenient as the revisionist opportunists decided to join the coalition Ministries, with this hated Jana Sangh whose hardcore consists of the semi-fascist RSS. Is it not better that such characterizations are removed from the Programme so that the unscrupulous place-hunters have a free hand in deciding their alliances?

Immediately after the elections, when in U.P. and Bihar the Jana Sangh emerged as a strong party, the Rightist leaders began to say that there should be no untouchability approach towards the Jana Sangh; that its rank and file is changing and that to carry on the fight against it, it should be welcomed as a worthy partner in the coalition Ministry. And Bhupesh Gupta went one step further and began to assure that the Jana Sangh leaders also were becoming more anti-imperialist. Is there any wonder that they should delete the entire section dealing with political parties?

A further reason is that it contains wrong formulations regarding the Congress whose opportunist implications are now easily seen. The entire part of the section dealing with the Congress does nowhere talk about a relentless fight against the Congress and its leaders, the need to rescue the masses from their influence, to expose the treacherous character of the leadership.

It makes the formulation : "The division between the masses that follow the Congress and the masses that follow the democratic opposition is the most important division in our democratic forces today". An opportunist formulation which screens the disruptive reactionary class role of the Congress leadership and creates illusions about winning over the Congress masses without undermining their leaders. It further exaggerates the process of differentiation inside the Congress and makes it appear as if the progressive forces have been waging a great fight against the reactionary forces inside the Congress and demands that the revisionists make serious ceaseless efforts to forge unity with the progressive forces within the Congress, directly and through common mass movements, to bring about a Leftward shift in the policy of the Government, to fight for the realization of the demands of the National Democratic Front. This, in effect, was nothing but a line of becoming the tail of the so-called progressives in the Congress.

Nothing but right opportunism could result from this and our Party had warned against it.

Two years ago, we had warned precisely against these opportunist results: "When in these circumstances the revisionists talk about making ceaseless efforts directly to forge unity with the progressive forces within the Congress, it is not difficult to see what this formulation means in practice. All that these efforts will amount to is that instead of rousing the people against the policies of the Congress and thereby drawing the Congress masses into the struggle, the revisionists will only be seeking cooperation with this or that so-called progressive group inside the Congress. All that they

need to do is to label someone progressive in comparison with someone else... The masses behind the Congress do form a big section of our people.... But surely their cooperation is not to be had by singing hosannas of the Congress... But the revisionists just did not talk about a struggle against the Congress. All they talk about is to seek cooperation with the 'progressive group'. Shastri is preferable to Patil, Nanda to Morarji—that is all that this will result in." This is exactly what has happened. However, the revisionist leaders consider all as minor aberrations.

Servility to Congress

How is it that the revisionists' estimate of almost all parties has proved to be wrong and farcical? Because it was based on the supremacy of the national bourgeoisie and, following from it, the supremacy of the National Congress. If you declare the national bourgeoisie to be a leading force in the revolution, you must respect its organization (which represents the bourgeois-landlord alliance). Hence the servility towards the Congress—in the name of its following, in the name of the progressive wing and progressive forces.

Their estimate about the DMK, the Muslim League was the same as made by the Congress bosses who claimed that they were the representatives of national interests. In their eyes, as during the British days, the Congress represented anti-imperialism while other organizations like the Muslim League, the DMK represented anti-national tendencies.

In describing the Jana Sangh as communal and reactionary they did not offend the national bourgeois leaders of the Congress who also attack the Jana Sangh in the same way. And, in practice, they exactly followed the Congress by compromising and collaborating with the Jana Sangh. This was formulated by their unscrupulous parliamentary opportunism—by the conception of parliamentary path. After all, if you have decided to sell yourself to the class enemy of the working class, does it matter to which section you sell yourself?—this seems to be their argument.

No wonder they exposed themselves completely in regard to their characterization of the political parties and their subsequent policy towards them. The radicalization of the people and the growing isolation of the Congress unmasked the reactionary character of their characterization and they had to be withdrawn.

Listen to their confession: "The party's line of overcoming the division between the masses following the democratic opposition and those following the Congress was again incorrectly and narrowly interpreted to foster certain Right opportunist attitude towards the Congress. We were perfectly correct in emphasizing the importance of positive approach towards democratic elements. But there was considerable exaggeration of their potentialities. In our agitation and propaganda, while trying to attract them (which was correct), we did not always pay due attention as to how the Left masses and others who had moved away from the Congress would react. On the question, for instance, of Indira-Morarji tussle over the Prime Ministership some of the utterances and observations from the party centre including the central organ were of a Right-opportunist character. These created wrong impressions about our party line and we had to face volleys of questions on that score during the general elections. This is not, however, to suggest that a differentiated treatment of the two was by itself wrong."

Here you get the disgusting face of the revisionists. Events compel them to own the mistakes inherent in their policy. While owning them they want to suggest that they were due to a wrong interpretation and implementation of their basically correct policies. A dishonest claim.

But the long extract is enough to show the utter bankruptcy of their pro-Congress formulations. The servility towards the Congress and the national bourgeoisie makes them a hanger-on of the Congress. In the name of winning over the Congress masses they find themselves far behind the radical masses who disown them. They support Indira against Morarji, exposing themselves so crudely that during the

elections their bona fides as Left are challenged. And yet they justify their differentiation between the two. They have not learnt anything. They are not prepared to change their outlook; self-criticism is only a screen to continue their treacherous policies.

At the same time, their characterization about the Congress has led to so many fiascos that they seek to delete the entire portion so that their treachery cannot be traced to their opportunist formulations and they are free in future to ally with anyone they choose.

PART IV : CHAUVINISM DURING THE INDO-PAK WAR

In his article on the Patna Congress, hardly a fortnight after its session, Bhupesh Gupta writes the following: "At the time of the Indo-Pak war our party came out not only for national defence but also for peaceful settlement of the Indo-Pak problem. It stood by the minority community—which then felt insecure and which was also subjected to threats and persecutions... The party became the foremost defender and upholder of the historic Tashkent Declaration."

Compare this tall claim with what these gentlemen are forced to admit in the Political Report to their Congress. While completely justifying their chauvinistic stand, the report had to admit, "In the first place we did not pay much attention to the necessity of appealing to the healthy forces in Pakistan and East Pakistan... Understandably, our comrades there felt upset and became critical. It was, of course, right on our part to arouse the spirit of defence and highlight the defence tasks when the fighting was on. But our agitation at times was defective in the sense we did not sufficiently stress the need for an end to the war and on peaceful methods".

"In our agitation we were not always mindful of the specific nature of the Indo-Pak war and of its implications in the internal political life of the country, when the reaction to what we say and do among the vast minority community cannot be discounted." (This is euphemism for saying that

their utterances were understood as communal utterances by the minority community, and, in our opinion, they were rightly understood as such.)

And then the report says that they were lukewarm to Soviet pronouncements and moves which led to Tashkent; they were critical of Soviet statements. "No wonder it is Lal Bahadur Shastri's public statement in support for the Soviet proposal for Indo-Pakistan talks that came before that of the party."

Guilty of Communalism

If these words have any meaning, it means that the revisionist leaders opposed peaceful settlement, forgot the common bonds of toilers and betrayed all principles of internationalism and in the bargain were guilty of communal utterances. Can anyone with a minimum sense of honesty present the role of the party as a glorious role, claim that it stood by the minority? Bhupesh Gupta prints this claim in bold letters and subsequently in his article paraphrases some of the criticism omitting all references to opposition to Soviet moves for peaceful settlement.

That is how they make self-criticism and attach no importance to it. But it is enough to prove that they make lying claims about themselves.

In "*Left-wing Communism*", Lenin wrote: "A political party's attitude towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it *in practice* fulfils its obligations towards its *class* and the working people. Frankly acknowledging a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analysing the conditions that have led up to it, and thrashing out the means of rectification—that is the hall-mark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the *class*, and then the masses."

It is, of course, useless to quote Lenin to these people. The way they treat their self-criticism, the way they admit mistakes only to deny them, only show that they are a non-

serious crowd for whom training and educating the class has no meaning. In fact, their self-criticism is only formal; it is perhaps forced on them because of the crude communalism of their policy. But there is not a twinge of conscience that they betrayed the working class or that they deserted to the camp of the capitalist-landlord rulers. Listen to what they say in the same Political Report:

“The Indo-Pak war saw a great upsurge of anti-imperialism and democratic sentiments throughout the country, and the U.S. and British imperialists stood thoroughly exposed and universally denounced”. See, there was not chauvinism at all but only a great anti-imperialist upsurge. Need we then wonder that these gentlemen in the name of leading the anti-imperialist upsurge, joined the disgusting race for rousing national chauvinism? They are not in the least ashamed of it, they boast of it. Only occasionally they say, we did not keep ourselves on guard against bourgeois nationalism.

Certificate to Government

And then note the following sentence: “Secularism passed a severe test”. This is what the paid hirelings of the Government, the official spokesmen and a host of fanatical communal nationalists from the Congress have been telling the world. And these revisionist leaders in their utter sycophancy are spreading this fable and giving a certificate to the Government of their beloved national bourgeoisie. They are not bothered to find out whether they themselves have passed the test of internationalism; they are very much concerned whether the bourgeois-landlord Government passed the test of secularism and they are in a hurry to certify it.

Why do you conceal the well-known fact that the Government was far from secular in its outlook, that its officials oppressed the minority community on suspicion and large numbers of people were arrested just because they were Muslims? There were protests from well-meaning Congressmen and Nanda and others were apologetic. The Home Minister, just as a fig-leaf, gave a homily to police officers to be

judicious in their arrests and not to show suspicion against the minority, and uphold the secular outlook.

It is known that indiscriminate arrests were made from amongst the minority community. One had to be in a Congress jail at the time to understand how the arrests were just vindictive, full of malice against the Muslims. This came out of a communal outlook that is rampant in the Government. Everyone knows that among those arrested were Muslims who were members of the Congress for forty years, some who, though spurned by the Congress, refused to join the Muslim League at great cost to themselves, some who had been in British jails for years, some who were leaders of the local Congress in its difficult days.

To cover this gross attack on the community, the Congress leaders circulated the lie that secularism had passed the test; that everyone stood by the ideals of nationalism. And the revisionist leaders join in this dirty trick. Actually they themselves have to admit that the minority was harassed and they claim credit for defending it. And yet when it comes to the criticism of the Government they go on distributing bouquets to the Congress Government. Why don't our revisionists bring these facts before the people and expose official claims? Why don't they explain who passed the test? Were the people expected to join in a massacre of the Muslims because of the Indo-Pak war?

No Different from Jana Sangh

One need not go into a detailed discussion of the Indo-Pakistan war. But is it not a facile description to declare it to be an anti-imperialist upsurge? Why forget the wretched conditions of the people of Kashmir, the extinction of all liberties that had taken place under the rule of Bakshi—the agent of the Union Government? The Congress Government has every reason to screen the facts about suppression of democracy in Kashmir. Should those who claim to be Marxists forget this trifle when giving an overall certificate of anti-imperialism to the conflict. Besides, has the defeat of

Pakistan forces contributed an iota to the restoration and expansion of the liberties of the people of Kashmir?

Apart from this, what does their analysis show? That they just echo exactly what the bourgeois-landlord Government was saying about Pakistan and calmly certify that the Indian ruling class had no class aims of its own; that the bourgeois-landlord clique was only acting out of patriotic motives. Is there anything to distinguish them from the worst chauvinists including the Jana Sangh?

A party which sees the misdeeds only of the Government of a foreign country but has nothing to say about the Government of its own country is just an appendage of the ruling classes.

Listen further, "The Tashkent spirit had also to face direct and indirect resistance from the Ayub regime...It is, however, mainly due to Pakistan's negative attitude that the Tashkent Agreement is not being duly implemented and the Tashkent spirit has not become a dominant factor in Indo-Pak relations". This reads like the report of the Government of India's External Affairs Ministry, not the report of an independent political party.

It is extremely doubtful whether Prime Minister Kosygin will join in throwing this one-sided blame on Pakistan. But the revisionist hangers-on of the Government of India completely identify themselves with the bourgeois-landlord clique and echo every explanation which it offers to justify itself. They are such wonderful Marxists that for them it is not necessary to analyse the class aims of the Government in foreign policy. What is the use when it is all patriotic and defending the country! They do not wish to remember that the bourgeoisie always presents its interests as national and patriotic interests and that the proletarian party has to unmask it.

Proletarian Foreign Policy

A hundred years ago, in the Inaugural Address of the International Working Men's Association (First International), Marx

said, "If the emancipation of the working class requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfil that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in viratical wars the people's blood and treasure? It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes, but the heroic resistance of their criminal folly by the working class of England that saved the west of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic...have taught the working class the duty to master themselves the mystery of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power, to combine in simultaneous denunciations and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations".

"The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working class."

Marx made the fight for an independent proletarian foreign policy a part of the struggle for working class emancipation. But the revisionists would have none of it. They prefer to adopt the class policy of the bourgeois landlord Government as their own and cloak it under the garb of patriotism.

After this can anyone attach any importance to what they say about the national bourgeoisie or the big bourgeoisie, or can anyone take them seriously when they now talk of ending the Congress rule or bourgeois rule in any form? If you identify yourself so completely with the exploiting classes in their foreign policy, if you have nothing but complete justification of their policy, it is futile to expect that you will fight them.

PART V : ALLIANCE WITH THE JANA SANGH

The revisionist opportunism in connection with the parties of extreme reaction like the Jana Sangh has been directly or

indirectly endorsed by the Patna Congress. There is no refutation of the opportunist alliance with the Jana Sangh in several State Ministries. The National Council of the revisionists last year formulated the opportunist line in the following words : "In the struggle for building up the united front in the coming period, the task of exposure and fight against the policies of the Right-reactionary parties and of watching and combating their reactionary moves at every step in time assumes crucial importance. To underestimate or play down the task would be fatal for the Left and democratic movement".

Having made this offering to the trusting rank and file, these slimy opportunists then turn to the practical course of compromise and conciliation with the communalists : "At the same time the question of how to expose and fight these parties has to be tackled skilfully and taking into account the concrete features of the new situation". Oh, the question is only how to expose—whether 'abstractly' by exposing their misdeeds among the masses, their communalism, their support to the vested interests and denouncing them as enemies or concretely by joining hands with them in coalition Ministries, welcoming them as great allies in the fight against the Congress, and cheating the masses to believe that the Jana Sangh is also an opposition party—a party of democratic opposition to the Congress. They, of course, chose the concrete way in contrast to the "Left-sectarian" abstract way of which, of course, the CPI(M) is guilty.

What is the 'new situation' that has emerged to justify this treacherous policy? "The mass upsurge is affecting even the rank and file of the reactionary parties with a mass base. Such is the case with the Jana Sangh, for instance, and our experience in Bihar has shown this". Here you get the dishonest revisionist leadership in its true colours. What is the reality, gentlemen?

The reality shown by the elections and events following it is that the economic crisis and Congress policies have led to tremendous discontent and unrest among the people. And

where the democratic movement is weak, where Left parties fail to inspire the people, this discontent is manipulated by the treacherous Jana Sangh, exploited by it for its own purpose—the trusting masses believing that the Jana Sangh also is seriously interested in fighting the class policies of the Congress.

This is totally different from the analysis that mass upsurge is affecting the mass following of the Jana Sangh. The revisionists want the people to believe that the Jana Sangh has a huge stable mass base and that now the masses are coming into the arena of struggle, therefore, the tactics of united front with it should be pursued—of course, in the name of exposing it. The fact is that there is a spontaneous mass discontent which the Jana Sangh is trying to exploit and which the revisionists help it to exploit when they refuse to wage a direct battle against it and expose and defeat its attempts to sidetrack the mass unrest.

The revisionist discovery of a loyal and stable mass base of the Jana Sangh, is just an excuse to justify their shameless collaboration with it.

Read further what their earlier resolution says: “The contradiction between American imperialism and the Indian people is sharpening. This also shakes the basis of the Right reactionary parties.” So what? Don’t expose them but form united front Ministries with them? Here is the sage advice: “Under these circumstances our exposure and fight has to be done flexibly in such a manner and on the basis of such an approach as would further the process of political differentiation within these parties as far as possible. Exposure has to be concrete and political related to policies from issue to issue”. You see, exposing their communalism, their support to the vested interests and refusing to cooperate with them is not concrete, political or from issue to issue. Oh, no, to take a position before the masses that the Jana Sangh is a reactionary political party with no place in the democratic movement is not concrete, it is dogmatic and rigid. Listen, “A dogmatic and rigid approach of ‘untouchability’ will only

result in more and more initiative passing into their hands with dangerous consequences for the country.”

Here is the whole line of surrender to communalism in a nutshell. They are not collaborating with these Muslim-baiters, these arch reactionaries with RSS leaders as the core of their leadership; they are just furthering the process of ‘political differentiation’ inside the Jana Sangh; when they join hands with a semi-fascist organization in an opportunist Ministry they are not surrendering to communalism; they are just being concrete and exposing it from issue to issue.

Only the most gullible people can swallow these bankrupt claims and fail to see that the revisionist leaders, in their opportunism have come out with an open justification of coalition and collaboration with parties of extreme reaction.

Tactics, methods and manoeuvres which the working class adopts in relation to democratic parties with whom it has something in common, are suggested in connection with extreme reactionary parties against which the progressive forces must wage a relentless battle. The reactionary and the the democratic parties do not have even a common class enemy. The Jana Sangh is the extreme wing of the classes whom the progressive forces want to rout. Its difference with the Congress is that the latter is not a sufficiently avowed agent of the exploiting classes and not sufficiently avowedly anti-Communist. To talk of tactics of united front in connection with the organization is to join hands with it against the people. That is where a vague anti-Congressism, uninhibited by class outlook and discipline leads.

It should be realized that the pro-Jana Sangh policy of the revisionists is not a lapse; it is finely worked out with nice pros and cons, and painted bright with the slogan of concrete exposure. It is a deliberate line pursued relentlessly despite the repeated massacres organized by the Jana Sangh.

It is this line that was endorsed by the Patna Congress. Where has it led the revisionists? In the name of avoiding misunderstanding with masses, of leading the anti-Congress upsurge, they become the biggest advertisers of the Swatantra

Party and its Ministry in Rajasthan—the Swatantra Party which according to testimony of *Pravda*, was financed during the elections from CIA funds. This, of course, is a minor detail for these gatherers of political garbage. It was a wonderful sight to see Bhupesh Gupta holding a joint Press Conference along with Gayatri Devi—the Jaipur Maharani—all in the name of enabling the masses to reap their own experience.

This approach and line naturally led to bold initiative—not to fight the class enemy but to join hands with him. In fact, the line was evolved, the excuses were invented to suit an opportunist practice. Long before the National Council resolution, the State units of the revisionists decided to join hands with the Jana Sangh leaving it to their centre to invent theoretical excuses. They write in their Political Report, “Difficulties, however, arose in Bihar, U.P. and Punjab. Should the Party join the non-Congress Government which would include the Jana Sangh?” “Our Bihar comrades took the bold initiative and decided, with the approval of the Secretariat, to join the coalition Government”. Bold initiative, indeed, not in the cause of revolution, but to get closer to counter-revolution.

It is this same approach that enables them to give a certificate of honesty—democratic sincerity to the Jana Sangh, in one of the write-ups in *New Age*. That is really how their ranks are made to understand their approach to the Jana Sangh: “The inclusion of the Jana Sangh in the Government is not a sop; its participation is on the basis of a concrete programme which is formulated to meet the immediate demands of the people and which is non-communal in nature”.

In Bihar perhaps, the excuse was that the Jana Sangh would not be in a dominant position in the Ministry. In U.P., there was no such excuse. But the relentless course of opportunism demanded that here also the revisionists should join the Jana Sangh. The State Council asserted itself and also agreed with the proposal to join in a Jana Sangh dominated Ministry.

Listen to their report: "In U.P., the position was different on account of the fact that in the Samyukta Vidhayak Dal the Jana Sangh has 97 members, which is more than the SSP, CPI and Republicans put together. The Party Centre was averse to our participation in a coalition Ministry, in which the Jana Sangh would naturally occupy a dominant position. But the overwhelming majority in the State executive felt otherwise and the Party Centre ultimately came to the same conclusion". (It seems the State Executive coerced their Centre to shed 'dogmatism' and the latter was always willing.) The reason of course, is, "otherwise the people would have misunderstood our position". You see the entire issue without finesse and frills. It has nothing to do with differentiation, winning over the people or functioning in a Left-dominated Ministry. It is plain and simple—the coercion of place-hunters who are prepared to sell any principle to get a few ministerial posts and join hands with the avowed enemies of the people.

And, finally, this outlook led them to the slogan for a democratic non-Congress coalition from which they did not exclude the Jana Sangh or the Swatantra. They specifically stated that there would be no untouchability in connection with the implementation of this slogan. Criticized by us and others they tried to wriggle out of the formulation by saying that all they meant was a Government of only democratic parties.

Now in their Political Report they are forced to give up all truck with the Jana Sangh in connection with this slogan and admit that they were prevaricating in their earlier formulation, leaving the door open to it.

This is how they make a dishonest attempt to disown what they preached and riggle out of an inconvenient formulation: "The National Council meeting of April has made it plain that such a democratic coalition must be based on a common minimum programme, the guidelines of which have got to be anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly, etc...A reactionary coalition is thus ruled out, although for tactical purposes it

was not expressly stated in April as to which parties, as their policies stand today, are likely to be out of bounds in a democratic coalition." For 'tactical purposes' these worthies with bold initiative dared not tell the people that their new democratic Government will have nothing to do with the Jana Sangh. They wanted to create illusions among the masses that the Jana Sangh also might be an honourable partner in this coalition. May we ask these gentlemen, which class do you wish to serve by your tactics? The working class or the monopolists?

How is it that every time this fear of the Jana Sangh dominates their minds? If they do not *support* a Jana Sangh dominated Ministry, the masses will misunderstand them. If they do not *join* a Ministry along with the Jana Sangh, the masses again will misunderstand. If they expose the Jana Sangh, they will be isolated from the masses. If they frontally state that the Jana Sangh is not a democratic party and has no place in a democratic coalition, again it is not the Jana Sangh but these worthies that will be isolated. From where comes this inferiority complex before a semi-fascist force, this subservient attitude to it? All this has nothing to do with reality. It is because they have decided to be in the opportunist coalition Ministries at all costs, it is because without the Jana Sangh they cannot be in the Ministries that these elements are discovering excuses to act as Jana Sangh stooges.

No wonder then that they reaped the full harvest of such a policy in the shape of growth of communalism. But all that they do is to relieve themselves verbally by a few tirades against the Jana Sangh but combine to collaborate with it in the Ministries. The more servile their cooperation, the more treacherous their surrender, the more strong their verbal denunciation without an iota of change in their practice.

The Ranchi carnage was organized by the Jana Sangh, aided by Congress elements. The Jana Sangh was partner of the revisionists in the coalition Ministry. It is known that

this Ministry totally failed to protect the Muslims who were hunted down in broad daylight—their houses set on fire, the men and women butchered, with the police standing on the sidelines or directly encouraging the goondas.

Though they seek to screen the Ministry, they have to admit in their report: “At the time of actual riots the Bihar Government failed to rise to the occasion and its role in firmly dealing with the communal outbreak fell far below expectations. And this was all the more disappointing in view of the fact that the Bihar United Front Ministry happens to be dominated broadly by democratic and secular forces.”

To give a certificate of secularism to the Ministry after Ranchi massacres requires an extraordinary capacity for lying and only reveals an attempt to screen the direct ministerial guilt in connection with the butchery. It is not correct to state that the Ministry failed to rise to the occasion, the fact is that the Ministry was a guilty partner in the Ranchi massacres. But even then the admission that is forced out of the revisionists is significant.

Gentlemen, what did you do after the ghastly massacres? Was your conscience stirred? Were you not moved? They did heroic things. Listen: “However our party has not hesitated to come out sharply against the Jana Sangh and the RSS and also the communal-minded Congress leaders who sought to play with fire for their own political ends”. (*Political Report*)

Great heroes! They came out in verbal denunciation of the RSS but did not demand expulsion of the Jana Sangh from the Ministry nor thought it fit to resign from this treacherous coalition bespattered with the blood of innocent minorities. Oh, no, ministerial posts they would not give up; resignation of the Jana Sangh they would not demand for that would cause collapse of the “non-Congress” alternative Ministry. Therefore, they took bold initiative to unleash a few verbal sallies against the Jana Sangh in public while embracing it in the Ministry.

Gentlemen, would heavens have fallen if you had resigned from the Ministry? Would you have been isolated from the common man in Bihar if you had protested against this conspiracy to divide toilers, to butcher one section, and uphold the banner of toilers' unity by resigning from the Ministry? Is the peasant of Bihar, the worker, the petty bourgeois so devoid of democratic consciousness that he would not have understood your gesture of solidarity, your resignation? Here there is no excuse that you would have isolated yourself from the people. The only reason is that in your gross opportunism you were not unwilling to pay the price of a few hundred Muslim lives to continue to remain in the Ministry. You preferred to remain in the company of the Jana Sangh over the dead bodies, the mangled bodies, of hundreds of Muslim workers. That is why you have to be denounced as the worst type of communalists. The Congress professes secularism and practices communalism. You profess historical materialism and practice communalism.

Can any importance be attached to the revisionists' verbal denunciations of extreme reaction after this performance? In their *Political Report*, the revisionists make such protests repeatedly to mislead their ranks. But they do not in the least criticize their practice towards the Jana Sangh. Consider the following hypocritical statement. "From the experience of these riots it would appear that we are neither sufficiently aware of the grave danger of communalism in the post-election situation nor are we alert and active enough in facing up to the challenge. It is not realized that the menace of communalism, which has received great encouragement from the electoral victories of the Jana Sangh, can be most effectively met only by activising and mobilizing all secular and anti-communal forces irrespective of Party affiliation".

Is your solicitude to fight communalism not hypocritical when you aid and abet it and screen its misdeeds by joining hands with it in a coalition? No wonder, then, that you have to bemoan that your party is not properly fighting the Jana

Sangh. You have to admit, "Despite all our programmatic and other declarations, we have not developed any sustained and ceaseless exposure and struggle against even the organized Rightist parties, the Jana Sangh and Swatantra Party. The dangerous potentialities of these and other Rightist forces tend to be minimized at least in the actual day-to-day practice in our ranks and in the political activity of the party. Even after the last general elections there has been a tendency to underestimate the danger and the party is not naturally oriented to properly understand the massive offensive of reaction."

Your party is not only underestimating the Jana Sangh, but has deliberately laid down a line of cultivating the Jana Sangh in the name of a concrete fight, of united front tactics. You address a homily to your ranks and pose as if the leadership sees the danger which the ranks do not see. If your party fails to see the dangerous potentialities it is because you have given it a line of collaborating with communalism. That is why your pose to fight the parties of extreme reaction is just a swindle. Once again the *Political Report* states, "the Jana Sangh has become a great menace and it is using its gains in the last general elections to organize massively, both openly and covertly, aggressive forces of Hindu communalism...U.S. imperialists and their CIA are already backing up communal reaction to wreck democracy and even undermine our independence".

After this great knowledge, after knowing that the CIA is backing Hindu communal reaction and that the Jana Sangh is leading it, what do the revisionists do? They once again join hands with this CIA-backed communal reaction in another opportunist Ministry—the Bhola Paswan Ministry in Bihar—without the least sense of shame. A few months ago they sold their support to Mahamaya Prasad Sinha to be in company with the Jana Sangh; today they have sold it to another rank opportunist from the Congress to have the glory of the Jana Sangh's company. For what purpose, gentlemen? To save yourselves from isolation? To pursue the "noble"

aim of establishing a non-Congress Government in collaboration with every political opportunist that defects from the Congress?

Any sane or honest person may ask—gentlemen, where is the political differentiation in the Jana Sangh that you wanted to promote? All this is seen in the political degeneration of the revisionists who for the sake of a few ministerial posts shed all scruples and finds themselves at home in the company of the communal butchers.

And these are the people who want to teach us how to fight communalism in West Bengal. The revisionist crowd has crowned its infamy with its alliance with the Jana Sangh—and revealed to the whole world the depths that can be reached by a leadership which has sold all the basic principles of Marxism along with all sense of self-respect, decency and integrity.

PART VI : THEY SEE NO DANGER FROM U.S. IMPERIALISM

The inexorable course of events in India has uncovered the class-collaborationist illusions and policies of the revisionist leaders and the latter are now forced to admit that their party had a non-class approach, etc. Of course, all this is done in the name of self-criticism, or criticism of practice while stressing that the basic formulations in their Programme were correct.

Listen to what they say in their report: “There were illusions about the Third Five-Year Plan and capitalist planning, notwithstanding all our programmatic repudiation of the capitalist path. There were unmistakable tendencies to view the problems of planning from a non-class standpoint and this on occasions resulted in toning down our propaganda and agitation in regard to the Five-Year Plan”.

The reality is, gentlemen, that your Programme has laid down a line of sowing illusions about the Plan, a line of “national” outlook in preference to class outlook.

Their Programme even now contains the following: “The

Second and Third Five-Year Plans took measures to establish in the state sector heavy and machine-building industry. The state sector developed not only in these industries but also in finance and to a certain extent in trade. *Thus the state sector* contributed to the building of independent national economy and to the weakening of the grip of foreign monopoly capital and to a certain extent the Indian monopolies". (*Programme*, p. 12) And, again, "The giant industrial complexes now taking shape or expanding as at Bhilai, Barauni, Ranchi, Hardwar, Hyderabad and other places, stand as milestones on our road to economic self-sufficiency and independence. India, no longer linked and dependent solely on the world capitalist market *has been able to advance along the road of independent industrial growth*". (p. 14)

Screening Danger from U.S. Imperialism

These formulations were made precisely at a time when even the blind could see that India's economic dependence on the USA was rapidly growing and endangering our economic independence and sovereignty, when the Government of India was constantly yielding to U.S. imperialism. Was it not an attempt on your part to screen the economic surrender of the national bourgeoisie and paint it as independent economic development, though on capitalist lines? What is the use of now hypocritically regretting that there were illusions and a non-class outlook?

And again the reality is that the revisionists are even now concealing the blunt truth that the capitalist path not only leads to crisis and all that but paves the way to economic subjugation. Need there be any surprise that a completely class collaborationist practice should emerge out of this outlook?

One of the characteristics of international revisionism is its deliberate and studied attempt to screen the imminent danger from American imperialism and dispense with the necessity of a joint fight against it by minimizing its strength. The Patna Congress of the revisionists continues this tradition.

It cannot be denied by any sane person that one of the most outstanding developments in India during the last five years is the rapid advance of American pressure against our sovereignty and the direct threat created by it to our freedom and independence. A year ago, our party warned against "the growing threat to our national independence and sovereignty at the hands of the imperialists, notably the U.S. imperialists, and the danger of the big bourgeois-landlord dominated Government of India surrendering to them, step by step, in the face of the growing imperialist pressure and blackmail. This is patent and the danger is real. There can be no two opinions about it and we are witnessing increasing awareness of this danger in our countrymen. In the days to come, as the economic crisis deepens and the pressure of the imperialists increases, the danger of greater and greater concessions to the imperialists by the big bourgeois-led Government, allowing the foreign monopolists to make still bigger inroads into our economy and political life becomes more serious. It would be dangerous to underestimate this menace and relax our struggle against it".

Refusal to See Threat to Freedom

Can any party which professes to be Marxist miss this danger, the seriousness of American threat to Indian freedom? One has to take only a glance at the Political Resolution of the revisionists passed at Patna to realize that for the revisionist leaders imperialist menace does not exist. It seems that now they are so much convinced about the efficacy of the New Epoch that they think that the very mention of the word American imperialism is superfluous.

They profess that they are organizing an anti-imperialist, etc., revolution but when they pass a solemn political resolution and put forward a six-point programme for rallying the people, they just forget American imperialism—an omission for which they will no doubt earn the thanks of the CIA-backed communalists. Read their resolution and their Political Report and you will find that this crowd does not show

even a distant awareness that what is at stake is our freedom and independence.

They talk about foreign monopolists making super-profits in India, they not being interested in Indian industrialization; on one or two occasions they even boldly assert that Indian economy is being held to ransom by the monopolists; that India's foreign policy, etc., is being assailed—but one thing they never pin-point—that national freedom is being threatened. How can it be, with their beloved national bourgeoisie in power? And above all, in their resolution they do their best to scrupulously avoid all mention of American imperialism. They content themselves with talking about monopolists or imperialism in general. There seems to be an allergy to mention American imperialism whom the 1960 Moscow Statement declared to be the main enemy of all peoples. Is it the shyness of a leadership which in 1962 welcomed American imperialism as a friend against socialist China?

On page 2 of the Resolution, foreign monopoly capital is mentioned and it is stated it does not “desire the industrialization of our country”. In the same para, it is stated, “Hence our economy continues to be held to ransom by the imperialists, who are interested only in their super profits and not the development of the country”, etc. (Once again, no reference to the danger to political independence). On page 3, “foreign monopoly interests and their Indian partners in the import trade fatten at the cost of our development”. On page 5, U.S. imperialists are mentioned. They “are at present concentrating on undermining and subverting our policy of non-alignment and dragging India into their scheme of neo-colonialist aggression”. On page 7 it is stated that more and more concessions are made to foreign private capital and increased foreign collaboration; on page 14, the CIA is mentioned as helping the forces of Right reaction. Even the scuttling of the Fourth Plan is explained as due to the pressure of the Indian monopolists, concealing the glaring truth that the American imperialists also forcefully demanded the abandonment of the Plan.

Their Six-Point Programme

From all this it should be clear that these gentlemen totally fail to realize the grip of American imperialists over our economy and do not see the danger to the independence of our country. Of this you do not find even a passing mention in their political resolution. They are no doubt, great anti-imperialist warmen organizing an anti-imperialist revolution; only they do not believe that American imperialism presents any serious danger to Indian freedom.

This is fully reflected in their six-point programme, whose importance for the revisionists can be gauged from the following: "Such political unity of the Left and democratic forces, backed up by a common democratic platform, becomes all the more necessary when confrontation between the forces of reaction and neo-colonialism on the one hand and those of anti-imperialism, democracy and socialism on the other becomes sharper and more bitter and *the power at the Centre* comes on the agenda as the crucial political question before the nation." (*Resolution*, p. 15)

So this is a programme for confronting neo-colonialism, of power at the Centre. And what does this platform contain?

Of course, it includes a host of demands from agrarian reforms, defence of wages, anti-imperialist foreign policy, defence of parliamentary democracy to national integration and cultural rights of tribal peoples—all are there. Only the struggle against American imperialism, against growing dependence on it, against its menace to our independence from the USA is studiously and deliberately dropped.

Perhaps the only *distant reference to foreign influence is to be found* in point 4. Point 4 of the platform vaguely talks about defence of national sovereignty and building up of economic independence—against whom it is not stated. Of course, nowhere in the platform American imperialism is even mentioned. Point 4 talks of only breakup of monopoly houses and only moratorium on foreign debts.

This is their platform of confronting neo-colonialism and for raising the question of power at the Centre.

If you read through all their documents you find that there is an attempt to enter into verbal attacks against American penetration without drawing any serious political conclusion. This happens because of two things: First, their pathetic faith in the national bourgeoisie; and second, their belief that Soviet help is so patent and effective that American imperialism can create no danger to Indian freedom.

Significant Silence

Another thing is of great significance. A large number of people in our country have noted that the monstrous defence expenditure of the Government of India is a terrible drag on our economic development and is intensifying the crisis. What liberal economists including the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission could clearly see, the revisionist lackeys refuse to see. There is not a word about reduction of defence expenditure in their platform. They dare not attack the national bourgeoisie on this sore point, because they themselves are purely chauvinist and do not wish to lose their credentials with the bourgeois-nationalist crowd.

Even in section 6 of the platform dealing with foreign policy, all reference to a fight against American imperialism, all mention of American imperialism, is deliberately dropped. Non-alignment, peace, struggle on all issues against imperialism, etc. are there. But you will not find any reference to American imperialism—the bulwark of world reaction, the mainstay of world imperialism. Even in connection with Vietnam there is no reference to the aggressor. General support to liberation struggles etc.—but against whom? You will not find it there. If elsewhere the platform had emphasized the struggle against U.S. imperialism, then this omission in the foreign policy section could have been explained away. But it seems to be a part of a deliberate policy.

It is thus clear that the platform is carefully adapted to protect the pro-imperialist and bourgeois-chauvinistic susceptibilities of some parties of the Left like the PSP, etc., on

whom the revisionists count in their efforts at parliamentary turn-over—which they call the question of power at the Centre.

Foreign Policy

Can you imagine any party in India professing Marxism utterly ignoring the important and dangerous developments in relation to the country's foreign policy when it passes a new political resolution after four years? Menacing developments have taken place on this question. Nowhere is the pressure of U.S. imperialism so evident and brazenfaced as on this issue. The Union Government's betrayal of Vietnam in breaking off trade relations with North Vietnam at the dictates of American imperialism, its despatch of Bhilai steel and Tata trucks to help the puppet regime are international scandals and have defaced India's image all over the world.

But our revisionist deserters, with their pipe-dreams of capturing power at the Centre by parliamentary intrigues and opportunist concessions, have no time to devote any attention to foreign policy in their resolution. There is no section analysing, elaborating the recent developments in foreign policy though they themselves in their Political Report say, "The situation emphasizes great urgency for popular mass initiative in this country on international issues, all the more so because the vacillations and capitulations on the part of the Indian Government on the one hand and the pressure of the Rightist forces, backed by U.S. imperialists on the other".

Having thus stressed the urgency of mass initiative, they forget all about recent foreign policy developments in their resolution; they fail to place the new dangers and content themselves with stating certain general demands and principles of foreign policy in their platform. In the entire resolution there is not a word of criticism or attack against the Government for its treacherous conciliation and compromise on issues of foreign policy.

In our Programme we had stated the following in relation to the foreign policy of the Government of India:

“Although the Government’s foreign policy continues to be within the broad framework of non-alignment and opposition to world war, its increasing reliance on Western monopoly aid to fulfil five-year plans of capitalist development, its growing economic collaboration with foreign finance capitalists, its continued membership of the British Commonwealth and as a result of all this, its prevarication on a number of anti-colonial issues in the recent period, objectively facilitate the U.S. designs of neo-colonialism and aggression and lead to India’s isolation from the powerful currents of peace, democracy, freedom and socialism and as such is harmful to our interests. It is thus evident that neither the policy of non-alignment nor its genuine implementation can be taken for granted with the big bourgeoisie leading the state and pursuing anti-people policies.”

In contrast to this, the revisionists had certified the Government’s foreign policy in the following words: “The foreign policy pursued by the Government of India is, in the main, a policy of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism...It is sometimes vitiated by lapses and compromises, but as a whole the main character of the policy has been preserved. Progressive forces in the country continue to defend this policy and combat the reactionary pressures against it”.

Covering Government’s Misdeeds

The contrast between the viewpoints is quite clear. Events of the four years have shattered the basis for the revisionist advertisement of the Government of India’s policy. They are now compelled to say something different and yet screen the treachery of the bourgeois-landlord Government.

They say, “The vacillations and deviations on the part of the Government of India have now come to such a pass that India is now hardly looked upon in the world as having any effective or worthwhile foreign policy in the interest of struggle for peace and freedom. The basic policy of non-alignment has not been abandoned; however, the Government is shifting towards the West. But the pressures of the U.S. and

other imperialists and Indian reactionaries have largely succeeded in making it ineffective.” (*Political Report*, p. 13)

These are, of course, significant admissions from people who till yesterday were asking all progressive forces to support the Government of India’s foreign policy. These admissions have been forced out of them by the march of events and even then they are doing their best to screen the big bourgeois-landlord combine. Is it correct to state that the pressures of U.S. imperialists have only succeeded in making non-alignment ineffective? Gentlemen, why are you again covering the misdeeds of your Government? A shift to the West, which you speak of does not mean non-alignment is just ineffective. It definitely means that to the extent that you shift you give up non-alignment—not that you are ineffective.

You yourself are forced to condemn Indira Gandhi’s containment of China statement in Washington. Does it only mean that non-alignment is ineffective? You yourself attack the Indian Government for developing friendly relations with the butcher regime of Indonesian militarists. It is correct to describe it as shift to the West; but not just as making non-alignment ineffective.

Helping Forces of Colonialism

And you make the following significant, and considering your chauvinist outlook, a very significant admission: “In Southeast Asia the Indian Government’s foreign policy is pursued mainly by the consideration of India-China problem to the detriment of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism.”

In plain language it means that because of hostility to People’s China, the Indian Government is taking a position in South-east Asia which goes against the interests of anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle. This, of course, is true. But this does not mean that non-alignment is just rendered ineffective. It means directly or indirectly helping the forces of imperialism and colonialism.

The fact is that the revisionist leaders, even though they now criticize the Government of India, still fail to see the

havoc that the class policies of the Government are doing in the international field. They fail to note that hostility to socialist China has become a key-note in the Government of India's foreign policy and that it has nothing to do with the protection of legitimate Indian interests. Under this screen the Government of India is giving a national colour to its policy of growing concessions and surrender before American imperialism in foreign policy. Since the revisionists themselves are victims of insane anti-China hatred, since their hatred is as deep as that of their bourgeois bosses, they are unable to see this key link in the shift and present the matter as if non-alignment is only rendered ineffective.

Even on the question of Vietnam they do not attack the Government of India squarely and expose its game of screening American aggression. Not in one of the official statements the fact is mentioned that American imperialists are the aggressors and they must withdraw. The aggressor and the aggressed are put on the same footing. All that they say is the Government does not go beyond pious expression of deep concern and asking the U.S. to stop bombing, etc.

And our revisionists have dropped a rather minor matter from the discussion on foreign policy in their report—the Indo-Pakistan war of 1965. Was it not a part of our foreign policy and foreign relations? Perhaps not, according to the revisionists. You see, according to them, it was a patriotic and anti-imperialist upsurge led by the big bourgeois-landlord Government. Pakistan was the aggressor and so on.

And, gentlemen, why are you so eager to certify the Government of India's stand on the West Asian crisis? Is it not true that while condemning Israel, the Government of India dared not utter a word against the real aggressor—American imperialism? How is it that on every occasion you forget this small detail of American imperialism?

PART VII : LEFT UNITY OR LEFT DISRUPTION

Eager to secure parliamentary majority by manipulation and opportunist compromises, the revisionists in their Political

Resolution have raised the slogan of Left unity as part of this intrigue. They, however, want the people to believe that they are advancing it as an instrument of mobilizing the people against the forces of reaction in the coming great confrontation.

There is no dearth of high-sounding words. Their Political Resolution states: "Such political unity of the Left and democratic forces, backed up by a common democratic platform, becomes all the more necessary for the coming period when the confrontation between the forces of reaction and neo-colonialism on the one hand and those of anti-imperialism, democracy and socialism on the other becomes sharper and more bitter and the power at the Centre comes on the agenda as the crucial political question before the nation."

None will disagree if the slogan of Left unity meant genuine united front of the fighting Left against American penetration and the growing danger it creates for Indian freedom, against the bourgeois-landlord government. But this is precisely what the revisionists do not have in mind. Their Political Resolution, as we have seen, is shy on the question of American danger to our country; the platform for democratic unity has been drawn so as not to offend the susceptibilities of the PSP and SSP leaders who do not see any American danger.

If we look a little deeply into the revisionist conception of Left unity, its opportunist character is easily seen. In their Political Report they write that in order to bring about such a development it is necessary that the four parties—ours, theirs, the SSP and the PSP—should come together in a united front. Having said this they praise the SSP and the PSP for their pro-unity leanings while attack us for our alleged disruption. According to them, we are one of the main obstacles to Left unity.

According to them, it is unfortunate that the SSP and PSP still refuse to *fully* acknowledge the great threat posed by the Rightist reaction although after the general elections there has been a greater awareness on their part of the necessity to unite the Left and democratic forces.

What is the reality? How can the revisionists say that the PSP and the SSP only refuse to fully acknowledge the threat of Right reaction? The SSP leaders like the revisionists are in alliance with the Jana Sangh in Bihar—they were partners in the Jana Sangh-dominated U.P. Ministry and in alliance with it they are busy organizing the Kutch satyagraha today. Is this just not being fully aware of Right danger or total blindness to it and alliance with a reactionary party? The PSP is following the same pattern and has shown further progress by allying itself with the Shiva Sena in the Bombay Corporation elections. It refused to join the united front in the last general election in West Bengal and Maharashtra. And the SSP leaders in Bombay are veering towards the Shiva Sena—the party's representatives in the Corporation supported Shiva Sena's candidate for mayoralty in the name of fighting the Congress.

With these facts facing them, how can the revisionists say that now after the elections the PSP leaders are showing greater awareness for Left unity? In West Bengal the PSP leadership was compelled by democratic pressure to join the United Front Ministry. At the same time, its all-India leaders joined hands with the Congress in slandering the U.F. Ministry and invited the Centre to pull it down. The defectors from the PSP played an important role in toppling down the Ministry. And its greater awareness of Left unity, discovered by the revisionists in the PSP, is proved by its desertion from the United Front.

While the SSP overcame its earlier outlook of no truck with the Communists and joined in the two Ministries of West Bengal and Kerala, it effected a number of opportunist manoeuvres, by forming Ministries in alliance with the Jana Sangh. And during recent months its all-India leadership has attacked our Party repeatedly but has had hardly anything to say against the Jana Sangh. Does all this show greater awareness of fighting the Right and unity with the Left? It is certainly correct to strive for an understanding with the SSP for unity of the Left forces, but one need not be blind to the practice followed by its leadership.

According to the revisionists, the SSP and PSP are improving in their outlook towards Left unity; only our Party shows no sign of improvement. This is what they write: "The continued hostility of the CPM towards our party is yet another negative factor that disturbs Left unity and hence enables the Rightist parties to take advantage of the situation." So it is not the revisionists who join hands with the Jana Sangh in the Ministry that disturb Left unity and enable the reactionaries to take advantage of the situation, nor the PSP which is in alliance with both the Jana Sangh and the Shiva Sena; it is our Party which exposes and fights the Jana Sangh, which exposes the opportunism of the revisionists in supporting these communal elements that obstruct the fight against reaction.

And this is their constant refrain. The anti-Communist PSP is recommended; and in the name of Left unity fire is concentrated against our Party.

It does not require more than average intelligence to understand that the so-called Left unity, whose content is a fight against our Party and its policies, is nothing but an invitation to Left disruption. They declare that our Party is one of the main obstacles to Left unity: "As far as the CPM was concerned, it bothered little to act according to the spirit of the Left parties' meetings—one of the main reasons why the necessary progress could not be made in building the united front on an all-India scale was precisely this disruptive and hostile attitude of the CPM towards our Party." These gentlemen, who found to their cost that open opposition to CPI (Marxist) led to their rout in Kerala in 1965, have no doubt become clever under international guidance and have decided to fight our Party with the name of unity on their lips.

How they laud the disruption organized by them: "The most important achievement in building up the united front was that of our West Bengal Committee". Everyone knows that the revisionists utilizing the vacillating elements and the Ghosh group wrecked the United Front and presented a

number of seats to the Congress. But for this rank betrayal West Bengal would have seen a rout of the Congress at polls with a decisive majority for the United Front. But this they glorify as their achievement. And naturally so, for their main objective, hidden though it may be, is to fight us, isolate us, to form a united front of all vacillating parties against us.

Everyone in West Bengal knows the treacherous role that these people played in October last when Ajoy Mukherjee vacillated and was on the point of submitting the resignation of his Ministry, and when the Centre had decided to hand over West Bengal to the Army, and lists for the arrests of twenty thousand were kept ready. It was attack on the democratic movement, on our Party, an attack to smash the United Front by repressing us and isolating us.

It put to the test the professions of these people to defend Left unity and the United Front. How did they discharge themselves? By screening the treacherous game of the vacillators and blaming us for the conspiracy that was hatched. This is how they cover the conspirators and slander us: "Not only during the critical days of the October crisis but all along our comrades in the U.F. Ministry and U.F. had to fight the disruptive pressures and activities by the CPM on the one hand and the Ghosh-Kabir supporters and the like on the other."

It is not accidental that the revisionists club us with the Ghosh-Kabir group. This is their line—the line of slandering and isolating us in the name of Left unity, the line of relying on every shady element as firm supporter of the United Front and Left unity, and preparing a third force. It follows from their opportunist outlook, their parliamentary illusions, their ideological corruption. When the ruling classes were singling out our Party for attack in West Bengal to disrupt the United Front, why did these people start blaming us? They accused us of sectarianism, they charged us with disruption because of our consistent advocacy of the interests of the masses, defence of working class interests, for which we were being attacked by the ruling classes.

These gentlemen thought they would run the Ministry for a longer term, that by wooing Ghosh and others they will be cooling their heels in the ministerial chambers for a pretty long time. To purchase the running of the Ministry for a few more months they wanted to give up the defence of mass interests and placate the vacillating and opportunist elements in the Ministry in the name of unity; when they found us firm, they dubbed us sectarians disrupting the United Front Ministry. The charge of disruption was hurled because they realized that the Governor would not allow the Ministry to remain in office if it continued to stand by the masses.

They virtually admit all this in their Political Report: "There was however some underestimation about the mischief-making capacity of the Centre and Ghosh-Kabir group. It was thought that somehow or other the United Front government would continue for a longer period than it actually did."

After the October events also they underestimated the mischief-making capacity of the Centre. How touching! It means that after the October events also these gentlemen continued to have illusions about the Indira Government and the Constitution! Real parliamentarians who 'underestimated', if you please, the mischief-making capacity the Centre when the entire people of India knew what the Centre was doing. But this admission speaks volumes for their parliamentary illusions and their pathetic faith in the bourgeois-landlord government.

And they also underestimated, after the October events, the utterly treacherous character of the Ghosh-Kabir group. They had illusions about them also for they were part of the glorious united front reared by them in opposition to us. Is it not significant that the traitors and defectors came precisely from that with which the Dange revisionists formed a rival united front to disrupt Left unity? They preferred alliance with these elements in preference to us, to oppose us, and they harvested a crop of betrayers. And yet they pride themselves on their notable achievement in West Bengal.

From where does this illusion about the Central Government? From where comes this illusion about the defectors? And from where this continuous tirade against us? It comes from the fact that the revisionists are in reality seeking allies from the vacillating Right to fight us. This is their conception of Left unity and united front.

No one who is serious about Left unity will adopt a disruptive attitude towards mass organizations. The revisionists themselves, trained in the use of deceptive phrases and hypocritical professions, talk about urgent steps to strengthen the unity of the trade union movement. What is their practice? They form rival unions, organize disruption of existing unions out of sheer rivalry with our Party, run the AITUC bureaucratically. The functioning of the AITUC is a disgrace, since no democratic norm is observed. A member of the Working Committee, our Party member, is bureaucratically prevented from doing his job as a member of the Secretariat. Disruption at the base, dictatorial attitude at the top in mass organizations—this is how they defend Left unity.

In Bombay, having lost morale after the attack of the Shiva Seña, their leadership has virtually closed down the Girni Kamgar Union though the ranks demand its functioning. They will not resurrect the GKU in cooperation with our comrades. The latest instance of how they defend trade union unity and the rights of the worker is seen in the provocative openly anti-working class outpourings of M. N. Govindan Nair, the revisionist Kerala Minister. Fighting the struggling construction workers on the Idikki Project, like a henchman of the capitalists, he not only refused to accept their demands, but circulated lying charges about sabotage against them; he also told a blunt untruth that the foreign aiders of the project were thinking of withdrawing their aid in view of the strike—to raise anti-working class feelings among the people of Kerala.

One may ask these gentlemen: Against whom is your front directed? Is it against the bourgeois-landlord government, against the Congress Government at the Centre? If it

is so, why is it that every time our Party in Kerala exposes the Central Government's responsibility in starving the people of Kerala, you run to its rescue like a paid retainer, and start attacking our Party in the Ministry? You take exactly the same attitude and say the same things that the leaders of the Congress in Kerala say. You screen the Central Government and slander our Party in the Ministry.

Recently when our Party gave a call for exposing the Centre's game in refusing to release agreed food supplies, they again opposed steps for a movement against the Centre and tried to divert popular discontent against our Ministers. Instead of building Left unity they undermine it from within, because they are only interested in fighting our Party and isolating us.

The culminating point of their opportunist policies is to be seen in their attempt to form a "third" force to disrupt the United Front. It is known that a leader of the revisionists in West Bengal threatened our Party that a third force could be formed any time he wished. But the Kerala revisionists have gone much ahead and started direct negotiations with the Kerala Congress leaders to form a 'third force' Ministry. The plot was laid and preliminary discussions regarding the distribution of the portfolios were also gone through. It is known to our Party that a prominent leader of the Kerala Congress met a revisionist Minister and some others and discussed the operation scuttle with them.

The resolution of the Kerala State Committee published in our last issue solemnly states: "Before we conclude this discussion about the Rightists, allow us to deal with the charge that the Industries Minister (T. V. Thomas) also participated in a conspiracy to overthrow the present government and the challenge of the Rightists that we should prove this charge. It was with the fullest responsibility and with all the details of the conspiracy in hand...that our Party Secretary and the Chief Minister laid bare this conspiracy." The same resolution gives details about the Rightists' open attempt to undermine the Ministry in virtual cooperation

with the Congress. This is the meaning of the Left unity slogan given by the Patna Resolution.

The Left unity slogan of the revisionists is thus a device to cheat their honest ranks and followers who desire united front of all Left forces; by paying verbal homage to it and concentrating fire on our Party as virtually the main obstacle to it, the revisionist leaders in fact seek to disrupt Left unity; their practice is one of opportunist alliance with all kinds of unstable elements against our Party and the genuine Left, as for instance in West Bengal during the last elections. The main purpose of their tactics is to build a third force to isolate the real Left, and play the Congress game of disrupting the democratic opposition. This finds expression in their machinations in Kerala to topple the United Front Ministry and form an alternative Ministry with the support of the Kerala Congress.

With the word 'Left unity' on their lips the revisionists bend themselves to the same effort that the Congress does—to isolate our Party from its allies and the people. They will not succeed where their bosses have failed.