

BASIC QUESTIONS OF CONTROVERSY OVER PARTY PROGRAMME AT VIJAYAWADA

NATIONAL DEMOCRACY AND NON-CAPITALIST PATH

Comrade E. M. S. Namboodiripad submitted a document entitled *Revisionism and Dogmatism in the CPI* to the National Council in February 1963. The National Council, while referring this document to a commission for detailed discussion and study along with other documents on the ideological and programmatic questions before the Party, passed a resolution repudiating certain unfounded and unwarranted charges which the author had made against the majority of the National Council. In June 1963 this document of Comrade E. M. S. was published for inner-party circulation. The commission appointed hardly met or functioned for the purposes of discussing this document.

Later in December 1963, in the context of our discussions regarding the preparation of documents for our forthcoming Party Congress, Comrade E. M. S. Namboodiripad submitted another document which is in the nature of a report on the programmatic and ideological questions before the Party. He held the view that instead of preparing three separate documents for the Party Congress, viz., a Party Programme, a Document on Ideological Question and a Political Resolution, we should prepare one omnibus report on all these three questions which should be the only document before the Congress. This report-document has been resubmitted by Comrade E. M. S. to the Secretariat, with some amendments, as his draft document for the Congress.

This finalised report-document of Comrade E. M. S. contains in a more or less finished form the same ideas of the author on the ideological, programmatic and political questions facing the Party which the author had dealt with in a different context in his earlier document mentioned above. In his *Revisionism and Dogmatism in the CPI* the author attempts to go to the root of our programmatic and ideological differences, by making a survey of our Party history mainly of the post-independence period.

Before, therefore, dealing with his finalised report-document it was thought necessary that a detailed study be made of his earlier document because in that he discusses his main ideas in greater detail and in the context of his conception of our Party history. It is hoped that this study which is in the form of a running commentary may be useful as material for organising a discussion on both the documents of the author. In this study an attempt has been made to go into the pre-independence history of our Party because it was felt that the roots of our differences and of the deviations in our Party cannot be properly uncovered unless we go back to their origin in the early formative periods of our Party.

In the introductory sections of his book, which is 128 printed pages, Comrade E. M. S. poses the problem in the context of the National Council resolution of November 1962 on the Chinese aggression, which he considers was the culminating point in the career of the majority of the National Council towards revisionism.

POSING THE PROBLEM

Stating that the November 1962 Resolution of the National Council is "fundamentally wrong" and based on an "alien class outlook" and "bourgeois nationalist approach to the border dispute," the author charges the majority of the National Council of following "a fully worked out ideological-political line—the line of attuning the work-

ing class and peasant movement to the requirements of the bourgeoisie."

He also charges the majority of a "disruptive attitude towards inner-party relations," an "anti-Leninist attitude towards the comrades who hold the minority point of view." This alien class ideological and political line of the majority and its disruptive organisational methods are leading to the disintegration of the Party and even threatening to split the Party.

The majority says it is fighting dogmatism and sectarianism of the minority—which, the author admits, has done serious damage and which is undoubtedly strong in our Party. But the majority itself is revisionist and Right-opportunist and not Marxist-Leninist.

In the section "Dogmatism and Revisionism: the Common Root," the author says that both the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement of the Communist and Workers' Parties stated that revisionism was the main danger at present in the international communist movement and called for fight against both revisionism and dogmatism. At present Chinese and Albanian dogmatism and sectarianism are criticised in the international communist movement: but Yugoslav revisionism is also fought. But the majority comrades of the National Council want to fight only dogmatism and sectarianism.

Then the author gives quotations from Lenin to prove that both revisionism and Right-opportunism and dogmatism and Left-opportunism have alien class roots, and concludes that the class roots of opportunism of both types are the same broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie, the small masters, who in the process of capitalist development join the ranks of the proletariat.

To fight both the opportunist deviations, therefore, it is necessary to carry out the proletarianisation of the Party. This was never seriously undertaken by our Party. Instead,

vices of bourgeois parliamentarianism began to permeate the Party since 1952. To steel the Party, it is necessary to conduct persistent ideological struggle against the revivalist and other theories of the Indian bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideologues. At no stage in the history of the Party the leadership did this. Besides, there was no proper schooling of the ranks in the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. This led to the emergence of both trends: revisionist—Right-opportunist, and dogmatist—Left-opportunist. Incorrect fight against these is leading to the emergence of hardened factions and groups. Hence the author says, he is attempting a study of both these trends in the Party. His study may be referred to a commission.

BACKGROUND OF INNER-PARTY CONTROVERSY

With this general introduction, the author proceeds to give the background of inner-Party controversy in the post-independence period.

Under the heading "Strategic Conception—before and after the Second Congress," the author proceeds to discuss cursorily the problems posed before the Party by the transfer of power and the attainment by India of independence and how they were tackled by the main documents of the Party of that period, viz.:

1. CC Resolution on Mountbatten Award, June 1947
2. CC Resolution on the eve of the 2nd Party Congress, December 1947
3. Political Thesis of the 2nd Party Congress, February 1948
4. Report on Left Deviation in the CPI, June 1950.

On the eve of transfer of power in 1947, the Party was faced with the problem of characterising the independent governments coming into being in India and Pakistan. Were

they popular governments? Was it independence? Was this agreement a compromise—a final surrender and capitulation of the bourgeoisie to the forces of imperialism and princes, or could these governments—the state power—be used by the national leadership and the people to foil the imperialist conspiracy?

The Mountbatten Resolution of the CC of the CPI passed in June 1947 gave a definite answer to this question. It stated that though the forces of the freedom movement had forced the imperialists to open negotiations with Indian leaders and to talk of agreeing to Indian independence, they were manoeuvring to forge a new alliance with princes, big landlords and with big business in order to control the Indian state and Indian economy through it. All the same, the resolution said the coming agreement was opening "new opportunities for national advance"; and concluded that "the two popular governments and constituent assemblies are the strategic weapons in the hands of the national leadership. It is the task of the national movement that they are used for the rapid realisation of national aims." It called for the broadest front against imperialism and its allies.

The author then goes on to show how the subsequent Party documents, viz., the December 1947 CC Resolution, the Political Thesis of the 2nd Congress, Comrade B. T. Ranadive's speech on the same, rejected this portion of the June resolution. They took the position that the Mountbatten agreement was an abject surrender and a final capitulation on the part of the Indian leadership. The government formed was a government of national surrender—a government of collaborators. In the state which thus emerged, it was the "imperialist-feudal-bourgeois combine" that held power.

The document then discusses the difference between the Political Thesis (2nd Congress) and the "Tactical Line" of the PB (1949). The latter makes the bourgeoisie the spearhead and leader in the "imperialist-feudal-bourgeois com-

bine." This led that document, i.e., the "Tactical Line," to characterise the stage of the revolution in India soon after transfer of power as the socialist stage or more exactly "combining the characteristics of both the stages of the Russian Revolution" (i.e., February and October).

The subsequent document "Left Deviation in the CPI", adopted by the CC in June 1950 rejected the PB Tactical Line, which it said was a Left-sectarian distortion of the Political Thesis of the 2nd Congress. "The Left Deviation in the CPI", while generally upholding the position of the 2nd Congress Political Thesis, clarified certain points:

(1) In the "imperialist-feudal-bourgeois combine" that held power in the new state, the bourgeoisie came last and that too was a section of the bourgeoisie, i.e., the big bourgeoisie.

(2) Therefore, the stage of the revolution was anti-imperialist, anti-feudal.

A furious inner-Party struggle ensued between the supporters of the PB "Tactical Line" and of "The Left Deviation in the CPI" document. This was resolved by the Party Programme, which was published in April 1951 and adopted by the Special Conference of the CPI in October 1951.

So far, the author has merely brought out the main formulations of the four successive documents mentioned above, without giving a judgement on those.

He sums up "the crux of the controversy" between the original "Tactical Line" document and the subsequent critique of that document:

1. "Tactical Line" (1949)—The formal political independence, secured in 1947, was so used by the bourgeoisie to defeat the manoeuvres of imperialism in so far as they affect its own class interests; the colonial position was modified to make independence real to the bourgeoisie.

Revolution is basically anti-capitalist, though certain tasks of an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal character have to be fulfilled.

2. *Subsequent Documents of 1950*: Indian collaborationist government is surrendering position after position to imperialists; colonial position of the country basically remains unchanged.

Revolution is anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, though, in the process, the forces of revolution have to fight a section of the bourgeoisie (big bourgeoisie) as an integral part of the enemy to be defeated.

The author's own opinions on these appraisals are now given in the section "Correction by the New Programme" (pp. 25-29). First, how is the 1951 Programme appraised?

Went a great deal in clearing the confusion of 1947-51;

First effort to steer clear of revisionism and Right-opportunism on the one hand, and dogmatism and Left-sectarianism, on the other;

Effective for the time being, but lagged far behind fast moving developments in India and the world.

According to the author, the 1951 Programme bared "the class reality behind the transfer of power": *not* a "national advance" and real independence, as it appeared to the people—but the setting up by imperialists of "a government of landlords, princes and of the reactionary big bourgeoisie collaborating with the British imperialists." This was "a rejection of the non-class approach to the transfer of power made in the 1947 June Resolution."

To that extent—the criticism of that resolution made in all the three subsequent documents was endorsed in the new Programme.

Having said that, the author makes contradictory formulations about the Programme:

On the one hand, it corrected the non-class and revisionist understanding of the 1947 resolution;

On the other hand, it corrected the dogmatic and sectarian approach of the subsequent documents;

All the same, the Programme was permeated with a fundamentally dogmatic outlook.

How did the new Programme negate the non-class and revisionist misunderstanding of the 1947 resolution?

Because it negated the idea (non-class and revisionist) of 1947 resolution of using the newly-formed governments as weapons to defeat imperialist conspiracy. Programme said the Congress government was a creation of imperialists and its tool in perpetuating colonial order.

How did it correct the dogmatic and sectarian approach of the subsequent documents?

While the subsequent documents (both PB "Tactical Line" and "Left-Sectarian Deviation") in varying ways recognised the pro-imperialist class character and called for its overthrow, *they mechanically applied the lessons of Russian or Chinese revolution*. This was corrected!

Then how was the outlook of the Programme "fundamentally dogmatic"?

While the class-character of the Congress government, as given in the Programme had to be corrected, "the essence of the failure" of the Programme was the inability to see the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism, and the new possibilities.

That is why "the assessment of the social and political basis of the government was unrealistic and sectarian."

The author thinks that the dogmatic understanding of the Programme exists *not* in the sectarian understanding of the class nature of the government and about the role of that class, but on the non-understanding of the new stage of general crisis of capitalism.

That is why every one of the *assessments* of the Programme proved wrong, e.g., peace policy—against war-mongering of capitalist countries; independent capitalist development; less police repression—not a police state.

Then the author goes on to recite what happened from Palghat to Amritsar.

Amendments to Programme drafted before Palghat; Palghat incorporated the sense of the amendments in the Political Resolution, but refused to amend the Programme.

At Palghat, differences on the Programme as well as on the assessment of the current situation;

Points enumerated, resolved only formally at Palghat.

After 1957 election, question of the rise of Right-reaction. At Amritsar, "simultaneous battle" decided upon (impact of 20th Congress and 12-Parties' Declaration not mentioned);

Dismissal of the Kerala Ministry;

India-China question;

Differences sharpen;

1960—Eighty-one Parties' Conference—Statement. Implications of the new concepts in the same; new stage of general crisis, national democracy; non-capitalist path not worked out.

So at Vijayawada—two Political Resolutions and two Programmes.

Vijayawada unanimity on the resolution and the election tactics later and the campaign;

Then India-China conflict, new problem: how to integrate patriotism with proletarian internationalism;

At Vijayawada, author disagreed with both drafts, now on Indo-China conflict, he disagrees with November 1962 resolution;

So he now attempts to deal with these differences in the background of the ideological confusion that gripped the Party since 1955 or from 1947.

THE TWO DRAFT PROGRAMMES

With this introduction, the author then proceeds to show how both the majority and minority draft programmes and draft resolutions at the Vijayawada Congress are wrong, abstract and "subjectively created schemes of Indian revolution" because our leadership never made any serious effort to assimilate and apply the major conclusions of the 81-Parties' Conference to the ideological problems facing the Party.

He takes as an example how the two draft programmes apply to Indian conditions the *two concepts* formulated in the 81-Parties' Statement, viz., the concepts of *national democracy* and *non-capitalist path*.

Briefly speaking, the criticism is

Majority draft lays emphasis on the fight for national democracy and underplays non-capitalist path;

Minority draft lays the main emphasis on the fight for non-capitalist path and for the instrument of realising it — *people's democracy*. National democracy is a less important transitional form of alliance to reach people's democracy.

The *majority* draft is said to take up the tasks of the non-capitalist path only after national democratic front is successfully formed and is able to set up the government of national democracy. The suggestion is that the majority

draft recommends stress only on anti-imperialist, anti-feudal tasks, while fighting for building the national democratic front.

The *minority* draft, on the other hand, straightaway takes up the fight for the non-capitalist path in the struggle to build the national democratic front and continually popularises people's democracy.

The *author's* conception of a correct correlation of national democracy and non-capitalist path is given on page 41, last para.

Struggle between capitalist and non-capitalist path begins as political power shifts from imperialism to national bourgeoisie.

In the course of this conflict expressing itself in economic, political and ideological fields, the national democratic front gets built up and is able to direct state machinery.

To the extent, the working class achieves hegemony in the NDF, to that extent the shift from the capitalist to non-capitalist path takes place.

Struggle between capitalist and non-capitalist path is a *generalised form of class struggle* through which the proletariat *unites* with the national bourgeoisie in anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks and *struggles* to isolate it from the masses by fighting against the agonies of the capitalist path of development.

This is the dynamic conception of non-capitalist path as a process of social development.

According to the author, the majority as well as minority drafts miss this revolutionary essence of national democracy and non-capitalist path because *they* miss the major fact of world historic importance noted in the Moscow Statement — that "a new stage has begun in the development of the general crisis of capitalism" characterised by the "growing

instability of the entire world economic system of capitalism—a profound crisis in bourgeois politics and ideology.”

In the context of this new stage of general crisis of capitalism, any country building capitalism will have unstable economy and its politics and ideology in profound crisis.

NON-CAPITALIST PATH

Is the concept of non-capitalist path of development a new concept in Marxism? In what context was it formulated originally and what is new in its application to the present stage? Only when we answer these questions will we be able to see the correct interconnection between the *new* concept of national democracy and the new application of the concept of the non-capitalist path.

The idea of the non-capitalist path was formulated in the context of the question: How do independent underdeveloped countries, i.e., countries which are not industrially developed and where feudal or semi-feudal relations still rule in agriculture, make their transition to socialism? Must they first develop capitalism to become industrially advanced so as to become mature for socialist revolution?

This question was first raised by Engels in the context of the colonies of an imperialist country like England after socialist revolution has become victorious there.

In a letter addressed to Karl Kautsky on September 12, 1882, Frederick Engels discussed the attitude of the working class party to the colonial policy of the capitalist governments of countries like England, and said:

“India will perhaps, indeed very probably, make a revolution, and as a proletariat in process of self-emancipation cannot conduct any colonial wars, it would be allowed to run its course. . .”

Here Engels is referring to national-liberation revolution. With reference to further developments thereafter, he comments:

“Once Europe is reorganised, and North America, that will furnish such colossal power and such an example that semi-civilised countries will of themselves follow in their wake; economic needs, if anything, will see to that. But as to what social and political phases these countries will then have to pass through before they likewise arrive at socialist organisation, I think we today can advance only idle hypotheses.” (Marx and Engels, *On Colonialism*, F.L.P.H. Moscow, p. 306)

The question was more specifically formulated in the Programme and the Colonial Theses of the 6th World Congress of the Communist International. The conception of the role of the national bourgeoisie in the national-liberation struggle was that it was *oppositional* to imperialism, it leads and heads the mass national-liberation movement, but it is anti-revolutionary, so it capitulates again and again to imperialism as the mass movement breaks through the bounds set by it.

Though warning was given in these theses that this capitulation is never final until the mass movement assumes an overwhelming and decisive character, the *conclusion* was drawn that if national bourgeoisie leading the mass liberation movement achieves independence it is never complete, imperialism retains economic strings in its hands, some further development is allowed, the country passes from a colonial status to that of a semi-colonial status.

If, on the other hand, the national liberation is achieved under the leadership of a national united front at the head of which stands the working class, complete independence is achieved, the state that is set up is of the character of the democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants, such a government, in close alliance with the country of victorious socialism, can complete the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution and can build the pre-requisites of socialism, i.e., a developed industry and agriculture *in a non-capitalist way*.

According to this pre-Second World War analysis of the Communist International.

(i) National-liberation movement, led by the national bourgeoisie, would not achieve complete independence; it would pass on to a semi-colonial status, having *not* an independent capitalist development but a stunted capitalist growth controlled by imperialism in its own interests.

(ii) Non-capitalist path of development would open up only for the country where the national-liberation revolution had won under the leadership of the working class and the new independent state was allied to the country of victorious socialism.

This analysis continued after the Second World War right up to 1956—up to the 20th Congress of the CPSU. There was the classic example of China to prove the old thesis. China became independent in 1927 under the national bourgeoisie, under the Kuomintang led by Chiang Kai-shek. What took place there in the next ten years is not independent capitalist development; but the development of compradore bureaucratic capitalism under the tutelage of imperialism. Therefore, there the task was to replace that government with the government of new democracy led by the working class. Such a government in alliance with the country of victorious socialism would be able to complete the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution and build the pre-requisites of socialism in a *non-capitalist way*.

This was the analysis of *New Democracy* of Mao Tse-tung. (1939)

This was brilliantly confirmed as far as China was concerned when the Chinese people's revolution won its historic victory in 1949.

The same analysis was generalised for all countries and was implicit in the documents of the Communist Infor-

mation Bureau, which described the world after the end of the Second World War and the emergence of the socialist system, as divided into two camps. The anti-imperialist democratic camp and the imperialist, anti-democratic camp. The newly-independent countries which had won their independence under the national bourgeoisie were declared as not really independent and under the grip of the imperialists. Thus they (their governments) were put in the imperialist anti-democratic camp.

Our Programme of 1951 was based on this analysis. It said that the imperialists set up the Congress government. It was a bourgeois-landlord government in the grip of imperialists, unable to industrialise the country or carry out agrarian reforms, i.e., unable to build an independent economy even on capitalist lines—such a government has to be overthrown and replaced by a government of people's democracy under which alone the pre-requisites of socialism can be built in the non-capitalist way.

Such is the background of the old analysis and the possibilities of the application of the non-capitalist path for the underdeveloped countries as visualised in it. The author is right when he says that the leadership did not make a collective effort to get an integrated understanding of the analysis of the new epoch, the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism and the new possibilities of solving the cardinal problems of the day in a new way, and apply the same to the problem of social revolution in our own country. That the author in this provocative and controversial document makes such an attempt must be welcomed as a contribution to the discussion.

CRITIQUE OF AUTHOR'S ANALYSIS

Has the author himself worked out an integrated correct understanding of the new epoch, the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism and of the new possibilities?

Or, is he picking just some isolated features of the same

to suit his pet theory which he has been pursuing since Vijayawada, that a correct understanding of the Indian situation and our line can be got by negating what he calls the revisionist approach of the majority, as well as the Left-sectarian and dogmatic approach of the minority?

I am afraid he is doing the latter thing. Instead of grasping what is *new* in the analysis of the 1960 Statement and trying to apply that new to the problems of Indian social development of the post-independence period, he just picks and chooses certain features of that analysis and uses them to "prove" the revisionist understanding of the majority draft. He says the majority draft overstates national democracy and underplays non-capitalist path while the minority draft does the opposite. He says both do not understand the dynamic conception of the non-capitalist path "and the close interconnection" between the fight for it and the fight for national democracy. But the author himself has not posed this interconnection concretely and correctly so that he lays himself open to the charge that he is underplaying national democracy.

This is because the author has not posed the question as to what is *new* in the conception of the non-capitalist path as applied now in the new epoch and in the period of the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism.

As we have stated before, according to the older understanding as given in the documents of the 6th World Congress or in the Cominform documents, underdeveloped or former colonial countries, which gain independence under the leadership of bourgeois class forces, never become really independent. The grip of imperialism prevents them from gaining economic independence. Politically, they were satellites of imperialism. World socialism and international communist movement considered such states in the camp of imperialism, while communist and democratic movement in the country set themselves the task of overthrowing the government in such countries and replacing it by a

government of people's democracy so as to make the path of non-capitalist development to socialism possible.

NEW SITUATION

After the Second World War, when people's democracies emerged in a number of European countries and the Chinese revolution became victorious, the socialist system emerged and the increase of its military and economic strength began shifting the balance of forces in the world towards socialism and against capitalism, a new world situation and new stage of the general crisis of capitalism began to shape itself.

An upsurge of national-liberation revolutions in a number of countries of Asia and Africa resulted in their attaining independence. Independent countries which thus emerged were not only of two types as visualised in the old understanding, i.e., either satellites of imperialists, semi-colonies on the one hand or people's democracies on the other. A third type now emerged, typified by India, Indonesia, Burma and other countries. These states were led by the national bourgeoisie; they were not in the military alliances of imperialism; they generally pursued the policies of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism; though not freed from imperialist economic grip they were struggling to build independent economies keeping relations with both socialist and imperialist camps.

This reality was shaping itself in these countries but still our 1951 Programme drafted under the influence of the old understanding ignored the same. India was declared a satellite state, a semi-colony, whose bourgeois-landlord rulers, were incapable of building an independent economy and who, in the field of foreign policy were facilitating imperialist aggression and pursuing a spurious peace policy.

This error arose not only because there was a lag in understanding the full import and impact of the new epoch

and the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism, but also because in the international communist movement and in our Party there were strong tendencies which underestimated the significance of the national-liberation movement led by the national bourgeoisie and the fact that the national bourgeoisie had not exhausted its progressive role. This led to sectarian mistakes and to the self-isolation of the communists and the working class, from the national-liberation movement instead of to their hegemony in the same. However, we put aside this latter consideration here.

Thus, according to the new understanding, there are three types of newly-independent countries:

(i) Countries in military alliance of imperialism, of dependent economy, where democracy is suppressed—e.g., South Vietnam, South Korea, Philippines, Pakistan, etc.

(ii) Non-aligned countries, striving to develop independent economy on capitalist lines, countries of bourgeois democracy, with a certain measure of bourgeois-democratic freedom.

(iii) Countries of people's democracy, developing along non-capitalist path to socialism.

The second type of countries, India, Indonesia, Burma, UAR, Ceylon and some others, are middle-of-the-road countries, both internationally and internally. *Internationally*, being non-aligned and generally standing for peace and anti-colonialism, the socialist camp and the international communist movement accords support to these governments, renders them economic aid to help them to strengthen economic independence.

Internally, these governments, in so far as they strive to develop independent economy (and in that measure anti-imperialist and anti-feudal) and in so far as they afford a certain degree of bourgeois-democratic freedom, the Communist Parties do not set forth the objective of their

immediate overthrow, but concentrate on two-fold objectives.

(i) *Isolate and eliminate* reactionary forces, which are seeking to put the clock back and take the country in the pro-imperialist and anti-democratic direction;

(ii) *Develop* struggles against the government to prevent its backsliding in the above direction, to mobilise and unite the patriotic masses to build independent national economy in the non-capitalist way and for government changes capable of implementing those policies.

In terms of the old understanding, as in our 1951 Programme, the working class and the Party are confronted with a government which is pro-imperialist, a satellite government incapable of building an independent economy, they unleash a struggle on the basis of a broad national front to overthrow this government.

The programme of this struggle is to complete the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal national independence revolution. If this struggle is victorious under the leadership of the proletariat, a people's democracy is formed and thereafter the task of building the prerequisites of socialism in the non-capitalist way is undertaken.

THE CAPITALIST PATH

But in terms of the new understanding, the working class and the Party are confronted with a national bourgeois government, which is consolidating its political independence and striving to attain economic independence, though in a capitalist way, by maintaining relations with both socialist and imperialist camps.

Masses are face to face with a middle-of-the-road government, which is building independent economy though in a capitalist way and maintains a certain measure of bourgeois freedom. Masses experience that the capitalist path

of building independent economy heaps economic burdens on them; does not raise but rather lowers their standard of living. They see that with the growth of capitalism and with the growth of monopoly and concentration of capital, the soil for reactionary forces grows and these forces begin pressurising the government to turn to pro-imperialist and anti-democratic policies.

The bankruptcy of the capitalist path to secure economic independence for the country and a better standard of living for the people becomes more and more apparent to the patriotic people and masses.

Is it possible for countries like India, Indonesia, etc., to reach economic independence, that is, the stage of mature industrialisation and developed agriculture in the capitalist way?

This possibility cannot be excluded in the context of the new world situation (new epoch and the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism) and also because of the possibilities it opens up for the national bourgeoisie as a whole to pursue its class aim of building an independent economy in the capitalist way. Of course, such a development would be a protracted path, heaping burdens and suffering on the masses and involving dangers for the nation.

But to recognise the possibility soberly, is neither to have illusions about capitalism nor to underestimate the impact of the new epoch.

On the other hand, to keep this possibility soberly in view is to recognise the middle-of-the-road character of such governments, their dual role, their alternate swings in the progressive and reactionary directions.

But this middle-of-the-road capitalist way of building independent national economy, which is glorified by the ideologues of the bourgeoisie as "mixed economy" and as the "democratic way of achieving socialistic pattern" in practice leads to the unfolding of the well-known contra-

dictions of capitalist development, concentration of capital, growth of monopoly on the one hand and the growing disparities of income and a totally insufficient growth of the standard of living of the masses on the other. This is taking place when the economy of the country is yet within the sphere of influence of world capitalist economy, when the grip of imperialists on certain sectors of our economy still continues.

This creates the soil on which reactionary forces grow, and taking advantage of the discontent of the masses, seek to subvert even this middle-of-the-road path in the pro-imperialist and anti-democratic directions.

This path of development therefore leads to (1) growing burdens, suffering on the masses; (2) growing influence of the monopolies on the state machine and consequent growth of corruption; (3) growth of reactionary forces and danger of subversion, of slipping back into imperialist grip.

At the same time, as a result of this development, there is the growth and expansion of democratic classes, in the first place, there is the growth of the working class due to industrialisation. Then there is the growth of peasant farmers with land or with tenancy rights because of some land reform. There is the growth of the intelligentsia engaged in the growing industries and construction works. There is also the expansion of the national bourgeoisie in the lower strata. These classes, together with the masses of common people, constitute the people of India. They constitute the nation.

If the proletariat and its Party have to come forward to unite the people in a national democratic front and to make a bid for hegemony in the struggle for the social development that is taking place in the country, it is not enough at this stage to put forward just an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal programme.

The national bourgeoisie having to a limited extent

carried out anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks, have begun building independent national economy though in the capitalist way.

THE ALTERNATIVE PATH

The masses and the people being faced with the burdens, the sufferings and the dangers of this way, are seeking an alternative path, are asking the question: Must India build the capitalist way? Is there no other path? Capitalist path stands discredited in the eyes of the masses and that is why the present ruling class proclaims socialism as its objective. The principles of their development planning, whose objective is independent self-reliant national economy, raising the standard of living of the masses and doing away with economic inequalities, are heavy industry in the public sector, agrarian reform and democracy. These are progressive principles. But the manner in which they are implemented in the actual plan, leads to the burdens on and sufferings of the people and to the endangering of independent development itself.

In this context the working class and its Party come forward with an alternative path of building independent national economy—the path of non-capitalist development. This programme is well known. It is not necessary to repeat it here.

Can such a programme unite all sections of the peasants and the exploited masses? Of course, such unity or united front based on it will not come as soon as you put forward the programme. It will require a long, arduous and many-sided struggle. As a result of this struggle, a change in the relation of class forces has to be brought about. The balance of class forces must shift in favour of the leadership of the working class, in favour of the worker-peasant alliance. It must result in the isolation of the reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie. Only when such a shift in the relations of class forces is brought about can national democracy and

its government come into existence and the implementation of the programme of non-capitalist path begin.

The author is right when he says that fight for the non-capitalist path begins as soon as the newly-independent national bourgeois government, having stabilised itself begins the task of constructing independent national economy.

He is right in this, that the fight for non-capitalist path and for national democracy go hand in hand and cannot be separated.

He is also right when he says that the minority draft believes that the realisation of the non-capitalist path is only possible under the sole leadership of the working class, under a people's democracy, it attaches no importance to national democracy.

But having set himself the task of artificially demarcating himself from both the majority and minority, he says the majority draft over-estimates national democracy, i.e., only kowtows to the bourgeoisie and does not work out the class policy of uniting and struggling against the bourgeoisie. His claim is that he himself has succeeded in giving a concrete application of the struggle for non-capitalist path and national democracy to Indian conditions.

He does not see how this struggle has a dual aspect—it is both patriotic as well as anti-mass-exploitation. Let us examine his claim.

He does not concretely formulate what shifts in the relations of class forces and class alignment have to be brought about by this struggle to achieve national democracy.

He does not show concretely how far in an underdeveloped country like India, which has launched on the path of building independent national economy in the capitalist way, national democracy is an achievable objective, both because of favourable internal conditions and favourable

world situation, provided the Party has a correct analysis, approach and tactical line of struggle.

Under national democracy, the building of mature industrialisation and developed agriculture in the non-capitalist way, can lead to continual strengthening of the leading role of the working class and of the worker-peasant alliance and the progressive weakening of capitalist elements and can create conditions for transition to socialism, provided the working class and its Party pursue a correct policy and line of struggle.

Let us concretise these points. That will enable us to develop the critique of the author's understanding and method.

The alternative programme we put forward before our people, as against the path of building independent national economy in the capitalist way which is what the planning of the government amounts to, is in content a non-capitalist path achieving the same result, i.e., economic independence.

This alternative path, it must be clearly understood, is neither an anti-capitalist programme in the sense of uprooting of all capitalist relations nor a programme of building socialism. It is an alternative programme of building independent national economy, without, at the same time, allowing capitalist development in the familiar way, i.e., curbing the growth of monopoly, breaking its power where it has grown, taking effective measures to curb growth of inequalities of income and to ensure rising standard of living of the masses.

The fight for this path puts forward solution for the two-fold crises which the implementation of the Plan under the Congress government brings forth. First, the Congress planning is leading to growth of monopoly, its influence over state machine and public sector, huge profits of these monopolists, rising corruption—all this is leading to crisis of resources and foreign currency for development. This

creates the soil for the growth of reaction and for their attempt to subvert national policies of non-alignment and independent development.

Our alternative path presents a solution to the problem of resources, shows the path of mobilising resources within the country by nationalising banks, oil, export-import trade and other key industries which involve both foreign and Indian monopolists.

Secondly, the present Congress planning is leading to growing burdens on and suffering of the masses and a very slow rate of growth of living standards.

The alternative path, by putting forward alternative resources through nationalisation and through expansion of public sector and by fighting for complete agrarian reforms and for the strengthening of the economy of the vast masses of middle and poor peasants and agricultural labourers through developing cooperatives and by giving them technical and material aid, creates conditions for raising the standard of living of the masses.

Thus, while formulating and fighting for this alternative path—the non-capitalist path, we develop a basic criticism of the present planning, which, though based on the three progressive principles noted above, is so implemented that in practice it leads to all the evils and contradictions of capitalism.

At the same time, we point out that the only way to build independent national economy, evading the crises mentioned above and the danger of reactionary anti-national subversion, is the alternative path we propose. That is why on its basis, it becomes possible to unite all sections of the people, including the patriotic national bourgeoisie.

DYNAMIC CONCEPTION

What the author calls the dynamic conception of the non-capitalist path has to be understood only in this way.

It is the most effective way of achieving the national objective today—building independent national economy, without heaping burdens and suffering on the masses but by ensuring a steady and continuous rise in their standard of living; without exposing the country to reactionary anti-national subversion and by strengthening political and economic independence.

This is a consistently anti-imperialist, democratic path of building the nation's economy.

In fighting to mobilise the masses for it, we must combine the patriotic approach towards building independent national economy with unwavering struggle for bettering the living standards of the masses; we must concentrate fire on the reactionary anti-democratic forces; we must seek to unite all the patriotic sections.

If the struggle is developed along these lines, it will gather mass and momentum; it will succeed in isolating the reactionary pro-imperialist sections of the bourgeoisie; it will shift the balance of class forces in favour of working class leadership and of worker-peasant alliance and thus create conditions for uniting with the patriotic national bourgeoisie and for the formation of national democratic front powerful enough to take the strings of government in hand.

Building independent national economy, along the non-capitalist path under such a national democracy creates the material and class pre-requisites for the transition to socialism.

All this is possible in the new epoch and in the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism, not only because capitalism is discredited but also because the socialist system has become a decisive force, capable of crushing imperialist aggression, capable of giving economic aid to underdeveloped countries enabling them to build their independent national economies, avoiding dangers of capitalist development.

Has the author worked out such an integrated conception of non-capitalist path and national democracy and its application to India? He has not. He is so absorbed in fighting the alleged revisionism of the majority draft that he remains somewhere in the middle — but nearer to the minority draft.

If you do not see that possibility of national democracy in the present world situation means the possibility of the working class and worker-peasant alliance sharing leadership with patriotic sections of the national bourgeoisie to implement the non-capitalist path of building national economy, you do not understand the conception at all. But such a possibility can be realised only if the working-class Party combines the patriotic and class approach correctly and struggles to establish the initiative of the working-class leadership and of worker-peasant alliance in the national democratic front.