

In Reply to CPI(M)'s 'Once More On The S U C'

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
(Fortnightly)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL. 6
No. 22

1st JULY, '73
SUNDAY

PRICE 30 P.
Air Surcharge 4. P.

Demonstration Against Congress Food Policy

Calcutta, June 27—Organised under the leadership of the Calcutta District Committee of the SUCI, hundreds of citizens waited in a strong mass deputation today upon the Regional Manager, Food Corporation of India, at Calcutta in protest against supply of inedible and poisonous wheat through ration shops. The deputationists demanded regular and adequate supply of proper quality of food grains at fair prices through ration shops.

Earlier a meeting was held at Subodh Mallick Square under the presidentship of Com. Ranjit Dhar, former Councillor of the Calcutta Corporation and a member of the Secretariat of the West Bengal State Committee of the SUCI, where a memorandum containing the various demands relating to supply of food grains to the people was unanimously adopted. A strong criticism of the food policy of West Bengal as well as the Central Government was made in general and parti-

cularly the recent cut by 100 grammes in the quota of rice, supplied in areas under statutory rationing, per head per week was condemned. The meeting sounded a note of caution about further cut in rice and wheat quotas and urged upon the people to organise themselves for a united mass movement against price-rise of essential articles and the anti-people projected pro-blackmarketeer food policy of the Congress and its Governments and for restoration of the cut in quota of rice.

Assam in the Grip of Severe Flood

Gauhati, June 25—Heavy rains in Assam have caused severe flood in Goalpara areas. Even after twentyfive years since the independence of our country and in spite of fanfare declaring the "progress of the country" made during the Congress regime, Assam still remains a chronic victim of periodical floods, throwing the people to the fury of nature and consequent death of innumerable people, destruction of

whatever little they possess and damage to their standing crops etc. every year. A flood-control multi-purpose Brahmaputra Valley Project is the burning need of Assam but still the project remains a far cry. Com. Ashit Bhattacharya, Secretary of the Assam State Committee of the SUCI, has, in a statement, demanded proper rehabilitation of the victims of this year's flood.

People's Democracy has published an article entitled *Once More On The SUC*. Like the article *A Word To The SUC* published earlier in the same organ of the CPI(M), this article also is replete with innuendoes, abuse and slander against the SUCI and distortion of its stands. Over and above, in this article we have been charged with subjectivism and exercise in syllogism. Had the CPI(M) leadership correctly understood what subjectivism and syllogism actually mean then they would have realised that the way they have discussed different subjects, drawn conclusions and criticised the SUCI in this article is a glaring example of subjectivism and exercise in syllogism. There is no doubt that the CPI(M) leadership are trying to whip up a campaign of hate, slander and *canard* against the SUCI.

What may be the motive behind this campaign? The SUCI has criticised the political line of people's democratic revolution of the CPI(M) as incorrect so much so that it not only would mislead the revolutionary forces in our country away from the real enemy, namely, the ruling bourgeoisie, thereby exhausting them in the long run and helping the ruling bourgeoisie to further consolidate its class rule but also refuses to smash the capitalist state machine and even to overthrow the "big bourgeoisie", meaning the big industrial bourgeoisie, i.e., the monopolists from state power. The strategic programme for people's democratic revolution of the CPI(M), in spite of revolutionary verbiage, objectively boils down to a programme of bourgeois national reformism. The SUCI has also criticised some other formulations of the CPI(M) on some important issues. The motive behind the anti-SUCI campaign by the CPI(M) leadership is to develop a blind and strong feeling among the ranks and supporters of the party against the SUCI, incite them not to hear the criticism and read the books, literature and writings of the SUCI and conceal the truth.

We oppose this campaign of hate, slander and *canard*, not because it is directed against us. If they so desire, the CPI(M) leadership can carry on this campaign as

long as they like. We are not at all worried about it. We oppose it; because, it creates blindness, party fanaticism, irrationality and lack of philosophical tolerance of others' views, destroys the normal healthy atmosphere, that is necessary for conducting polemical discussions, criticism and self-criticism, develops absence of reasonable mind in the mental framework of different sections in society, thereby providing a favourable ground for all reactionary and obscurant ideas to easily penetrate into different walks of life, which gives fascism the opportunity to vegetate quickly and widely.

Indian Situation

The article is purported to deal mainly with the question of the character of the Indian state and the present stage of the revolution in our country. It is, therefore, proper that we should state our case briefly to help our people understand our stand correctly.

With the transfer of power on August 15, 1947 by the then British imperialist rulers of our country to the leaders of the Indian National Congress, the political rule of foreign imperialism in India came to an end, the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie, including the big industrial bourgeoisie, reflecting the interest of native industry (distinct from

(Contd. to page 2)

PRESENT STAGE OF THE INDIAN REVOLUTION

(Contd. from page 1)

the comprador section), that was then politically represented by the leadership of the Indian National Congress and was leading the anti-imperialist national liberation movement by our people, capturing state power through compromise with British imperialism and establishing its own state, a bourgeois national state. *To this extent, the bourgeois-democratic revolution in our country was achieved in a half-baked and truncated way with many of the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution till then remaining unaccomplished. Henceforth, with the passing of state power from the hands of one old class, namely, the British imperialists, into the hands of a new class, namely, the Indian bourgeoisie, to the extent the main political task of the Indian revolution has been to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power, to that extent the Indian revolution entered the stage of socialist revolution, notwithstanding the fact that many of the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution till then remained unaccomplished.*

With the establishment of a bourgeois national state in India, conditions for relatively the freest, widest and speediest development of Indian capitalism possible in the prevailing international and national situation have been created and the ruling Indian bourgeoisie has been making all-out efforts to develop India as a powerful capitalist country in the shortest possible time. Notwithstanding the fact that, in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the attitude of the bourgeoisie, particularly of a former colonial country, towards feudalism is compromising, the ruling bourgeoisie in our country has liquidated feudal relations in our land system, though feudal

remnants in the form of habits and custom in rural relationship still exist, and developed Indian capitalism considerably. In fact, in spite of relatively considerable weakness of Indian capitalism compared to capitalism in the powerful imperialist capitalist countries, we have now a modern centralised type of state machine and Indian capitalism not only has grown and become the principal economic form but also has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopoly, through the merger of bank capital with industrial capital and on the basis of this finance capital has given birth to a financial oligarchy, that has established its dominance over the entire economy of the country, has been making export of capital (though the amount is relatively small) as distinguished from export of commodities to the foreign countries and is increasingly showing imperialist features. Those, who refuse to recognise these features as imperialist features, on the plea of "the present age of multi-national corporations, when such things are common" are not only erring against Lenin's teachings on imperialism but also sinking into worst type of modern revisionism. Indeed, India is very slowly but gradually and steadily growing as an imperialist country.

World capitalism now is in the grip of deepening crisis. World capitalist economy has lost even the relative stability of market in the period of its general crisis, which it used to enjoy till the second world war, as a result of which crisis has become more frequent, more prolonged and affecting more branches of industries and the tendency of decay and stagnation of capitalist economy has become more pronounced. One cannot forget that in the midst of this deepening crisis

of world capitalist economy, of which the capitalist economy of our country is a part, the Indian bourgeoisie is trying to develop India as a powerful capitalist country. The modest industrial development, which India has succeeded in achieving, is already associated with a shadow of crisis. In the third phase of the period of general crisis of world capitalism, marked by absence of relative stability of market in the period of general crisis, which world capitalist economy used to enjoy till the second world war, Indian capitalism is incapable of total mechanisation and modernisation of our agriculture, removing the grinding poverty of the people, opening the door of uninterrupted industrial development, carrying out industrial revolution and solving the unemployment problem in the country. The existing capitalist relations of production are acting as a severe brake on further and continuous growth of the productive forces and completing these tasks. While not for a single moment minimising the importance and necessity of distribution of land to the landless and poor peasants, we like to make it clear that unless the existing capitalist relations of production are replaced, *in the main*, by socialist relations of production, the burning problems of our people cannot be solved, our agriculture totally mechanised and modernised grinding pauperisation of the people removed, surplus from agriculture utilised for industrial development properly, present economic backwardness overcome, door of uninterrupted industrial development opened, industrial revolution carried out and the unemployment problem solved now. This cannot be

done without overthrowing the bourgeoisie from state power and smashing the capitalist state machine.

The fundamental question of every revolution is the question of state power. In the words of Stalin, "In the hands of which class, or which classes, is power concentrated; which class or which classes, must be overthrown; which class, or which classes, must take power—such is "the main question of every revolution". (Works. Vol 9 Moscow 1954. P 207) The main question of our revolution is to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power by a revolutionary alliance of the proletariat including the agricultural labourers, the poor peasants, the middle peasants (vacillating), the semi-proletarian masses, the lower strata of the urban middle class and all other exploited people, led by the proletariat. *To this extent, the bourgeois-democratic revolution in our country has been politically completed and, to that extent, the Indian revolution becomes a socialist revolution.*

This does not mean that *all* the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the socio-cultural-economic sphere in our country have been completed. In the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, when the bourgeois-democratic revolution is a part and parcel of world socialist revolution and the bourgeoisie has become mortally afraid of revolution and counter-revolutionary as a world social force, the bourgeoisie cannot complete *all* the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. For this reason during the twenty-five years of bourgeois rule since the independence of our country though feudal relations in the land system have been done

Characterisation of the Indian Bourgeoisie by the SUC and the CPI Differs Fundamentally

away with and Indian capitalism has been developed to such a high stage as to give birth to monopoly and a financial oligarchy, that has established its dominance over the entire economy of the country, the ruling bourgeoisie has not been able to free the country from feudal remnants in the form of habits and custom in rural relationship. So the programme of completing whatever anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in our country still remain unaccomplished is to be incorporated in the programme of socialist revolution for overthrowing the bourgeoisie from state power and smashing the capitalist state machine. For this reason our socialist revolution bears in it an anti-imperialist and, to some extent, anti-feudal content. This involves a question as to how best the proletariat can utilise the situation to, on the one hand, isolate the bourgeoisie to the maximum and, on the other hand, rally all the genuine anti-imperialist forces in the country in the proletarian united front.

This is, in short, our analysis of the Indian situation, the character of the Indian state, the present stage of the revolution in our country and its task.

Thus, the SUCI has nowhere stated that the ruling bourgeoisie in our country has already completed *all* the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. On the contrary, it is of the considered view that in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the bourgeoisie cannot complete *all* the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. How is it then that the CPI(M) leadership in the article *Once More On The SUC* have commented: "The SUC wants a Socialist revo-

lution in India—that is, the Indian bourgeoisie has already completed the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the stage is set for the socialist revolution"? Is it because of lack of elementary political honesty leading to Satanic design of putting into our mouth what we have not said, or, is it because of their utter ignorance of elementary Marxist-Leninist teaching about the stages of revolution?

Bracketing the SUCI with the CPI

To prove their contention that the SUCI and the CPI are "strange bed-fellows" and that they "stand on the same ground", what a desperate but childish attempt the CPI(M) leadership have made! The gentlemen in the CPI(M) leadership have argued that, since the CPI characterises the present Indian state as being the state of the national bourgeoisie and the SUCI characterises the Indian state as the state of the Indian bourgeoisie so the CPI and the SUCI are "bed-fellows" and "stand on the same ground." Wonderful? What a Marxist way of analysis! Is it not resorting to syllogistic nonsense? Any way, let us point out the fallacy in this contention of the CPI(M) leadership.

The CPI considers the Indian bourgeoisie to be divided into two sections, one national bourgeois section and the monopolists. In its programme adopted at the Bombay session held after the split of the parent CPI, it has characterised the present Indian state as the "organ of class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole", where the big business, i.e., the monopolists, exercise influence over the state. But according to the CPI, as the national bourgeoisie has a role to play in completing

the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and, though not revolutionary, is yet a progressive ally of the proletariat in the people's democratic front to complete the people's democratic revolution and as the national bourgeoisie is in control of the state, there exists a national democratic phase in the people's democratic revolution. Whereas the SUCI considers it anti-Marxist and most irrelevant to divide the Indian bourgeoisie into sections in discussing the question of the Indian state. Moreover, the SUCI holds that, after the capture of state power by it, the Indian bourgeoisie has no progressive role to perform now; on the country, it has become the enemy of our people. It further holds that the present Indian state is a capitalist state machine, the state of the Indian bourgeoisie. Indian capitalism has given birth to monopoly and a financial oligarchy, that has established its dominance over the entire economy of the country, has been making export of capital (though the amount is relatively small) as distinguished from export of commodities to the foreign countries and is increasingly showing imperialist features. For these reasons the monopolists are at the helm of the Indian state. So, to open the door of social progress, the Indian bourgeoisie has to be overthrown from state power and the capitalist state machine is to be smashed. Had the CPI(M) leadership any scruple, they would have seen a world of fundamental differences between the formulation of the CPI and that of the SUCI and, so, would not have bracketed the SUCI with the CPI. But the gentlemen in the CPI(M) leadership have either not cared a whit to study our stand and find out the funda-

mental differences between the CPI and the SUCI in this regard, or, not the capability of understanding the differences. Whatever may be the reason, the position remains the same.

However much the CPI(M) leadership may object to our contention that the difference between the CPI and the CPI(M) is merely semantic, the fact is that as regards the present stage of the Indian revolution, its aim and the main disposition of social forces for it, that is, on all fundamental questions of the revolution, they have no basic difference. Both the CPI and the CPI(M) divide the Indian bourgeoisie in two sections, the non-big bourgeoisie and the big bourgeoisie, i.e., the monopolists in discussing the question of the Indian state. Both hold a section of the Indian bourgeoisie, namely, the national bourgeoisie, as an ally of the proletariat in the people's democratic front for their people's democratic revolution; while the CPI(M) views the national bourgeoisie as an ally throughout the whole phase of the people's democratic revolution, the CPI views it as an ally only in the national democratic phase, which is, according to the CPI, a part of the people's democratic phase of revolution. Both characterise the present stage of the Indian revolution as anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, anti-monopolist and democratic. Both view the overthrow from state power only of the big bourgeoisie, i.e., the monopolists and not the Indian bourgeoisie as a class. Both refuse to recognise the existing Indian state as a capitalist state, thereby refusing in actuality, to smash the capitalist state machine for different reasons of their own (though the CPI(M), in its programme has talked of smashing the state machine in the manner of uttering *mantras*). The difference between them boils down

Difference between CPI and CPI(M) is merely Semantic

to this that, as the CPI views that the national bourgeoisie as a whole is in control of the state, it has found, after Khrushchev's discovery, a national democratic phase in the people's democratic revolution, whereas the CPI(M) with the sole aim of drawing a distinction between it and the CPI cannot agree to the CPI's formulation that the national bourgeoisie as a whole is in control of state power in our country and, so, there is no necessity of discovering a national democratic phase in the people's democratic revolution and of raising the slogan of national democratic front with the national bourgeoisie. But this again is only a semantic difference. For, the CPI(M), in its programme adopted at its seventh congress at Calcutta, has characterised the Indian State as a "national state", which, as every Marxist knows, cannot be anything other than the state of the national bourgeoisie. There is another difference between them with regard to political behaviour towards the Indira Congress. While the CPI regards the Indira Congress as representing the "progressive" national bourgeoisie, over whom the monopolists exercise influence from time to time, the CPI(M) thinks that a section within the Indira Congress represents the national bourgeoisie. In close examination, one will find that all these are semantic differences or at best tactical differences and hence, not of fundamental nature.

But when we bracket the CPI(M) with the CPI, we do it on cogent reasons. The reasons may be summed up as follows: First, both the CPI and the CPI(M) were once in the same party with fundamentally the same culture, mental make-up and methodological approach to

problems, which the undivided CPI carried and the present CPI carries. Fourth, there is no fundamental difference between the CPI and the CPI(M) in their formulation of the main political line of the revolution in our country. In the circumstances, is it wrong to conclude that the CPI(M) leadership, in order to justify the existence of the CPI(M) as a separate party, are manufacturing mythical differences with the CPI under cover of 'revolutionary' verbiage and dishing them out to their ranks and the masses of the people? The CPI(M) leadership should know that we need not whip up anti-CPI(M) feeling in our ranks to reassure them of the *raison d'être* of our existence, as alleged by them in the article.

fundamental difference on any of these matters, they could not have remained in the same party for so long a time. Second, characterisation of the state, determination of the stage of revolution and the main disposition of social forces for the revolution—they constitute the main political line of a party. The section of the undivided CPI, which later on formed the CPI(M), at no time, even at the time of the split of the undivided CPI, spoke of their fundamental differences on the character of the Indian state, the present stage of the Indian revolution and the alignment of social forces for the revolution, as formulated in the programmes adopted at the Palghat congress, the Amritsar congress and the Vijaywada congress of the undivided CPI. In fact, had there been any fundamental difference on any of these matters relating to the revolution in our country, the two sections, the CPI section and the CPI(M) section, within the undivided CPI, if they were serious, would not have remained in the same party for years together. Moreover, though the CPI(M) always decries the CPI as "revisionist Right Communists", the CPI(M)'s present characterisation of the Indian state as a bourgeois-landlord state led by the big bourgeoisie, as contained in its programme, is a carbon-copy of the characterisation of the Indian state as a bourgeois-landlord state headed by big business, as made by the "revisionists" at the Palghat congress of the undivided CPI, a characterisation which continued till its Vijaywada congress. Third, the process of formation of the undivided CPI is the process of formation of the CPI(M) also with the result that the latter carries the same culture, habit, mental make-up and methodological approach to

problems, which the undivided CPI carried and the present CPI carries. Fourth, there is no fundamental difference between the CPI and the CPI(M) in their formulation of the main political line of the revolution in our country. In the circumstances, is it wrong to conclude that the CPI(M) leadership, in order to justify the existence of the CPI(M) as a separate party, are manufacturing mythical differences with the CPI under cover of 'revolutionary' verbiage and dishing them out to their ranks and the masses of the people? The CPI(M) leadership should know that we need not whip up anti-CPI(M) feeling in our ranks to reassure them of the *raison d'être* of our existence, as alleged by them in the article.

CPI(M) in a Mess

In the CPI(M)'s programme adopted at its seventh congress held at Calcutta, the present Indian state has been described as a "national state" (Para 7), which, as every Marxist knows, can only be the state of the national bourgeoisie fulfilling "the function of securing the freest, widest and speediest development of capitalism". (*Selected works of Lenin*. Two Volume Edition, Vol. 1. Moscow 1946. P 566) In paragraph 12 of this programme, it has been stated, "After independence, the ruling bourgeoisie proceeded to develop the country's economy on the lines of capitalism to further strengthen its class position in society," which means that the present state in our country is the state of the bourgeoisie. From these formulations of the CPI(M), any Marxist will logically conclude that, inasmuch as the main task of the Indian revolution is to overthrow the Indian bourgeoisie from state power by a revolutionary alliance led by the

proletariat, to that extent, the Indian revolution has entered the stage of *socialist* revolution. So, by defining the present stage of the Indian revolution as anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, anti-monopolist, and democratic as also by advocating that the national bourgeoisie is a participant in the people's democratic front to achieve the people's democratic revolution, the CPI(M) is actually refusing to smash the existing capitalist state machine and thereby refusing also to overthrow even the "big bourgeoisie" from state power whatever might be its vociferous attacks against the "big bourgeoisie." Then what difference is there between the strategical programme of the CPI(M) for people's democratic revolution and that of national democratic revolution of the CPI, other than some terminological differences? The strategic programme for people's democratic revolution, therefore, in reality, essentially boils down to a programme of bourgeois national reformism. In fact, a close examination of the state structure after the establishment of the people's democratic state and people's democratic government, as contained in the programme adopted at the ninth congress of the CPI(M), will reveal it.

In paragraph 56 of the programme adopted at seventh congress of the CPI(M), the present Indian state has been described as "the organ of 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." No Marxist party ever characterises a state in this way. In Russia, for example, after the overthrow of the tsarist regime, state power passed into the hands of the bourgeoisie who were joined by the landowners. But Lenin did not characterise the state in Russia as the state of the bourgeoisie and landowners

To define Indian Revolution as anti-feudal and anti-imperialist with national bourgeoisie as an ally means to refuse to smash the existing capitalist state machine

headed by the bourgeoisie in the manner of the CPI(M) leadership. He simply characterised it as a bourgeois state. Because, the predominant character of that state was the bourgeois character. According to Marxism-Leninism, the character of a mixed phenomenon is determined by its predominant character. Even if it is assumed for the sake of argument that the present Indian state is a state of the bourgeoisie and landlords, led by the big bourgeoisie, as characterised by the CPI(M), then it becomes a case of mixed phenomenon. What can a state led by the "big bourgeoisie", meaning big industrial bourgeoisie, meaning the monopolists, their compromising attitude towards feudalism notwithstanding, be other than a capitalist state machine, a bourgeois state? In the circumstances, the attribute "led by the big bourgeoisie" ascribed to the present Indian state by the CPI(M) leadership becomes a semantic exercise and the Indian state, judged by its predominant class character, becomes a bourgeois state, a capitalist state machine. If because of the leadership of the "big bourgeoisie", i.e., the big industrial bourgeoisie, i.e., the monopolists, over the Indian state, the state ceases to be a state of the Indian bourgeoisie then the states in the advanced capitalist countries and, for that matter, in all other capitalist countries, where capitalism has given birth to monopoly, cease to be states of the bourgeoisie of the respective countries. If the CPI(M) leadership take this position then they will have no other alternative than to reach the Naxalite conclusion that in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, there is no possibility of the emergence of any bourgeois national state. No Marxist can accept

this erroneous proposition unless he wants to disgrace himself as muddle-headed.

In this connection it should be noted that there are some, who, in view of the fact that there is influence of foreign finance capital on the economy of our country, refuse to recognise the present Indian state as an independent bourgeois national state, i.e., a state of the Indian bourgeoisie, a capitalist state machine. They are thoroughly mistaken. For, economic influence of foreign finance capital on the economy of a country has nothing whatever to do with the question of the existence of the state in that country as an independent bourgeois national state. Lenin has said: "Not only small states but even Russia, for example, is economically entirely dependent on the power of the imperialist finance capital of the "rich" bourgeois countries. Not only the miniature Balkan states but even America in the nineteenth century was economically a colony of Europe...but it has nothing whatever to do with the question of national movements and the national state. For the question of political self-determination of nations in bourgeois society and their independence as states, Rosa Luxemburg has substituted the question of their economic independence". (*Ibid* P567. Emphasis added) In the nineteenth century, America was economically a colony of Europe. But, in spite of that, was not the American state then a state of the American bourgeoisie? In recent times, US imperialist finance capital has tremendously strengthened its position in Canada's economy. For this reason has the Canadian state ceased to be a state of the Canadian bourgeoisie? Every one knows that Great Britain is now flooded with US imperialist finance capital. But will any

Marxist say, on this ground, that the present British state is not a state of the British bourgeoisie? If influence of foreign finance capital on the national economy of a capitalist country negates the existence of the state in the country as being the state of the bourgeoisie of that country then there is at present no independent bourgeois national state in the whole world. A theoretically wrong and factually incorrect proposition.

CPI(M)'s Questions

In the article *Once More On The SUC*, the CPI(M) leadership have put some questions to us. We now proceed to give replies to those questions one by one.

First. If the present Indian state is a state of the Indian bourgeoisie then "why is it that feudal and semi-feudal relations in land have not been abolished? Why is it that the policies of the Congress rulers are directed to pauperising the general mass of the peasantry? After all, a bourgeoisie in sole control of a state would have first of all abolished feudal and semi-feudal landlordism and freed the general mass of the peasantry—not only to solve the food problem, not only to produce the necessary raw material for industry, not only to produce the surplus necessary for industrialisation from agriculture, but also to create an ever-widening internal market which can sustain developing industrialisation". So, it is not the SUCI but the CPI(M), that thinks that, in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, more so in the third phase of the period of general crisis of world capitalism, even the bourgeoisie in control of a state in a former colony, where national capitalism has grown and developed under the subjugation of foreign imperialist finance capital, making compromises

with foreign imperialism and native feudalism, not only can but also will complete the anti-feudal tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in our country. What a boundless confidence in the bourgeoisie and capitalism in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution! And still asserting that the CPI(M) has fundamental differences with the CPI and still claiming all the time to be a Marxist-Leninist party in our country! No, gentlemen in the top hierarchy of the CPI(M) leadership, this is against Marxism-Leninism, against the teachings of Lenin. In the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, when bourgeois-democratic revolution has become a part and parcel of the world socialist revolution, the bourgeoisie, after the establishment of a national state, in control of the state cannot fully complete the anti-feudal tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The responsibility of completing these tasks has now fallen on the proletariat. We know that we will at once be charged by the CPI(M) that if that be so, how is it that the SUCI holds that the Indian bourgeoisie has abolished feudal relations in our land system. There is nothing wrong and anti-Marxist in this formulation of ours. Firstly because, when the SUCI says that the feudal relations in the land system in our country have been abolished, it does not mean that all the anti-feudal tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in our country have been accomplished. It holds that there are still remnants of feudalism in the form of habits and custom in rural relationship in our country. Secondly because, the anti-feudal tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution do not limit themselves in the abolition of

Economic Dependence has Nothing to do with the Question of National State, the State of the Bourgeoisie

feudal relations in the land system only; there are many other tasks in the socio-cultural-economic sphere. When Marxism-Leninism states that in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the bourgeoisie cannot complete the anti-feudal tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution then it means that the bourgeoisie cannot complete all these anti-feudal tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Marxism-Leninism has nowhere and never said that the bourgeoisie cannot accomplish any of these tasks and for that matter cannot abolish even feudal and semi-feudal relations in the land system. Had Marxism-Leninism stated that in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution the bourgeoisie cannot accomplish any of the anti-feudal tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and for that matter cannot abolish feudal and semi-feudal relations in the land system then how is it that as capitalism develops and penetrates more and more into the land system in a country, it replaces feudal and semi-feudal relations in the land system? Are we to suppose that capitalism can make "decisive inroads" into agriculture without breaking feudal and semi-feudal relations in the land system? How is it that feudal relations in the land system of our country have been replaced by capitalist relations in our country? By the way, the CPI(M) leadership are talking of feudal and semi-feudal relations in our land system. Will they categorically define, according to the tenets of Marxism-Leninism, what those relations are and where they exist in the land system in our country? Feudal remnants

in the form of habits and custom in rural relationship must not be confused with feudal relations of production in land i.e., feudal land-relations.

Here we must say a few words about the 'Marxist' way of analysis of the CPI(M). The CPI(M) leadership start with the wrong premise that if the Indian bourgeoisie had been in sole control of the Indian state then it would have completed the anti-feudal tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution even in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. Then they wrongly hold that feudal and semi-feudal relations in our land system exist. Accordingly they come to the conclusion that, since, according to them, under a state in control of the Indian bourgeoisie there would not have existed feudal and semi-feudal relations in the system and since in our land system such relations, according to them, still exist so the present state in India is not the state of the Indian bourgeoisie. How simple Marxism becomes when the gentlemen in the CPI(M) leadership handle it. No, gentlemen, Marxism is not so simple as to be correctly understood and handled by the simpletons. It is the most complicated science. We are constrained to say that this 'Marxist' way of analysis of the CPI(M) is sans Marxism. It is a simple deduction on a wrong hypothesis and an exercise in syllogism.

The CPI(M) leadership have further stated that "despite the powerful demand in the country for abolition of landlordism, it is landlordism, which thrives and the peasantry that gets pauperised." This is another instance of self-contradiction in the stand of the CPI(M). Mr.

Namboodiripad, in his Note for the programme of the CPI(M), has observed that the land reform measures of the Congress Governments are calculated "to facilitate, quicken the pace of capitalist transformation of landed property" (Para 5), a statement that has not been contradicted by the party. The programme adopted at the seventh congress of the CPI(M) states that "the aim and direction of its (congress's) agrarian policies is...to transform the feudal landlords into capitalist landlords and develop a stratum of rich peasants" (Para 34). It further states "that capitalism has made *decisive inroads*" in our land system. (Para 102, Emphasis added) In the booklet *Tasks on the Kisan Front*, accepted at the Nurmahal session of the Central Committee of the CPI(M) in October, 1966, it has been stated; "It would be naive on the part of anybody to think that all this has not enabled capitalism to make further inroads into our agriculture and brought about greater class differentiation among our peasantry." (Para 6 Emphasis added) In an article entitled *Marxbadi Communist Partir Dristibhangite Congressi Bhumi Sanskar* published in a supplement to *Ganasakti* dated April 7 last, Mr. Promode Das Gupta has written in the background of the resolution on certain agrarian issues adopted by the Central Committee of the CPI(M) at its Muzaffarpur session in March last: "Capitalism has made *extreme inroads* into the peasant society". But while arguing with us, in their bid to prove that our revolution is anti-feudal and anti-imperialist, the CPI(M) leadership have told us that the more capitalism is making *decisive inroads*, the more land-lordism

(feudalism) is thriving in our country. Thus they are saying, on the one hand, that capitalism is more and more infiltrating into land and, on the other hand, that landlordism (feudalism) is thriving. So, the conclusion, any one will draw from it, is that the more capitalism infiltrates in land, the more landlordism (feudalism) thrives. An absurd proposition indeed! For with capitalism increasingly infiltrating into our land, landlordism cannot thrive and *vice versa*, if the term, landlordism, means feudalism. But if by landlordism the CPI(M) leadership do not mean feudalism and if they by the term, capitalist landlord, mean the rural land-owning class in a capitalist society then struggle for overthrowing this landlordism cannot but be directed for the overthrow of capitalism and smashing the capitalist state machine and, for that reason, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie from state power in the country. Why then are the CPI(M) leadership making such contradictory statements? Is it that placed in a tight corner before our criticism, they are trying to wriggle out of the difficult position, to quote Lenin, "like a blind puppy, sniffing at random first in one direction and then in another"?

The CPI(M) leadership have also stated that had the Indian bourgeoisie been in sole control of the state then it would have "freed the general mass of the peasantry and reversed the process of pauperising the general mass of the peasantry" in order "to create an ever-widening internal market which can sustain developing industrialisation" of our country. Again what a sickening sycophany of the Indian bourgeoisie, main enemy of our people! Even a staunch

CPI(M) Discusses Development of Present-day Capitalism in Such a way as if it is Discussing Development of Capitalism in the Era Of World Capitalist Revolution

bourgeois apologist would have been chary of giving this certificate of progressiveness to the ruling bourgeoisie of India. Marxism demands concrete analysis of concrete condition. We are here discussing the development of capitalism in a relatively backward capitalist country like India in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, particularly in the third phase of the period of general crisis of world capitalism, and not the development of capitalism in the epoch of rising capitalism, i.e., in the era of world capitalist revolution. But, the CPI(M) leadership, on the one hand, are saying that the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the present era are part and parcel of world socialist revolution and, on the other hand, while arguing with us, are talking of capitalism in such a way as if they are discussing the development of capitalism vis-a-vis the role of the bourgeoisie in the epoch of world capitalist revolution. These self-styled Marxist leaders do not at all understand that in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, more so in the third phase of the period of general crisis of world capitalism, the bourgeoisie cannot free the general mass of the peasantry and remove their grinding poverty. At no time can present-day capitalism "create an ever-widening internal market which can sustain developing industrialisation." Could it do so then there would have been no economic crisis of capitalist over-production. The CPI(M) leadership have naively asked why the policies of the Congress rulers are pauperising the general mass of the peasantry. Do they not know that at present under a capitalist state the masses of the people cannot

but be pauperised? Do they not understand that the impoverishment of the masses of our people is an expression of the Indian state being a capitalist state? However, we want them to look into what Lenin has said: "the impoverishment of the masses of the people (that indispensable point in all the Narodnik arguments about the market) not only does not hinder the development of capitalism but, on the contrary, is the expression of that development, is a condition of capitalism and strengthens it. Capitalism needs the "free labourer", and impoverishment consists in the petty producers being converted into wage-workers. The impoverishment of the masses is accompanied by the enrichment of few exploiters; the ruin and decline of small establishments is accompanied by the strengthening and development of bigger ones; both processes facilitate the growth of the market; the "impoverished" peasant who formerly lived by his own farming now lives by "earnings", i.e., by the sale of his labour-power; he now has to purchase essential articles of consumption (although in a smaller quantity and of inferior quality). On the other hand, the means of production from which this peasant is freed are concentrated in the hands of a minority, are converted into *capital*, and the product now appears on the market." (*Collected Works*. Vol. I. Moscow 1963. Pp. 102-103). We think that the CPI(M) leadership have now understood why the state of the Indian bourgeoisie cannot free the general mass of the peasantry, why it cannot end the process of impoverishment of the peasant mass, why the agrarian policies of the Congress rulers are pauperising the general mass

of the peasantry. But are we to take study classes on elementary Marxism to make the CPI(M) leadership catch the point?

Second, "How is it that we have a State of the bourgeoisie and all its policies only lead to the further strengthening of foreign monopolist positions in the country's economy? ...How come that a State of bourgeoisie allows foreign imperialism to thrive in this fashion in the country?" The questions imply that the CPI(M) leadership think that had the bourgeoisie been in control of the state, they would not have allowed foreign finance capital to strengthen its position in India's economy and would have completed the anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. What an appreciation of the Indian bourgeoisie again! No, gentlemen, even if the bourgeoisie is in control of the state, it cannot complete the anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution now a days. The proletariat is to complete them. This is the Leninist teaching. Do not the CPI(M) leadership understand that if, in the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the bourgeoisie could complete the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution then Lenin would not have repeatedly told the communists of the essential necessity of the establishment of proletarian leadership in the bourgeois-democratic revolution? So, by these questions the CPI(M) leadership have not merely meant to say that, in the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the ruling bourgeoisie can complete the anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. By using the expression, "allows foreign imperialism

to thrive in this fashion in the country", they have also slipped, may be unknowingly, into the Naxalite position that the Indian state is a semi-colonial state.

The programme adopted at the seventh congress of the CPI(M) states that "the big bourgeoisie" leading the Indian state "are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital in pursuit of the capitalist path of development". If the expression, "in pursuit of the capitalist path of development", used here, means "for the development of Indian capitalism" then nobody denies what is stated. But how in that case does this collaboration with foreign finance capital prove that the present Indian state is not a state of the Indian bourgeoisie? On the contrary, it proves that the present state in our country is a state of the Indian bourgeoisie.

Collaboration with foreign finance capital may be for two purposes. First, the collaboration may be the exigency of the ruling bourgeoisie in the prevailing condition for the development of Indian capitalism. In that case, the state even though led by "the big bourgeoisie" "increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital" is a capitalist state machine and, for that purpose, it can not but be a bourgeois state. But if the collaboration helps "foreign imperialism to thrive" in our country to the detriment of development of Indian capitalism and native industry then the collaborating bourgeoisie is comprador in character. In that case, the state led by the collaborating bourgeoisie becomes a semi-colonial state and the independent sovereign national state ceases to exist. There is no third alternative. In the CPI(M)'s party programme, the collaboration is stated to be "in pursuit of the capitalist path of development", i.e., for the development of

CPI(M) Attributes Nationalistic and Patriotic Content to the Character of the "Big Bourgeoisie"

Indian capitalism. So, the present Indian state, in spite of collaboration by the "big bourgeoisie", meaning the big industrial bourgeoisie, i.e., the monopolists, with foreign finance capital and leading the state, is a capitalist state machine, a bourgeois state, i.e., the state of the Indian bourgeoisie.

The programme also states that the "big bourgeoisie", meaning the big industrial bourgeoisie, i.e., the monopolists, leading the Indian state have not only "contradictions" but also "conflicts" (mark the word conflicts) with foreign imperialism on such issues as "issues of war and peace, on the economic and political relations with socialist countries, on the terms of aid from foreign monopolists,...on the question of foreign policy and defence of our national independence" and the CPI(M) has assured its "unstinted support" (mark it) to the government, a government led by "the big bourgeoisie" "who are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital", "on all economic and political issues of conflict with imperialism and all issues which involve questions of strengthening our sovereignty and independent foreign policy." (Para 108. Emphasis added). The CPI(M) would not have given this assurance of "unstinted support" on the issues just mentioned to the collaborating "big bourgeoisie," had it not viewed the collaborating "big bourgeoisie" as representing national and patriotic interests in case of its conflicts with foreign imperialism on the issues. Thus, the CPI(M), by the formulation quoted above, has even admitted, may be unknowingly, that the collaborating "big bourgeoisie" leading the Indian state is a section of the national bourgeoisie reflecting the interest of Indian capitalism and native industry and has

attributed a national and patriotic character to the "big bourgeoisie", i.e., the monopolists, in spite of its vociferous attacks elsewhere against the "big bourgeoisie." This position of the CPI(M) is farther to the right of the position taken by the CPI, which at least does not hold the view that the collaborating "big bourgeoisie", i.e., the big industrial bourgeoisie, i.e., the monopolists represent national and patriotic interests. Rather, the CPI says that the influence of the monopolists detracts the national bourgeois state from nationalistic and patriotic path. However, see the fun of self-contradiction in the argument of the CPI(M). On the one hand, the CPI(M) leadership are refusing to characterise the present state in our country as the state of the Indian bourgeoisie on the plea that the state is led by "the big bourgeoisie" which is compromising with feudalism and collaborating increasingly with foreign imperialism. On the other hand, they are saying that the "big bourgeoisie" has not only "contradictions" but also "conflicts" with foreign imperialism on such issues and they are characterising these "conflicts" in such a way that they are attributing nationalistic and patriotic content to the character of the "big bourgeoisie".

Again while arguing with us, in their bid to prove that our revolution is people's democratic revolution, they have again taken the position that the "big bourgeoisie" through increasing collaboration with foreign finance capital is helping "foreign imperialism to thrive" in our country, without caring where it leads them. If this is taken as true, then it means that the "big bourgeoisie" leading the Indian state is of comprador character and, so, the Indian state a semi-colonial state. There is no escape

from it. Half-subjectivist and half-empiricist as they are, the CPI(M) leadership are taking different positions on the same issue at different times. And still they are Marxists!

How do Marxists explain the increasing collaboration with foreign finance capital? Lenin has said: "Developing capitalism knows two historical tendencies in the national question. The first is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression, and the creation of national states. The second is the development and growing frequency of international intercourse in every form, the breakdown of national barriers, the creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc. Both tendencies are a universal law of capitalism. The former predominates in the beginning of its development, the latter characterises a mature capitalism that is moving towards its transformation into socialist society." (*Collected Works*. Vol. 20. Moscow 1964. P27) Indian capitalism, notwithstanding its relative backwardness compared to capitalism in powerful imperialist capitalist countries, is manifesting the second tendency of capitalism, namely, the tendency of cosmopolitanism, indicating its maturity to a degree.

Third. If the Indian state is a state of the Indian bourgeoisie then "How is it that in the whole period of Independence it is the big monopolist houses that have amassed riches while the medium and small sectors have been pushed from crisis to crisis?" So, the CPI(M) leadership think that under a state in control of the Indian bourgeoisie, under capitalist system, the monopolists would not have amassed riches nor would the medium and small capitalists have faced crisis

after crisis. Have the CPI(M) leadership gone out of their heads, otherwise, how can they ask such a silly question and publish it in print in their party organ? Anyone with a modicum of Marxism knows that, under capitalism, the law of development of capitalism operates and hence, there is no escape from antagonistic competition between the different capitalists for securing market and for existence, the ruin and decline of small and relatively inefficient establishments accompanied by the growth and development of the bigger ones, the creation of monopoly, the birth of a financial oligarchy, the dominance of the financial oligarchy over the entire economy of the country, export of capital to the foreign countries as distinguished from export of commodities and slow but gradual and steady manifestation of imperialist features. So, in a capitalist state, whatever be its form, the more capitalism consolidates, the more the monopoly houses prosper and the more the medium and small sector faces crisis after crisis. This is the Marxist understanding of the development of capitalism. This phenomenon is all the more true in the third phase of the period of general crisis of world capitalism, when world capitalist economy has lost even the relative stability of market, which it used to enjoy till the second world war. But the CPI(M) leadership cannot understand it and they naively ask how it is that in the twenty-five years since independence of the country the monopoly houses have amassed fabulous riches while the medium and small capitalists have gone to rack and ruin. Because of their failure to understand the law of development of capitalism in general and particularly in the present era, they have come to the absurd conclusion that the monopolists have been able to amass

Before Completion of Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution Russia Entered the Stage of Socialist Revolution

fabulous riches precisely because of their compromise with feudalism and this would not have taken place, if the present state in India had been a state of the Indian bourgeoisie, i.e., under a capitalist state machine. And this leadership are supposed to lead the Indian people to revolution and to power! We request the ranks of the CPI(M) to ponder over the question.

Skipping Stages in Revolution

The CPI(M) leadership have told us that "it is not because of any particular glamour for the term that the CPI(M) characterises the present stage of the Indian revolution as People's Democratic." What special glamour is there in the term people's democratic revolution? Who has said that it is because of any particular glamour for the term that the CPI(M) characterises the present stage of the Indian revolution as people's democratic? The SUCI has not said it. Then why this irrelevant and useless prattle? The CPI(M) leadership have reminded us that there "has been no revolution without distinct stages" and quoted a passage from Lenin's *Socialism and the Peasantry*, which is completely irrelevant for the point at issue. Be that as it may, who has said that there can be a revolution without stages? The SUCI in any event has not said it. Then why this advice to us? This sermon might have served some purpose, had it been delivered to the Trotskyites and those 'versatile' leaders of the undivided CPI, who now adorn the CPI(M) leadership, in the 1930's.

In the article *Once More On The SUC*, the CPI(M) leadership have charged us with talking about skipping the stages of the Indian revolution and about a one-stage revolution. This charge

is false, inasmuch as the SUCI has never advocated for skipping the stages of the revolution or for achieving a one-stage revolution in our country. So, this is either a wilful distortion of the SUCI's stand, or, due to their complete innocence of elementary teachings of Marxism-Leninism about the stages of revolution in understanding the SUCI's stand in this regard. All the same.

Before we enter into discussion on the tenability of this charge levelled against us by the CPI(M) leadership, we like to put two questions to them. First, is it their point that unless the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution are completed, a country under no circumstances can enter the stage of socialist revolution? Second, if so, wherefrom have they got this idea, which is contrary to Lenin's teachings in his *April Thesis* and the history and fundamental teachings of the socialist November Revolution in Russia?

Lenin analysed the Russian situation and the stage of the Russian revolution after the overthrow of the tsarist regime thus: "What, then, is the first stage? It is the passing of state power to the bourgeoisie. Before the February-March revolution of 1917, state power in Russia was in the hands of one old class, namely, the feudal landed nobility headed by Nicholas Romanov. After the revolution, the power is in the hands of a different class, a new class, namely, the bourgeoisie. The passing of state power from one class to another is the first, the principal, the basic sign of a revolution, both in the strictly scientific and in the practical political meaning of the term. To this extent, the bourgeois, or the bourgeois-democratic, revolution in Russia is completed."

(*Collected Works*. Vol. 24. Moscow 1964. P. 44) What was the character of the second stage of the Russian revolution? "...with the poor peasants, with the semi-proletarians, with all the exploited, against capitalism, including the rural rich, the Kulaks, the profiteers, and to that extent the revolution becomes a socialist one." (*Collected Works* Vol. 28. Moscow 1965. P 300).

Every student of Marxism knows that after the first stage of the Russian revolution when Lenin in his *April Thesis* characterised the second stage of the Russian revolution as a socialist one, let alone completion, almost the whole of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the socio-cultural-economic field remained unaccomplished. If before the completion of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution a country under no circumstances can enter the stage of the socialist revolution, as contended by the CPI(M) leadership, how is it then that Lenin characterised the second stage of the Russian revolution, the stage of the November revolution, as the socialist stage? And for so characterising was Lenin guilty of skipping the democratic stage of the revolution and advocating a one-stage revolution in Russia? Only a congenial Social-Democrat can say so.

We know that the gentlemen in the CPI(M) leadership, in tune with the "revisionist Right CPI", may at once reply that the Russian revolution had its peculiarities and that Lenin in consideration of the existence of dual power and the political maturity of the proletariat concluded that after the February-March revolution Russia had entered the stage of socialist revolu-

tion. We are fully acquainted with this sort of naive and revisionist line of argument. Without going into detailed discussion, for the present, we want to tell them this much that, in spite of many of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks in the socio-cultural-economic field of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia still remaining unaccomplished, the main question, on the basis of which Lenin concluded in his *April Thesis* that Russia had entered the stage of socialist revolution, was not the existence of dual power, nor the maturity of the proletariat but the fact that after the February-March revolution state power in Russia passed from the hands of an old class, namely, the feudal landed nobility into the hands of a new class, namely, the bourgeoisie and that the main task of the Russian revolution, therefore, was to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power. In his coming to the conclusion that Russia had entered the stage of socialist revolution, the existence of dual power and the maturity of the proletariat in Russia were not the determinant. Moreover, if political maturity of the proletariat in a country is the determinant in deciding the stage of revolution in that country then one is to conclude that Great Britain and the USA are not yet in the stage of socialist revolution and that, even though the character of the states in these countries will remain the same as at present, when the proletariat there will be politically mature in future then the stage of revolution will be a socialist one. What nonsense!

The CPI(M) leadership have quoted in the article a passage from Lenin's *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*. If they have quoted it to exhibit their pedantry in Marxism then that is a different

In Concluding That Russia Had Entered the Stage of Socialist Revolution, Existence of Dual Power and Political Maturity of Proletariat Were Not the Determinant

matter. But if they have quoted it in order to counter our analysis that state power in our country having passed from the hands of the old class, namely, the British imperialists into the hands of a new class, namely, the Indian bourgeoisie and *to that extent*, the main political task of the Indian revolution being to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power by a revolutionary alliance led by the proletariat, *to that extent*, the Indian revolution has entered the stage of socialist revolution, notwithstanding many of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks in the socio-cultural-economic field of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in our country remaining unaccomplished, then the quotation has backfired. It does not support their stand; on the contrary, it goes in our favour. First, in the passage quoted, Lenin has stated that there is no Chinese Wall between the bourgeois-democratic stage and the socialist stage of revolution. It is because of there being no Chinese Wall between the two stages, in the course of our conducting the national liberation movement, i.e., the bourgeois-democratic revolution, when state power passed from the hands of the old class, namely, the British imperialists, into the hands of a new class, namely, the Indian bourgeoisie and with this passing of state power into the hands of the bourgeoisie, the main task of the revolution being to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power and smash the capitalist state machine, India *to that extent*, has entered the stage of socialist revolution, notwithstanding many of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution remaining unaccom-

plished. Had there been a Chinese Wall between the two stages, this would not have been possible. When the CPI(M) leadership assert that, since the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution have not been completed, in spite of state power passing from the hands of foreign imperialists into the hands of the bourgeoisie, our revolution by no means can enter the stage of socialist revolution, it is they, who erect an artificial Chinese Wall between the two stages, and speak in tune with the then Russian Mensheviks.

Second, in another portion of the passage, Lenin has spoken of "the preparedness of the proletariat." But when the CPI(M) leadership quote it in support of their contention that our revolution—in spite of the fact that state power has passed from the hands of the old class into the hands of a new class, namely, the bourgeoisie—has not entered the stage of socialist revolution, it appears to us that they have not at all understood the context and background in reference to which Lenin has said it. Moreover, by their quotation in this way, they are almost slipping into the position of the Trotskyites that, no matter which class is in state power and whatever be the stage of the revolution, a country may enter the stage of socialist revolution, provided that the proletariat has the "preparedness", i.e., political maturity. In fact, we are acquainted with this sort of argument of Mr. B. T. Ranadive during the period of 1948 and 1949. However, let us examine now in what context and background Lenin has said it. When after the November revolu-

tion, the Constituent Assembly in Russia was dispersed by the Bolshevik Party, Kautsky charged Lenin and the Bolshevik Party with destroying democracy in Russia on the plea that the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution not being completed till then, to disperse the Constituent Assembly, a democratic institution, meant to destroy democracy. In giving the lie to this opportunist Menshevik stand of Kautsky, Lenin asked, when the proletariat had overthrown the bourgeoisie from state power through November revolution on the basis of an alliance with the whole of the peasantry and established democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry and when, at a time, may be within a very short time, the proletariat had already acquired the necessary "preparedness", i.e., political maturity and achieved the necessary closeness in its alliance with the poor peasants to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, should or should it not disperse the Constituent Assembly and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, the context and background, in reference to which Lenin has spoken of "the preparedness of the proletariat," relate to the question of timing of the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat after going through a very short period of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry after the capture of the state power by the revolutionary alliance led by the proletariat through the November revolution and not to the time when Lenin in his *April Thesis* has observed that with the passing of state power from the hands of the old class, namely, the feudal landed nobility, into the hands of a new class,

namely, the bourgeoisie, *to that extent*, the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia has been completed and Russia has entered the stage of socialist revolution.

We have often heard from the CPI(M) leadership that the SUCI is such a party that it has not even a party programme. They themselves have said that the party programme deals with the stage of the revolution. If that be so then the allegation against the SUCI is not true. For, there may be two types of programmes. The programme may be a strategic programme of the party, which deals with the question of state power, the present stage of revolution in the country, the main disposition of social forces for the revolution, all connected with the question of the stage of revolution. This programme stands unchanged so long as the state remains the same and, consequently, the stage of revolution and the main disposition of social forces for the revolution in the country remain unchanged. Only with their changes, the strategic programme is changed. The SUCI has certainly a strategic programme, which it adopted at the time of its formation in 1948 and in which the above-mentioned questions, namely, of state power, the stage of revolution and the main disposition of social forces, of the Indian revolution have been discussed. There may be a second kind of programme dealing with questions relating to day-to-day democratic movements, and class struggles, changes in situation other than those in the question of state power, stage of revolution and main disposition of social forces for the revolution, and other issues. We have our programmes on the basis of which we contested elections published as our election manifestos. We have our

Strategic Line of People's Democratic Revolution of CPI(M) Objectively Boils Down to the Programme of Bourgeois National Reformism

programmes to guide our mass organisations in day-to-day class struggles and movements to realise their democratic demands. We have our programmes on the basis of which we continuously strive to develop and strengthen the unity of the left and democratic parties and forces and the united struggles by our people. Moreover, in various articles and writings published in the organs of our party, we have discussed issues like development of Indian capitalism, its present-day character, abolition of feudal relations in the land system and other changes, that have taken place in our country since independence. Hence, it is not true to say that the SUCI has no programme. We, of course, admit that, unlike the CPI(M), we do not adopt strategic programmes of the party periodically, annually or biennially; nor does our strategic programme, unlike the CPI(M)'s, contain everything under the sun from taccavi loans to supply of raw materials to the capitalists via vivid description of the distress of our half-fed and half-clad people. The CPI(M) claims itself to be the genuine inheritor of the undivided CPI for which it has numbered its first Congress at Calcutta after the split of the parent party as the seventh congress. It also claims itself to be a Marxist party. How is it then that from the second congress of the undivided CPI to the ninth congress of the CPI(M) as many as eight programmes, meaning strategic programmes, of the party have been adopted, even though the character of the Indian state, the present stage of the Indian revolution and the main disposition of social forces for the revolution have during the period,

remained the same? How is it that, in spite of the character of the Indian state, the present stage of the Indian revolution and the main disposition of social forces for the revolution remaining the same since independence, the party in its strategic programmes has characterised the Indian state, the stage of the Indian revolution and the main disposition of social forces for the revolution differently? The CPI(M) claims itself to be a revolutionary party. How is it then that in its party programme adopted at its seventh congress as revised by its ninth congress (Para 88) what has been described as the tasks "in the sphere of state structure" of the people's democratic state and government are such that a close and careful examination of those tasks will reveal beyond any shade of doubt that they do not view the smashing of the present capitalist state machine but suggest some reforms and changes in the existing capitalist state structure? So, gentlemen in the CPI(M) leadership, your concept of the people's democratic state and government is not that of a state and government established through a revolution smashing the existing capitalist state machine but of a state and government of the people's democratic front of which the national bourgeoisie is a constituent, formed through election under the prevailing bourgeois order. Wonderful indeed! If this be your concept that without smashing the existing capitalist state machine you can establish the people's democratic state and government through election, say it, gentlemen, say it openly. After Khrushchev has discovered the path, the CPI is not feeling

shy to openly say it. Why do you then feel shy? We have all through been saying that your people's democratic revolution will be no revolution; it will be all *talk* of revolution, under the smoke-screen of revolutionary verbiage the strategic line of people's democratic revolution will objectively boil down to the programme of bourgeois national reformism and that it is the ballot box and not the revolution you actually aim at. Does not your programme also corroborate it? The main political lines of revolution of the undivided CPI, the present CPI, the CPI (M) and the CPI (ML) have all through been blind carbon-copies of the political lines of this or that communist party abroad, a fact which cannot be reasonably denied and often admitted unknowingly by the leaders of these parties in their moments of weakness. Such blind carbon-copy cannot make concrete analysis of concrete condition and, hence, the main political line of the CPI(M) of people's democratic revolution does not reflect the reality in our country. So, it is bourgeois national reformism or modern revisionism, as the case may be, that remains the main political line of the party interspersed by left adventurist tactics.

Character of the CPI(M)

The gentlemen in the CPI(M) leadership have bitterly accused us with the charge that we have resorted to "syllogistic nonsense" in coming to the conclusion that there are groups in the CPI(M) and that it is a petty bourgeois party. No, gentlemen, you are perfectly wrong. Syllogism is not our cup of tea. We have come to this conclusion on the basis of scientific probability, which reflects a determinist law, corroborated by facts

gathered not from "the anti-room of the monopolist Press or the bourdoir of the Right Communists" but from published writings by the leaders of the CPI(M). If the CPI (M) leadership are acquainted with the law of probability, they should have seen our point. However, let us explain.

One of the features, that distinguishes a bourgeois or a petty bourgeois party from a proletarian revolutionary party, is its concept about leadership. Whereas in a bourgeois or a petty bourgeois party this concept is that of a formal democratic leadership, the concept of leadership in a proletarian revolutionary party is that of collective leadership. What is collective leadership? In the words of Lenin, collective knowledge of the members of the party, in which the principles of proletarian democracy work, is collective leadership. By this collective knowledge are not meant only the political and economic ideas. It, on the contrary, means a co-ordinated and comprehensive knowledge on all matters, from art and literature to private life, covering every aspect of life and society. But this knowledge cannot exist in vacuum; it cannot be abstract. It must have a concretised form expressing itself through some individual in the highest organism of the party. Only when collective knowledge of all the members of a party expresses through a leader of the party, it is proved that collective leadership has emerged in that party. So, the concretised form of expression of the collective knowledge of all the members of the party is collective leadership. The leader of the party, in whom the collective knowledge of the party is best personified, is the concretised form of collective leadership. And that leader, in whom the collective knowledge of the party finds its best expression,

GROUPS EXIST IN THE CPI(M)

is the thinker, the leader, the teacher and the guide of the party. This leader cannot be made through adjustment, compromise or agreement between different leaders of the party. He emerges as the leader in course of the conscious struggles by the members of the party to develop concrete concept of collective leadership. In fact, *the struggle for the emergence of collective leadership in personified and concretised form, involving the leaders and the ranks inside the party and the class and the masses outside it, is, in one main sense, the struggle for the emergence of the principles of democratic centralism inside the party, i.e., the struggle for the building up of a communist party.*

It should be realised that the phenomenon of leadership within a communist party is not that of parallel leaders in the party. It is the phenomenon of the leader of the leaders. In his life time, Lenin was the leader of all other leaders, including Stalin, of the Bolshevik Party. He was the thinker, the leader, the teacher and the guide of the party. All other leaders from the core of their heart believed it and expressed it without reservation in public. Same is the case with Mao Tse tung. He is the thinker, the leader, the teacher and the guide of the Communist Party of China. This is the true form of the collective leadership. So, the emergence of the leadership of Lenin, Stalin and Mao-Tse-tung is the concretised expression of collective leadership in those parties. When such a concretised form of collective leadership does not emerge in a party, the party objectively practises mechanical centralisation based on formal democracy, paying lip service to the principles of democratic centralism. In such a situation, the party cannot assume the character of an organism, nor does correct sense of authority in the party work.

What really works is constitutional authority. Moreover, in such a situation, the party invariably gives birth to a bureaucratic leadership at the top and is, for all practical purposes, divided into two compartments—on the one side, exists a group of leaders and theoreticians divorced from practice and on the other side, remain the honest, loyal but fanatic and blind workers and activists. In bourgeois or formal democracy, no matter however model in democratic form the constitution is, individual leadership works through democratic form in actuality. Hence, individualism and individual leadership are not eliminated and groups exist in the party. Only when collective leadership expresses itself in concretised form through some leader and, instead of formal democracy, the principles of proletarian democracy objectively operate, individual leadership and groups are eliminated.

But is that the position in the CPI, CPI(M) and the CPI(ML)? Is there any one in any of these nominally communist parties, who is the leader of all the leaders in the party, whom all the members of the Central Committee and other leaders of the party regard as the thinker, the leader, the teacher and the guide of the party? In fact, none of the leaders of any of these parties is the leader of other leaders, they are all leaders; all parallel leaders. In a party, in which there are parallel leaders, there is bound to be the existence of groups centring round each leader. When groupism raises its ugly head, the existence of groups becomes palpable. At other times, when groupism does not come to the surface, the unity of the party is not disturbed. No amount of loud protest can negate this scientific teaching of Marxism-Leninism about party. Thus, it is not syllogism but, scien-

tific probability, a science, that has led us to conclude that there are groups in the CPI(M).

Now let us turn to the factual position. First of all, we refer to the Note for the Programme of the CPI(M) submitted by Mr. Namboodiripad, in which at Para 90 he has admitted the existence of various "trends" and "groups" in the undivided CPI. After the split of the parent party these groups joined the CPI(M) or remained in the CPI, as a result of which both the CPI and the CPI(M) have in them various trends and groups. Now let us turn to what Mr. Promode Das Gupta has written in his article entitled *Paschim Bange Bampanthi Subidhabader Ekti Dik* published in the special *Saradia* issue 1374 B.S. of *Deshhitaishi*. In this article, one will find the following passages—(1) "Since then he (Parimal Das Gupta) was maintaining his *separate group*". (2) "Then the Jail Committee had to be dissolved and *two groups* were formed—one of the groups was called *Jyoti's group* and the other was called *Promode's group*. The opinion of the majority of those who were in *Promode's group* was that our attitude towards *Jyoti's group* would be that, without making any compromise on political issues, we should unite with that *group* in the organisational field for fighting against the Dangeites" (3) "After coming out of jails, that is, towards the beginning of 1964, the *existence of these two groups* continued. By the middle of January, at the initiative of our Central leaders, the work of establishing unity between these *two groups* made some headway". (4) "But centring round the election of Bhupesh Gupta to the Rajya Sabha bitterness between these *two groups* increased." (5) "At that time at New Delhi with the help of Comrade Sundarayya this decision was

taken that, on the basis of the statement by these 32 members of the National Council, we, that is, the *two groups* would work together". (6) "At the time of discussion of the draft programme of the party, it was found that persons of different trends were combining *centring round different groups*". (Emphasis added). After this is there any scope of denying that in the CPI(M) there are different groups?

We know that we will be charged by the CPI(M) leadership with equating the struggle within the Congress with that within the CPI(M). But this trick will not work. For, we know that the nature of struggle within the Congress and that within the CPI(M) are not the same. We have never said that they are the same. But that is not the point at issue. The point at issue is whether there are groups within the CPI(M). What do Mr. Namboodiripad's Note and Mr. Promode Das Gupta's article say? Do they not admit that there are "groups" within the CPI(M)? Again we will be charged that these two leaders have not spoken of existence of groups but of the existence of different trends of thinking within the CPI(M) and that we have confused different trends of thinking within the CPI(M) as groups. These two leaders have used the term "groups" and there is no reason to believe that they do not know what the term, group, actually connotes. So, there is no escape from admission of the fact that there are groups within the CPI(M). Now about the term "trends" used by Mr. Namboodiripad. Every Marxist knows that in a class-divided society, different trends of thinking mean different class trends of thinking. We know that in a real communist party also at times differences among its members on definite matters may occur and such differences continue to exist till

It is Not Syllogism But Scientific Probability, a Science, That Confirms CPI(M) as A Petty Bourgeois Party

they are resolved through inner-party struggle. But this phenomenon has nothing in common with the existence of different trends of thinking within the CPI(M). For, the differences, that often arise in a real communist party, are the differences and contradictions between different sets of opinions or readings in the same structure of methodological approach or trend of thinking or process of thinking. This sort of difference in a real communist party at no time and under no circumstances means the existence of different trends of thinking. If for any peculiar reason, at any time, different trends of thinking develop in a real communist party then it cannot but purge out the members representing these trends, in order to maintain ideological centralism of the party. A communist party, that refuses to do it, in the name of maintaining the unity of the party, glosses over and compromises on the fundamental question relating to ideology and principle and in that way, destroying ideological centralism, reduces the party to a party of the petty bourgeoisie. But it is strange that Mr. Namboodiripad not only admits the existence of different trends of thinking, which in our class-divided society can only mean different class trends of thinking, but also advocates for the existence and continuance of such trends in the party. And it should be noted that the CPI(M) in its reply to Mr. Namboodiripad's Note (this reply is entitled *Our Views on E.M.S. Namboodiripad's Critique of Draft Programme*) has neither denied the existence of different groups and trends nor rejected Mr. Namboodiripad's contention of the necessity of existence and continuance of different trends and groups in the

CPI(M). Perhaps for the 'healthy' growth of the party!

All this means that the CPI(M) has within it not only groups but also groups with different class thinking as well. Such a thing can exist only in a petty bourgeois party. So, gentlemen, it is not syllogism; it is scientific probability, a science, on the basis of which we have come to this conclusion corroborated by the writings of the leaders of the CPI(M) themselves.

CPI(M) Evades Questions

In our article *In Reply To CPI(M)'s 'A word to the SUC'* we gave replies to the fictitious charges by the CPI(M) leadership against us in the matter of the breakdown of the United Front in West Bengal and raised some questions. The CPI(M) leadership have, in their usual manner, evaded all the points we discussed in reply to their false charges and the questions raised by us and have again slandered us on those some points on which we gave our replies in our article. We do not want to repeat here what we stated in our earlier article but we want the CPI(M) leadership to give replies to our questions. We, therefore, ask them the following questions.

First, about United Front in West Bengal. Did not the CPI(M) advance in 1969 and 1970 the theory of '*a new class-based front*' as against the conception of the United Front of the left and democratic parties and forces? Did not the CPI(M) then say that this '*new class-based front*' was "no longer in the stage of announcement" but '*a reality today*'? Was this theory of "*a new class-based front*" right at the material time? If not, has the CPI(M) ever admitted openly its mistake, disclosed its reasons and analysed the conditions, that gave rise to it

to fulfil its obligations as a serious party towards the class and the masses? Is it not a fact that from this theory of "*a new class-based front*" of the CPI(M) emanated its approach and attitude towards and functioning in the United Front and behaviour towards the fraternal constituent parties of the Front? Were not the left sectarian and disruptive activities of the CPI(M) emanating from the left adventurist theory of "*a new class-based front*" responsible in the main for the disruption of the United Front? As the biggest left party in West Bengal and claiming itself to be a Marxist party was it or was it not the bounden duty of the CPI(M), after the actual breakdown of the United Front, to again combine and arrest the left and democratic parties in a front opposed to the Congress in the prevailing situation? Did the CPI(M) perform this bounden duty, or, did it behave in a reverse way pushing almost all the democratic parties, including the CPI, which, in spite of its all-India policy of alignment with the Congress, was continuing in the United Front, into the arms of the Congress, thereby precipitating a serious problem for leftism, left democratic unity and united democratic mass movements, to prevent which attempts were made by forming the EPC at the initiative of the SUCI? Is it a proof of the CPI(M)'s striving all through for the unity of the left and democratic parties and forces and the SUCI's mere talking of such unity, or, is it a proof of the SUCI's consistent striving for the unity of the left and democratic parties and forces and the CPI(M)'s mere talking of such unity?

Second, about bank nationalisation. In our earlier article, we had shown that the CPI(M) had "welcomed" bank nationalisation as "a big event", "a step in the right

direction", "something good", "a forward measure to meet the situation" setting in motion "the process of mass radicalization and mass polarization" and a measure "in tune with anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people". We know what is there in the political report of the ninth congress of the CPI(M) about bank nationalisation. That in no way contradicts the basic outlook about bank nationalisation expressed in the foregoing quotations; on the contrary, it has worsened the position by making confusion worse confounded. But had the CPI(M) even corrected its old stand in the political report of its ninth congress, our position would have remained the same. Because, the point is whether the CPI(M) has praised bank nationalisation in this language or not. At a time when the Congress as a whole was virtually sinking and the Indira wing of the Congress was trying hard to survive by creating a so-called radical image about it, did or did not the CPI(M), like the CPI, help the creation of that image of the Indira wing of the Congress, by praising bank nationalisation in such glowing terms?

Third, about seeing progressiveness within the Indira Congress. In our earlier article, it was not our point that the CPI(M) did not criticise the Congress. The point was whether or not the CPI(M) had found anti-big landlord, anti-monopoly "healthy" trend within the Indira Congress. Has the CPI(M) ever stated that the "Indira Gandhi wing also contains within its fold a healthy trend which hates big landlords and monopolists" and that the Indira wing of the Congress "has raised certain slogans and taken certain measures which are in tune with anti-monopoly

(Contd. to page 14)

CPI(M) Trying to Conceal Truth From Ranks and Supporters

(Contd. from page 13)

democratic aspirations of the people"? If so, is it not seeing progressiveness in the Indira Congress? Has not this assessment by the CPI(M) of the Indira Congress helped the creation of an image of the latter as progressive at its most difficult time?

Fourth, about united front with a section of the Indira Congress. In the article *Once More On The SUC*, the CPI(M) leadership have written "the CPI(M) has never taken the position that there are no democratic forces in the Congress. Where the CPI(M) differs with the Right CP.....is that only if the unity of the left and democratic forces outside the Congress is built can it draw the democratic forces in the Congress out of it and bring them into the fighting ranks of people." What a silly argument! Whichever party has a mass following contains within it democratic forces, if the masses are not branded as undemocratic. Then why such a generalised statement and why is this mention of the presence of democratic forces only within the Indira Congress to the exclusion of other bourgeois parties? Does it not mean the drawing of a distinction between the Indira Congress and other bourgeois parties? Does it not help in the creation of an image as democratic of the Indira Congress? Then again, the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPI(M) in question nowhere states that the democratic forces within the Indira Congress are to be drawn out of it and then and then only there can be a front with them, as cooked up by the CPI(M) leadership now in the face of our argument.

The resolution views a "far broader front of the democratic forces, including a section of the Indira Gandhi Congress." Does the expression, forming a front with "a section of the Indira Gandhi Congress", occurring in the resolution, connote the idea of drawing the democratic forces out of the Indira Congress and then forming a front with them, or, does it mean the formation of a front with the democratic forces within the Indira Congress even when these forces will continue to remain within the Congress as its "section"? Is it not that if these forces are drawn out of the Indira Congress then they cannot be called "a section of the Indira Gandhi Congress", as mentioned in the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPI(M)?

Appeal to the CPI(M)

At this time, when the ruling Congress and its Governments are mounting attacks on the left and democratic parties and forces in our country, it is essentially necessary to not only maintain but also still more strengthen the unity of the left and democratic parties and forces and of the united struggles by our people against the main enemy of the people, namely, the Indian bourgeoisie. We hope and trust that the polemical discussions, that are now being conducted by the CPI(M) and the SUCI, should be conducted in such a healthy way as not to develop blindness, party fanaticism and animosity in the ranks and supporters of the respective parties but to evolve proper understanding among them, cement more solidly the unity of the left and democratic parties and forces as also of the united struggles by our people, properly train and educate our people by helping them to correctly

KKMS Conferences in Orissa

Cuttack, June 26—Thana conferences of the Krushak O Khet Majuria Sangh were held on different dates at different places in the state to mobilise the poor and middle peasants and agricultural labourers for organised and sustained movements for the realisation of their demands.

The Sukinda Thana conference of the KKMS was held at Sukinda on 13th, 14th and 15th June last. About 200 delegates from different villages within the Thana attended the delegates session and the open session of the conference was a huge gathering. In the conference various burning problems of the peasants and agricultural labourers of the

Thana were discussed and a programme of militant movement was adopted. A strong 35-member Thana Committee with Com. Shyam Singh Mahant as President and Com. Mayadhar Navak as Secretary for the current year was formed. The two sessions were addressed, among others, by Coms. Tapas Dutta, Karunakar Das, Gaganbehari Pattanayak, Chakradhar Rath, Mayadhar Nayak and Balaram Show.

The Bhandaripokhuri Thana conference of the KKMS was held on 23rd, 24th and 25th June last under the presidentship of Com. Balaram Show.

DSO Demonstrates in Orissa

Jajpur, June 18—Under the leadership of the Democratic Students' Organisation, Jajpur Sub-division unit, a strong deputation of students demonstrated before the Sub-divisional Officer today demanding, among others, supply of food and other essential articles at fair prices in adequate quantities regularly, providing employment to the unemployed, relief to persons affected by drought and flood, irrigation facilities and remission of tuition and other fees in case of students affected. The deputation was led by Com. Jagabandhu Boral and Com Dwarika Rath, student leaders of Orissa.

understand the respective stands of the CPI(M) and the SUCI and crystallise a correct political line in the country. We, on our part, are determined to observe this norm and achieve the objective while conducting the polemical discussions. We request the CPI(M) to observe it and help in creating a healthy atmosphere for conducting ideological struggles.

LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT IN WEST BENGAL

According to official figures, 234 industrial units, involving 18,107 workers remained closed in West Bengal as on 31st October last. Thereafter about 40 other industrial units were closed till the end of the first quarter of the current year.

Over and above the forced unemployment of more than 35,000 workers of these closed industrial units, about a lakh of workers had been laid off during the last several months for power crisis in the state.

These official figures prove beyond any shade of doubt the falsity of the claim by the Congress party and its Government in the state that under them more people are getting new employments. The fact is just the other way round—compared to the small number of persons newly employed, thousands of persons who were in employment have now lost their jobs.