

FOREWORD TO FIRST EDITION

I

The Indian Communist Movement is of more than fifty years age. Though it is too short a time to reckon with when compared to the thousands of years of our Country's history, it is fairly a long period in view of advancing world revolution which has provided a rich experience of unique nature. The Great October Revolution and the successful Chinese revolution are the products of this period. Everyone knows that they have played and are still playing a decisive role in shaping the course of world events.

It is a fact that the leadership of the communist movement has failed to deliver the goods as far as the Indian revolution is concerned, because it could neither understand nor resolve the fundamental problems facing the revolution. As such right and 'left-opportunism' was the order of the day, leading to splits and further splits. At the same time we can not minimise the role of revolutionary struggles – national as well as class struggles – and revolutionary movements led by the communists during this period. The communist revolutionaries representing the trend of revolutionary Marxism–Leninism have their roots in them. Experience of last one decade has shown that they have begun to reply the questions and resolve the problems relating to the Indian revolution.

The role of imperialism in the period of pre-transfer of power and aftermath, needs a correct understanding not only for communist revolutionaries, but also for all anti-imperialist and democratic forces. Then alone they can adopt a correct attitude towards it. The same is needed in respect of the bourgeoisie as a whole and its sections as well. Comprador as well as national. The same is the case with feudalism. This is all the more important because, imperialist and pro-imperialist ideologues assert that there is no imperialism and feudalism in India. Consequently,

they assert that it is capitalism that dominates Indian society, though feudal relations can be found here and there with varying degrees of difference.

Comrade Tarimela Nagi Reddy dealt almost all the problems, as they were in 1971-72, facing Indian revolution. He had to present the subject in the form of Statement in the court of Additional Sessions Judge, Hyderabad, in which, he together with his colleagues were tried. At the same time he concentrated his attention on the role of foreign capital in India. Inseparably connected with this problem is that the comprador bourgeoisie and feudalism. He has dealt these subjects extensively in his work. There is enough material to show the possible quantum of foreign capital present in our country together with its growth year by year. But the way it is operating is a closed book even to educated sections not to speak of common man, because it is neither analysed comprehensively nor correct conclusions are drawn, with a Marxist-Leninist point of view. He has collected information to this effect from works of Indian and foreign authors. He has done strenuous research work basing on this material and that published in our country. Analysing all this material in a systematic way, he had drawn the conclusion that imperialism and feudalism still dominate the Indian society and that the Indian regime is none other than that of comprador bourgeoisie and land-lords defending the interests of imperialism and feudalism. Events of this decade have proved that they are correct.

II

In spite of facts and figures available being incomplete and in-comprehensive, India is the centre of "202 subsidiaries and 536 branches of foreign companies; of these there are about 23 multinational corporations which rank among the 50 corporate giants in the world". (**The Hindu**, Survey of Industry 1977). This information makes it clear that Indian ruling classes are enjoying the patronage of more than half of the "corporate giants in the world". Thus our country is being plundered by these multi-nationals and our people cannot afford this luxury any more.

Though they are said to be belonging to America, Britain,

Japan, West Germany and some more countries, it is the American capital, which dominates them. Since the British capital had a monopoly position in our country during its colonial regime, it has continued and improved its position after the transfer of power in 1947. All these facts are stated by the author himself. According to **Indian Express** (8.1. '78), the information available from 393 branches, the assets have risen from Rs. 1672 crores in 1972-73 to Rs. 2084 crores in 1975-76, which is about 25% increase. The change in the Central and State governments from Congress Party to Janata Party and others, have not affected their fortunes adversely. On the contrary, these parties are welcoming them with open arms. Therefore the rate of increase of foreign capital in our country is growing into enormous proportions.

The latest figures available in this connection, though of a different variety (valid up to December 31, 1977) are as following:

	<i>Rs. In Crores</i>
Foreign debt	11,588.86
United States	2,823.79
Soviet Union	336.75

(**Indian Express**, July 14, 1978).

According to the same source the total number of foreign creditors was 32 including I.B.R.D., I.D.A. and O.P.E.C. funds. I.E.A., West Germany, U.K., Japan and Iran are the "larger lenders" next only to U.S. and U.S.S.R.

The amount mentioned here is the outstanding debt in which the amount repaid is not included. This again is the foreign capital, dumped in India, other than the investments of multinationals. An indication about their extent is given above.

The foreign debt has found its way not only into public sector and the governments' development schemes, but also into private sector either directly or through financial institutions. This again is a foreign investment in India, in a different form, where in the government guarantees its repayment. It works out to per capita Rs. 193. The extent of dependence is colossal. Those who are embellishing Indian independence should be able to explain this fact and its bearing on it. United States being the single biggest creditor has a dominating role in Indian economy though the

investment of the U.K. is the highest.

The Soviet Union, with her highly centralised economy is the single biggest multinational in the world. She is a creditor next only to U.S. But the difference between the two is considerable. It is not difficult to understand why it is so. The Soviet Union is a new comer as an imperialist power. Her economy is weak and is diverted into arms race. She is employing more Shylockean methods with short-term agreements, rupee payments, 'compensation basis' and so on

The Indo-Soviet treaty's military nature is well-known. As such Soviet Union has stakes not only in Indian economy, but also in defence. With the recent change in the political set up, the Soviet Union has lost its exclusive position which she enjoyed during latter part of Congress regime. Not withstanding the change, she is still a force to reckon with.

Apart from the sophisticated military equipment which India is having from Soviet Union, the turn-over of trade has also increased considerably. If it was Rs. 900 crores in 1977, it is expected to become Rs. 1050 crores in 1978 (both the figures are estimated) according to **Indian Express**, December 12, 1977. It is considerably a higher figure than what was in 1971-72. According to the same source, exports from India to U.S.S.R. of "non-traditional items", are as following for 1978 :

Steel structurals, Storage instruments.

Garrage equipment hand tools.

Medical and Surgical instruments.

Aluminium power cables.

Electronic instruments, etc.

These are in addition to "traditional export items", such as Tea, Coffee, Spices, Cashew Kernals.

The spokesmen of the government are making much publicity of exports in the socalled non-traditional items as mentioned above. Most of these "non-traditional items" are the products of the industries set up by either with the aid or in collaboration with Soviet Union or East European countries. They are products of cheap labour and cheap raw materials available in this country.

Therefore they are purchasing them at cheap prices so that they may sell them abroad at high prices, and make profits out of these deals.

The same source says, "An important addition to the list in 1978 is machinery equipment manufactured at industrial enterprises built in India with Soviet assistance, valued at over Rs. 90 million. These are meant for projects set up with Soviet assistance in third countries". This is how the Soviet Union is asserting its ownership on the industrial enterprises built in India with Soviet assistance. India's economic backwardness prevents her from consuming what all India produces. She can not sell her surplus in the international market in open competition even if there is some scope in the developing countries. Soviet Union dictates India to transfer the surplus to third world countries so that the Soviet Union may appropriate the price of the equipment, which is exhorbitant and is more than international price.

* There is also a list of imports in which Soviet Union replaces partially western countries in exporting kerosene, crude etc. There other items which can be done away with because India can produce them (urea, cotton, asbestos etc). But the most important aspect of imports is importing "components, raw materials and spare parts for the Soviet assisted projects in India". Thus the Soviet-assisted projects are made more or less permanently dependent on the aid-giving country. The people are made to believe that the Soviet aid is meant for developing an independent economy in India. Facts proved contrary.

The so-called 'aid' extended by Soviet Union has not stopped at maintaining the 'status-quo' in India, in the sense that she has been helping the ruling classes, by way of supplementing her aid to that of Western countries. On the other hand the 'aid' has developed into one of hegemonism in form and content because of its unequal nature, facilitating the imperialist plunder of Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has gone a long way in controlling Indian defence, especially the Navy and Air Force with supply of sophisticated equipment to armed forces in general and Border Forces in particular. Soviet Union's role in shaping and implementing the war policies (Indo-Pakistan wars of 1965 and 1970), in forcing an unequal and imperialist treaty (Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation), and the fascist repression

culminating in proclamation of Emergency, during the latter part of Congress regime provide ample evidence of her hegemonism in India. Therefore, the Soviet Union has become a hegemonistic power, in India. She continues to be the same even after a change in the government in 1977, with somewhat reduced strength.

The Soviet Union is supposed to be providing India, an 'aid' on much favourable terms and without any 'political strings', as claimed by revisionists and neo-revisionists. If the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation has any meaning, it is not only 'political strings' but also economic and military 'strings', with which the Soviet 'aid' is provided. The terms cannot be favourable, when the 'aid' is reducing the economy totally dependent on aid-giving country.

The choice for India is not one between more favourable terms and less favourable terms or partial dependence and total dependence. It is between dependence and independence. It applies, not only to Western countries but also to Soviet Union. They have to sell their industrial goods, i.e., plants, equipment, machinery and technical know-how out right and India has to purchase it on that basis so that the ownership in the real sense of the term is enjoyed by India and India alone, without being dependent either for spare parts or for markets of the surplus products. This applies not only to economy as a whole, but also for defence. It is the two super powers which have become a menace for India, because it is they who are dominating our country in all fields; political, economic, military and cultural. The character of the domination is imperialist.

If this is the state of affairs ever since 1970, when the author completed this work, is it not correct to conclude that the imperialist domination especially that of the two super powers is growing every passing day which in turn intensifies their contradictions. A struggle for independence against the hegemonism of the two super powers and liquidation of imperialism is anything but justified.

III

Imperialism has stayed in India for fairly a long time, which is already over due. The advancing national liberation movement,

before and after the transfer of power could not stem its development in the sense of export of finance capital with all its concomitants. The comprador bourgeoisie is the by-product of imperialism. The prolonged presence of imperialism facilitated its growth rather than retarding it, not to speak of having no comprador bourgeoisie at all. The author has marshalled numerous facts and figures, analysed them, and drawn conclusions that India has its major share of comprador bourgeoisie, which is the creation of imperialism. Those who have doubts about it, in the absence of any data can go through the facts and convince themselves about its existence.

There are some who do not relish the word "comprador" and want to substitute with some other word which they have not yet found! If we are in a position to substitute or coin some word for imperialism, we can as well do the same for comprador bourgeoisie. It is obvious that it is impossible. At the same time it is not the words that matters us. It is the concept that matters much. The concept of comprador bourgeoisie is quite in accordance with that of imperialism. If some one has an allergy towards it, for his own reason, no body can help him. Some times it is the bourgeois nationalism which is coming in the way of accepting this objective reality.

Imperialism, for its survival is adopting ever so-many new forms - economic as well as political - in the former colonial countries. India being one, and an important one at that. Collaboration arrangements is one such form which has been adopted extensively after the Second World War. The sum and substance of the arrangements is total dependence on foreign powers, Western as well as Soviet Union. Indian big business which is collaborationist is the comprador bourgeoisie, donning the mantle of collaboration. The rapid growth of big business is inseparably linked with the growth of foreign capital in India. Added to this, the public sector is also collaborationist i.e. comprador in character, though it consumes the finances from State budgets in considerable measure.

If the author has provided the figures available by 1970, we have some pertaining to the period between 1972 and 1975, which are not so comprehensive. According to official sources, the assets of the 20 top industrial houses in the country have risen from Rs

3,059 to 4,485 crores (about 46 per cent). The Tatas and Birlas top the list with a distinction of being the first and second for the last three decades ! If the Tatas rate of growth is 43 per cent, the Birlas is 50 per cent. How is that the growth is phenomenal inspite of chronic economic crisis and recession. It can be explained on the basis of dumping of foreign capital on a massive scale and these industrial houses continue to be collaborationist. The big industrial houses always have their lion's share in the foreign loans. Part of the loans together with a part of their share of profits do add to the quantum of assets. It has become a perennial affair and the official spokesmen of the ruling classes cannot hide it ! (The information was given in the parliament and appeared in the **Indian Express**, Decemeber 22, 1977).

It is usual for the spokesmen of the government to talk of the so-called export oriented economy. It is well-known that there has been an adverse balance of trade althrough. Loans from imperialist powers has been a traditional form to cover it up. The present favourable position of foreign exchange reserves is the result of import of foreign capital on a massive scale, which is not at all an indication of a sound economy. On the other hand it is the same old practice of dumping foreign capital in its intensive form. A new pattern is being practiced, which envisages setting up the industries for export purposes. We can have an insight of such an industry in a news item appeared in **Indian Express** of 26.12. '77, which is as following :

"Mandovi Pellots Ltd., a company jointly promoted by Chowgules and Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL) and incorporated in Marmagoa, for the manufacture of iron ore pellets, is entering the capital market, some time in January 1978.

"The total cost of the project is about 48 crores and is being met by a pattern of financing which is unique in the industry and in India for a project of its size".

The company has obtained credit of Rs. 24.73 crores from the equipment suppliers, Voest Alpines of Austria. Besides this credit, the company has also obtained an advance of Rs. 12.73 crores from the Consortium of Japanese Steel Mills, who are the buyers

of pellets that would be manufactured by the company.

As much as 87.5 per cent of the total cost of equipment, engine services, ocean frieght and spare parts will be supplied by Voest Alpines by way of deferred payment credit facilities which is spread over 8 years. The same deferred payment credit will be repaid in 16 instalments after the company goes into production at an interest rate of seven per cent per annum.

The company has obtained a licence for the import of the plant and machinery from Austria. The government has also approved the interest payable to Voest Alpines on deferred payment facilities".

This long extract provides various aspects of foreign collaboration. The Chowgules is one of the top big business houses which is expected to enjoy the fruits of this deal. The SAIL is mainly a government concern, consisting of public sector steel plants, which also shares the spoils of the deal. The two concerns together are having about 87.5 per cent of the total cost as a debt from foreign concerns. It is only 12.5 per cent, which is met by indigenous sources (share capital etc.). To cap all this, the entire production is already purchased by the Japanese steel monopoly concern, even before the production has begun! It clearly means that the concern is owned and controlled by Japan and other foreign monopolies and India gets foreign exchange by way of "exports" of pellots. Of course the bigbusiness together with the government gets some remuneration, mostly in the name of profits etc, for the services they have rendered and are going to render, by way of supplying the cheap labour and cheap raw materials. This is how the export - oriented policy is implemented in its naked form. This is another form of comprador nature of the top strata of private sector and the public sector, as a whole.

The comprador nature of our economy is clearer today than yesterday. When Indian workers working in the iron ore mines are facing a large scale retrenchment as the export quantity of iron ore is fastly dwindling because of world wide recession and glut in the steel market. The problem is not limited to retrenchment alone. The investment made by the government by way of developing railway lines, ports and other transport is becoming idle with no

hope of revival. The international recession has already gripped the other sectors of the economy. Almost all industries are running below their capacity. As a result, unemployment, retrenchment, lock-outs and closures have become the order of the day. Therefore the working class and other sections of affected people have taken up the path of struggle to fight back the imperialist and comprador offensive. And it is a development desired by all anti-imperialist forces in India as well as the world.

IV

The revisionists and neo-revisionists have been living in the worlds of their own. These worlds are of ruling classes but certainly not of the revolutionary proletariat. For them, imperialism means western imperialism in general and U.S. imperialism in particular, as was the position existing immediately after the Second World War. They do not recognise the reality of the Soviet Union changing into social imperialist power, strong and powerful enough to become next only to America, and stronger and more powerful from military point of view. Herein lies the significance of their support of the hegemonistic policies of Soviet Union in India masquerading them as Socialist. Thus they have become social-imperialists in India.

Their characterisation of a major part of Indian big bourgeoisie as national and anti-imperialist is a corollary of their departure from Marxism-Leninism. They have no explanation for the comprador bourgeoisie created by British imperialism during its colonial rule. They have no explanation for the comprador bourgeoisie created by foreign capital, especially that of U.S., exported to our country on a massive scale, whose enormous proportion can be seen by the latest figure being more than Rs. 11,000 crores and American finance capital, about Rs. 3,000 crores as an outstanding debt besides the investment of the multinationals. They have no explanation to offer regarding the comprador bourgeoisie created by Soviet finance capital, which is younger in age but stronger in power and influence. Consequently, they have become apologists of not only U.S. and Soviet imperialism but also the comprador bourgeoisie created by them. If the revisionists represent Soviet social imperialism and its comprador bourgeoisie, the neo-revisionists speak for imperialism and comprador bourgeoisie, as a whole with an emphasis on Soviet

social imperialism and its comprador bourgeoisie. There can be no other explanation, for the latter's alliance with Janata combine.

There was a time, when opposing U.S. imperialism was correctly considered as anti-imperialism because, it was and still is the leader of western imperialist powers. With the emergence of Soviet Union as an imperialist power, next only to America, anti-imperialism cannot be limited to anti-American imperialism alone. It has to be extended to Soviet Union as well. The two super powers have been contending for hegemony not only on a world scale, but also on the soil of India. In view of the changed situation, anti-imperialism has no meaning if it does not include Soviet social imperialism. Contrary to this objective reality, they continue to treat the Soviet Union as a socialist country which is not. Hence their anti-imperialism is sham. If the revisionists identify themselves with Soviet Union, they are supporting one hegemonistic power against the other (U.S. imperialism). But the neo-revisionists support Soviet social imperialism together with welcoming multinationals, meaning that they are with imperialism as a whole as long as inter-imperialist contradictions do not reach a breaking point. They are bound to align themselves with social imperialism, when such a situation arises. Historical experience has proved that revisionism of all hues has served imperialism as a whole and the dominant imperialist powers in a given situation. The revisionists and neo-revisionists in our country are no exception to this.

Though a trend in the left adventurism has negated the role of national bourgeoisie in the people's democratic revolution, the discussion among the communist revolutionaries did not centre around this issue because it did not make much headway. Instead, the whole controversy was related to people's armed struggle as against individual terrorism in its various forms. The communist revolutionaries uphold the former and reject the latter. This is the reason why the left adventurist view point about the role of the national bourgeoisie was not discussed by the author. Moreover it was not a serious controversial subject at any time.

The revisionists and neo-revisionists refuse to accept the role of agrarian revolution as a axis to the people's democratic revolution because they underestimate the existence of feudalism and semi-feudalism in India. They embellish the capitalist

development in agriculture when even the official spokesmen were clear that the modernization and mechanization which has taken place in the countryside has been marginal and skindeep. (The development of capitalism includes some other features also). The result has been that they have aligned themselves with the class of landlords who are dominating the rural economy and who have entered and spread over trade and industry which in turn is subsidised and patronised by the government and foreign capital. Thus their alignment with the ruling classes i.e., comprador bourgeoisie and landlord, has become total. Their departure from Marxism-Leninism can only lead them to this miserable plight.

The author, with his profound analysis of the facts and figures, rejects both the revisionist views as departure from Marxism-Leninism.

V

There are a good number of intellectuals who claim that there is no feudalism in India. They have their own anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist theories in support of their contention. But the real situation obtaining in India does not confirm their theories. Abolition of princely states and zamindari system is but abolition of the specific forms of feudal relations but not the content of feudal relations in the main. The land concentration with the class of landlords is the main form of feudal relations and other forms (tenancy, share-cropping, forced labour, usury) are interlinked with it. The author has provided facts and figures and drawn conclusions to this end. Neither the developments during the sixties nor those of the seventies indicate any substantial change, not to speak of a basic one.

According to a news item (*Indian Express*, May 22, 1978) about Reserve Banks' study, "The total capital expenditure by rural households during the year 1971-72 amounted to Rs. 1993 crores representing about five per cent of gross domestic product (GDP) and eleven per cent of GDP from the agriculture sector ..." (One would like to have as latest figures as possible. But we have no other alternative than treating them as latest covering the decade, the Reserve Bank's survey being a better source).

The capital expenditure incurred by rural households is in

the main, the investment on farm equipment of irrigation facilities and so on. The eleven per cent of GDP is too small in relation to the large percentage necessary for development of capitalism in agriculture. One can find improved forms of equipment and irrigational facilities etc., in areas where commercial crops are grown and perennial irrigation exists. But then, it is limited to the top strata of the farm households i.e., landlords and rich peasants.

The study further says : "There was a marked decline in the proportion of households reporting capital expenditure in farm business in almost all states over the decade. Though it was difficult to pin-point the factors responsible for this position, it could be attributed partly to the rise in prices and partly to the deterioration in the income of cultivators eroding their capacity to save and invest." It is only partially a correct conclusion. Not all farmers can save and invest except the landlords and the rich peasants. While the middle peasants are leading a life of meeting their both ends, the poor are working as hired labourers partly because their small parts are uneconomic. (The study does not include the agricultural labourers in poor peasants). As such they have nothing to save and invest. The study agrees with this position from a different stand point : "The greater concentration of expenditure in respect of all types of activities in the higher asset groups also signified that despite the two decades of planning the fruits of development did not percolate to the lower strata groups of Rs. 2500 and below". Even this conclusion is partially true. Not all "farmers" belonging to the groups of assets of above Rs. 2500 have benefits from the plan. On the contrary, only a privileged section of them have monopolised the benefits. These are the conclusions which are drawn by the author himself. But it took three decades for the Reserve Bank to do the same, of course with the limitations noted above !

Another important conclusion drawn by the survey which sums up the result of the development of agriculture through planning is this : "Among cultivator households, although a relatively larger proportion of households reported expenditure on agricultural implements, machinery and transport equipment, the average expenditure on these items was low which suggested that equipment and machinery purchased were of the traditional type." What does this mean? The items mentioned here are the means of production for landlords and peasants. If the traditional

type of machinery and equipment purchased and the expenditure incurred was low, it shows that there has been no modernisation, not to speak of mechanization to any degree worth mentioning, that a section of landlords and rich peasants could purchase machinery (tractors and pumpsets) from out of the loans they had from the governments and financial institutions together with grants and subsidies. The rest having traditional one i.e., ploughs, bullock carts etc., which represent feudal means of production. Due to rise in prices of oil in recent years a considerable part of the machinery is either lying idle or used for different purposes (tractor being used for transport).

(All these extracts are from *Indian Express*, dated May 2, 1978).

About the Land Ceiling Acts and their implementation, the less said, the better. Here is what an editorial by the *Indian Express* says :

The total surplus on the basis of present ceiling laws, which will become available for redistribution adds up to a paltry 4.2 million acres. Even if all this surplus is actually acquired and distributed, which is doubtful considering past performance, it will be hardly enough to satisfy a fraction of the vast masses of our land hungry agricultural labourers and poor peasants and will not bring about any significant transformation of land relations in the country-side. (May 19, 1978).

The editorial also suggests, "a basic revision of the concept and application of land reform aimed at land to tiller which is called for". It can only be the seizure of land from landlords and its distribution among the landless and those having small plots of land which cannot provide two meals a day. It is wrong to expect such a drastic step from the present regime representing the landlords.

The author has drawn the conclusion that in spite of land reforms including the Ceiling Acts, there is no change in the concentration of land with the class of landlords. The above paper has to concede it, though belatedly, in a different way that the present land ceiling acts "will not bring about any significant

transformation of land relations in the country side."

There is tenancy, share-cropping and usury prevalent everywhere. But they do not come to the surface because the dealings are rather traditional and illicit. Together with land concentration and pre-capitalist means of production these features do denote the predominance of feudal and semi-feudal relations all-over the country. It was so in 1970, and it continues to be the same even today (1978).

Does it mean that there are no change what-so-ever? Yes, there are. The abolition of zamindari system and princely states is a change. The abolition of bonded labour system is a change. Enacting ceiling legislations is a change. Introduction of machinery, fertilisers, seeds of high yielding varieties etc., is a change. But the cumulative effect of these changes is not the development of capitalism, replacing feudalism. On the contrary, a new type of class of landlords is being developed, who are in power at various levels, who are appropriating the major part of the allocations from State and Central budgets including foreign loans. As a part of this feature, capitalist relations have developed to a **marginal** extent. Instead of understanding their highly limited nature, they are being embellished, only to relegate the task of agrarian revolution into the background.

The capitalism is in a chronic crisis. There is a recession all over the world including India. Its impact on agriculture is serious. There is a glut in the market of food grains. Those who have surplus to sell (landlords and rich peasants) are not getting remunerative prices. The same is the case with commercial crops except the tea. As such even the marginal capitalist relations are in crisis. Then how can we expect that there is a scope for capitalist development in future? Obviously not.

VI

Lenin says the following about the significance of the reforms which are introduced by the ruling classes in general :

"A reformist change is one, which leaves intact the foundations of the power of the ruling classes and is merely a concession leaving its power unimpaired. A revolutionary change, undermines the foundations of power".

(Collected Works, Volume XXII, Page 344)

India is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. The ruling classes i.e., comprador bourgeoisie and landlords are defending interests of imperialism, feudalism, and semi-feudalism. Revolts of workers, peasants and other oppressed sections all over the country have become the order of the day for the last three decades. The ruling classes are desperately trying to save themselves and their masters by introducing one reform after another. They have help and guidance from imperialism. Notwithstanding this they are sinking and the revolution is advancing.

The reforms being what they are have not changed the foundations of the Indian society in general and the ruling classes in particular. Hence there is imperialism; there is feudalism and semi-feudalism. There is no change in their foundations of power. To think that there is no imperialism, no feudalism, no semi-feudalism is not to accept the reality.

There is no doubt that Indian Revolution is advancing. The days are not far off when they are liquidated and the revolutionary classes led by working class seizes the power. It is the struggle for power and its consolidation which provides land to the poor, protects the national industry etc. It is called the People's Democratic Revolution.

VII

Comrade Tarimela Nagi Reddy is no more. It would have been in the fitness of the things that he writes a Foreword or an Introduction to his outstanding work which is the product of his extensive study and effort. He was in a better position to elaborate various formulations he made, and the conclusions he has drawn. His untimely death has deprived the communist revolutionaries and the world of readers of this opportunity.

We could not collect the required material or data to supplement what is in the work and make it up-to-date. This is due to the reason beyond our control. We are sure that the same will be provided when the second edition is brought out. At the same time, we would like to make it clear that except a change in the government, with all its implications, there is none in the

economic scene which is of a substantial nature. The change is for worse if there is any. Hence we are firmly in a position to say that the analysis of Indian situation he has made, and the conclusions he has drawn are valid even today. They will be guidelines for the Marxists-Leninists and democratic forces for further study and future course of action. The communist revolutionaries all over India are indebted to him, for his unique contribution which enriches their Marxist-Leninist understanding of Indian situation as it exists today.

A few words about his life and work.

He was born (11-2-1917) in a well-to-do family. He completed his M.A., and was about to complete Law, when he was arrested by the British imperialists for his revolutionary activities. He was associated with the then existing communist party ever since he started his political activities. He was a good orator, agitator and organiser. He had organised and led many a struggles of the rural poor against the atrocities of the landlords. He has led the underground life during the period of 1947-51 when he was the leader and Secretary of the Regional Committee of Rayala Seema in Andhra Pradesh (then the composite Madras province). The authorities could not arrest him in spite of the best efforts till he himself had come out in 1952. Ever since he was either a member of Legislature or the Parliament, till he resigned from the Legislature of Andhra Pradesh in 1969.

He was always towards the Left in all controversies which arose inside the party. He had finally chosen his place in the ranks of communist revolutionaries, and remained there till the end. He fought against right opportunism and left adventurism and the present work is a product of this struggle. It is not accidental that he was writing an article against revisionism just two days before his death when his pen stopped writing. Such was his glorious revolutionary career.

Silver-tongued orator as he was, his speeches inside and outside the Legislature and Parliament were full of substance. He was well read and he knew what he was speaking about, which is a rare exception in Indian orators. He had been unparalleled propagandist of communist revolutionary line. He went underground to carry on revolutionary activities immediately after the proclamation of emergency towards the end of June

1975. While being underground he devoted his attention to strengthen and improve the organisation on an all Indian scale in general, and Andhra Pradesh in particular. He worked for the unity of communist revolutionaries till the end of his life.

He held leading positions inside the party. He was a member of the National Council in the United party. He was the convenor of the Co-ordination Committee of Andhra Communist Revolutionaries. He was the member of Central Committee of the U.C.C.R.I. (M.L.) [Unity Centre of Communist Revolutionaries of India (Marxist - Leninist)], at the time of his death. He took a leading role in its formation.

He worked for Indian Revolution to the last day of his life. The advancing age was no bar to his work as an orator, organiser and writer. His death was sudden and he spent only two days in the hospital. He was conscious to the last minute. We could not save him inspite of the best efforts of the Doctors and the Comrades attending him. He died on 28th July, 1976, in Osmania General Hospital, Hyderabad, at the age of 59. His loss is irreparable to Indian Revolution and communist revolutionaries.

He loved the people immensely and the people reciprocated it in the same degree. He is known for knowing the pulse of the people, and was acting accordingly. He was one of the architects of communist revolutionary line and he defended it against the campaign let loose by adverseries.

He was in Indian revolutionary political scene for more than 35 years. He sacrificed what all he had for Indian Revolution. He is the produt of the best in the communist revolutionary movement. It is a proud privilege of communist revolutionaries to have him as their leader.

July 16, 1978.

Naveen Chandra

(DEVULAPALLI VENKATESWARA RAO)