

## PARTY PROGRAMME

Now we come to the criticism of the Party Programme made by our comrades.

The Party Programme, a product of twenty years of struggle for a correct analysis of the national and international situation and concrete application of Marxism-Leninism to Indian conditions, a product which strove to steer clear of both rightist and leftist errors, to draw the lessons from our past mistakes and achievements, is based on firm Marxist-Leninist ideological foundations, contrary to the critics who challenge its sound ideological basis.

To cite the main points :

(a) *New epoch* : The right-reformist and revisionist interpretation of it as an epoch of peaceful competition between socialism and imperialism, peaceful coexistence of states as a general line of foreign policy of socialist revolution is decisively rejected. The gross underestimation of imperialism and the deliberate underplaying of the role of foreign capital and, consequently, ignoring the dangers it poses to the political independence of the newly liberated countries, etc., is sharply exposed and pinned down.

While doing so, the Programme has guarded against the danger of interpreting events in the old framework, the framework of international correlation of class forces as it existed prior to the victory in the anti-fascist war, the emergence of east European People's Democracies and the great Chinese revolution, and viewing developments in that framework. Some of the grave mistakes in the *Political Thesis* of our Second Party Congress and the 1951 Programme can be traced to this defect. The Programme corrects both these errors.

(b) *On national independence* : Moving in the old framework our Party was, for long, interpreting it as formal independence and was dogmatically maintaining that there can be no political and national independence without economic independence. Thereby, while correctly uphold-

ing the Marxist-Leninist truth that it is not full and complete independence as long as dependence on foreign capital remains, we discounted the factor of political independence and its significance under the changed conditions, the changes in the world balance of forces when the imperialists can no longer do as they like.

On the other hand, the right-reformist and revisionist theoreticians, under the plea of the new epoch, that everything is fundamentally changed, etc., were running into ecstasies in describing our national independence as almost full and complete, as independent and free as is post-second world war Britain or France, and thus virtually negating the still existing task of complete national liberation.

Our Programme steers clear of both these deviations and puts this issue on correct lines.

(c) *On the class character of the state*: The right-opportunists and revisionists were describing it as a bourgeois state. They neither see nor accept the leadership of the big bourgeoisie in the new state and government nor its alliance with feudal and semi-feudal landlordism and its economic collaboration with foreign capital.

The sectarian and dogmatic trend, on the other hand, was treating the new Indian state as a mere continuation of the old imperialist state with the only change that imperialist rule had changed from direct to indirect and that the Indian big bourgeoisie had become its junior partner in the state. Now, of course, it is being given another name, i.e., a neo-colonial state where the U.S. imperialists have become the senior partner in place of the British.

The Programme refutes both these theses as wrong and takes a correct stand.

(d) *On the character of the big bourgeoisie*: The right-reformists, while verbally denouncing them as reactionary, etc., were identifying them with the so-called parties of right reaction, placing them outside the Congress party and the ruling class. They describe the state as a national bourgeois state. They denounce the big bourgeoisie in words and in deeds certify them as patriotic national bourgeoisie, and advocate alliance and a united front with them. Their political alliance with landlordism

and economic collaboration with imperialism are sought to be shielded.

The left-sectarian trend was either placing the entire bourgeois class as having gone over to imperialism under the growing threat of class revolution, or attempting, as revealed in the recent discussions, to dub it as comprador, in order to prove its 'stooge' or 'lackey' character, while denying the existence of any contradictions whatsoever between them and foreign capital. They have come to consider these contradictions, if any, as not only of no significance for the class strategy of United Front but even of no significance for tactical purposes. They presume that these contradictions simply diminish under the impact of the growing crisis and refute the view that though they diminish and disappear in the final phase of the revolutionary upheaval, they do exist and get accentuated under the impact of the growing crisis. They also reject the programmatic formulation that this big bourgeoisie "seeks to utilise its hold over the state and new opportunities to strengthen its position by attacking the people on the one hand and, on the other, to resolve the conflicts and contradictions with imperialism and feudalism by pressure, bargain and compromise."

The Programme does not permit either of these deviations to make inroads into it.

(e) *On the assessment of the capitalist path*: The right-reformists and revisionists began characterising it as a path of independent capitalist development and a path that can achieve industrial revolution under the leadership of the bourgeoisie with the aid of foreign capital on the one hand, and the fraternal assistance of the socialist world, on the other, despite all its ups and downs and other difficulties. The growth of foreign capital in the country was not considered a growing menace to our national independence, as according to them, the quantum of native capital and its growth were far greater, compared to foreign capital. They saw in it the strengthening of our national independence and consolidation of the newly won freedom.

The left critics on the other hand were simply pooh-poohing the whole thing, for them it was all for consoli-

dation of imperialism and feudalism in the country, as plans and a path dictated by the foreign capitalists to be put through by their Indian lackeys in the state and government. They were reluctant to learn from the revolutionary concept, "despise the enemy strategically and tactically take him into account", and were content with denouncing it as an utter failure, thus repeating only the ultimate truth that such a path is no substitute for the democratic revolution to smash the existing feudal, imperialist and big business fetters on the productive forces. They refuse to take into account either the limited possibilities of advance present in the path or the actual growth of capitalist industrialisation and development while indulging in mouthing the general truth that the capitalist path is closed since the world capitalist order is on its way out of the stage of history and the world socialist revolution is in the epoch of its final triumph.

They assess the entire developments during the last two decades of national independence as merely strengthening of foreign capital and the strengthening of feudal and semi-feudal landlordism while tending to clean miss the powerful growth of capitalism in the fields of industry as well as agriculture in the country.

Our Party Programme does not allow either of these deviations both in assessing the capitalist path and in the tasks of exposing it and fighting it in the concrete.

Similar is the case with the issues of foreign capital and its role, the role and character of Soviet aid, and National Democracy and the parliamentary path. In the face of these facts, it is utterly untenable to criticise the Programme as one without a sound ideological basis.

Let us take up the main points of their criticism levelled against our Party Programme.

They challenge the correctness of our characterisation of Indian independence as 'political independence', and call it 'formal independence' or 'nominal independence'.

They challenge the class character of the present Indian state and government as made in our Party Programme—a bourgeois-landlord state led by the big bourgeoisie which is collaborating with foreign capital in pursuance of their capitalist path of development—and assert that it is a "neo-

colonial state with a puppet regime serving mainly the imperialists and feudalists." They, in order to buttress the above two points of theirs, characterise the present Indian big industrial bourgeoisie as comprador bourgeoisie, which acts as the 'lackey', 'puppet' and 'stooge' of U.S. imperialism.

They emphasise exclusively the collaboration aspect of the Indian big bourgeoisie with foreign monopoly capital and refuse to take note of the conflicts and contradictions that do exist between them.

They assess the internal and external policies of the present Indian state and government from the above stated standpoint of theirs and tend to negate the extent of the capitalist development that has taken place in the industrial and agricultural sectors during the last two decades, and depict it as merely strengthening of foreign imperialism, native feudalism and the Indian big comprador class.

All these differences with the Party Programme to a superficial observer may appear to be minor or matters of greater or lesser emphasis on certain aspects. But a careful analysis reveals that they are of a vital and fundamental nature. If all these are accepted as correct, the Party Programme cannot have any legs to stand on and will cease to be valid anymore. It can remain and serve the Party only if these are rejected as totally wrong and utterly untenable.

Such is the essence of the problem before us.

## CONCLUSION

If we take all the arguments of the critics of the ideological document, what do they amount to? They amount to a total repudiation of the understanding of the epoch. They imply liquidation of the Socialist camp; they convey that capitalism has been restored in the USSR leading to imperialist policies; that the major fight of the working class of the world, of the peoples and nations of the world is not against American imperialism but against the Soviet and American imperialisms. The fight against