

THE PROGRAMME ISSUES

The serious differences over programmatic and policy issues inside the Indian Communist movement, let alone the earlier period before the programme of 1951 was adopted, started anew in the middle of June, 1955, i.e., with the June C. C. resolution, as a draft for the Fourth Party Congress held at Pālgat in April 1956. Notwithstanding the different shades of opinions and views by different members of the then Central Committee, two sharply opposed stands clearly expressed themselves and the same can be seen from the discussion documents and Forums released, preceding the Congress.

In brief, one view was that the Nehru Government, as it was constituted and was functioning, essentially represented the aspirations of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal sections of the Indian bourgeoisie, that it was encountering increasing opposition from the right reactionary sections who were avowedly pro-imperialist and pro-feudal, and hence it was necessary to lend some sort of support to the Government to fight the danger of extreme reaction.

Of course, this line which was being fervently advocated

for several years by a small group of CCMs led by P. C. Joshi was quite unacceptable to the then dominant leadership of our Party. It was only subsequently that such a full-fledged line of cooperation with the Nehru Government came to be accepted by the revisionist party.

It is redundant to narrate here the manner in which the CPSU has gone in the matter, as it has been dealt at length in our Programme discussions and the ideological draft of our C. C. Hence we propose to confine here to the subject of the CPC's assessment regarding our Programme.

The Chinese viewpoint on the Indian situation is nowhere more clearly elaborated than in the two published documents of the CPC, i.e., "Nehru's Philosophy" and "Once More on Nehru's Philosophy". All other Chinese Communist material regarding India consists either in the form of recent editorials in the PEOPLE'S DAILY, short notes and comments in their Press, and Radio Peking broadcasts. All these taken together can be treated as systematically expounded views on the entire Indian issue. What does this assessment of the Indian bourgeoisie and the character of the Congress Government, in the main, state?

It maintains that the Indian big bourgeoisie is a parasitic class fostered by British imperialism, that it represents the comprador, bureaucratic capital in India, and that the Congress Government acts as the chief instrument and the main mouthpiece of this comparador, bureaucratic monopoly capitalist class.

It holds the view that, for some time after the attaining of political independence for India, Nehru in some degree acted on behalf of the non-comparador, non-bureaucratic and non-monopoly sections, but, of late, due to the sharpening of the internal class contradictions, had gone over to imperialism and had become the lackey and mouthpiece of imperialism, like the Chiang Kai-shek Government after 1927.

It, then, practically comes to the conclusion that the stage and nature of the Indian revolution is principally anti-imperialist and the fight against British imperialism and also against U.S. imperialism gets specially emphasised, though the struggle against feudal landlordism and

bureaucratic capital is stated to be fundamental and important.

Our analysis of the Indian bourgeoisie, its divisions into different categories, the class character of the new Indian state and government, and the stage and strategy of the revolution worked out accordingly in the Party Programme do not tally with the analysis and assessment of the CPC comrades. Our study of the concrete conditions of the Indian situation compels us to differ with them and arrive at different conclusions of our own in the matter. What are the essential factors and the principal ground on which we differ?

First of all, we proceed on the widely accepted premise which was repeatedly emphasised by the Communist International in its documents that India, when it was completely colonial, was the most capitalistically developed country among the colonial and semi-colonial countries. During the period of the Second World War, and more particularly in the post-Independence period—for nearly three decades since 1939—capitalism had further developed and the capitalists had strengthened their class position in the society, and today stand on a footing far different and stronger than from their counterparts in the pre-liberation China of the 1930s and '40s.

This difference between present-day Indian capitalism and the Indian bourgeoisie on the one hand and the pre-liberation capitalist development of China and the Chinese bourgeoisie is a very important factor which every Marxist-Leninist has to take into account and cannot afford to ignore.

Secondly, there exists a vital difference between the place and role of the comprador bourgeoisie and its bureaucratic capital in the pre-liberation Chinese society and that of the place and role of the big bourgeoisie in present-day India. The phenomenon of commercial or comprador bourgeoisie was, no doubt, common to all the colonial and semi-colonial countries under imperialist domination. This section of the trading bourgeoisie, linked as it was with imperialism and dependent upon it, was parasitic in nature, did not reflect the native industrial interests, and was often found in the service of imperialism and its capital.

In India, too, this category of the bourgeoisie had its existence and played its servitors' role at one stage of development or the other, with one degree of difference or the other compared to their counterparts in other countries. Even today this element is not totally absent in India. But the fact to be noted here is that, it is the industrial big bourgeoisie which, today, has emerged as a powerful force holding the leading position in the new state and government, and not the comprador element.

Closely connected with it is the concept of bureaucratic capital, i.e., the big comprador capital which, in alliance with feudalism and in utter dependence on imperialism, amasses wealth by utilising the state bureaucratic apparatus and does not interest itself either in the expansion of industries or the development of the national economy. This is a specific characteristic of the Chiang Kai-shek regime dominated by the notorious four big families of Soong, Kung, Chang and Lin.

Though certain tendencies of the nature are present in the Indian situation, too, it is by no means the principal characteristic of the Indian big bourgeoisie which is heading the state and government. Hence our Programme states that the present Indian Government is a bourgeois-landlord Government led by the big bourgeoisie which is compromising and collaborating with foreign monopoly capital. It further observes that this big bourgeoisie is, by its nature, counter-revolutionary, inimical to the people and cannot have any place in the People's Democratic Front, even though there still exist conflicts and contradictions between them and the foreign monopolists—a factor to be taken into account for tactical purposes and not at all for the strategical objectives at the present stage. From this follows the nature of our revolution, i.e., anti-feudal, anti-imperialist and anti-monopolist.

The third point of difference arises regarding the appraisal of the Nehru Government, its class character and role, prior to 1959, i.e., before the good relations between India and China were strained and the Indian Government had veered round to the containment of China policy initiated by the U.S. imperialists. The Nehru Government as well as the present Indian Government is a Government formed

by the Congress party. The entire record of its programme, policy, activities and the role of the Indian National Congress prove beyond any doubt that its leadership represented, in the main, the class interests of the Indian big bourgeoisie, and its national-reformist opposition to imperialism, in the pre-Independence days, was due to that character.

Several documents of the Communist International (C.I.) have stated, and our Party has always maintained, that the all-India leadership of the Congress party represented the interests of the Indian big bourgeoisie. We cannot subscribe to the view that the Congress Government, at any stage of its existence during the last twenty years, represented the interests of the middle and non-big bourgeoisie (which the CPC characterises as national bourgeoisie), as against and in demarcation to the Indian Big Business which is compromising and collaborating with the imperialists and allying with big landlordism.

The markedly servile behaviour of the Nehru Government towards imperialism during the 1947-53 period as well as the subsequent, comparatively, independent, anti-imperialist and vocal postures adopted by it between 1954 and 1959—both these were class policies of the Indian bourgeoisie led by the big bourgeoisie, and it is wrong to think that the former arose because the Government represented Big Business and bureaucratic capital and the latter emanated because it represented the class interests of the middle and non-big bourgeoisie. Similarly, the surrenderist stances glaringly noted after the 1959 period are the continuation of the same class policies, adopted to the narrow, selfish needs of the class in the present phase of development.

It is quite a different thing to state that the middle and non-big capitalist sections also are sharing state power though they are coming to be hit more and more as the economic crisis is deepening. But to say that the Congress Government represented the non-big Indian bourgeoisie till 1959 and that it became the instrument of the big monopolists subsequently, is contrary to facts and the concrete class realities in India.

The fourth point of divergence is about the assessment

of the actual growth of internal class contradictions and their impact on the Government of Nehru which, according to the CPC, had led to its surrender and going over to imperialism. In other words, it is an attempt at explaining in class terms the reasons for the change in foreign policy of the Indian Government after 1959, from one of Sino-Indian friendship and amity to that of hostility to and containment of China policy.

The explanation in plain terms is that the Nehru Government which was till then representing the class interests of the non-big bourgeoisie and to that extent playing an oppositional role to imperialism, had, due to the extreme sharpening of internal contradictions, transformed itself into the representative of the anti-national big bourgeoisie and big landlords, and a lackey of imperialism.

We disagree with both the above premises, and have already dealt with one aspect showing how it has always been a bourgeois-landlord government led by the big bourgeoisie which is compromising and collaborating with imperialism. Then coming to the question of intensified class contradictions at home which are supposed to have led the Government to reduce itself to the stage of 'stooge', 'puppet', and 'lackey' of imperialism, it needs a brief discussion. It is an incontrovertible truth that, "as social contradictions grow, the national bourgeoisie inclines more and more to compromise with domestic reaction and imperialism", as emphasised in the Moscow Statement of 81 Parties.

Our contention is that as far as the big capitalists of the Indian bourgeoisie are concerned, they, after gaining of political independence and securing of leadership in the new state power are compromising and collaborating with imperialism. The other non-big Indian bourgeoisie has neither so far split away from the big bourgeoisie nor politically differentiated with it, let alone playing an oppositional role and abandoning it in face of growing class contradictions and consequent threat to its very existence at the hands of revolution. This development so envisaged did not yet actually take place either in the 1959 period or even now in 1967, more than seven years after such an assessment was made.

It is an admitted fact that the crisis in the Indian eco-

nomy is deepening, that it has also extended to the political sphere, and that different social contradictions inherent in the situation are getting accentuated. But an exaggeration of either the degree, depth and maturity of these contradictions or the extent of their subjective political expression is fraught with the risk of committing serious errors. As correctly observed by the Sixth Congress of the C.I., in its thesis on The Revolutionary Movement in Colonies and Semi-Colonies, there exists an "excessively marked lack of correspondence between the objective revolutionary situation and the weakness of the subjective factors", and it persists even today, in several countries.

Our own experience teaches that the Congress party still holds considerable political influence among the people, that several bourgeois-landlord reactionary parties still command certain mass following, that the character of many petty-bourgeois parties and groups still is not exposed to any appreciable extent, and that the proletariat and its revolutionary party are far from properly organised and built. In face of such reality it would be a grave error to exaggerate this aspect of sharpening class contradictions to the point of suggesting that class revolution on the part of the masses has already become so immediate and acute and menacing to the bourgeoisie as to make its capitulation to imperialism final and irrevocable.

What we observe in the contemporary world situation is that several bourgeois-landlord governments in the newly liberated countries, despite their basic compromising and collaborationist policies towards foreign monopoly capitalism and imperialism, are trying to exploit the different world contradictions that are prevailing, so as to bargain with the imperialists and to extract concessions from them. The case of Pakistan, which is drawn into the imperialist military blocs and still is formally not out of them, is a glaring example in this regard.

Hence, we do not find any valid reason for the present Indian Government, which has a more wider social base when compared to most of its counterparts in several countries and which does not face the imminent threat of class revolution at home, opting to play the role of a 'puppet', 'stooge' and 'lackey' of imperialism.

One can understand the argument that its need for dollars and rubles to buttress its class position and its designs to crush the Communist movement at home are at the root of its joining the chorus of the atrocious U.S. policy of 'containment of Communist China'. This dangerous line, of course, has its own logic, if pursued to the end, and it need be fought out and defeated. But from this neither a case of sharpened class contradictions as immediate cause for the government to join hands with the U.S. imperialists and their 'containment of China' policy, nor the Indian big bourgeoisie being the representative of the big bureaucratic capital to act as the parasitic puppets of imperialism, etc., should be built, and it does not also stand the test of facts and realities.

Lastly, two differing views emerge from the above analysis on the question of the stage and strategy of our revolution—the one enunciated in our Party Programme and the other that follows from the CPC's analysis. The assessment of the CPC leads one to conclude that the new Indian state is not a bourgeois-landlord state, led by the big bourgeoisie, which pursues the capitalist path of development in collaboration with foreign monopoly capital, but a puppet government, led by bureaucratic capitalism, run by them, principally, in the interests of imperialism while reconciling themselves to live as parasites, depending on the crumbs thrown by their foreign masters.

If such a premise were to be accepted as a fact of life, then the national liberation aspect of our revolution stands in the forefront, the edge of the revolution will have to be directed against the foreign imperialists, the contradiction between alien imperialists and the nation as a whole assumes the principal role, and a corresponding strategy of general national united front will have to be substituted in place of the present class strategy incorporated in our Programme. The concept of concentrating the main fire against the bourgeois-landlord state power with the agrarian revolution as its axis will have to be given up.

These differences of ours with the understanding of the CPC are not new, and all the comrades who assembled at Delhi in January 1964, to discuss the outlines of the new Draft Programme had discussed about them. Further, with

a view to keeping other comrades of our Party, who were to participate in the then proposed programmatic and ideological discussion, informed about these differences this was mentioned in the introduction to the draft in the words: "We would also like to bring to your notice that on some of the concrete questions such as the characterisation of the present Indian state, the nature of the present government and its leadership, we have some differences and serious reservations with the positions taken by CPC, as well as CPSU, in some of their documents. In drafting our programme we tried to incorporate our understanding on these questions and excluded all this from the ideological document". (From "A Contribution to Ideological Debate")

Of course, these aspects were again clarified during the Party Congress discussions by comrades who were piloting the draft programme on behalf of the Steering Committee, for the benefit of the delegates. But it becomes now evident that several of our Party members at different levels have not been able to follow all the intricacies involved in these differences and find themselves confused when divergent views are put across in the Chinese Communist Press and over Radio Peking. Hence, we are compelled to once again cover all the ground already covered at some stage or other of our inner-Party discussions.