

COMMUNIST PARTY CALLS FOR

**A FIGHTING FRONT
OF TOILING MILLIONS**

**AGAINST
IMPERIALISTS AND
THEIR COLLABORATORS**

**FOR FREEDOM
AND DEMOCRACY**

**REVIEW OF THE SECOND CONGRESS
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA**

1948

115

REVIEW OF THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA

[Issued by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of India]

THE 632 delegates who met at the pandal of the Second Congress of the Communist Party of India in Calcutta, from February 28 to March 6, came straight from the numerous battle-fields scattered all over India, where the toiling masses of our country are waging bitter and prolonged struggles for an independent and democratic India where the people will rule.

They came from scenes of great strike battles of Bombay and Kanpur, of Madura, Coimbatore and Golden Rock, and of the great industrial area of Calcutta.

They came from the scenes of peasant struggles of Bihar and U.P., of the struggles against landlordism in Tamilnad, Andhra and Malabar and from the areas in Maharashtra where the Warli peasants waged their heroic battle against serfdom and landlord oppression.

They came from the battle-fields of struggles against the Princely autocracy in the States of Rajputana, Central India, as well as from the States of the South, and above all from the battle-fields of Warangal and Nalgonda where the peasants of Telengana are putting up an epic armed resistance against the armed might of the Nizami's autocracy and his satellites, the deshmukh landlords.

There were student delegates fresh from the great student battles of Bombay, Calcutta and Kanpur, and about fifteen women delegates who are struggling with great determination to build a women's movement in the various Provinces of India. There were also delegates from those territories of India in the North-West and the East which have been partitioned off and reconstituted as the State of Pakistan.

These delegates all together represented a powerful and rising movement which was challenging the might of the imperialist-bourgeois-feudal combine which had come into existence after the Mountbatten Award, a movement of the toiling and the common people fighting against the collaborationist policy of the bourgeois leadership, fighting for the victory of the democratic revolution.

As. 4

Five Years of Trials and Struggles

THE Congress was meeting after five years, years of great political changes in the world as well as in India. These were also years of great trials and struggles for the Communist Party, years through which despite slander and opposition, despite brutal repression, it had grown in stature as a leading revolutionary force in India.

During the war, the Communist Party took the correct proletarian stand of lining up with the anti-Fascist camp which was headed by the USSR, the bulwark of Socialist revolution.

It took that stand because it was a stand of correct proletarian internationalism, a stand in conformity with the interests of the people of India as well as of all other countries.

It enabled the proletariat in every country to join in the common fight not only to smash Fascist-imperialism but also to strengthen the people's democratic forces against Anglo-American imperialism.

In India the parties of the Left, which talked in terms of Socialism and the world working-class movement, betrayed the cause of the world working-class and of Socialism by taking a stand against the anti-Fascist people's war. They trailed behind the bourgeois leaderships of the Congress and the League which were gambling on the Japanese invasion while seeking at the same time a compromise with imperialism. It was the Communist Party alone which stood out boldly for a real proletarian line, a line which was in the interests of the working-class and the toiling millions throughout the world as well as in India itself.

In those days there were many people who foretold the complete collapse of the Communist Party now that it was taking a line which was against the line which the national movement and its leadership were taking.

They were proved false prophets. Fighting against the stream, the Communist Party in those days stood boldly by the people, campaigned against the repression launched by imperialism against the national movement, rallied the peasant masses to campaign against famine, to fight the blackmarkets. It stood by the working-class and the toiling masses in those difficult days of war.

Thus it was that despite slander and opposition from the Right and Left leaders of the national movement, the Communist Party, though it lost some of its masses, grew in strength in the country as a whole. Its membership rose from 10,000 to 50,000, its organised strength among the working-class, peasants and the students increased in the same measure.

After the end of the war the bourgeois leadership of the Congress sought to turn the people against the Communists. "We made the August revolution while the Communist Party

was on the other side"—this was the keynote of the slander campaign which the Congress leaders ran against the Communists, inciting and provoking attacks on the Communist Party offices and presses and even against individual members of the Party.

But the real face of the national leadership was unmasked when the post-war revolutionary upsurge broke out towards the end of 1945. Terrified by the rising tempo of the revolutionary activity of the masses, the leaderships of the Congress and the League took the path of compromise and collaboration with imperialism.

While the Communist Party was participating in the heroic struggles in connection with the release of the INA prisoners and later on fully supported the great revolts of the Royal Indian Navy and the armed forces, the Congress leaders were denouncing the fighting masses as goondas and turning their backs on the struggle of the masses.

While the Communist Party was forging in these as well as the rising struggles of the peasants and workers, unity and solidarity of Hindus and Muslims, Touchable and Untouchable toiling people, the Congress and the League leaderships were pursuing the path of compromise with imperialism and of disruption of people's struggles, a path which led to communal carnage of an unprecedented magnitude and which ultimately culminated in the partition of the country, enabling imperialism to exploit this division to disrupt the struggle of the common people for a democratic revolution and real independence.

Since the very beginning of the post-war revolutionary upsurge, the Communist Party has been participating in and leading the battles of the masses.

It was the Communists who led the wave of protest strikes which greeted the glorious revolt of the RIN ratings against imperialist arrogance and oppression.

It was the Communist Party which led the big strike struggles both in the railways and the textile industry which broke out in the years 1946 and 1947.

TEBHAGA STRUGGLE

In these very years the Communist Party led the great struggle of lakhs of Bengali peasants for Tebhaga which spread over more than eleven districts of Bengal.

The Party also led the the great struggle of a lakh of Warli peasants against serfdom and is today leading the magnificent partisan warfare of the peasants of Telengana against the Nizam's autocracy.

While the bourgeois leaderships of the Congress and the League, pursuing the policy of collaboration with imperialism and of rivalry and competition against each other, with the aim of grabbing markets and a share of State

power, created conditions that led to the most ghastly communal riots that India had ever seen and while even some leaders of the Left parties too were swept into this communal frenzy, it was the Communist Party alone which stood firm by the principles of proletarian unity, by the cause of the solidarity of the toiling and common people in the struggle against exploitation.

In the riots of 1946 and 1947 it was the Communist Party which came forward boldly denouncing imperialism as the arch-incendiary of riots.

It was the Communist Party which nailed down the main responsibility of the compromising and riot-mongering policy of the Congress and the League leaderships for these riots and strove hard, despite difficulties, to maintain the unity of Hindu and Muslim toiling people.

In 1946, it was the Communists who created Hasanabad, the flaming example of Hindu-Muslim unity right in the midst of the riot-inflamed countryside of Bengal.

In 1947, in the midst of the post-partition riots in the Punjab, it was the Communist Party members who displayed rare heroism in facing death in their efforts to save members of the minority community from the hands of the murderous riot mobs.

In Calcutta and Delhi it was the Communists who were in the forefront of the heroic demonstrations which were organised to fight back the riots.

As the spearhead and the leader of the principal struggles of the masses, of workers, peasants and students, it was the Communist Party of India which became the main target of repression at the hands of the Congress Ministries in the years 1946-47.

Communist workers and rank-and-file members have been shot dead by policemen, as at Amalner and at Golden Rock; their following has been harassed and tortured, as in Malabar at the hands of the Malabar Special Police; their workers have been set upon and murdered by goondas, as in Coimbatore; their following has been put in jail in thousands, as in the Tebhaga battle. But the Communists and the masses led by the Communist Party have not faltered or wavered in the face of the heaviest repression.

They have fought back repression in the spirit of the martyrs of Amalner and Golden Rock, in the spirit of the students who defied the ban on their Conference in Bombay.

Repression has not crushed the Communists; on the contrary, the unflinching fight of the Communists against repression is rousing the anger of the common people against repression by the so-called popular Ministries and is leading more and more to the isolation of these Ministries.

Thus through the years of the post-war struggle, the Communist Party has emerged all the stronger, breaking down the walls of slander and provocation, leading mass

struggles, fighting back riots, and advancing forward despite the repression of popular Ministries.

Though the Party was leading these battles, still it continued to vacillate in its policy and line. It had not made a completely new evaluation of the forces in the post-war period, of the role of the national bourgeoisie, of the new tactics of imperialism, and of the strength of the popular forces.

By August 1946, the Party came to a correct understanding of the new upsurge, began to lead mass struggles decisively and had also evolved correct political slogans. It is especially after the August Resolution that the Party led the great working-class and peasant battles of the recent past.

But failing to understand the treacherous role of the national leadership, the Party was again derailed into reformism, especially because of a strong reformist trend of certain members of the Central Committee.

The vacillations of the Party culminated a year later in the Mountbatten Resolution, which looked upon the Mountbatten Award as an advance, instead of a new offensive of imperialism; which considered the National Government as a strategic weapon of advancing towards national freedom, instead of as a Government of compromise and surrender.

This led the Party to come out with slogans like "All support to Nehru Government", when that Government was attacking the masses and betraying the cause of Indian freedom. It made the Party come out with the opportunist slogan of a united front between the Government and the people, when the Government was suppressing the people in the interests of Big Business.

This developed illusions about national reconstruction—and cooperation for it with the Government of the national bourgeoisie, when the latter was daily attacking the living standards of the workers.

With this outlook the Party got completely confounded and confused by the wave of riots and mass massacres following partition and began to trail completely behind Nehru and Gandhi.

In short, the Mountbatten Resolution tied the Party to the treacherous policies of the bourgeoisie.

BREAK WITH REFORMISM

In December 1947, the Central Committee of the Communist Party met and reviewed the whole situation. It adopted a Statement of Policy and a document formulating the policy of revolutionary defence against the collaborationist policy of the bourgeois leadership, of consolidating the struggle of the masses for building the Democratic Front for the

achievement of democratic revolution and a people's government.

The December meeting made a break with the reformist understanding of the previous resolution; correctly characterising the National Government as a government of collaboration and surrender, it raised the question of political power and called on the working-class to rebuild people's unity through a Democratic Front—so that power is really secured by the toiling millions.

It shed all illusions about the national bourgeoisie and declared that the national bourgeoisie had ceased to play an oppositional role, and that the Congress High Command which represented it had gone over to the camp of imperialism.

On the basis of this it declared that there should be no illusion that the Congress as an organisation would be in the Democratic Front, and that the struggle for real freedom and democracy would have to be waged in opposition to the collaborationist policy of the Congress leadership.

The Central Committee appointed a Drafting Commission to prepare a Draft Political Thesis on the basis of these documents to be placed before the Second Party Congress. In the meanwhile the Statement of Policy and the document adopted by the Central Committee were issued to the entire Party ranks as a basis for discussing the general line of the Party in the Provincial Conferences and in their units.

For two months, January and February, the entire Party ranks were eagerly discussing these documents, self-critically reviewing their own past work and the work of their higher Committees. The delegates to the Congress were in the majority of cases elected in Provincial Conferences in which discussions had taken place over these documents.

The delegates who came to the Congress were mostly mass leaders who had their finger tips on the pulse of the rising struggle of the masses. They knew what the hesitations and vacillations of the foregoing period had meant for their work among the masses. They came to the Congress with the firm determination to end the vacillations and mistakes of the past and to make a collective effort to evolve a correct revolutionary line.

Their own experience of mass struggles, of the deepening crisis on every front, of the growing disillusionment of the masses with the policies of the Congress leadership had made them impatient of vacillations and hesitations and vigilant of mistakes.

Report on Political Thesis

THERE were three main reports delivered at the Congress on behalf of the Central Committee.

The first was a report on the Draft Political Thesis by Com. B. T. Ranadive.

The second was a report on Pakistan presented by Com. Bhowani Sen in connection with the resolution to restrict the organisation of the Communist Party to the boundaries of the Indian Union, leaving the Communist Party organisations in the territories separated and reconstituted as Pakistan State free to organise a separate Communist Party.

The third report presented by Com. B. T. Ranadive was a self-critical review of the policies of the Party during the last five years.

These reports were presented before the Congress one after another, and the discussion on them started only after all of them had already been placed before the delegates. About 100 delegates participated in the discussion, which was keen and lively and contributed greatly to forging a united understanding and towards improving the Draft placed before the Congress.

In his opening report on the Draft Political Thesis, Com. Ranadive pointedly dealt with those key issues over which the Thesis was making a sharp break with the old understanding.

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Dealing with the salient features of the new international situation, Com. Ranadive pointed out that there was no Chinese Wall between the international situation and our national situation. Many of our mistakes in the past had arisen from an incorrect understanding of the new world situation which had come into existence after the end of the anti-Fascist war. They had arisen because we had failed to understand the significance of the new features of the present international situation for our national movement.

Communists were the first to say that as a result of the military defeat of the Fascist-imperialists, the forces of world imperialism would be weakened immensely and the forces of the working-class and the people fighting for democracy and Socialism would emerge stronger.

With the end of the war the correlation of forces between the world of Socialism and the world of capitalism has changed. The balance has shifted in favour of the world of Socialism and against the world of capitalism. This changed correlation of forces naturally found expression in the tremendous strengthening of the forces of Socialism and democracy.

"The Soviet Union emerges as a strong power, a strong State and a strong economic unit", declared Comrade Ranadive. "Along with that, the Eastern European countries have broken out of the imperialist orbit and are marching towards Socialism.

"In the great continent of Asia, the Chinese Liberation Army is marching ahead victoriously, and throughout the colonies, colonial revolts are developing rapidly.

"In the Central and Eastern European countries, the Communist Parties, which were once hunted parties, have come to the forefront as the biggest parties, showing the maturity of the working-class, in the struggle against reaction and for a People's Democracy and for Socialism."

This changed correlation of forces expressed itself also in the weakness of world imperialism. It is seen in the desperate efforts the Anglo-American imperialists are making to save the capitalist social order from its impending doom.

It is seen in the desperate offensive which the Anglo-American imperialists have launched to rally together all reactionary forces in every country, to stop the onrushing tide of social revolution, to prepare the ground to unleash a new world war for domination over all peoples and for the destruction of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

This new correlation of forces is expressing itself in the aggravated crisis of the colonial system; it is expressing itself in the rise of powerful movements of national and social liberation in the colonies and dependencies of imperialism.

TWO CAMPS

In every country, including the colonies, the bourgeoisie and their servitors; the Social Democrats, menaced by the revolution, are lining up with the Anglo-American imperialists in their fight against the forces of democracy and Socialism. In every country, including the colonies, the bourgeoisie and its henchmen are taking the position of subservience to the Anglo-American imperialist masters and against the interests of national independence and democracy of their own countries.

This new correlation of forces expresses itself in the formation of two camps, which face each other in irreconcilable conflict—the camp of Anglo-American imperialism and their reactionary allies, and the camp of all the peoples, fighting for their national independence and democracy, led by the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

It is this situation, this changed correlation of forces, in which the bourgeoisie in each country is openly joining the camp of reaction and imperialism, and openly betraying the cause of national independence and democracy

of its own country and people, which places upon the proletariat in each country the responsibility to come forward as the most resolute champion of the fight for national independence and People's Democracy.

It is this situation, this changed correlation of forces, in which the bourgeoisie of all countries is lining up under the leadership of Anglo-American imperialism in its drive for world domination and for the unleashing of a new world war, which places upon the proletariat of all countries the historic responsibility of building a solid front to consolidate the camp of anti-imperialism, democracy and Socialism and to hurl back the offensive of reaction and imperialism.

Defining the fight for a People's Democracy, Com. Ranadive made points which can be summarised in the following manner:

The struggle for People's Democracy is a democratic fight of the millions, the masses of workers, peasants and the toiling intelligentsia against reaction, against imperialism, a fight which does not remain confined to what is commonly known as bourgeois democracy, but gets intertwined with the fight for Socialism.

People's Democracy represents the changed correlation of forces in every country where conditions are mature for the isolation of the collaborating bourgeoisie in such a way that the struggle for democracy and the struggle for Socialism get intertwined in a single revolutionary struggle.

People's Democracy represents a new kind of State, based on the alliance of workers, peasants and progressive intelligentsia, under the leadership of the proletariat. It goes ahead to smash landlordism and the power of capital, so that the conditions are created not only for the flowering of real democracy, but also for the building of Socialism.

People's Democracy is really the fight for rallying the majority of the people against capitalism, against the rule of reaction, and for the freedom of every country.

This is the revolutionary meaning of the struggle for People's Democracy, in the course of which the bourgeoisie all over the world finds it more and more difficult to gather any appreciable mass force behind it, because in the course of the deepening crisis of capitalism, it exposes itself more and more nakedly before the common toiling millions as the ally of Anglo-American imperialism.

The fight for People's Democracy in every country must, therefore, be conducted also against its own collaborating bourgeoisie.

It is a part of the world-wide fight of the world proletariat and the camp of anti-imperialism, democracy, peace and Socialism against the menace of Anglo-American imperialism trying to dominate the world and to unleash a new world war.

It is necessary to understand the salient features of the new world situation:

1 As against the apparent strength of the Anglo-American imperialist colossus which is seeking to bolster up reaction in every country, it is necessary to realise that the strength of the camp of anti-imperialism, democracy and Socialism is far greater.

That strength is expressed in the increased might of the Socialist Soviet Union, in the stability and strength of the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe, which are advancing firmly towards Socialism; it is expressed in the giant victorious strides with which the Liberation Army of the Chinese people is marching forward towards creating a real People's Democracy for the whole of China and thus opening a new and big breach in the wall of world imperialism.

It is expressed in the new revolutionary movements which are growing in the colonies like India and Burma, Indonesia and Viet Nam—movements led by the proletariat, which are challenging the efforts to perpetuate their colonial status and the basis for imperialist-bourgeois collaboration.

There is not the slightest doubt that it is these forces of anti-imperialism, democracy and Socialism which are today potentially stronger than the might of Anglo-American imperialism, which is being corroded from within by the deepening crisis of capitalism.

2 In every country the bourgeoisie and its henchmen have gone over to the camp of Anglo-American imperialism. This creates conditions for unmasking them before the people as enemies of national independence and democracy; it creates conditions for the proletariat to emerge as the champion of the fight for national independence and People's Democracy.

In every country in different degrees, conditions are maturing for the proletariat to come forward and lead the fight for People's Democracy, for the power of the working-class, in alliance with the other exploited classes, for the transition towards Socialism.

If we get this understanding, then we will realise that what is happening in our country is an integral part of what is happening elsewhere, the crack-up of the world imperialist system after the military defeat of Fascism, a crack-up of its economic system, which throws new and additional burdens on the shoulders of the masses and makes them more and more angry against the existing system, and thus creates conditions for the waging of a victorious fight for People's Democracy and Socialism.

In the context of this understanding of the world situation and the position of the world bourgeoisie, Comrade Ranadive referred to the fact that the past resolutions of the Central Committee of our Party had not correctly placed

the compromising and collaborationist role of the national bourgeois leadership.

Referring to the Resolution of the Central Committee on the Mountbatten Award, he said that though the resolution referred to the compromising role of the bourgeoisie, it did not nail down the compromising role of Nehru and Patel and therefore did not place before us the task of fighting and isolating their collaborationist policies. He pointed out that even in the Resolution of the Central Committee of August 1946 this fact was absent.

BASIS OF COLLABORATION

He stated that these resolutions had not sufficiently stressed the compromising and collaborationist role of the national bourgeoisie and the national leadership and had not emphasised the fact that both had crossed over to the camp of imperialism. This fact, he said, would be found clearly and sharply nailed down in the present Draft Thesis.

He pointed out that we missed this big fact, which in its turn led to a series of reformist deviations, because of our failure to study the economic changes that had taken place in India during the course of the war.

"One of the basic things", he pointed out, "which happened in the course of the war and which has a profound bearing on the collaborationist role of the bourgeoisie, is that the process of war enriched the bourgeoisie, and there was a tremendous accumulation of capital in their hands for which they hoped to find an outlet through building industries, especially in collaboration with American imperialism.

"The economic basis of collaboration was laid through inflation, through fleecing of the people, through profiteering and blackmarketing, which led to the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and to the intensification of poverty, starvation and misery among the common people, on the other" (Bengal famine).

Referring to the great post-war revolutionary upsurge, which also arose out of the deepening economic crisis as a result of the intensified exploitation of the war period, Comrade Ranadive pointed out:

"The bourgeoisie recognised the significance of the new upsurge and the danger that it represented to its own position and therefore turned its face decidedly against the upsurge and began calling the fighting people **goondas**. It was this fear of the rising upsurge also that turned the bourgeoisie towards collaboration."

Proceeding further, Comrade Ranadive pointed out that we missed the significant fact that the great driving force behind the revolutionary upsurge of the masses was the deepening crisis of the colonial system.

CENTRAL SLOGAN

"We did not make a correct analysis of the economic crisis, did not make every Party Member, every Provincial Committee Member, every Central Committee Member, understand that we were and are living in the midst of an economic crisis of gigantic magnitude. Instead of this, we accepted a large number of economic formulations made by bourgeois economists, and more and more forgot that the only solution of the crisis was through a change of the social order brought about by the fighting masses.

"It is because we missed all these that we are today putting the entire analysis of the crisis before the Congress, because it is necessary to understand once again that ours is a colonial agrarian country and the crisis cannot be solved without an agrarian revolution."

Explaining the real nature of the deepening economic crisis and the way in which the capitalists and the Congress leadership are seeking to solve it at the expense of the people, Comrade Ranadive said:

"There is no doubt that production is declining, but it is because the capitalists seek to retain high profits and high prices. In spite of the decline in production we will soon find that there are too many goods in the market; because the prices quoted are so high that they are beyond the reach of the ordinary man. In this sense this shortage of goods is only the reverse side of the process of impoverishment, of the one-sided distribution of national income.

"The capitalists seek to propagate that the workers are responsible for this shortage of goods; and they demand stern action against them. At the same time, finding that they cannot continue to sell for long at the present prices and at the same time determined to keep their profits high, they demand reduction in labour costs—wage-reduction, etc.

"The cry of shortage of goods is only a preparatory cry to pass on the burdens of the crisis to the workers and the people; and one which conceals that the decline in production is brought about by the selfish struggle to maintain high profits—that it is part of the capitalist crisis itself."

Sharply negating the formulations made about the National Government in the former Central Committee resolution, he said:

"We characterise here the National Government as a government of national surrender, of collaborators, a government of compromise. Thus in place of our former wrong characterisation about the Government as one of national advance with which we should have a joint front, we have now the characterisation that it is a government of national surrender and collaboration.

"The conclusion that follows from this is that the basic policy of the working-class and its Party must be one of opposition to this Government, and this is what is sharply underlined in this Thesis. We must, therefore, consistently and continuously unmask before the masses the compromising and collaborating face of this Government.

"Our first task today must be to run an unceasing campaign to win the majority of the masses to our side; and it is this alone that will enable us to achieve our objective of replacing the present collaborationist Government by a Government representing the workers, peasants and other sections of the petty bourgeoisie. This forms the central slogan of our programme of the Democratic Front."

Referring to other illusions and to halfway-house solutions, Comrade Ranadive said:

"There are some who still have illusions that if any Left party joins this Government, it will be a progressive act; we must, however, declare that no honest party can participate in this collaborationist Government. Any Left party that enters this Government will be committing an act of treachery towards the toiling masses."

Explaining the slogan of the People's Democratic Front, he said that it was an alliance of the working-class, the peasantry, the oppressed middle-class and the intelligentsia.

"We visualise", he continued, "that as the Front grows, we can marshal all people around the slogan of the democratic revolution, disillusion them about the present Government and develop sufficient sanction behind the demand for a People's Democratic State. The central question is the question of power and we have answered that question by declaring that the working-class will demand a People's Democratic State."

Outlining the tasks of partial struggles on the various fronts, Comrade Ranadive sharply polemised against the old outlook of looking at partial struggles only as partial struggles for partial gains.

He pointed out that the imperialist-feudal-bourgeois order in India was collapsing and that the collaborationist bourgeoisie, despite its frantic efforts to sustain it and prop it up, will not be in a position to prevent it from collapsing and to rebuild it.

On the contrary, the policies which the Congress leadership and the Government are following, the policy of proping up landlordism in a new way instead of abolishing it altogether, the policy of screening and protecting the feudal autocrats behind the veil of accession and mergers, the policy of aiding Big Business to act as tools of Anglo-American imperialists to place the ever-growing burdens on the heads of the workers and the common people—all these policies can only result in the further deepening of the crisis

and transferring this burden on to the shoulders of the masses.

Hence it is necessary to realise that the period that has opened is not one of stable bourgeois development, despite the rosy pictures of national reconstruction which the hypocritical bards of the national bourgeoisie continue to sing. It is one of deepening crisis, of the disintegration of the imperialist-feudal order.

DEMOCRATIC FRONT

It is a period in which the central slogans of democratic revolution, namely, the abolition of landlordism without compensation and land to the tiller, nationalisation of industries, breaking the power of Big Business and workers' control, smashing the power of feudal autocracy, of jagirdars, Nawabs, Princelings, big and small, all these are on the immediate order of the day.

These slogans are realisable today and it is necessary that every partial struggle, whether it is of the workers or of the kisans or of the States peoples against autocracy, has to be fought in the context of the immediate realisation of these slogans.

It is necessary to popularise in every partial struggle the central and basic slogans. The toiling masses should be inspired to advance towards the realisation of a People's Democratic State based on the power of the working-class allied with other oppressed classes.

On the issue of the States, Comrade Ranadive pointed out that it was necessary to make a complete break with the old conception of fighting for Responsible Government only, of considering accession, mergers and the like as progressive steps towards the elimination of feudal autocracy.

"On the question of the States", he pointed out, "we must take a correct stand of fighting for complete democracy, for the immediate final liquidation of the feudal order. We must not mislead the people by creating illusions about accession and about the mergers of various small States into a single State or of certain other small States into neighbouring Provinces.

"We must clearly point out that all these are merely clever devices to protect and retain the feudal order. In fact, all these devices are an expression of the collaborationist alliance that is being forged between the Congress leadership and the Congress Governments on the one hand and the feudal autocrats on the other, an unholy alliance in the face of the rising tide of the struggle of the States peoples for the complete liquidation of feudal autocracy.

"We must realise that the revolutionary struggle of the States peoples today has to be carried on against the line-up between the Indian Union Government, manned by the

Congress leaders, and the autocratic rulers and the compromising Praja Mandal leaders. This fight will have to be led by the working-class and its Party."

Concluding his report, Comrade Ranadive said:

"Let us not forget that despite our mistakes we have great achievements to our credit. In the war as well as in the post-war period our Party has grown as no other Party, though had it not been for its mistakes, it would have developed even ten times stronger.

"Masses of people have fought for their demands, have fought glorious battles under the leadership of the Party. Our Party had the privilege of leading the biggest battles. Our Party was at the head of the students' struggles. Everywhere people say that the one Party which leads the battles of the masses is the Communist Party.

"Telengana is another big landmark in the history of struggles led under the leadership of our Party. Here we took the struggle to new qualitative heights with exemplary organisation. Circles close to the Nizam tremble before the name of Telengana. For Telengana today means Communists and Communists mean Telengana.

"No Party in India can claim to have led so many battles in the post-war period as we have led.

"No Party in India has to its credit struggles like that in Travancore, the glorious battle of Vayalar, the strike struggles of Coimbatore, Kanpur and Amalner, and lastly the agrarian struggle of Telengana.

"In the recent past our leadership hesitated and vacillated. But the masses under our leadership have fought continuously and that has raised the prestige of our Party.

"Remember that we are a force that is feared by the existing ruling class. The fear is real because we lead the majority of the organised working-class, the majority of the organised peasantry, the organised students. We are a force and we should not underestimate ourselves. If in the past two years, in spite of these mistakes we achieved all this, then without these mistakes we must go forward today ten times more swiftly than ever before in the history of our Party and our people."

Report on Pakistan

THE next important report was made by Com. Bhowani Sen on Pakistan. It was in the context of the question which had arisen because of the partition of the country and the separation of the territories of Pakistan and their incorporation into a new State.

The question of confining the organisations of the Communist Party of India to the boundaries of the Indian Union and leaving the Communist Party units in the separated

territories of Pakistan free to form a separate Communist Party was before the Congress for decision.

Com. Bhowani Sen's report placed this question in the correct perspective, emphasising the fundamental unity of the Communist movement throughout India.

At the outset, Com. Bhowani Sen raised the question of two opinions or trends in relation to the Indian Union and Pakistan: one opinion or trend considered the Indian Union to be progressive, while in contrast it considered Pakistan to be reactionary; while another opinion or trend considered Pakistan at least an advance towards Muslim freedom from Hindu domination. Com. Bhowani Sen emphasised that we must make a fundamental departure from the old outlook and resolve this controversy in a scientific manner.

Both the Indian Union and Pakistan, he declared, were dominated by reactionary capitalists and landlords, collaborating with imperialism. It was as wrong to think that the Indian Union was progressive as to assert that Pakistan was an advance towards the so-called Muslim freedom from Hindu domination.

In reality there was no such thing as Muslim freedom; neither was there any such thing as Hindu domination. Did the Hindu worker oppress the Muslim worker? Did the Hindu peasant dominate over the Muslim peasant? On the contrary, they were one and all oppressed by the same people, imperialists and their landlord-capitalist allies.

The Muslim League propagated the false theory of Hindu domination in order to conceal the real character, real purpose and real motive for partition, which was one of consolidating and safeguarding Muslim vested interests against the richer and more powerful Hindu competitors. They diverted the genuine indignation of the oppressed Muslim masses against imperialism and the vested interests into communal channels and thus played the game of imperialism which wanted to partition the country and keep both Muslims and Hindus enslaved.

From this central point, Com. Bhowani Sen emphasised the fundamental unity of the Communist movements both in India and Pakistan; they are faced with the same task of radically changing the existing order and building up really free independent people's democratic States in their respective countries.

From this it follows that henceforth the most important task that is before the Party is the unity of the democratic movements in Pakistan as well as in the Indian Union. It is this unity which guarantees the liquidation of the existing order in a revolutionary manner.

In the course of his report, Com. Bhowani Sen raised and answered three questions:

(1) What factors led to the formation of Pakistan?

(2) What is the character of the Pakistan State and the Pakistan Government?

(3) What is the future of Pakistan?

Referring to the future of Pakistan, he pointed out that imperialism had not quit Pakistan, nor had anything like Muslim freedom or any freedom whatsoever been established there. Imperialism is very much present in Pakistan; its representatives are the real men who rule behind the scene.

He exposed the hollowness of the rumour which is being spread by Congressmen in the Indian Union that Pakistan is going to collapse because of its economic weakness. Imperialism has not created Pakistan so that it may collapse. Out of these economic difficulties what is coming is not the automatic collapse of Pakistan but the further strengthening of the imperialist-landlord-bourgeois ruling clique. There is already talk of a military pact being under preparation and Mr. Jinnah has openly declared that Pakistan will remain within the British Commonwealth.

FUTURE OF PAKISTAN

Com. Bhowani Sen pointed out that unless the people in Pakistan stand up and fight the policies of the Government and of the League leadership, unmask and defeat them, their freedom cannot be realised. The future of Pakistan will be determined by the democratic movement of the people, and the unity of the two democratic movements of India and Pakistan will together free both India and Pakistan from imperialist bondage.

Polemising against the theory of automatic collapse of Pakistan, Com. Bhowani Sen said that we must take a bold stand against this sort of demagoguery and expose the policy of the Congress leadership, who is putting across this propaganda in order to befool the Indian people and keep them in permanent conflict and hostility with the people of Pakistan.

Answering the three questions, Com. Bhowani Sen proceeded to show how imperialism was creating and maintaining a permanent state of war between India and Pakistan. He pointed out that for the purpose of maintaining strained relations between the two Dominions, imperialism uses all its agents, spreads lies, both among Hindus and Muslims, to ensure permanent hostility between these two, so that it may be able to strengthen its domination and its authority.

"Thus lies have been multiplied like inflation of money. When there is inflation of money, the value of the coin decreases. In the same way the effectiveness of these lies decreases."

Com. Bhowani Sen referred to the question of Kashmir

imperialism was utilising it to create an open
between the two Dominions.
pointedly referred to the mistake committed by the
in connection with Kashmir. He exposed how we
made the people believe that the march of the Indian army
into Kashmir was the march of the democratic forces for
the purpose of freeing the Muslim peasant from the raiders.
But what has been the result?

The result was that after such a long period of warfare,
Kashmir did not become free but was going to be under
Anglo-American domination.

This mistake, Com. Bhowani Sen pointed out, arose be-
cause we thought the Indian Union to be progressive and
Pakistan reactionary. Out of this followed the logical con-
clusion that since the Indian Union is progressive, accession
to the Indian Union is a progressive step.

But what has happened? Princedom remains, landlords
are still there, and it is the army of the Indian Union which
dominates over the toiling people of Kashmir. Therefore,
we have to understand this question of accession and look
at it from a new angle.

In fact this posing of the question as one of accession
or no accession is the weapon by which reaction seeks to
divert the popular energy from the revolutionary direction.

"We must not enter this trap," said Com. Bhowani Sen,
"and for us there is no question of accession. Such acces-
sion will only lead to the forging of an alliance between the
Government of the Indian Union or of Pakistan with
Princely autocracy.

"There can be no question of accession before the
complete victorious democratic revolution has been achieved,
before the toiling peasants have got land, before Princely
autocracy is really liquidated and power has passed into the
hands of the masses. It is after all this that the victorious
people of the States will decide their relations to the Indian
Union or Pakistan."

"The real way out", said Com. Bhowani Sen, "is the way
of the heroic people of Telengana. The real solution to this
question is on the field of battle. The heroic people of
Telengana, the great example of their fight against auto-
cracy, not only show what will happen inside the States,
but also what will be the real future of India and Pakis-
tan. That is the way the victorious people must march
to freedom and real democracy.

"Therefore, we must respect this battle, this struggle
inside Hyderabad, of the people of Hyderabad, as a struggle
of a new type. We must be proud to say that here at least
there is the force that will achieve Indian liberation.

"Kashmir has gone to UNO. And the fate of Kashmir
lies at the feet of imperialism. But something else is hap-
pening in Hyderabad. The difference between Hyderabad

and Kashmir is the difference between our old understand-
ing and our new understanding."

Emphasising the point further to the loud acclamation
of the delegates, Com. Bhowani Sen said:

"In Hyderabad, in 2,000 villages the writ of the Nizam's
administration has ceased to run, people's volunteers defend
people's rule. In 2,000 villages People's Democracy has been
established. This is the difference between Kashmir and
Hyderabad.

"The question is whether the people will go the Hydera-
bad way or the Kashmir way; and our duty is to make the
people go the Hyderabad way. If we can create this spirit
of revolution among the masses, among the toiling people,
we shall find reaction collapsing like a house of cards."

In the latter part of his report, Com. Bhowani Sen out-
lined the programme and tasks of the Democratic Front
in Pakistan and showed how they were exactly similar to
those of the Democratic Front in India, thus once again
emphasising the fundamental unity and solidarity of the
movement for independence and People's Democracy in both
the States.

Report on Reformist Deviation

THE next important report placed before the Congress
was the one on reformist deviation, introduced by Com.
B. T. Ranadive. The delegates who had come with the
firm determination to forge a new revolutionary line also
wanted to be clear about the mistakes of their own as well
as of the leadership, for without a clear understanding of
the past mistakes there could be no firm understanding of
the new revolutionary line, nor could there be any guaran-
tee against future mistakes.

Comrade Ranadive's speech on this report was a sharp
and clear exposition of the reformist deviations and vacil-
lations displayed by the old Central Committee in the exe-
cution of the otherwise correct line pursued by the Party.
The review generally covered the period between the two
Congresses of the Party.

In regard to the line adopted by the Party in the period
of the anti-Fascist people's war, Comrade Ranadive empha-
sised its fundamental correctness and the achievements
which the Party had been able to make because it adopted
fundamentally correct proletarian slogans in that period.

He pointed out that if the Communist Party had followed
in the wake of other bourgeois parties and had gone in for
a full-scale opposition to the anti-Fascist people's war, with
all its organised strength among the working-class and the
peasantry, it would have spelt a veritable disaster for the
whole country.

and how imperialism was utilising it to create an open clash between the two Dominions.

He pointedly referred to the mistake committed by the Party in connection with Kashmir. He exposed how we made the people believe that the march of the Indian army into Kashmir was the march of the democratic forces for the purpose of freeing the Muslim peasant from the raiders. But what has been the result?

The result was that after such a long period of warfare, Kashmir did not become free but was going to be under Anglo-American domination.

This mistake, Com. Bhowani Sen pointed out, arose because we thought the Indian Union to be progressive and Pakistan reactionary. Out of this followed the logical conclusion that since the Indian Union is progressive, accession to the Indian Union is a progressive step.

But what has happened? Princedom remains, landlords are still there, and it is the army of the Indian Union which dominates over the toiling people of Kashmir. Therefore, we have to understand this question of accession and look at it from a new angle.

In fact this posing of the question as one of accession or no accession is the weapon by which reaction seeks to divert the popular energy from the revolutionary direction.

"We must not enter this trap," said Com. Bhowani Sen, "and for us there is no question of accession. Such accession will only lead to the forging of an alliance between the Government of the Indian Union or of Pakistan with Princely autocracy.

"There can be no question of accession before the complete victorious democratic revolution has been achieved, before the toiling peasants have got land, before Princely autocracy is really liquidated and power has passed into the hands of the masses. It is after all this that the victorious people of the States will decide their relations to the Indian Union or Pakistan."

"The real way out", said Com. Bhowani Sen, "is the way of the heroic people of Telengana. The real solution to this question is on the field of battle. The heroic people of Telengana, the great example of their fight against autocracy, not only show what will happen inside the States, but also what will be the real future of India and Pakistan. That is the way the victorious people must march to freedom and real democracy.

"Therefore, we must respect this battle, this struggle inside Hyderabad, of the people of Hyderabad, as a struggle of a new type. We must be proud to say that here at least there is the force that will achieve Indian liberation.

"Kashmir has gone to UNO. And the fate of Kashmir lies at the feet of imperialism. But something else is happening in Hyderabad. The difference between Hyderabad

and Kashmir is the difference between our old understanding and our new understanding."

Emphasising the point further to the loud acclamation of the delegates, Com. Bhowani Sen said:

"In Hyderabad, in 2,000 villages the writ of the Nizam's administration has ceased to run, people's volunteers defend people's rule. In 2,000 villages People's Democracy has been established. This is the difference between Kashmir and Hyderabad.

"The question is whether the people will go the Hyderabad way or the Kashmir way; and our duty is to make the people go the Hyderabad way. If we can create this spirit of revolution among the masses, among the toiling people, we shall find reaction collapsing like a house of cards."

In the latter part of his report, Com. Bhowani Sen outlined the programme and tasks of the Democratic Front in Pakistan and showed how they were exactly similar to those of the Democratic Front in India, thus once again emphasising the fundamental unity and solidarity of the movement for independence and People's Democracy in both the States.

Report on Reformist Deviation

THE next important report placed before the Congress was the one on reformist deviation, introduced by Com. B. T. Ranadive. The delegates who had come with the firm determination to forge a new revolutionary line also wanted to be clear about the mistakes of their own as well as of the leadership, for without a clear understanding of the past mistakes there could be no firm understanding of the new revolutionary line, nor could there be any guarantee against future mistakes.

Comrade Ranadive's speech on this report was a sharp and clear exposition of the reformist deviations and vacillations displayed by the old Central Committee in the execution of the otherwise correct line pursued by the Party. The review generally covered the period between the two Congresses of the Party.

In regard to the line adopted by the Party in the period of the anti-Fascist people's war, Comrade Ranadive emphasised its fundamental correctness and the achievements which the Party had been able to make because it adopted fundamentally correct proletarian slogans in that period.

He pointed out that if the Communist Party had followed in the wake of other bourgeois parties and had gone in for a full-scale opposition to the anti-Fascist people's war, with all its organised strength among the working-class and the peasantry, it would have spelt a veritable disaster for the whole country.

By holding firm the correct proletarian line the Communist Party not only remained true to the banner of proletarian internationalism, not only strengthened its bases among the workers and peasants, but also saved the country from what could have been a veritable disaster.

The mistakes in that period arose from a wrong understanding that the military defeat of Fascism would automatically lead to the liquidation and elimination of imperialism itself and as such to the automatic liberation of all peoples.

This wrong understanding which was part of the analysis given in "Forward to Freedom," underestimated the intrigues and sabotage that the imperialists were carrying out in the people's camp.

The mistaken theory that imperialism was a prisoner in the people's camp made us forget the fact that imperialism continued to function in India even in the period of the anti-Fascist people's war, strengthening at every step the imperialist-feudal economy and its own role, even at the cost of sabotaging the war against Fascist aggression.

This total underestimation of the role of imperialism in the period of the people's war made us lose sight of the task of exposing imperialism and fighting it within the framework of support for the anti-Fascist war.

For instance, in connection with the food crisis and the Bengal famine we correctly exposed the role of the hoarders and blackmarketeers but forgot to expose the role of imperialism, whose policy of inflation and of bribing the Indian bourgeoisie and of transferring the burden of the war on to the shoulders of the people was actually the root cause of the food crisis as well as the disastrous Bengal famine.

Similarly, while we were quite correct in organising the peasant effort to grow more food, we tended to forget that the main fight against the imperialist-feudal agrarian structure should not be slackened.

Again, we were right in preventing sabotage in production and avoiding strikes as far as it was consistent with the defence of the living conditions of the working-class, but it was necessary for us to see that it was not possible to raise or organise production as long as production remained in the hands of profiteering capitalists and an imperialist Government for whom profits and not interests of the anti-Fascist war constituted the main guiding factor.

It was not only in connection with the attitude to imperialism, it was pointed out, but in connection with the understanding of the day-to-day developments of the war that a number of mistakes were committed. We ignored changes in the military situation developing during the course of war, changes which would have enabled us to adjust our strategy to suit new conditions.

With the battle of Stalingrad, for instance, and the turn in the tide of war, as the defeat of Fascism became

certain, we could have adopted supple tactics in relation to the struggle against imperialism in preparation for the post-war revolutionary upsurge, increasingly marshalling and unleashing the forces of struggle as the war situation improved, applying extreme pressure, both economic and political, and creating a serious situation for imperialism.

We were right in those days in demanding the release of national leaders and raising the slogan of national government for national defence, but in fighting for these slogans we trailed too much behind the national bourgeois leadership, instead of taking an independent proletarian stand. We overrated the supposed anti-Fascism of the bourgeois leadership and did not sufficiently realise and expose their opportunist role and gambling policy in relation to the Japanese invasion.

Thus the two reformist deviations of this period were:
i) that the edge of our fight against imperialism was dulled; and
ii) that we began to trail behind the bourgeoisie instead of exposing it and following an independent policy.

This expressed itself in this that the Left groups and parties which were only carrying out the policy of the opportunist bourgeois leadership, were attacked even more severely by us than the national leadership, calling the Left groups 'fifth column' and agents of the Fascist Powers.

This also expressed itself very sharply on the question of the application of the slogan of self-determination of nationalities to the Hindu-Muslim question.

Undoubtedly the main slogan raised by the Party that the Hindu-Muslim question was the distorted expression of the existence of various nationalities in India was fundamentally sound. We were quite correct when we nailed down the Congress opposition to self-determination of nationalities and we correctly exposed and fought the Congress leadership for its refusal to take its stand on that principle in order to build a joint front against imperialism.

But we did not ask the bourgeois-landlord leadership of the Muslim League as to where it stood in relation to the struggle of the masses against imperialism. On the contrary, we often applied the principle of self-determination in a manner which helped the separatist demand of the Muslim League for Pakistan.

This serious deviation arose mainly because in those days we were trailing behind the bourgeois leadership of both the Congress and the League and had illusions that the unity of the Hindus and Muslims and of the Congress and the League could be achieved by the bourgeois leaderships themselves. It was because of these illusions that we busied ourselves in working out detailed "practical" solutions to suit the separatist demand of the League leadership.

We did not see that the bourgeois leaderships of both the Congress and the League, which were pursuing opportunist and compromising policies vis-a-vis Fascism and imperialism, could not be united for a real anti-Fascist, anti-imperialist stand.

We forgot the fundamental Leninist teaching that the unity of the people of different nationalities, communities, etc., can be achieved only by the proletariat by bringing the toiling and common people of both together in the common fight against imperialism and reaction, only by simultaneously exposing the demand of the dominating and separatist bourgeoisie, only by firmly standing for the right of self-determination of nationalities which could be really implemented by the people in the context of the achievement of democratic revolution.

It was these two reformist deviations of the war period, namely, the underestimation of the role of imperialism, and the trailing behind the bourgeois leaderships and the faith in their anti-Fascist and anti-imperialist bona fides, which were the root cause of the serious reformist deviations which we committed in the post-war period.

The result was that when the war ended we were not quick enough to see the new rising post-war revolutionary upsurge, nor did we see the changed correlation of forces in which imperialism menaced by the rising revolutionary tide began to seek a new social basis in the colonies, namely, the collaborationist bourgeoisie in order to perpetuate its domination over the colonial people.

Instead there was a tendency to fall a prey to reformist theories about peaceful development towards independence and Socialism, and to abjure struggle.

Our ranks began instinctively to lead the upsurge from about the end of 1945, but it was only in July-August 1946 that the Central Committee was able to see the existence of the revolutionary upsurge and work out the main slogans of developing the partial struggles for the achievement of the democratic revolution and for the seizure of power by the people.

The Central Committee resolution of August 1946 was a great turning point. It gave the line clear to our ranks to lead the great strike battles on the railways and the textiles, to head the great struggles of the peasants for Tebhaga in Bengal and similar struggles in U.P. and Bihar which enabled our comrades to unleash revolutionary struggles against the feudal autocracy in Travancore and against the autocracy of the Nizam in Hyderabad.

Though the August Resolution gave our Party a correct line to head the struggles, there were many comrades who thought that it was a Left-sectarian resolution. It is from this time that there came into existence two trends inside the Central Committee. There was a trend inside the Central Committee which thought that the August Reso-

lution was Left-sectarian. In reality the fault of the August Resolution was that it suffered from a Right-reformist deviation; for, though the August Resolution gave a clear call for heading the struggles, though it spoke of the compromising policies of the Congress and League leaderships, it still left plenty of room for illusions about the oppositional role of the national bourgeois leadership.

Its real failing was that it failed to characterise sharply the collaborationist role of the bourgeois leaderships of both Congress and League which had become quite apparent after the formation of the Interim Government, in which both the Congress and the League leaders were participating.

After August 1946 came the bloody riots in Calcutta, Noakhali and Bihar. Towards the end of the year came the repression on the Communist Party in the South; about 100 leading Communists were jailed without trial.

The imperialist-bourgeois combine had opened its offensive against the rising upsurge. In the face of this offensive, those in the Central Committee who had originally opposed the August Resolution as Left-sectarian began now to resile back and turn towards a Right-reformist repudiation of the Resolution.

The formulation that the Interim Government was a government of compromise and surrender was thrown overboard. A sharp criticism of the Congress Ministries which were suppressing the workers' and peasants' struggles as agents of vested interests was condemned as incorrect. They were to be given a clean alibi while only the bureaucracy which was in fact doing their bidding was to be attacked.

The great struggles of the working-class of Travancore which culminated in the heroic resistance of Vayalar and Punnappa battles, the dogged struggle of the textile workers of Coimbatore in the teeth of murderous goonda attacks, the revolt of the Warlis, all these were dubbed as vanguardist actions that had provoked Ministerial and police repression and, therefore, were to be discouraged.

There was a tendency to line up behind the hypocritical bourgeois slogan of national reconstruction and of minimising strikes while ignoring the brutal offensive which the capitalists had opened against the living standards of the working-class. There was even a tendency to think in terms of agreeing to the treacherous slogan of industrial truce.

In the face of the riots of 1946 and 1947 there was a tendency to line up behind Gandhi and Nehru instead of exposing their policy which was itself playing into the hands of the imperialist-feudal riot-mongers and often even directly inciting riots. There was a servile throwing of bouquets to the bourgeois leaders like Gandhi and Nehru in the name of fighting communal reaction.

Such was the backsliding and retreat noticeable within the ranks of the Central Committee which came in the face of the offensive of reaction, namely, communal riots and repression. It was advocated mainly by Com. P. C. Joshi, representing the reformist trend inside the Central Committee. Vacillations and reformism of the majority of the members of the Central Committee reached their culmination in the June meeting of the Central Committee (1947) on the discussions on the Mountbatten Award. Every amendment which sought to put down that the Mountbatten Award was a concession to the national bourgeoisie and that the national bourgeois leadership was striking a deal against the interests of the people was negated or watered down, and it was asserted that the Mountbatten Award was a concession to the national movement and the Indian people. After the defeat of these amendments the resolution was adopted without opposition.

For a time nobody saw the enormity of the reformist deviation involved in that Resolution. To cover up the greatest betrayal of revolution, to screen the treacherous deal it had struck with imperialism, the bourgeois leadership raised the hope of "freedom won" through huge celebrations throughout the country.

We were ourselves taken in by this. When the ghastly post-partition riots began in the Punjab and Delhi, we did not see them as the inevitable nemesis of the treacherous policy of collaboration with imperialism and its feudal allies which the Congress leadership itself was pursuing. Instead of exposing that policy, we lined up behind Gandhi and Nehru and became supporters of the Nehru Government. We built up a theory of differences between Sardar Patel on the one hand and Nehru and Gandhi on the other to justify our uncritical support to Nehru and Gandhi who in fact were pursuing the same policy as Sardar Patel.

We forgot the simple truth that the riot offensive of imperialism and its reactionary allies could not be defeated by lining up behind Gandhi and Nehru and by glorifying their alleged "fight" against communal reaction, but only by defeating the collaborationist policy of the entire bourgeois leadership and the Government.

However, in the months after August 15, the majority of the Central Committee out of their own experience soon began to discover how far they had strayed from the correct revolutionary line which they had themselves begun to shape since August 1946.

In the meeting of the Central Committee which was held in December 1947, the majority of the Committee took a firm stand and adopted the Statement of Policy and the document for the Party Congress on the basis of which the present Draft Political Thesis was framed. Com. Joshi who accepted the Statement of Policy, had not yet made a

complete turn and did not vote in the meeting for the document.

Summing up his report on reformist deviation, Com. Ranadive said:

"Today, Com. Joshi unreservedly accepts the political Thesis, though he will certainly have to struggle very much to make a complete turn. For a time there was a serious situation inside our Party. Reformism had invaded our ranks.

"It would be wrong to think that all mistakes were made by the Central Committee and the Political Bureau alone. There is no doubt that theirs was the main responsibility. But all, including the delegates assembled here, will have to turn the light inwards and self-critically examine their own mistakes and their experience of the struggles.

"It is only through such Bolshevik self-criticism that we can, at this Congress, unify the entire Party behind the revolutionary line that we are formulating here and equip ourselves to advance into the coming battles with bold faith and firm confidence."

Com. Ranadive's report which he took nearly 4½ hours to deliver, was listened to in the midst of pin-drop silence. In the course of his speech he had not only criticised Com. Joshi, but had also nailed down the reformist deviations of every other Political Bureau and Central Committee member, including himself.

Next to speak after Com. Ranadive had finished his report was Com. Joshi himself. He fully supported Com. Ranadive's report. He said that he himself was the leader and organiser of the Right-reformist deviations inside the Party and he was the last among the Central Committee members to accept the political line of the Thesis. He mercilessly criticised his own mistakes and traced their ideological roots to the repudiation of Marxism and Leninism. He was overwhelmed with emotion as he made these points in the course of his one-hour speech.

Discussion on Reports

THE discussions on these reports started only after all the reports were delivered and were notable for the initiative shown by the delegates, who together submitted a large number of amendments to the Draft Thesis directed to strengthening it, and the vigour and firmness with which they expressed their criticisms of the Thesis and of the leadership.

Delegate after delegate came to the microphone and out of his own experience in daily struggle, moved amendments or made suggestions for changes in the Thesis; later, in the discussion on the report on the reformist deviations,

there was the same frank and decisive vigour from numerous delegates explaining how reformist deviation had crept into the Party and the enormous harm it had caused.

In the discussion on the Draft Thesis, particularly important was the sharp controversy on the question of the building of the Democratic Front. A considerable number of delegates declared that the formulations in the Thesis concerning the Democratic Front were confused and capable of misinterpretation.

From Com. Satyapal Dang came a clear-cut speech asserting that in the Thesis the conception of the Democratic Front as a coalition of Left parties still remained and its real character as a "monolithic mass organisation" was not at all emphasised or underlined. He declared that it was very necessary to clear this point for two reasons.

First, to bring out the great responsibility that rests on the shoulders of the Communist Party for building the Democratic Front, and secondly, the need for a very severe struggle against the reactionary agents of the Right in the Left camp before any unity of the Left can be achieved.

From Sunil Mukherjee, Secretary of the Bihar Provincial Committee of the Party, came equally strong criticism of the formulations of the Thesis on this issue; and a number of comrades from different Provinces also participated, supporting the criticisms made.

So also from the floor of the Congress a number of delegates came out in sharp attacks on the weaknesses in the formulation of the concrete tasks and tactics of effecting the agrarian revolution, the main axis of the democratic revolution in our country.

Com. Hanumantha Rao from Andhra, said that we must have a clear-cut analysis of the changes in the agrarian economy during the war years, so that our comrades on the kisan front can understand who will be our allies and who our enemies in the struggle for agrarian revolution.

So also Com. Indradip Sinha from Bihar stressed the need for a more detailed up-to-date analysis of the class set-up in the rural areas: in Bihar, Com. Indradip said, class differentiation of the peasantry during wartime had led to further pauperisation of the middle and poor peasantry and a considerable increase in the number of landless labourers; thus, today about 65 per cent of the rural population possessed less than 15 acres of land while 30 per cent were landless. This indicated that the agrarian revolution must be carried out by these 95 per cent against the remaining 5 per cent.

Indradip stressed finally that the need for the Communists to turn their face more firmly and decisively towards the agricultural proletariat who were the main lever for achieving the agrarian revolution, was absent in the Draft.

Other speakers stressed the insufficient treatment of the problem of the States' people's struggles and the tactics

to be adopted on this front; women delegates so vigorously protested that the problems and tasks of Communists on their front had been totally ignored in the Thesis and this defect must be made up; a similar criticism came from the student delegates.

Right in the middle of this discussion came the strongest criticism of all, from a number of delegates from Telengana, pointing out that the revolutionary significance of the Telengana struggle for the present epoch of maturing democratic revolution in India was absent in the Thesis.

This last criticism was no sooner made than accepted by the Central Committee and a delegate from Telengana was given the opportunity to move a special resolution (published in *People's Age* No. 36-37) on this question; in a stirring speech that evoked thunderous applause, this delegate detailed the mighty struggle being waged there, and appealed to the Congress to understand its historic significance and support it with all their strength and vigour.

The Congress responded to this moving appeal by adopting the resolution standing and amidst resounding cheers.

After 34 delegates had taken part in the discussions, Comrade Ranadive summed up the entire discussion.

Greeting the soundness of the criticisms made by many delegates, he declared in particular that the section on the Democratic Front would have to be changed and strengthened; regarding the criticisms made on the analysis of the agrarian crisis, the States' people's struggles, the tasks on the women's and students' fronts, Com. Ranadive said that all these criticisms would be taken into account when the detailed analysis of the tasks on various fronts was made by the new Central Committee.

He finally asked that the Thesis be adopted by the Congress and the new Central Committee be charged with the task of amending the Thesis for publication in the light of the discussion and the various amendments moved in the Congress. This proposal was accepted unanimously amidst great applause.

There was a discussion on the proposal to confine the Communist Party organisation to the boundaries of the Indian Union and to enable the Party units in the territories now separated as Pakistan to reconstitute themselves into a separate Communist Party organisation. Some comrades opposed the proposal, saying that by allowing a separate Party to be formed in Pakistan, we were tailing behind the separatists and accepting the imperialist partition itself.

In answering the discussion on this question, Comrades Sajjad Zaheer and Ranadive explained why a separate Party was needed just in the interests of building a united Communist movement in both the territories. This would enable us to fight more effectively, to forge the unity of

the Communist movements in both the territories and defeat the disruptors especially in Pakistan.

The Communist Party organisation in Pakistan would be responsible for shaping and formulating the policy and leading the struggle in Pakistan in the same way as the Party organisations in the Indian Union would be responsible for the same task in the Indian Union.

The joint action of the two Parties, the coordination of their tasks in the common struggle against their respective Governments representing the unholy alliance of imperialism, the bourgeoisie and feudal elements, would ensure the fundamental unity of the Communist movement and a victory of the democratic revolution in both the countries.

After this explanation the resolution was put to vote and passed by an overwhelming majority.

After the discussion on the report on reformist deviation was over, the Congress authorised the new Central Committee to draft a complete analysis of the reformist deviation inside the Party since 1939 and circulate it among Party members.

The Congress also adopted the amended constitution of the Party as presented by Com. Adhikari.

In the discussion on the amended draft, the main point discussed was in the preamble. The preamble as it appeared in the draft constitution submitted by the Central Committee, contained no direct reference to the dictatorship of the proletariat. It stated the basic aim of the Party as the "organising of the toiling masses in the struggle for the victorious anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, for complete national independence, for the establishment of a people's democratic State led by the working-class and the building of Socialism according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism."

On this issue there was a lively discussion. On behalf of the Central Committee, it was made clear that a people's democratic State itself meant the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was also stated that in the present phase of the general crisis of capitalism after the Second World War, a people's democratic State represents a specific form of class alliance led by the proletariat and becomes the instrument of completing not only the people's democratic revolution but also of carrying it forward to the achievement of Socialism.

However, several delegates who spoke on the question insisted that the references to the dictatorship of the proletariat must be explicitly there and declared that it was a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism and no ambiguity, no loopholes, for a possible reformist deviation must be left on this point.

Finally, Com. Bhowani Sen moved an amendment which added the words "for the realisation of the dictatorship of

the proletariat" after the words "people's democratic State led by the working-class."

This was accepted by Com. Adhikari and then by the Congress as a whole.

ELECTION OF NEW CENTRAL COMMITTEE

On the concluding day of the Congress, the outgoing Central Committee placed a panel of the new Central Committee before the Congress for adoption. It was an enlarged Central Committee which, while it included the majority of the old Central Committee members, also included nearly an equal number of new Central Committee members drawn from the main leaders of the mass struggles on different fronts from several Provinces. It was a Central Committee truly representative of the great mass struggles that the Party was leading on the various fronts throughout India.

There was a keen discussion from among the delegates on this panel. The delegates wanted to be assured that the new Central Committee would have a firm majority of such comrades who had fought for the new revolutionary line and who would ensure its correct execution in the future. The proposed Central Committee panel also included the name of Com. Joshi.

In the course of the discussion, various amendments were moved to the panel and six more nominations were put up. The whole enlarged panel was then put to vote in order to elect the fixed number for the Central Committee as decided by the Congress.

In the course of this polling the entire panel proposed by the Central Committee, excepting the name of Com. Joshi, was passed. Though Com. Joshi had accepted the political Thesis and expressed his acceptance of it as well as of the report on reformist deviation before the Congress, the voting showed that the Congress was of the opinion that he should not be in the new Central Committee because he had been the last of the old Central Committee members to accept the new line and had resisted it more strongly than anyone else.

Immediately after the election of the new Central Committee, the Committee met during the Congress itself and unanimously elected Com. B. T. Ranadive as General Secretary of the Party. Com. Ranadive's election was then announced to the Congress and greeted with loud applause.

The election of a Control Commission of three comrades, which will be responsible for dealing with all appeals over questions of discipline, and the adoption of the reports of the Credential Commission and the Auditing Commission (which approved the finances of the Party) were then carried unanimously.

The entire Party Congress was keenly followed by a

strong fraternal delegation which had come from the brother Communist Parties of the various countries to specially attend the Congress.

The Second Congress of the Communist Party of India thus marks a great turning point in the history of our Party. It displayed a magnificent and united initiative of the rank-and-file delegates and the leadership of the Party in evolving a revolutionary line, policy and tactics in a period of revolutionary crisis in India.

It has made a decisive break with the reformist deviation of Party policy which continued for five years or more.

As a result of this Congress the Party emerges solidly united behind the new revolutionary line and behind the new leadership, ready to go into action with firm faith in Marxism-Leninism and full confidence in the revolutionary spirit of the masses.

The Party Congress has handled with great firmness and collective wisdom a serious inner-Party crisis. And that this serious inner-Party crisis was solved with such firmness, discipline and united determination did honour to the entire rank-and-file delegates and leadership of the Party, to their loyalty to the principles of Marxism and Leninism, to their loyalty to the principles of the Communist Party organisation and to the cause of the proletarian revolution.

OTHER DOCUMENTS

*Of the 2nd Congress of the Communist Party of
India*

1. TOWARDS THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT TO
WIN REAL INDEPENDENCE AND
PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY: Statement of
Policy—As. 2
2. POLITICAL THESIS
3. CONSTITUTION

The first document is ready, the other two will be ready shortly. All available at the PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE, LTD., Bombay, and at all provincial branches.