

UNITE ON THE BASIS OF LINE AND SPIRIT OF VIJAYAWADA AND MARCH-IN-STEP FORWARD

SOME QUESTIONS OF STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF BUILDING THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC FRONT

The Author points out in one place that "Marxist-Leninists of today are making a realistic appraisal of all the aspects of capitalist development—how it transforms the hitherto underdeveloped countries into developing economies, but how in the process it gives rise to innumerable contradictions, creates untold miseries and rocks the social system with crisis after crisis."

In other words, in the context of the new world situation, in several newly-independent countries, the national bourgeoisie which has come to power is utilising the new opportunities to consolidate national independence, strengthen economic independence, reduce colonial backwardness—through simultaneously developing capitalism; this leads to contradictions inherent in capitalist development—growth of monopoly, impoverishment of the masses, growth of unemployment and also to other conflicts and contradictions because of national bourgeoisie's compromises with imperialism and feudalism.

The author further points out that it was out of such a realistic appraisal that the Moscow Statement of 1960 developed the twin concepts of national democracy and non-capitalist path. In discussing these two concepts and their applicability to the conditions in India in the foregoing pages, we stressed how we have to take note of the dual character of this development and also its direction in order to work out the correct line for building the national democratic front.

Does the author take into account this dual character of the economic development under the national bourgeoisie, when he discusses the public-sector, i.e., the state capitalist sector? We shall examine his critique of the appraisal of the state sector in both the programme drafts.

ROLE OF THE STATE SECTOR

Quoting from the majority draft he concludes that it assesses "state control over economy as a factor directed not only against imperialism and feudalism but against monopoly capital as well." The other draft he says, considers the ruling party and the government themselves represent and serve the monopolists.

He further points out that while the majority draft stresses "the failure of the monopolistic sections to subordinate the state completely to their own interests," it also states in another place that "these monopolistic combines utilise their links with the state apparatus and the bureaucracy... to enhance their economic power, to emplant political reaction into governmental power..." This, he thinks is a contradiction and no effort is made in the draft to reconcile these two positions.

Then he outlines the essential features of the present economic development in the country and quotes figures about the growth of monopoly in the plan period. He says "the growth of monopolies, the impoverishment of the common people, the widening of the disparities between the wealthy and the poor—these are the commonly agreed points in both the drafts."

AUTHOR'S CRITIQUE OF MAJORITY DRAFT

The burden of his critique mainly of the majority draft and also of the other draft is that they over-stress the progressive significance of state sector, forgetting that it is in the main an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie for

building capitalism and for facilitating the growth of monopolies.

He clinches his argument by quoting from the first edition of the *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* where a warning is sounded against such an over-estimation and "against assuming that they will automatically and under all conditions help to strengthen the anti-imperialist forces." He quotes further from the same book:

Should capitalism continue to develop with the concentration of production inherent in it, the state owned sectors may here too become the economic bulwark of a reactionary regime if power gets into the hands of representatives of the biggest, essentially monopolist national companies.

He ends up with the pronouncement—"Failure to take account of such dangerous possibilities inherent in the public sector under a capitalist framework forms fertile soil for revisionism—it amounts to ideological surrender to the national bourgeoisie."

One must surely appreciate the zeal of the author in exposing and condemning the 'revisionism' of the majority draft. However that zeal should not make him read things in the draft which are not there. For instance, the draft has nowhere said that state sector is "a factor directed against monopoly;" nor has it said "that state sector has foiled the 'bid' of the monopolist sections of the bourgeoisie to completely subordinate the state to their narrow class interests." These are unfair summaries of what is actually stated in the programme and which the author himself quotes:

The turn towards industrialisation, the creation of the state sector, certain limitations on the activities of foreign private capital in key branches of industry, measures to channel and control investments of private capital—all these marked a change, signifying the failure of the

bid which monopolistic sections of the bourgeoisie were making to subordinate the newly-won independence and the anti-imperialist, anti-colonial national bourgeois state completely to their own narrow interests and to place the entire economy of the country under their private control. (emphasis added)

This para describes what happened when the government representing the national bourgeoisie as a whole, made a turn to industrialisation, with the formulation of the Second Five-Year Plan, with the decision to build heavy industries in the public sector and with other methods of control over private capital. *All these measures* take together foiled the bid of the monopolists to *completely* subordinate the state to their narrow interests.

STATE SECTOR AND MONOPOLY GROUPS

What was the issue involved? Creation of basic and heavy industries in the state sector as a base for country's industrialisation—this policy was already put forward by the Indian National Congress in its National Planning Commission report by Jawaharlal Nehru and K. T. Shah in 1938. Indian monopolists headed by Tata and Birla had produced another plan in 1944 in which they had argued that the state should leave the main manufacturing industries, including heavy and basic industries, to the private enterprise and concentrate on power, transport, communication and defence industries only. When the First Five-Year Plan was approaching completion and when the Congress government was seeking aid from Western countries to set up iron and steel industry in the public sector they met with a refusal from the imperialists. They were prepared to give aid to set up these industries in the private sector. It is well known that building of heavy and basic industries in the public sector became possible mainly with the aid of the Soviet Union. As our Vijayawada resolution

says, "the public sector has grown despite every effort by imperialist and certain monopolist circles inside our country to thwart the growth."

Indian monopolists had the resources to put up additional iron and steel plant and the foreign monopoly capital was prepared to help them. This was their ambition as announced in the Tata-Birla Plan of 1944. If this were allowed to be realised they would have been in a position to get a grip over the government. This was prevented for the time being by the measures taken by the government. This is all what it means. It does not mean that the monopolists' bid to get control over the government is foiled for all time nor does it mean that state sector has become an instrument for curbing monopolists.

Further the programme (majority draft) brings out two aspects of the state sector. First, the programme clearly lays down that what is developing in India under the Congress government is capitalism and though "state-owned capital has enlarged its field of investments and ownership to heavy metallurgical and machine building industry, oil, coal, etc., the state sector also develops state capitalism in as much as this state is an organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie."

It also says, "However, since this developing economy especially in the state sector, facilitates India's march towards economic independence and has an anti-imperialist and anti-colonial aspect it fulfills a national purpose and as such is progressive."

This is exactly what the *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* says: "In the countries of Asia and Africa state capitalism in its present form is not an instrument of imperialist monopolies." It serves as "a defence against the attack of the capitalist monopolies of the West." All this warrants to the conclusion that at the present stage in the liberated non-socialist countries state capitalism plays a progressive role.

In the form it arose the state sector, was opposed by imperialists and by a section of monopolists. The specific steps taken by the government representing the interest of the national bourgeoisie as a whole to set the country on the road to independent industrialisation though on capitalist lines, temporarily foiled the bid of these monopolists to get a grip over the government. But as the state sector went on developing, while it curbed the imperialists in getting or extending their grip on our developing basic industries, it created more favourable conditions for the development of private sector—for the growth of capitalism. When capitalism grows its inherent and inevitable contradictions also develop. On the one hand, there is a concentration of production (larger units) and a concentration of capital (giant companies and inter-lockings) and growth of monopoly and concentration of economic power; on the other hand there is a relative impoverishment of the working class and office employees, a certain ruin of the small industrialists, and self-employed artisans, growing economic burdens on the large class of owner-peasants created by the land reforms, utter pauperisation of small peasants and landless agricultural labourers and growth of allround unemployment.

Thus while state sector develops, monopoly groups also strengthen as part of the development of independent capitalism promoted by the building of heavy and basic industries. These strengthened monopolies now return to the charge and begin attacking the public sector. This process is described by the draft programme in para 32 (quoted on p. 85). There is no contradiction in all this if the state sector is recognised as state capitalism in a newly-independent country, functioning in the context of the new world situation playing a dual role: (1) as a factor promoting economic independence, playing to that extend an anti-

imperialist and anti-colonial role, fulfilling a national purpose hence progressive, (2) promoting growth of capitalist relations, and therefore the growth of monopoly and impoverishment, etc.

The majority draft carries the analysis further and shows how this development is leading up to the rise of reaction and a complicated political situation. The author has quoted only a part of it on page 85.

The draft programme says:

But these monopolistic circles which have arisen and developed under conditions of colonialism and have grown ever since, have not been able to set up their undivided political power in the country. The state in India represents the power of the national bourgeoisie as a whole. However these monopolistic combines utilise their links with the state apparatus and the bureaucracy in the field of import quotas, use of foreign currency, raw materials and resources of finance to enhance their economic power, to implant political reaction into governmental power and to change the foreign policy of the country.

PROGRAMME DEMANDS RE: STATE SECTOR

It is this scientific understanding of the dual role of the state sector in our economy and the danger arising out of the growth of monopoly to the common objective of national regeneration that enables the majority draft to formulate the demands vis-a-vis the state sector correctly so that they become the basis of a national democratic front including the patriotic national bourgeoisie:

Strengthen the state sector:

—The state sector to be rapidly developed to become the dominant sector of our national economy in every possible manner;

—reform, improve and democratise the existing state sector administration;

—rapidly expand the scope of the state sectors by reserving to it key and heavy industries as envisaged in the original industrial policy resolution;

—extend the sphere of nationalisation to cover banking and general insurance, coal and other mining, oil distribution and plantations.

We do not claim that the analysis of the role of the public sector as given in the majority draft programme is the last word. It has to be improved and made more concrete in the light of subsequent experience. But the basic features of a correct scientific analysis of the *dual role* of the state sector and of the dangers, are there in the majority draft while they are absent in the minority draft.

DANGERS AHEAD

But the author must conduct an equal struggle against revisionism and dogmatism at all times and under all circumstances. That makes him blind to the merits of the majority draft so much so that he himself forgets to emphasise the dual role of the state sector. Quoting from the *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* where it is stated that if state power gets exclusively in the hands of "biggest—essentially monopolist, national companies" *there is a danger of state capitalism becoming state monopoly capitalism*. It is true our programme does not make that formulation (emphasised above), though it sharply pinpoints the danger of monopoly groups' bid to get the grip over the government and calls for a fight against the same.

The speech by Comrade Ajoy Ghosh adopted by the Vijayawada Congress puts the point in this way:

The growth of monopoly constitutes a serious danger to our people. If this growth continues and of the monopolists who have already got powerful supporters and

representatives in the government, then even the state sector will more and more tend to become an instrument in their hands and *acquire features of state monopoly capitalism*. We cannot rule out such a danger. Hence all the need to fight against monopoly and its growth. (p. 51, emphasis added.)

This is a more cautious formulation than what the first edition of the *Fundamentals* (1959) which stated:

In that case state capitalism can become state monopoly capitalism and be put at the disposal of the most reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie which would try to use the power of the state against the people. (emphasis added)

The question of state capitalism in a country like India—which is still underdeveloped, though having a far greater concentration of industrial and banking business than in any other newly-independent country of the east, is a question which requires more factual and scientific study. It appears that Soviet economists have been studying this question further since the first edition of the *Fundamentals* was written. Some tentative results of that study are noted in V. I. Pavlov's book *India: Economic Freedom vs Imperialism* (PPH, 1963). They may be summed up thus:

—The monopoly groups of the Indian bourgeoisie, which developed even in the pre-independence period and which have grown tremendously in economic power in the period of the two Five-Year Plans, have extended their collaboration with foreign monopoly capital at a dangerous pace. Yet this *collaboration is not of compradore type*. In India the local commercial and usurer's capital developed into industrial and banking capital—the leading groups of which supported the national movement in the pre-independence period.

—Today the Indian monopoly groups have reached a higher level of concentration of industrial and banking business, including interlinking of the two. All the same the monopoly groups in India *cannot be placed in the category of finance capital*.

—If however, with the growth of concentration of capital and production and with the extensive construction of heavy industry which is now being primarily created in the state sector—the big monopoly groups succeed in gaining control over the state sector or in breaking it up in their favour—then conditions will arise for the growth of finance capital. This will lead to the rise of state monopoly capital and reaction in the saddle.

—That is exactly the reason why the working class and democratic forces must do everything to prevent such a development which will strengthen imperialism though temporarily and be a setback to national democratic revolution. That is why both the progressive forces in India as well as socialist countries are interested in preventing such a development. (*India: Economic Freedom versus Imperialism*, V. I. Pavlov, PPH, 1963, pp. 44-46)

Thus we find that the second edition of the *Fundamentals* published after the Moscow Statement of 1960, cuts out that sentence about state capitalism becoming state monopoly capital, quoted above (which is the last sentence in the para quoted by the author from the first edition, on p. 90) and replaces it by the following:

In these conditions, therefore, everything will depend on the relationship between the various classes and the social and political forces and which of them will have a decisive influence on social development. (*Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*, second revised edition, FLPH, Moscow, 1963, p. 419.)

The author analyses "the consequences of capitalist development in India in the same way that he analysed the state sector, brushing aside the twofold aspect and stressing only one side: the mounting economic burdens on the masses, growing economic disparities, corruption, growing factional squabbles in Congress group, Rajaji's slogan "Congress Raj: Licence-Quota-Contract-Raj" becoming popular among masses out of mass disgust against Congress raj, tendency to prefer military dictatorship to such democracy and planning.

How do these negative features arise? The author answers:

—The root of all these economic, political and ideological ills from which the nation is suffering is the bourgeois domination over the economy, politics and ideology of the country.

—They all show that the Marxist-Leninist characterisation of capitalism in the third phase of its general crisis—its economy being unstable and its policies and ideology being in profound crisis—applies to capitalist development in India.

—All sorts of conflicts and factional struggles in economic and political field arise because each for himself and the devil take the hind most is the law according to which the capitalist society functions.

So the conclusion drawn is:

It is in the interest of the nation as a whole that its development goes along the non-capitalist rather than the capitalist path.

How will the people come to the non-capitalist path?

Only the Communist Party standing at the head of the working class and uniting the mass of peasantry can carry on a patient, continuous and consistent struggle against the bourgeoisie which though in the national democratic

front, and therefore an ally in fulfilling anti-imperialist and anti-feudal task is a determined opponent of the mass of working people who desire national development to take to the non-capitalist path.

We have faithfully summarised the author's conception of the consequences of capitalist development in India proceeding under the Congress government and the way he understands "the rich ideas contained in the Moscow Statement." The reader can compare this with the picture we have given of the political and economic development as reviewed by us successively at Palghat, Amritsar and at Vijayawada and how the ideas of the Moscow Statement are understood by us and applied to Indian conditions in our unanimous resolution at Vijayawada.

Such a careful comparison should enable the reader to see that our author in his zeal to wage equal and simultaneous struggle against revisionism and dogmatism in the CPI and in his special zeal to fight the revisionism of the majority in particular, has just missed the specific new element in the developing situation in the newly-independent countries including India and the specific new in the analysis of the slogans of the fourth chapter of the Moscow Statement.

NEW IN THE SITUATION

It is this new in the situation that required the replacing of the slogan of people's democracy by that of national democracy. It is worth while repeating what we stated earlier in a different way:

1. New in the situation was that in the context of the new epoch and the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism, in the newly-independent countries, national bourgeois governments had arisen which by and large were pursuing independent policy of non-alignment, of consolidating economic independence though on capitalist basis—and preserving a modicum of democracy. *Both socialist*

countries and the working class and the progressive forces in the countries themselves had to take note of this new phenomenon as a factor in the anti-imperialist struggle.

2. New in the situation was that as economic development proceeded under the national bourgeois government its dual aspect became apparent—on the one hand there was a certain consolidation of political independence and progress towards economic independence, on the other hand conflicts and contradictions arise under the capitalist nature of the development: growth of monopoly groups, concentration of economic power in their hands, relative impoverishment of the common people—slowing down and crisis in the course of development. *As a result the contradiction between imperialism and the country sharpened so also the contradiction between the national government and the democratic forces sharpened.*

3. New in the situation was the reflection of this economic development in the political plane—there was the emergence of a powerful reactionary group, based on the monopoly elements and allied with other reactionary feudal elements, which sought to subvert the national policies and democracy, using the slogan of anti-communism and frustration of the masses. The activities of the Right-wing inside the national government and the ruling party aided these tendencies. In this complex situation our Party was evolving a path of struggle and unity—utilising to the maximum existing democratic freedoms.

This path of struggle and unity which we were evolving from Palghat to Amritsar—was perfected to some extent by us at Vijayawada in the speech of Com. Ajoy Ghosh and in the resolution. That path of struggle is spearheaded against the reactionary groups. It is a path of pursuing the tactics of unity and struggle vis-a-vis the national bourgeois government, unleashing mass struggle against it for the defence and improvement of living conditions of the masses, for bringing about a Leftward shift in the policies

of the government, for consistent enforcement of national policies paralysing the activities of the Right-wing inside the Congress, supporting the government and the ruling party when it fights imperialism and reaction.

4. New in the situation was that the national united front which existed in the pre-independence period was broken when the national bourgeoisie formed the government and the problem was to form a new national democratic front—based on alliance of classes interested in carrying through to completion the programme of national democratic revolution. As the front emerges in the process of struggle and becomes successful. It is able to replace the present government by a government which is a reliable instrument for carrying through the programme. Our efforts to solve this problem in the context of the new elements of the situation mentioned above were tremendously aided by the scientific formulations of the fourth chapter of the Moscow Statement. *Though we did not pass any of the programme drafts at Vijayawada—the basic ideas of the Moscow Statement have already been applied in formulations we have made of the national democratic front and of the government of the national democratic front.*

As our Vijayawada resolution points out, the national democratic front comes into existence as a result of a broad-based militant and powerful mass struggle spearheaded against the forces of Right-reaction, directed against the government in order to bring about changes in its policies and leading in the process of its development to attaining the correlation of forces in our country.

The national democratic front that gets formed in this process and the government of national democracy that arises on its basis when it becomes victorious are described in our resolution as “organs of struggle against reactionary forces” and also as instrument for carrying through to completion the programme of eliminating the hold of foreign capital, for carrying out radical agrarian reforms

which really benefit the peasantry, for thoroughly industrialising the country without allowing monopoly to develop, and for expanding democracy. This programme amounts to preparing the pre-requisites for transition to socialism in a non-capitalist way.

What is new in this whole conception?

First, the front and its government arise on the basis of a differentiation in the ranks of the national bourgeoisie and of the ruling circles themselves—a differentiation which has an objective basis and which is accelerated by the mounting mass democratic movement—which is national in form and whose driving forces are of worker-peasant masses.

Secondly, the front and the government based on it—are a fighting alliance of the patriotic sections of the national bourgeoisie, working class, peasantry and the intelligentsia and the common people. It must have a unity of will to carry out the abovementioned programme, bringing about institutional changes, unleashing the initiative of the toiling masses.

Thirdly, as the government proceeds to implement the programme—the position of the toiling masses goes on strengthening enormously—the correlation of forces changes continuously in favour of the common people creating the conditions necessary for the transition to socialism.

Such is the way in which we have tried to apply the ideas of national democracy and non-capitalist path in an integrated way to Indian conditions in our Vijayawada resolution and more specifically in the majority draft programme. The author in his zeal to fight the revisionism of the majority, completely misses the new in the analysis and the slogans of the fourth chapter of the Moscow Statement. He reduces the exposure of the capitalist path of development and the struggle to take the patriotic forces to the non-capitalist path—to a struggle against the bourgeoisie as a whole.

He does not see the twofold nature of the capitalist development in a newly-independent country like ours. That is why he does not see that the front of struggle and unity that grows up against it is *national* in form while its driving force are *class* forces of working class and peasantry. The author has talked of integrating national democracy with non-capitalist path. He has also stated that national democracy is the state form for implementing the non-capitalist path. Has he worked out such an integration in terms of the concrete conditions developing in India? He has not. A genuine effort to do this in the Vijayawada resolution and in the majority draft he just ignores. From his high pedestal of the sole Marxist-Leninist in the Communist Party he pontificates:

The emphasis on national democracy laid in one draft (majority) almost vulgarised the revolutionary concept of national democracy and makes it out as if it is just a Left variant of bourgeois democracy; while the emphasis on non-capitalist path laid in the other draft contains the seeds of sectarian attempts to give an anti-capitalist edge to the concept of national democracy.

Now have a look at the author's idea of this integration—which is supposed to be free both from revisionism and dogmatism.

National democracy being a class alliance in which the national bourgeoisie is a part, it will be *fantastic to make the non-capitalist path the basis on which all the patriotic forces are to be united. This is of course true.* (p. 99)

The national democratic front is not directed against capitalism. It is directed *only* against imperialism and feudalism. (p. 99)

Within such an all-class front, however, there are two major forces contending against each other with their

respective programmes and perspectives... the bourgeoisie and the common people. (p. 94)

The author has given no clue as to how these contradictions in the front are solved and how the front becomes an instrument of the unity of all the common people of "the nation as a whole" to implement the non-capitalist path? The author himself says correctly that such a path is in the interest of the nation as a whole.

This contradiction can be solved only when we realise that the national democratic front is not only against imperialism and feudalism but in the concrete conditions of India it is spearheaded against reactionary monopoly groups and other feudal reactionary elements and arises in process of paralysing the activity of the Right-wing in the ruling circles.

This contradiction is solved when we realise that the front thus formed is national in form and that its content includes the class forces of worker-peasant playing a significant role.

In short, scientific integration of the twin ideas of national democracy and non-capitalist path, with the actual conditions of economic and political development in India can be achieved only when we see the new in the world and Indian situation as we have outlined in the foregoing. The key point to note and carefully study is the process of differentiation that is taking place in the Indian national bourgeoisie and in the ruling circles.

Soviet students of economic development in India are taking note of such differentiation:

The growth of monopolist tendencies which are supported in every possible way by the imperialists will inevitably deepen the process of differentiation among the national bourgeoisie, the majority of which has common interests with the working classes in their resistance to these tendencies. Resistance to monopolist mani-

festation is not merely democratic but also anti-imperialist in nature since the Indian monopolists are backed by their Western counterparts. (V. P. Pavlov, *India: Economic Freedom vs Imperialism*, PPH, 1963, p. 54)

However, it must be borne in mind that though the fact of this differentiation helps, the formation of the national democratic front does not take place just because of it. It is formed as has been stated both in the Vijayawada resolution and the majority draft programme in the course of a powerful and militant struggle in which the working class, forging worker-peasant alliance, shows the greatest initiative in bringing the broad masses in motion to fight for implementation of national policies—non-alignment, economic independence, curbing monopoly, expanding democracy, improving living conditions of masses—in a people's way. Thus worker-peasant alliance becomes the driving force of the national democratic front that gets formed in the course of that struggle. As stated in a discussion article—"The National Democratic and National Bourgeois State" published in *New Age (Monthly)*, July-August 1962

The stronger and more solid their alliance the more probable it is that the national bourgeoisie, its more progressive elements will not abandon the path of revolution, will not lose anti-imperialism and will prove itself able to take part in the national front.

Now we come to the question of applying these ideas to the question of evolving a political line—tactic of building the national democratic front—the attitude we adopt to various parties in evolving those tactics.

MAIN CONTROVERSY AT VIJAYAWADA

The author presents "the main controversy at Vijayawada" somewhat in this way: Revisionist (majority) and

dogmatist (minority) trends were contending with each other. Com. Ajoy Ghosh brought about unity by formulating the problem in the correct Marxist-Leninist way. But this unity was based on formal acceptance of the correct position formulated by Com. Ajoy Ghosh. Revisionist majority went on interpreting the correct line in its own way and began to tail behind the national bourgeoisie. Dogmatists interpreted the line in the sectarian way but they continued the militant fight against the bourgeoisie.

Now that Comrade Ajoy Ghosh is no more with us the responsibility of interpreting the correct line of Comrade Ajoy Ghosh has fallen on our author. When two alternative political resolutions came before the Congress, our author vigorously polemised against what he called the Dange-Ghosh thesis (majority line) though he did not agree with the other alternative draft. When Com. Ajoy Ghosh produced the speech and it was accepted as the basis to amend the majority draft, then the author accepted the same as the correct Marxist-Leninist position. Today when the Vijayawada documents, Ajoy's speech and the resolution are being interpreted in two different ways, revisionist and dogmatist—then in such a situation the author has to come forward to give the correct Marxist-Leninist interpretation of those documents.

The author says there were at the Vijayawada Congress, "two interpretations of the Moscow Statement, two assessments of post-independence developments in India, two lines of strategy and tactics which the Indian working class and the general democratic movement should adopt."

We have dealt with the former two in the earlier sections. How does he present the two lines of strategy and tactics?

One point of view is said to be that the parties and elements of Right-reaction being organised by and large outside the Congress should be fought by building unity with the Congress.

The other point of view is said to be that the main reactionary forces of the nation being inside the Congress, fight should be directed against the Congress though no quarter should be given to forces of reaction outside the Congress.

First, he represents the point of view 'crudely', nay wrongly. The majority draft resolution before the Vijayawada Congress has not said that the forces of Right-reaction are mainly outside the Congress. That resolution in the section on "The Rise of Right Reaction" says how this force had arisen in the period after our Amritsar Congress, building its separate party, putting forward its alternative programme of national policies and democracy, with anti-communism and opposition to socialism as its main slogans. It described its class character as representing "most reactionary business men," "many feudal elements," enjoying support of imperialists and communal parties. This trend is seeking mass support among the people frustrated by the anti-people policies of the Congress. Then it says:

The extent and gravity of the menace cannot be assessed by mere reference to the strength of the Swatantra Party or communal parties like the Jana Sangh. Right-reaction consists not merely of these parties but has powerful supporters and representatives in key positions in the country's economic life, in the administration and military apparatus and inside the ruling party itself even at the highest level. (*Resolution on the Present Political Situation*, p. 27)

Now if we turn to the political resolution at the Vijayawada Congress we find the same analysis of the Right-reaction and the identical sentence we have quoted above. So the author is deliberately distorting the position of the majority as to the relation of Right-reaction and the National Congress.

What about the strategy of the fight against Right-reaction? Did the majority propose lining behind the Congress in order to fight Right-reaction? At Amritsar when the question of Right-reaction came up for the first time, our resolution had said that "the extreme Right, therefore, cannot be defeated without a simultaneous battle waged with determination and vigour, to defeat the anti-people policies of the government," and it called for a two-sided battle. But between Amritsar and Vijayawada the menace of Right-reaction had grown, it had emerged as an independent political force openly putting forward its line. A deeper analysis of the phenomenon and a change of tactics were needed. While recognising that the Right-reaction has powerful supporters in the Right-wing in the ruling circles and to some extent in the Congress itself, and it feeds on the mass frustration arising from the anti-people policies of the Congress government, it was necessary to sharply differentiate it from the Congress as a whole. Thus it was necessary now to wage a determined and resolute struggle against Right-reaction, exposing its anti-national policies and programme, isolating it from the general mass of nationalist-minded democratic people; while at same time waging determined and resolute struggle against the anti-people policies of the Congress government and also resolutely campaigning for the support of its progressive measures and policies.

This was the tactics proposed in the majority draft resolution and word to word adopted in the finalised Vijayawada political resolution.

What about the alternative political resolution? It remains generally rooted in the understanding of the Amritsar Resolution. While it appears to move a little forward from the Amritsar position it fails to differentiate between Right-reaction and the National Congress and

therefore its actual tactics do not go beyond those outlined at Amritsar.

The author, in his effort to justify his opposition in Vijayawada to both the majority and minority drafts, wants to present the matter as if Com. Ajoy Ghosh's speech said something different from both the drafts which he accepts. Actually, the majority draft, Vijayawada resolution and Ajoy's speech take identical position on this point. Only the alternative draft takes a different and a Left-sectarian position. The author quotes one para from Com. Ajoy Ghosh's speech to show that he does not approve of a general united front with the Congress to fight Right-reaction. Neither had the majority draft proposed any such thing.

But there are certain important formulations about the estimation of the situation, about the role and class character of Right-reaction and about the tactics which the author finds it convenient to ignore.

Comrade Ajoy Ghosh said: "Does it follow that a general united front with the Congress is possible *today*—that is, *with the Congress as it is today*?" (emphasis added)

While stating that, "The Congress is the organ of the national bourgeoisie as a whole—including its Right-wing," he also states that "at the same time it would be a mistake to *equate* the Congress with parties of Right-reaction. Many of the declared policies of the Congress and some of its measures are in today's context *progressive*—foreign policy, public sector, secularism and so on" (emphasis Ajoy's).

Com. Ajoy Ghosh has said something more about the differentiation of the bourgeoisie and about the class character of Right-reaction.

While stating that the Indian industrialists and financiers have not split into two sections—one pro-imperialist section supporting the Swatantra Party and the other anti-imperialist supporting the Congress, he draws our pointed

attention to the dangerous activities of the reactionary monopolists:

Nevertheless, taking the country as a whole, the real and immediate danger is that of a further and more pronounced shift to the Right, a shift brought about *under the leadership of the most reactionary monopolists with semi-feudal elements, allied to them, playing an important but subordinate role: It is this that extreme reactionaries both in the Congress and outside it are striving for.* (emphasis Ajoy's).

So, though no split has taken place—a differentiation has taken place—and the reactionary monopoly groups, with semi-feudal elements allied to them are behind the Swatantra Party and are also influencing the Right-wing inside the Congress.

Further, it is Comrade Ajoy Ghosh who in his Vijayawada speech, called upon us “to shed complacency” and realise the “sharp alternatives that face our nation”. He said:

Either the democratic forces unite, isolate and defeat the forces of Right-reaction, arrest the shift of the government to the Right and bring about a shift to the Left, i.e., towards democratic advance. Or forces of reaction, pressing on with the offensive and aided by their allies in the Congress and the government bring about an all-sided shift to the Right.

CLASS-CHARACTER OF PARTIES

But our author, who has unsheathed his sword against both revisionist and dogmatist trends in the Party and has taken upon himself the responsibility to show the correct Marxist-Leninist path to the Party as a whole, does not find it convenient to take note of the analysis of this situation in the country and its class-analysis given by our late General Secretary. He is worried that even after Vijayawada resolution was unanimously accepted, some

people (revisionists) are interpreting the same as unity with the Congress against its Right-reactionary opponents. These conflicting interpretations arise because, he says, the question of the class character of other opposition parties has not been finally settled. The author says, the National Congress has been correctly defined as the organ of the national bourgeoisie *as a whole* including its Right-wing and that explains its progressive as well as reactionary features—its dual role. But what about parties like the Swatantra and Jana Sangh etc.? Some people think that these parties were of “a single reactionary character” representing the interests of reactionary monopoly groups and some feudal elements. This characterisation, the author thinks, is wrong and this leads to the understanding of choosing the Congress as against the Right-reaction “as the lesser of two evils.” There also is the other understanding of considering both as equally reactionary. Both these assessments are wrong, says the author, forgetting that the first assessment of the class character of the Right-reactionary parties is given by Ajoy Ghosh himself in his Vijayawada speech. This leads the author to a new discovery; he says both the assessments are wrong because: “Both fail to take account of the reality that every single political party and group in the country is guided by the ideology of the national bourgeoisie.”

He says further, “The dual character of the bourgeoisie—its class interests as well as their reflection in the ideological field—therefore becomes the common trait of all political parties including the most reactionary ones.”

AUTHOR'S NOVEL THEORY

According to this strange theory all parties, the Swatantra Party, the PSP and the Socialist Party and also the communal and separatist parties are all parties reflecting the ideology of the national bourgeoisie and have therefore a dual character. Swatantra Party, for instance, says the

author, is a party of reaction in terms of the class composition of its leadership and of its slogans and policy directed against non-alignment, planning, public sector, etc. Still it gives such a slogan as "down with quota—licence—contract raj" which though reactionary in aim "gives expression to the healthy democratic discontent of the common people as well as the non-monopoly sections of the bourgeoisie against the anti-democratic use of the public sector institutions by the ruling party."

Similarly the author says, the PSP and SP though their policies are often more reactionary than the Congress, even pro-American, but still they launch struggles against price rise, taxation, etc.

According to the author, the same applies to political parties and groups which represent casteism, communalism, linguism, tribal and regional separatism. They are disruptive of working class unity but they also take up issues as prices, taxation and official corruption and agitate for them.

What is the conclusion which the author draws from all this? "The situation in all these parties is as complex as in the Congress." Does not Ajoy Ghosh say that "a large part of the forces of the Right are inside the Congress" together with political allies. "This applies to these other parties also, with some modification of course."

This novel theory is worked out to throw overboard the warning of Comrade Ajoy Ghosh—which represents the spirit of the Vijayawada line itself—that "it would be a mistake to *equate* the Congress with parties of Right-reaction." Equating the Congress with parties of Right-reaction, the author says "in some cases we will have to unite with the Congress against one or more of the opposition parties, while in some other cases it will be other way about."

The author asks, have we not said that the democratic front we are building is neither a general united front with the Congress as it is not anti-Congress front?

Of course, that was how the line of the Party was partly defended at Vijayawada. But is that all? Did not Ajoy Ghosh's speech and the resolution lay down a *definite* direction to our efforts to build the national democratic front. That direction, which we have quoted once before, is "to isolate and defeat the forces of Right-reaction, arrest the shift of the government to the Right and bring about a shift to the Left, i.e., towards democratic advance."

That direction is implicit in the assesment we made at Palghat "that the division between the masses that follow parties of the democratic opposition is the most important division in the democratic camp." And Com. Ajoy Ghosh said in his speech at Vijayawada that "the situation continues" even today.

Does this mean that we do not want to unite with masses who are under the influence of parties *not* belonging to the democratic opposition, i.e., parties of Right-reaction and of communalism and separatism? Of course, we have to. But we adopt entirely different tactics for the purpose as far as the parties of Right-reaction and communalism are concerned. The class composition of the leadership of these parties and their programme is basically alien to that of the national democratic front. So we all the time fight against their leadership and their programme, expose them and isolate them, so that we are able wean their masses away from them. We pursue the tactics of unity and struggle vis-a-vis the Congress. They are laid down in great detail in Com. Ajoy Ghosh's speech. Even about the PSP and SP he has said that, "while waging a sharp ideological struggle there is need for correct approach towards these parties, so as to draw them and especially their followings wherever possible into common activity and struggle."

AN ALIBI FOR LEFT-OPPORTUNIST LINE

But in relation to the parties of the Right-reaction and of communalism we do not pursue the tactics of unity and

struggle in the same way that we do vis-a-vis the Congress or the parties of democratic opposition. We fight and isolate their leadership and programme and the parties as a whole in order to wean away the masses from them. We fight and agitate to break the Congress-Muslim League bloc, and Congress-Ganatantra bloc, the SP-Swatantra-Janasangh bloc.

We thought all this was elementary. But the author is so obsessed with the alleged revisionism of the majority who he thinks are distorting the Vijayawada line, to line-up wholesale with the Congress, that he invented this theory to ensure militancy combined with broadest unity. But what is the result? The theory provides a basis for repudiating the Vijayawada line as we have shown; and what is more, it provides an alibi for all manner of opportunist alliances with the Muslim League, Swatantra, Jana Sangh and the DMK.

Reactionary parties often make demagogic use of slogans which give expression to "the healthy democratic discontent of the common people." But is that the only criterion to judge their partial progressivism? The Nazi Party of Germany made demagogic use of the slogan "down the Treaty of Versailles" by which the "allied" imperialists enforced enslaving conditions on the German people. But the use of that slogan did not change the class character and the utterly reactionary nature of the Nazi Party.

In short the author has invented this utterly untenable theory not to fight the alleged revisionism of the majority but to provide an alibi for a Left-sectarian distortion of the Vijayawada line. Thus in the three concluding sections of his book, viz., "Revisionism & Right-Opportunism after Vijayawada," "The Anti-Party Approach" and "Why No Release Campaign," the author puts off his mask of equal fight against revisionism and Left-sectarianism and launches a full-scale and slanderous attack on the National Council majority itself.

His main thesis in these concluding sections is that after Vijayawada the majority of the National Council went full-scale ahead in distorting the Vijayawada line and in going forward to line-up with the Congress wholesale under the guise of fighting Right-reaction, to giving up all struggle against the Congress government and of adopting the line of rank bourgeois nationalism.

AUTHOR'S WORK ON NATIONAL INTEGRATION

He has taken up two questions—the question of national integration and the question of India-China conflict. On both these issues which arose after the Vijayawada Congress, the author says the majority took the standpoint of bourgeois nationalism and lined up behind the Congress government.

Under the head of national integration he refers to two issues which arose in the course of general elections, viz., the attitude towards the separatist party, the DMK in Tamilnad, and the attitude towards the party of Sikh communalism, the Akali Party in the Punjab. The suggestion is that the policy of electoral adjustment with the DMK in Madras and with the Akali Party in the Punjab which worked out in the course of evolving election tactics and followed in practice in both these states in the general elections, were basically correct. The author has evolved, as we have seen, the theory of national bourgeois nature of all parties in India to justify the same. But now the majorities both in Tamilnad and in the Punjab have repudiated those tactics and considered them as opportunist alliances with communalism and separatism. This is considered by the author as lining-up behind the Congress.

The author does not take up these issues for detailed discussion but merely refers to his detailed document on national integration.

It must be admitted that the author has done some deep thinking and work on this question. After Com. Ajoy Ghosh,

he was Party's representative on the All-Party National Integration Committee which was formed under the initiative of the National Congress leaders particularly Jawaharlal Nehru. Much of author's work is quoted extensively in Jolly Kaul's book on *National Integration* (PPH, 1962). In his latest document submitted to the National Council—as an omnibus single draft covering ideological, programmatic and political issues, the author has catalogued a series of demands and solutions of the various aspects of national integration which are by and large correct.

It must also be admitted that the author's document and his thesis on the various questions of national unity and national integration which have arisen in the post-independence period, have not been discussed in the National Council. This is a pity. For these are basic and policy issues involved and they have got to be clinched.

A BASIC QUESTION RAISED

For instance the author raises one such basic issue which is the running thread of his document on "National Integration." He says: "The distinction between the two (bourgeois and proletarian) class points of view, between the two class approaches (bourgeois and proletarian) to the question of national unity should be fundamental basis on which what are today called problems of national integration should be tackled." (p. 112)

Further he says: "*failure to take the independent proletarian stand of demarcation from bourgeois nationalism has already had very serious consequences for the unity of the working class movement, unity of the Communist Party.*" (emphasis author's, p. 113).

While agreeing with the author that the problems of various types of "fissiparous tendencies"—communal, caste, provincial, linguistic, etc., cannot be solved only by the

simple expedient of Congress-Communist unity, we want to remind the author that they cannot be solved by crudely counterposing bourgeois nationalist vs proletarian point of view, without taking account of the fact that most of these problems arise out of feudal and semi-feudal relations and are a hangover of the colonial past.

In dealing with the national question as it came up before advanced capitalist countries, where it was a question of oppressor and oppressed nations, Lenin taught us to make the sharpest distinction between the bourgeois and proletarian standpoint. Independent proletarian stand of demarcation from the bourgeois nationalism of the advanced (oppressor) nation meant unconditional support to the right of self-determination to the point of secession of the oppressed nation. This meant support to the bourgeoisie of that nation in so far as it was making that just and democratic demand. This is right as far as a relatively advanced capitalist country was concerned where the question of nationalities was one of colonial status of the oppressed nationalities.

But as soon as we attempted to apply this bourgeois nationalist vs proletarian demarcation mechanically to India we landed in a Left-sectarian error—of 16 Constituent assemblies (here we are not referring to Pakistan error). In the Indian context, the struggle for complete independence from imperialism and their props, the feudal princes, was the main thing. The demand for creation of autonomous linguistic states as constituent units of the independent Indian republic had to be won in the struggle against British imperialism and princely rule. This required the unity of the Indian nation and for this what was necessary and sufficient was the recognition of the autonomous state-existence for linguistic units. The right of secession was neither required nor asked for. The national bourgeoisie through its most enlightened and patriotic representatives had asked for formation of linguistic states in accordance to the wishes of the people (The Nehru report

of 1928 before the Joint Commission). The demand could be won by anti-imperialist united front in which the national bourgeoisie participated, demarcation from the bourgeoisie had to be in the framework of the tactics of unity and struggle, demarcation could not be by raising the demand for secession—which would be disruptive of unity, demarcation had to be by liquidating the princely states and by sustained fight for the demand.

When after independence the all-India ruling bourgeois circles refused to reorganise states on linguistic basis and refused to break up and merge the princely states in the respective adjoining linguistic states, the movement which started was again a united front movement in which the local national bourgeoisie either participated or was neutralised in joint people's struggles which took place in 1954-57.

The demand for the redemarcation of states on linguistic basis was a national as well as a democratic demand. It was national because it arose in the course of the national movement, as part of the demand for national independence; the national movement demanded not only an independent national state but also demanded that the national state should be redemarcated into autonomous constituent units which were based on contiguous regions where the overwhelming majority of the people spoke a common language and were further united by common history and cultural peculiarity etc. It was an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal demand, directed against imperialist-feudal-princes-alliance which had resulted in an arbitrary division of the national territories of peoples speaking common language.

It was a democratic demand also in the sense that it recognised the democratic right of the people of the various linguistic regions to have their respective autonomous states within the Indian Union. Besides it was a demand which strengthened national unity of the people in their struggle against imperialism and feudalism. That is why the pro-

gressive national bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the common people had common interest in the demand and therefore the national bourgeoisie had a place in the united front forged for the achievement of the demand. Therefore the proletariat and the common people have to and do join hands with the progressive national bourgeoisie in the struggle for its realisation. In this sense there is no confrontation or demarcation between the bourgeois and proletarian points of view—but unity of demand and even to some extent action.

But there is a demarcation and conflict between the two both within the front and outside it. A section of the ruling national bourgeoisie both at the centre and at the state level opposes the demand. Why? Having become the ruling class after the attainment of independence a section of the national bourgeoisie both at the centre and in the states is interested first and foremost in consolidating its state power against the common people rather than in extending democracy, in completing the national democratic revolution.

With regard to the section of the national bourgeoisie which supports the demand there is a confrontation and contradiction between the standpoint of the two classes. The section of the national bourgeoisie which supports the demand is not prepared to join the mass struggle for it, this is one point of difference. But the most important point of difference and demarcation is this that while the bourgeoisie, at least a reactionary section of it, does not look upon the struggle for this demand as a struggle for democracy for strengthening national unity, but as a struggle of one linguistic group against another, importing linguistic chauvinism and similar tendencies disruptive of national unity.

On the other hand the working class looks upon this struggle as one for restoring equal rights for all linguistic and national groups in the Indian Union, for ensuring the rights and full protection for minorities in all states—in

short as a struggle for democracy and for strengthening national unity and which must get the support of the common people of all linguistic groups.

A CORRECT CLASS APPROACH

Thus the working class as the most consistent and militant champion of democracy is in the forefront of all in fighting for the creation of linguistic states, for uniting common people of all linguistic groups in this struggle, for the full protection of minorities, against all manifestation of chauvinism and of narrow nationalism which is disruptive of national unity of the common people belonging to all linguistic and other groups. For this very reason the working class also stands for the unity with the progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie which respects these values and is prepared to stand up for them.

Thus in India the struggle against narrow linguism, against communalism, chauvinism and casteism, against injustice to oppressed castes and tribal people is a part of the struggle for the completing of national democratic revolution, a part of the struggle for democracy and therefore the independent proletarian stand is not one of demarcation and struggle against bourgeois nationalism in general but against reactionary bourgeois nationalism conducted in alliance with progressive and democratic sections of national bourgeoisie.

A number of conflicts and contradictions are bound to arise in the course of this struggle and these cannot be solved by the simple panacea which the author puts forward—of demarcating the independent proletarian stand from the stand of bourgeois nationalism. For instance, border disputes arise between newly-formed neighbouring linguistic states. Will it do to say that bourgeois nationalism exploits them to sow dissensions in the common people and that the proletariat has to keep away from it? Such an abstract demarcation of 'independent proletarian stand'

from bourgeois nationalism will only result in handing over the masses to the chauvinistic sections of the bourgeoisie. The problem arose because the newly-formed linguistic states were formed by taking the British formed districts as units in grouping contiguous linguistic areas together, our demand was that this should have been done by taking village as the unit. Progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie also stand for such a solution. Independent proletarian stand therefore would consist in not standing aloof but in actively intervening in the dispute forging the unity of progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie and of the common people of both sides who stand for a solution on such a democratic and just basis.

Thus the Maharashtra Committee's intervention in the struggle over the border dispute between Maharashtra and Karnatak, because it had this principled basis, succeeded in checking chauvinistic distortions and did not have all those disastrous effects which were forecast by certain comrades. That is exactly the reason why the commission appointed by the National Council supported the proposed intervention. The author refers to this issue in a tendential manner only to prove the alleged bourgeois nationalism of the majority.

Nobody has suggested that the problems of national integration can be solved "by the simple expedient of Congress-Communist unity against the forces of disruption." But to pose the whole question as one of struggle between the bourgeoisie and proletariat—to forget that it is above all a question of democracy, of eliminating outgrowths and survivals of colonial and feudal and semi-feudal relations, to forget that this struggle needs the proletarian initiative for forging the broadest unity of the democratic masses including the democratic and progressive sections of the bourgeoisie, to forget that the great mass of these elements are under the influence of the National Congress, to forget that the National Congress has on many of these questions taken

a far more democratic stand than many other democratic parties except the Communist Party, to forget all this is to renounce the struggle for national integration and against the forces of disruption.

It is this which leads the author to the fantastic theory that all parties, except the CPI, including the reactionary and communal parties are parties of the national bourgeoisie—a theory which provides an alibi for the policy of opportunist alliance with such parties as the DMK, the Akalis, the Muslim League, etc. It is necessary to make a thorough examination of the author's documents and articles on national integration. There is much that is right in these documents and articles, but they need a re-examination in the light of the ideas and criticism explained above.

SLANDERS REPUDIATED

The author concludes his book by once again returning to the charge that the majority of the National Council crowned its ignoble descent in the mire of revisionism by passing the National Council resolution of national defence against Chinese aggression against India in November 1962. We have refuted the charges made by the author against the majority in earlier sections. We may repeat our main conclusions of this refutation.

The majority took the stand that it was not enough to pay lip-service to support to defence measures against the Chinese invasion but, in the early stages, to actively move the masses to participate in the same and to stand four-square with the Nehru government which by and large did not give up its stand of settling the issue by peaceful negotiations while doing everything to strengthen defence and resisted the pressure to give up non-alignment and to join the so-called defence of imperialist military alliance. This initial stand enabled the Party first to counter the attack of the reactionaries and of the ruling circles on the Party and secondly to effectively expose and oppose the line of reac-

tion and of the imperialists which was using the conflict to subvert non-alignment, to drag India into a western military alliance and to start a virulent anti-communist campaign.

It is a lie and a calumny to say that the majority welcomed imperialist arms aid. The words of the National Council November resolution are there to bear witness to this. After the initial stage, the National Council was in the forefront ceaselessly exposing the dangers of the imperialist aid and the motives behind the same.

It is dishonest and a slander to lump the sharp and principled criticism which the National Council made of the stand of Chinese CP and of the government of PRC on the border conflict, of their violation of the 1960 Statement of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties, with the anti-China campaign of the reactionaries. In fact the sharp exposure of the anti-Leninist stand of the Chinese leaders on the border dispute, of their repudiation of the commonly-agreed principles of the international communist movement were necessary to defend international communism which was sought to be discredited wholesale by the reactionaries, taking advantage of the utterly wrong and indefensible action of the Chinese leaders. Our criticism and exposure of the positions of the Chinese leadership is a continuation and further development of the stand taken by late Comrade Ajoy Ghosh in his speech before the 1960 Moscow conference of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties. It is carried forward in our letter to the brother Parties sent in 1963 and is further developed in Comrade Dange's reply to the slanderous attack by the Chinese leadership on our Party. The positions we have taken in them are now being generally considered in line with those which the majority of the Communist Parties are taking vis-a-vis the Chinese leaders' stand.

It is a dishonest slander to state that the majority of the National Council has switched over to the line of a general

united front with the National Congress. It is the National Council majority and not the 'Left' comrades which initiated the powerful mass campaign against tax burden, price rise, against lowering living conditions of the masses, for nationalisation of banks, etc., for state trading in food grains and so on, which has already won some initial victories.

The gross calumny that the majority of the National Council was responsible for the arrest of comrades and that they did not organise a release campaign has been repudiated and flung back several times. The author who makes this foul charge in company with the Chinese leaders, never mentions the fact that the Party outside was under the fire of the reactionaries who attacked our offices and meetings, etc. The Party had to fight back this offensive before it could launch a counter-offensive for the defence of the living conditions of the masses and for the release of comrades. Despite difficult conditions, the release campaign in 1962-64 was not a whit less powerful than in 1949-51, both through demonstrations and through courts and yet the slander is continued. This has nothing to do with reality but is a byproduct of the virulent anti-Party campaign by the 'Lefts' which has the support of the Chinese leadership.

SUMMING UP

The majority of the National Council never claimed that it was infallible or that there were no shortcomings and defects in its leadership and work. But the minority which disagreed with the decision and the line of the National Council, instead of abiding by the majority decisions and seeking to resolve the differences through inner-Party discussion and through practice, took the road of throwing overboard Party forms and norms, and of functioning parallel party set up which has steadily grown into open disruption and split. A section of the minority was conti-

nuing its tactics, which it adopted at Vijayawada Congress—tactics of revolt and non-cooperation, inspired by its arrogant and over-confident conviction that it was fighting revisionism, bourgeois nationalism and betrayal of proletarian internationalism of the majority—which has been getting increasing support from the Chinese leadership.

But such an attitude of support to it was not expected of the author, who says he disagrees with the Chinese leadership both on the India-China border dispute and on the ideological question, and who disagreed also with the minority position at Vijayawada. He also disagreed at Vijayawada with the majority draft political resolution and majority draft programme, though he accepted the main strategic concepts which formed their basis. He accepted Com. Ajoy's speech and the final resolution, which as we have shown is basically not different that the majority political resolution and programme. In November 1962 he disagreed with both the majority as well as the minority drafts on the question of the Chinese aggression and stand of the Party.

When the first *Pravda* article appeared he thought the position he had taken in his draft was more correct and in line with the stand of the international communist movement and that the stand of the majority was one of bourgeois nationalism and revisionism and betrayal of proletarian internationalism. This conviction led him to formulate the theory that the debacle in the Communist Party of India was due to the fact that the leadership always fought revisionism with dogmatism and vice versa but never with genuine Marxism-Leninism.

In the present document, which we have reviewed at some length, the author has sought to apply this theory to a survey of our post-independence Party history, to our differences in understanding the basic ideas in the Moscow Statement of 1960, to our differences on the Vijayawada documents and finally to post-Vijayawada developments.

We have attempted to show that his claim to fight both these deviations equally and simultaneously—laudable in itself, does not bear fruit, as it is not based on the concrete analysis of *the new* both in the international and national situation. This leads him to a onesided understanding of the international as well as national situation and to propounding unsound theories about the class character of political parties in India including reactionary parties which only becomes a convenient alibi for a Left-opportunist line of adjustments if not alliance, with Muslim League, the Akali Party, the DMK and the rest.

Undoubtedly the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism has proved the utter bankruptcy of the capitalist system as a whole—in the economic, political and ideological fields. This, coupled with the fact that the socialist system is becoming a decisive force in the world, is proving that the path of independent capitalist development which has opened up for the newly-independent advanced countries is a bankrupt path and that the peoples of such countries have now the possibility of switching over to the path of non-capitalist development which will enable them to achieve national regeneration and further social progress more effectively and more painlessly. All this is true. But the point is that the proletariat and its party have to work out the strategy and tactics of this switchover in the concrete conditions obtaining in our country today as a result of a decade and half of such a capitalist development.

For this, only loud-mouthed phrases about the bankruptcy of the capitalist path would not do. It is necessary to see and study the *dual aspect* of the independent capitalist development in an underdeveloped country like ours, to study the conflicts and contradictions it gives rise to, to take note of the differentiation that is taking place in the ranks of the national bourgeoisie as a result of concentration of capital and the growth of monopoly groups, to study the changing class-structure of the peasantry as a result of

even the present land reforms and of the growth of a certain commercialisation of agriculture, to study the changing structure of the growing working class as a result of our industry slowly emerging out of the colonial status.

These economic and class changes find their reflection in the political field. There is the emergence of the Right-reaction with an alternative platform; there is the emergence of the Right- and Left-wing in the Congress—the ruling party; there is the potential growth of the democratic forces on the one hand and the disunity in the democratic forces on the other; the anti-people policies of the ruling party are leading to growing frustration among the masses on which reaction feeds. But at the same time the ruling party is forced to concede certain measure of democratic freedoms which can be used by the working class and the peasant masses to build under mass organisations and a national democratic movement.

This situation is posing before our Party and the democratic forces in general the sharp alternatives which Com. Ajoy Ghosh outlined in his speech at Vijayawada and which we have quoted earlier. Are we going to use these democratic freedoms to build a powerful national democratic movement, which will overcome the disunity in democratic forces as it grows—mainly the disunity between the masses following the Congress and those following the CP and the democratic opposition parties, which will rend reaction, halt the drift to the Right of the Congress, and bring about a shift to the Left in policies of the ruling party? Or will we allow free rein to the forces of national disruption, to disrupt and split our party itself, so that the Right-reaction and the Rightwing in the Congress join hands to subvert national policies, crush the existing democratic freedoms and put back the clock of progress?

It is this grim background, which gives urgency to the task of imbibing the spirit of our Vijayawada decisions, of

carrying them forward to formulate the Party programme of building the national democratic front and achieving a government of national democracy, to work out a political line directed to rout the Right-reaction, to paralyse the Rightwing inside the Congress, to bring about a shift to the Left, by developing an approach of struggle and unity which will enable us to unite the democratic forces following the Congress with those following the parties of democratic opposition.

This approach and spirit, this way of posing the problems of study and work—which is the spirit of Vijayawada decisions is entirely lacking in the author's book. The author accuses the majority of distorting the Vijayawada line into a line of general united front with the Congress as it is, but in actual practice this false accusation only serves him as a cover to hide his own repudiation of the true spirit of Vijayawada. His blind subjective hatred for the leadership of the majority has led him to propound theories which serve as an alibi for the Left-opportunist line.

Actually there is so much in common between the general outlook and stand of the majority and that of the author, that one is pained and surprised at this development. This criticism is offered to the author and to those of his way of thinking for the purpose of fraternal and collective discussion. We agree this ought to have been done much earlier. But even now it is not too late. This is not a finished document. It is a review and a comment which puts forward certain posers and lines of study arising from a fairly extensive survey of the development of our Party policy in the pre-independence and post-independence periods—which if frankly discussed in the ranks of the leadership may help the coming together, in the first place of those following the author's ideas and those of the majority. This in turn may help the further process of forging unity in the Party on the basis of the Vijayawada line and its development.