

A large red graphic of a five-pointed star above a hammer and sickle symbol, which is the emblem of the Communist Party of India. The star is positioned at the top center, and the hammer and sickle are positioned below it, with the sickle curving around the bottom and right sides of the text.

**THE POLITICAL REPORT
ADOPTED BY THE PLENARY CONFERENCE OF
THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY
OF INDIA
IN JUNE 1960**

Price Re. 1.

PREFACE

The most remarkable feature of the period we are passing through, is the unprecedented rise of the masses. The great post-war revolutionary tide that swept away feudal and capitalist social order first in Eastern Europe and then in China, forced imperialism to retreat from a number of their most prized colonies is far from spent, now nearly two decades. The entire area from far East to Near East is still in turmoil. A great wind of change is blowing all over Africa. The tide, impudently enough, has reached the new hemisphere, and has interfered, so far with impunity the 'sacred' Monroe Doctrine. The yankee prerogatives are no longer supreme, even in the new world.

This onward march of the masses has assumed an elemental character that was neither foreseen nor planned by their erstwhile leaderships. Indeed the masses have repeatedly transcended the bounds set by the leaderships and have suprised both their friends and their enemies by their resilience, in face of the weariest odds. It is true that only an able leadership can enable this mighty upsurge to fulfill its destiny. Such a leadership is being forged, shaped and directed by the urge of the masses.

This upsurge is spreading in all directions and is truly universal. Even in the Workers' States, the masses are no longer content to toe the line. They are continually pressing for greater freedom and fuller scope for enjoyment of life.

II

Not merely in the social sphere but also in all other spheres of human endeavour the masses are making new history. The great achievements in the Soviet Union in spheres of science and technology are due principally to the fact that there the masses have obtained full opportunity of educating themselves, and thus playing a vital role in development of human knowledge and power. In the long run it is masses who are making the modern scientific 'miracles' possible in the Soviet Union.

In India today, the clue to the solution of the basic problem of Indian revolution, lies in the basic characteristics of the age. We have to learn anew the marxist truth, not only in words but also in deeds, that only through mass activity that all our problems can be solved. We have not only to teach the masses but also learn, as often, from them. To theorise is not enough, the essential thing is to practice. Without practice even the theory has no sanction. All the aberrations in our movement, defeatism, bureaucratism, sectarian and other deniations arise from the lack of proper attitude to the masses, lack of confidence in the decisive role of the masses, above all lack of deep roots among the masses.

We, Revolutionary Communists, are confronted with the task of providing a correct revolutionary leadership to the masses. We are convinced of the correctness of our analysis, our strategical and tactical conclusions. It is not enough to proclaim them from house tops to bring the masses to us. We have to go to the masses and convince

III

them through their experiences of life and struggle, the correctness of our path, forge unbreakable link with the masses, enrich our judgements with the thoughts, feelings and experiences of the masses, in short, become a mass party; not merely for them but also of them. Only in this process we shall be able to solve the problems confronting us, and become a true instrument for the expression of the aspirations of our people.

Calcutta,
July 1960.

The Political Report
Adopted By The Plenary Conference Of
The Revolutionary Communist Party Of India
In June 1960.

A. INTERNATIONAL SECTION

Economic Situation—Advanced Capitalist Countries

No social system dies of itself, not even a moribund one. The energy and decisive action of the new class can alone replace the old and exhausted one. Had the working class of Europe made good use of the opportunities provided by history, we would have been living in a different and better world. But the expectations have not been fulfilled, and world capitalism has been granted fresh lease of life by default, time and again.

World Capitalism has not been slow to use these respites to reorganize its economic base and secure stabilization. At the conclusion of the Second World War, world capitalism was confronted with tremendous difficulties due to enormous shrinkage in its world market, caused by the extension of workers' rule, and threat of still greater shrinkage from the ever-increasing tempo of the liberation

movements in the colonies, sharpening of its inner contradictions at home and on top of it all inter-imperialist rivalries abroad. Since the War, various methods were tried to overcome these difficulties, they tried war—both hot and cold. But not one of their problems has been solved. As a consequence, since the war, world capitalism has faced three crises, one after another. Yet world capitalism has not succumbed; not only that, it has been able not only to recoup from the ravages of war, but also has achieved measurable expansion of its productive capacity. Though it would be venturing on astrology to predict how long world capitalism would be able to maintain this growth, one thing is certain, *viz.* that this growth does in no way connote the possibility of capitalism assuming a progressive role in the society. Indeed, the survival and growth has been achieved not by any degree of mitigation of the contradictions world capitalism is beset with, but by their further accentuation.

The principal features of world capitalism during this decade are: (1) Enormous growth, increasing power and concentration of monopoly, (2) Greater domination of the State apparatus by the monopolies in order to use its powers, both economic and political, for the purposes of maintaining production and high profits, (3) Dependence of the economy on war order, heavy military budget and enormous growth of armament economy, (4) Rationalization and tendency towards automation, (5) Deliberate fostering of inflation and depreciation of value of money.

These trends have neither freed world capitalism from the recurrence of crises—the frequency of which is greater

now than before—nor have they made it any easier for world capitalism to approach capacity production, nor again have these mitigated the acute unemployment problem.

In metropolitan countries, this situation is further accentuated by: (1) The uneven development among the advanced countries themselves; (2) Their rivalries and competition in scramble for markets and raw materials, now that all imperialist countries have completed their reconstruction and surpassed their pre-war production level in a shrunk world market; (3) The aspiration of the newly-liberated countries to increase their productive capacity, to secure favourable trade terms; and to alter their trade pattern; (4) Increase in the productive capacity and entry into the world export trade in a significant manner by the Workers States.

The Former Colonies Of Imperialism

The second sector of capitalist world economy is occupied by the former colonies who are still within the capitalist world system. Their generic economic character is one of backwardness and dependence on imperialist countries even though among themselves extreme unevenness in economic development exists. In none of these countries, capitalism has been able to supplant feudalism completely, indeed in some countries feudalism is still dominant and though in varying degrees stagnant agriculture forms the main basis of their national economies, industrial products form a very small percentage of their national income. Such industries as even the most developed

among these possess are subsidiary and mainly foreign-dominated. Such of their natural wealth as is exploited like coal, oil, other minerals are either completely in the hands of foreign monopolies or are dependent on them in respect of finance, market etc. The entire export import trade of all these countries are controlled by the imperialists who remain their principal customers. Their entire monetary system is bound up with that of imperialists. In short, in the economic sense, these politically independent countries are still the freebooting ground of the imperialists.

In some of these countries, the ruling classes have been compelled to undertake some sort of economic development, more in the sterile interest of broadening their economic base, than in the virile interest of the well-being of the people and economic independence of the countries. The rate of these developments is too slow even to arrest the stagnation, not to speak of overcoming them. Within the framework of a decaying capitalist system, and necessarily dependent on world imperialism, the dream of the indigeneous capitalist rulers of an independent industrial development has no likelihood of fulfilment. In order to acquire the required momentum, to arrest the stagnation and finally overcome it, a much faster rate of integrated agricultural and industrial development is obligatory. But the crux of the matter is that the social organization necessary for a faster rate of development would necessitate violation of the bounds of the capitalist and pre-capitalist relations of production. No exploiting class is vouchsafed such virtues of self-denial. Consequently, we have in these countries

economies based on the interests of the feudals, the capitalists and the imperialists. To be sure, from country to country the respective shares of the partners vary—thus presenting a picture of extreme unevenness even within that framework of generic backwardness. Tied as the economies of these countries are with those of imperialists, they suffer more during economic recession and share less in prosperity than the metropolitan countries themselves. The stability of the economies of these groups of countries is thus made precarious in the extreme.

The Colonies Proper

The third sector in the world capitalist economy is composed of the colonies proper, where economic domination of imperialists is protected by their own political rule. The generic economic character of the full-fledged colonies is of extreme backwardness, where primitive conditions still prevail, except where exigencies of imperialist exploitation of the natural resources of these countries and strategic purposes required some development of communications, power, irrigation which have nothing to do with the real needs of the people and the economies of the regions. Thanks to the shrinkage of capitalist world market due to social revolutions in Europe and Asia, the colonies proper are being subjected to fiercer exploitation to make up for the losses of imperialism elsewhere.

Economic Situation In The Workers' States

The economic picture in the USSR, China and other Workers' states where the capitalist system has been

replaced by a planned socialist economy stands out in glaring contrast with the above. Fortythree years ago occurred the first breach in the world capitalist system. Then Russia was a backward country in every sense of the term. Since then the Soviet Union was for more than three decades the lone island of workers' rule in a surging sea of capitalism. It faced intervention for years and the economic blockade and finally came the Nazi invasion, which perpetrated unparalleled vandalism on the Soviet soil. Through this sea of troubles, mere survival would have been an achievement. But thanks to the abolition of the outmoded exploitative capitalist system and establishment of socialist production relations, the Soviet Union has not only survived, economically it is the First State in Europe and second only to the USA—the capitalist paradise—which has enjoyed not only complete immunity from all destruction due to war but has actually been aided by the wars to increase its productive capacity at the cost of its rival powers. Even though the USA is still ahead of the USSR in productive capacity, its rate of development is very much slower than that of the USSR.

The tremendous momentum of the current Seven Year Plan of the USSR is unthinkable in capitalist economy anytime anywhere. On the basis of 1953, the gains in industrial output in the five succeeding years in the USA is only 11% while the corresponding figure for the USSR is 90%.

The development rate in all the Workers' States taken together is no less striking. Taking 1937 as the base year,

the volume of industrial production in the socialist sector has risen nine-fold, while the capitalist world merely doubled its output.

Under Developed Countries—Socialist vis-a-vis Capitalist

The contrast between the socialist and the capitalist economies is more pronounced in the backward countries than in the advanced. A comparison between India and China is most pertinent here as both started at nearly the same time, though the initial advantage lay with India.

Year	COAL (Mil.Tons)		ELEC. POWER (Mil. KWH)		STEEL (Mil.Tons)		GRAIN (Mil. Tons)	
	India	China	India	China	India	China	India	China
1949	21	32	4908	4320	0.986	0.1	45	108
1953	30	66	6192	7260	1.08	1.35	52	154
1957	36	130		19300	1.12	5.35	68	185
1958	38	270		27500	1.18	8.0	62	250

The annual average rate of rise in production during China's first Five Year Plan is 10.9% in industrial and agricultural production, while in India, during the entire Five year period of the First Plan, agricultural production rose by 14.7% and industrial production by 18.2%. As a matter of fact the very high targets for 1962 has already been surpassed in 1959 in China, thus completing a much larger Five Year Plan than that of India in two years, whereas the modest target of 25% increase in national product envisaged in India's Second Plan is likely to fall short by at least 20%. Indeed, the rate of development of China is unheard of in

the history of any nation. The annual rate of development in the backward East European countries has been above that of the West European countries. The overall picture is this that though the socialist sector is still considerably behind the capitalist sector in productions, the former is progressing at a rate many times faster than the latter and it has been estimated that at this rate they would catch up with the capitalist world with another rise of 130% in her production.

Incidentally, it is pertinent to recall that due to serious obstacles put up by the imperialists and the errors in policies both economic and political of the leadership of the Workers' States the task of building up of socialism in these countries had become much more difficult. As a result there have arisen today in the Workers' States the problems of ensuring continued better living conditions and wider democracy, for the masses, greater socialization and complete elimination of bureaucracy.

However, the basic difference in productive relations between the rival systems remains and is the root cause of the vast difference in their rates of development. The inherent strength of the Workers' States lies in the absence of the fetters of private ownership of means of production and consequently private appropriation of the social products. The unsurpassed mastery of technology by socialism and its mode of using human knowledge to subjugate nature's powers are evidences of the superiority of the socialist system. Automation, peaceful use of atomic energy, rocket technology successful venture into cosmic space—all

these have brought humanity on the threshold of hitherto unimaginable, revolutionary changes; and in all these spheres socialism has established a firm lead over capitalism. Moreover the need of extensively using these technological innovations is coming into violent clash with the Capitalist relations of production. They raise more urgently and forcibly the issue of socialism which alone can utilize these innovations in the interest of the humanity.

Political Situation

These contradictory economic realities in the two opposing worlds determine their course of political development. The imperialists, unable to solve the contradictions within their system, strive to eliminate their rival—the Workers' States of U. S. S. R., China and other countries of East Europe and Asia. For this purpose, their global strategy is to dominate directly as many of the countries as possible by employment of sheer violence, and use these countries not only as fields of exploitation and enslavement but as bases for war against the Soviet Union and the other Workers' Countries.

But neither the other advanced countries nor all backward countries are amenable to direct rule of the imperialist powers. Therefore, in these cases their strategy is to foster reactionary regimes as would readily fall in line with the designs of the imperialist powers to the detriment of the interests of the masses in these countries. The methods of installing and maintaining these reactionary regimes are

cold war, pressure of trade and commerce, financial and military aid etc., albeit under the specious plea of defending freedom of the individual, democratic institutions etc., etc.

Owing to the encirclement of the Soviet Union and other countries of the Soviet Camp by the ring of aggressive military pacts and bases, their Governments are compelled to take countermeasures of defence and preparedness. In the absence of any threat of war the huge resources which are now being used for defence preparations in the Workers' States, could have been diverted for ensuring a much higher rate and a more balanced pattern of economic development. This in its turn would have created a more favourable situation for the masses in these countries to wipe out the social and economic inequalities existing inside their societies and also attain standards of living much higher than those existing even in the most developed capitalist countries. Therein lies the significance of peace for the Workers' States.

War or Peace

Not merely to the people of the socialist countries, but also to those of the rest of the world, irrespective of the social system they are under, the prevention of a global warfare is an immediate task—a question of life and death; all the more so because of tremendous increase of the destructive potential, which threatens not this or that country, but the entire humanity. At least on this one

question, the appeal of the socialists against war could not be silenced by any propaganda barrage of the imperialists who have been trying to convince the people that their war was only preventive. The imperialists point out to the people of their countries that it is the socialists who are the real instigators of war. For they have neither renounced their ideal of armed revolution nor the method of class struggle. They point out how the Russian revolution broke out in connexion with the First World War and how the countries of Eastern Europe and China came under socialist rule in connexion with the Second World War. They point out with great verisimilitude that the communists hope to achieve world revolution in course of another war and by march of their victorious armies.

These assertions are all lies. In fact most of the socialist revolutions broke out in protest against wars unleashed by the imperialists themselves. Paris Commune rose in defence of the Republic, the Russian Revolution became victorious because of its consistent fight against imperialist war, just as the Chinese Revolution succeeded through its struggles against Japanese imperialism. Neither the Franco-Prussian War, nor the First nor again the Second World War was instigated or needed by the socialists. Indeed, they triumphed only against these wars. Indeed, not only for protecting the gains of the victorious revolutions, but also in the interest of furthering revolutionary aim in the capitalist countries, world peace is a better condition. Under conditions of war, hot or cold, the capitalists seek to impose new fetters on the toiling

people, restrict their hard-earned freedom. The most democratic countries take on fascist hues, stimulate war, mass-hysteria and chauvinism, blunt the edge of class-consciousness. While in the absence of a war situation it becomes more difficult for the bourgeoisie to impose restrictions on the toilers' freedom it is easier for the toiling people to confront their rulers with the consequences of their system. War is a way out for the capitalists and not for the socialists.

As for the advocacy of the class struggles by the socialists, it must be made clear that they have neither created nor engineered it. They have only made humanity conscious of the reality of class struggle going on in society since the birth of classes. The socialists are guilty only of providing the oppressed classes and the society with a programme for abolishing it speedily and resolutely, pursuing the same method history has vouchsafed.

Unable even to suggest seriously that the socialist system has need of colonies, the imperialists pose the question: What then is the aim of world socialist revolution? Is not its achievement conceived of in terms of socialist States making an armed assault on the capitalist States? The answer is a hundred times 'No'. The basic premise of social revolution is not the armed might of another country but the contradictions inherent in the capitalist system. So long as imperialists do not intervene, the organized might of the overwhelming section of the exploited, oppressed masses of any country are quite capable of

dealing with their own exploiters. Without the armed aid of any State, the Bolsheviks proved themselves mightier than the world of interventionists. They had, as all revolutionary people are bound to have, the unstinted moral and political support of the masses of the people of the countries of imperialism. Today the forces of such support are immensely stronger. Because today the people of the Workers' States are in a position to express their solidarity with the struggling masses in the capitalist countries. Besides, the vast colonial masses are roused. The people in the metropolitan countries do not trust their masters. Moreover, the socialists in principle do not advocate export of armed missionaries. The armed intervention of a Socialist State can become relevant only in the event of counter-revolutionary provocation and intervention by the imperialists; and after Korea the Imperialists should know that they can venture in that direction only at their peril.

The entire history of this century proves that the rapacity of imperialism of this country or that, is responsible for every war — great or small. It is imperialism that twice within one generation involved the whole world in the most barbarous methods of solving international questions. To be sure, we socialists prefer civilized peaceful methods, to those whereby the toiling people of one country is hurled against their own brothers. To be sure we prefer negotiated solution of all disputes between nations. But we are equally aware that imperialism is a system which through no amount of moral preaching can alter the dynamics of its inherent contradictions. So long as imperialism remains, capitalism remains, the threat of war would

remain, and no amount of reason, however sweetened, would succeed in altering its course. As long as imperialism remains mankind shall experience wars, isolated or global. This is why the revolutionary communists while waging a relentless fight against imperialist wars are obliged to defend and support the wars of liberation of oppressed nationalities against imperialism. To ensure durable peace, everlasting peace, the source of war, viz: capitalism and imperialism shall have to be abolished by the victory of world socialist revolution.

Meanwhile, so long as capitalist States remain, so long as revolution does not mature in those countries, a primary duty not only of the socialist States, but also of all socialists, is to mobilize all the forces against war, to checkmate every effort of the capitalists towards war. Short of social revolution, which is the main and the immediate task of the masses under capitalist yoke, such a movement may at best secure temporary relief, may prevent a small war from becoming a world wide holocaust or atomic destruction, may postpone an immediate war, may release international tension, may cause some amount of disarmament—even though temporarily. All these temporary gains are valuable as are reforms within a bourgeois system, if we do not forget their limited and transitory scope. Just as we strive for reforms without renouncing our right to revolution, similarly we should strive for and welcome every inch of ground and every minute of time, without losing our perspective of world revolution.

The bourgeoisie — well aware of the socialists' devotion to the cause of peace—strive to blackmail them; the bour-

geoisie demand that the socialists renounce their goal of world revolution in order to demonstrate their devotion to peace. No socialist, worthy of his salt, should succumb to such blackmail, renounce the aim of everlasting peace for temporary respites.

The pessimists question: If we do not renounce world revolution, why would the bourgeoisie concede? The answer is clear. The bourgeoisie concede nothing out of charitable considerations; neither peace nor social reforms. Just as the reforms are bye-products of revolutionary struggles, so are these temporary respites from threats of war, bye-products of revolutionary struggles of international proletariat for socialism.

For the socialists, the struggle for peace is not one which is separate and distinct from the struggle of the colonial peoples for their freedom, of workers in the metropolitan countries for socialism and of the world proletariat against imperialism and war. The socialists support all these struggles despite the fact that they may lead to temporary disturbance of peace, for these struggles help to create a world order where alone lasting peace can become a reality.

For a socialist, there can never be a question of subordinating the struggle for socialism to the struggle for peace. So far as durable peace is concerned, it is synonymous with socialism. So far as temporary peace is concerned, it is merely a bye-product of the struggle for socialism, for everlasting peace.

Just as the socialists counterpose the goal of world socialism and lasting peace to the central slogan of imperialism, viz: war, similarly against the imperialist strategy of domination, reaction and militarization, the socialists counterpose the slogans of self-determination of nations, socialist revolution and proletarian democracy. And consequently they demand abrogation of all aggressive military pacts, withdrawal of troops from foreign territory, and demolition of military bases on foreign land, disarmament, reduction of war budgets, and defence of all the democratic rights gained by the struggles of the people. These are the basic demands of the people in the metropolitan countries, colonies, newly-liberated areas in support of which, struggles are raging all over the world and most particularly in the colonies of imperialism, direct or otherwise.

The Colonial Revolutions

Under the given situation, the two immediate tasks of the revolutionary communists are to prevent the outbreak of another war and to ensure the liberation of all colonial people. The success attending these two tasks of utmost immediate importance, would radically alter the fast changing world situation in favour of a world revolutionary upheaval. Today, the colonial front happens to be the principal active fighting front against imperialism.

The one most dominant feature of the post-Second World War period is the revolt of the colonial peoples. Never before in history were so many arrayed against so few. While in China, North Korea and North Vietnam, the national liberation struggle became victorious through

revolutionary struggle against imperialism, in countries like India, Indonesia, Burma, Ghana etc., the imperialists, faced with mass upsurge and revolts, struck a deal with the local owning classes and had to relinquish their direct political rule. All these defeats and retreats of imperialism, particularly the victory of Chinese revolution and the struggle of the Chinese people against American intervention in Korea, have inspired the entire colonial world against imperialism. A decade and half after the Second World War, there is yet no sign of exhaustion of this struggle, on the contrary, new struggles are breaking out even now in the most backward areas, signifying the depth and sweep of the struggle of the colonial peoples.

These conditions have deepened the world crisis of capitalism by rendering its task of stabilization ever more difficult and by defeating its policy of intenser exploitation of the more backward areas, as a way out of its contradictions and have brought on sharper clash between the imperialists themselves. Every single victory of the colonial peoples is making it easier for the working class of the metropolitan countries to deal the final death-blow to capitalism, and imperialism, thus making the world safer for socialism, peace and progress.

The Need of A Revolutionary Leadership

In all these struggles, the principal role is assigned by history to the international proletariat. From the metropolitan countries where they are the most numerous section of the people, right down to the most backward ones where they are still a small minority, the proletariat holds the key position, objectively. Subjectively, they alone are the

most consistent fighters in these struggles. The working class can succeed in these struggles not only by their own relentless struggle, but also by their ability to draw in the other sections of the people most affected by the policies of the ruling classes. In metropolitan countries, the decisive urban petty bourgeois sections are fast being polarized, and the majority of them are natural allies of the proletariat. In all under-developed newly-liberated countries, the urban petty bourgeoisie excepting its top layer, and the overwhelming sections of the peasantry, in the colonies, the entire peasantry and petty-bourgeois sections, constitute the main driving force of the international revolution. The proletariat must march at their head only then the success of these movements would be assured.

However, the objectively decisive role of the international proletariat is not asserting itself yet on the subjective plane. The greatest problem in the world socialist movement today is the lack of a bold, class conscious, revolutionary leadership. This has made the survival of world capitalism possible. For this the pro-imperialist policies of the social-democratic parties as well as the class-collaborationist, opportunist and revisionist policies of the Communist Parties are responsible.

However the reawakening of the Soviet masses and their increasing political initiative in the recent period, together with the anti-imperialist and socialist struggles in the rest of the world, have raised the world revolutionary movement to a new unprecedented height. These have created a highly favourable situation for the growth of a revolutionary international leadership.

B. NATIONAL SECTION

Aftermath Of British Rule

In the context of the above world conditions, what is the situation in India? After two centuries of ruthless plunder and exploitation, the post Second World War mass resurgence forced British Imperialism to withdraw its political rule from India. It left India the poorest country on earth, peopled with teeming destitute population, its manufactures destroyed, its agriculture moribund.

Though since the First World War, some industries had grown up, placing India in a somewhat better position than other colonial countries, industrial revolution in India remained a far cry. Of the industries, only textile industry (both cotton and jute) is sizeable. The rest were ancillary in character and small in size. As a result, though India contained the largest working class among the colonies, she had no claim to the status of an industrial country. To all intents and purposes, India remained as a classical example of a colony of imperialism for the supply of valuable raw materials for British industries and for investment of British capital in India mainly for the purpose of reaping super-profits.

Indian agriculture had been consistently declining since the advent of British Imperialism, whose systematic destruction of India's ancient manufacture, threw ever larger masses on agriculture, with consequent fragmentation of land. The British Government did not maintain the essential irrigation system that had been one of the principal

tasks of the Indian Governments from ancient times. The steady decline in output with growing pressure of population made India unable even to feed its people. When the British Imperialism left India, the overwhelming mass of the village people had not much more than 2 annas per head per day in 1930—31 prices and the urban people a little more. That is to say, the overwhelming masses of the people could not afford more than one coarse meal a day.

Economic Situation After Transfer of Power

For four years after British withdrawal, the Government of India—now administered by the Congress Party, practically took no measures to alter the above conditions, till by 1950 the country was on the verge of bankruptcy, a country-wide scarcity, and an all-round crisis. The rising tide of struggles of the colonial people all over the world and more particularly the victory of the Chinese revolution inspired the Indian people in their struggle against the mounting distress and against the repressive policies of the Government of India. It is only then that our present rulers realized that merely to run the administration and leave everything else to the mercy of God, would threaten not only the profits of the class they represented but also their political rule. Thus arose the First Five Year Plan to be followed by other successive Plans.

The First Five Year Plan

The most important objective of the First Plan was to increase agricultural production; it had another aim, viz.: to correct the disequilibrium caused by the partition. The

Plan outlay was Rs. 2378/- crores in 5 years of which 27.7% was to be devoted to agricultural development; 24% for social services, 12.8% for power and only 5.8% for large-scale industries, mining and scientific research.

However, even this modest plan could not be implemented fully, the actual outlay reaching only Rs. 1600/- crores, i. e., a shortfall of over 17%.

At the conclusion of the Plan period, agricultural production was estimated to be higher by 19%, industrial production by 40%. The national income was computed to have risen by about 17.5% and the per capita income by about 10.5%.

To the Government, the picture of the country appeared quite satisfactory. But the masses of the people have quite another story to tell. Firstly, the real aim of the Plan was to conform more to the needs of the capitalists than to the needs of the people; i.e., to direct the resources of the country towards agriculture at the cost of industrial development. The imperialists themselves were quite conscious of the necessity of effecting simulated growth of Indian economy as the growing poverty of the people not only caused shrinkage in the market and caused economic crisis but also threatened capitalism politically. But they intended that the Indian Government should primarily direct its energies to agriculture. The Indian industrial sector should remain in the hands of the private capitalists who should produce consumer goods only, leaving the basic industries to imperialists at home. Secondly, the Government of India should provide extensive services and cheap

power for the development of private enterprise which would ensure higher profits and therefore higher productions.'

The First Plan with its agricultural bias, more or less fell in line with the wishes of the imperialists. In spite of the rise of production, the social impact of the Plan has been anti-people. Firstly, the Plan ensured that the entire burden of the Plan shall rest on the people and the resources of the vested interests shall be left untouched. Actually, the process of raising the resources, i. e., by enhancing indirect taxes on articles of mass consumption, deficit financing and inflation and foreign aid, in a country like India, are extremely reactionary measures. Responsible economists have computed that without affecting the present level of standard of living of the masses, India could raise three times more money than it spent in the First Plan, if it dared to go against the vested interests.

Secondly, the problem of agricultural development in a country like India where the pressure of land is one of the main problems can never be solved in isolation. Rapid industrial growth and consequent reduction of pressure on land is a prerequisite for any success in agricultural development.

Even in its isolated treatment, the efforts of the First Plan have been solely to enrich the rich peasantry who constitute about 1% of the population. To the vast masses of middle and poor peasantry, the First Plan conferred no benefit at all.

It is now conceded that (a) the rise in agricultural output during the First Plan was due more to repeated and exceptionally favourable monsoon than to the efforts of the Plan and consequently unstable; and (b) this rate of agricultural development is far short of the requirements of the country.

Thirdly, (a) the rise in industrial output is not due so much to the installation of new capacity as due to fuller utilization of existing capacity; (b) the very high overall percentage of industrial production is really deceptive. Because much of the rise has been contributed by miscellaneous industries which has little role in industrial revolution; (c) this growth has been made possible in an artificial manner by injecting large amount of money into the economy through the so-called social services and rather dubious projects which have had no value whatsoever, and thereby widening the market for the goods of the industry; and lastly (d) throughout this period industrial profits have been rising steeply.

Fourthly, the First Plan is conspicuously silent about the most urgent, difficult and gigantic problem viz: of unemployment,

Indeed, the real aim of the Government in introducing the First plan was to rescue Indian capitalism in the face of the growing economic crisis in the country, increasing discontent of the masses of India, rising tide of the colonial revolution and victory and consolidation of the Chinese revolution.

In the name of agricultural development the generous Government aid strengthened the new class of rich peasantry. The investment in communications and power-multipurpose projects etc., provided not only services essential to the capitalists at cheaper rates but at the same time created a buoyancy in the market with prospects of higher profits.

To give the Plan its real name would be to call it a Plan for the capitalists and by the capitalists and based on the so-called Keynesian method to tide over the crisis period of capitalism by methods of injecting liquid money into the economy and thus creating a simulated demand, which would help restore falling profits of the capitalists and prevent the breakdown of the production cycle. This kind of 'Development Plan' may seem new and very exciting to intellectuals of the underdeveloped countries but as a matter of fact there is no novelty in these measures which with variations were tried by liberals like Roosevelt and fascists like Hitler—all representatives of the bourgeoisie for tiding over a critical period.

The Plan framers, when introducing the Plan, made vain statements about their object not being mere increase of productions within the existing frame-work of unregulated profit, which they rightly said would cause the flow of wealth into the hands of few, but social justice and remoulding the existing framework. In actual practice they did precisely what they warned themselves against and yet told about the great success of the First Plan and complain about the lack of enthusiasm amongst the people in such endeavours.

The Second Five Year Plan

However, much pleased with themselves, the Indian ruling class embarked on the Second Plan. They declared that its distinctive feature would be that firstly it would be much bigger in size; secondly, it would have pronounced accent on the neglected aspect of the First Plan, viz: rapid industrialization, thirdly, expansion of employment opportunities, fourthly, reduction of inequalities of wealth and economic power. Sensing perhaps that these objectives may be viewed by the people as a mere rehash of the First Plan objectives, the Plan framers very wisely inscribed the legend of "Socialist Pattern of Society" on its signboard.

The total Second Plan investment in public sector was stipulated at Rs. 4000 crores. Of the total outlay, nearly a third, i. e., Rs. 1586/- crores was for agriculture, irrigation and community development; industry and mining were to receive Rs. 890/- crores, i. e., some 18.5%, communications to account for Rs. 1385/- crores or 28.9%, the remaining portion to social services.

With the above investment, the Second Plan was expected to achieve a 25% rise in national income and an 18% rise in per capita income. The increase in agricultural production was envisaged to be about 18%.

Halfway, the Second Plan ran into very serious difficulties. Both agricultural and industrial rate fell; adverse balance of trade assumed serious proportions and there were very considerable foreign exchange difficulties. Tax receipts, loans, savings, were all much below the expectations of the Plan. Above all, the inflationary trend present from the beginning of the Plan continued to mount.

Faced with the crisis, there were two alternatives: either to undertake bold new social policy or to accept defeat and prune the Plan. True to its class character, the Government decided to prune the Plan by one-fifth. What is remarkable in this context is that there was no dearth of capital in the country. The private sector which was expected to invest about Rs. 850 crores during the entire Plan period of 5 years, i. e., Rs. 170 crores per year actually invested the entire amount of Rs. 850/- crores in the first two years of the Plan. i. e., at about Rs. 425/- crores per year. This expresses in eloquent terms the tremendous rate of profit gathering by the private sector for which the Plans have created the atmosphere, the unwillingness of the Government to touch this sector's loot, the extent of tax-dodging indulged in by big money, in fact the reactionary social character of the Government and its policies.

The pruned Second Plan is now expected to achieve not much more than the First Plan. The investment shall be of the order of 8% of the national income. The national and per capita incomes can at best rise by some 20% and 10% respectively, i. e., barely sufficient to support the increase in the population.

The rate of rise in agricultural production in the Second Plan was again, as in the First Plan, due to very favourable monsoon conditions and the achievements are very unstable. However, even if the rate of increase is maintained throughout the Third Plan, there is likely to be a 25% deficit in food grain alone, by the end of the Third Plan. Even now, before the completion of the Second Plan, widespread scarcity and steep rise in food prices are evident.

The signal failure of the Second Plan lies in its inability to check the unemployment problem from getting more acute and ominous. The extent of unemployment calculated by the Planning Commission errs on the side of gross understatement. On the eve of the Second Plan, the backlog of unemployment was estimated to be of the order of 5.3 millions and the new entrants to the labour force during the Plan period of the order of 10 millions. The Second Plan was expected at least to provide for the new entrants, leaving the backlog intact. With the pruning of the Plan and other policy deficiencies, the new employment creation is optimistically expected to be of the order of 7 millions, meaning that on the eve of the Third Plan the backlog of unemployment would increase to about 8 millions — that according to the Government itself.

The above statistics grossly underestimate the extent of actual lack of employment; it entirely ignores the vast problem of under-employment due mainly to the seasonal employment of agricultural labourers and poor peasants and their forced idleness. Taking all factors into consideration, the extent of unemployment would be at least double the figure arrived at by the Government. In face of that, the efforts of the two Plans are insignificant.

The considerable increase in the overall rate of industrial production is very deceptive. Because much of the high percentage is contributed by industries whose previous productions were negligible, or by industries producing miscellaneous goods or consumers goods, on the basis of cottage or small-scale industries.

The installation of basic industries compared to the needs is still quite negligible. Finally, the most important aspect is that industrial products, mostly consumer goods, contribute only 10% of our national income, and therefore, being dependent on the stagnant and unstable agricultural production, its role in national reconstruction is as yet secondary.

Apart from productive sectors, there has been considerable money allotments in services of various kinds, railways and other communications, health, education, Community Development Projects and National Extension Services. But the failure to utilize the sanctioned amounts is a generic character both of the First as well as of the Second Plan. However, even if the Plan targets were achieved, the results would have fallen far short of the requirements of the country. Finally even such benefits as could have accrued to the people by these developments have been nullified by corruption, inefficiency, enormous expenditure in maintaining a swollen bureaucratic apparatus.

Community Development Project

One particular form of social services, viz: the Community Development Projects and the National Extension Service, demands special attention because of the great deal of boosting this programme has received as well as the vast sums spent on this account, all of which has literally gone down the drain. Its services towards introduction of superior techniques in agriculture is nil, while its other social activities in the village have gone entirely to waste. The reason is very obvious. In relation to the state of

our agricultural economy the basic principles of the programme are entirely unsuited. To a starving population, the first requirements are food and employment. To our peasantry, the first requirement is land, the second is adequate aid for agricultural operations. So long as these two basic demands are not fulfilled, the technological advices or social services are a mere satire on the condition of the vast masses of the peasantry. What the Community Development Projects and the National Extension Service have actually achieved is to stimulate the growth of a rich peasant layer in the villages. Rightly, the name of C. D. and the N. E. S. are a bye-word and reproach in the country side. Moreover, the entire machinery is completely unsuited to the tasks allotted to them.

Critique of the Plans.

In order to make a correct assessment of any economic situation, three questions must be answered: 1) are the productive forces developing? 2) at what rate does the development proceed? 3) what are the social forms of the developments?

The answer to the first query is undoubtedly in the affirmative in relation to the Indian economy of to day. But then it was developing even during the British regime in some manner. Indeed, without some sort of development, any social organism is bound to break up. In the interest of better exploitation of the natural resources, raw materials, the British regime was compelled to allow some developments which served their interests.

With the transfer of power, the new Government let things slide for four years till serious crises compelled them to recognize the need to undertake bolder measures to develop India's economy, if not for the well-being of her people, at least to strengthen the economic and political base of their class rule. Thus arose the policy of development through deliberate State efforts which are expressed in the five year plans. These plans, in spite of their reactionary social character, have in fact maintained and even increased, even though far short of the requirements of the country, the pace of economic expansion.

Tempo of Development

The question is the quality of the development which is bound up with its rate and direction. We often hear a great deal about India's great development activities. But the annual rate of development of India's economy during these much-publicized Plan period is not very much higher than either the rate of development during the British period, or the present rate of development, say in Pakistan or Thailand.

At the time of Britain's departure from India, the rate of investment was around 5% and annual rate of development around 2%. Whereas during the First Plan, the rate of investment was around 6% and the annual average rate of development some 3.6%. During the Second Plan, investment has been stepped up to about 8 to 9% but the rate of development is around 3.6% to 4%. Whereas in Pakistan and Thailand—with no democracy, no plan, no socialistic pattern of society, the rate of development during 1951—57

had been of the order of 3% and 3.6% respectively. If we compare the rate of growth of the Eastern European countries with that of India, the lack of dynamism in India's economy would be apparent. In 1957 and 1958, the rate of economic growth per year in Albania was 14% and 15%, in Bulgaria 8% and 8%, in Rumania 10%, in East Germany 9% and 8%, in Czechoslovakia 7% and 8%.

As a matter of fact, with 3.9% rate of growth, we are just keeping ourselves abreast with the growth of population and even then the stability of that rate is extremely uncertain as 48% of India's national product is derived from her agriculture which is still a gamble in rains. At this rate, we would not even be able to solve the problem of our stagnation and backwardness, not to speak of approaching a decent human standard of living for our entire population.

Even in respect of economic development, the present ruling class is unable to move except at a snail's pace. The peculiar problem of our development is precisely this that we have to run fast even to stand still. In order to improve the material conditions of our people, we have to run very much faster indeed. Our investments and progress in percentage terms cannot be compared with those of the developments of the advanced countries. They are not confronted with accumulated problems of two centuries as we are. In the case of advanced countries even a small rate of annual investment and advance means in physical terms considerably more than the high rates in low-income countries.

Judging by the performances of the First or Second Plan, it is now more than clear that the present rate of investment should at least be doubled or even trebled to make an appreciable impact on the lives of our people. Without such rate of development, neither the problems of regeneration of our agriculture, feeding our people, ensuring employment for the vast unemployed or under-employed by massive development of industries, could be solved. The present rulers cannot deny this. But the crux of the problem is of finding the resources.

Resource For The Plans—A Class Problem

The problem of resources is a class problem—a problem of radical and drastic social reforms and pooling of all available resources—a problem of reorganization of our entire social structure. It is true that we are a backward country with a low rate of capital formation. That is because a far larger share of the national income is received by the rich in our country than in the most advanced countries like the U. S. A. or the U. K. The upper 20% of the population in our country receive 55% of the national income, while those in the U. S. A. and the U. K. receive 44% and 48% of their national income respectively. Of our national income 28% goes to the share of entirely unproductive strata, who reinvest not more than 25%—30% of their income. A large share of the national income goes out of the country: of what is left, half is again distributed as dividends. It is, therefore, clear that though the actual capital formation is low, the potential surplus which could be invested without reducing the standard of living of the

masses is considerably very much larger than the rates of investment envisaged in our Plan, and is sufficient for a very much higher rate of growth. It has been estimated that the potential surplus in our economy is two or three times the rate of investments in our Plans. The mobilization of these existing surplus resources, however, can never be effected by a Government whose main interest lies in preservation of the wealth and privileges of the small wealthy class.

Requisites Of Genuine Planning

The mobilization of the resources and their investment is not a mere question of taxation, but of the entire policy of the State in social, economic and political affairs. We have to 1) break our ties with the Commonwealth and the sterling area, to ensure complete freedom of action — both political and economic; 2) nationalize all financial institutions, viz: banks, general insurance and all basic and large-scale industries, transport and communications without compensation though in some cases special consideration may have to be made; 3) nationalize foreign trade and completely prohibit import of all non-essential goods; 4) ensure a national minimum standard of living; 5) control production, price and distribution of all articles of mass consumption; 6) provide gainful employment to all; 7) provide land to the peasants and transform the petty-production in agriculture to large-scale production by organizing cooperatives; 8) embark on a massive industrialization programme; 9) guarantee full civil liberties. This is not yet socialism but mere historically determined essential

prerequisites for creating a free, happy and prosperous society in India.

The Social Essence of The Plans

The answer to the third query, viz: the direction of our development, would reveal its social character and the real nature of India's development plans. We inherited from the British two forms; viz: the feudal and the capitalist, not in contradiction to each other, but intermingled with each other. On the assumption of political power by the bourgeoisie, the necessity of extending the political and economic base of capitalism should have spelt the end of feudal forms of exploitation. But in an era when private property in the means of production in all its forms is under attack, the senile Indian bourgeoisie dared not challenge its feudal form. As a consequence, the agrarian reforms are half-hearted, and the road to capitalist agriculture has been thrown open without abolishing land monopoly in reality, without abolishing absolute rent or share-cropping.

In industry, we inherited a monopoly closely allied with imperialism and in trade and commerce a comprador class, expert in freebooting. In course of the last ten years, the monopoly domination of Indian industry has continually grown and the commercial classes are as rapacious as ever. (Profit in imported articles: sodii bicarb 130%. 1/2 h. p. motors 300%, hydrosulphide of soda 200% old newspapers 242%, Singer sewing machine 102%, shaving blades 128% etc.). During the Plan period, rate of profit in industry has trebled, the productions have gone up by nearly

50%, but the taxes realized from the corporations is up by only 12%. As for the "Socialist pattern of society", only 10% of the national product is contributed by the industry against 48% by agriculture; and after all the great noise of tremendous growth of public sector in last ten years, State enterprises generate only 5.1% of the national product, while private sector generates 89.2%. The rich 20% of the population receive 55% of total national income, while the 60% of the poorest receive only 28%, and this polarization is getting ever more acute every day.

Our foreign trade is still dominated by foreign banks. Key sectors of our economy are still in the control of imperialists whose actual investments in India—Rs. 480.7 crores up to 1955 (excluding foreign banks and insurances), though relatively small, is continually growing.

Nationalization Vis-A-Vis Socialism

Two other features of our economy need to be placed in proper perspective for the picture to be complete; viz: the State sector, the nationalization policies, and the programmes on co-operative farming—together with their "Socialist" character. The State is not a supra-class organization holding the balance even. In a class-ridden society, either one or the other of the basic classes is bound to dominate it. The pro-capitalist policies of the Government of India clearly betray its domination by the monopoly capitalists. The nationalization by such a State is a development not towards socialism but towards monopoly State capitalism. In all imperialist States, such a State sector exists and particularly in this Post-War period is being extended,

denoting firmer grip of the monopoly capitalists on the State apparatus and extensive use of the State apparatus in the interest of monopoly capitalists. In imperialist France, the State sector extends to one-fifth of the industrial-finance sector.

Either during a period of crisis, or when very large funds are required to provide capitalism with particular services or raw materials, which are not likely to yield either high or quick profits, the State intervention is expressly desired by the monopoly bosses, in order to use the resources and the power of the State. The State sectors within the capitalist economy are not only run in the interests of the monopolists but they actually run them as nominees of the State. In social content it is exactly the opposite of socialism.

In spite of its reactionary social character, the socialists demand nationalization even in capitalist society, not because of its socialist character but because of its technological superiority of centralization to petty production, its natural gravitation in the direction of social production, because it provides the organizational framework (State-ization) for socialist construction on the assumption of power by the proletariat. It facilitates strict accounting and control. In its immediate aspect, it does not bring about socialist transformation but it helps in our struggle for socialism. That is why all class-conscious workers support nationalization even under capitalism and counterpose workers control of production to the control of the nationalized institutions by the bourgeois monopolists or their agents.

Co-operative Farming

Though on the nationalization question some steps have already been taken the slogan of co-operative farming is still a mere expression of pious wish. For years now, the Government was not prepared to go beyond service co-operatives. However, on the presumption that some day the Government would translate its wish into action, we must assess its character. Just as there is no shade of socialism in nationalization, similarly there is no trace of socialism either in co-operative farming or in joint farming or in service co-operatives. Co-operative farming as such is purely capitalist in character insofar as the property rights of the individual members of the co-operatives are left intact. Its advantage lies in change from petty production to large scale production which alone permits modern scientific agriculture to open up the path of introducing mechanization and electrification of agriculture, and high rate of agricultural production which alone can save the peasantry. From co-operative to collective is a far cry. The precondition for the latter being socialist power.

In varying degrees, co-operative farming exists in many developed countries. Even in our own country, the monopoly bourgeoisie actually advocated co-operative farming long before anybody else and even considered some measure of coercion towards this as desirable. They correctly assumed that left to itself, automatically, purely voluntarily, co-operative farming shall never become general.

In this context, the opposition to co-operative farming is singularly illconceived and uniformed in the sense that it

underwrites the prejudices of the petty producer who cannot grasp its perspective. Co-operative farming, by itself, does not constitute any threat either to the institution of private property as such, or to the capitalist production relations. Indeed co-operative farming under the present situation in India, would actually strengthen capitalism inasmuch as it would cause expansion of the market, by creating a viable agrarian economy, produce the necessary food for the rapidly increasing population, open up the avenue for investment of bank capital in agriculture in a large manner, and in effect politically strengthen bourgeois rule.

Only that class of the rich peasantry which mainly exploits land in the feudal mode of share-cropping, i. e., without investing any capital on land, oppose co-operative farming "logically" from their class standpoint. Indeed from the social stand point co-operative farming would mean complete abolition of the remnants of feudal exploitation and only that.

In the present set-up of India, no viable class or stratum can be seriously interested in opposition to co-operative farming. All the opposition is generated by ignorance, superstition, stupidity and opportunism.

Even those who overemphasize the voluntary aspect of introduction of co-operative farming do so to cater to reactionary elements who thrive on share-cropping and mislead the poor and middle peasantry. It is more in the interest of the latter than that of any other class or stratum that co-operative farming is an immediate necessity. The only safeguard they need is one that would prevent the land

monopolists from covering up their monopoly or from dominating the co-operatives. That is why we should advocate the cooperatives of the landless, the poor and the middle peasantry to the exclusion of the rich. These co-operatives should be offered general economic incentives.

Implications of The Plans

Surveying the entire field the following conclusions are thus inescapable:

(1) That every measure taken by the Congress Government in the various spheres have gone to the strengthening of capitalism in our country;

(2) That feudalism has not been abolished but has been incorporated into the capitalist system;

(3) That the development of indigenous capitalism, is taking place not in opposition to imperialism but in collaboration with it;

(4) That the limitations of the present regime in fully implementing a democratic programme arise from its dual compromise with feudalism and imperialism;

(5) That the indigenous bourgeoisie in spite of its pivotal position is so weak that it is quite content with its collaboration with imperialism and so long as the position of the Indian bourgeoisie does not become very much stronger, in its relation with imperialism, collaboration would continue to be a dominant feature;

(6) That feudalism as a social system has long ceased to have any viability. During the British regime only the force of arms could keep it up. Now after 1947, with accession of the native States and the taking over by State of the rights of the intermediaries, there is no likelihood of any feudal restoration; that in spite of the fact that all vestiges of feudalism have not yet been eliminated;

(7) That the return of imperialism is equally impossible except through war and invasion. Even in that remote contingency imperialism would not be able to establish direct rule nor would it be able to create a feudal class-base of its power.

The Political Situation

The correlation of class forces obtaining in the country is that the Indian bourgeoisie with which is incorporated the vestiges of feudal elements, with the support of imperialist bourgeoisie, is ruling over the rest of the nation, the proletariat, the urban petty-bourgeoisie, the landless semi-proletarian, the vast poor and middle peasantry and against them.

The political institution of this rule is parliamentary democracy, which contains all the shortcomings of a class which has become senile historically. We have universal adult franchise but no proportional representation; we have fundamental rights but not all of them are justiceable; we have an independent judiciary but only in theory; we have a rule of law but that is vitiated by a permanent Act for imprisonment without trial; we are a Republic but we owe

allegiance to the head of a foreign State; we are an independent country but we are solely dependent on imperialism for all equipments of our defence forces; we are anti-colonial but we dare not throw out the colonialists from our own soil.

India's Foreign Policy

But the apologists of the bourgeoisie declare, we have an independent foreign policy. Is the policy 'independent' in relation to the internal conditions of the country or is it independent of its external circumstances? Either way it is impossible. Foreign policy of any government is the external projection of its internal policies or rather the task of the foreign policy of any country can be no more than the creation of favourable external circumstances for the successful execution of its internal policies. Beyond that basis, foreign policy is nothing but an expression of pious platitudes, in which of course our representatives excel a great deal.

If by independent foreign policy is meant that we do not always say the same things, or vote in the same way in the U. N. O. as do the U. S. A. or the U. K., that does not prove our independence very much. If by independent foreign policy is meant that we have no military pact with the U. S. A., the U. K. or the U. S. S. R., that again does not prove very much.

In a football game not all the players are assigned the same task. Nor in international strategy of imperialism need all the States mouth the same phrases, or play the

same role. The strategic position of India, the temper of her violently anti-imperialist people, the influence of the socialist constructions around, victory of the Chinese revolution and its magnetic pull for colonial peoples in Asia including India, compel the Indian Government to play a seemingly neutralist role, while the realities of India's internal economy and politics prove her to be only a neutral on the side of world capitalism.

Before Korean War

Even this verisimilitude of neutrality was not adopted by our Government by its own choice. The position of the Government of India in 1948 was well and logically expressed by one of the foremost mouthpieces of Indian bourgeoisie.

“Association with the Commonwealth which is more friendly to the U. S. A. than to the U. S. S. R. implies that in effect we are leaning towards the U. S. A. The logical consequence of this political fact (association with the Commonwealth) should be clear. We cannot in the United Nations or elsewhere take a line except on a minor issue which is contrary to that taken by the Commonwealth and the U. S. A.”

In 1950 India completely lined up with the aggressive U. S. imperialists in the Korean War. Even as late as September, 1951, more than a year after the outbreak of the Korean War, the Indian Ambassador to the United States publicly protested: “We deplore the word ‘neutralism’ as applied to us *in our situation*. In recent sessions of

the United Nations General Assembly, we have voted as you did 38 times out of 51, abstaining 11 times, and differed from you only twice.”

After Korean War

However, in the succeeding years the Government of India did differ from this or that imperialist power on a larger number of issues than before. But none but the gullible victims of Nehru-demagogy can claim that these differences constitute a definite breach with imperialism and adoption of a consistent opposition to the war plans and aggression of imperialism. The most eloquent commentary on the relation of Indian Government with imperialism, its consistent refusal to denounce the barbarities that are being committed by the imperialists in the colonial lands, the diplomatic silence of the Government of India in connexion with the struggles of the colonial peoples whether in Morocco or Malaya, in Kenya or Algeria, is definitely in the interest of the imperialists and against the colonial people. These policies are clearly the extensions of the home policy of the Government of India, viz: suppression of the demands of the toiling people.

The very manoeuvring of the Government of India, though within very limited range, reflect the reality of emergence of victorious Chinese revolution the concrete demonstration of its might in the Korean war. Indeed it has now been appreciated even by the rabid imperialists that the foreign policy of the Government of India is the only possible policy even for a friend of imperialism.

Now in the background of the border dispute with China, spokesmen of the Government of India, feel free to declare openly that though they take the aid of the socialist countries, "India looks to the U.S.A. and other western nations more than anybody else."

Rule Of Indian Social Classes

The feudal-based imperialist regime could not carry out such a progress. The ruling indigenous bourgeoisie have ignored the interests of the toiling people and have been content to rule with support of the feudal remnants, the upper stratum of the middle classes and the benevolent patronage of imperialism for more than a decade. They have tried unplanned development for the first four years and planned development for the past nine years. But we are still in the same squalor as of old; hunger, unemployment stagnation stalk this ancient and once prosperous land; India still is the slum of the world. And the worst is that the worst is yet to come. The ruling bourgeoisie have tried all their methods and have failed. They have nothing but vacuous socialistic phrase—mongering and democrati-demagogy, to counter the exasperation, the bitter disillusionment, the rising resentment of the masses. Their failure shall inevitably place on the agenda the historic question—who shall prevail? Either the bourgeoisie shall shift to the right, tear up its veil of democratic pretensions and effect a fascist overturn by violence, as has happened in some newly — liberated countries; or a new correlation of class forces shall be effected — and the proletariat with its allies the urban lower middle classes, the middle and poor peasantry and the landless, representing the will of the

overwhelming section of the people, shall assume its historic responsibilities; for fulfilment of the deep and abiding aspirations of our people.

Reform or Revolution

The question can be decided only by open, broad, decisive struggle of the basic contending classes. History has not vouchsafed the revolutionary classes any other method. Certain illusions have developed in our country concerning the role of universal adult franchise and parliamentary institutions, in effecting a progressive shift in the correlation of class force in India. The illusion is due first to inexperience of our masses regarding these institutions, secondly to the propaganda of the bourgeoisie, thirdly the parliamentary cretinism of the C. P. I and the P. S. P. and fourthly the accidental success of the C. P. I. in Kerala.

One swallow does not make a summer, nor does one success in a State legislature under peculiar circumstances controvert the historical truth that under the rule of capitalism, universal adult franchise and representative institutions are mere instruments for registering a particular correlation of class forces effected outside of it and independent of it. The representative institutions can no more change the correlation of class forces than a thermometer can effect change in the thermal state. The accident of the Communist Party in Kerala polls in 1957 is duly compensated for by the other 'accident' of the success of reactionaries in 1960 and that after two years of Communist Party Government in Kerala. The events of Kerala, instead of marking a

new departure of history, proves on the contrary the historical truth that classes cannot move diagonally for long, sacrificing their respective contradictory interests; that even the possibility of a threat to the vested interests would impel them to violate any constitution created by themselves.

That precisely is the problem in all the former colonies of imperialism. The capitalist—feudal—imperialist combination has nowhere been able to satisfy even the minimum demands of the people, and rather than risking sacrifice of the vested interests, they have sacrificed the constitutions of their own make. Bourgeois democracy is a guarantee, not against the bourgeoisie, but against the toiling people. The recent histories—from France to Pakistan—proves conclusively the historic truth once again that against the exploiting classes nothing avails except the unrelenting direct struggles of the people.

It is necessary at the same time to remember that though parliament and adult franchise by itself cannot effect the change in the class relations, it nevertheless has the power to help or obstruct the development of struggles of the people, of drawing the backward masses into its vortex, giving expression to the will of the people, though to a very limited extent. Only when the parliaments are entirely powerless, the revolutionary classes can dispense with the use of its platform. Till then, parliamentary activity is a part of the propaganda, agitation and organizational work of the revolutionary classes.

Need of a Revolutionary Party:

The most important precondition for the victory of the revolutionary classes is their subjective preparation, organization of a revolutionary party, a party which not only expresses the revolutionary will of the people, but also is capable of mobilizing the vast masses. Such a party shall have to be based not only on correct scientific revolutionary principles, but must have mass character, i. e., it must be able to draw within its field the best elements of the oppressed classes and train them in the performance of their duties as leaders of the people. In India, this lack of subjective preparations has condemned the revolutionary classes to ineffectuality time and again.

To build up such a party, the first necessity is to combat and eliminate all influences of bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideologies. Such a task would not have been difficult in a period of recurrent crises except for the presence among the mass of parties, which apparently stand for the masses against their exploiters, but in reality protect the vital interests of the exploiting classes, by blunting the edge of the revolutionary struggles, by distorting the perspective, by revolutionary struggles, by distorting the perspective, by confining the energies of the masses to securing the redress of only their immediate grievances, in short, by reformism. In effect such parties function as the second line of defence of the bourgeoisie.

Role of Indian Political Parties : The Communist Party:

Of such parties the most important in India is the Communist Party of India, not only because it is the largest and the most well-organized of such parties, but principally because it functions in the name of Communism, a name which is the symbol of the hopes and aspirations of the down-trodden masses all over the world, and also because it thrives in the reflected glory of the socialist constructs in all lands where Workers States have been established.

The history of the Communist Party of India is a history of distortions and even betrayals of the people. It is not that they thwart the masses at every step as does the Praja Socialist Party. In fact the C. P. I. is the foremost Party in India in agitational activities. Their role is far more subtle and insidious and therefore far more dangerous. In most day to day struggles they are with the people. But whenever the fundamental interests of the ruling classes were in danger, they were found on the other side. They stood against the Civil Disobedience Movement of the thirties; they collaborated with imperialism in the holy name of defending the Soviet Union, in 1942 in the Post-War resurgence, they played the role of tranquilizer; on the transfer of power they pledged their loyalties to the Congress.

Today, on the eve of another crisis, the Communist Party of India again stands against the fundamental interests of the people, as before, in a very subtle manner. Their latest ideological stand is a proof of their latest betrayal.

Their understanding is that the main enemy is feudalism and imperialism and the task of defeating these forces devolves on a 'government of democratic unity', which includes the Indian bourgeoisie. Nobody disputes the necessity of completely defeating and completely eliminating the forces of feudalism and imperialism in India. But the crux of the problem is how to achieve it and what are the social forces available for it.

Such a formulation completely ignores the significance of 1947 transfer of power and the subsequent agrarian legislations undertaken by the Congress Government which has altered the class relations in the country preponderantly in favour of the Indian bourgeoisie. The basis of such a formulation is that India is still a colonial country where the imperialist regime stands on the basis of feudalism. This is a gross travesty of historical facts, deliberately manufactured, in order to describe a progressive (if not a revolutionary) role to the Indian bourgeoisie and thus covering up the reactionary character of the class collaboration that the Communist Party of India pursues.

Previous to 1947, the rule of imperialism stood on the basis of feudalism and the compradore section of the bourgeoisie collaborated with imperialism at all critical moments and even participated in the exercise of imperialist power.

In face of the tremendous mass resurgence in the post-War period, imperialism was compelled to retreat by hand-

ing over political power to the Indian bourgeoisie as a whole. The tottering feudal elements with their main prop, imperialist political support, surrendered to the Indian bourgeoisie which in its turn instead of liquidating feudalism completely, incorporated it within the bourgeois framework of social relations in which the interests of the feudal elements were protected through bourgeois form of property, bourgeois law and bourgeois State power. This is the essence of the changes that have taken place in the country.

To be sure, the rehabilitation of the feudal vested interests have not eliminated all feudal forms of exploitation, nor transfer of power have eliminated imperialist exploitation. But these are protected by none other than the Indian bourgeoisie. That is why the Indian bourgeoisie is no longer - what the Communist Party of India so generously or erroneously term 'national' or progressive. With the transfer of power, the oppositional role of the Indian bourgeoisie is at an end. Such a role the Indian bourgeoisie can assume only in the event of an imperialist aggression against India's integrity or sovereignty. The Communist Party of India raises the same question of 'national' struggle in collaboration with the Indian bourgeoisie against the imperialist and feudal vested interests which are protected by the same 'national, bourgeoisie. The absurdity of their position is patent. This absurd position the Communist Party of India had to manufacture in order to cover the heinous treachery they are committing in the form of class collaboration with

the Indian bourgeoisie. They may not agree with all the policy details of the Indian bourgeoisie represented by the Congress Government, but then not even all sections of the bourgeoisie support all and every policy of the Congress Government. But they nevertheless stand with the Indian bourgeoisie with the Congress Government—the enemy of all the toiling people of India.

Without breaking this shield of Indian bourgeoisie, it would be impossible for the toiling masses of India to get at the main enemy, the Indian bourgeoisie. From this analysis it would be utterly wrong, to make the Communist Party of India the main target of our attack. Not a Party, but a class, can be the main target of attack as the main enemy. The Communist Party strives to stand not on the bourgeoisie but on the toiling sections. Its political class-character is petty-bourgeois, and it uses Marxist phrasology only in order to deceive the masses better. The task of the Revolutionary Communists would be to unmask this petty-bourgeois character of the Communist Party and isolate it from the revolutionary classes.

The Praja Socialist Party :

In order to establish the revolutionary content of Communist movement in India, there are other political ideologies to be eliminated. Of them that of the Praja Socialist Party which is based on Gandhism and is a tail-endist organisation of the Indian bourgeoisie is urgent

but less difficult. Because of its consistent opposition to the vital interests of the people even in their day-to-day struggles, their propaganda against the socialist countries, and favour of American imperialism they are being exposed very considerably among the advanced sections of the toiling people as agents of the main enemy, viz., the Indian bourgeoisie. As a result, the influence of the P. S. P. is more pronounced among the backward sections of the toiling people, than among the vanguard. The Socialist Party a splinter of the P. S. P. -has all features of the parent organisation with this difference that it recognizes the political necessity of agitation. Being unable to undertake fundamental class issues, it often therefore indulges in peculiar Quixotism only to attract attention of the people. The very uncertainties of its political behaviour marks it out as a potential supporter of any reactionary adventure.

Other Left Parties:

There are numerous other political parties, mostly of local or regional character, whose political behaviour is not strictly predicatable. Some among them profess revolutionary ideology but are unable to exercise any decisive influence principally due to their organizational limitations. From the point of view of the task of establishing revolutionary communism as the dominant ideology of our toiling people, these parties and groups have a significance far out of proportion to their present strength or influence on events.

A Call For Unification of All Revolutionary Forces:

The task of the Revolutionary Communist Party of India-itself a victim of smallness-is to consolidate all these revolutionary parties and groups on the principle of revolutionary Marxism as an important step towards the building up of a mass party of revolutionary communism.

In this connexion, notice has to be taken of a trend which views this proces of consolidation with misgivings, prompted in their opinion, by very laudable sentiments, viz., purity of political principles and organizational unity. There is also in them a lurking sentiment of Party patriotism, i. e. loyalty to the achievements of the Party.

The Basis of Revolutionary Unity :

We must clearly affirm that there can be no question of consolidating forces which differ on fundamental questions of Marxism-Leninism. No organization is worth the name of a party which contains within it opposite ideological trends. A Marxist-Leninist organization cannot tolerate an alien trend within itself. The cohesion of the Party must be based not only on acceptance of the main principles but also on the main strategy of Marxism-Leninism. Within that framework, there may be differences of opinion which are perfectly capable of being accommodated and finally resolved within the party on the basis of Democratic Centralism- the Marxist-Leninist principle of organization.

To refuse to recognize difference of opinion of such minor nature is tantamount to rejection of the principle of democratic centralism, and lapse into sectarianism, and acceptance of the monolithic structure of the Party. A Party of this kind would not be able to function as the instrument of expression of the will of the people.

As for the political contribution of any single group or party, for that the repository would be the historical experience of the vanguard of the revolutionary class. The experience of the revolutionary class is the only truthful biography of any Party or group, not the Party itself.

We, Revolutionary Communists, must not accept our organizational weakness as an outcome of the purity of our principles. So long as our principles are sound, clear and firm, we should never despair of convincing others who differ with us not on fundamentals but on mere details or on minor questions. In the growth and development of Revolutionary Communism, the defence of our fundamental principles not only among the Vanguard but also among the masses shall be our principal task.

STATE OF THE MOVEMENT.

The building up of a mass party of Revolutionary Communism is inseparably connected with the experiences of the masses - not merely of injustice and inequality, of exploitation and oppression, but also of struggles against these. The ideological struggles against capitalism and its pseudo-left variants, assumes relevance only as needs of the concrete

struggles of the masses. Through their struggles, the masses not only learn that the downfall of the outmoded social structure and its replacement by socialism is inevitable, but also create the party, fashion the instrument of their deliverance.

Never before in India were conditions more favourable for the development of mass struggles against capitalism.

With the withdrawal of imperialist administration, the possessing classes of India can no longer practise that sleight-of-hand by which they used to ascribe all ills of the present society to foreign domination. Even their appeal for time no longer stands to reason. They have had more than a decade to prove their bonafides. They have executed two Five Year Plans.

And yet the basic problems of the masses have continued to become more acute every day. Inequality, injustice, exploitation and oppression are more rampant than ever. True, capitalism has been able to expand its base in course of this last decade, but that has not made it more secure. The mounting unemployment, widespread food scarcity, declining buying power of the masses of the people are impelling them on to the road of the struggle. Stagnation in agriculture, decline in export, increasing adversity in balance of trade are constantly threatening a sharp economic crisis. Thus the unstable equilibrium is getting more precarious every day. The ever-growing gap between the actual rate of growth and the rate of growth needed even to prevent a decline in the standard of living, not to speak

of its rise, is creating conditions in which serious and widespread mass struggles have become inevitable. Not merely that, the inevitable has become real. Despite very great unevenness, this very large country is continually being swept by vast and at times bitter struggles not only of industrial workers, landless peasantry, share croppers, urban lower middle classes, but also comparatively secure and well off employees are being drawn into the vortex of these struggles, which clearly reveal the depth of the crises. The most striking feature of these struggles, in spite of Government assertion to the contrary, is that these are being forced from below. They are taking place in spite of their leadership. Indeed the masses are straining at the leash.

That these struggles are not more widespread, not more continual, not more bitter, is due to the very character of the existing leadership composed of bourgeois reformists, petty-bourgeois vacillators, and left opportunists, whose sole aim is to feather their own nest, and for the purpose, protect the present social order. They mislead the struggles, deviate them from their correct path and prevent the masses from discovering the real face of their enemy and drawing the necessary active militant conclusions. The masses are already wary of them. They get on with this leadership because the urge for struggle is too strong and there is not yet parallel leadership formed. In fact the mass struggles in India today or crying out for a serious, capable, revolutionary, alternative leadership.

The lack of a revolutionary leadership does not merely mean prolongation of the existing system. The loss of faith by the masses in their struggles, after repeated betrayals, would create conditions in which capitalism in crisis would find an easy path to fascism. If the country does not move forward, it would inevitably fall backward. That this is no mere theoretical conjecture, but an urgent unavoidable outcome, is proved by the recent histories of many countries, near and far, advanced and backward. Even now, in spite of the vast and grim struggles, the reactionaries are very far from being isolated.

For the Revolutionary Communists, the problem is how to undertake the tremendous responsibilities of this vast movement, with their limited strength. The challenge has to be met firstly by discarding the petty-bourgeois fear that the strength of the party is the strength of the struggle. The struggle draws its strength from the depth of the crisis. The task of the party is to give it clear and courageous expression, and to unambiguously indicate before the masses the correct path. This task cannot be accomplished from a distance by non-participants. The party of Revolutionary Communists must participate in every serious struggle of the masses, irrespective of who at the moment may be at the head of it, must generalize and give expression to every incipient struggle of the masses for the realization of their aims.

Most struggles inevitably entail setbacks, losses, for the party and for the masses, even defeats. But these losses are bound to be temporary phenomena. Irrespective

of the immediate outcome, every serious struggle is bound ultimately to strengthen the masses and the party. Fighting always in the sure knowledge of ultimate victory, we must not be deterred by possibilities of defeats we know to be temporary. Treachery and betrayal are today the biggest enemies of the masses and the most dangerous ones. There are no circumstances in which merciless struggles against betrayals of the struggles can be considered inopportune. We must continually stand for unity of the masses in action, but never surrender our inalienable right to denounce treachery and betrayal in clearest terms. Nor must we become sectarians, isolated from the progressive struggles of the masses on the plea of protecting the purity of our principles. Only by our inseparable link with the masses, only by strengthening their struggles, furthering their aims, can the party of Revolutionary Communists become the alternative leader of the Indian masses.

In course of the struggles, all Revolutionary Communists must orientate their tactics on the clear understanding of the strategic task imposed by the conditions obtaining in India today and the prevailing world situation. The condition is that in spite of the objective maturity for liquidating capitalism, the subjective factor is sorely lacking. However, the existing world situation is more favourable than ever before to the formation of the subjective leadership. In this period many bitter and widespread struggles would arise through which the subjective factor will have to be forged. In this period, the conquest of the masses by isolating the reformists and opportunists and by

liquidating the enemies must remain our principal strategic task.

This strategic task is unthinkable without the considered attention to all, even practical questions of tactics. It is necessary to help the masses in the process of their daily struggles to find the bridge between the present demands and the programme of the Indian revolution. With this end in view, the Revolutionary Communists put forward a programme of transitional demands, flowing from today's conditions and from today's consciousness of the wide layers of the masses and unalterably leading to one final conclusion: the overthrow of capitalism and the conquest of power by the proletariat. The essence of the transitional demands is contained in the fact that ever more openly and a decisively they will be directed against the very bases of the bourgeois regime itself, as none of the basic problems of the masses is capable of being finally solved in this epoch within the limits of the capitalist property relations and of the bourgeois State.

TRANSITIONAL PROGRAMME OF THE PARTY.

A) *International Relations :*

1. Withdrawal from the British Commonwealth and Sterling Bloc.
2. Closer relations with the Workers' States and newly-freed under developed countries in their struggle against imperialism.

3. Full support to all anti-imperialist liberation movements and struggles against the outbreak of another world war.
4. Liquidation of all foreign occupied territories on Indian mainland.
5. Publication and abrogation of all secret treaties and pacts.
6. Defence of Soviet Union, People's China and other Workers' States against capitalist attack,
7. Support to mass struggle in Workers' States in their demand for greater democracy, better living conditions and wider socialization.
8. Support to the struggle of the working class for socialism in metropolitan countries.

B) *Democratic Demands :*

1. Freedom of speech, press and assembly and provisions to legally secure them; abolition of executive prerogative to curtail them.
2. To guarantee the right to work, rest, education and security.
3. Repeal of the anti-democratic and repressive laws; the Preventive Detention, the Security and the Essential Services Acts.
4. Release of all political prisoners.
5. Right of recall of elected representatives.

6. Genuine safeguards for linguistic and cultural minorities.
7. Special provisions for upliftment and autonomy for the tribal and backward peoples.
8. Abolition of the use of all titles and personal distinctions.
9. Stoppage of privy purse.

C) *Planning :*

1. To ensure genuine planning in the interest of the masses, complete overall control of supply of raw materials, production, price, distribution and resources of the country are essential.

D) *Industry and Working Class :*

1. Nationalization and centralization of all banks and general insurance.
2. Nationalization of all basic industries, mines, plantations and big organized industries and worker's control of production in them.
3. Immediate large-scale production of agricultural machinery and implements.
4. State monopoly of foreign trade.
5. Complete prohibition of import of all luxury goods.
6. Limitation of profit distribution.

7. Prevention of tax dodging through inspection of company accounts by Trade Unions and Consumers' Co-operatives.
8. Ceiling on salaries.
9. No purchase of foreign arms.
10. Nationalization of wholesale trade in consumers' goods.
11. Complete freedom to organize and the right to strike.
12. Sliding scale of wages to fight against rising prices.
13. Sliding scale of hours to fight unemployment.
14. Equal pay for equal work.
15. Introduction of the system of industrial training for workers.
16. Organization of cottage industries on co-operative basis.

E) *Agriculture and Peasantry :*

1. Elimination of intermediaries and land to the tillers.
2. Fixation of a ceiling on land to ensure an economic holding for a family of five.
3. All surplus land to be distributed free among the landless and the poor agriculturists through their own committees.
4. Enforcement of land ceilings of 20 acres of double crop land or equivalent for a family of five.

5. Cancellation of debts of the landless and the poor and middle peasants.
6. No realization of arrears of rent from the uneconomic holding.
7. Exemption for tillers of uneconomic holding from paying any taxes or rents.
8. Abolition of the land rent system and introduction of tax on agricultural income in a sliding scale.
9. Timely and adequate supply of long-term agricultural loan at low rate of interest without collateral security.
10. Adequate and timely supply of fertilizers, seeds and implements.
11. Rapid expansion of small-scale irrigation facilities.
12. Minimum guaranteed prices for agricultural produce.
13. Supply of industrial consumers goods to poor and landless peasantry at a price within their reach.
14. Fixation of a minimum wage for agricultural workers.
15. Introduction of co-operative farming, on a voluntary basis.
16. Introduction of scientific farming through Model State Farms.
17. Complete self-sufficiency in food.
18. Establishment of agricultural marketing agencies on co-operative basis.
19. Organization of consumers' co-operatives.

F) *Health and Sanitation :*

1. Immediate introduction of free and compulsory primary education and extension of education upto secondary stage within a short time.
2. Immediate removal of adult illiteracy.
3. Mass expansion of higher and technical education for the entire population.
4. Adequate remuneration for teachers.
5. Introduction of free medical aid to all.
6. Eradication of the evil of adulteration in food and medicine.
7. Introduction of adequate sanitary measures throughout the country.