

# SOME QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE INDIAN REVOLUTION

Our country has become politically independent but emancipation of the people from all sorts of exploitation, economic, political, social and cultural is yet to be achieved. Emancipation of our people demands the overthrow of the existing capitalist order in our country through revolution under the leadership of the working class. But serious mistakes and confusions of fundamental character about the stage of the Indian revolution, its strategy and tactics are prevailing among the political parties and the people. Without removing these mistakes and confusions, we shall not be able to make our revolution victorious. We, therefore, propose to discuss in this article some questions concerning our revolution.

No two countries are exactly similar in all respects. Due to difference in the degree of development of capitalism, the character of society and the state, administrative machinery, alignment of social forces, national-cultural make-up, theoretical and practical maturity of the people and so many other matters, each one of which in some way or other influences the course of revolution, the revolution of one country cannot be a replica of that in another country. It is for this difference in concrete conditions in different countries that the application of Marxism-Leninism, which provides only the general guiding principles of revolution, cannot be the same everywhere. Integration of these general guiding principles with the actual practice of revolution in a country is the only way to make the revolution of that country successful. By this way alone can we concretise Marxism-Leninism on the soil.

This is simple reiteration of old, accepted, position. But this reiteration has now become particularly necessary in our country, when independent analysis of the Indian situation and creative application of the general guiding principles of Marxism-Leninism in the context of

concrete condition of our country for the success of our revolution has yielded place to blind and mechanical acceptance of the programmes of some communist parties abroad, when historical parallels and analogy have taken the place of independent working out of policies and tactics suited to our country. Otherwise, how can the CPI advocate here the revisionist Khrushchevite line of national democratic revolution? How can the CPI(M) express fundamentally the same idea in its political line for people's democratic revolution? How can the Naxalites, on the analogy of China, preach that the Chinese way is also our way? It goes without saying that such a blind copying of the policies and tactics of foreign communist parties will only stand in the way of victory of our revolution.

## Pre-revolution Chinese Society

For the proper understanding of our readers we should examine pre-revolution Chinese society in order to show its basic difference with present-day Indian society. Some of the characteristics of pre-revolution Chinese society are mentioned below. First, a large part of the Chinese territory was under the direct political rule of the Japanese imperialists. This part was a

Japanese colony. Second, the rest of the country was divided into different spheres of influence of different foreign imperialist powers; over this part various cliques of old and new warlords, puppets of foreign imperialist powers, having their own armies, ruled. The warlords used to carry on incessant wars among them and sometimes they would even fight against the so-called Central Government, which had no real control over the country as a whole. There was no centralised administration with well-knit modern communication system. (vide Mao Tse-tung. **Why Can China's Red Political Power Exist?**) Third, "imperialism controls not only China's vital financial and economic arteries but also her political and military power." (Mao Tse-tung. **The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party**) Fourth, "the landlords, armed and unarmed, are not only the economic but also the administrative and judicial power." (Stalin. **Revolution in China and Tasks of the Comintern**) Fifth, centralised capitalist national market did not develop and "localised agricultural economy (instead of unified capitalist economy)" prevailed. (**Why Can China's Red Political Power Exist?**) Sixth, national capitalism "has not become the principal social-economic form in China; quite feeble in strength, it is mostly tied in varying degrees to both foreign imperialism and domestic feudalism." (**The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party**) "The national bourgeoisie in China is weak in the extreme, incomparably weaker than the Russian bourgeoisie was in the period of 1905." (Stalin. **The Prospect of Revolution in China**.)

Russia in the period of 1905 was little developed capitalistically. It was a backward country with primitive

pre-capitalist economy. Pre-revolution China was incomparably less capitalistically developed than even the backward primitive Russia of 1905. An idea of pre-revolution Chinese society may be had from the fact that in 1950, one year after the founding of the People's Republic of China, Chinese society was "30 per cent capitalist and 70 per cent feudal" (Laio Lu-yen. **Rural Class Status and Land Reforms**)

These characteristics invariably lead to the conclusion that pre-revolution Chinese society was colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal in character. Com. Mao Tse-tung described pre-revolution Chinese society as follows: "In China today, society is colonial in the Japanese-occupied areas, and basically semi-colonial in the areas under Kuomintang rule; but both in the Japanese-occupied areas and the areas under Kuomintang rule, society is predominantly feudal and semi-feudal. This, then, is the character of present-day China. The politics of such a society are predominantly colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal politics, its economy is predominantly a colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal economy, and its culture, which reflects such politics and such an economy and occupies the dominant position, is colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal culture." (**On New Democracy**)

## Indian Agriculture

Present-day Indian society, on the contrary, is a developed capitalist society. It is often argued by the CPI(M), CPI and the Naxalites that, since agriculture is the largest single source of national income, Indian society is semi-colonial and semi-feudal. This argument is untenable. These so-called communist parties confuse agricultural economy

(Continued to page 4)

# PRE-REVOLUTION CHINESE SOCIETY AND

(Continued from page 3)

as feudal economy. Agricultural economy, *ipso facto*, does not mean feudal economy, as industrial economy is not synonymous with capitalist economy. It is a fact that in India agriculture is the largest single source of national income. But our agriculture is capitalist agriculture.

Does not capitalist agriculture presuppose mechanised agriculture on the basis of big land farming? Did not Marx himself say that capitalism, by introducing machinery, revolutionised agriculture? Mechanised agriculture based on big land farming, as is the case in Great Britain and the USA, is certainly not the general pattern of our agriculture. How then can our agriculture be called capitalist agriculture? This is the burden of argument of these so-called communist parties. This argument also does not stand. It is true that Marx spoke of introduction by capitalism of machinery in agriculture. But Marxism requires concrete analysis of concrete condition. The above observation of Marx is to be understood in the context of the concrete condition under which it was made. To parrot what Marx had said about the role of capitalism in the epoch of rising capitalism, when capitalism as a world social force was revolutionary, developing and not crisis-ridden, at the present time, when capitalism as a world social force has become definitely counter-revolutionary, moribund, crisis-ridden and incapable of carrying out industrial revolution, is to fail to make concrete analysis of concrete condition. In the epoch of rising capitalism, in its own interests capitalism mechanised agriculture on the basis of big land farming precisely for the simple reason that without doing it capitalism could not release from land thousands of persons necessary as wage-labour for the rapidly growing industries

and carry out industrial revolution. But in the present era of imperialism and of proletarian revolutions, particularly in the post-second world war period, the position is completely changed. Capitalism today is mortally afraid of revolution; as a world social force it has become definitely counter-revolutionary. It is moribund and rent with serious crisis. Till the first world war, in spite of its general crisis, as Lenin observed, capitalism was developing far more rapidly than before. But its present crisis is different. For, capitalism has now lost even the relative stability of market, which world capitalist economy used to enjoy even in the period of its general crisis up to the second world war. As a result, crisis has now become almost an everyday affair, prolonged, affecting every-branch of industries. The tendency of decay and stagnation also has become more pronounced. In this situation, it is next to impossible for capitalism even to keep the existing industries running and fully utilise their installed capacities without militarising the economy. Militarisation of economy also, far from easing the crisis, is, on the contrary, making it more acute. Faced with mounting crisis of this nature, capitalism today is absolutely incapable of carrying out industrial revolution.

Look at the condition in our country. Even the little industrial development, which India has succeeded in achieving, has already landed the capitalist economy of the country into the mire of serious crisis of market, leading to closure of industrial establishments, non-utilisation of installed capacities of industries, stoppage of shifts, *en masse* retrenchment and lay-off of workers, etc., all acting as a brake on rapid and further industrialisation, which the Indian bourgeoisie wants to

do, in order to develop India as a powerful capitalist country in the shortest possible time. Even heavy dose of artificial stimulation of the economy through increased defence production is failing to stem the tide of economic recession. In the circumstances, if the ruling bourgeoisie in our country organises our agriculture on the basis of mechanised big land farming then it will render millions of persons now attached to land (they are, of course, not fully employed even now) surplus, to absorb whom in industries is beyond the power of the present Indian capitalist economy. Unemployment of this vast multitude of people, so rendered surplus, will further lower the overall purchasing power of the population, still contract the already-contracted home market and bring the Indian national economy on to the verge of collapse, if not actually collapse it. For this reason the ruling Indian bourgeoisie can ill afford to mechanise and modernise our agriculture on the basis of big land farming (not only the ruling bourgeoisie but also Mr. Nambudiripad, when he was Chief Minister of Kerala as leader of the united CPI, refused to mechanise agriculture for the same reason), even though it knows that the way to overcome the economic backwardness of our country lies in mechanising and modernising our agriculture. These so-called communist parties should remember that even in the advanced capitalist countries of the West, where agriculture is organised on the basis of mechanised big land farming, we are finding suggestions from bourgeois economists to revert to small farming as means to fight the mounting crisis. In fine, in the present situation in our country, absence of mechanised agriculture based on big land farming is no logic for concluding that our agriculture is not capitalist but semi-feudal.

Those, who so do, refuse to make concrete analysis of concrete condition. They vulgarise Marxism-Leninism.

In ascertaining if the agriculture of a country is capitalist agriculture or not, Com. Lenin stressed on three points, namely, (1) number of agricultural labourers, (2) concentration of land in the hands of a few and (3) nature of trade and commerce of agricultural produce, in that country. First, about the number of agricultural labourers. Landless agricultural labourers constitute 24 per cent of the total rural households in our country (vide *Towards Growth with Social Justice*). But they are not all. There are allotment-holding wage-workers with small patches of land in a state of utter ruin unable to exist without sale of their labour-power. They are also agricultural labourers (vide Lenin. *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*) Households owning land upto 2.4 acres may be taken as belonging to this type of agricultural labourers. According to 1961 census figures, they account for about 37 per cent of the total rural households. Thus, agricultural labourers in our country will not be less than 61 per cent of the total rural households. In fact, they will be more. Because, the official figures in this case err on the side of under-estimation. The labour-power of this vast number of people has become a commodity for capitalist national market and is being exploited for the production of agricultural commodities for capitalist national market. When labour-power becomes a commodity for capitalist national market, society is capitalist.

Second, about concentration of land in the hands of a few. According to the *Report of the Committee on Distribution of Income and Levels of Living*, in 1959-60, the top 1 per cent of the households.

# PRESENT-DAY INDIAN SOCIETY COMPARED

owned 16 per cent of the total holdings in our country, the top 5 per cent owned 40 per cent and the top 10 per cent owned 56 per cent of the total holdings while the bottom 20 per cent of the households did not own any land at all. Mind that this was the position even after enforcement of land-ceiling provisions of land reforms legislation. The class, into whose hands land is, thus, being concentrated, is not the old feudal landlord class but a new class, the rural bourgeois class, producing with the help of agricultural labourers agricultural commodities for capitalist national market.

Third, about the nature of trade and commerce of agricultural produce. It is an undeniable fact that, like industrial goods, agricultural produce also is now a commodity for capitalist national market subject to the law of demand and supply of capitalist market, hoarding, speculation, bank advances, price manipulation by the monopolists, etc. The law of maximum profit, that operates in the case of industrial goods, operates with equal force in the case of agricultural produce also. Agricultural produce is no less under the grip of the monopolists than industrial goods are. In view of all this our people have been agitating for complete state-trading in food grains, oil seeds, jute, cotton and other agricultural produce. Had not the nature of trade and commerce in agricultural produce in our country been fully capitalistic, the demand for state-trading would not have been raised. Not only agricultural produce but land as well has become a commodity for capitalist national market here.

## Feudal Remnant

Is there then no feudal remnant in our land system? "When the First Plan was being formulated, intermediary tenures like *zamindaris*, *jagirs*

and *inams* covered more than 40 per cent of the area. There were large disparities in the ownership of land held under *ryotwari* tenure which covered the other 60 per cent area; and a substantial portion of land was cultivated through tenants-at-will and share-croppers." (Draft Fourth Plan published in 1966) After the enforcement of land reforms legislation by different state governments the situation has changed. Intermediary rent-receiving rights in land have been abolished and direct relationship between the state and the peasant has been established. Tenants-at-will and share-croppers, however, still continue to exist. But, according to the National Sample Survey conducted in 1960-61, they together accounted for a negligible percentage of the total operated land in our country, 11.6 per cent.

Exaction of rent from the tenant-at-will and share-cropping are not independent of the surrounding economy. Only in relation to the surrounding capitalist economy of our country can their real nature be understood. Rent paid by the tenant-at-will is monetary consideration paid to the owner of the land leased out to the former for unspecified period. Under capitalism lease is not a feudal transaction entered into by and between the lessor and the lessee. Such lease is not only land but also mines, houses and even plants and machinery is very common under capitalism. Will any body call it feudalism? Certainly not. The capitalist state also leases out land to the farmer. The case of settlement-holders in Assam is an example of it. This is not feudalism. Tenancy-at-will, therefore, is no proof of feudal relations in land system in our country.

Same can be said of share-croppers. Share-croppers in our country may be divided into two categories—(1) those

who cultivate the land with ploughs, cattle, seeds, etc. supplied by the owners of the land and (2) those who cultivate the land with their own ploughs, cattle, seeds, etc. In the former case the land-owner, like the capitalist employer, supplies the means of production while the share-cropper supplies only the labour-power. As price of his labour-power the share-cropper gets a share of the produce of the land he cultivates. But price of labour-power is wage. Thus, the former type of share-croppers are practically wage-workers, the difference being that here wage is paid in kind (share of produce of the land) and not in money. But payment in kind makes no basic difference. The wages of agricultural labourers here in many cases also are paid in kind. For such payment in kind they do not cease to be wage-workers. The other type of share-cropping, where the share-cropper supplies plough, cattle, seed, etc. in addition to his labour-power, is, in the words of Lenin, a transitional form to capitalism. Present-day capitalism in the face of mounting crisis in general, particularly Indian capitalism born under the subjugation of foreign finance capital and having for this reason a stunted growth and having developed by making compromises with feudalism cannot outright fight out the obsolete form and is adapting the obsolete form for its development. Such insignificant hang-overs of feudalism in the land system exist even in the advanced capitalist countries of the West. In 1920 when Lenin presented to the Second Congress of the Comintern the Preliminary Draft Theses on the Agrarian Question "payment of rent or share of crop (for example, the metayers, share-croppers in France, Italy and other countries) to the big landlords" and "share-croppers in the

USA" existed. Payment of rent for land and share cropping are still in existence in these countries. No Marxist-Leninist will certainly say that the agriculture in France, Italy or the USA is semi-feudal because of the existence of the system of payment of rent or share of crop to the big landlords, as the CPI(M), CPI and the Naxalites are saying in respect of the Indian agriculture.

## Present-day Indian Society

From what has been discussed so far it is clear that our agriculture is capitalist agriculture. Even though agriculture here is the largest single source of national income, Indian society is not a semi-colonial semi-feudal society. India now is a developed capitalist country ranking "tenth among the world's industrial nations." (S. Chandrasekhar, *American Aid and India's Economic Development*) Unlike in China, here pre-capitalist localised agricultural economy is a thing of distant past. In India, national capitalism has not only grown and become the principal economic form but also turned fully into monopoly. Through coalescence of industrial capital with bank capital it has given birth to powerful finance capital and financial oligarchy, which has established its dominance over the national economy. The Indian monopolists are exporting capital to foreign countries and, in collaboration with the native bourgeoisie of these countries, setting up joint ventures there. Some of these countries are even powerful imperialist countries like Great Britain, Canada and the USA. Of these foreign countries "Kenya leads the list with 9 ventures with Indian participation, followed by 7 in Ethiopia, 7 in Malaysia, 6 in Nigeria, 5 in Ceylon, 4 in Iran, 3 each in the United

(Continued to page 6)

# Indian Big Bourgeoisie Not Of Comprador Character

(Continued from page 5)

Kingdom, Saudi Arabia and Zambia, 2 each in Canada, Ireland, West Indies, Uganda and Libya and 1 each in Afganistan, Iraq, Lebanon, Indonesia, Thailand, the USA, Columbia, Tanzania and Ghana." (Eastern Economist dated June 12, 1970) The joint ventures are over and above the Indian concerns, that existed before, with total assets of Rs. 235 crores (after valuation changes arising from devaluation of the Indian currency in June, 1966) as at the end of 1961. (vide Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, August, 1969) Indian banks are doing substantial business in foreign countries. What do these facts tell? Students of political economy know that exploitation of the natural resources and people of one country by the finance capital of a foreign country is what is called imperialist exploitation. The above-mentioned facts establish that Indian finance capital is already engaged in exploiting the natural resources and peoples of other countries. In other words, India is already in the process of emerging as an imperialist country. It is true that compared to the powerful imperialist countries, exploitation by Indian finance capital of foreign countries is insignificant. But that is a question of degree and not of quality.

## Chinese Big Bourgeoisie and Indian Big Bourgeoisie

The Naxalites in their mistaken zeal to establish India as a semi-colonial country argue in the face of these glaring facts to the contrary that the capital, which the Indian monopolists are investing in foreign countries, is not Indian capital but *benami* US capital with fake Indian label and that those, who are investing the capital, are not monopolists but comprador bourgeoisie. What proof do they advance in support of their argument? No proof what-

soever. They only show their pig-headed obstinacy refusing to recognise the reality. Let us for the sake of argument assume that the capital invested by the Tatas, Birlas and such other big capitalists abroad is *benami* US capital with fake Indian mark. But even this assumption, though admittedly incorrect, cannot explain how can the Tatas, Birlas and such other big Indian capitalists are increasingly becoming partners, of course, junior partners but all the same partners, of international trusts and cartels. As explained by our leader, Com. Shibdas Ghosh, only monopolists serving the interests of the development of national capitalism and native industry and not comprador bourgeoisie directly serving the interests of foreign imperialists and acting as their subservient agent can become partners of international capitalist monopolies. Had the Tatas, Birlas and such other big capitalists, who are investing capital in foreign countries, been comprador in character and subservient agents of the foreign imperialists then it would not have been possible for them to occupy the position as partners of international trusts and cartels. The very position of theirs as partners of international capitalist monopolies establishes beyond any question that they are monopolists and not comprador bourgeoisie.

Every student of political economy knows that money is not always capital. Only at a particular stage of development of society money is transformed into capital. Before that money is only a medium of exchange. Then again, capitalism does not exhibit the same tendency all through its development. It has, in fact, two tendencies. In the first stage of its development, the awakening of national life occurs when the national bourgeoisie conducts struggles against national

oppression for the establishment of the national state. But in the later phase of its development, in the stage of monopoly, the national bourgeoisie, which had earlier fought for the establishment of the national state and which, in the mean time, has developed into monopolist, tries to accelerate international intercourse in every form by breaking down national barriers for achieving international unity of capital, politics, etc. Both these tendencies are a universal law of capitalism, which shows that monopolists develop from that section of the national bourgeoisie, that had conducted national movements in the first stage of development of national capitalism against national oppression for the establishment of independent sovereign national state.

Lenin said: "Developing capitalism knows two historical tendencies in the national question. The first is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression, and the creation of national states. The second is the development and growing frequency of international intercourse in every form, the break-down of national barriers, the creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc. Both tendencies are a universal law of capitalism. The former predominates in the beginning of its development, the latter characterises a mature capitalism that is moving towards its transformation into socialist society." (Critical Remarks on the National Question) It is clear from the foregoing observation of Lenin that monopolists, who seek to achieve international unity of capital, (the Tatas, Birlas and other big capitalists of India are striving to achieve international unity of capital by setting up joint ventures in our country in collaboration with foreign monopolists as

well as by establishing joint ventures with Indian participation in foreign countries), develop not from the comprador section of the national bourgeoisie, that directly serves the interests of foreign imperialists, opposes the national point of view in favour of foreign imperialists and acts as their subservient agent, but from that section of the national bourgeoisie, that in the early stage of development of national capitalism had conducted national movement against national oppression for the creation of the national state and reflects the interests of development of national capitalism and native industry. A monopolist, therefore, cannot be comprador in character. A comprador capitalist may, however, in course of time become a monopolist, provided that he engages himself in the development of national capitalism and native industry, transforms himself from comprador to national capitalist, takes the path of development as a monopolist and ultimately emerges as a monopolist. Though a comprador capitalist can, thus, develop into a monopolist, a monopolist cannot develop into a comprador capitalist. In the light of this brilliant elaboration of the Leninist understanding of the law of development of monopoly, as made out by Com. Shibdas Ghosh, one of the outstanding Marxist-Leninist thinkers of the day, the Tatas, Birlas and others, who are the big bourgeoisie of present-day India, can by no means be characterised as comprador bourgeoisie. They are monopolists. To brand the Tatas, Birlas and such other big capitalists as monopolists (this branding is, no doubt, correct) and at the same time characterise them as comprador bourgeoisie is to suffer from rotten confused thinking.

The big bourgeoisie of pre-revolution China stands on a

# Indian State an Independent Sovereign National State

different footing. Who were the Chinese big bourgeoisie? The four big families of Chiang, Soong, Kung and Chen were the big bourgeoisie of pre-revolution China. They were also known in China as bureaucratic capitalists. This big bourgeoisie was comprador in character, as repeatedly pointed out by Mao Tse-tung. Only once did he loosely use the term, "monopoly capitalism", along with the terms, "comprador" and "feudal", in respect of the Chinese big bourgeoisie in the sense that these four big families monopolised the economy of China. What is the history of the development of the Chinese big bourgeoisie? About ten to twenty thousand million US dollars (Mao Tse-tung estimated this amount) accumulated in the hands of these four big families of feudal origin. This money in course of time was transformed into capital. But in the absence of development of any centralised Chinese capitalist national market and continued existence of pre-capitalist localised agricultural economy, owing to feudal rule, this capital remained mostly idle and used to be spent in luxuries, resulting in this capital becoming bureaucratic, meaning that it did not serve the interests of development of national capitalism and native industry. The Chinese big bourgeoisie did not develop any industry of its own. (vide Yu Huai. *The National Bourgeoisie in the Chinese Revolution*) A portion of this capital was, however, used for carrying on trade and commerce with the capitalists of foreign imperialist countries.

But neither the idleness of this capital nor the nature of trade and commerce carried on by the big bourgeoisie of pre-revolution China should be confused with the idleness of present-day capital of advanced capitalist countries now being noticed and that of the trade and commerce,

which the national bourgeoisie carries on as part and parcel of capitalist national market in the interests of development of national capitalism and native industry, respectively. As pointed out by Com. Shibdas Ghosh, General Secretary of our Party, capital of powerful capitalist countries is idle today not because of absence of development of capitalist national market and continued existence of pre-capitalist localised agricultural economy, as was the case in pre-revolution China, but because of intensification of crises of capitalist economy due to loss of even the relative stability of market, which world capitalist economy used to enjoy in the period of general crisis of capitalism till the second world war, frequent and prolonged economic recessions affecting larger branches of industries, inability of the bourgeoisie to fully utilise the installed capacities of even the existing industries in spite of artificial stimulation by the state of increased defence production, all contributing to unwillingness of the bourgeoisie to take any further risk of new investment of capital for industrial development and consequent lack of social urge for new investment of capital. The trade and commerce carried on by the big bourgeoisie of pre-revolution China was subordinated to the interests of foreign imperialists, was against the interests of development of Chinese national capitalism and native industry and was part and parcel of China's pre-capitalist localised agricultural economy. Its nature was, therefore, basically different from the nature of trade and commerce, which the national bourgeoisie in a country carries on as part and parcel of its capitalist national market in the interests of development of its national capitalism and native industry.

To conclude. There is basically no similarity between pre-revolution Chinese society, which was colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal in character and present-day Indian society, which is a developed capitalist society.

## Character of State and State Structure

This fundamental difference in the economic base between pre-revolution China and present-day India is reflected in the states of the two countries. In pre-revolution China, in the Japanese-occupied areas state power was in the hands of the Japanese imperialists while in the areas under Kuomintang rule state power was exercised by the native feudal landlord class in alliance with the bureaucratic capitalists, both of whom were puppets of foreign imperialism. The area under Kuomintang rule, as already stated, was then divided into different spheres of influence of foreign imperialist powers over which various cliques of old and new warlords, puppets of foreign imperialists, having their own armies ruled with the backing of this or that foreign imperialist power and native bureaucratic capitalists. These warlords were engaged in incessant wars among themselves. They sometimes would carry on wars even against the Central administration. The Central administration had no real control over the warlords and the areas under them. It is, thus, clear that pre-revolution Chinese state was a mediaeval type of loose primitive state with practically no centralised system of administration and modern system of communication. Parliamentary ideas and institutions were absent. Chiang Kai-shek's parliament had not even the semblance of a bourgeois national parliament. In the absence of objective conditions for its growth and

development Social-Democratism did not grow. Adoption of Social-Democratic programmes by the rulers to disrupt the working class movement, in the circumstances, was out of question in pre-revolution China.

In our country the situation is fundamentally different. In the pre-independence days, the Indian bourgeoisie was split into two sections—(1) comprador section that directly served the interests of foreign imperialists, acted as their subservient agent and opposed the national point of view in the anti-imperialist national liberation movement and (2) national reformist section that supported the national movement, even though it was mortally afraid of revolution and represented a special vacillating compromising tendency. Stalin analysed the situation thus: "The situation is somewhat different in countries like India. The fundamental and new feature of the conditions of life of colonies like India is not only that the national bourgeoisie has split into a revolutionary party and a compromising party, but primarily that the compromising section of the bourgeoisie has already managed, in the main, to strike a deal with imperialism. Fearing revolution more than it fears imperialism, and concerned more about its money-bags than about the interests of its own country, this section of the bourgeoisie, the richest and most influential section, is going over entirely to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution. It is forming a bloc with imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country." (*Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East*) This analysis was subsequently reiterated with greater precision by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern

(Continued to page 8)

## Economic Dependence has nothing Whatever

(Continued from page 7)

led by Stalin in its colonial thesis. The thesis *inter alia* states: "The national bourgeoisie in these colonial countries does not adopt a uniform attitude in relation to imperialism. A part of the bourgeoisie, more especially the trading bourgeoisie, directly serves the interests of imperialist capital (the so-called comprador bourgeoisie). In general, it more or less consistently defends the anti-national imperialist point of view directed against the whole nationalist movement, in common with the feudal allies of imperialism and the more highly paid native officials. The remaining portions of the native bourgeoisie, especially the portion reflecting the interests of native industry, support the national movement and represent a special vacillating compromising tendency which may be designated as national reformism (or, in the terminology of the theses of the Second Congress of the Communist International, a bourgeois democratic tendency)." It goes without saying that the leadership of the Indian National Congress represented the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie. The then British imperialist rulers of our country had, through compromise, transferred political power to the leadership of the Congress. It means that the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie has captured state power in our country and, so, the present Indian state is an independent sovereign bourgeois national state.

The state in India even under the colonial rule of the British imperialists was a centralised state. With the attainment of political independence and liquidation of the "native states" under the Rajas and Maharajas the ruling bourgeoisie has further consolidated the state machinery,

which it had inherited in tact from the erstwhile British imperialist rulers of our country. The present Indian state is a modern type of centralised state more or less like the states in the advanced capitalist countries of the West. By rapidly developing state-monopoly capitalism, rock bottom foundation stone of fascism, concentrating more and more powers in the hands of the state, propagating fascistic culture by fusion of spiritualism with the technological aspect of science and by all these means subjugating increasingly the state to the interests of monopoly, the ruling bourgeoisie is creating conditions for the rapid advance of fascism in India. By adopting Social-Democratic measures, it is proceeding along that path. Lastly, parliamentary ideas and institutions here have not only grown; they have taken firm root into the soil and even polluted the working class movement.

### Question of Satellite State

The Naxalites do not regard the present Indian state as an independent, sovereign national state. To them the political independence of the country is only formal, the present Indian state is a satellite to foreign imperialist powers and the India Government a stooge government. The ground, which they advance in support of this analysis of theirs, is that foreign imperialist finance capital is still exploiting India and India is economically dependent on foreign imperialists. Let us examine this argument. Firstly, can the present Indian state nationalise the foreign capital invested here? Certainly it can, if it so desires. There is nothing to prevent the present Indian state from exercising this sovereign power of it. How then can one say that the present Indian state is not an independent sovereign national state?

Then again, economic dependence has nothing whatever to do with the question of the national state. An instance may help our readers to understand the absurdity of the logic of the Naxalites. Every one knows that the victory of the American War of Independence led to the establishment of the independent sovereign national state of America. But it is also known to every body that America was economically a colony of Europe even in the nineteenth century. Now if the Naxalites' argument that economic dependence reduces a national state to the position of a satellite state is accepted then the independent, sovereign national state of America established through the victory of the American War of Independence became a satellite to Europe for its economic dependence on Europe. Neither in the nineteenth century nor at any time thereafter had there been any revolution for the establishment of any independent sovereign national state of America. The only logical conclusion, that follows from it, is that the same 'satellite state' is still continuing. In other words, the present American state is not an independent sovereign national state but a satellite to Europe. But the reality today is that the American state is the strongest imperialist state in the world on which are economically dependent the powerful imperialist countries like Great Britain, France, Canada, etc. That means that the British, French and the Canadian states are not independent sovereign national states but satellites to the 'satellite' American state. The only conclusion, that we reach, if we accept the Naxalites' argument that economic dependence reduces a state to a satellite state as correct, is that in this world there is no

independent sovereign national state and every capitalist state is satellite to some other capitalist state which again is satellite to some other capitalist state which again... So continues the chain. Do the Naxalites now realise what incredible nonsense their argument leads them to? They should bear in mind that economic dependence has nothing whatever to do with the question of the national state. Look here what Lenin said: "Not only small states, but even Russia, for example, is economically entirely dependent on the power of the imperialist finance capital of the 'rich' bourgeois countries. Not only the miniature Balkan states, but even America in the nineteenth century was economically a colony of Europe, as Marx pointed out in *Capital*... but it has nothing whatever to do with the question of national movements and the national state. For the question of political self-determination of nations in bourgeois society, and of their independence as states, Rosa Luxemburg has substituted the question of their independence." (*The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*). We have already discussed before the two tendencies of capitalism. The second tendency of acceleration of international intercourse of every form breaking down national barriers for creating international unity of capital, economic life, politics, etc. characterises monopoly capitalism. Increasing investment of foreign finance capital in India and of Indian finance capital in foreign countries are not signs of India's satellite character, as the Naxalites wrongly suppose, but are expressions of its attempt to achieve international unity of capital, expressions of the maturity of Indian monopoly capitalism. In the present days, when the

## to do With the Question of National State

bourgeoisie has thrown overboard the banner of complete national independence and picked up the flag of cosmopolitanism, investment of capital by the capitalists of one country in another capitalist country has become the order of the day. That is why we not only find the USA investing huge amount of capital in other countries (for example, direct US investment as at the end of 1968 was 6703 million dollars in Great Britain, 1910 million dollars in France, 19488 million dollars in Canada; vide *Survey of Current Business* published by US Department of Commerce) but also see that a relatively capitalistically much less advanced country like India is investing capital even in the powerful imperialist countries of the USA, Great Britain, Canada, etc.

“The national state is the form of state that is *most suitable* for present-day conditions” (i.e., capitalist, civilised, economically progressive conditions, as distinguished from mediaeval pre-capitalist, etc.), “it is the form in which it can best fulfil its functions” (i.e., the function of securing the freest, widest and speediest development of capitalism).” (Lenin. *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*) The present Indian state fully satisfies this distinguishing characteristic of the national state. It is the form of state that is most suitable to the Indian bourgeoisie for the relatively freest, widest and speediest development of Indian capitalism in the present international and national situation. In fact it is only after the establishment of the present Indian state that conditions for the relatively freest, widest and speediest development of Indian capitalism have been created. Before the establishment of this state i.e., under the colonial rule of the

British imperialists, Indian capitalism could not develop as freely as it can develop now, notwithstanding the fact that India even under colonial rule was the most capitalistically developed country among the colonies.

### Contradiction with Foreign Imperialism

One of the reasons, that has led the Naxalites to conclude that the present Indian state is satellite to foreign imperialist powers, is their failure to correctly study the nature of contradiction between the Indian bourgeoisie and foreign imperialists. The CPI(M) and the CPI also have failed to correctly study it.

Owing to inability of the ruling Indian bourgeoisie to introduce radical land reforms, resulting in utter pauperisation of almost the entire peasantry (the rich peasants and the well-to-do middle peasants are the only exception), due to acute unemployment of millions and millions of the people, inconceivably poor wages of the workers, heavy burden of indirect taxes like excise duties and sky-rocketing prices of essential commodities for living, the purchasing power of our people has become extremely low with the result that the home market has severely contracted, bringing in its wake serious crisis of market to the capitalists. To stem the tide of this crisis, the Indian bourgeoisie is trying its best to secure foreign markets. But foreign markets are controlled by powerful imperialists. Thus, in the economic sphere in the matter of securing foreign markets for Indian goods and exploitation by Indian finance capital of foreign countries, the Indian bourgeoisie is increasingly coming into conflicts with powerful foreign imperialists. The more capitalistically advanced India is becoming, the more sharp the antagonism

between the Indian bourgeoisie and foreign imperialist powers in the economic sphere is growing. This is one aspect of the contradiction.

There is another aspect. We have already shown that Indian finance capital is exploiting foreign countries and that India is in the process of emerging as an imperialist country. The more capitalistically India is developing, the more pronounced and open the latent imperialist tendencies inherent in the capitalist economy of the country are getting and, so, the more compromising towards imperialism as such the Indian bourgeoisie is becoming for its akinness to imperialism, akinness born and stimulated by the sense of belonging to the camp of imperialism.

Thus, intensification of antagonism with foreign imperialists in the economic sphere on the one hand and on the other hand more akinness to and, hence, more compromising towards imperialism as such constitute the two aspects of the same contradiction between the Indian bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism. As taught by Com. Shibdas Ghosh, “the increasing akinness of the present Indian state to imperialism as such is no indication of its being a satellite to foreign imperialist powers, as its growing antagonism with foreign imperialists for economic reasons is no sign of its ‘progressiveness.’ These two are different expressions of the same complex contradiction between a developing imperialist country and already developed powerful imperialist countries.” (Unapproved translation from original Bengali by us—Editor P.E.) Anyone, who takes note of the growing antagonism only without taking into account the increasing akinness, is apt to take the anti-imperialist posture of the Indian state as

progressive while anyone, who loses sight of the growing antagonism but concentrates only on the increasing akinness to imperialism as such, is liable to regard the Indian state as a satellite to foreign imperialists. Both would be equally wrong.

### Stage of Revolution

We should now take up the question of the stage of pre-revolution China and that of our revolution. Lenin said: “The fundamental question of every revolution is the question of state power.” (A Dual Power) Com. Stalin elaborated it as follows: “In the hands of which class or which classes, is power concentrated; which class, or which classes, must be overthrown; which class, or which classes, must take power—such is the main question of revolution.” (The Party’s Three Fundamental Slogans on the Peasant Problem)

What was the position in this respect in pre-revolution China? As already stated, in the Japanese-occupied areas state power was in the hands of foreign imperialists, namely, Japanese imperialists; in the areas under Kuomintang rule state power used to be exercised by the native feudal landlord class in alliance with the bureaucratic capitalists, puppets of foreign imperialists. So, foreign imperialism and native feudal landlord class and the bureaucratic capitalists, puppets of foreign imperialism, were the main enemies of the Chinese revolution. Hence, the main tasks of the Chinese revolution were to overthrow foreign imperialist rule and carry out a national revolution for complete national independence as also to overthrow the native feudal landlord class and bureaucratic capitalists, puppets of foreign imperialists, and carry out a democratic revolution. These two tasks were intermingled

(Continued to page 10)

# Indian Revolution is Anti-Capitalist Socialist Revolution

(Continued from page 9)

but "of the two tasks the primary one was the national revolution for the overthrow of imperialism." (Mao Tse-tung. *The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party*) To overthrow foreign imperialism and native feudal landlord class and the bureaucratic capitalists, puppets of foreign imperialists, is the task of anti-imperialist anti-feudal bourgeois democratic revolution. So, the Chinese revolution was bourgeois democratic in character. But in the present era of imperialism and of proletarian revolution, a bourgeois democratic revolution carried out under the leadership of the working class fundamentally differs from the old type bourgeois democratic revolution carried out under bourgeois leadership for the establishment of the bourgeois democratic state. To differentiate between the two, the bourgeois democratic revolution now carried out under the leadership of the working class is called new or people's democratic revolution. The Chinese revolution was, therefore, a new democratic or people's democratic revolution.

It may be necessary to say a few words about the people's democratic revolutions of the Central and South-East European countries. These countries, before the revolutions, differed vitally from one another in socio-political-economic conditions. For example, Czechoslovakia was a developed capitalist country with the bourgeoisie in state power while Albania was ruled by the *beys* (feudal landlords). Accordingly, these countries were placed in different stages of revolution. But in the second world war all these countries were overrun and occupied by Hitlerite Germany with the result that the rule of foreign imperialism, namely, German fascism and its local puppets was established in each of them. The

fascist German occupation fundamentally altered the main tasks of the revolutions of the Central and South-East European countries. With the establishment of the rule of German fascists and their puppets, the main task of the revolution became to overthrow the rule of German fascists and native puppets and carry out national revolution for national independence. The revolutions in these countries also were, therefore, bourgeois democratic in character. But as they were led by the working class, they were people's democratic revolutions.

But that is not the case in our country. Here neither foreign imperialism nor native feudal landlord class is in state power. Bureaucratic capitalists, puppets of foreign imperialist powers, also are not in state power either. Here the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie, which conducted the national movement for national independence, as represented by the leadership of the Indian National Congress, has captured state power. The present Indian state is an independent sovereign bourgeois national state. Hence, the main enemy of the Indian revolution is the Indian bourgeoisie and the main task of the revolution is to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power under the leadership of the working class. The task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie from state power under the leadership of the working class is the main political task of a socialist revolution. The political task of overthrowing the ruling class from state power and not the economic, social and cultural tasks immediately following the revolution determine, in the main, the character of the revolution. So, the Indian revolution is in character an anti-capitalist socialist revolution. In the sense, in which the November Revolution in Russia is a socialist revolution,

the Indian revolution is thousand times more a socialist revolution.

Not only from the point of view of the main political task but also in consideration of the economic programme to be followed immediately after the revolution our revolution is anti-capitalist socialist revolution. For, even though small production, which at present plays a significant role in the economy of India and which engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously and on a mass scale, will, no doubt, continue to exist even after the revolution and, as such, there will not be any general decree wiping out capitalism in every form immediately after the revolution, yet it can be said here and now that in view of present development of capitalism in our country anti-capitalist measures for socialist reconstruction of the national economy are sure to be adopted immediately after the revolution.

Is there then no unaccomplished task of the bourgeois democratic revolution in our country? There are certainly unaccomplished tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution. For example, in the agrarian field, even though the main task of transforming the relations of production and motive force of production into capitalist relations of production and capitalist motive force of production of the bourgeois democratic revolution has been completed yet there still remain unaccomplished tasks of distribution of land to the peasants and mechanisation and modernisation of our agriculture. The anti-imperialist content of our revolution calls for confiscation of foreign finance capital and abrogation of treaties inimical to people's interests made with the foreign imperialist powers. In the social and cultural sphere, the volume of unaccomplished tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolu-

tion is relatively larger—the tasks of social and cultural revolution for democratisation of society are to be completed, which include, among others, the question of freeing the people from religious bondage in general, the communal problem in particular, the question of minority nationality and of national oppression, the question of removing the present subservient position of women in society, the question of eradicating the moral and cultural depravity now marked in society in increasing measure with the increase in influence of the CPI(M) in particular and the question of changing the cultural life of the people in general, etc. All these unaccomplished tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution are to be completed under the programme of the socialist revolution. That, of course, does not mean that we should first complete these unaccomplished tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution and then we shall enforce anti-capitalist measures for socialist transformation of society. There is no watertight compartment between the two; the two are intermingled. And they, therefore, will proceed simultaneously.

But can there be a socialist revolution before *full* completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution, before capitalism saturates and before the working class constitutes a majority of population in the country? We still hear the so-called communist parties in our country putting these silly questions replied to thousand and one times by Lenin, Stalin and others. If the correlation of social forces in a country places it in the stage of socialist revolution and the concrete situation provides the proletariat with the opportunity to rally the people round it and successfully carry out the socialist revolution, should it even then wait till capitalism saturates and



## CPI(M)'s Political Line Full of Contradictions

the workers become a majority of population in the country? Only a congenital Social-Democratic party answers the questions in the affirmative. History will provide answers to the questions also. It is an undeniable fact that the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia were completed fully only much after the November Revolution. It is also an undeniable fact that at the time of the November Revolution, let alone saturation of capitalism, Russia was "a country little developed in the capitalist sense at that." (Stalin. *The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists*) It is equally an undeniable fact that the workers at the time of the November Revolution constituted not a majority but a microscopic minority of the Russian population. Yet Lenin did not wait. Under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party led by him the November Revolution was successfully carried out. And the November Revolution was a proletarian socialist revolution. From the point of view of volume of unaccomplished tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution, number of workers and degree of development of capitalism, present-day India is far ahead of pre-November Revolution Russia—there cannot be two opinions about it.

### CPI(M) in a Mess

It is, thus, clear that the CPI(M), CPI and the Naxalites suffer from serious mistakes of fundamental character about the revolution in our country. But it must be said to the credit of the Naxalites that if their premise that the present Indian state is a satellite to foreign imperialists is accepted as correct (the premise is fundamentally incorrect) then their political line of anti-imperialist anti-feudal people's democratic revolution becomes the only logical conclusion. But that

cannot be said of the CPI(M) and the CPI. Their political lines are full of contradictions.

When the united CPI split into the CPI and the CPI(M) in 1964, the CPI(M) leaders contended that the split was necessitated by fundamental differences between the two sections over three main questions, namely (1) reading about the CPSU and modern revisionism, (2) attitude towards the Communist Party of China and (3) the stage of the Indian revolution. In our considered view, no such fundamental differences, as alleged by the CPI(M) leaders at the time of formation of the party, exist now between the CPI(M) and the CPI.

Let us take the case of revisionism in general and the CPSU in particular first. Tied to the apron string of revisionist CPSU leadership and munching every revisionist idea, like the theory of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism through parliamentary means even in the present era, manufactured by the CPSU leadership, the CPI has no other alternative than to be a revisionist party. But the CPI(M) also has not ruled out the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism even in the present era in the existing alignment of world social forces by parliamentary means. The CPI(M)'s policy of class collaboration with the Jotedars and the monopolists is expressed in its activities in the peasant and the trade union fronts. It is true that the CPI(M) has not as yet tied itself to the apron string of the revisionist CPSU leadership but it has aligned itself with the Rumanian Communist Party, which is several leagues ahead of the CPSU along the revisionist path, a party that refuses even to recognise the necessity of centre of international leadership in conducting world communist movement, a party that has become for all practical purposes a nationalist party. The people will not be surprised if

one day they find the CPI(M) wooing the revisionist CPSU leadership on the latter according recognition to the former, which the CPSU cannot do now in view of its present relation with the CPI. In fact, the CPI(M) leaders are already at work to placate the CPSU leaders and win their confidence and recognition.

It is true that in 1962, on the occasion of the Sino-Indian border clash, the united CPI as a whole in general and the "revisionist Dangeites" in particular threw to the winds all tenets of proletarian internationalism and behaved most shamelessly as flunkies of the Indian reactionaries. They over-Nehrueed Nehru himself in carrying on vile propaganda against the Communist Party of China in general and particularly Chairman Mao Tse-tung. But our people still remember the role at that time of Gopalan, Namboodiripad, Jyoti Basu and other top leaders of the united CPI, who now 'adorn' the top leadership of the CPI(M). They also joined with no less gusto than the "revisionist Dangeites" in the anti-Chinese chorus branding China as an aggressor and supporting every act of the India Government in the name of defending India. At the time of formation of the CPI(M), the leadership of the party, to exploit the pro-CPC feeling of the ranks, expressed support to the Communist Party of China. But no sooner had the leadership of the CPC pointed out the revisionist character of the CPI(M) leadership and lent support to the political line of those, who subsequently came out of the CPI(M) to form the CPI (ML), than this support of the CPI(M) evaporated and was replaced by unfriendliness. Like its new mentor, the Rumanian Communist Party, the CPI(M) also is no believer in the necessity of centre of international leadership in conducting world communist movement; it has become a

national communist party, a nationalist party. For its national character diehard reactionaries like Swatantra leader, Rajagopalachari, Syndicate Congress boss, Kamraj and such other persons are all praise for the CPI(M). But every one knows that without proletarian internationalism there can never be communism. There cannot be anything called national communism, which, like Hitler's national socialism, is only a variant of social fascism.

Now about the so-called fundamental differences over the question of the stage of the Indian revolution of which the CPI(M) leaders made so much hullabaloo at the time of the split of the united CPI and formation of the CPI(M). Immediately before the split how did the united CPI characterise the present Indian state? It then characterised the present Indian state as a "bourgeois-landlord state headed by the big bourgeoisie." And how does the CPI(M) now characterise the Indian state? In its programme it has characterised the present Indian state as a "bourgeois-landlord state led by the big bourgeoisie." There was, thus, no difference, not to speak of fundamental difference, over the class character of the present Indian state between the "revisionist Dangeites" and the 'revolutionary' Rana-diveites at the time of the split of the united CPI.

By the way, what sort of class characterisation is it to characterise the present Indian state as a "bourgeois-landlord state headed by the big bourgeoisie"? According to *dialectical materialism*, the character of a mixed phenomenon is determined by its predominant character. Analogy is always imperfect but, only to drive home our point, we present an analogy here. Take the case of a man. He has both good and bad qualities. We

(Continued to page 12)

## No Fundamental Difference between CPI(M) and CPI

(Continued from page 11)

call him good or bad according as the good or the bad qualities predominate in him. We never call him a good-bad man headed by goodness or a good-bad man headed by badness. Because, such characterisation of the man would be ridiculously absurd. Same is the case with the Indian state. Either it is a bourgeois state, if its predominant character is bourgeois, or, it is a feudal state (if the CPI(M) means by landlord feudal landlord class), if its predominant character is feudal. To characterise it as a "bourgeois-landlord state headed by the big bourgeoisie" is not characterisation at all. It goes without saying that it is not the Rajas and Maharajas, who have captured state power, and given the Tatas and Birlas protection. It is, on the contrary, the Tatas and Birlas, who have captured state power joined hands with the former Rajas and Maharajas and given the latter protection, who in the mean time have become capitalists. The present Indian state is a bourgeois national state.

To come to the point. It may be argued that fundamental differences over the question of class character of the present Indian state developed within the united CPI, which led to its split. Let us examine the position. The CPI in its Bombay session after the split adopted a programme, which stated that "The State in India is the organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole, which upholds and develops capitalism and capitalist relations of production, distribution and exchange in the national economy of India" (Article 46). The CPI, thus, considers the present Indian state as a bourgeois national state. The CPI(M) leaders for such a class characterisation by the CPI of the present Indian state rightly observe; "They characterize the present Indian State and Government

as a bourgeois state and Government. Though from this it should follow that the revolution against such a state-power—with that power in the hands of the bourgeoisie—can not but be proletarian, socialist, in character when it comes to defining the state of the revolution, they define it as democratic—in their words National Democratic." (String of Lies to Hoodwink the Ranks published in *People's Democracy* dated February 16, 1969) This is certainly an example of self-contradiction from which the CPI suffers, not just a minor matter but a fundamental error—concerning our revolution. No real communist party can commit such a mistake.

What is the position of the CPI(M) in this respect? "State power is exercised by three different sections, the big bourgeoisie, the non-big bourgeoisie and the landlords; the big bourgeoisie and its political representatives are occupying the leading position in the State and Government." (M. Basavpunniah. Controversy over "Class Differentiation" within Indian Bourgeoisie published in *Mainstream* dated November 22, 1969). This is CPI(M)'s characterisation of the present Indian state. Mark the words, "three different sections," which presupposes three sections of the same class and not three different classes. And what is that class of which the big bourgeoisie, the non-big bourgeoisie and the landlords are "three different sections"? Basavpunniah answers the question thus: "Every student of politics acquainted with ABC of Marxism-Leninism knows that 'the bourgeoisie' covers the big bourgeoisie, the non-big bourgeoisie and even landlords." (Sardesai Enlightens "Foreign Readers" published in *People's Democracy* dated September 20, 1970) So, according to the CPI(M), state power in present day India is exercised by all the "three

sections" of the Indian bourgeoisie. It means that the present Indian state is a bourgeois national state. This is also admitted by Basavpunniah in unambiguous terms. Look at the following formulation by him and you will be convinced of the correctness of what we say. "It does not require much Marxism to say that it (the present Indian state—Editor, P.E.) is a bourgeois State and not a proletarian State, as in the final analysis there are only two types of class States, in the modern world, the bourgeois and the proletarian, and the State in India, evidently, is not proletarian state." (Controversy over "Class Differentiation" within Indian Bourgeoisie) Basavpunniah's statement above that in the modern world only two types of states, bourgeois states and proletarian states, exist is obviously wrong. For, besides these two types of states there are other types of states like colonial states, semi-colonial semi-feudal states, in the modern world. But that is not the point at issue. The point for discussion is about the class character of the present Indian state. From the analysis made by the CPI(M) leadership quoted by us in this paragraph it is evidently clear that, even according to the CPI(M), the present Indian state is a bourgeois national state. Hence, the main task of the Indian revolution cannot but be to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power under the leadership of the working class, which is the main political task of socialist revolution. So, the logical conclusion of the analysis by the CPI(M) is that India is in the stage of socialist revolution and not anti-imperialist anti-feudal people's democratic revolution. Yet the CPI(M) repeats to disgusting extent that ours is an anti-imperialist anti-feudal people's democratic revolu-

tion. Thus, the CPI(M) also like the CPI suffers from self-contradiction. The retort made by the CPI(M) against the CPI for charactering the Indian state as a bourgeois state and at the same time defining the Indian revolution as a democratic revolution applies to the CPI(M) also for the same self-contradiction, confused thinking and muddle-headedness from which it equally suffers.

Then again, as already stated, the CPI's national democratic revolution is essentially anti-imperialist anti-feudal democratic. And what is the immediate aim of the CPI(M)'s people's democratic revolution? Basavpunniah says "completion of the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist and democratic tasks" (Sardesai Enlightens "Foreign Readers). Thus, so far as the immediate aim of the Indian revolution is concerned, there is no difference, let alone fundamental difference, between the CPI(M) and the CPI.

The CPI considers the rich peasants and "the progressive section of the Indian bourgeoisie" an ally of its national democratic revolution. The CPI(M) also holds the rich peasants and the non-big bourgeoisie of India as an ally of its people's democratic revolution. So, here also there is no difference, not to speak of fundamental difference, between the CPI(M) and the CPI.

Is there any difference in assessing who constitutes "the progressive section of the bourgeoisie" or "the non-big bourgeoisie," as the case may be, that is an ally of the revolution? No; there is no difference between the CPI(M) and the CPI in this respect also. The CPI considers that a section of the Congress (R) represents "the progressive section of the bourgeoisie" with whom national democratic front should be formed to complete the anti-imperialist

# Chinese Pattern of Revolutionary War Not Possible here

anti-feudal democratic tasks. The CPI (M) also under the smoke-screen of revolutionary verbiage follows the same track. It regards a section of the Congress(R) as progressive. Look at the statements issued by the CPI(M) on bank nationalisation and election of Giri as President of India and you will find concrete proof of it. The Central Committee of the party in a resolution (published in *People's Democracy* dated February 15, 1970) has seen "healthy trend which hates big landlords and monopolies" and reflects "anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people" within the fold of the Indira Congress. Where then is the fundamental difference between the CPI(M) and the CPI in this respect? We know that the CPI(M) leadership will try to befool the ranks by citing the example of alliance of the Congress (R) with the CPI in the last mid-term election in Kerala. There is no doubt that this is an unprincipled oppositionist alliance motivated not by the interests of developing democratic movements but by exigency of parliamentary election to *anyhow* gain more seats. But the CPI (M) also made equally unprincipled and opportunist clandestine understanding with the arch reactionary Syndicate Congress in the mid-term election in Kerala. It also supported the Congress (R) candidates in the by-elections from Dholai Assembly constituency in Assam and Julana and Bahadurgarh Assembly constituencies in Haryana against only leftist candidates, SUC candidates, there.

It is, thus clear that the hullabaloo created by the CPI (M) leaders about fundamental differences with the CPI is an eye-wash meant to bamboozle the ranks and supporters of the party by exploiting their blind but genuine hatred against revisionism in concealing equally revisionist character of the party as also

to appear before the masses as a truly revolutionary working class party. There is, in fact, no such fundamental difference as alleged.

## Other Mistakes

Besides the mistake in determining the stage of revolution of our country—a mistake of fundamental character, which testifies to the non-working class character of these so-called communist parties—other serious mistakes also are committed by them. These parties, especially the Naxalites, wrongly confuse the military strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare, as developed by Mao Tse-tung and subsequently by Che Guevara, to be the same as the strategy and tactics of the people's democratic revolution. It should be realised that the military strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare are applicable not only to the people's democratic revolution but also to other revolutions, national revolution, socialist revolution. Wherever the revolutionary war against counter-revolution is protracted and long-drawn the strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare are suitable. The strategy of revolution depends on the alignment of social forces in the country and not on the military strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare. But the strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare are not only dependent on the strategy and tactics of the revolution but also subject to adjustment and change according to the strategy and tactics of the revolution.

Then again, the Naxalites further confuses the Chinese pattern of revolutionary war of encircling cities from countryside as the only form of guerrilla warfare and consider it applicable to each and every country. This is also wrong. But what was the Chinese pattern of revolutionary war? The Chinese revolutionaries created liberated base areas in rural areas amid the encirclement of counter-revolutionary White

political power, extended these base areas, encircled the cities from the countryside, proceeded gradually to take over the cities and ultimately won nation-wide victory in the armed revolutionary war against armed counter-revolution. This pattern of war succeeded in China because of some *peculiar conditions*. Mao Tse-tung said: "The phenomenon that within a country one or several small areas under Red political power should exist for a long time amid the encirclement of White political power is one that has never been found elsewhere in the world. It can exist and develop under certain conditions." (*Why Can China's Red Political Power Exist?*) And what were the conditions? The most important of these conditions were—(1) self-sufficing pre-capitalist localised agricultural economy instead of centralised capitalist economy, (2) loose mediaeval type of state without centralised system of administration and well-knit modern system of communication and (3) incessant wars and splits within the ruling class of pre-revolution China. In addition to these three conditions, others were sound mass base of the revolutionaries, first rate party organisation, adequately strong Red army, terrain favourable to the revolutionaries for military operations and economic strength sufficient for self-support of the revolutionaries.

These conditions are absent in our country, How then can the Chinese pattern of revolutionary war—encirclement of cities from countryside—be applied with success here? The Naxalites should realise that because of the self-sufficing pre-capitalist localised agricultural economy in pre-revolution China it was possible for the small liberated areas to exist for a long time and develop amid the encirclement of counter-revolutionary political power. Even though completely cut off from the

rest of the country, these small liberated areas did not dry up and collapse for want of economic intercourse so vital for the lives of the people only because the self-sufficing pre-capitalist localised agricultural economy provided the economic intercourse necessary for sustaining the lives of the people of the liberated areas. Had there been centralised capitalist economy in pre-revolution China these liberated areas would have dried up and collapsed for want of economic intercourse by being cut off from the economic life of the country. It is for this simple reason, as taught by our leader, Com. Shibdas Ghosh, even if it is possible militarily for the revolutionaries in our country to create small liberated bases in rural areas here amid encirclement of capitalist political power then they are sure to dry up and collapse for being cut off economically. Besides, where modern centralised type of state with centralised system of administration and modern means of communication, as is in existence in our country, exists, it is not possible for such small liberated areas amid the encirclement of counter-revolutionary political power to continue existence for a long period in the face of all out military offensive by the capitalist state. Furthermore, it should also be noted that in pre-revolution China, the feudal landlord class being in state power, the main centre of counter-revolution was the villages, while in our country the economy being centralised capitalist economy and the bourgeoisie being in state power, the bastion of counter-revolution is in the industrial areas. Hence, as scientifically pointed out by Com. Ghosh, here the revolutionary struggle for seizure of state power in the villages can succeed only if it is backed by

(Continued to page 14)

# INDIAN BOURGEOISIE A HOMOGENEOUS CLASS

(Continued from page 13)

simultaneous revolutionary uprising by workers, peasants and other exploited masses of the people throughout the country.

Thirdly, what the Naxalites are doing in the villages in the name of agrarian revolution and creation of liberated base is a caricature of revolution. Isolated from the masses, these acts are nothing but individual terroristic acts. And their recent activities in cities and towns express complete renunciation of Marxism-Leninism. They smack of petty-bourgeois revolutionism of Debray. All these acts are doing more dis-service to the cause of the Indian revolution than any good, notwithstanding sincerity, sacrificing spirit and militancy of the Naxalites.

## Differentiation within Indian Bourgeoisie

Is the Indian bourgeoisie a homogeneous class now? A correct answer to this question is important, inasmuch as it is related to the question of reserve of the proletariat in the revolution of our country. As stated already, in the period of national movement for national independence, the Indian bourgeoisie was split into a comprador section and a national reformist section. The comprador section directly served the interests of foreign imperialists and acted as their subservient agent while the national reformist section conducted national movement for national independence. Thus, even in the days of national movement for national independence, a section of the Indian bourgeoisie, the comprador section, left the camp of revolution and went over to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution. In August, 1947, the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie, which conducted the national movement for

national independence and was represented by the leadership of the Indian National Congress, captured state power. And with the capture of state power this section too has left the camp of revolution and gone over to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution. So, the Indian bourgeoisie as a class has left the camp of revolution and gone over to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution—the comprador section before India had become politically independent and the rest, the national reformist section, after independence. In the circumstances, there is no section of the bourgeoisie left in the camp of revolution now in our country.

None denies that antagonistic contradictions for economic reasons exist between the monopolists and the small capitalists in our country, as they exist between individual monopolists and between individual small capitalists themselves. Such antagonistic contradictions for economic reasons exist within the bourgeoisie of each and every bourgeois country, including the powerful imperialist countries like the USA, Great Britain, France, etc. But for this reason no communist worth the name will ever conclude that the bourgeoisie there is not homogeneous as a class or that it is split. Marxists-Leninists regard the bourgeoisie to be split and not homogeneous only when a section of it does not stand for the aggregate interest of national capitalism and the other section fights for the interests of development of national capitalism and the latter section having politically differentiated and disassociated with the former, joins the camp of revolution. This was the case in pre-revolution China where the comprador bourgeoisie directly served the interests of foreign imperialists,

acted as their subservient agent, was opposed to the interests of development of Chinese national capitalism and joined the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution while the national bourgeoisie stood for interests of Chinese national capitalism, politically differentiated and disassociated with the comprador bourgeoisie and joined the camp of revolution. But that is not the position in our country now. In spite of antagonistic contradictions for economic reasons between the monopolists and the small capitalists' both the monopolists and the small capitalists have the common interests of defending the present bourgeois national state and both stand for aggregate interests of Indian capitalism. Small capitalists' opposition to monopolists is not for the former's opposition to monopoly as such but because of the opposition the former receive from the monopolists in their attempts to become monopolists. It should be realised that where a bourgeois national state has been established, as in our country, the bourgeoisie is homogeneous as a class and no such differentiation within the bourgeoisie takes place.

The CPI(M) leadership also admits that such differentiation within the Indian bourgeoisie neither has taken place nor is in sight. Basavpunniah observes: "The CPI(M) is of the definite and considered opinion that it is utterly wrong on the part of any Marxist-Leninist to state that such a political differentiation has either taken place or is round the corner." (Controversy over "Class Differentiation" within Indian Bourgeoisie) Thus, the CPI(M) leadership in analysing the stage of the Indian revolution says that the non-big bourgeoisie is exercising state power along with the big bourgeoisie; it also admits that the non-big bourgeoisie

has not politically differentiated with the big bourgeoisie. And still it in the disposition of classes for the people's democratic revolution advocated by it counts on the non-big bourgeoisie as an ally of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle for seizure of power. Is it not self-contradiction? The CPI(M) leadership may argue and, in fact, it has argued that though such a differentiation has not taken place up till now yet it "is bound to take place" (Ibid) in future and, as such, the non-big bourgeoisie has been counted as an ally of the people's democratic revolution. The presumption that such a differentiation is bound to take place in future is not correct. For, as stated already, in a country, where the bourgeoisie has succeed in establishing its independent, sovereign national state, such a differentiation within the bourgeoisie cannot occur. In spite of the non-big bourgeoisie having antagonistic contradictions with the big bourgeoisie for economic reasons, both the big bourgeoisie and the non-big bourgeoisie have the common interest of preserving the bourgeois national state for defending the aggregate interests of national capitalism. A few individual small capitalist elements may support the revolutionary struggle by the proletariat for seizure of power being 'declassed'. But that is an individual phenomenon. There is no likelihood that the non-big bourgeoisie as a section in our country will politically differentiate and disassociate with the big bourgeoisie, join the camp of revolution as an ally of the proletariat and conduct revolutionary struggle under the leadership of the working class for overthrowing its own state, the bourgeois national state, and establishing a socialist state, which will liquidate capitalism.

(Continued to page 15)

## Identification of Individual Interest With Social Interest Necessary for Withering away of State

(Continued from page 2)

individual interest with social interest, and is the greatest obstacle against attainment of emancipation and complete freedom of the individual. For if it continues to exist, the contradiction between individual interest and social interest will remain antagonistic and, consequently, the state will not wither away, even though classes are eliminated in the economic sphere. As a result, the individual will not gain emancipation and complete freedom; because, as long as the state will continue to exist, its repressive character will also be there. Hence, while conducting the struggle for complete victory of socialism, the struggle for emancipation and complete freedom of the individual should aim at transforming the antagonistic nature of contradiction between individual interest and social interest into a non-antagonistic one. When this will be possible then and then only we will see that the demands of the people and their nature and character have undergone a fundamental change. At this high level of cultural revolution under socialism the state will wither away and the individual will enjoy complete freedom being freed from social coercion." (Cultural Revolution of China. Translation from original Bengali by us not yet approved—Editor, P. E.) He has further stated: "The struggle for the emancipation of the individual is to-day historically bound up inextricably with the struggle for overthrowing capitalism i.e., the struggle for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat \*\*\* After overthrowing the bourgeoisie from state power and eliminating its power from the economic field the struggle

for the complete victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat under socialism is at one the struggle for the withering away of the state and achieving emancipation and complete freedom of the individual from the coercion of the state." (Cultural Movement of India and our Tasks. Translation from original Bengali by us not yet approved—Editor, P. E.) By this development of the Marxist-Leninist idea about state in general and the question of the withering away of the state in particular, Com. Ghosh has, no doubt, enriched the science of revolution. The Party led by him feels proud of it.

The November Revolution has also vindicated the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist teaching about Party. According to Marxism-Leninism, the Party is the leading instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Any and every type of party cannot fulfil this historical task. Only a revolutionary working class party, i.e., a real Communist Party can do it. Such a Party is the vanguard detachment of the working class, absorbing in it only the best elements, the revolutionary conscious elements of the proletariat. Such a Party cannot be a "party of the whole people" of Khrushchev's conception or of the conception of the present revisionist leadership of the CPSU. It should be realised that to regard the Party as "the party of the whole people" means to refuse to recognise the leading role of the Party, fail to differentiate the vanguard of the proletariat from the rest of the class and the masses, neglect the responsible duty of developing the class and the masses ideologically, politically to the level of the vanguard and degenerate the Party into a platform of heterogeneous

elements for some sort of united actions. This is not Leninist conception of Party.

The parties, that are moving in our country with the name communist attached to them, are not real Communist Parties. The history of these parties, their process of thinking and process of movement, the methodology followed by them in analysing phenomena, their assessment of the international situation, their formulation of the stage of revolution in our country, their strategical and tactical lines, their understanding of the idea of proletarian internationalism, their concept about the relationship between international communist leadership and individual communist parties, their emergence as national parties, their political behaviour on each and every important question, like the Sino-Indian border clash, their understanding of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism of Party organisation, the existence of groups inside them, the process of formation of these parties, etc., etc., all go to establish beyond any shade of doubt that, notwithstanding their Communist names, they are petty bourgeois parties masquerading as Communists. The SUCI is the only real Communist Party in India. Only a real Communist Party can lead the people to power through revolution and to their emancipation and complete freedom. In their own interests, therefore, the Indian people should help the SUCI by all means to make it stronger and still stronger. That is the call of the November Revolution here. Long live the November Revolution! Long live socialist revolution in India! Long live the SUCI! Long live Com. Shibdas Ghosh!

## With Wrong Strategy of Revolution there cannot be correct form of movements

(Continued from page 14)

### Day-to-Day Movements

Every Marxist-Leninist knows that strategy applied in day-to-day movements is tactics. He also knows that tactics, among others, deal with the forms of struggle and the forms of organisation of the proletariat to conduct the struggle. If the strategy of revolution is wrong, the tactics are bound to be wrong and in that case the form of struggle cannot but be wrong. This explains why the united CPI all through suffered from right reformism followed by left adventurism again followed by right reformism. This also explains why the day-to-day movements conducted under the leadership of the CPI(M) or the CPI are bogged into the labyrinth of economism and parliamentarism. This equally explains why the Naxalites are engaged in petty bourgeois revolutionism. A mistake in determining the stage of revolution is a mistake of fundamental character expressing the non-working class character of the party that commits the mistake. Such a party, no matter how big it is or what name it has, cannot lead the people to power through revolution. The CPI (M), CPI and the CPI(ML) are such non-working class parties falsely masquerading as communist parties. The sooner our people realise this truth, shun all illusion about them and organise themselves under the revolutionary banner of the Socialist Unity Centre of India, the nearer will be the day of their emancipation from all sorts of exploitation of man by man. History demands it of our people.

Read **GANADABI**

Fortnightly Bengali Organ of  
S. U. C. I

48, Lenin Sarani, Calcutta-13