

To All T. U. Units :

FURTHER NOTE RE: MAY DAY

Dear Comrades,

You have received the Prosect Note dated 16.4.50 on "Joint May Day Celebrations".

1) This is to inform you that, subsequently on 18.4, there has been an attempt by certain elements inside the U.T.U.C. (leaders of RSP, Bolshevik Party) to create a hitch in the joint preparations for observance of May Day. They have now claimed, quite falsely, that the decisions arrived at by BFTUC and UTUC representatives at the talks on 13.4 were only "tentative" and not final ! Their latest stand is that these two organisations should not take united action without the HMS as, according to them, this would "harm" the cause of unity. They are also trying to make any united action dependent on All-India agreement, etc. Meanwhile, the disruptive local HMS leaders (Sibnath Banerjee & Co) are sticking to their stand - "no unity with the Communists" - as was expected.

Thus, the anti-unity elements inside the UTUC are trying their utmost, with the indirect co-operation of the Socialist leaders, to postpone any united working class action, any joint resistance to the fascist Labour Bills, any joint May Day delebration. Inside both the UTUC and HMS, sharp differences of opinion have arisen between the pro-unity and anti-unity elements.

The net result of the latest talks is as follows :

- a) The proposed T.U. delegates' meeting of April 22nd is POSTPONED for the time being. BFTUC Unions should note this and see that their delegates do not go unnecessarily to 249, Bowbazar Street that day.
- b) Satyapriya Bannerjee and a UTUC representative are going to Nagpur to meet R.S. Ruikar (President HMS) to try to get his approval for joint participation in May Day by either the provincial HMS units or, failing that, by at least the F.B. members of HMS.
- c) On their return from Nagpur, the UTUC General Council will meet on 22.4. to take a final decision, and they will meet BFTUC representatives on 23.4 for further talks.

These developments once more emphasise the fact that unity cannot be secured by "top" negotiations and statements alone, and that "the success of the unity movements depends, first and foremost, on the mass initiative from below" (Prosect Note, 16.4.50). Anti-unity elements at the top - are trying to take advantage of the weak mass pressure from below to create all sorts of obstacles. At the same time, they are extremely panicky and on the defensive at the growing support for united action, and bitter cleavages of opinion are showing themselves inside the UTUC and HMS.

Our comrades must realise that a joint observance of May Day, however limited in scale, as protest against the Government's anti-working class measures is of vital political importance for launching a countrywide unity crusade. To bring it about despite all obstacles, is first and foremost our responsibility. Therefore, all-out efforts must be made by every Union and every T.U. unit to carry the campaign into the mass of the workers, into the factories and bustees, for appealing to and drawing in the broadest section of the working class and achieving united action on a local scale wherever possible, and also for raising the demand that May Day must be observed centrally by the 3 organisations together. On the extent and strength of this mass mobilisation from below depends whether the anti-unity elements will get isolated or not.

Do not under-estimate the tremendous urge for united action among the workers. Appeal boldly to them in a really fraternal and non-sectarian way. Work up pressure of their own ranks on the local leaders of UTUC and HMS unions. But we should be careful not to hurl abuses and accusations in a disruptive way. On the other hand, we must plainly tell the workers that 'unity' will not come from

above unless they forge unity in their own factories and confront the leaders with their determined desire for joint action in defence of common rights.

EVEN IF THE "TOP" NEGOTIATIONS FINALLY FAIL, THE BPTUC UNIONS WILL INDEPENDENTLY OBSERVE MAY DAY ON AS WIDE AND BROAD-BASED A SCALE AS POSSIBLE AND ALL PREPARATIONS FOR THE SAME MUST BE MADE.

II) The India Government has advised all employers to grant the workers holiday on May Day, on the condition that they work on Sunday, April 30th, or any other holiday. Our unions should immediately raise the demand for unconditional holiday on May Day - the day of international working class solidarity, on which it is the traditional right of the workers of all countries to have a holiday. We should make it clear that workers will not be compelled to do extra work in lieu of May Day. On the basis of this stand, we should hold meetings, ascertain the general sentiment of the workers on this question and organise petitions, deputations, etc., to the managements. Wherever it is possible to unite and mobilise the majority of workers, Unions should advance the slogan of "gheraoing" the managers and themselves "taking" a holiday even if the employers refuse it.

21.4.

P R O S E C T



P.B. CIRCULAR NO.5/50

To all Party Members.

ON DRAFT RESOLUTION BY THE P.B.  
FOR DISCUSSION AMONG PARTY RANKS

Comrades,

This document which the P.B. has unanimously adopted is being released to the Party ranks before its adoption by the Central Committee, for two purposes:-

Firstly, to enable the ranks to participate actively, and help the P.B. and C.C., in formulating correct strategy and tactics through their opinions based on their rich practical experience as well as theoretical knowledge.

Secondly, to enable the ranks to conduct their discussions in such a way that both Left Sectarianism and Right Reformism are correctly fought.

This document deals with the basic mistakes of the PB in a general way with the help of the documents of the C.P.S.U.(B), "Lasting Peace" editorial, documents of the Communist Party of China, the speeches and resolutions of the T.U.C.A.A. Conference at Peking and the criticism of the P.B. made by various units and members of the Party.

The main shortcoming of the document is that it deals with the main mistakes only in a broad general way and does not give a review of struggles led during the last 2½ years. It does not deal with such issues as Problems of nationalities and Linguistic Provinces. These questions, including the struggles we have led in jails, will be dealt with in separate documents. It will take time for the P.B. to prepare the same.

Separate documents are being prepared on "People's Democracy", "Agrarian Question", and "Tactics on the Working-Class Front". A document is also ready on P.B.'s unpardonable crime in criticising Com. Mao Tze-tung wrongly and publicly. The P.B. is also preparing a Self-Critical Report on its work. This report will give a full self-critical account of P.B.'s activities including such criminal actions as delayed publication of the "Lasting Peace" editorial etc. These documents will be sent to you as soon as possible.

The P.B. hopes that every Party unit will discuss this document on the broad general line it presents and help the PB and CC with their opinions based on their rich experience learned through our mistakes, while at the same time keeping vigilant eye on the manoeuvres of the Nehru Government and Tito-agents to smash the Party both from outside and inside with the help of renegades like Joshi and others.

7th April, 1950.

Greetings,

P.B.

MAIN FEATURES OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC  
STRUGGLES AND THE MAIN TASKS OF THE  
COMMUNIST PARTY

I

The Indian people's democratic struggles have developed with unprecedented force after the Second World War. They are directed against foreign imperialism and its servitors, the big bourgeoisie, feudal Princes and landlords. Their main character is anti-imperialist and anti-feudal. They are an integral part of the general revolutionary advance of national liberation struggle of the peoples of colonies and dependencies. They form a component part of the international anti-imperialist democratic camp led by the U.S.S.R. The distinguishing feature of the present stage of the main anti-imperialist movement is that it is led by the working class and its Party, the Communist Party.

The leading role of the proletariat in the anti-imperialist struggle has lent the national liberation movement the character of a struggle not for bourgeois democracy but for People's Democracy.

In the struggle for **national liberation**, the Communist Party is to unite under the leadership of the working class the workers, all the peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and the middle bourgeoisie which is interested in saving itself from cut-throat foreign competition and of imperialist oppression.

People's Democracy will guarantee both emancipation from imperialist oppression and the carrying out of genuinely democratic transformation, creating the necessary pre-requisites for a transition to Socialist construction.

The Resolutions of the Polit Bureau adopted in 1948 and 1949 on fundamental questions of the present stage of Indian Revolution committed Left-Sectarian deviation from the correct path of Marxism-Leninism.

The Editorial Article in the Organ of the Information Bureau of Communist and Workers' Parties, in its issue dated 27th January 1950 outlined for us the Lenin-Stalin strategy and tactics of the present stage of our revolution and thus threw a sharp light on this left sectarian deviation. The Polit Bureau's statement on this Editorial Article issued on 22nd February did not correctly draw the lessons from this deviation and sought to minimise the seriousness of the Left-Sectarian deviation the Polit Bureau had committed. It was not merely a question of our lagging behind the revolutionary possibilities nor of only of certain dogmatist and sectarian mistakes of tactics. It was not an ordinary error. It was a serious 'Left' opportunist deviation in defining the present stage, the strategy and the class relations in our revolution.

"Any one who commits mistakes regarding the nature of the revolution is bound to commit mistakes regarding concrete revolutionary tasks."

The Polit Bureau not only made wrong, anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist formulations on the question of the nature of the revolution. It also committed serious left-sectarian mistakes regarding revolutionary tactics and concrete revolutionary tasks. It was guilty of a grave departure from the teachings of Lenin and Stalin.

A proper understanding and seriousness of this deviation can arise out of a correct understanding of the concrete historical circumstances, the path taken by the victorious Chinese revolution and the lessons thereof.

II

After the Great October Socialist Revolution, the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples of colonies and semi-colonies grew more and more intense, constantly undermining the rear of imperialism. "The October Revolution has ushered in a new era", said J.V. Stalin, "the era of colonial revolutions which are being conducted in the oppressed countries of the world in alliance with the proletariat and under the leadership of the proletariat." (Problems of Leninism, Moscow edition, 1947, p.201).

The defeat of the fascist aggressors in the Second World War, the world-historic victory of the U.S.S.R., and the fact that a number of countries have dropped out of the capitalist system and are taking to the path of socialist development undermined

the authority...



the authority of Imperialism in the colonial and dependent countries to a greater and hitherto unprecedented extent. This has deepened the crisis of the colonial system which is the most important component part of the general crisis of capitalism. The world historic victory of the Chinese people over the combined forces of the reactionary Kuomintang and American Imperialism is striking proof of the advance of the national liberation struggle of the colonial and dependent countries.

"The mighty advance of the post-war revolutionary, liberation struggle in the dependent and colonial countries has shaken the entire system of world imperialism to its very foundations and shows that the colonial peoples refuse to live any longer in the old way, and the ruling classes in the metropolitan countries are unable any longer to rule them in the old way." In these words, the Editorial article in "For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy", No.4 of 1950, sums up the essence of the present situation in colonial and dependent countries.

The outstanding features of the national liberation struggles of the colonial peoples against Imperialism are as follows: Armed struggle has become the main form of struggle in many colonies and semi-colonies; these struggles are being led by the working class and its Party, the Communist Party; the big bourgeoisie has gone over into the camp of imperialism; and the peasantry constitutes the driving force in the struggle for national liberation.

"The experience of the victorious national-liberation struggle of the Chinese people teaches", states the Editorial Article in "For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy" No.4 of 1950, "that the working class must unite with all classes, parties, groups and organisations willing to fight the imperialists and their hirelings and to form a broad, nation-wide united front, headed by the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, the Party equipped with the theory of Marxism-Leninism; the Party that has mastered the art of revolutionary strategy and tactics; that breathes the spirit of revolutionary irreconcilability to enemies of the people, the spirit of proletarian organisation and discipline in the mass movement of the peoples."

The Chinese experience tells us that "A decisive condition for the victorious outcome of the national liberation struggle is the formation, when the necessary internal conditions allow for it, of people's liberation armies under the leadership of the Communist Party."

"The path taken by the Chinese people in defeating imperialism and its lackeys and in founding the People's Republic of China is the path that should be taken by the people of the various colonial and dependent countries in their struggle for national independence and people's democracy", states Liu Shao-chi, the Vice-President of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

The path taken by the Chinese working class in winning victory in the struggle for national liberation can be summed up as follows:-

(1) The Chinese working class, through ceaseless struggles, won the support of the broad masses of the people, and became the true leader of the Chinese people's liberation movement. It won the support of the broad peasant masses and organised agrarian revolutionary struggles in which broad peasant masses participated.

(2) It united with the broad masses of petty-bourgeoisie in the cities, especially the revolutionary intelligentsia. It could build up a broad United National Front of all parties, classes and groups that are prepared to fight Imperialism. It differentiated the national bourgeoisie from the compradore bourgeoisie and treated the former as allies in the national liberation struggle.

(3) Many activists of the Chinese working class went to the countryside and set in motion the ~~rk~~ broad peasant masses against the landlords, built up numerous small armed forces and set up guerilla bases, which grew into powerful people's liberation army in course of the long period of guerilla warfare.

(4) In the cities, the working class avoided fighting pitched battles, under unfavourable conditions, labour movement was carried on by maintaining compact organisation and accumulation of strength, by making use of the smallest possibilities of legal and open activity. It made use of the minute contradictions in the enemy ranks to organise and educate the working masses, to lead them in the day-to-day minor struggles for the improvement of their living conditions.

"All these...

"All these legal activities and open struggles", states Liu Shao-chi, "of course, had to be conducted in various forms and through various contacts, so that they might be carried out under an absolutely secret organisation. In this way, legal struggles were combined with revolutionary secret work, thus accumulating revolutionary strength for the ripe moment when the workers would be called upon to collaborate with the People's Liberation Army in occupying the city. This was the main direction of work in the cities before the victory of the revolution."

(5) The Chinese working class and the Chinese labour movement was led by the Communist Party of China.

The Chinese working class could follow this path because it acquired the knowledge that "in a semi-colonial and semi-feudalistic country like China, the working class definitely cannot fundamentally better its status and livelihood...without building a revolutionary army under its own leadership and waging a revolutionary war against the rule of imperialism and its lackeys with the support of the broad masses of the people."

This is the path that has been taken by the people of China and is being taken by other colonial countries such as Malaya, Burma, Viet Nam and Indonesia. The colonial and dependent countries are taking this path on account of the very character of the colonial peoples' revolutionary struggle.

The character of this revolution was described with brilliant clarity by Comrade Stalin in May 1927, in the following generalisation regarding the question of the nature of the Chinese revolution:-

"The present-day Chinese revolution is a confluence of two currents of revolutionary movements - the movement against the feudal survivals and that against Imperialism. The Chinese bourgeois democratic revolution is the confluence of the struggle against feudal survivals and the struggle against Imperialism." (Stalin: "On the Chinese Revolution and the Tasks of the Communist International").

"Left" opportunism which occurred within the Communist Party of China, which opposed the correct line pursued by Comrade Mao Tze-tung, ignored the anti-imperialist character of the Chinese revolution. "The Trotskyites were just opposing this line. They thought China's question in relation to foreign countries was merely the customs question, thus negating the anti-imperialist nature of the Chinese revolution." (Chen Po-ta: "Stalin and Chinese Revolution").

The "Left" opportunism of the Chinese Trotskyists ignored the anti-imperialist nature of the Chinese Revolution and maintained that after the comprador bourgeoisie led by Chiang Kai-shek had come into power, the struggle against Imperialism had ceased to exist, that a Turkish type of revolution headed by Kemal had been accomplished. Answering the Trotskyists, Stalin said -

"In China, imperialism has to beat the living body of national China, hacking it into small pieces and wresting away entire provinces in order to maintain its old position or at least a part of them.

"Hence though in Turkey the struggle against imperialism can end with the unfinished anti-imperialist revolution of the Kemalists, in China it must adopt a profoundly popular and clearly national character and must extend step by step until it reaches a desperate battle with imperialism, shaking the very foundations of imperialism throughout the world."

(Stalin: "Talk with Students of Sun Yat-sen University").

These formulations of Comrade Stalin on the Chinese question is of profound significance in understanding the problems of Indian national liberation revolution. The Indian struggle for national liberation must take the path that has been victoriously traversed by the Chinese people led by the Communist Party of China and its leader Comrade Mao Tze-tung. India is a colonial and semi-feudal country, the nature of the Indian revolution, like China is anti-imperialist and anti-feudal. The Left Sectarian deviation on the Indian question arose out of ignoring its anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character, out of presentation of the class relations obtaining after the imposition of Mountbatten Award in a way that implies as if an anti-imperialist revolution has been accomplished.



III

India is a colonial country ruled by British Imperialism. Despite the fact that India occupies one of the first places among colonial countries, in the numerical strength of the proletariat, her industry bears a typically colonial character. It is exclusively dependent on British capital and majority of Indian capital is British. In spite of the growth of certain branches of Indian industry, the general level of industrial development in India is extremely low even today. The colonial backwardness of India's economy stands out in sharp relief in the fact that industrial production in India comprises only 20 per cent of the total value of the entire production of India and is less than 2 per cent of the industrial production of capitalist countries, in spite of the fact that approximately one-sixth of the whole world's population lives in India. Heavy industry, above all metallurgy, still remains insignificant. A machine building industry which is the foundation of real industrialisation and the basis of the economic independence of a country is practically non-existent in India.

India's economy is mainly agrarian. The overwhelming majority of the Indian population is engaged in agriculture. According to the figures of the last census (1941), 393.3 million people or more than 87 per cent of the entire population of the country live in villages.

Even after the imposition of the Mountbatten Award, Indian Union as well as Pakistan remain economically, politically and militarily under the domination of British Imperialism. British capital has retained and is increasing its dominating position in the economy of India and Pakistan. Over and above, in the period after 2nd World War, American capital is penetrating the economy of India more actively, and the American monopolies are attempting in every way to consolidate their position in India.

British and American imperialists, despite the aggravation of their contradictions in all parts of the world, are pursuing in India as in other South-East Asian countries the common aim of strengthening the imperialist rule and hindering in every way the industrialisation of India, retaining these countries as colonial appendages supplying the imperialist industry with agricultural raw material and with market for its goods.

The Indian big bourgeoisie, who have grown at the tail of foreign capital, has been installed into power by the foreign imperialists as custodians of their interests. The rule of foreign imperialists in India is advantageous to the Indian big bourgeoisie. It is interested in the assistance of British imperialism for a struggle against the people's movement. It betrayed the national liberation movement for the sake of its class interests. The Government of Nehru and Patel represent the anti-national big bourgeoisie and the feudal classes. They are servitors of Anglo-American imperialist powers.

Thus the character of the Indian Revolution, even after the imposition of Mountbatten Award, remains anti-imperialist and national-liberationist.

The report on Strategy and Tactics adopted by the Polit Bureau, denied, as the Trotskyists did on the Chinese question, the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character of the Indian revolution and the colonial character of India's economy, after the imposition of the Mountbatten Award.

The Report on Strategy and Tactics states:-

"In industrial matters, the Government has thrown off its mask and has come forward as an avowedly capitalist Government. It has given up nationalisation, it has assured defence of the capitalist order."

This is open repudiation of the formulation that imperialist domination exists, that Indian industries bear a colonial character, that the Nehru-Patel Government is defending the interests of the imperialist rulers.

This is further borne out in the following passage:-

"In its internal policy, the Government, as we have seen, seeks to rule by terror in the interests of capitalists, in the defence of the present capitalist set-up."

This is....

This is open denial of the fact that colonial slavery exists, that the 'rule by terror' is the continuation and further intensification of imperialist suppression with the native big bourgeoisie as its executors.

The Report further states:-

"The bourgeoisie and their Government have come out not only as mere compromisers and collaborators; they have come out as the spearhead of the counter-revolutionary forces, the main force which alone, because of its mass influence can defend the capitalist order, create disruption among the masses and organise terror. No other class, neither imperialism nor feudalism can do it. No other class can secure wide social support, even though temporary for the present regime of capitalist order; none can direct such terror and still continue to exist and rule for some time."

Underestimation of imperialism and over-estimation of the native big bourgeoisie - such is the keynote of this Left Sectarian formulation. It ascribes not only independence but also a leading role and a wide social support to the Indian big bourgeoisie. This counter-revolutionary formulation reaches its climax in the following passage:-

"The Indian bourgeoisie is the most fighting, active partner in the bourgeois-feudal-imperialist combine. In relation to the people it is the strongest of the three and today when the main immediate task of the combine is to stem the tide of revolution, the Indian bourgeoisie comes forward as the leading member of the combine.

"The fight for revolution therefore breaks out directly against the rule of the Congress Government - and no amount of curses and abuses to imperialism can alter the fact.

"In the consciousness of people as well as reality the fight for revolution means the fight to overthrow the Congress Government. It is so because the Congress Government and the bourgeoisie are not mere puppets but because in reality they are active partners and leading force in the combine."

So the fight against the Congress Government is not the fight against the Imperialist oppressors, whose puppets the Congress Governments and the Indian big bourgeoisie are. On the other hand it is argued that it is not the Indian big bourgeoisie who are puppets of the foreign imperialists but the foreign imperialists are the puppets of the Indian bourgeoisie. It is not the dog that wags the tail but the tail that wags the dog.

Such is the conception of collaboration of Indian bourgeoisie and British imperialism, that is presented in the Report on Strategy and Tactics.

Thus it is openly stated that imperialist rule has disappeared, that the native bourgeoisie has got an independent national state, that there is no basis for a broad united front because the "revolution starts with divided forces". This defeatist sectarian analysis proceeds out of the fact that the Trotskyist proposition on the colonial question is being presented, that a Kernalist type of revolution has been accomplished in India. Obviously the Polit Bureau who adopted this report, failed to see the possibility of a broad united front embracing the entire peasantry and in alliance with even the middle bourgeoisie; they failed to see this because, lessons were drawn from the Trotskyist line on China and not from Stalin's analysis. It is therefore not an accident that Mao Tze-tung was denounced as Right opportunist.

Basing itself on this fundamentally 'Left' opportunist analysis of the Indian situation, the report gives a serious warning against anti-imperialist slogans. In Section IX, the Report States:-

"On this question also there is a tendency among certain comrades to repeat only general slogans about the Indian Union Government having joined the Anglo-American bloc, about repeating that repression in India is launched at the dictates of American imperialism - without caring to marshal out facts to prove the statement and arguing as if the majority of the people, including the petty bourgeois followers of the Congress have already accepted the fact that the Government is collaborationist, that it is not pursuing an independent policy."

at the first...



At the first reading, it appears, as if, the intention of the author is not to deny the collaborationist, puppet character of the Government, that the author warns the Party that such expressions as puppet Government etc. should not be uttered without "facts" to prove the same. But the report itself emphatically maintains throughout, that Nehru-Patel Government is not a puppet, but the leading force of the imperialist-bourgeois-feudal combine. Thus the caution given in Section IX is actually a warning against the Stalinist formulation about Anglo-American domination over the Indian people, and it is shamefaced advocacy of its own 'Left' opportunist thesis.

It is thus clear, that the basic analysis of class relations in India made in the report on Strategy and Tactics, is the 'left' opportunist conception that the Mountbatten Award has done away with Imperialism, that Indian industries no longer bear a colonial character. Contrary to the Marxist-Leninist analysis that Imperialism seeks to keep India a colonial backward agrarian country, the Report presents the alternative analysis that the possibility of independent capitalist development has been opened up. Judge, for example, the following passage:-

"Increase in production without a corresponding guarantee of profits, of reduction of wages, and increase in work-load per worker - hold terror for the capitalists - who see the world-crisis in the near future.

"The capitalists seek to find a way out by importing more upto date machinery - which would relieve them from employment and ensure big profits by reducing the wage-bill."

This amounts to ascribing to the Indian bourgeoisie an independent role, to concealment of the fact that the Indian big bourgeoisie is carrying out the orders of their imperialist masters in keeping India industrially backward. The analysis of the Polit Bureau conceals the fact that the Government is assuring super profits to foreign monopolies in the first instance, that the anti-labour policy of Nehru Government is a measure to serve not only the Indian capitalists but primarily the imperialist interests. The formulations of the Polit Bureau wrongly indicate as if anti-imperialist revolution has been accomplished by transferring power to the bourgeoisie, as if an agrarian revolution is being carried out by the bourgeoisie and a stage has been set for capitalist development.

Contrast this 'Left' opportunist understanding with the following analysis based on Lenin and Stalin teachings:-

"The partition of India into two parts - India and Pakistan - affected by British Imperialism in August 1947 and the granting of fictitious independence to both these parts in the form of dominion status has not changed the colonial character of the economy of these dominions.

"This dismemberment of India has increased the economic dependence of both these dominions and has sharply worsened their economic position and still more hampered the development of their productive forces. All this creates favourable conditions for British imperialists to retain India and Pakistan as agrarian and raw material appendages of Britain." (Balabushevich).

On the question of native States, the Left Sectarian deviation of the Polit Bureau consists in the failure to see in it the true significance of imperialist manoeuvres.

In the Report on Strategy and Tactics, the Indian big bourgeoisie has been ascribed not only an independent role, but also an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal role within certain limitations. Dealing with the Hyderabad question, the Report states:-

"There was the conflict not only between the Nizam and the Indian Union but also the Indian Union and British Imperialism. But all the three sides were determined to see that the masses nowhere came in the picture. These negotiations once more confirmed the formulation of the Party Thesis which stated that in all conflicts between Imperialism and the Indian Union Government, the masses will not be appealed to for action and the problem will be settled at Government levels. Here of course the masses were bypassed though it appeared that the problem was not settled through negotiations and bargaining at Government level, in actual reality it has been settled like that. For, the use of arms against the Nizam was only made to ensure the compromise already sanctioned by imperialism and nothing else."

It means.....

It means that the Nehru Government in sending troops to Hyderabad was solving conflict between Indian Union and the Nizam at Government level, without drawing the masses into the fight. But the reality is that Nehru's troops entered into Hyderabad primarily at the dictates of British Imperialism to save the crumbling feudal Princely order in Hyderabad, to suppress the fighting people of Telengana, whom Nizam's Razakars failed to suppress. The Report on Strategy and Tactics replaces the correct formulation of big bourgeoisie's surrender to imperialism by a formulation that conflicts between Imperialism, feudalism and big bourgeoisie are being solved "at Governmental level". British Imperialism, Indian Union, Native States and Pakistan are conceived as independent Governments allied to each other and solving their conflicts at Governmental level. As if, a sort of bourgeois democratic progress is taking place, the authors' only contention is that such progress is taking place in the reformist way, without the masses.

This is made very clear in the following passage of the Report on Strategy and Tactics:-

"We do find that in actual life, the formulation that the conflict between imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie will be settled at Governmental level sometimes confirmed, sometimes slightly amended. For instance, in relation to Kashmir, the conflict between British Imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie though no doubt fought within the framework of compromise, is negotiated through an Indo-Pakistan clash but its another feature is that neither in India nor in Pakistan the masses are really appealed to."

This is actually denial of the truth that: It is imperialism that is using the Governments of Indian Union and Pakistan against one another to strengthen its hold over both the dominions, and to take possession of Kashmir as a military base. On the contrary, the above passage makes it appear as if India and Pakistan are two independent powers vying with each other for the possession of Kashmir and then appealing to imperialism for solution of the conflict at governmental level without the masses etc.

The Report on Strategy and Tactics goes on to make the following staggering formulation:-

"But imperialism forgot one important and vital factor in its calculation - the people - whom the bourgeoisie alone could utilise. In actual life therefore the bourgeoisie acting within the framework of the Mountbatten compromising plan have been able to bargain hard and advance its own interests and swing the Princes to its side from being a reserve of imperialism. Though the various States signed the instruments of accession prepared by Mountbatten which only handed over defence, foreign affairs etc. etc. to the Centre - the Congress leaders soon utilised the threat of mass movement on the one hand and refusal of military help on the other. Thus Prince after Prince was compelled to agree to elected legislature, which though they were with restricted franchise, were enough to give the bourgeoisie the required majority and pressure to dominate the States from within - and collaborate with feudal elements on terms favourable to the bourgeoisie - and in consonance with its new status at the Centre." ("Strategy and Tactics", page 8 - cyclo edition).

This is nothing but ascribing to the big bourgeoisie a progressive role, as if it was carrying out the tasks of bourgeois democratic progress in the States, as if the big bourgeoisie was not saving feudal princedom from collapse but reforming it. This shows that our Left Sectarianism arises out of the faith in the big bourgeoisie, as Right Reformism does. Compare the above wrong and counter-revolutionary formulation with the following correct formulation made by Leonidov in the article on India's Feudocratic Dynasties:-

"The "reforms" of the Princes' States carried out by the Government has lent new firmness to the tottering position of the Maharajas, who had been appointed Governors of their own fiefs and of whole provinces." (New Times, No.32, 1948).

Thus the Nehru-Patel Government, contrary to the estimates of our Polit Bureau, is strengthening crumbling princedom and not reforming it.

On the Peasant Question, the Left Sectarian line of the Polit Bureau arises out of the failure to see colonial-feudal character as the dominant character of Indian agriculture.

The essence...



The essence of Land-relations existing in India is this:

The system of feudal and semi-feudal landlordism was introduced by British rulers for consolidating their domination, for making India a supplier of agricultural raw material and a market for British industries. This has led in the course of the two centuries of British rule to the complete pauperisation of the peasantry and to the deterioration of agriculture. The dominant form of exploitation in agriculture is imperialist-feudal exploitation. Growth of capitalist relations is yet very insignificant. Feudal rack-renting and usury, supply of slave labour and raw materials to the imperialist colonisers are the dominant features of this system. The agrarian reforms proposed by the Congress Government seek to save feudal landlordism from an agrarian revolution. The peasantry constitutes the most important ally of the working class in the democratic revolution. The peasants can win their emancipation only under the leadership of the proletariat, just as the proletariat can lead the colonial revolution to victory only in alliance with the peasantry and by leading them. The main slogan of the agrarian revolution is abolition of landlordism without any compensation and land to tillers of the soil. The proletariat must strengthen its alliance with all the peasantry by unleashing agrarian revolution, by leading the peasant masses by means of armed struggle in the rural areas, for abolition of feudal exploitation, agrarian reform and national liberation.

The Polit Bureau Resolution On Agrarian Question, as well as the Report on Strategy and Tactics have laid down a fundamentally wrong analysis on the agrarian question. It undermines the struggle against feudal exploitation and makes agrarian revolution almost synonymous with proletarian revolution. It fails to see that semi-feudal form of exploitation is dominant in Indian agriculture, that the land-relations in India, despite the penetration of capitalist relations is preponderantly semi-feudal.

The Polit Bureau Resolution On the Agrarian Question states:-

"To conclude, feudalism is not dead despite development of capitalist relations. But the struggle against feudal relations becomes linked with the struggle against the new capitalist exploiters in the countryside. To attempt to carry out the one without the other is to be guilty of class collaboration and disrupt the struggle for agrarian revolution. It gets directly linked with the struggle for land itself - for today the struggle for land is directed against the monopoly in land of the landlords and rich peasants - both in landlord and ryotwari areas. The land-hunger of the people cannot be satisfied without attacking the land-monopoly of the old and new monopolists. The slogan of agrarian revolution, Land to the Tiller, is directed against both."

From this un-Marxist and fundamentally wrong analysis, the Strategy of Socialist revolution is presented, - namely firm reliance on agricultural workers and poor peasants, fight against landlords and rich peasants and virtually neutralisation of middle peasants. The way the vacillating role of the middle peasants is presented, the call for "winning over" the middle peasant, actually reduced to neutralisation of the middle peasant.

This is the strategy of depriving the working class of the most important ally, the peasantry as a whole, of disrupting the agrarian revolution at a time when it is bursting forth in all parts of the country, of liquidating the national liberation struggle against imperialism at a time when it is maturing as an armed struggle in the countryside, of throwing sections of the peasantry into the arms of the bourgeois reformists at a time when the Congress Government is being exposed as unwilling and incapable to carry out any agrarian reform and as betrayers of all the promises the Congress had made about abolition of landlordism.

This wrong and disruptive strategy advanced by the Polit Bureau has resulted in this that Party not only lagged behind the tempo of the developing agrarian upsurge throughout the country, but was responsible for stemming the tide of the agrarian revolution and even for disrupting it in certain places.

In justification of its Left Sectarian line on the Peasant Question, the Polit Bureau resolution 'On Agrarian Question' advanced the following thesis:-

"What was the ideological postulate of this reformism, which continues now and which was there before the war itself? It was the formula, the uncritical formula, that the agrarian struggle was only against feudalism in land (a counter-part of

the formulation...

the formulation that the national struggle was only against imperialism); it led to a failure to understand the changing class reality in rural areas - and, therefore, to the advocacy of collaborationist tactics with rich exploiting elements, and to the development of the conception of peasant unity in which the oppressed section, the real driving force, the agricultural workers and poor peasants, was deprived of its leading role."

What does the passage drive at? It drives at the imaginary position that capitalist character is the dominant character of Indian agriculture, that unity of all the peasantry against feudalism and imperialism is a myth. Obviously, the thesis starts from a wrong conception of capitalism. It identifies commodity production by itself with capitalism. It does not see that Indian agricultural commodities, besides food crops, are mostly raw materials for foreign imperialists, a fact which lends to Indian agriculture the dominant character of semi-feudal economy under colonial subjection and not of capitalist agriculture. The essence of capitalist mode of production is production of surplus value, exploitation of wage labour, and it occupies an insignificant part in Indian agriculture. Obviously the PE resolution takes all forms of exploitation, exploitation of imperialists, moneylenders, feudal landlords and commercial middlemen as capitalist exploitation. It is the un-Marxist conception of capitalism, which regards every form of extortion as capitalist extortion thereby negating the most fundamental formulation of Marx that capitalist exploitation consists in extraction of surplus value, that commodity production, by itself, is not capitalism, that there is such a system called precapitalist commodity production.

Further, the resolution 'On Agrarian Question' repudiates the truth that imperialist colonial exploitation of Indian agriculture is not developing capitalist relations in agriculture but is hindering its growth and strengthening feudal and semi-feudal forms of exploitation and that the measures of the Congress Government for the so-called abolition of Landlordism even if carried out are not freeing the path of capitalist development in agriculture but on the other hand consolidating the system of semi-feudal exploitation.

The Polit Bureau's wrong analysis of the land relations has its root, among others, in the wrong conception about the nature of India's agricultural workers. The pauperised landless peasants have been identified with agricultural proletariat of the Western type. The following analysis of Comrade Balabushevich is highly instructive:-

"The big army of the agricultural proletariat is a clear indication of the relative agrarian over-population in India. Indian agricultural workers are essentially different from the agricultural workers of the advanced capitalist countries. Side by side with the workers employed in kulak and land-owners' farms (as a rule on a daily and for not more than 3 or 4 months in the year), the great masses of agricultural workers also comprise of those enslaved, the so-called agricultural servants, debt-slaves and others amongst dispossessed strata of the rural population crushed down by feudal exploitation. To the same category belong the impoverished and proletarianised rural artisans (the potters, the banners, the blacksmiths etc.). The position of the small proprietors and the small tenants working on very tiny plots of land is very little different from the position of the agricultural workers. It is absolutely self-evident that only fundamental changes in social relationships, only an agrarian revolution, can abolish the feudal remnants and ameliorate the conditions of the Indian peasantry and the agricultural proletariat."

Under these conditions, "The agricultural workers who cannot but be a very important force in the developing agrarian revolution are playing a very big role in the peasant movement in many districts of the country" - observes Comrade Balabushevich. He has correctly characterised the peasant movement in the following words -

"The post-war peasant movement in India is developing under the slogan of the consolidation of the alliance of the working class and the peasantry and it is closely interwoven with the general democratic movement, which is developing under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party."

On the question of the role of the Indian Bourgeoisie, the Polit Bureau has made un-Marxist, unreal and left Sectarian formulation by characterising the entire Indian bourgeoisie as spearhead of counter-revolution, collaborationist and leader of the imperialist-bourgeois-feudal combine. It did so because it failed to see imperialist domination over Indian economy, the colonial character of Indian industries and the monopoly hold of a few families.

A few large...



A few large families - the Tata, Birla, Dalmia, Singhanian, Goenka, Walchand Hirachand and some others, had always been the sub-agents of British capital, their concerns are linked with foreign capital through many threads, they control enormous resources, they control the Congress organisation and guide its policy through Nehru and Patel. They are anti-national and imperialist-agents. They constitute the big bourgeoisie who together with foreign imperialists hamper the growth and interests of the middle bourgeoisie in this country. These plutocratic groups have financial connections with the feudal dynasties of the Indian Princes.

The interlocking of British monopolies with the firms of the Indian big bourgeoisie is proceeding rapidly. Of the four oldest and biggest British colonial firms in India - heirs and successors of the British East India Company - the three firms, Gillanders, Arbuthnot & Co., Bird & Co., and Martin and Burns - which directly control 200 companies in India have already assigned part of their share to Indian partners. The majority of shares remain in British hands. All strategic industries are controlled by them.

The new monopoly capital in India, which the Indian National Congress represents is in fact principally Anglo-Indian capital. A number of Indian firms have also concluded agreements with American Trusts. As Leonidov points out in New Times No.32 of 1948, the Birla Bank has direct connections with the National City Bank of New York. This New York bank is also becoming the financial agent of Tata's new aviation trust. The Indian plutocrats are on the way to make further deals with American monopolies. The greedy eyes of these plutocracies rallied round Patel and Nehru are casting covetous looks on the other South East Asian countries. They cherish the dream of becoming the chief agents of the British and American capital in the exploitation of South-East Asian countries.

These big bourgeoisie, whose will, the Congress leaders are carrying out, want to suppress at all costs, the national liberation movement, their aim is to cement and strengthen the "colonial-feudal-capitalistic" regime in India.

Already in 1925 Com. Stalin had pointed out that the Indian national bourgeoisie had split into a revolutionary party and a compromising party and that the compromising section of this bourgeoisie has already managed to come to an agreement with Imperialism. Com. Stalin emphasised in this connection that the compromising section of the Indian bourgeoisie had entered into a bloc with Imperialism against the workers and peasants of its own country. "The victory of the revolution cannot be achieved unless this bloc is smashed. But in order to break this bloc first must be concentrated on the compromising national bourgeoisie; ~~the~~ treachery must be exposed, the toiling masses must be emancipated from its influence and the conditions necessary for the hegemony of the proletariat must be systematically prepared. In other words, it is a question of preparing the proletariat of such colonies as India for the role of leader in the liberation movement, and of dislodging, step by step, the bourgeoisie and its spokesmen from this honourable position. The task is to create a revolutionary anti-imperialist bloc and to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat within the bloc." (Stalin: National and Colonial Question).

The compromising section of the Indian big bourgeoisie, i.e. the big bourgeoisie (Tata-Birla-Dalmia etc.) represented by the Congress leadership, had already come to an agreement with Imperialism even before the second world war. After the end of the second world war they have given up whatever opposition they used to put up against imperialism, and finally became custodians of imperialist rule. They did so because they were alarmed at the growing revolutionary forces and their narrow class interests demanded open surrender to imperialism.

But, as Com. Balabushevich correctly points out in Problems of Economics No.8:-

"The final going over of the Indian big bourgeoisie into the camp of reaction and imperialism does not exclude the fact that individual groupings in the national bourgeoisie can still at one or another time, during one or another period, become fellow travellers with the democratic forces in their struggle against imperialism and its allies in India. In the first instance, they comprise those elements of the bourgeoisie whose interests in particular run counter to those of the foreign capital that is flowing increasingly into the country. It also comprises the rising bourgeoisie of those national regions of India, which are more backward in their development. This bourgeoisie is dissatisfied with the predominance of the already constituted monopoly groups. At the same time one must bear in mind that under the present conditions of the extreme accentuation

of the general...

of the general crisis of capitalism, when a specially sharp polarisation of class forces is taking place both on an international scale and within the bounds of every capitalist country taken individually, these oppositional strata of the Indian bourgeoisie ought not to be regarded in any way as reliable or stable members of the anti-imperialist camp."

No section of the bourgeoisie or the petty-bourgeoisie can become the leader of the national liberation struggle, the middle bourgeoisie must be considered as the vacillating ally of the Democratic Front, the working class, all the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie must constitute firmly the Democratic Front under the leadership of the working class. The main fight is directed against imperialism, feudalism and the native big bourgeoisie.

The Polit Bureau resolutions failed to make such a correct analysis of class relations, rejected the documents of the Andhra P.C. which adopted generally correct formulations on these questions, and laid down a Left Sectarian strategy, because the Polit Bureau did not correctly understand the significance of Mountbatten Award, did not realise that behind the facade of transfer of power, Imperialism maintains its domination and through partition, strengthens its hold over both Indian Union and Pakistan.

In all the major formulations of the Polit Bureau, the running thread is that Imperialism has retreated, national bourgeoisie has got a national state and colonial character of Indian economy has been considerably undermined. In other words the Mountbatten Award represents an advance.

It is significant that both Right opportunism and "Left" opportunism inside the Party proceed out of the same root, namely: the wrong conception that the Indian bourgeoisie has already taken India a step forward in the direction of national independence, that a considerable degree of decolonisation has taken place. Both Right Reformism and Left Sectarianism have the common root, namely blindness to see the existence of Imperialist domination in the new period.

#### IV

Right opportunism inside the Party arose out of faith in the so-called revolutionary role of the bourgeoisie. In the present period it has its root in the wrong conception about the significance of the Mountbatten Award, failure to see imperialism behind the facade of transfer of power.

The old Central Committee, in June 1947 adopted a resolution on the Mountbatten Award which contained the following formulation :-

"The Communist Party is of opinion that new opportunities for national advance has been won. The two popular Governments and Constituent Assemblies are the strategic weapons in the hands of the national leadership. It is the task of the national movement to ensure that they are used for the rapid realisation of national aims."

This right opportunist formulation denies that the big bourgeoisie has finally gone over to Imperialism, that the Mountbatten Award, through partition, has created new strategic weapons not for national liberation but for maintaining colonial domination.

Commenting on this resolution Comrade Maslennikov observes in an article in "Problems of Economic" No. 9, 1949, published in Moscow :-

"However, the old leadership of the Communist Party was nevertheless not free from the reformist influence which told in the policy of the Party in the period of the Second World War. "The Mountbatten Plan" for the partition of India and granting of Dominion Status to India and Pakistan which was nothing but a deal between British Imperialism and the Indian bourgeois top strata, a new form of the economic and political dependence of these dominions on British Imperialism was evaluated by the former leadership of the Indian Communist Party as some kind of 'step forward' and not as a new form of attack of British Imperialism on the Indian people. After the partition of India into two dominions, the leadership of the Communist Party took the decision to support the bourgeois Nehru Government and on the 'expediency' of forming a united national front from Gandhi to Communists. This reformist line was strongly criticised and condemned at the .....



Second Congress of the Indian Communist Party which took place in February-March 1948."

The Second Party Congress corrected the right opportunist understanding about the new situation.

Evaluating the results of the Second Party Congress, Comrade Balabushevich in an article in Problems of Economics No.8 (Moscow), writes as follows:-

"The Second Congress of the Communist Party which took place during the end of February and beginning of March 1948, was an important step in the life of the Indian Communist Party and a big political event inside the country. The Congress demonstrated a big increase in the influence of the Communist Party.

"The Congress advanced the most important task in the new stage, the struggle for the consolidation by all means of the People's Democratic Front, which must be the embodiment of the alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class. The Congress proclaimed the following demands as the central slogan of the People's Democratic Front at the present stage of the national liberation movement in India.

"(1) Complete national independence, severance from the British Empire and the Anglo-American reactionary bloc, and the establishment of close economic, political and cultural ties with the genuinely democratic countries and above all with the Soviet Union.

"(2) Abolition of landlordism without compensation and distribution of land to the tillers of the soil.

"(3) A determined democratisation of India and its conversion into a union of national, people's democratic republics on the basis of the principle of national self-determination; the abolition of princely States.

"(4) Nationalisation of the key branches of industry and the confiscation of foreign and above all, of British enterprises, a radical improvement in the position of the working class.

"The Communist Party set itself as a specially important task, the building of unity of the democratic movements in the Indian Union and Pakistan and emphasised that this unity is the indispensable condition for the liberation of both these dominions from imperialist oppression and the most important pre-requisite for a successful struggle for real democratisation of both the parts of India."

Such are the achievements of the Second Congress. It rejected the right-reformist line pursued by the old Central Committee. It asserted that the big bourgeoisie and the leadership of the Congress had betrayed the masses and had gone over to imperialism. It made clear that imperialist domination continued to exist and that the Mountbatten Award was a "cunning counter-offensive" against the people.\* It put forward a correct programme of the democratic front. It emphasised the leadership of the working class in the class-alliance of the Democratic Front and in the national liberation struggle. (\*It pointed out that the fight against imperialism remained the main task)

Thus the main decisions of the Congress were an effective weapon both against Right opportunism and Left-sectarianism. This must be particularly borne in mind when at the present time attempts are being made to revive right opportunism, taking advantage of the Left sectarian deviation of the PB, and when on the other hand, some others are seeking to minimise the Left sectarian crimes of the PB by making out that the mistakes of the PB are already present in the Political Thesis itself.

Nevertheless the Political Thesis (which was finally prepared by the Drafting Committee on the basis of the amendments adopted at the Congress) does contain left sectarian formulations. These became the starting point for the serious Left-deviation later on developed by the PB. Thus -

(1) The Political Thesis while it pointed out the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal character of the present i.e. people's democratic stage of the revolution in India, failed to demarcate it sharply from the next i.e. the socialist stage.

On the other hand...

On the other hand it made the wrong formulation about the achievement of people's democracy and "the simultaneous building of socialism", "at one stroke".

(2) The Political Thesis did not distinguish between big bourgeois and the other sections of the bourgeoisie, and did not differentiate their roles. It placed the whole bourgeoisie in the category of "collaborationist".

(3) The Political Thesis did not point out the colonial character of the Indian industries. It did not emphasise the compradore character of the Indian big capital which was acting as the agent of Anglo-American monopoly capital in maintaining India under foreign imperialist domination as their colonial base. Instead it tended to wrongly emphasise the independent development of Indian big capital and its conflict with imperialism, its gaining some big concessions from imperialism by "political bargaining".

(4) Its analysis of Indian economic crisis proceeds with the understanding as if Indian economy is independent capitalist economy.

(5) It did not give any warning against Left Sectarian deviation.

It is a significant fact that the Andhra Secretariat which contained members of the Central Committee and two PBMs, when they took up the task, soon after the Congress, of concretising the general line laid down by the Second Congress, came up against these very weaknesses of the Political Thesis. Their draft resolution of July 1948, which they submitted to the PB, sought to remove these weaknesses. Basing themselves on the brilliant analysis of the new stage of the colonial revolutions contained in Mao Tze-tung's "New Democracy" - the Andhra Secretariat underlined the following points in their document:-

The present stage of the revolution was in the main anti-imperialist and anti-feudal;

The class alliance of the Democratic Front must be based on the fact that it is the big monopolist bourgeoisie and not the whole bourgeoisie which has gone over to imperialism and that a correct attitude will have to be adopted towards the middle bourgeoisie oppressed by foreign imperialism and Indian monopoly capital;

The Agrarian Revolution - to wipe out the feudal and semi-feudal system of landlordism and to give land to the tillers is the crux of the democratic revolution. The class alliance in the Agrarian Revolution must include the vast masses of the peasantry and correct attitude must be adopted towards those rich peasants who in the main do not feudally exploit.

The perspective of the development of the revolution in India was similar to that of the Chinese revolution and that the Proletariat and its Party will have to concentrate on developing the agrarian revolution and the armed struggle in the countryside as the main direction of advance. The Andhra Secretariat correctly pointed out in their document that unless the programme and the general line laid down by the Congress was concretised in this way there was a danger of serious left-sectarian mistakes.

The Andhra document, despite the fact that it contained some weaknesses of formulations, in the main proposed a very correct approach to the concretisation and precise formulation of the general line of the Party.

The Polit Bureau, on the other hand, thinking in terms of removing these weaknesses took an opposite direction, and rejected the Andhra document as "right reformist". The Polit Bureau in its documents, in fact repudiated all the strong points of the Political Thesis and in fact elaborated a consistently worked-out Left-sectarian thesis. It completely overhauled the Political Thesis by characterising the bourgeoisie as the leading force in imperialist-bourgeois-feudal combine, explained the stage of the revolution as anti-capitalist in character, described the rich peasants as the spearhead of counter-revolution and worked out a strategy of proletarian Socialist revolution, masked by deceptive phrases.

The Polit Bureau completely swung over to "Left" Opportunism.

It is wrong to characterise "Left" opportunism as less dangerous than Right opportunism. Both are equally dangerous, both are anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist,

trends,...



trends, both the trends sabotage the revolution. They do so in different ways. A determined struggle against both these deviations is an essential condition for making the Communist Party the real and practical leader of the revolution - for training really revolutionary cadres capable of leading the national liberation struggle to victory. Stalin's definition of these two deviations, as they arise in the work of the Communist Parties in colonial and dependent countries must be our unfailing guide in our struggle against these deviations.

"The first deviation consists in under-rating the revolutionary possibilities of the liberation movement and in over-rating the idea of a united all-embracing national front in the colonies and dependent countries without due regard for the state and degree of development of these countries. This is a deviation to the Right, which threatens to degrade the revolutionary movement and to submerge the Communist elements in the general welter of bourgeois nationalists. It is the direct duty of the University of the Peoples of the East to combat this deviation with the utmost determination.

"The second deviation consists in over-rating the revolutionary possibilities of the liberation movement and in under-rating the importance of an alliance between the working class and the revolutionary bourgeoisie against imperialism. The Communists in Java, who recently erroneously put forward the slogan of a Soviet government for their country, suffer, it seems, from this deviation. This is a deviation to the Left, which threatens to isolate the Communist Party from the masses and to transform it into a sect. A determined struggle against this deviation is an essential condition for the training of really revolutionary cadres for the colonies and dependent countries of the East." (On the Colonial Question - Lenin-Stalin-Zhukov, PPH edition, pp.21-22).

In another place Stalin has defined these two deviations as follows:-

"The political self-determination of the Chinese Communists will develop in the struggle against two equally harmful deviations: Right Liquidationism which ignores the independent class amalgamation with the general democratic national movement and the extreme Left-sentiments which endeavour to skip the revolutionary-democratic stage of the movement and directly adopt the aims of the proletarian dictatorship and the Soviet government forgetting the peasantry, that basic and decisive factor in the Chinese movement for national emancipation." (Stalin's speech in August 1927 in 'Marxism and the National & Colonial Question', L.W. edition, italics Stalin's).

In the period before the Second Party Congress, Right opportunism dominated the leadership and the cadres of the Communist Party of India. The result was that we repudiated the struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat in the new stage of the national liberation struggle that had opened after the 2nd world war and pursued the right opportunist policy laid down in our "Mountbatten Resolution" which sought to tie the fighting masses to the tail of the treacherous national big bourgeoisie.

In 1946 and 1947, the Indian working class fought gigantic struggles and emerged as the leader of the struggle for national liberation, peasant struggles in a number of provinces opened up the possibility of leading armed struggles as in other South East Asian countries. Steeped in the morass of Right Opportunism, we refused to proceed along that path and preached cooperation with the big bourgeois leadership which had already been betraying the revolution. We trailed behind the bourgeoisie.

Left-sectarian deviation has dominated the resolutions of the Polit Bureau and the work of the leading cadres of the Party in the past two years which followed the Second Party Congress. The result was that we sought to skip over the anti-imperialist anti-feudal stage of the revolution and began to talk of the aims of the Socialist stage of the revolution - such as fighting capitalist elements in the countryside etc. We forgot that the vast masses of the peasantry - ground down under the imperialist-sponsored system of feudal and semi-feudal landlordism - constituted the basic and decisive force of the national liberation struggle in India and failed to concentrate on developing the agrarian revolution.

In 1948 and 1949, immense possibilities of leading agrarian revolution and armed struggle e...



armed struggle for liberation in the rural areas were opened up, but our "Left" Opportunism disrupted the peasant front; ignored the rural armed struggle and kept the proletariat isolated from its allies in the present stage of democratic revolution. We isolated the vanguard of the working class from the mass of people.

Thus the consequences of both Right Opportunism and "Left" Opportunism have been the same, namely hinder the growth of the revolution, in two different ways. Right opportunism makes the vanguard trail behind the bourgeoisie while 'Left' opportunism isolates the vanguard from the masses.

Our dogmatic Left Sectarian formulations on the character of the revolution resulted in Left adventurist forms of struggle. It consisted in this: We neglected armed struggle of the peasantry in the rural areas, either we have not developed them (except in Telengana, Andhra and Hajong areas) or we have not led them as in Kakdwip and Midnapore. We did so because our guiding line was the dogmatic position that revolutionary uprising must occur in the cities first, struggle in the rural areas is subordinated to the same. Anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character of the revolution was completely missed and agrarian revolution was dangerously minimised. Thus our concentration on armed demonstrations in Calcutta disregarding all consequences, was adventurist in character and led to serious loss of cadres and harmed the organisation. Similarly some of the clashes inside Prisons were examples of extreme adventurism.

Our Left adventurist actions have spelled disaster on the Party organisation and on the working class movement itself.

In this respect the following account of Comrade Li Li-san, the Chinese Communist leader is highly instructive:-

"For quite a long time, because we did not realise the fact that, under the rule of fascist white terror in a semi-colonial and semi-feudalistic country as China, revolutionary trade union organisations and revolutionary struggles had no legal protection whatsoever. We did not know how to organise proper defence and retreat on the occasions when the movement met with set-backs; on the contrary, we adventurously organised offensives and openly organised workers' strikes and demonstrations and even armed struggle. As a result, the revolutionary organisations and revolutionary forces in the cities suffered severe damages and destruction, creating terrific losses and at one time even leading to the destruction of practically all organisations of the Party and revolutionary mass organisations by the enemy. I myself committed serious mistakes on this question and therefore feel deeply about these historical lessons." (Li Li-san's report at TUCAA).

What is the lesson to be drawn from this account? It is thus summed up by Comrade Liu Shao-chi in his address to the TUCAA held at Peking:-

"Armed struggle can, and must be, the main form in the People's Liberation struggles in many colonial and semi-colonial countries. But this does not mean that armed struggle does not need the co-ordination of other forms of struggle. Armed struggle is to be carried on in the countryside, while in the enemy-controlled cities and areas, other legal and illegal mass struggles should be conducted to coordinate with it."

Judging in this light, we can ascertain which struggles were correctly led and which struggles were Left adventurist. A review of these struggles will be made as soon as possible.

What is the guiding line given by the Chinese comrades in respect of struggle in the cities? The guiding line is - the enemy must not be able to destroy our Party and the mass organisations but the working class led by the Party must be able to inflict losses on the enemy. We must proceed with this line. Unless this guiding line is kept in view, there will be either Right Opportunist or "Left" adventurist betrayals. With this guiding line we must judge what is the ripe moment for a particular form of action and what is the unripe moment, when to advance and when to retreat. "Left" adventurist tactics advocate - Advance always and all along the line. Right Opportunist tactics advocate - Retreat always and all along the line.

We had given, on many occasions, infantile calls for General Strikes, without organising....



organising the workers, without careful preparation, without making serious efforts to bring about unity of workers and without considering whether it was possible for the workers to come out in the face of Police terror. On most of such occasions workers did not respond. Questions have been asked whether these calls were justified or not. These were undoubtedly adventurous calls, not from the angle reformists call them adventurous, but from the revolutionary angle.

Reformists denounce them as adventurous because they stand for only peaceful forms of mobilisation and retreat all along the line. They denounce the calls for General Strikes etc. as well as all clashes between the police and the people as adventurous.

Once we realise that the key task of the working class is to lead armed struggle of the peasantry in the rural areas, the whole question becomes clear. If that is understood, the supreme importance of preserving cadres in the city, the necessity of fighting in different forms under different circumstances can be seen.

At the same time one must not run away with the idea that mass demonstrations and workers' political strikes that had successfully taken place between 1947 and 1949 in different cities are adventurous actions. The big role played by these mass political strikes in raising the Indian proletariat to the level of the leader of the general struggle must not be minimised. In 'Problems of Economics' No.8 (Moscow) Balabushevich evaluated these strike struggles in the following way:-

"After the partitioning of the country, the political strikes and mass actions of the workers against the anti-popular policy of the Congress Government in India and of the Muslim League Government in Pakistan, against the persecution of the Communist Parties, the All India Trade Union Congress and other progressive democratic organisations by the Governments of both the dominions, have assumed a wide sweep.

"The most important events in the life of India were such political actions of the proletariat as the one-day general strike of 700,000 workers of Bombay as a mark of protest against the lifting of price control by the Congress Government (December 1947), the one-day general strike of 100,000 workers in Calcutta against the adoption of the law by the Bengal Provincial Legislature giving the Bengal Government extraordinary plenary powers (January, 1948), the one-day general strike of 200,000 workers of Central Provinces and Berar against the anti-working class policy of the Government (March 1949), the one-day strike of 50,000 Calcutta workers as a mark of protest against the introduction of the anti-working class legislation (July 1948) and a whole number of the big political actions as well as a large number of protest strikes against the persecution of the Communist Party..."

To this we must add the general strike in Hyderabad and 75,000 textile workers' strike in Bombay that had taken place very recently.

Balabushevich continues:-

"The growing political struggles of the Indian proletariat clearly proves that it is resolutely emerging in defence not only of its own economic interests but is leading the struggle for the defence of the interests of the broad toiling masses and against the reactionary bloc of the imperialists, the big bourgeoisie and the landlords. Thus in practice, it rises to the level of the leader of the general struggle."

Such political strikes and mass actions will take place in the cities even in future under circumstances when the Government is put on the defensive, when people's offensive forces the police to retreat. We must take advantage of such ripe moments without jumping into premature adventurous actions.

What is the guiding line to be followed in this respect? The guiding line is given in the manifesto of the Trade Union Conference of Asian and Australasian countries. It is as follows:-

"In the cities under white terror, apply with good judgment and elasticity the tactics that can best ensure the defence of your interests. Active trade

unionists !...



unionists ! You must be present whenever the masses are, even in the trade union organisations and institutions led by reactionaries. You must organize the day to day struggles of the masses for the defence of their interests, in particular, opposing slave labour and every kind of discrimination. In this way you will prepare and gather forces to organise, when a favourable opportunity arises, broad mass movements that will deliver decisive blows at the reactionary forces."

The main content of the above guiding line is preservation of cadres. It is not a no-strike line, but it is a serious warning against reckless offensive always and all along the line. Apply with good judgment when and what form of struggle will inflict an injury on the enemy. Raise new cadres, preserve the cadres and strengthen the trade union and Party organisations, make the Party real leader of the working class, multiply Party's contact with the masses.

We went wrong because our guiding line had been to rely on developing political general strikes as the only means to fight white terror, because we failed to visualise that: the working class can win basic improvement in its conditions of life and labour by fighting imperialism and by leading the agrarian revolution, by organising armed struggle in the rural areas. Because we proceeded on the understanding that working class offensive can continuously advance without any zigzag. We committed this deviation because we overlooked the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal aspect of the revolution. Because we analysed events and formulated our tasks in the dogmatic ways by drawing historical parallels with the Russian revolution.

How to adopt a correct tactics ? In order to adopt correct tactics, the concrete historical circumstances must be taken into account. It is of prime importance to take note of the fact that we are passing through an unprecedented advance of the colonial people's struggles, the agrarian revolutionary forces in India are maturing very fast, imperialists suffering enormous defeats are increasing their offensive, armed revolution is facing armed counter-revolution throughout the colonial world.

In this situation it is possible and imperative for the Communist Party to develop Telenganas in many parts of the country. Once this is done - we will be in the midst of a radically different situation. All our activities must be guided by this prime consideration - how to develop Telenganas in as many areas as possible. Telengana ~~xxxx~~ way must be our principal way.

In the big cities and industrial centres we must lead mass movements of the working class, intelligentsia and others. We must work tirelessly to build the unity of the working-class to resist all attacks on their jobs, wages and other living conditions, isolating the national reformist and social reformist splitters exposing them as agents of British and American Labourite splitters, as the hirelings of Anglo-American imperialists. Organised working-class led by the Communist Party must be the leading force of all broad mass movements in the city.

We must develop broadest possible peace movement with unprecedented skill and energy. The movement for peace and against Anglo-American imperialist warmongers should proceed under the following slogans: Quit Commonwealth; unity of the democratic forces of India and Pakistan in the struggle against Anglo-American designs to make the two countries their colonial and war bases; All support to the national liberation movement of Viet Nam, Indonesia, Burma, Malaya, Philippines; No transport of supply of armaments and troops to carry on the war of aggression against the peoples of these countries. It must be actively linked with the powerful movement that is gathering strength in all countries under the leadership of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress.

We must develop a broad movement against police repression, against the suppression of the democratic rights and civil liberties of workers and ordinary citizens drawing into it the widest strata of the people. We must expose the central and provincial governments as agents of imperialist colonisers.

Forms of struggle must be flexible, from strikes to peaceful demonstrations, from open legal rallies to illegal propaganda and agitation. Our aim is to build up revolutionary organizations of the working class and the democratic masses in the cities, the Communist Party units and committees, Trade Unions, factory and mill committees, youth, women and student organisations, etc. - whose leading cadres and organisational apparatus would be functioning illegally among the broad masses, and would be capable of leading the ever-widening mass movement in the face of repression and white terror.

We must.....



We must organise - organise and organise the workers and the democratic masses in the cities and industrial centres. Thus we will not only be able to lead the mass movements in the cities but will enable us to send contingents of working class militants and revolutionary intelligentsia to organise and lead struggles in the rural areas.

If we work with this perspective - we will get ripe moments, when the enemy is put on the defensive and big upheavals can be led in cities.

In order that we may be able to do so, Comrade Liu Shao-chi has laid down four important directives in his inaugural address at the TUCAA session at Peking:-

1. The working class must unite with all other classes, parties and groups, organisations and individuals who are willing to oppose the oppression of imperialism and its lackeys, to form a broad, nation-wide united front and ready to wage a resolute struggle against imperialism and its lackeys.

2. This nation-wide united front must be led by the working class which opposes imperialism most resolutely, most courageously and most unselfishly and by its political Party, the Communist Party both of which must become the centre of this front. It cannot be led by the wavering and compromising national bourgeoisie or the petty bourgeoisie and their political parties.

3. In order to enable the working class and its political Party, the Communist Party, to become the centre for uniting all the national, anti-imperialist forces and successfully to lead the national united front to victory, it is necessary to build up through patient struggles a Communist Party equipped with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, a party mastering strategy and tactics, a party practising self-criticism and strict discipline and which is closely linked with the masses.

4. It is necessary to set up wherever and whenever possible a People's Liberation Army led by the Communist Party, an army which is powerful and skilful in fighting enemies, as well as strong points for the operation of these armies and also to coordinate the mass struggles in the enemy controlled areas with the armed struggle. Moreover, armed struggle is the main form of struggle in the national liberation struggle in many colonies and semi-colonies.

There is a specific Right opportunist interpretation of the Editorial Article of the Cominform Organ dated 27th January.

The interpretation is this: 'India is at a stage when armed struggle is not on the agenda'. 'We must concentrate on exposure campaign'.

If so, then is Telengana and Andhra struggles all wrong? If Telengana and Andhra struggles are correct then is there any fundamental difference between Andhra and the rest of India? If such a fundamental difference exists then what are the main points of difference?

To say that Telengana and Andhra struggles are wrong is to preach worst form of Reformism.

In answering the above questions our guide must be the Peking Manifesto. What is the essence of the Peking Manifesto? It consists in this: agrarian struggles against Imperialism and Feudalism, wherever they develop must be conducted as armed struggle, - partisan war etc. It is precisely by following this guide that the armed struggle in Telengana and Andhra are being correctly led. It follows that wherever the Party is in a position to unleash agrarian struggles - as in Kakdwip, Midnapore, Hajong area - they must be led as armed struggle. If this understanding is repudiated, then Peking Manifesto ceases to be the guide.

Now the question arises - what are the factors that have made armed struggle in Andhra a reality? The main factors are these - unity of peasant masses for land and against the Government, leadership of the Communist Party over the peasantry and the very existence of agrarian crisis.

Undoubtedly, similar situation exists in many parts of the country. Where the unity of the peasant masses for land and against the Government has not yet been forged, or where the leadership of the Party over the peasant masses has not yet

been established....



been established - it is the task of the party to develop the same as a precondition for developing armed struggle. This is the essence of the slogan - Strengthen the alliance of the working class with all the peasantry. To ignore this condition is to commit Left adventurist deviation.

But undoubtedly peasant movement in many parts of the country has already been raised to the level when it can be led forward only in the Telengana way or it can only be betrayed.

Thus the Right reformist interpretation of the editorial article of the Cominform organ is nothing but repudiation of the historic manifesto of the TUCAA at Peking. This interpretation can mean only one thing - namely advocacy of peaceful parliamentarism. The Peking Manifesto is a clear warning against all shades of peaceful parliamentarism. It must be understood that the Editorial Article of the Cominform Organ itself has summed up the essence of the Peking Manifesto and there is no scope for any opportunist interpretation of the same.

Right opportunist deviation will also arise if we interpret the directives of the Peking Manifesto as a line of 'no-strike' and peaceful propaganda, if we do not take up the question of armed struggle in the rural areas seriously, if we rule out all struggles in the city under all circumstances, finally if we forget that it is a period of revolutionary advance. In the existing situation, we are faced with this advance in certain sectors (as in Andhra and Hajong area) where our comrades have been, on the whole, correctly applying Marxist-Leninist tactics, we are faced with set-backs in certain areas as in West Bengal where we have failed to adopt correct tactics. But the situation will develop in favour of revolutionary advance and also take a zigzag course for some time to come.

Even if we take correct line but apply it in the way of dogmatists, we will commit many more serious mistakes. Even our fundamental deviations arise out of dogmatism. Right opportunism and "left" opportunism both arise in us from dogmatism. We commit so many serious mistakes because we are dogmatists. What does dogmatism mean? It means applying certain general formulations mechanically without taking into consideration concrete circumstances, it means failure to change Party directives even when the concrete situation changes, it means taking the Party line as rigid provisions of a penal code and not as a guide to action. Party line must be considered as guide to action. What does it mean? It means that in each specific circumstance, in applying the Party line one should take into account what are the concrete circumstances, how can the objective underlying the Party line be attained, on what consideration the Party line was drawn up and what variation it requires in the given circumstance.

Dogmatism arises not only when the correct Party line is applied but also in formulating the Party line itself. Our rejection of the Andhra P.C. resolution - our rejection of the 'China way' - was itself a specimen of dogmatism. We wanted to apply the concrete line of revolutionary activities as in the Russian revolution to India under different conditions and in a different period. We refused to learn the lessons of history, we refused to learn from the rich experiences of the Chinese revolution where Lenin and Stalin teachings were concretely applied, under conditions of imperialist domination and colonial slavery, conditions similar to that of India on many essential points.

Once we correct the mistakes by implementing the sound directives contained in the TUCAA held at Peking and the editorial article of the "For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy" No.4 of 1950, the Communist Party will be able to unleash the forces of national liberation struggle for complete independence and People's Democracy. Suffering enormous defeats, the Anglo-American imperialists and their stooges, the Nehru-Patel Government are conspiring in a fury to attack the democratic movements more fiercely than ever before. In doing so they are using all weapons, - Police terror, communal riots, right-wing Socialist disruption and attack on the Communist Party from inside as well as outside. The warning given by the Moscow Radio and Pravda that the American-Yugoslav embassies in Delhi are organising secret agents to break the Party must be taken seriously.

Ruthless struggle against all trends of bourgeois national reformism, complete liquidation of Left Sectarianism, strict discipline based on the principles of Democratic Centralism, indefatigable activity among the masses, ideological remoulding of the entire Party, and criticism and self-criticism are the

weapons....



weapons which must be used to the fullest extent to ward off the attacks of the enemy so that we can be at the head of a gigantic upheaval of national liberation struggle. We will win because world historical forces are marching in our favour.

Serious blunders and deviations have been committed by the Party leadership for its refusal to learn. There are four sources from which the Party leadership must learn: firstly from the teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin; secondly from the rich experiences of the brother Communist Parties, particularly from the Communist Party of China led by Comrade Mao Tze-tung; thirdly from the lower units and rank and file Party members who are in contact with the masses; and fourthly from the masses themselves. Lacking the Bolshevik modesty to learn from all these sources, the Party leadership has become bureaucratized and dogmatist. Eagerness to teach everybody and refusal to learn from anybody are the vices of a bureaucratic leadership and it is these vices that are responsible for all the major weaknesses of the Party. The class origin of these vices lies in the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia having no revolutionary experience and Marxist-Leninist outlook. It is this class-position that nourishes dogmatism and obstructs, at every step, correct Marxist-Leninist understanding. This makes the question of functioning inner-Party democracy - Democratic Centralism - a question of supreme importance.

---

PRICE : As 0-5-0

---

C O R R E C T I O N   S L I P

There are a few mistakes in the 'P.B. DRAFT FOR THE C.C. AND FOR DISCUSSION AMONG PARTY RANKS'

- (1) Page 3, para 1, line 1, make "states Liu Shao-Chi" into "states Li Li-San,"
  - (2) Page 10, para 6, line 1, it should be "The compromising section of the Indian bourgeoisie" and not "Indian big bourgeoisie"
  - (3) Page 14, para 4, in the quotation from Stalin, line 3 should read as "ignores the independent class aims of the Chinese proletariat and leads to a loose amalgamation with the general democratic national movement .....". In the cycloed copy the underlined words have been omitted.
-