

FOURTH LECTURE

THE PRESENT STAGE OF THE REVOLUTION

STAGE OF REVOLUTION

(a) The basic aim of the present phase of the Indian revolution is to complete the anti-imperialist, antifeudal, democratic revolution and to prepare for the transition to socialism.

The question arises as to why the CPI is not advocating a socialist revolution immediately. This is not because the CPI does not want socialism nor because it despairs of ever attaining socialism. It is because the objective and subjective conditions are not yet ripe to make socialism the central aim of the present stage of the revolution.

This is because, in spite of having won freedom, the Indian people have not as yet resolved their contradiction with imperialism and feudalism, have not yet won economic independence and completed the task of democratising their society and economy.

As a result, the national bourgeoisie has not yet exhausted its anti-imperialist and antifeudal potential. The task, therefore, is not primarily, at this stage, to solve the contradiction between the working class and the capitalist class but that between the Indian people as a whole, including the national bourgeoisie, and the imperialists, feudalists and their ally—the monopoly bourgeoisie.

Therefore, as we learnt in our first lecture on the Indian Revolution, the CPI must pick on the main contradiction and strike the main blow at the main enemy.

On this point, the CPI has been clear ever since the terrible fiasco of and heavy damage caused by the 'left' sectarian line which it followed from 1948 to 1951. Forgetting

the revolution, the CPI considered it as its main task to fight and overcome Indian capitalism as a whole. It completely missed the national-democratic character of our revolution. It made out that the national bourgeoisie as a whole, including the rich peasants, was the main enemy. It, therefore, isolated itself from its possible allies, its mass base began to shrink, the main enemy was missed and the Indian people could not develop much faith in the wisdom of the CPI, though the courage and self-sacrifice of its members were admired. The membership of the party came down from about a lakh to about 10,000 or so. Its organisation was in shambles. Many of its fine leaders and cadres were physically liquidated and many more became disillusioned and demoralised. Its mass organisations like the trade unions, kisan sabhas, students' federation, etc. were totally smashed up. The entire movement was thrown back and the CPI lost a good chance of emerging as one of the leading forces of the nation at a time when the entire people were at the crossroads. Thus, the CPI has learnt to its cost that simply indulging in ultrarevolutionary phrases does not help it or the revolution. To be a revolutionary one must make a scientific study of social reality, find out the stage of the revolution and the main and secondary contradictions. Only then can it go on to make a revolutionary change of that reality.

(b) What have been the cardinal features of the development of Indian society since independence? What has taken place is development along capitalist lines, the attempt to build up a capitalist India based on capitalist relations of production. The Congress party, as the ruling party for 20 years, has made this objective the basic aim of its activity.

At the same time, the capitalist path of development has been pursued—a path whose links with foreign monopoly capital and with feudal and semifeudal interests results in compromises with them.

This is the basic characterisation made by the CPI with regard to the path of development pursued under the lea-

dership of the Congress party and government. The CPI does not have any illusions whatever that the Congress is building socialism. It ruthlessly exposes and sternly combats all official propaganda made to this effect. It is a malicious slander of the CPM leadership that attributes to the CPI the view that it had "revisionist illusions" that the Congress party, under Nehru's leadership, was building socialism.

At the same time, the CPI sharply demarcates itself from the oversimplified concepts of the CPM Programme that practically nothing has happened since independence and that the imperialists and feudalists are ruling the roost as in the days of colonialism. It does not share the view of the CPM that the Indian economy and consequently its basic policies and state structure are a kind of semicolonial, dependent and satellite economy. The official leadership of the CPM is now facing a serious crisis since the "ultras" in that party are criticising it for surrendering to the revisionists with regard to the basic programmatic concepts.

CAPITALIST PATH

What have been the results of development along the capitalist path?

Some advance has been made since freedom was won. The national income has risen by about 73 per cent; industrial production has increased by about 100 per cent and agricultural production by about 45 per cent. Basic industrial plants—steel, oil, engineering, chemical, etc.—have come up and India is now producing goods that were not produced at all some 15 years ago. The attempt to sabotage of India's plans for building heavy and basic industries by the imperialist monopolies did not meet with success. Aid from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries was asked for and given and economic relations with the socialist countries have steadily expanded over the past 14 years. India succeeded in laying the foundations of a heavy machine-building industry and in considerably

expanding iron and steel, machine tools, coalmining and oil industries. New branches of industries and projects which emerged as a result of socialist aid go a long way in eliminating the legacy of the colonial past and reduce India's dependence on the capitalist world market for trained manpower, materials and machinery. The state sector developed in the spheres of industry (especially heavy industry), finance and partly trade. This has contributed to the building of independent national economy and to the weakening of the grip of foreign monopoly capital and to a certain extent the Indian monopolies. As a result of the measure of industrialisation that has taken place, the working class has not only expanded quantitatively but changed qualitatively with new skilled workers coming up in the heavy, basic industries sector. This has not only added to the productive forces of the nation but strengthened one of the decisive elements of the democratic movement and the essential leader in the future transition to socialism.

In the field of agrarian relations as well, the congress governments have substantially curbed feudal vested interests through various legislative measures. These have gone hand-in-hand with conscious efforts to develop and foster a class of rich peasants and capitalist landlords who could become the backbone of the new capitalist agrarian set up and who, with state aid, could expand production, adopt modern technique, develop money crops as raw materials for industries, build and sustain cooperative credit institutions, etc. The major part of the area under cultivation is within the category of self-operated ownership holdings while the area under lease, which constituted the major area before land reform, is now confined to a small area. The curbing of the semifeudal land relations together with the independent capitalist development of the national economy has given an impetus to the growing commercialisation of agriculture, production for the market and replacement of tenants-at-will by wage labour. Capitalist relations of production have made significant inroads into the agrarian set up.

These are some of the cardinal changes brought about by the development of India along the capitalist path in the last 20 years. Not to see these changes, not to acknowledge them in the fear that this acknowledgement would bring grist to the mill of the Congress, is to violate the most basic tenet of Marxist science, namely, to make a concrete study of the concrete situation and to proceed from the premise that material reality is primary. It is precisely the dogmatism of the CPM that prompts it to be blind to these changes in their theoretical understanding and to, as a result, either commit serious practical mistakes or indulge in sheer opportunism. It is the same dogmatism that handicapped the CPI as a whole in the first eight years after independence and which prevented it from acknowledging the fact that India had become independent in 1947. It is this dogmatism that isolates the communists not only from the reality but from the masses, from its allies and leads it to commit very serious political mistakes. It is this dogmatism, precisely, that brought grist to the mill of the Congress and to the other opponents of the CPI.

CONTRADICTIONS OF CAPITALIST PATH

It should be most categorically stated, however, that the features mentioned above do not by any means exhaust the content of the capitalist path of development pursued for the past 20 years. We should take into account certain other features of the capitalist path and then come to our generalisation about it.

The capitalist path has failed to solve the problem of economic independence of India. The economy of independent India is not an independent economy. The development has been a slow and halting process, extremely painful for the masses and resulting in a miserably low rate of growth. The obstacles that stand in the way of India's achieving full economic independence cannot be swept aside precisely because of the capitalist path pursued by the national bourgeoisie.

Developing along the capitalist path, the ruling Congress party has contracted huge foreign loans amounting to Rs. 4,005.05 crores on 31 July 1967, the bulk of which is owed to the USA and other imperialists and which has to be paid back in precious foreign exchange amounting now to Rs. 300 crores per year. It has relied to a dangerous extent on imports of machinery, technique, spare parts and raw materials on the imperialist countries. It has tied up the major part of India's trade with these countries. It has made terrible concessions to the foreign private monopolists whose investments have more than trebled since independence, reaching the figure of close to Rs. 850 crores as against Rs. 250 crores in mid-1948. It allows almost Rs. 100 crores to be pumped out of the country as profits, dividends, payment for patents and royalties, repatriation of inflated capital, freight payments, and so on. It has brushed aside its own Industrial Policy Resolution and, especially in the strategic field of fertiliser production, allowed the foreign monopolists to have the majority share of capital, management as well as rights of price fixation and distribution. It has gone in for indiscriminate foreign collaboration agreements which have badly hit our own industries, skilled engineers and gravely weakened the drive towards self-reliance.

Its agrarian policy and approach to agrarian relations has resulted in a retention of strong survivals of semifeudal relations. Sharecropping, concealed leasing, usury and concentration of land in a few hands (10 per cent of the agricultural families possesses 58 per cent of the land under cultivation) are still characteristic features of the production relations in agriculture. The ruling national bourgeoisie pursued the aim of fostering capitalism in the countryside, not on the basis of an all-out offensive against the semifeudal vested interests, but through a process of compromise with and concessions to them. The congress agrarian reforms did not bring about a radical transformation of the agrarian set up in the interests of the mass of the peasantry. The main productive force in agriculture, the toiling

peasant, was not set free from multifarious forms of semifeudal exploitation and lives in abject poverty. A tremendous eviction offensive was launched against the peasantry in the name of resumption of lands by landlords for the purposes of self-cultivation. The huge compensation to the landlords amounting to Rs. 641 crores was thrust upon the peasantry. Subletting and sharecropping continue as classic examples of semifeudal exploitation. Ceiling laws were reduced to a total farce.

In the country as a whole 2.43 per cent of the rural households, each owning more than 30 acres, holds between them 28.5 per cent of the total land whereas at the other end 82.5 per cent owns between them only 27.43 per cent of the total land. About 92 per cent of the entire rural credit is supplied by the moneylenders at exorbitant rates of interest. The indebtedness of the peasantry has increased from Rs. 954 crores to Rs. 1,332 crores.

The dominant character of socio-economic life in India's countryside is the interpenetration of strong survivals of feudalism and growing capitalist relations of production. The survival of semifeudal modes of exploitation combined with the growth of the commercialisation of agriculture has produced a new set of reactionary vested interests. Landlords, usurers and wholesale dealers, often combined in the same person, constitute the modern parasites holding up the progress of agriculture and supporting right reaction. It should be noted that the stranglehold of commercial and financial interests over the rural markets during the last several years has been tightened enormously. The price mechanism and market manipulation, sharp fluctuations in prices and the fleecing of the bulk of the peasants as a producer and consumer also act as strong depressors of agricultural production.

The combined result of all these policies and of the set up of production relations in the countryside has resulted in a very slow rate of growth of agricultural production, i.e. about 2.8 per cent annually, for all agricultural

commodities and 2.6 per cent for foodgrains. It has left our agriculture still exposed to the vagaries of the monsoon. This was demonstrated with devastating effect in 1965-66 and 1966-67 when the failure of the monsoon led to a 17 per cent fall in agricultural production and threw our people into the jaws of starvation and whole economy out of gear. As a result of this stifling grip of outmoded relations of production, the very independence of the nation has been seriously threatened. Food imports, under PL-480, have led to the piling up of counterpart funds to the extent of Rs. 1,500 crores. These counterpart funds have been shamelessly used by the US imperialists to openly blackmail the government and interfere in the political life of the country through the CIA and other agencies. These food imports have led to a drain of our meagre foreign exchange resources in the recent period to the extent of about Rs. 190 crores a year.

Another menacing antinational feature of the capitalist path of development is the growth of monopolies who seek to enrich themselves at the expense of the people and the broader sections of the national bourgeoisie. The Monopolies Commission Report has pointed out that 75 monopoly houses own assets worth Rs. 2,605.95 crores which comes to 46.9 per cent of the total private sector's corporate capital. Recent estimates have shown that Tatas (Rs. 519 crores) and Birlas (Rs. 460 crores) own officially declared capital assets of nearly Rs. 1,000 crores. Some of the other top monopoly houses are Martin Burn (Rs. 154 crores), Mafatlal (Rs. 107 crores), Bangur (Rs. 88 crores), Thapar (Rs. 85 crores), Walchand (Rs. 83 crores), Sri Ram (Rs. 73 crores), Sahu-Jain (Rs. 66 crores), Scindia (Rs. 64 crores). Twenty-two monopoly houses have assets worth Rs. 2,268 crores and have an average rate of growth of Rs. 37.1 per cent. The reports of the Vivian Bose Enquiry into the Dalmia-Jain concerns and of Dr. Hazari into the way the Birlas have gone in for licences have demonstrated the way in which India's monopolists constantly are on the look out to retard or distort production in order to make

profits. Maximum profit with minimum production is their aim.

The monopolists have also established their firm grip over the banks. In 1966 the total deposits with all the scheduled banks amounted to about Rs. 3,800 crores and of these, the top 15 banks had deposits worth Rs. 2,204 crores. All the big newspaper chains, both in English and Indian languages, are owned by the monopolists. In addition to their officially declared capital, the monopolists own the bulk of the huge amounts of black money floating around in the economy which was estimated in 1964 to be about Rs. 3,000 crores. The trading sector is under the grip of these same forces which are now seeking to penetrate in the rural sector in a big way and to establish still closer contacts with the landlords and other rural vested interests.

This growth of monopoly is no accident. It is inherent in the very law of capitalist development. The government has aided the growth of monopolies, made heavy concessions to them and allowed them to penetrate in the public sector, which has also been pressed into their service on occasions.

It is essential to realise that the tremendous growth of monopolies is not just an economic phenomenon. It has the most direct, immediate and grave consequences for the entire social and political life of the country. The monopolists, particularly in the recent years, have greatly increased their influence over the state and government policies. Their links with the bureaucracy and the top military circles have greatly strengthened. The rampant corruption which corrodes the social fabric is mainly the result of their activities. In the last two years, they have been extremely active in the field of buying up MPs and MLAs, toppling governments and openly browbeating ministers. These monopolists have established very close links with the imperialists and are actively collaborating with them in their neocolonialist drive against India. Their control of the press is also used to poison the minds of the people and win them for their nefarious designs.

Yet another hateful feature of the capitalist path is the terrible misery that it inflicts on the common man. The prime necessities of life have not been provided. The average per capita expenditure on consumption (which includes the rich as well as the poor) is less than Rs. 25 per month or 77 paise per day. More than 60 per cent of our population has less than Rs. 25 to spend for the purposes of consumption, while 33 per cent has only about Rs. 15 per month. Some 80 per cent of our people lives well below the minimum level of subsistence. As each five-year plan progresses, the number of unemployed has increased. It went up from seven million at the end of Second Plan to about 10 million at the end of the Third. A noticeable trend has been the sharp increase in the amount of educated unemployed, especially engineers and technicians. Prices have risen consistently and at the sharper pace as the years go on. The official (and obviously understated) wholesale price index has risen from 98.1 in 1955-56 to 203.5 in the year 1966-67. The real wages of the worker have fallen. Housing, health, education, employment—none of the problems of the people have been solved. Life is joyless, uncertain and a burden.

Nor is this an accident. Nor was it inevitable. The misery of the people and the worsening of their living standards are the direct consequence of the capitalist path of development. It is a manifestation in India of the law of absolute and relative improvement about which Marx wrote when analysing the question of capital accumulation. It is the consequence of the basic policy of the government which seeks to place the burdens of capitalist development on the masses.

Devaluation and Crisis

The woeful features of the capitalist path of development came to a head with the devaluation of the rupee in June 1966, the blackest act of treachery since independence. Carried out at the dictates of US imperialism, acting

through the World Bank, by a clique in Delhi, it raised, at one stroke, by 57 per cent the cost of our foreign debts and our imports and cheapened our export earnings. It was followed up by a "liberal" import policy and by de-control of various commodities leading to still more adverse consequences. It was done because of the dangerous degree to which the Government of India relied on loans from the imperialists and was motivated by the expectation that by surrendering to the imperialists, more aid would be forthcoming. This proved to be completely illusory. Caught in their own crisis and impelled by the desire to win more concessions and force more surrenders, the US and other imperialists have sharply curtailed their aid, particularly that for the various development projects.

Following devaluation, the crisis of the capitalist path of development erupted in the so-called inflationary recession. The government tried to make out that the sharp drop in agricultural and industrial production, as well as the actual decline in the national income, was due to Chinese and Pakistani aggression and drought. Its claim was that these were factors beyond the control of the government which could not, therefore, be blamed for the debacle. Nobody denies that the extra expenditure on defence and the drought were factors in the crisis, though it can certainly be questioned as to whether Rs. 1,000 crores a year need be spent on defence. But the question is—why defence expenditure and drought could exercise the influence that they did? The debacle of the capitalist path was hastened by these factors but the debacle itself was inevitable. The drought, for example, was so extensive because of the criminal failure to properly develop an extensive irrigation network and the decline in agricultural production was due to the outmoded agrarian relations which left most of the units of production quite unable to cope with the slightest of mishaps. Moreover, the refusal of the congress government to go in for an effective procurement policy directed against the landlords and the hoarders as well as to nationalise the wholesale trade in foodgrains sharply

accentuated the food shortage and sharply pushed up the price of foodgrains. And it has been estimated that about 90 per cent of the entire rise in the wholesale price level is due to the rise in the prices of foodgrains. Again, the sharp drop and even absolute decline in industrial production was not mainly due to shortage of agricultural raw materials. It was chiefly due to the fact that the government's policy had made our country's industrial structure dangerously dependent on the imperialist powers for finance, raw materials, spares and components. And when the imperialists, especially the US, applied pressure, the Government of India simply caved in instead of going in for a bold self-reliance. The direction of India's exports was also mainly to the imperialist countries.

The industrial crisis was also due to the terrible state of poverty of the people which sharply curtailed their purchasing power and restricted the market. It was due to the predominance of the monopolies which went in for restriction of production, for maintaining high prices and trying all the time for superprofits. It was, finally, due to the anarchy in production inherent in the capitalist system—despite 15 years of planning there is lack of purposive and comprehensively thought-out growth with proper relationships and material balances.

Thus, it can be said that the devaluation and the economic crisis were the inexorable working out of the laws of capitalist development in the specific conditions of the underdeveloped and semidependent nature of India's economy. Devaluation and the economic crisis have revealed the bankruptcy of the capitalist path. They have proved beyond doubt the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist analysis made by the CPI that the capitalist path cannot bring the country to economic independence and all-round democratic, social progress. The capitalist path is not the path along which the Indian people can march to the completion of the national-democratic revolution. The nation-

al economy has to be taken off this path and placed on the noncapitalist path of national regeneration.

INDIAN STATE

Just as in the economic sphere the ruling Congress party placed the country on the capitalist path, so also with regard to the state it brought about changes in the same direction. Marxism-Leninism teaches that the superstructure of a given social formation (in which state power is a crucial element) corresponds to the economic base and is meant to strengthen and uphold it. This is exactly borne out by the experience of independent India.

The state in India is the organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole, in which the big bourgeoisie holds powerful influence. This class rule has strong links with the landlords. These factors give rise to reactionary pulls on the state power.

It is necessary to emphasise two points in this connection. *First*, one has to be absolutely clear about the class character of the Indian state and resolutely rebuff all the capitalist propaganda about the so-called nonclass and purely democratic character of the Indian state. Living experience has proved the class character of this state power. It has, without exception, been used by the ruling Congress party to maintain the domination of the Indian capitalist class as a whole. This does not apply only to the sphere of economic policy, which has been dealt with above. It applies with equal force to the political sphere. In every single instance, where the interests of the capitalists have clashed with that of the interests of any section of the toiling people, the state has invariably sided with the capitalists and against the masses. When the national interests have demanded the arrest and even hanging of blackmarketeers and hoarders, the Congress ruling party has used the state power to pamper these vicious elements and protected them from the wrath of the people.

The CPI does not deny that the Indian state and the

Constitution, which provides for adult franchise and parliamentary democracy and which contains certain fundamental rights and directive principles, are a historic advance over the previous imperialist-bureaucratic rule. Unlike the CPM it does not hold to the view that, as in the field of economic policy, nothing has changed and that all the democratic institutions and rights won by the toilers through arduous struggles are nothing but a sham. The CPI believes that the parliamentary democratic system and the democratic rights are real, valuable and give the masses chance of advancing to their goal through sweeping struggles. It, however, also does not agree with the view that there are not very serious limitations to the democratic set up, as well as certain inherent and built-in dangers. First and foremost, there is the terrible power of money which completely distorts democracy and deprives it of real content. Then, there are the emergency powers and other provisions in the Constitution which can be and have been used to abrogate all democratic rights and to establish what has been called a constitutional dictatorship. Further, there are the tremendous overriding powers of the central government which make a mockery of what is supposed to be a federally-structured state. Moreover, the class composition of the military, judicial and administrative services heavily tilt the scales in favour of the vested interests. Finally, the monopolists, feudalists and other indigenous reactionary forces, backed by and collaborated with by the imperialists (especially the US), which have been protected and pampered by the Indian state, are now stepping up their offensive against even the limited parliamentary democracy that now exists and are working for its subversion. They seek to replace it by an openly authoritarian and dictatorial form of state.

This analysis of the character of the Indian state made by the CPI has been vividly confirmed by the recent events. The manner in which the emergency powers were used, ostensibly in the name of the needs of national defence, to beat down the democratic movement, to arbitrarily arrest

the leaders of the democratic masses and to do away with the Kerala assembly and other elected organs, will be still fresh in the memory. But so will it be remembered how the democratic movement fought back, how the elected representatives of the people used the Parliament and legislatures to assail the government, how numerous meetings and demonstrations were held, how the democratic lowyers kept up a running battle. And it will be recalled that as a result of this democratic counterattack, the government was compelled to partially retrace its steps.

Then one can take up the fourth general election. A veritable political earthquake took place, the congress rule was replaced in nine states and put in a precarious position at the centre as well. In many states, noncongress democratic ministries came to power. The democratic masses had clearly used their right of franchise to good effect. And they could do this because their consciousness had been raised and their will sharpened through sweeping mass actions and struggles, including the tremendous bundh movements. And when the democratic ministries, despite all the limitations of the power at their disposal and despite their heterogeneous character as well as outright mistakes, began implementing some points of the democratic minimum programme and, above all, when they made it clear that they were not going to allow the police to be used against the people when they went into struggle, the vested interests were up in arms. In their offensive against the democratic ministries, they were fully supported and backed by the central congress government. The precarious food situation was used for purposes of blackmail. The governors acted in a thoroughly anticonstitutional and anti-democratic manner. Most of the top bureaucrats sabotaged and engaged in subversion. Bribery and lure of office were openly resorted to. A grand campaign was launched to topple the democratic ministries. The Constitution and the principles of democracy were thrown to the winds. For a short period, it looked as if the campaign had succeeded since puppet ministries were installed in West Bengal,

Bihar and Punjab. But the democratic masses hit back; they organised bundhs and civil disobedience movements, with West Bengal in the lead. Additionally, the ruling of the West Bengal speaker, the struggle waged in the Parliament and other legislative bodies, the actions of the democratic lawyers and, above all, the stirring of the democratic conscience of the nation played their part. The result was that the toppers themselves were toppled and the democratic forces could either force mid-term elections or reinstal their ministries.

All this experience confirms the CPI analysis as to the class character of the state, the limitations of and danger to the democratic system in the country as well as the possibilities of advancing the national-democratic revolution through using the possibilities of the system and struggling to enlarge their scope.

The *second* point of the characterisation of the Indian state power made by the CPI demarcates it from the characterisation of the CPM. The latter's Programme is of the view that the Indian state is a bourgeois-landlord state in which the big bourgeoisie, increasingly collaborating with imperialism, exercises leadership. The logical implication of this characterisation is that Indian state is a state of right reaction, more or less corresponding to the state under Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang. It would be a neo-colonialist state, not very different from, say, that of South Korea, South Vietnam or Thailand. The ultras in the CPM are perfectly correct when they state that this is the precise meaning of the formulation made in the CPM Programme.

Where does the CPI Programme's characterisation differ and what does it mean? The CPI holds that the Indian state is the class rule of the entire Indian capitalist class—the monopoly bourgeoisie, the nonmonopoly bourgeoisie and the rural bourgeoisie. In this state the big monopoly bourgeoisie wields powerful influence. Moreover, this class power has strong links with the landlords. Thus, on top of the inherent limitations and defects of bourgeois demo-

cracy, in India there is the added factor of the powerful influence of the big bourgeoisie and the links with the landlords. The pressure to move the state and its basic policies to the right, the pull to convert the state into a state of right reaction and to do away with even the limited parliamentary democracy, is constantly present and keeps on intensifying. But at the same time, it has to be noted that the Indian ruling class is not homogeneous, that the process of differentiation of the top monopoly groups from the rest of the bourgeoisie is growing and that the monopoly bourgeoisie has not managed to establish its undisputed leadership of the class as a whole. Contradictions and conflicts between the different segments of the ruling class keep on developing. The democratic forces, and especially the CPI, have to take the initiative to build the national-democratic front, have to objectively assess this reality and shape their strategy accordingly.

It is utterly wrong to imagine that the more reactionary one makes out the Indian state to be, the more "revolutionary" one is. If this were so, it would be best to call the Indian state a fascist dictatorship and then expect the "revolution" to immediately break out. To be a revolutionary one has to, first and foremost, make a strictly scientific analysis of reality, including the character of the state power.

The reactionary pressure on the Indian state is further strengthened by the influence and activities of the foreign monopoly interests. These forces have vigorously stepped up their activities, especially in the recent period. The use of PL-480 counterpart funds in the elections and for other purposes and the nefarious activities of the CIA are now common knowledge. The dangerous comings and goings between top civil and military officers to the US and other imperialist embassies, the "free and frank" talks between different Indian generals and the imperialist ambassadors, are all dangerous portents.

It is a combination of these right reactionary forces—the imperialists, the Indian monopoly capitalists and the

feudal and semifeudal elements—which seek to undermine parliamentary democracy and make it the exclusive instrument of their narrow interests and to convert the Indian state into a state of right reaction.

The Communist Party of India defends the parliamentary and democratic institutions and strives to preserve and develop them further, to make democracy full and real for all. In the struggle to do this, while full use is made of parliamentary institutions, extraparliamentary mass struggles become the main means and the chief weapon in the hands of the democratic forces.

Foreign Policy

(e) An important expression of the class character of the Indian state is the basic principles of the foreign policy which has been followed by the Government of India. The foreign policy of a country is the result of the class interests of the ruling class, as well as of the balance of political forces within the country and the world as a whole. The foreign policy of the Government of India is an excellent illustration of the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principle.

This policy is, in the main, a foreign policy of peace, non-alignment and anticolonialism. It is sometimes vitiated by lapses and compromises but as a whole the main character of the policy has been generally preserved.

The questions arise as to why the Government of India has pursued such a policy and what should be the attitude of the CPI towards this policy?

The very class interests of the national bourgeoisie demand such a policy. Even to build a capitalist India, the national bourgeoisie has learnt from experience that the forces of war and colonialism have to be opposed. If world war should result, gone would be the dreams of building a capitalist India. And if colonialism were to go on being strengthened, then, too, these prospects would shrivel. The national bourgeoisie has also learnt from experience that it is the Soviet Union and other socialist coun-

tries which come forward to provide aid, materials, technique and technicians to build up heavy industries, to buy Indian goods and so on. Without this the imperialists would long ago have made the independence of the country a formality and the hopes of the national bourgeoisie illusory. Hence, it knows that if it aligns India with the imperialists, it will have to accept the role of a satellite power. Naturally, at the same time, being a bourgeoisie, wanting capitalism to be built in India, it has no intention of aligning itself with the socialist powers and becoming a partner in the socialist camp. It is against the imperialist policy of war and colonialism, but it also is not for socialism and socialist power. Hence it is nonaligned.

But this nonalignment is not to be confused with some kind of “play between the two camps” or with a policy of using the socialist powers to strike a bargain with the imperialists which is what the CPM makes out. The policy of nonalignment is directed against the imperialist drive towards world war; it is based on the acceptance of the principles of peaceful coexistence and has an anti-imperialist content. It coincides, in some respects, with the foreign policy of the socialist states. It expresses the desire of the newly-independent states to maintain their independence and not to fall under imperialist tutelage. It is a policy which has been adopted not only by India but by the vast majority of the newly-independent states, like the UAR, Burma, Algeria, etc.

At the same time, it is quite clear that the policy of nonalignment is not the basis of the foreign policy of a socialist state. The first principle of the foreign policy of a socialist state would be to strive for the closest possible solidarity and fraternal unity of all socialist states and the strengthening of the socialist camp as a whole. The official advocates of the nonalignment policy in India, moreover, adopt a totally wrong approach when they declare that nonalignment is meant to remain at an equidistance from both camps, when they equate the imperialist aggressive combine with the alliance for peace and self-defence of

the socialist countries and when they try to make out that nonalignment means remaining neutral in international disputes and refusing to take sides in any conflict. All these theoretical positions miss the most important point, i.e. that nonalignment is an expression of the independence of the former colonial and semicolonial countries and is a continuation of their freedom struggle against imperialism. It is a policy based on a refusal to give up sovereign judgement and to join hands with all those countries who take a similar position and who are for world peace.

The foreign policy of the Government of India insofar as it is based on the principles of peace, nonalignment and anticolonialism, is a foreign policy that is in the interests not only of the national bourgeoisie but also of the Indian people as a whole. The Indian people are vitally interested that world peace be preserved. They want that the newly-won and hard-gained independence of their country should find expression in a foreign policy that refuses to toe the imperialist line and which is based on national sovereignty. They have a natural feeling of solidarity with all the peoples still living under the colonial yoke. They have deep feelings of friendship for the Soviet Union and other friendly socialist states. Nor is it a matter merely of feelings. The Indian people have time and again expressed their determination that the Government of India adopt a foreign policy that coincides with their feelings and which raises the international prestige of India. They have made their position clear time and again. And this popular pressure and action is also one of the key factors behind the Government of India adopting such a foreign policy. Any slackening of popular pressure on this front, any disruption of popular unity around this platform would have the most harmful consequences.

It should also be emphasised that such a policy of nonalignment would have been unthinkable but for the new balance of political forces in the world as a whole. Nonalignment is made possible for India and other newly-independent countries because of the new epoch in which

the world socialist system and the anti-imperialist forces determine the main trend of world events and when the balance has tilted against world imperialism. It is not the lessening of the ferocity of imperialism, but the increasing crisis of its system and the weakening of its power that prevent it from being able to browbeat and blackmail the newly-independent states. It is this weakened position of imperialism and the wise farsighted policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist states which make the nonalignment policy possible.

Taking all these factors into account, the CPI extends general support to the basic principles and main features of the foreign policy of the Government of India. At the same time, the CPI wages an ideological struggle against the official propaganda equating the socialist and imperialist systems. The CPI does its most to mobilise the people in support of these basic policies and principles. It tries its best to educate the broad masses on international issues and in a spirit of anti-imperialist solidarity. It devotes a great deal of effort in popularising the achievements and the fundamental policies of the Soviet Union and other friendly socialist states.

The CPI takes serious note of the fact that the basic principles and main features of the foreign policy of the Government of India have come under severe attack from right reactionary forces, backed and instigated by the imperialists. The growth of the power of the Indian monopolists, the increasing neocolonialist offensive of the US imperialists, the crisis of the capitalist path of development and the totally anti-Marxist, chauvinist, sectarian and adventurist line of the Maoists, have all combined to put the nonaligned foreign policy on trial. As a result, serious vacillations and lapses have taken place. The anti-imperialist content of the foreign policy is being emasculated. The firmness with which imperialist aggression used to be condemned and the numerous initiatives taken in the earlier period have been conspicuous by their absence.

A most glaring example is the attitude of the Government

of India to the US imperialist aggression in Vietnam. While it calls for cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam and is opposed to the escalation of the conflict and for a peaceful settlement on the basis of the Geneva Agreement of 1954, it refuses to either name or condemn the US aggressors, cuts off trade with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and ships raw materials to South Vietnam which can be used for the war of aggression.

Under imperialist pressure, especially from the West German revanchists, it refuses to recognise the German Democratic Republic. It does not take a firm and consistent stand against neocolonialist conspiracies in Africa and Asia and has nothing to say against the provocations and aggression of the US imperialists in Latin America. At the same time, it has to be recognised that the main character of the foreign policy has been generally preserved.

It is essential to mobilise the masses and the democratic movement against these vacillations, compromises and slide-backs. It is essential to struggle against the notion that world peace, foreign policy and international issues are of no interest to the masses and that the struggle of the people will get "diverted" if attention is paid to such problems. It is essential, further, to be clear on the point that the foreign policy of the Government of India should not be taken for granted, should not be regarded as being "safe" against subversion and reversal.

It is also essential to work out suitable forms of dialogue and action that would enable the CPI to explain and convince other left and democratic parties about the necessity for taking a consistent anti-imperialist stand on international issues and for supporting a foreign policy of nonalignment, world peace and anticolonialism. It has to be explained to them how the adoption and adherence to such a policy are essential for the preservation and stabilisation of our hard-won freedom. It should be pointed out to them that genuine patriotism itself demands a sense of solidarity with all other anti-imperialist forces in the world. This, moreover, is one of the healthy traditions of our freedom fight

itself, e.g. the sending of the Congress Medical Mission to China, the support to Republican Spain and to Czechoslovakia against Nazism, etc.

It is of the utmost importance for the party as a whole to realise the importance of the struggle for world peace and against the forces of imperialism and colonialism. The party has to educate its mass base on the significance of these issues and their relevance to the struggle to complete the national-democratic revolution. The characterisation of imperialism as one of the targets of the revolution, the alliance between imperialism and domestic reaction, the different attitudes of different classes to international events, have all to be brought out in this context. So also the question of building up the peace and solidarity movements as an integral part of the united front work of the party.

THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

The CPI is far from content with simply analysing the situation. As a party of revolution it follows the grand teaching of Marx that "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it." What is the main direction in which the CPI wants to change India? Undoubtedly, in the direction of socialism, to bring India into the mainstream of world development today, i.e. the transition from capitalism to socialism. Before this objective can be attained, the Indian revolution has to pass through a necessary transitional stage, i.e. the stage of completing the national-democratic revolution.

Why is this revolution called national-democratic? What are the targets of the revolution? What are the motive forces of the revolution? These questions have to be clarified at this stage.

The revolution is called national-democratic because it is called upon to complete the unfinished tasks of the national-liberation struggle, of the fight for freedom. The Indian people fought for 150 years to wipe out the imperialist system, to uproot feudalism and to establish a democratic and just social order. In 1947, they accomplished the throwing off

of the political domination of the colonialists and the ending of the open, direct political rule of the British imperialists. Since then they have advanced some distance towards economic independence. But the imperialist grip on our economy, the tying of our national economy to the world imperialist division of labour, the existence of feudal and semifeudal survivals, the backward state of the economy and the miserable conditions of the people remain. Economic independence, all-round national progress on a democratic basis, especially the carrying out of radical agrarian reform, have yet to be won. It is these tasks that history has placed on the agenda of the Indian revolution. It is these tasks that determine its character.

In addition, in the 20 years since independence, there has been another very significant development, i.e. the development of a definite stratum of monopolists among the Indian bourgeoisie. This process had already begun in the closing years of British imperialist rule but the inherent laws of the capitalist path of development, pursued since freedom, gave it a qualitatively new impetus. This monopolist stratum stands foursquare against the democratic development of the country. It has close relations and innumerable ties with the imperialists and the semifeudal elements and actually collaborates with them. It is opposed to the elimination of the imperialist stranglehold and connections, as well as to the uprooting of the semifeudal survivals. It wants capitalist development of a type which would fit in with the retention of imperialism and semifeudalism. It is consumed with hatred of the people, democracy and progress. Lenin's important thesis that monopoly means all-round reaction fully applies to them.

Targets and Motive Forces

Thus, in order to complete the unfinished revolution, in order to win economic independence, to ensure national regeneration, all-round economic and social progress and democracy, who are the enemies to be overthrown?

First, the imperialists; *second*, the landlords and other

feudal remnants; *third*, the Indian monopolists. It is these three enemies who are holding up the progress of India today. These are the three targets of the national-democratic revolution.

In order to topple these three enemies, which are the classes to be united? Or, in other words, which are the classes objectively interested in the carrying out of the national-democratic revolution?

First, the working class. This class is the most consistent fighter against not only imperialism, feudalism and monopoly capitalism but against all forms of exploitation. It is a class which is not only interested in the carrying out of the national-democratic revolution but also in going forward from it to the socialist revolution.

Second, the entire cultivating peasantry. The agricultural labourers and the poor peasantry will form the backbone of the national-democratic revolution in the countryside. They are the worst victims of semifeudal production relations in the countryside. But they are not the only strata objectively interested in the accomplishment of this revolution. The other sections of the peasantry—the middle peasants and the rich peasants—have also to be united with. The middle peasants are interested in the thorough wiping out of feudalism, as also in radical agrarian reform from which they, too, stand to benefit. The rich peasants can also be won over to the side of the national-democratic revolution. While they are an exploiting stratum and have connections with the landlords and, thus, vacillate, they are also exploited by the monopoly manipulations of the power of the landlords. They would benefit from the break up of the landlord power or, at the least, not be damaged by it. Hence, it is objectively possible to bring them into the national-democratic front.

Third, the rising class of the urban and rural intelligentsia. This class suffers acutely under the present dispensation, both economically and culturally. Its creative capacities are frustrated and it feels itself unable to contribute fully to national development.

Fourth, the nonmonopoly section of the national bourgeoisie. This class is objectively interested, in terms of its own class interests, in the completion of the national-democratic revolution. Due to the objective process of differentiation in the ranks of the Indian capitalist class and the emergence of a monopoly stratum, the heterogeneous character of this class has been more and more revealed. There is an objective basis for the conflict between the monopoly and nonmonopoly sections of the bourgeoisie, since the former expands also at the cost of the latter. The nonmonopoly bourgeoisie has also comparatively less links with the imperialists and the semifeudal forces. In the Indian context, this nonmonopoly stratum of the bourgeoisie has an important role to play in the national-democratic revolution. It should never be forgotten, however, that it is an exploiting stratum and it has connections with the imperialists, semifeudalists, as well as the monopolists, however little. It fears the revolutionary actions and independent movements of the toiling masses. It has, therefore, a dual character and has to be both united with and struggled against.

These four classes have to be united and brought into battle against the three enemies. This is the dividing line of revolution and counterrevolution in the national-democratic stage of the Indian revolution. These four classes have to be united and their full strength unleashed in a revolutionary onslaught against the present state power in India. Unless these four classes dislodge the present ruling combine and overthrow the present state power by revolutionary action, there is no possibility of completing the national-democratic revolution. The broadest possible united front of all possible revolutionary and democratic forces has to be built precisely in order to strike the most massive possible revolutionary blow at the present Indian state and to win the new national-democratic state.

BUILDING NATIONAL-DEMOCRATIC FRONT

The realisation of this revolutionary objective depends upon sweeping mass revolutionary actions and movements.

It requires the establishment of a broad national-democratic front to act as the instrument of the national-democratic revolution.

The classes to be brought into the front are the working class, the entire peasantry, the intelligentsia and the non-monopoly national bourgeoisie. The worker-peasant alliance will be the pivot of such a front.

How is such a front to be brought into existence? It comes into existence, first and foremost, out of mass struggles. Such struggles would be of different types and for different demands, starting from those to win the immediate demands of the toiling people to direct political action, to battles over issues of national policy. It has to be emphasised again and again that without a rising storm of mass struggles, there is absolutely no chance of building such a front. At the same time, the establishment of broad unity and the progress towards the winning of such a front surely helps forward the rising tempo of mass struggles. Unity for struggle, struggle reinforcing and broadening unity and leading to further struggle and more unity—such is the dialectics of the development of the united front.

To build such a front requires overcoming the division that exists today among the democratic masses. The democratic masses are divided among a number of political parties. Some follow and are in the ruling Congress party, while another section is in the united fronts struggling against the antipeople policies of the ruling party. The healing of this division has itself to be attained through mass struggles, parliamentary and extraparliamentary actions, against the reactionary antipeople policies.

At the same time, the forces of communalism and right reaction who seek to disrupt these struggles and movements have to be isolated and defeated. As the tempo of the struggles and movements rises, the national-democratic front will draw into its ranks not only the masses following the Congress but also progressive sections within that party.

It is simply a stupid slander to suggest that the CPI believes that the Congress "purged" of its rightwing would itself become the national democratic front. The NDF is not only built up through struggles against the Congress and its antipeople policies but its growth itself leads to a polarisation within the Congress and the coming over to it of the masses following the Congress, as well as progressive sections within it. Neither the progressive forces joining the Congress nor the Congress "reforming" itself to become the NDF—is at all the way how the CPI views the building of the NDF.

At the same time, the CPI attaches greatest importance to drawing the democratic masses following the Congress into joint mass struggles and actions. It is anxious that progressive sections inside the Congress and the left and democratic parties and forces outside it should come together, begin dialogues, discussions and start various kinds of joint actions, leading eventually to the establishment of a regular united front between them. The left and democratic parties have to take the initiative in this regard and so conduct themselves and their actions to bring about such an eventuality. Here again, the main lever will undoubtedly be mass struggles and movements.

Which class has to take the initiative and play the vanguard role in building the NDF? There can be no doubt that this historic responsibility, in the Indian situation, falls squarely on the shoulders of the Indian working class. The building of its mass organisations, the waging of determined struggle to secure its own minimum and day-to-day demands, the forging of its own class unity are of the greatest importance in this context. But this is far from enough. The working class has to take the initiative with regard to policy matters, to political issues, to the shaping of the very future of the nation. It would be simply criminal to confine the actions of the working class to economic issues or to the narrow range of its demands. The working class has to be politicalised. It has to be made conscious of its historic responsibility. It has to come for-

ward as the champion of the interests and demands of all the other democratic classes. It has to come forward as the path-finder for the entire nation.

Above all, it has to be realised that the NDF and the national-democratic movement which it will head and out of which it will emerge depend upon the cultivating peasants and the agricultural workers in the vast rural areas who move into action. Determined efforts will have to be made in this regard. Without the NDF taking root in the villages, it cannot possibly acquire countrywide sweep and striking force; it cannot hope to accomplish the revolutionary seizure of power. The working class has to assist the peasantry to build its mass organisations and develop its struggles. It is in this manner that the worker-peasant alliance will be built, which is the pivot of the NDF.

The initiator and prime builder of the NDF is the working class. Its pivot is the worker-peasant alliance. Its main driving force is the working class, the peasantry, the urban middle strata and the intelligentsia. The nonmonopoly sections of the national bourgeoisie and the masses following it will play a positive role in the effort to build the NDF and will become its component part. Thus, while the NDF is the front of four classes, not all the classes play the same role in building it.

It is this NDF which will head the revolutionary process culminating in the removal of the congress government from power, in the replacement of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole represented by the present Indian state by the national-democratic state and government.

Leadership of Front

Question arises as to who will lead the NDF and which class will lead the four-class alliance and the state power based on it. The CPI is of the view that for the successful completion of the national-democratic revolution, the present exclusive leadership of the nation by the national bourgeoisie has to be ended. Without breaking bourgeois

hegemony over the nation, the NDF cannot be built and much less can it advance to the revolutionary seizure of power. The CPI is also of the view that it is possible in the new world situation, as well as the specific conditions in India, even before the exclusive leadership of the working class is established in the NDF, the national-democratic revolution can be completed. The leadership of the NDF will belong to all firm anti-imperialist, antifeudal and antimonopoly forces.

It is this point that has been seized upon by the leadership of the CPM to advance the slander that the CPI has gone revisionist and does not "want" that the national-democratic revolution be led by the working class. It is this point and this point alone that demarcates the CPI concept of national democracy from the CPM concept of people's democracy. Both national democracy and people's democracy are forms of the completion of the anti-imperialist, antifeudal, democratic revolution. Both in national democracy as also in people's democracy, there is a four-class alliance—workers, peasants, urban middle strata and intelligentsia and the nonmonopoly national bourgeoisie. There is also no difference with regard to the future—both national democracy and people's democracy are forms of transition to socialism.

Sticking to the experience of China and the East European countries, the CPM advances the concept of people's democracy and insists that without the leadership of the working class, the anti-imperialist, antifeudal and democratic revolution cannot be completed in India. It makes acceptance of working class leadership a precondition for the building of the united front. The CPM has not bothered to study either the changes in the world balance of forces or the specific situation in India. Today with the tremendous weakening of world imperialism, with the world socialist system and anti-imperialist forces increasingly determining the main trend of world developments, the anti-imperialist and antifeudal, democratic potentialities of the various nonproletarian democratic classes have greatly

increased. Their independent activity and role have also greatly increased as compared to some two decades ago. Thus not only can the working class more easily unite with these classes, but it has also to reckon with their greater potentialities and role.

To insist in each and every country, including India, that all these classes accept the working class leadership as a prior condition to the building of the united front would be the height of sectarianism.

Secondly, in China as well as in most of the East European countries prior to their liberation, the nonproletarian democratic classes, especially the nonbureaucratic bourgeoisie (China) or the noncollaborationist bourgeoisie (Eastern Europe), were relatively weak economically and politically. The major and strongest section of the bourgeoisie had already formed a bloc with imperialism and feudalism or fascism and feudalism. The working class in those countries had no contenders, so to say, for leadership and without its leadership the relatively weaker nonproletarian democratic classes could not be welded together into a united front. Such is certainly not the situation in India. The nonproletarian democratic classes, including the nonmonopoly stratum of the national bourgeoisie, are far stronger economically and politically than their counterparts in China and Eastern Europe prior to the revolution in those countries. The working class in India, so to say, has to treat with its allies on a far more equal footing. Any premature insistence about the need to accept its leadership before the NDF is formed would simply wreck the building of the NDF.

Thus it is not a question of subjective desire, a matter of "wanting" the leadership of the working class. It is, above all, a matter of the strictest scientific analysis of the world balance of class forces and the position within the country and then evolving a concrete strategic perspective. And it is on this basis that the argument should proceed. Does or does not the CPM agree that the world balance of class forces has radically altered compared to

1945 or 1949 when the East European and Chinese people's democratic revolutions took place? Does or does not the CPM agree that the concrete relationship between the working class and the nonproletarian democratic classes in India is different from what it was in Eastern Europe and China? If so, then how will the building of the anti-imperialist, antifeudal democratic united front differ in our country from that of the other above-mentioned countries? The CPM leadership does not pose these questions to itself either out of ignorance or fear. Dogmatism offers them readymade recipes from the revolutions made in other epochs and in other countries.

What is the perspective of the NDF? Does the CPI believe that the NDF is an end in itself and that it has no future? And what about the question of leadership in the perspective of this context? Just as the formation of the NDF was made possible through struggle, its continuation and development also depend upon struggle. The struggle now is to implement the programme of the NDF, i.e. the programme of completing the national-democratic revolution. The struggle to implement the full programme of the NDF is primarily directed against the stout resistance offered by the imperialists, the landlords and other semifeudal elements who have been dislodged from power, but not completely defeated nor thoroughly uprooted. Considering the class composition of the NDF there will be struggle within it also as the implementation of the programme proceeds. The working class and its party, the Communist Party of India, will be the most consistent, farsighted and selfless fighters for the implementation of the NDF programme both against the class enemies of the national-democratic revolution as also against the vacillation, drift and, at times, even outright opposition of its partners in the NDF. It is through this process that the balance within the NDF will shift in favour of the working class and the worker-peasant alliance. It is through this process that the way will be paved for the leadership of the working class in the state. And, finally, it is through

this process that the transition to socialism commences and the next stage of the Indian revolution begins.

It is in this manner that the CPI visualises the entire revolutionary transformation of the presentday Indian society into the future socialist India through the transitional stage of national democracy. This brings us to the question of the programme of the NDF, of the path on to which it will steer the Indian economy and society.

NONCAPITALIST PATH

The NDF and the national-democratic state will, through the implementation of its programme, place India on the noncapitalist path to socialism. It needs to be explained as to what exactly the noncapitalist path means in the Indian context. This is particularly necessary since the view has gained currency that the noncapitalist path is possible only in very backward countries where capitalist relations of production have not developed or developed very slightly.

In essence, the noncapitalist path means that in order to make the transition to socialism it is not necessary for the newly-independent countries to first develop into full-blown capitalist countries. It is not obligatory that the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America should all traverse the path taken by the USA and Western Europe, particularly. It is not obligatory for them to develop capitalism, then monopoly capitalism and in this manner prepare the objective conditions (a certain level of industrialisation and growth of productive forces) and the subjective factor (above all, a working class of sufficient strength and maturity which would act as the leader) necessary for the transition to socialism. It is possible, in the new epoch, to prepare these preconditions in a new way, i.e. the noncapitalist way. The experience of Mongolia and the Central Asian Soviet Republics provided confirmation of this possibility in the past. The UAR, Syria, Algeria, Burma, Congo (Brazzaville), Guinea, etc. provide example of the same possibility in the new epoch. Such a noncapitalist transition is only possible provided there is a firm alliance

between the countries taking this path and the socialist countries and all other forces fighting imperialism and for socialism. It is only possible provided the state power is firmly in the hands and under the leadership of firm anti-imperialist, antifeudal and revolutionary democratic forces.

But it will be asked: How is this possible in India where capitalist relations of production have already developed in the spheres of production and exchange and distribution and where a monopolist stratum has already emerged?

If India had already developed into an independent, full-blown capitalist country, then, obviously, the stage of the revolution would not be national-democratic but socialist. The position in India is that, while capitalist relations of production are growing rapidly and are being actively promoted, they have not become the exclusive or preponderant relations of production to nearly the same degree as in the developed capitalist countries like the USA, UK, France, Italy, etc. Precapitalist relations of production, especially in the field of agriculture, occupy an important position. Imperialism and foreign economic exploitation are very much a reality. It is still possible, then, to reverse the gears of the capitalist development, cut off this development before it reaches the stage of full-blown capitalism and to place the country on the road to socialism through the transitional noncapitalist stage.

How is this to be achieved? What are the basic elements of the programme of the national-democratic front, i.e. of the noncapitalist path?

First, the grip of foreign monopoly capital will be completely eliminated. Effective steps will be taken to stop the entry of private foreign capital into the country.

Second, the state sector, independent of foreign monopolies and functioning on a democratic basis, will be made the dominant sector in our national economy. Key and heavy industries will be developed in the state sector and the sphere of nationalisation will be extended to banks, general insurance, foreign trade, oil, coal and other mines and plantations. It will take over industries and establish-

ments where industrial control measures prove inadequate to prevent corruption and profiteering and to serve the interests of the people and the national economy.

The state sector will be rid of inefficient and corrupt bureaucrats and of all persons connected with the monopolists. It will be reformed and democratized with the participation of the elected representatives of the workers in the management.

Third, Indian monopoly combines will be broken up and any tendency to develop monopoly will be effectively checked. An enquiry will be instituted into the antinational and antipeople practices of the Indian monopolists and their power will be eliminated.

Fourth, the power of the landlords and feudal remnants will be completely smashed. Concentration of land-ownership will be broken by abolishing all forms of landlordism, by imposing effective ceilings on landholdings and by distributing surplus land to agricultural labourers and poor peasants free of cost. The interests of the small landholders will be fully protected. Compensation to the landlords will be stopped, and all oppressive debts due to landlords and usurers cancelled. Land revenue will be replaced by a new system of graded land tax based on income and with the exemption of all uneconomic holdings. All types of fallow land, other than those required for common village purposes will be distributed to agricultural labourers and poor peasants. State farms will be set up. Adequate credit arrangements will be made and irrigation facilities promoted. Multipurpose cooperatives will be encouraged, including cooperatives for the purpose of cultivation.

Fifth, facilities will be provided to all nonmonopolist private sector enterprises and small-scale industries by providing them with raw materials at reasonable prices, credit and marketing facilities and allowing them reasonable profits. At the same time, the national-democratic government will purposefully direct the economy on such lines that the growth of capitalism, both in industry and agriculture is progressively restricted and the prerequisites

created for putting our country on the road to socialism. Thus, while imperialist and Indian monopoly capital will be totally eliminated, a dual policy will be followed towards other forms of capitalist production relations—a policy of providing facilities and, simultaneously, of restricting its growth by stages.

In the transitional noncapitalist stage, the carrying out of the abovementioned revolutionary measures will lay the basis for a veritable upsurge of the productive forces of the nation. It will lead rapidly to the attainment of economic independence, to the raising of the living standards of the people and to social progress. It will result in the national regeneration and rebirth of India.

Of crucial importance in the programme of the NDF—some of the basic elements of which have been outlined above—is the democratisation of the whole of society and of the state structure. It will do away with all the crippling restrictions placed upon democratic development by the remnants of feudalism (e.g. social disabilities of women, the caste system, etc.) and by the shackles of capitalism. A democratic state in the hands of the democratic classes will play a key role in the national-democratic revolutionary transformation of society.

A national-democratic state pursuing the noncapitalist path of development—such is the alternative that the Communist Party of India places before the Indian people. It is an alternative to the present capitalist path of development with its inherent contradiction and generation of reactionary pulls and pressures.

FORM OF REVOLUTION

The CPI believes that the winning of the national-democratic state is possible by peaceful means and will strive to make a reality of this possibility. It is of the view that in the present epoch and in the given conditions of India, there are two possible forms of the national-democratic revolution. A revolution is inevitable but its forms allow of variation, depending upon the international balance

of class forces and the concrete conditions in the given country, mainly upon the latter.

It is possible that by developing a powerful mass revolutionary movement, by winning a stable majority in Parliament, backed by such a movement, the working class and its allies will be able to overcome the resistance of the forces of reaction and transform Parliament from an instrument serving the bourgeoisie into a genuine instrument of people's will for effecting a fundamental transformation in the social, economic and state structure. It is possible in India to avoid the possibility of going through an armed civil war as the form of the revolutionary transformation. Such a possibility has been made real by the changed balance of forces in the world to the advantage of the forces struggling for a revolutionary transformation of society and for socialism. This change has made the possibility of the imperialist export of counterrevolution far more difficult than in the past and it was precisely this export of counterrevolution which was one of the most important factors making armed civil war more or less inevitable and peaceful transition a very rare chance. Besides, in India, the class alliance for the national-democratic revolution is a very broad one and the forces opposing the revolution have a very narrow social base and can be isolated to a very considerable extent. Finally, in India the people through their struggle have won certain democratic rights and a parliamentary democratic form of state has been secured which offers certain scope to the democratic forces and whose potential can be increased through the extension of democracy. In the countries where the revolution succeeded through a bitter armed civil war, such rights and such a system did not exist.

At the same time, the Communist Party of India is fully aware that the ruling class will stop at nothing to retain its position. Marxist-Leninist theory, as also the living experience of our own struggles, teaches that in order to preserve its power, the ruling class will not hesitate in the least to throw overboard all democratic principles and

the parliamentary democratic system itself. It may not be possible for the national-democratic forces to act in time to paralyse these antidemocratic, counterrevolutionary actions. It may not be possible for them to avert the armed civil war imposed on them by the forces of reaction. Therefore, the forces of the national-democratic revolution have to be prepared for all contingencies, for any sudden twists and turns in the situation.

It should be emphasised that the building of a powerful mass revolutionary movement and the striving to secure a stable majority in Parliament, backed by such a movement, do not only help in the endeavour to secure a peaceful revolutionary transition but also provide the necessary strength whereby the contingency of an armed civil war may be successfully met. Provided the revolutionary perspective is kept in view, provided there are no reformist, parliamentary illusions. The very process of striving for a peaceful revolutionary transition creates the necessary conditions for meeting any challenges thrown by the forces of reaction. It is against all the tenets of Marxism-Leninism to equate violence and armed civil war with revolution, to make out that revolutionary power can only be born from the barrel of a gun. Communists do not make a fetish of either violence or nonviolence. They work for revolution, if possible in a peaceful form but if necessary, through armed civil war.

Reading Material for Third and Fourth Lectures:

1. R. Palme Dutt: **India Today**
2. Hiren Mukerjee: **India Struggles for Freedom**
3. **Moscow Statement, 1960, of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties** (Chapter III on the National Liberation Movement)
4. **Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, Moscow,** (Chapter on National Liberation Struggle)
5. **Programme of the Communist Party of India** (as amended at Patna Party Congress)
6. **Political Report and Political Resolution of Patna Party Congress**