

Crisis of the Plan

The crisis of the Plan stems from the basic policies of the Government. Refusing to carry out real agrarian reforms and relying on landlords and a stratum of rich peasants to develop agriculture has led to a virtual stagnation in our agriculture. The effect of such attempts at development has been discussed in detail in the Report of Ladejinsky, who studied the performance of the Package Scheme districts on behalf of the Government. Reliance on the profit motive of the capitalists and securing for them the capital needed from the common people by increasing prices has, under conditions of a protected market, led to unheard of increase in profits. Many industries declare as much as 30 per cent as dividends alone. And what is more, it has led to tax-evasions, colossal accumulation of black-money and speculation and hoarding.

As already seen, refusal to take over foreign concerns, but increasing reliance on foreign imperialist aid and on foreign private capital, has only enabled them to have a bigger and bigger share in the loot of the protected market that India is and has not even mitigated our foreign exchange problems.

Is there any wonder then that despite the much vaunted planning the growth of national income has been one of the lowest in the world? Between 1953-54 and 1960-61, the average annual rate of growth of national income in India has been a meagre 3.4 per cent whereas even countries without a plan to boast had a greater rate of growth. Philippines and Thailand had 5.6 per cent.

In fact, India's rate of growth was far less than the average rate of 4.2 per cent for the ECAFE countries as a whole.

The intensification of exploitation of the working people is seen in the shrinking share of the workers in the income generated in the industries. According to the Census of Manufacturing Industries, 1962, the value added by manufacture was Rs. 988 crores out of which the share of wages accounted for Rs. 389 crores, i.e., 39 per cent. But, in 1951, the share of wages in the value added by manufacture accounted for 46 per cent. Within ten years, a fall of nearly one-sixth!

The mass of the people did not take these burdens meekly. By February-March, 1963, i.e., about three months after Chinese armies had withdrawn, and a de facto cease-fire had come into being, the working class in many places began to fight against the new impositions such as compulsory collection of Defence Fund, overtime, etc. The unprecedented burden of taxation imposed in the 1963-64 Budget proposals, the Gold Control Order which threw lakhs of working goldsmiths out of employment, and the proposed Compulsory Deposit Scheme gave rise to huge demonstrations throughout the country. The Government thought that it could get through these impositions by raising the slogan of "country in danger" and appealing to the patriotism of the common people. But the people saw that the monopolists and richer sections were not only left free but were being enabled to loot the people still more. The people gave vent to their anger by defeating Congress candidates in the series of bye-elections that were held in the middle of 1963.

The group bickerings inside the Congress which had just abated following the border war also erupted. Charges of corruption against Congress ministers were openly made by their rivals in the Congress party. The party's stock was going down. The huge demonstration of the 'Great March' organised by the Party in September 1963 showed the mood of the masses.

It became necessary for the Congress leadership to resort to manoeuvres to stop the rot. The 'Kamaraj Plan' was evolved and implemented inside the organisation. On the other hand, in

order to hoodwink the people, a great debate was organised on the definition of socialism and in Jaipur, the AICC came out with a long draft resolution on 'Democratic Socialism' which was adopted with fanfare at the Bhuvanewar Session of the Congress in January 1964.

It should be noted that despite all this demagoguery about socialism, the Congress leadership did not agree to the slightest change in their basic policies. Not even state-trading in wholesale foodgrains or nationalisation of banks—measures which had become urgent in the face of the spiralling prices were accepted.

With such policies, these manoeuvres failed to resolve the crisis. It was stated that the Kamaraj Plan would demonstrate that the Congress leaders were not interested in offices and those ministers who were 'Kamaraj-ed' would devote their time and energies for the organisation and strengthen it.

In reality, the group bickerings far from abating, have actually intensified. The removal of C. B. Gupta led to further intensification of the group bickerings in Uttar Pradesh. In Bihar, the removal of Binodanand Jha has led to new alignment of groups and struggle. Same is the case in Orissa. The most outstanding feature of the worsening of the crisis is seen in Kashmir. The ex-Prime Minister Bakshi, a member of the Congress Working Committee, had to be detained under the D.I.R.

The 'unanimous' election of Sri Lal Bahadur Shastri as the leader of the Congress Parliamentary Party was paraded as evidence of the new unity and cohesion in the party. But the further intensification of the struggles in the States has shattered the myth of this unity. Matters have gone to such extent that in Kerala, neither Kamaraj nor Dhebar nor S. K. Patil could persuade the dissident Congressmen from voting for the no-confidence motion against the ministry. President's rule had to be resorted to and in the subsequent period, the dissidents have broken away and have formed their own party which has decided to contest the elections against the Congress in the coming elections.

Immediately after the Chinese armies crossed the McMahon Line, Nehru boasted that one good result was that automatically

national integration had been achieved. But, the communal riots that broke out in Calcutta, Rourkela and other towns exploded the myth. It is obvious that the Congress party, which cannot get over the group struggles and forge unity in its own ranks, can never strengthen the unity of the nation that was achieved during the freedom struggle and forge national integration.

How is it that a party that led the freedom struggle, within a few years of achieving freedom, has been rent with such factions and struggles for power? Or, is it that different groups are fighting on the basis of different policies?

These factors undoubtedly play their part in these struggles. But their role should not be exaggerated. At the root of all this is the fact that it is the bourgeoisie that is wielding power; and that it has thrown up a monopoly section. Secondly, it is sharing power with the landlords.

It must be realised that although they are all exploiting classes, they have their conflict with each other. Even within the class, conflict and rivalry characterise these classes. The most important factor is that the State plays the most leading part in the development of capitalism. The control of the State by a group is of tremendous advantage in getting the cream of development by way of quotas, industrial licences, contracts, financial assistance, etc.

Added to all this is the fact that caste and other pre-capitalist social organisations still exist in India. In the struggle for power, individuals and groups use the hold of such institutions and become the champion of this or that caste. The phenomenon that while religious practices based on caste are dying out, politics based on caste has been on the ascendancy.

So long as the present policies continue, so long as the big bourgeoisie heads the State and the alliance with the landlords continues, these groups and factional quarrels can never be overcome. On the other hand, the struggles will only intensify. Is it any wonder, with such policies, that corruption has grown on a scale never before seen, even during the period of British rule?

Corruption and graft have become so stinking that the Government was forced to do something about it. It appointed the

Santhanam Committee to study the subject and make recommendations. The 'Sadachar Samiti' was formed with great fanfare. It was forced to appoint the Das Commission to enquire into the charges against the Punjab Chief Minister Kairon.

However, the revelations of the Das Commission have been so staggering that the Government is seriously worried and wants some way to resile from enquiries into charges of corruption against other ministers.

Contrary to the recommendations of the Santhanam Committee that where ten parliament members or ten members of the assembly give signed memo of charges against any Central or State minister, as the case may be, then the Government should send it to a judicial person to decide whether there is a prima facie case, the Government says that it will itself decide whether there is a prima facie case. What faith can people have in the judgment of the Central Government when they know that when charges of corruption against Mr. Kairon were referred to Mr. Dhebar and to Nehru, both of them declared that there was no prima facie case?

These basic policies that have led to the strengthening of the position of the monopolists, to the increasing penetration of foreign capital, particularly US capital, to increasing reliance on foreign imperialist economic aid and to the seeking of military aid from the USA have had very serious repercussions. They have resulted in severe attacks on democratic rights and intensified repression on the working people on the one hand. Adverse comments were made by the Supreme Court on certain sections of the D.I.R. And yet, the Government uses this very Act to detain workers and trade union leaders and activists, simply because the detenu has been deprived of going to a court to assert his fundamental right. The continued retention of the State of Emergency two years after the Chinese armies have withdrawn and a de facto cease-fire came into existence reveals the length to which the Government has gone in attacking the democratic rights.

On the other hand, these policies have also had their impact on the foreign policy of the Government. Not to talk of what

happened in 1963, even recently, the Government refused to condemn the US Government's extension of the Seventh Fleet's exercises in the Indian Ocean. This silence, when US imperialism threatens the Asian countries with war-ships armed with nuclear warheads stands in sharp contrast with the Government's continued campaign of condemnation against the Chinese atom bomb blast. The Government, which is the Chairman of the International Commission on Vietnam kept absolutely mum when USA, in open violation of the Geneva Agreement, bombed North Vietnam in the Gulf of Tonkin. Only a month ago, the Government not only kept mum over the attempts made by Britain and the USA to have military bases in the Indian Ocean, but actually tried to cover these designs by saying they are only 'communication bases'! And yet, in the Cairo Conference, in the face of deep resentment of the other Afro-Asian Countries, it had to sign the Communiqué which strongly condemned these efforts to establish military bases.

The Bhubaneswar attempt to lull the people by talk of 'democratic socialism' also misfired. The huge and unprecedented struggles—statewide hartals and strikes in Kerala, Gujarat, Maharashtra, U.P., West Bengal, etc., reveal the failure of this manoeuvre as well. It must be remembered that these struggles had to be fought against intense repression.

The Government once again seeks to delude the people by talk of a bigger Fourth Five-Year Plan. It is supposed to be of the size of 21,000 to 22,500 crores. But, what the Government seeks to hide is that this is in terms of 1964 prices. And yet, even the formulation of the Plan has met with difficulties. Even now, there is no knowing how to get the resources. And the NDC, after accepting the size of the Plan, has appointed committees to go into the question of resources!

They have proposed that through additional taxation of Rs. 3000 crores, i.e., nearly three times the target of the Third Plan, should be realised.

Apart from foreign aid to the tune of Rs. 2000 crores, heavy reliance on foreign private capital is placed. US private capital alone is expected to invest over Rs. 800 crores.

Far from any prospect of carrying out land reforms, they have stated that there would be a moratorium on land reforms, as if much reforms have been carried out!

Thus, the basic policies will continue. This spells further intensification of the sufferings of the people, their further loot by monopolists—foreign and Indian—and landlords and speculators. The economic crisis will not be mitigated but will only further deepen, with such policies, all talk of gearing up the administration and achieving the targets is bogus.

The Dange group did not see in all this any manoeuvre on the part of the Congress leadership. Instead, they greeted the Kamaraj plan, as a result of which two Central Ministers, S.K. Patil and Morarji Desai, were asked to step down as a 'big victory' for them. For, had they not singled out those two persons as being solely responsible for all the anti-people policies of the Government?

In NEW AGE weekly, P. C. Joshi was analysing the different drafts of C. Subramanyam and of Nanda to find out which of the drafts submitted to the Jaipur AICC session was more progressive.

Similarly, it did not see the manoeuvre of the Congress leadership in the Bhubaneswar resolution on 'democratic socialism'—but clung to certain speeches by K. D. Malaviya and V.K. Krishna Menon and said:

"Even though the Congress Left did not succeed at Bhubaneswar in getting its demands accepted, the impact it made on the Congress organisation as a whole and indeed on our public life cannot be denied....."

"That has brought confidence to the masses and opened new vistas for broad-based popular struggles against Right reaction...."

And when Kamaraj, the Congress President, gave the call for socialist unity, instead of exposing the true nature of the call and their slogan of democracy and socialism, New Age Weekly had this to say on the call:

"Kamaraj's call for socialist unity has been somewhat distorted by the much publicised intervention of Jayaprakash

and Asoka Mehta. But if the call itself is a sincere wish for cooperation of all who sincerely desire an order in which the power of the monopolists is curbed and a turn is made away from the evils of the capitalist path—then it is bound to find general support despite the attempts by interested quarters to give it their own colour.’

And then, it goes on to say that ‘‘Kamaraj was right in taking initiative in the matter’’.

After thus hailing the move of Kamaraj to strengthen his own party and disrupt other parties, the Weekly, in a note of extreme disappointment, asks: ‘‘Does the anti-Communism of the Right inside the Congress keep the Communist Party and its supporters out of the scope of his unity efforts?’’ (New Age, 2. 2. 1964)

The Dange group was evidently willing to respond to the call of Kamaraj to unite with the Congress in the name of ‘socialist unity’; only the invitation did not come from Kamraj.

Similarly, after the death of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, when the Shastri Cabinet was formed, the Dange group’s main task was to search for individuals in the Cabinet in order to see ‘progressivism’ in it. New Age Weekly stated :

‘Public opinion has welcomed the entry into the cabinet of Indira Gandhi. At this moment, what is dominant in the Indian people’s mind is the necessity to preserve the positive policies of Jawaharlal Nehru and it seems to them that his daughter can be relied upon to carry forward his behests.’

Has this got anything to do with Marxism? The daughter can be relied upon to carry forward the father’s behests! As if policies are inheritances handed down from father to daughter!

With such an outlook, no wonder that even when they were forced to undertake a satyagraha—the Home Minister called it ‘token satyagraha’ and said the Government met it with ‘token arrests’—they abundantly made it clear that they were not fighting the Government, but were fighting only the hoarders and speculators. One of them went to the extent of saying that the price increase was a result of the conspiracy of the hoarders and speculators and Right reactionaries in order to overthrow the Shastri Government.

Thus, the bankruptcy of the Dange group’s assessment of the Indian situation and the tasks of the working class was revealed in their draft programme against the background of the very deep crisis of bourgeois planning; the utter bankruptcy and their political line of tailing behind the bourgeoisie stand exposed by their day-to-day practice in the background of the rising tempo to the mass movement and the discontent of the people against the Congress Government.

In order to cover up their line of tailing behind the bourgeoisie, they resorted to anti-China jingoism and chauvinism. In fact, they made this the central dividing line between us and them. They distorted our stand that while strengthening the defence of the country, the utmost emphasis must be placed on peaceful negotiations and political settlement of the India-China border dispute, and openly carried on a campaign that we were ‘‘pro-China’’. In reality, they had nothing to offer except to echo the bourgeoisie. When Pandit Nehru said that acceptance of the September 8, 1962 line was a pre-condition to any talks, parrot-like they echoed it. When Nehru said that talks can begin only after the acceptance by the Chinese Government of the Colombo proposals in toto, again they echoed it. In November 1963, when some of us made the proposals for unity, Dange in his reply asked: ‘‘Do they accept that the Colombo proposals must be accepted in toto, by China for talks?’’ They thought that by all this, we would be isolated from the mass of the Party members in the country.

Today, the bankruptcy of this line also stands revealed. More and more people are realising that the issue cannot be settled by military means, and that a political solution for the India-China border dispute has got to be found. This realisation has come even to some Congressmen, as evidenced by the speech of Mr. R. K. Khadilkar in Parliament. That even some bourgeois circles are coming to realise this is clear from the fact that newspapers like the ‘Capital’, and ‘Times of India’ (weekly comments by NJN) have begun to advocate that the Government of India should take the initiative for a political settlement. It should be recalled here that at the initiative of those whom the Dange group has been

dubbing as “pro-Chinese” and against the opposition of this group, we had got the NC to advocate a political settlement in April 1961. And that resolution has been sabotaged by the Dange group all these years.

Just as the ideological and political line of the Dange group has proved bankrupt, so also their organisational line has proved equally bankrupt.

From the moment they got control of the Party organisation they sought the method of suppression of those who were opposed to their political line. This was seen in the dissolution of the West Bengal Council, the elected Punjab State Council, and even so many district and local committees. Later, they sought to threaten the mass of Party members into submission to their line by threat of disciplinary actions against leading comrades. When the 32 members of the NC walked out and issued an appeal to Party members, they summarily suspended them and threatened expulsion, and appealed to the Party ranks to rally behind them. They expected that the sense of loyalty would make the majority of the Party comrades rally behind them.

However, the majority of the comrades passed resolution appealing to them to accept the demands of the 32 and save the unity of the Party. Enraged they began taking action against these committees and individuals.

The result of their organisational line is not that the majority of the comrades have rallied behind them, but that the majority—healthy and most devoted comrades who have made immense sacrifices in the cause of the Party and mass movement—have rallied against the Dange group, and are represented in this Congress. That such a thing should have happened in such a short time is the measure of the total bankruptcy of the Dange group in ideology, in politics and in organisation.

Truly, it can be stated that the Dange group has no right to call themselves the CPI and the people also do not take them to be such.

Truly, we can claim that we are the CPI, the inheritors of its glorious traditions of struggle for democracy and socialism.

The developments outlined in the last chapter underline the importance of a strong and united Communist Party based on a correct line of mass struggle engulfing every section of the people.

One of the manifestations of the intense crisis in which the economy and politics of the ruling classes had landed themselves is the ever-growing mass discontent which expresses itself in various forms and on various issues. The recent intensification of the food crisis in various parts of the country has brought the hitherto unorganised sections of the people into action. Demonstrations, rallies, satyagrahas and general strikes have taken place in various parts of the country drawing into their fold much larger number of the questions like the corrupt behaviour of Congress members who led demonstrations of protests.

Such manifestations of mass discontent against the regime however have been taking place against the background in which, due to the right opportunistic policies and disruptive organisational practices of the Dange group, the Communist Party has got split and the organised mass movement incapacitated to give centralised guidance to mass actions. The call given by the AITUC to organise the national campaign against high prices and tax burdens failed to culminate in the all-India General Strike which it was intended to do. The much talked of all-India satyagraha against high prices announced by the Dange group failed to produce expected results, the loud talk of Bharat Bandh proposed by them for September 7 also ended in fiasco.

It should, however, be noted that in this very period when the all-India calls unilaterally given by the Dange group failed to materialise the joint calls given in the States of Kerala (July 31), Gujarat (August 5), Maharashtra (August 12), U.P. (August 18), West Bengal (May 25 and September 25) and centres like Coimbatore witnessed successful mass actions. The contrast between the two sets of actions thus unmistakably shows the utter bankruptcy of the line pursued by the Dange group—the line giving demagogic calls for struggle without forging the

unity of all forces of militant resistance to the anti-people policies of the ruling party.

A stirring call should, therefore, go forth from this Congress to every member and friend of the Party that each and all of them should pledge themselves heart and soul into the work of organising the spontaneous mass action of resistance to the anti-people policies of the regime. Ever so many questions like prices, taxation and corruption which affect all sections of the people as well as issues which affect particular sections (like bonus, dearness allowance, retrenchment, eviction from land, etc.) are bringing larger and larger sections of the people into action. These actions, however, cannot be brought into successful conclusions unless they are totally organised and united under one banner. It is to the extent to which this task is undertaken by our Party that it will secure itself the role of the militant leader of the growing mass movement.

This task, however, cannot be undertaken by the mere willingness of our Party members and friends of the Party to work with zeal and even organise and give leadership to the fighting people. That, of course, is necessary, since in its absence it will be impossible for the party to undertake the job. It should, however, be supplemented by a correct appreciation of the political background against which these struggles are breaking out for the policies pursued by the ruling party as well as the parties of the opposition make the situation among the people extremely complicated. Some of the most important features of this complicated situation may be summarised as follows :

Firstly, the ruling Party is meeting the developing movement of mass resistance against its policies by a combination of repression and demagogy. Detentions without trial, lathi-charges and firings and other traditional methods of attempts to suppress the mass movements are resorted to wherever any section of the people offers resistance. At the same time demagogic declarations are made by the leaders of the ruling party and Government, such as introduction of state trading in foodgrains, rationing in the major cities and in deficit areas like Kerala, a new ordinance to be used against profiteers and hoarders, etc.

Secondly, in relation to the opposition parties, too, the ruling party adopts a dual policy—trying to conciliate and even absorb sections from a vowedly Right reactionary and communal parties like the Swatantra and Jan Sangh and invite all socialists outside the Congress to join its hands.

Thirdly, the above policy of the ruling party is having some effect on the opposition parties and on the mass organisations. A section of the old PSP has already accepted as genuine the call of the Congress for the unity of socialist forces inside and outside the ruling party; they have accepted the lead given by Asoka Mehta to walk into the forces of the Congress. This has happened to some other smaller groups too (including some of those who were considered fellow-travellers of the Congress), a section of the Swatantra Party including its entire provincial unit in Bihar has done the same, while the leadership of the remaining section of that party has begun to show signs of its desire to accommodate with the leadership of the ruling party. The ruling party has also been partly successful in disrupting the Communist Party making a section of our Party, led by Dange group spread illusions regarding the Congress party and its policies.

Fourthly, despite these manoeuvres resorted to by the leaders of the ruling party and the partial success attained by them, the bulk of the people owing allegiance to all parties are getting more and more disillusioned against the ruling party as well as parties like Swatantra and the Jan Sangh. Radical slogans like state trading in foodgrains, nationalisation of banks, etc., are being accepted by the larger and larger sections of the people so that even parties like Swatantra are increasingly finding it difficult to make the people accept them. The claims made by the leaders of the ruling party that they are building socialism, that they are curbing the monopolists and profiteers, etc., cease to be acceptable even to their own followers. As for parties like the Samyukta Socialist party, they are obliged by the developing course of events to adopt militant lines of struggle and join hands with other radical elements in organising united mass actions.

Such being the political background against which the various sections of the people are coming into action against the anti-

people policies of the Congress regime, it is necessary for our Party to take particular care to understand all the specific features of a particular struggle taking place among a particular section of the people or a particular locality. The leadership of the Party unit concerned should take special pains to keep track of all the twists and turns brought about by the combined interplay of the various factors operating in an extremely complicated situation. The one yardstick with which to measure all these twists and turns is the actual mood of the people in gauging which the Party and its leadership should take particular care. We would be committing an unpardonable sin if we fail to take into account the growing mass discontent against the regime and the consequent militancy of the people. We would not be worth our salt if we fail to give effective leadership to these mass struggles. Ability to lead the people in the face of severe repression resorted to by the Government is therefore an essential precondition for the Party's work among the people. It would, however, be equally unpardonable if we were to fail to take into account the impact made on the people by the demagogic declarations made by the ruling party as well as the manoeuvres resorted to by the ruling or other bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties in order to divert the mass movement.

It is necessary in this connection to bear in mind that sections of the ruling party as well as certain opposition (bourgeois and petty bourgeois) parties are taking certain issues affecting the common people and striving to lead them in the direction outlined by the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie. It is this that enables them to bring section of the masses behind them, even avowedly reactionary parties like the Swatantra are able to have some mass bases among a section of the people because they make clever use of the mass discontent on such issues as taxation, prices and corruption. As for the Jan Sangh and other parties of communalism and separatism, they are using the very same mass discontent and giving it their own particular communal and other character. It will be highly sectarian to dismiss all this as nothing but demagoguery resorted to by these parties.

All these developments clearly bring out the fallacy of the

thesis that the main enemy today is Right reaction represented by the Swatantra Party and Jan Sangh. In fact, although the Swatantra party gives the slogans of Right reaction in the crudest form, the fact is that the bulk of right reactionary forces—the monopolists and landlords—are in the Congress and look to the Congress Government to protect and foster their interests. The democratic movement can develop and become strong only in the measure that it firmly fights against the anti-people, anti-democratic policies of the Government, in fact against its entire line of development, its attempt to build capitalism in India and that, too, in collaboration with foreign capital and in compromise and alliance with landlords.

Out of these struggles of the people—joint struggles of the trade unions, kisans and democratic masses—out of the mass campaigns on democratic and political issues will be built the democratic front. In the course of the struggles and campaigns people's political consciousness should be heightened, the futility of the capitalist path of development should be exposed, and the alternative path of people's democratic development should be clearly placed before the people so that more and more they come to accept the programme of People's Democracy.

It must be remembered that the democratic front is essentially a front of the democratic classes, and political parties and organisations come into it reflecting the classes they represent.

While the Party should firmly fight against revisionist ideas, slogans and tactics of tailing behind the bourgeoisie and the ruling party—an essential condition for building the unity of the democratic classes and the democratic front is that the Communist Party should continuously struggle against all manifestations of sectarianism.

Sectarianism in building the unity of the democratic classes takes two forms: (1) Sectarianism towards the masses owing allegiance to the ruling Congress party; and (2) Sectarianism towards the masses rallied round the parties of opposition which are Right reactionary or Leftist with rabid anti-Communism as their basic outlook. Both arise from the failure to realise that the bulk of the masses who are to be won over to democratic

policies and into the democratic front are more or less equally divided into those who follow the Congress and those rallied round the non-Communist opposition parties. Despite the class interests which the leaders of these parties represent and reactionary ideas they seek to disseminate among their followings it must be clearly realised that the masses rallied behind them are objectively interested in a sharp turn to the left in economic policies so that landlord and monopolist exploitation is curbed; in bringing down prices; in civil liberties and democratic rights; in reducing the burden of taxation; in the preservation and further strengthening of non-alignment; in taking firm anti-imperialist positions; in firm measures against corruption for which both the bureaucrats and Congress ministers have become notorious.

It is just because the leaders of the ruling or opposition parties take one or other of these issues that they are able to rally masses around them. It will be highly sectarian to dismiss the masses following other parties by calling it "the result of demagogy". No amount of demagogy can, by itself give a mass following. Only when it is based on some real grievance of the people, on some of their democratic aspirations can it become effective. A real Marxist must discern the popular democratic substratum lying hidden in the popular demagogic campaign of other parties, clear it of the anti-democratic twist given by them and thus forge a common language with their masses even when fighting their anti-democratic and reactionary ideology.

There are several issues on which leaders of this or that party take a democratic, progressive stand. Leaders of the Congress party support non-alignment. Sections of Congressmen are interested in a leftward swing of Government's policies. They advocate state monopoly of wholesale trade in foodgrains and nationalisation of banks and genuine land reforms. The Samyukta Socialist party takes a popular stand on many mass issues on which it fights militantly. The DMK takes a popular stand on the issue of prices. Even parties of Right reaction fight against new tax burdens on the masses as well as corruption.

The Communist Party must have no hesitation in joining with any of them on concrete issues. Hesitation on this score really

betrays a sectarian attitude towards the masses rallied behind these parties. For, only thus will the Party be able to quickly break the wall between us and the masses rallied behind those parties, find a common language, and disperse the anti-communist prejudice that is instilled in them.

Such actions on concrete issues do not exhaust the possibilities of unity between the Communist Party and other parties.

United stand on issues of greater political significance will also become possible. Such, for instance, is the issue of ending the state of emergency on which all the opposition parties take a common stand. It should be the endeavour of the Party to find such issues and build unity whenever and wherever possible. In Parliament and legislatures, the Party should extend its support to the opposition parties when they are voicing a popular grievance, and do not mix it up with their own reactionary views and ideologies; demarcate the party from the opposition when it uses popular grievances for advancing reactionary causes; extend support to the Government when opposition to it is based on issues deliberately raised in order to confuse the issues, etc.

The Party should also intervene in all cases where ministerial or other crisis develop in the States or at the Centre. Removal of a particular minister, wholesale reorganisation of the ministry, charges and counter-charges made by rival groups in the ruling party—all these occasions should be made use of and so handled as to strengthen the forces of radicalism in the country as a whole and in the ruling party. The attitude of contempt for such "petty quarrels" among the ruling classes and within the ruling party, refusal to intervene in an transform such situation (to whatever slight extent it may be possible) will make the Party a totally ineffective force in a rapidly changing political situation.

The aim of all such political interventions as well as of united struggles and campaigns should be to strengthen the mass movements and struggles of the working people, to strengthen the unity of the trade unions, to develop the struggles and build united organisations of the peasants and agricultural labourers, to realise the partial demands of the working people and to

heighten the consciousness and strengthen the unity of the working class and peasantry. Only by building such unity of the working people through joint struggles and campaigns can the democratic movement advance and the democratic front be built. Negligence of this key task will lead to the opportunist tactic of manoeuvring at the top as the main form of 'political action'. Such reliance on manoeuvring divorced from mass actions and campaigns, far from building the unity of the masses, will lead them a prey to the demagogic appeals made by reactionary elements and to the disruptive activities of communal and other anti-national elements.

But the importance of mass organisations particularly of trade union and kisan fronts and the dangers arising from our serious weakness in these fronts must be fully grasped by us. Recent developments have made it all the more urgent. Building of mass organisations and developing the political consciousness of workers and peasants are always our basic tasks on the fulfilment of which depends the building of democratic front. But now in the context of intensified class struggle they have acquired more urgency. In the face of growing burdens on the people and increasing Government repression against the people, it is becoming more and more difficult to develop and defend mass struggles by depending on spontaneity. Hence, it has become absolutely necessary to build and develop mass organisations particularly of workers, peasants and agricultural labourers; it is also necessary to raise the political consciousness of the people. But we must note that our trade union front is weak, vast masses of workers remain unorganised, a large number of organised workers remain completely under reformist influence. Our trade union work is permeated with economism. So far as the peasantry front is concerned, our weakness is more pronounced. For the last several years, the mass organisations of peasants and agricultural workers are getting more and more weakened. In many places their existence become only formal. This utter neglect of kisan front shows that we were victims of revisionism in our understanding of the role of the peasantry in building the democratic front.

All these weaknesses will have to be overcome as soon as possible. The new committee that will be elected from this Congress will have to discuss these problems in detail and work out concrete tasks. The whole Party shall have to work on these fronts with a new outlook.

On the other hand, if the Party adopts the correct tactics of combining extensive activity among the working people in developing their united struggles and building their united organisations with political intervention at the top, the Party can play an effective role in rallying far bigger sections of the people against the anti-people policies of the Government and in the struggle against reaction.

We are not dealing with the concrete tasks on the trade union, kisan sabha and other mass fronts. This will have to be discussed in the appropriate committees and conclusions drawn, which would become the common consciousness of the entire party.

As for elections to the State Assemblies and Parliament the Party should endeavour to forge an electoral alliance on the basis of a programme with socialist and left democratic parties, groups and progressive individuals. It must adopt flexible tactics, without compromising its political principles, so as to enhance the party's representation in the State Legislatures and Parliament. It must be realised that with no proportionate representation, the system of elections based on single-member constituencies, places a very serious limitation on our representation, which is far below the strength of the mass movement led by us and our influence in the country. Under these circumstances, failure to adopt flexible tactics which would enable us to overcome these limitations, to some extent, would reduce the possibilities of political intervention and utilising the parliamentary and legislative forum for strengthening the mass movement.

In this connection, the coming elections for the Assembly in Kerala are of importance for the entire Party. The elections are taking place when the Congress party's stock is at a very low ebb, when it is torn with dissensions, and it is no longer possible for it to form the anti-Communist alliance it made for the 1960

mid-term elections. The possibilities exist for the Communist and democratic parties and progressive individuals together winning a majority and forming a non-Congress progressive ministry.

While it will be a dangerous illusion to imagine that a State Government formed by the Communist Party together with its allies can transform the economic or political set-up in the State, nonetheless, the formation of such a Government will be of great importance in today's conditions. It can play a positive role, both in Kerala as well as in the country as a whole. Apart from enabling the solution of a limited number of local problems which such a Government can without doubt do, its existence and functioning will bring greater morale to the democratic masses everywhere and thus strengthen the democratic movement. It can become a weapon in the hands of the masses in the struggle against the anti-people policies of the Central Government. It will at the same time further intensify the struggle between the forces of progress and reaction inside the ruling party itself. The Party should, therefore, endeavour to forge a programmatic alliance with democratic and Left parties and individuals in the State, and adopt flexible tactics without compromising our political principles, in order to not only win a majority but a sizable and stable majority for these forces, and in order to reduce the representation of the Congress Party to the minimum.

Another important task that the Party has to discharge in the immediate future is to campaign for and bring about the atmosphere for a political settlement of the India-China border dispute. At the Meerut Session of the National Council in 1959, we demanded that the question should be solved on a political basis. Again, immediately on the publication of the official team's report, we put forward this as the only solution of the dispute, in the teeth of opposition by the Dange group, and carried it in the National Council. The failure of the Communist Party to campaign for that resolution and bring about the atmosphere for a peaceful settlement was one of the contributory factors for the subsequent developments.

The bankruptcy of the line of the Dange group, which is the

same as that of the Government as well as of all the other opposition parties stands exposed today. It is growingly being realised that whatever might be the scale of military aid, India might get from the USA or USSR, there is no military solution to the dispute. The sooner negotiations take place for a political settlement, the sooner will the seeking of military aid go. It will considerably lessen the military burdens and ease the economic situation in the country.

It is of utmost importance, therefore, in the interest of the country in order to avoid the humiliating spectacle of seeing our ministers undertake missions to the Western imperialist countries begging military aid, that the Party campaigns vigorously for initiative by the Government for negotiations for a political settlement of the border problem with China.

It is through such a strengthening of the forces of progress by the independent political action of the Communist Party and its allies, by ever greater widening of the circle of the Party's allies, and not through the forging of "Congress-Communist united front" that the unity of the progressive forces will be built. For, despite the relatively progressive policy declarations of the Congress, and despite the subjective good intention of some of its leaders, the fact remains that the Congress as a whole is dominated by reactionary elements—the bulk of whom are in it. General united front with the Congress, as distinguished from united campaigns on concrete issues, is unthinkable.

As for the SSP, although it is true that they take a more radical economic questions, and after the walk-out by the pro-Congress section of the former PSP and merger with the SSP, although they are more militant yet their foreign policy is much more reactionary than that of the Congress. Joint work with them and joint struggles may help to bring about a change in this also. Yet, today there is no question of a general united front with it.

Nor can the question of general united front arise with reactionary and communal parties like the Swatantra and the Jan Sangh. For, they represent the ideology and politics with which

the Communist Party has to carry on a relentless and continuous struggle.

Yet, as stated earlier, it would be wrong and sectarian to refuse to form united front in action on concrete issues even with such parties. For, despite the wrong and harmful ideological poison the leaders have injected into the masses loyal to them, these masses are as interested in defending themselves against the vested interests as are the masses rallied behind the Communist Party. To find points of contact with them all, to develop joint action—such is the essence of the policy of united front, by pursuing which undeviatingly alone, combined with independent mobilisation and action by the Party, can the democratic front be built.

To carry out the tasks, it is of utmost importance that a real mass Communist Party, equipped with the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, and firmly based on Leninist principles of organisation be rapidly built.

In discharging the task mentioned above, we have to face the stiff opposition from the Dange group. Their opportunist politics combined with their disruptive organisational practices had made it extremely difficult for our comrades to develop the mass movement along the lines indicated above.

It is, however, a matter of satisfaction that we had gone far in effectively facing and overcoming this opposition from the Dange group. The response from the mass of Party members and sympathisers to the call given by us to repudiate the Dange group and rally around the line and struggle against the Congress regime has been magnificent. The renewal of Party membership undertaken by us has shown that not only has the majority joined us but that even those who have not joined us, a considerable section is still waiting and may subsequently join us. The Dange group has thus been proved to be what it really is—a very insignificant minority of Party members bossed over by a large number of leaders. Huge rallies which accompanied the district and State conferences which preceded this Congress showed unmistakably that the bulk of Party members and sympathisers have rallied behind the units represented in this Congress.

All this, let it be remembered, took place at a time when the Dange group had a very big weapon in their hands—the open support given to it by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Ever since July 1963 when the Open Letter issued by the Central Committee of the CPSU characterised those of us who opposed the policies and practices of the Dange group as an anti-Party group of splitters, taking orders from the Communist Party of China, the CPSU have put out so much propanganda material acknowledging the Dange group as the real Communist Party of India. This attitude of the leadership of the Soviet Party went to the extent that monthly organ for “Peace and Socialism” printed an article in which the notorious Dange Letters were denounced as forged at the very time when the Dange group itself was ostensibly conducting a probe into the genuineness of those letters through a commission! All this material emanating from the Soviet Party was naturally utilised by the Dange group to claim that it was the real Communist Party while those who opposed them are the splitters.

Recent development in the international Communist movement, however, have removed the bottom out of this propaganda line of the Dange group. The publication of the well-known Togliatti Memorandum was the first indication to show that there were some sections in the international movement, who by no stretch of imagination could be called “pro-China” in ideology, were unhappy about the methods adopted by the Soviet leadership in dealing with the controversy in the international movement. Scarcely had a few weeks elapsed since the publication of this Memorandum, when staggering news appeared about the change of leadership in the Soviet Party. It is, of course, yet premature to make an assessment of the likely implications of this change in the Soviet Party leadership on the international movement and consequently on the claim made by the Dange group that they constitute the real Communist Party of India. It is, however, indisputable that several parties like those of Austrian and Western Europe feel that the change in the leadership of the Soviet Party is not unconnected with the method followed in the past in dealing with the controversy of the international movement. The statement

issued by the Central Secretariat of the Dange group and several spokesmen of their group at the provincial and lower levels show that they too are panic-stricken trying to sort out all sources of excuses and explanations. It is obvious that the story of the change in the Soviet leadership came to them as a bombshell.

It would obviously be unwise for us to come to any conclusion on the reasons for this change in the leadership of the CPSU. We have naturally to wait for more and authentic information to come from the CPSU itself. We may confine ourselves to an expression of the hope entertained by bulk of members and sympathisers of the Communist Party of India that (a) the new leadership of the CPSU would accept the advice tendered by Togliatti in his Memorandum on the need for a change in the method of dealing with controversies in the international movement so that open polemical debate is replaced by business like discussions bilateral to begin with followed by a well-prepared international conference with a view to uniting the international movement; (b) that in any case our fraternal parties (including the CPSU and the CPC) would cease to interfere in the internal affairs of our Party, leaving it to the majority of our Party members to decide who are the authentic representatives of the Party, whether there is any anti-Party group in the Party and if so—who, whether the Dange Letters are genuine or forged, whether this or that leader of the Party deserves the confidence of Party members and so on.

This, however, would not overcome all the difficulties which we are facing today. After all, we are faced with the question which policy—that advocated by the Dange group or that for which we have been fighting—is correct. We will have to show in practice that the policies and practices which we symbolise yield better results in mobilising and uniting the mass of the Indian people in their resistance to the anti-people policies of the Congress regime. It is to the extent to which we go into action and show results that we will be able to inflict the most decisive defeat on the Dange group. We are sure that the deliberations of this Congress and the final decisions arrived at by us in this Congress will help us in this respect.

Comrades, while it is true that inside the Party there has been

a section which has been fighting against Right reformism and revisionism for a long time, yet it would be wrong to think that they were free from Right opportunist mistakes on this or that issue. The fact is that inside the Party no struggle against revisionism had been organised. Even when the 1957 Moscow Declaration sharply pointed out that the main danger facing the Communist movement is the danger of revisionism, and although the West Bengal and Punjab units of the Party had submitted documents on "Revisionism inside the Communist Party of India" and demanded a thorough inner-Party discussion on them, the discussion was sabotaged. In fact, even the National Council did not find it feasible to discuss the documents.

After the Left-sectarian deviation of the 1948-51 period which led to extreme adventurist tactics, there was every ground for a swing to Right opportunism. This was particularly so in view of the fact that parliamentary and legislative activities dominated the Party's activities since 1952.

Added to this was the fact that certain bourgeois developments were taking place, which to people in an underdeveloped country whose development had been arrested by a century and a half of colonial slavery, appears to be big. Moreover, the Indian bourgeoisie was cleverly manoeuvring with its slogans of public sector and socialism. In these conditions the ground was fertile in India particularly for the growth of revisionism inside the Communist Party and all the greater was the need, therefore, for a principled struggle against it—a struggle in which the entire Party took part. How true today has the warning of revisionism being the main danger admitted by the Twelve Parties' Declaration come in the case of the Communist Party of India.

One of the chief manifestations of revisionism is bourgeois nationalism, and the abandonment of proletarian internationalism. On several anti-imperialist issues—Algeria, Congo, etc., the Communist Party of India failed to mobilise the masses in solidarity with the struggle for freedom. Generally, it was content to pass resolutions welcoming the Government's stand. When the Government of India refused to recognise the provisional Algerian Government, when the Government of India refused to withdraw its

forces from Congo even after all the Asian-African countries had done so, the Party never came out sharply against the Government and mobilised the people.

We know the depth of bourgeois nationalism that has corroded the Party when the India-China border dispute came into the open and subsequently erupted into an armed clash at the border in October 1962.

But surrender to bourgeois nationalism had already taken place internally. Provincial Committees had already started following "their own" bourgeoisie against the people (including the Communist Party) of neighbouring States in relation to international State borders. In the case of the Maharashtra Committee, this reached its high watermark. With regard to the allocation of rivers, waters, location of projects, etc., also the same tendency manifested itself.

The Party must undertake a detailed report on revisionism inside the Party and the entire Party must be drawn into discussion.

While the struggle against revisionism must be relentlessly carried on, there is every danger of sectarianism also raising its head and it must be guarded against. We have already shown how in building the democratic movement, sectarianism manifests itself. Another manifestation of sectarianism is the refusal to see the contradictions between imperialism and even the monopolists and big bourgeoisie, and not to utilise tactically for isolating imperialism.

An equally important factor contributing to the growth of revisionism and manifestations of sectarianism is the fact that the theory of Marxism-Leninism has been totally neglected. In the period 1942-48, in the name of creative Marxism, the study of classics was condemned and the study of writings of the leaders of the Party was substituted for a study of the classics. It was this 'creative Marxism' that gave rise to the discredited theory of 'Muslim Nationalities' which found justification in Jinnah's theory of two nations, based on religion. That atrocious thesis could be swallowed uncritically by the Party was entirely due to the indifference bordering on contempt that was developed for Marxist theory in that period.

Subsequently, in the period 1948-51, there was a conscious attempt to undertake a study of classics at all levels. But when the line pursued at that time proved to be extremely Left sectarian, the Party once again relapsed into woeful neglect of the classics.

One of the major tasks that the Party has to undertake is a systematic study of the classics at all levels, without this, the Party will not be able to successfully struggle against revisionism nor can it guard itself against manifestations of sectarianism.

With revisionism and bourgeois nationalism on the ascendancy, principles of Leninist organisation were given the go-by. With the blow given to the Party by the Left sectarian line of 1948-51, discipline was getting shattered. It could be restored only on the basis of a principled struggle against sectarianism as well as a determined struggle against the monster of revisionism for which the soil was fertile. Added to this was the fact that without that revolutionary fervour born out of the revolutionary Marxist theory and practice, with activities in the Parliamentary, legislative, cooperative and such spheres being on the ascendant, with the colossal growth of bourgeois corruption in social and political life all round, Communist norms of life were getting shattered and bourgeois habits and mode of life,—softness and easy going life—began to grip Party comrades, particularly at the top levels. Responsibility and duties to the Party were shirked. Placing the interests of oneself above the interests of the Party began to grow.

In the pursuit of revisionism and in the attempt to get the Party to adopt a line of out-and-out tailing behind the bourgeoisie, degeneracy had reached the lowest depths, particularly at the top level. Systematically, and with a plan, discussions inside the National Council, the Central Executive Committee and even the Polit-Bureau and later the Secretariat were being leaked to the bourgeois press with a deliberate purpose. A section of the Party was being thus openly slandered. And yet the leaked 'commission report' was shelved. Everyone in the National Council knew who the real culprits were, although no cast-iron proof could be adduced. In fact, in one meeting, every member of the Secretariat pointed the accusing finger at one member. The proceedings of another meeting of the Secretariat at which

only five members were present were leaked out and printed in the bourgeois press within twentyfour hours and there could be no doubt that the leakage could have emanated only from one or more of three members of the Secretariat. In face of all this, despite repeated demands from the ranks to put an end to the leakages, the National Council kept absolutely mum. Such was the depth of degeneracy. Was there any wonder that on the outbreak of the armed conflict on the border, a section of the Party virtually acted as informers?

Character assassination was resorted to against those who would not toe the revisionist line. How could mutual respect develop between colleagues? Instead, contempt developed. And hence collective leadership, without which no Communist Party can develop, was non-existent.

As a result, inner-Party democracy and democratic centralism became non-existent. Ideas of federalism in Party organisation were growing and manifested themselves in practice. The lack of inner-Party democracy could be seen in the fact that no discussion was organised on even such documents as 12 Parties' Declaration of 1957 or the Moscow Statement of 1960.

While inner-Party democracy thus became virtually absent, on the other hand, its concomitant ultra-democracy also was prevalent.

A systematic, relentless and sustained struggle against all these anti-Marxist, bourgeois organisational methods and vices must be waged. Party norms must be asserted and Party life must be so organised that a collective leadership is rapidly built.

Through these struggles, we should rapidly build a real mass Communist Party strong in the theory of Marxism-Leninism firmly adhering to Leninist principles of Party organisation and capable of pursuing principled and flexible tactics to meet any given situation.

Comrades, the objective situation in the country is extremely favourable. Despite the terrific propaganda barrage of slander that the Government and all other parties let loose against us as being 'anti-national' since the border dispute with China and particularly after the border clash in October-November 1962,—a propaganda which was actively aided and indulged in with greater intensity by the revisionist Dange group—they did not succeed in

isolating us from our people. On the other hand, people in growing numbers look upon us as the relentless and selfless fighters for their interest. This has happened because experience has already proved to large sections of our people and every day will prove to still larger sections that the policies of the ruling Congress Party as well as those of the Right reactionary and communal opposition parties are condemning them to eternal poverty. Want and misery are leading the nation to a terrific catastrophe. Experience also brings them consciousness that the line of tailing behind the bourgeoisie and eulogising the path of capitalist development which the Dange group of revisionists has been practising and is bent upon pursuing, will bring them no relief. Inexorably they are drawn to the path of struggle to dislodge the bourgeoisie from its leading position that we place before them.

The only obstacle that has so far prevented the canalisation of all those who are gradually coming to realise the bankruptcy of the policies of those parties has been the systematic and determined attempt by the revisionists to take the Party to the path of class collaboration, as a result of which the Party was emasculated and bogged down in stagnation.

The very fact that the majority of the Party has disowned the revisionists in unmistakable terms and are represented in this Congress in such a short period of time is proof of the soundness, health and vitality of the bulk of the Party. This is our great and inestimable treasure.

Freed from the deadening machinations of the bourgeois agent Dange and his revisionist group, let us move forward with determination to build a real mass Communist Party, firmly carrying on the fight against revisionism, guarding against sectarianism, deeply studying, assimilating and applying the theory of Marxism-Leninism and basing ourselves on the Leninist principles of organisation as the only effective instrument of social transformation. The future belongs to us.

Forward to a real mass Communist Party based on Marxism-Leninism!

Forward to the Democratic Front!

Long live Marxism-Leninism and Proletarian Internationalism!

Long live the Communist Party of India!