

Behind Revolutionary Phrases, Disorganizing Struggle Against Imperialism

THOSE WHO DEPART FROM THE MARXIST-LENINIST path, spreading opportunist illusions or mouthing revolutionary phrases, are unmasked easily. The moment they come into contact with reality and make an attempt to tackle it, they expose their rejection of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, their abandonment of international outlook and experience and, above all, their inability to make a class analysis and develop a line of revolutionary action based on it.

The revisionists who betrayed internationalism in 1962 pretended to observe Marxist-Leninist discipline in their programme but ended in openly and shamelessly rejecting the leading role of the working class in the democratic revolution and spread illusions about National Democracy and the non-capitalist path.

The same tragedy has overtaken the dissident "Lefts" inside our Party. They show an amazing lack of capacity to understand the class realities and, like the revisionists, fail in making a correct analysis of the class forces behind the present Indian State.

Besides, they seem to be a class by themselves. They sometimes totally reject the world-picture—the characteristics of the new epoch—as given in 1960 Declaration of 81 Communist and

Workers' Parties, a Declaration accepted as revolutionary by all Parties.

It is no pleasure to say these things about people some of whom may still be in our ranks. We would have very much liked to discuss these issues inside the Party; but when some members cross the limit, stick denunciatory bulletins in public places, a reply has to be given. We are only interested in defending Party line against the vicious and erroneous attacks launched by these elements, and nothing more. It is not our purpose to fix the guilt of particular individuals, many of whom might be upright and honest people, but to reveal the basically wrong and anti-Leninist character of the line advocated by them, and the methods pursued by them.

DIFFERENCES : ON WHAT ?

At the outset it must be stated that differences inside a Communist Party might appear from time to time on several issues. Estimation of a given situation, major questions of tactical line, conduct on day-to-day questions—on all these differences are likely to arise.

But one does not discuss programmatic questions every day. The Programme, laying down the basic class-strategy and class-analysis of the Party, does not change every day or every few months. In any case, all differences have to be settled inside the Party and according to the rules of the Party, which while demanding the submission of the minority to the majority and the lower committees to higher committees, permit lower units to initiate discussions on current questions, questions of tactics, etc., and criticize the decisions of the higher committees.

But the dissidents have refused to observe these limits and, by circulating anonymous leaflets and pamphlets among Party members and members of the public, have attempted to discredit its line. This is enough to show that they are not prepared to observe the minimum discipline necessary for a Marxist-Leninist Party. On this count alone, they deserve to be disciplined and thrown out of the Party.

It may be that these elements do not regard the Party as a Marxist Party and, therefore, give themselves the liberty to

organize factions. But, then, why should we give them that liberty? It is a fact that they issue anonymous leaflets denouncing the Party leadership and Party line and Programme.

FACTIONS IN THE PARTY

Once more their methods bear a strange resemblance to those of the revisionists. In the united Party, the revisionists formed an open faction, leaked out the inner proceedings of the Secretariat, the Central Executive Committee and the National Council to *Link* and other bourgeois papers to discredit the Marxists opposing them, and did their best to undermine the discipline of the Party. The logic of the dissidents' activity is the same though they mouth revolutionary phrases.

The demand for the right to form factions inside the Party has international but bad precedents. "The essence of Trotskyism is, lastly, denial of necessity for iron discipline in the Party, recognition of freedom for factional groupings in the Party. . . According to Trotskyism, the CPSU(B) must not be a single united militant Party, but a collection of groups and factions, each with its own centre, its own discipline, its own press, and so forth" (Stalin, Report to the XVI Congress of the CPSU(B), *Works*, vol. 12, p. 86).

What is the politics, the political line professed and advocated by these people? For their disruptive attacks, for sticking denunciatory bulletins in public, they pretend to have the support of the founders of Marxism. The very quotations that they cite go against them. "The elaboration of a common programme for the Party, should not, of course, put an end to all polemics: it will firmly establish those basic views on the character, the aims and the tasks of our movement which must serve as the banner of a fighting party, a party that remains consolidated despite partial differences of opinion among its members on partial questions" (Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 4, p. 23).

In our last issue, we have already referred to the period for which Lenin wrote this. Apart from this, how does this quotation help the disruptionist activities of these elements? Freedom of discussion inside the Party, according to the rules of the Party, is always there. But this is quite different from the

type of "polemics" these people indulge in to denounce the Party line—polemics outside Party units, carried out by their faction and spread to the general public.

Besides, what does Lenin say? Mark the words of Lenin. "It (the Programme) will firmly establish those basic views on the character, the aim and the tasks of the movement"—the Programme establishes common understanding on the basic views, etc. It is not the basic views that are debated. These basic views consolidate the Party. What is permissible for debate are "differences of opinion among its members on partial questions". This is what Lenin says.

Is this the position of those who stick posters denouncing the Party leaders and Party line? Are the dissidents only interested in discussing partial differences on partial questions? Have they no basic differences—do they not reject the Party line from A to Z? Is it to discuss some partial questions that they openly violate Party discipline and organize their disruptive faction? Why do they mislead their readers to believe that they have only differences on partial questions and that they accept the basic Programme of the Party? It is enough to mention only a few of their confused erroneous formulations to understand that they have hardly anything in common with the Party.

STATE POWER : IN WHOSE HANDS ?

These elements are never tired of repeating that the central question of every revolution is that of State power. That, of course, is true. But it logically follows that a Marxist-Leninist Party must first understand which class or classes hold State power and who are to be overthrown. Marxism-Leninism demands a strict analysis of the classes that hold power, classes that are deprived of it and in opposition to it, and of those who are irreconcilably opposed to it—so that a blow is unitedly delivered against those who really wield State power.

What does our Party Programme say about the State? The State in India is the State of the bourgeoisie and landlords, led by the big bourgeoisie who are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital in pursuit of the capitalist path of development.

But this is not enough for our dissidents. This, of course, is a revisionist formulation, according to them. They must make a revolutionary formulation. So they say at one place that the Indian State is a neo-colonial State; at another place they say it is a State of neo-colonial Powers. Can you beat this class analysis?

How do they explain neo-colonial State? They hasten to add that India is not a puppet State or a stooge State like South Korea. They add: "By neo-colonial State we mean the economy of the State is not free from the exploitation of imperialist capital. Imperialist capital is penetrating more and more in India and its rate of exploitation is increasing."

They cite figures. "Between 1956-61 Rs.130 crores of new foreign capital was invested in India while Rs. 275 crores were taken out as profits." They seem to be unaware that the Government has borrowed hundreds of crores worth of capital from foreign imperialists including the USA—the total liability is more than Rs. 5000 crores. And they talk of only Rs. 130 crores of private foreign capital. So much about their economic figures.

How do you deduce the neo-colonialist State from imperialist exploitation or export of Rs. 275 crores of profit? "Because the economic and political strength of imperialism is many times stronger than the strength of Indian capital, imperialist influence affects the policy of the Indian State, its internal policies and the State machinery, etc., and it grows."

And, finally, they draw the conclusion that imperialism still rules India. "The Indian State is a neo-colonial bourgeois-landlord State. This State has three partners—(1) imperialist capitalist class, (2) bigger sections of the Indian capitalist class, (3) landlords, jotdars, moneylenders, etc."

This is their class analysis—India is still ruled by imperialism in cooperation with the big capitalists and landlords. It is imperialism that holds effective State power in its hands.

ERRONEOUS CLASS ANALYSIS

Not satisfied with this analysis, they improve it still further, "revolutionize" it and say the Indian State is the *State of neo-*

colonialist Powers (Don't laugh!). It seems that we are now being ruled both by British and American imperialism in collaboration with monopolists and landlords. They say the Party's leadership, which is Left in words and revisionist in deeds, describes the Indian State as the State of the capitalists and landlords with the big bourgeoisie in the leadership. This is an unreal analysis. The Indian State, according to them, is a State of neo-colonial Powers. The partners are (1) feudal and semi-feudal exploiters, (2) owners of monopoly capital—notorious thirteen or fourteen monopoly groups, and (3) American and British imperialists with the former getting stronger every day.

It is for this erroneous and bogus class analysis that they wage their public polemics; and for refusing to accept this ridiculous and childish formulation, they go on propagating that the Party leadership has become revisionist.

Any Marxist-Leninist party worth the name must fix the class character of the State correctly if it wants to lead a successful revolution. An erroneous class analysis will lead to a wrong strategic and tactical line, confusing friends with foes and foes with friends, and hamper the task of delivering a united blow against the ruling classes under the leadership of the working class.

How does the analysis compare with ours? Our Programme says: "The present Indian State is the organ of the class rule of the bourgeoisie and landlords, led by the big bourgeoisie who are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital in pursuit of the capitalist path of development. . . ." Here the holders of power are clearly defined as capitalist class and the landlords; they are led by the big bourgeoisie who are increasingly collaborating with imperialism; thus the danger of imperialism is also being pointed out.

CORRECT ESTIMATE OF U.S. DANGER

Our Programme correctly estimates the growing danger from American imperialism. Having recalled that the USA is the chief bulwark of world reaction, it warns: "In the circumstances, the penetration of American capital in India and our growing reliance on American 'aid' are creating a dangerous situation for our country also." Again, in the latest resolution

of the C.C., we underline the growing surrender of the Government to American dictates.

But we do not draw the conclusion that the American imperialists and British have succeeded in capturing State power in India, as the dissidents, pretending to be Left, do. This is nothing but glorification of imperialism. It is the task of the working class and its Party to rouse the people to the imperialist danger, to defeat the surrenderist moves of the Government and rouse the people to oust this Government because of this increasing danger.

But the dissidents want to announce that imperialism has already triumphed in capturing the State, and thereby they divert attention from the surrenderist moves of the Government, underestimate the struggle to prevent them. Their line, if accepted, will only facilitate the path of American penetration, and nothing more.

Is there anything common between the Party's outlook and them on this question? There is absolutely nothing that is common. These are basic differences and not "partial", "tactical" differences as they allege. To agree to their formulation is to agree to disorganize the struggle against American imperialism, against the surrenderist policy of the Government and help the worst reactionaries in India.

A neo-colonial State, but not a puppet State—this is their 'rich' discovery. A neo-colonial State must carry out the policy of the colonial Powers of imperialism. Does the present State in India carry out the policy of imperialism, of American imperialism, or of the big bourgeoisie and landlords, surrendering to imperialism in their narrow selfish interests?

BASICALLY WRONG PROPOSITION

And how can a neo-colonial State cease to be a puppet State since it must strictly carry out the policy of imperialism? But they are afraid of describing the Indian State as a puppet State; therefore, they stop at neo-colonial character.

According to them, the State is a neo-colonial State. It means that India has already lost her freedom. Well, gentlemen, we know certain reactionary circles are pressing along the path

which will end in our slavery. The Americans are also eagerly waiting for it. You have also decided that the battle is already lost. But the people and we think that the nefarious plans can be defeated ; and that it is not so easy for the dollar imperialists to swallow our country through the good graces of a charlatan class analysis.

From this basically wrong proposition they evolve a wrong and reactionary line on every front—but of this later.