

1st Floor, Bldg. 5, Betsy,
Erna, Dong

JUL 20 1977

COMMUNIST LEAGUE Indian Section OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Internal Information And
Discussion Bulletin. 000



VOLUME : II. NUMBER: 3.

JUNE : 1977..

*** CONTENTS ***

1..National Question in India..... Shrad Jhaveri.	1-7
2..Discussion notes on Party Programme.....	7-8
3..Discussion notes ;2; on Party Programme.....	8-9
4..Discussion notes ;3; Changes in the section of the Indian Bourgeoisie..... Shrad Jhaveri.	9-12
5..Discussion notes ;4; Towards a methodological criticism of the Indian Stalinists theory of two stages of Revolution and their programmatic conception of the Indian Revolution.	10-11
6..Discussion notes ;5; Gunnar Myrdal and Transitional Programme on agrarian question.	11-13
7..Discussion notes ;6; Transitional Programme of Indian Revolution Leon Trotsky on Transitional Programme.	13
8..Discussion notes ;7; Notes on the Transitional Programme on agrarian question.	14-15
9..Critical notes on the Programme of CPM ;adopted at Calcutta: Founding Congress. ...Shrad Jhaveri...	14-17
10..Letter of 21st May'77 from com. Somendra to com. Arya..	18-19
11..Report of com. Rashid on the Parliament Election and the other activities in Kerala..	19
Request.....REQUEST.....Request.	

Comrades,

As per the decision of the last CC the CS has forwarded the documents as the first instalment to initiate the written discussion on much needed Party Program. Please make all your efforts to send your contributions. The ball

is in your court now. *****

National Question in India

Nation is a historical category belonging to the epoch of ascendent capitalism. Modern nation or a nationality-in-formation is the product of capitalism. The advent of a modern nation-state is historically associated with rising capitalism. The historical process of destruction of feudalism and its replacement by development of capitalism was at the same time a process of the constitution of the peoples into nations. Hence on a global-historical scale, the victory of capitalism over feudalism has been linked up with national movements.

Under capitalism, commodity production becomes universal. In fact, the generalization of commodity production is one of the most salient features of capitalist mode of production. The bourgeoisie, as a class, had to capture home market for such generalization. Complete victory of commodity production on a capitalist basis over all previous modes of production required politically united territories whose population speaks a single language, whose unity and unhindered development are the most important conditions for genuinely free and extensive commerce and exchange on a scale commensurate with modern capitalism. This was the economic foundation for national movements and for formation of nationalities and nations.

The tendency, therefore, of every national movement is towards the formation of national states under which these requirements of modern capitalism are best satisfied. The national state was therefore typical and normal for the capitalist period.

Historico-economically, the self-determination of nations meant the political separation of their nations from alien national bodies and the formation of an independent national state. This right of self-determination of nations meant that only the nation itself has the right to determine its own destiny, that no other nation has the right to interfere forcibly in the life of nation, to destroy schools and other institutions, to violate its habits and customs, to repress its language or curtail its rights.

Formation of Eastern European States and Czar's Russia showed that states of mixed national composition are possible. These were called multi-national states. Marxist tradition during earlier period of development of Marxist policy on National Question at the beginning of this century, especially as elaborated by Karl Kautsky and Lenin, regarded multi-national states as abnormal exclusively in the sense of lack of conformity with what is best adapted to the requirements of developing capitalism. The internal constitution of such states was for some reason or other remained abnormal or underdeveloped.

Revolutionary Marxist tradition has always held that national question in general and the right of national self-determination is a democratic question and not a socialist principle. But national question or a national struggle for national independence and/or independent development of a nation or a nationality or struggle of an oppressed nation or a nationality is part of the class struggle and irrespective of its motive forces and because of its social content is progressive. As Leon Trotsky had stressed the national struggle is one of the most labyrinthine and complex struggles. But it is at the same time one of the extremely important forms of the class struggle.

That is why Marxists, since the beginning of this Century, made right of national self-determination an integral part of their programme. The major factor responsible for inclusion of this demand in a party programme was the fact that with uneven development of competitive capitalism resulting into world imperialist system with national oppression occurred during the epoch of capitalism.

Leninist tradition held that the struggles of oppressed nations possessed progressive historic significance. This tradition made a distinction between nationalism of the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation and nationalism of the oppressed masses of this oppressed nation. While the nationalism of the bourgeoisie is a means for subordinating and deceiving the masses, that of masses is the elementary expression of their just and progressive hatred for the most skillful, capable and ruthless of their oppressors, - the imperialists. Lenin taught that the proletariat does not have the right to turn its back on this kind of nationalism. It must demonstrate in practice that it is the most consistent and devoted fighter for the national liberation.

The Russian Revolution disclosed a new pattern so far as motive forces for the solution of this question are concerned. Because of her historic belatedness, Russia became a state of many nationalities. As Leon Trotsky has pointed out the whole development of a belated nation gets a contradictory and combined character. Historic extremes predominate in such a society. The tasks of one class are shouldered off upon another. In the national sphere also, the uprooting of medieval remnants fell to the lot of the proletariat. To secure their national liberation and cultural salvation from great Russian Czarism, the oppressed nationalities were compelled to link their fate with that of the working class.

In Russia, therefore, the national upsurge, like the agrarian, poured into the channel of October Revolution. The resolute struggle of the Bolshevik Party for the right of self-determination of oppressed nationalities in Russia facilitated in the extreme the conquest of power by the proletariat. As Leon Trotsky summed it up in mid-1939, it was as if the proletarian revolution had sucked in the democratic problems above all, the agrarian and national problems, giving to the Russian Revolution a combined character.

Basing himself on the experiences of Russian Revolution of 1917 in the light of Lenin's policy on the national question, Leon Trotsky observed that this subordination of belated national revolutions to the revolution of the proletariat follows a law which is valid throughout the world. According to him, if in the last century, the fundamental problem of wars and revolutions was still to guarantee a national market to the productive forces, the problem of our century was to free the productive forces from the national boundaries which have become iron fetters upon them. In his analysis, viewed from a broad historic sense, the national revolutions of the East are only stages of the world revolution of the proletariat, just as the national movements of Russia became stepping stones to the Soviet dictatorship.

Leon Trotsky fought strenuously against Stalin and Stalinist parties on the question of character of the bourgeoisie of the colonial and semi-colonial nations. True to the classical Leninist heritage, his theory of Permanent Revolution as applied to colonial and semi-colonial countries, refused to embellish colonial and semi-colonial bourgeoisie with revolutionary mission simply because the struggles of the oppressed nations had progressive significance. His criticism of Stalin's policy on national question concentrated on Stalin's and Stalinist parties' (1) failure to understand the permanent character of the revolution in an imperialist epoch, (2) pedantic schematization of the course of development and (3) chopping up of the living and combined process into dead stages imagined to be necessarily separated in time, etc., Trotsky, drawing from the experience of three Russian Revolutions and later second Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927, stressed that bourgeoisie of backward countries from the days of its milk teeth grows up as an agent of foreign capital, and not with standing its envious hatred of foreign capital, always does and always will in every decisive situation turn up in the same camp with it. True to the Leninist spirit of early Comintern days of 2nd. World Congress, he, especially during Chinese events of 1925-1927, advocated and vehemently fought for complete Independence of proletarian policy on national Question and of the Marxist Leninist Party.

In India prior to August 15, 1947, the national question assumed the most significant aspect of winning political Independence from British imperialism. While national question had many facets, winning of political independence was the most relevant aspect.

The National Question and the agrarian question are two of the most important tasks of a bourgeois-democratic revolution in a backward or historically belatedly emerging multi-national country. They are intertwined. But in India, prior to August 15, 1947, even though agrarian unrest had occurred often in explosive forms, at least since late twenties, national question, in the sense of achieving political independence, occupied the front place and commanded priority.

Since the First World War, a broad based multi-class national movement for independence developed simultaneously with the consolidation and expansion of multinational bourgeoisie in India in several important areas of industrial and financial activities

Stalinized Communist movement in India pursued a faulty Menshevik policy on the national question in general and national independence struggle and national bourgeoisie and its leadership of the national movement in particular. This policy was never consistent and was dictated by Stalin to suit ever-changing diplomatic needs of the Soviet bureaucracy. Its policy at the time of 1942 Quit India Movement is the most glaring illustration of this opportunism. Like its sister party during the Great Second Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927, Stalinist communist party of India, never consistently pursued at all independent proletarian class policy on national question and national liberation struggle. It

It never consistently maintained class independence of itself as a Leninist party. As a result, it could never, as envisaged by correct Leninist policy, wrest leadership of developing mass struggle for independence from the hands of compromiser, vacillating, timid and conciliationist Indian bourgeoisie. As a result, the leadership of the multi-class national movement for freedom from national oppression remained in the hands of multi-national Indian bourgeoisie.

As a result, in India, national revolution, in the sense of winning political independence from alien imperialist rule, could not become a stepping stone to the soviets.

The achievement of formal political independence on August 15, 1947, did not exhaust the national question in India.

The way in which it was achieved by the multi-national bourgeois leadership gave rise to a host of new problems, partition of the Indian sub-continent on religious lines into two separate multi-national states—India and Pakistan—exacerbated communal tensions, gave rise to the problem of displaced persons, left unsolved the problem of several nationalities, divided peoples of one distinct nationality—Bengalis—into inhabitants of two separate states based on religion etc.. In the immediate context, these problems occupied much attention of new bourgeois regime in India.

In addition, the problem of break up of feudal or princely states and their administrative and socio-political integration into the mainstream of bourgeois state and society for facilitating rapid expansion of home market cried for urgent solution.

The theory problem of nationalities and the reorganisation of states also remained to be tackled.

While reviewing the evolution of national question in India and Indian bourgeoisie's attempts to solve its various aspects, it is essential to remember that the theory of Permanent Revolution does not say that a bourgeoisie of a backward country will never undertake or succeed in this or that or any particular task of a national or agrarian question. What it teaches is that in the changed global context, bourgeoisie of a backward nation will not be in a position to solve in a consistently bourgeois-democratic manner the national or the agrarian question. Moreover this valid historical generalization drawn by Lenin and Trotsky from the revolutionary experience of 20th. century does not automatically ensure victory of the proletariat over the historic process. Much depends on the policy of a Leninist combat party on these two questions.

Deriving the revolutionary character of the bourgeoisie of a colonial or backward country from the socio-economic content of the national or the agrarian Question which of course is bourgeois-democratic, Stalinist of all hues, were led to supporting one or the other bourgeois formation on one or the other aspect of the national or agrarian question instead of evolving and pursuing independent Marxist revolutionary proletarian politics. The programmatic error of Stalinist lies in its methodologically incorrect abstract identification of socio-economic content of a problem of a bourgeois-democratic revolution in a backward country with its motive forces. In his struggles against Menshevism, Lenin had consistently refused to commit this error of a programmatic character. This programmatic error resulting from the methodological confusion over the dialectical relationship between the socio-economic content and the motive forces of problems of a bourgeois-democratic revolution in a backward country in the current period leads the stalinist parties of all varieties to practice class collaboration on every question. Stalinism approaches all such questions in isolation and abstractly. It tears asunder such problems from their concrete global and national context of dying capitalism and changed alignment of class forces and on the question of motive forces, views them as if they are the same as they were when bourgeois system was on rise. It refuses to recognise the changes that have taken place on a global scale in the global capitalist economy as well as class correlation of forces.

National question in India did not follow the same route of development as the British and French nationalism did. Nationalism in India grew and gathered momentum under the conditions of foreign imperialist rule. The peculiar problem of nationalities and national or religious minorities was a consequence of peculiar historical development of India under British Imperialist Rule.

Capitalism, as a historical force, in its imperialist form, assumed a contradictory role. To the extent that for its own ends of garnering social surplus for capital accumulation, destruction of feudal society was undertaken by it, it has a progressive effect.

But to the extent that the very same aims required maintenance of semi-feudal elements as a prop for its rule of subjugation, imperialism retained them and became reactionary.

In India, Indian feudalism was economically and politically debilitated by British Capitalism. British Imperialism unified India economically and administratively through the introduction of capitalist economic forms, creation of a network of modern means of communication and single centralized state apparatus. All these factors were vital for the development and consolidation of a loose fragmented and balkanized medieval population into a modern nation.

But at the same time, British imperialist policy of "Divide and Rule", its strategy of encouraging and supporting communal and other conservative forces in the country through creation of special communal and other constituencies, institutions and interests considerably accentuated the anti-national divisions in Indian society.

Moreover such a policy gave sustenance to artificial formation of socio-religious categories like Muslims, Sikhs and Depressed classes. These are national minorities which do not speak the same language, did not occupy definite territory and did not exhibit common life patterns. They are dispersed over the whole territory of India. They did not constitute a nation. The only exceptions were peoples inhabiting Sind, Baluchistan, the North-West Frontier, etc., where historically Muslims constituted distinct nationalities.

In India, the entire process of growth of nationalities and national minorities has been marked by unevenness because of the uneven development of capitalist penetration under British rule and of independent growth of capitalism since 1947. Bengalis, Gujaratis, Andhras, Malayalis, the Karnatakis, the Marathas, etc., grew at an uneven pace.

This historic uneven development of various regions and various nationalities inhibiting these regions has been greatly accentuated by the growth of capitalism especially after 1947. India, even though territorially reduced, is still a vast country having sub-continental dimensions. It consists of vast regions which are vastly dissimilar in every respect. Their economic and socio-cultural development is uneven. Thus unevenness of growth has resulted into widespread regional disparities between various nationalities in all the spheres.

India, under the British imperialism, was a conglomeration of artificially created administrative units. These units or provinces were not mainly linguistic entities embodying the aspirations of nationalities inhabiting these areas. These artificial administrative borders were to be recast and India to be made a federation of various nationalities.

Under the constitution of India, exclusive power of admitting or establishing new states, increasing or diminishing their area or area of extent, altering its boundaries, etc., vested in the parliament alone. The states of the federation have only the right to mere expression of views on such proposed changes. No unit representing nationality inhabiting it was given any choice in the matter when Union was formed. Thus in India, union is not an indestructible union composed of the indestructible states. In India, union is indestructible while states are destructible. Moreover, under various provisions of the constitution regional autonomy of these states can be curtailed even normal peaceful time.

Constitutional position on national question historically reflects two important trends. First of all, it reflects the subtle shift in the stand of Indian National Congress after 1947. While formerly it stood for right of secession, after 1947, objective requirements of bourgeoisie in India for largest possible territorial framework for its home market, compelled it to emphasize unity at the expense of diversity and separation. Debates in the Constituent Assembly on the question of right of state units to secede, on the question of Hindi as a state language, on the question of Centre and state relations show that overriding consideration was unity. At least on four vital areas where national question tends to be reflected in the constitutional sphere, this seems to be the case. Overriding legislative authority was given to the centre even for items in the concurrent list. Then emergency provisions also work against the principle of self-determination. So also in case of financial emergency. Lastly Centre is given directive issuing powers to see that its laws are implemented by the States.

Secondly, the constitution merely sanctifies the fact since 1935 that constituent units as mainly representing nationalities were not sovereign. Nor their union into a federation voluntary. The multi-national Indian union and the state is not a voluntary union of emergent nationalities having right to separate.

Communist party of India (Marxist) overlooks these aspects in its discussions on the National question.

At the time of the commencement of the constitution, there were 8 part A states, 8 part B states, and 10 part C states. These states were formed by integration of former Indian princely states of about 600 units, 216 of which had a population of a little over 19 millions and merged in provinces, 61 of which having about 7 million people constituted centrally administered areas while 275 with a population of about 35 million were integrated to create new administrative units.

In 1956, after much struggles and under economic compulsions, Indian bourgeoisie reorganized states on an almost linguistic basis.

Language problem is an integral part of national problem in India. It has complex aspects because of several historical factors. The survivals of old colonial order still persist in cultural sphere. The greater emphasis in unity leads to more emphasis on centre and towards forcible imposition of one sole language as the only language of the state. This emphasis leads to resistance to just claims of the nationalist and linguistic groups which are just evolving / The conflicts between multi-national and multi-lingual regional components also often lead to linguistic outbursts. The belated awakening of some tribes under process of nationalities in formation also give rise to the question of tribal dialects and their preservation and further development. Imperialist regime's language and educational policy left the problems of eradication of mass illiteracy, of low level of culture even amongst the bulk of literatis, of inadequate development of every Indian language and dialect to be tackled by the successor Indian bourgeois regime.

The constitution of India in Article 343(1) provides for the adoption of Hindi in Devnagari script for 15 years from 26.1.50. The use of English may be extended further. This provision was adopted by a majority of one vote only. Vehement opposition over the question of Hindi was voiced during the constituent Assembly Debates/

A set of constitutional provisions in Articles 29 and 30 provide safeguards and rights on the language question. These provisions constitute a considerable advance on the part of the Indian bourgeoisie towards a rational solution of the language question. But they leave much out of their scope. The most important is of course the question of tribal dialects. This problem has been largely neglected.

Eight schedule to the constitution enumerates 15 languages. These languages are spoken roughly by 87.13% while 13% speak those that are not included. These are generally literary and very backward languages. No *raison de tre* can be found for this schedule. It is not clear whether inclusion in this list accords the language in question any special or constitutional status or privileges. In any case, it is an anachronism and needs to be removed.

India, thus, is a multilingual, multi-national state where Indian bourgeoisie is also multi-lingual and multi-national.

Multi-nationality of India as a state has some paradoxical features. While Rajasthan (especially Marwari, Gujarati and Parsi) dominate corporate structure and especially Marwari capital has of late been a dominant factor in the indigenous sector of modern bourgeois economy in India, the state of Rajasthan, its place of origin, is one of the most backward states. Though Hindi is sought to be enforced as a national language, the Northern Hindi speaking belt continues to lag behind many other states of the Indian union in many areas of development. The Hindi speaking peoples inhabiting mainly u.p., m.p., Bihar, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana and Delhi are not consolidated into a single nation. The Hindi speaking people do not have even a conscious sense of having any national community as Hindustanis. The process of national consolidation at a macro level has not proceeded far and does not rest on any ethnic or linguistic basis but on a complex of the aggregate economic and political interests of all the peoples inhabiting the country of India Nations which were formed in 19th century such as Bengalis, Marathas, Gujaratis, Oriyas, Telugus, Tamils, etc. are highly developed. Even here some national characteristics as language culture national consciousness are strongly pronounced but in case of some nations, others such as economic or hereditary community are weaker. Maharashtra and west Bengal are the two most industrialist states but Maharashtrians and Bengalis have little control over the economy of their own states. The large industrial bases of these two

(6)

states are owned and controlled by other nationalities. In the distribution of industrial licenses, bank advances etc; Maharashtra, West Bengal and Tamilnadu hold the front positions. The central bureaucracy is mainly manned by people belonging mostly to five states of Tamilnadu, west Bengal, Punjab, Maharashtra and Kerala.

These facts show that so far not a single nationality has been able to dominate others and no particular nationality on all India scale is able to wield big stick.

The national policy of the party firmly upholds and rests on the right of national self-determination. The party consistently advocates and agitates for the widest possible regional autonomy for each nationality. The reorganisation of states in 1956 did not exhaust the problem. The problem is still to create constituent units of such size as are economically feasible and administratively manageable. The structure and functioning of such state unit must be such that the people inhabiting it could grasp the administrative process, ventilate their grievances and evince real interest and even participate in its activities. For this adoption of regional language as a means of communication is necessary.

Moreover such reorganisation of states should make provision against their uneven and lopsided development. Facilities fully were to be provided to each nationality of such recognized state. Adequate conditions such as mass literacy and mass education free and rich development of regional language, etc. were to be created for each nationality to enable it to freely participate in developing its distinct culture and cultural life. India, should be a free voluntary co-operative union of various equally flourishing nationalities having a common economic structure but variegated cultural patterns.

For the border regions and tribal belts, the policy of the party aims at terminating their isolation and estrangement, at helping them shed their patriarchal manner of life and lack of culture, at putting an end to their justifiable mistrust towards higher culture and economy of the central regions and peoples of advanced nationalities. On the border or boundary disputes and resources dispute, the party says that these must be determined and decided by the local inhabitants themselves on the basis of their economic and social conditions, national make-up of the population; etc.

There are several questions which Marxist policy on language question as part of national question has to confront what attitude a Leninist combat party should adopt towards different languages? Should it strive for equality between them or a predominance of few or one over the rest? What treatment should be meted out to backward and/or undeveloped languages? Should the party adopt numerical strength of the speakers of a particular language as the main criterion in deciding the attitude to be adopted towards it? Which shall be the link language? What should be its status to the other languages? Should it have some superior or privileged status? Or be equal among equals? How is it to be chosen? By means of a constitutional ukase or through consensus of different linguistic groups? Should not its acceptance be the result of the common voluntary consent of all?

True to Leninist heritage, the party opposes any kind of privilege for any language. The requirements of economic exchange under capitalism will themselves decide which language of the country it is to the advantage of the majority to know in the interest of commercial relations. These requirements will always come; the nationalities living in one state as long as they wish to live together to study the language of the majority. It all depends on the extent and rapidity of capitalist development in India. Decision thus arrived at will be all the former because it would then have been adopted voluntarily.

The party says that there is no need for compulsory official language. It opposes the element of coercion. Compulsory official language involves use of elements of coercion. The party's approach towards language question rests on four firm foundations. These are:-

(1) no compulsory language (2) teaching in vernaculars (3) no violation of rights of rights of minorities (4) no privileges of one language or the nation against the other.

Capitalist society is based on competition. It is competitive not only between national but also between various nationalities within the same country. This leads to inequality between various nationalities and languages of India. Hence inequality and unevenness of development mark the relations between various nationalities and linguistic groups in India. With the further development of capitalist, These are bound to be

accentuated . It is only after the socialist revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat that language question as well as national question will ultimately be solved as by product of socialist revolution.

15-5-77

Discussion Notes on Party Programme:-
National Question in India.

Our 1968 Party programme does not have a section on National Question in India at all. This is surprising but none the less true. Perhaps, it is suggestive of the general state of affairs prevalent amongst Indian Marxists on the National Question. Paucity of literature -both Marxist as well as non-Marxist- on National Question in India is too notorious to need any more stress here.

There are diverse reasons for this significant lacuna in the body of Marxist thought. Some thought that National Question exhausted itself with achievement of political Independence in August 1947. Some further thought that with reorganisation of states on a linguistic basis in 1956, Indian bourgeoisie did what it was best for it to do and some of the aspects of National Question were relegated to the peripheral considerations and it was assumed that agrarian question acquired prime importance since 1956 at least if not earlier from 1947. Some non-party leading Marxists thought that it might not be prudent to support various nationalities movements often erupting in India on diverse issues like border disputes, river disputes, formation of separate states, as such movements are often led by regional bourgeoisie to satisfy their narrow regional requirements and to support them would tantamount to giving such regional bourgeoisie and their aspirations mighty impulse.

It is therefore very much necessary that our party in its revised programme lay bare, even in sketchy and tentative outline, elements of a revolutionary Marxist policy on national question in India.

In early 1972, Com. Pankaj Roy attempted to pinpoint some of the salient features of a revolutionary Marxist position on National Question in India. To my knowledge this was the first systematic though tentative approach ever made on a party level. (see Review Article Service by CS for Members only, Critical Remarks on The National Question in India By Pankaj Roy, 6-2-1972, Mimeographed P-9.) Obviously this was prompted by developments in Bangla Desh. At that time even Fourth International was also inclined to the view that in view of developments like Bangla Desh, nationalities problems of Basque people, Quebec people, Negroes and Chicanos and Puerto Ricans as well as Ukrainians, etc.; National question was again coming to the fore on the global scale. (See Com. Livio Maitan's intervention during Bangla Desh Debates at the 1971 December Bombay National Conference of our party (then SWP). Notes in my file).

Com. Pankaj Roy's contribution is coloured by those concrete circumstances. That contribution also reflects the state of knowledge at that time of the comrades and availability of literature on national question.

For example, it did not pay adequate attention to the language question in India as a part of national problem. Perhaps, it did not thoroughly deal with the achievements of Indian bourgeoisie in solving some aspects of the national question. It did not draw their implications for the class struggles as well as for further development of the national question in India.

Roy's contribution did not try to link up national question with theory of Permanent Revolution as applicable to India. Nor did it assess the role of national question qua agrarian question.

In addition, a correct evaluation of role of national question Qua 1947 independence has to be made so as to enable us to better characterize August 15, 1947 from a revolutionary Marxist sociological perspective. Our 1968 party programme did characterize 1947 but intrinsically, not a connection with national question.

For example, did the achievement of political independence exhaust National Question in India? This is the crucial question, theory of permanent Revolution as applied to India must seek to answer.

If winning of formal political independence from alien imperialist power was an important ingredient of National Question prior to 1947, then, obviously the answer to this question is in affirmative. But though the most important aspect of National Question in India, prior to August 15, 1947, winning of formal political independence was not the only aspect of National Question in India. The thorny problem of nationalities, the communal problem of princely states, etc; cried for urgent solutions.

Further, even though August 15, 1947, secured a vast territorial home market for native bourgeoisie to expand politically unhindered, the way in which August 15, 1947 was achieved by and under the leadership of multi-national India Bourgeoisie, gave rise to a host of new aspects of National Question in both India and Pakistan consequent on partition of Indian sub-continent. These points need to be elaborated at length. Their implications have to be weighed carefully.

An adequate analysis of Indian bourgeoisie from the viewpoint of its nationality composition is also necessary.

Stalinist programme on National Question has to be analysed.

24-4-'77

Sharad Jhaveri,

Discussion Notes on the Programme - 2.

Ajit Roy on the character of state and the Indian bourgeoisie.
Ajit Roy's contribution on this subject are very rich and concrete.

Roy calls into question CPI(M)'s definition of the Indian state. In my view he is the only authority excepting us, who point out that landlord class as such cannot be a co-sharer in state power as the state has tried and largely succeeded in eliminating semi-feudal landlords. Roy also objects to CPI(M)'s definition on the ground that much of it is also descriptive. For example, "increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital, in pursuit of the capitalist path of development." According to Roy, capitalist development cannot be regarded as a necessary function of the collaboration with foreign finance capital, which is primary? Further, if foreign capital refuses to collaborate, will the state refuse to follow capitalist path?

Roy also objects to the phrase big bourgeoisie in CP(M)'s definition because according to him, it is a generic term which glosses over the differentiation within the class.

As for CPI definition, Roy finds the word "national bourgeoisie" objectionable. He says the word "national" is ambiguous. He rightly stresses that overall thrust of CPI characterization is to say that the state power in India is wielded by the bourgeoisie as a whole. Roy says even if this is broadly correct, it tends to gloss over the growth of sharp socio-economic differentiations within the Indian bourgeoisie with the consequent differences in the degree of their control over and share in the state power.

Roy says both ignore the fact of fast-rising agrarian bourgeoisie and its relation with the state power.

Roy classifies Indian bourgeoisie strata into four categories. These are:- monopoly bourgeoisie (2) big industrial bourgeoisie (3) small industrial and (4) agricultural which according to Roy is the largest section.

Ajit Roy provides two new insights. Though these facts are well known, their implications and state are not that much clear.

Roy says socio-economic policies pursued by the state have resulted into (1) re-distribution of national income in favour of the top monopolies and the agrarian bourgeoisie (2) direct state assistance with a view to quickening the pace of development of these two strata (3) increasing closer association of these two strata with various state organs-

Roy further states that monopolists have hold over the centre, agrarian bourgeoisie has over the states. He evaluates food grains procurement and pricing policies in this light.

This analysis needs no doubt to be incorporated in any analysis of the state power in India.

Roy thinks that state is not the organ of class rule of the entire Indian bourgeoisie but of a section of it.

I think we can't agree with the definition. We evaluate the class character of the state in its relation with the exploited classes as whole. We do not characterize state as a class institution from any specific interests of any specific stratum of Indian bourgeoisie.

For that would land us strategically into the position of supporting anti-monopoly strata against monopoly stratum of the Indian bourgeoisie. While contradictory interests and struggles ensuing therefrom between various strata of the Indian bourgeoisie are to be exploited by us whenever possible, we cannot strategically to any stratum of Indian bourgeoisie against others. That is why I find RSP's position as a whole quite satisfactory. We should unequivocally declare that Indian state is a class organ of the Indian bourgeoisie. Constituted as it is, it cannot be an instrument of socialist transformation.

I also find it difficult to accept Roy's separation between monopoly and big industrial stratum. Are not all monopoly houses also at the same time big industrial ones? His own book Monopoly Capitalism contradicts his thesis.

26-5-1977

Shared Zaveri.

Discussion on the Programme

Changes in the Sections on Indian Bourgeoisie. By Sharad Zaveri.

According to the Naxalites, India is a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. And Indian bourgeoisie is comprador. India is ruled by the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and the feudal landlord where the principal contradiction is between feudalism and the masses of peasantry.

It is essential to counter this thesis of Naxalites on the character of Indian bourgeoisie not simply for the sake of countering it but to show positively in our programme what really Indian bourgeoisie is.

In our 1968 programme we lack this. Through our programme we must equip our cadres on the real position of India's ruling class.

At the outset, we must be clear about what is meant by "comprador" and "semi-colonial".

Ajit Roy relies on the definition given by the 6th World Congress of Standardized Comintern. I prefer Mandel's given in Glossary to his book Late Capitalism.

According to the Mandel, Semi-colonial countries are those capitalist nations which are politically (formerly) independent, but whose economy continues to be dominated by international imperialist capital.

According to Mandel, comprador bourgeoisie is that section of the ruling class in colonial and semi-colonial countries which, although owning and accumulating capital, is closely tied to foreign imperialism, especially via the intermediary functions of merchant capital (import-export businesses) and normally does not engage in industrial investment.

Theoretically, it is obvious from these meanings of these two terms that Indian bourgeoisie is not comprador. Concrete material is to be found in Prit Sappal's articles in no. 1 and 2 of South Asia Marxist Review. Ajit Roy also takes up the question in his paper in the collection "State and Society".

Sappal's main thrust against Naxalite thesis is political. He strives to show that after 1947, Indian bourgeoisie is very much independent whenever necessary qua imperialism.

According to him, not a single inch of territory is under foreign rule now. Indian bourgeoisie is prepared to act decisively on its own even where it provokes or incurs greatest displeasure of imperialism (U.S.A.) for ex. in case of Bangla Desh; recognition of people's Republic of China.

Then he examines Trade and Tariffs policies and his point is that India has been pursuing a protectionist policy designed to promote indigenous industries. According to him, it is not the imperialism but Indian bourgeoisie which decides these policies.

He establishes that Indian bourgeoisie has a dual character which is contradictory. Naxalism fails to recognise it.

Sappal discusses semi-colonialism of China and India and concludes that India cannot be called a semi-colonial country in the same sense (emphasis in original) as China was before the revolution.

Both China and India face completion of democratic tasks. Moreover as Trotsky and history has shown, even in semi-colonial and semi-feudal China, revolution in 1925-27 could have succeeded even without people's war or guerrilla warfare strategy, given correct policy of CCP there.

It is clear from this resume of Sappal that he does not take into account the historical features of Indian bourgeoisie as a class which have a bearing on this case. He refers mainly to post-1947 developments.

But Indian bourgeoisie was not merely an agent of foreign imperialism. By the end of early eighties of the last century it began to invest in industries. Textile and cotton industry for example. Much material now is available to ascertain this fact. See Pavlov on The Indian Capitalist Class. Swadeshi Movement gave a great philip and after Ist. World War, momentum grew. Bourgeoisie also used the national mass movement for its own ends of consolidation. This needs to be developed to show that (a) on the whole it was not comprador and (b) in its earliest stages, its comprador strata were negligible.

Ajit Roy is seized of this problem since 1956 when his first booklet Indian Monopoly Capital -1953 was published. According to Roy, comprador elements of the Indian bourgeoisie never played any important role in economic and political development in India, at least since the turn of the century.

Roy adheres to his 1953 thesis that "the specific features of the historical development of Indian monopoly capital show that it differs radically (emphasis in original) from the bureaucratic comprador monopoly capital of the Chinese pattern, and is better characterized as the colonial version of the finance capital". (emphasis in original)

According to Roy, (1) in West monopoly stage arrived late. Here it came very early even before completion of agrarian revolution. (Is not this a case of combined development? - Sh.); (2) unlike West, Indian monopoly capital grew before it completely conquered the home market; (3) partition further depleted its home market; (4) here not much external market for it.

As against China, industrial base here was much wider. In China, the bureaucratic-monopoly capital had developed from the ranks of comprador bourgeoisie while here in India, monopoly capital has developed through the fusion of industrial and financial monopolies.

In our programme, in section on Indian bourgeoisie, we must also dwell on the peculiar features of its rise and growth and also on its multinational character.

28-5-'77.

Discussion Notes on Party Programme -4.

Towards a methodological criticism of Indian Stalinist Theory of two stages of Revolution and their programmatic conception of the Indian Revolution.

By; Sharad Jhaveri.
Jammagar.

It is essential that we deepen our understanding of the basic methodological flows contained in Stalinist approach (all varieties) to the problems of Indian Revolution. We all know too well that it is Stalinist or Menshevik. We know also that it is designed to subserve the needs of Soviet bureaucracy.

But a rapid consultation with Leon Trotsky's books on Permanent Revolution and some portions of Third International after Lenin led me to think that this is not sufficient with the help of Theory of Permanent Revolution in its application to India, we should be in a position to counter their arguments on a deeper methodological level.

For us, the reality of world economy constitutes the starting point for analysis of Indian social reality. We start from the character of the epoch. It is that of proletarian revolutions. Stalinists deny the actuality of proletarian revolutions. Here Trotsky makes a profound observation (p.4 of TI after Lenin) "In the present epoch,, the national orientation of the proletariat must and can flow only from a world orientation and not vice versa".

We don't reply in priori and in abstract that since the tasks of a bourgeois -democratic revolution are not completed, it is the bourgeoisie which must be supported politically and socialist tasks should be postponed to an indefinite future.

Along with Stalinists, we recognise that the tasks are bourgeois-democratic in character, But we differ from them in the need to invest bourgeoisie with ability or will to complete them. We say that whether it will be able to solve these tasks in a completely democratic and genuine manner cannot be answered on a national terrain simply. International contexts are to be reckoned with.

Stalinists approach the development of capitalism in India or national capitalism in isolation, tearing it as under from world economy of global capitalism. Its approach is abstract and metaphysical. Bourgeoisie on a historical scale, from the view point of evolution of society is a progressive class. This is true on a historical level of abstraction. It is a whole truth. But from this truth as a whole, it does not necessarily follow as a particular that Indian bourgeoisie is also progressive and must be supported. In order to approach Indian bourgeoisie in a correct historical materialist perspective, it is essential to step down from a general level of abstraction to a more concrete one. Here we take into account the concrete national and international circumstances such as a global decline of capitalism as a social system, lack of external market, narrow internal market, belatedness, rise of proletariat, etc.; to determine how far it is and to what extent it can be progressive. Of course, no question of reposing political confidence in it arises for us. Here we stand with Lenin whose whole dynamic political life was devoted to building an independent proletarian party.

Moreover we make (we should) a detailed study of the efforts of Indian bourgeoisie to solve its tasks. Trotsky in *Permanent Revolution* (p. 254) says; "The peculiarities of a country which has not accomplished or completed its democratic revolution are of such great significance that they must be taken as the basis for the programme of the proletarian vanguard. Only upon the basis of such a national programme can a CP develop its real and successful struggle for the majority of the working class and the toilers in general against the bourgeoisie and its democratic agents".

Stalinist in general do not adequately deal with the internal mechanism, class forces of the Indian revolution. Stalinist do not take into account the basic features of the world process. And in the light of that they do not analyse the national peculiarities. They forget that national peculiarities represent an original combination of the basic features of the world process". (Trotsky, P. 147, P. 4.)

Trotsky says (p. 256 P.R.) "under the conditions of the imperialist epoch the national democratic revolution can be carried through to a victorious end only when the social and political relationships of the country are mature for putting the proletariat in power as the leader of the masses of the people. And if this is not yet the case? Then the struggle for national liberation will only produce very partial results, results directed entirely against the working masses". (emphasis mine). How true for India?

Stalinist simply deduce the progressive character of the bourgeoisie from the simple fact that tasks are of a bourgeois-democratic character. They mechanically separate in space as well as in time the two stages of the revolution.

31.5-'77.

Discussion Notes on Party Programme No.:-5
Gunnar Myrdal and T. programme on Agrarian question.

The fact that Myrdal (*Asian Drama*) is cognisant of the gravity of land question in India is manifest in the lengthy discussion he develops in ch; 26 on Agricultural policy in the second volume of *Asian Drama*. I propose to write in depth on Myrdal and Agrarian question later on. Here my aim is more limited. I just put here on record what he has to suggest by way of remedial measures for the solution of agrarian problem with a view to see if he has any relevance for formulation of our transitional programme.

Myrdal stresses the neglect of the institutional and attitudinal problems (P; 1256). This is what E.H. Jacoby has called "Human -factor-first approach". Myrdal is of the view that the achievements of technological reforms (Green Revolution) are dependent on the extent of prior or at least simultaneous institutional changes (p. 1260). Of course, Myrdal urges that both types of reforms are closely interwoven and interdependent.

Before considering his proposals for renovation of agriculture it is instructive to note here the mode in which Myrdal presents certain basic facts of agrarian structure as a prelude to his elaboration of policy alternatives (p. 1367). He says that not result has been the strengthening of the upper strata in the rural society and a corresponding reduction in the position of sharecroppers and landless labourers. Agrarian policy whether in its technological or institutional aspects has tended to shift the power balance of the ruling structure in favour of the privileged classes. The piecemeal reforms have buttressed the socio-economic situation of these groups, whose interest in perpetuation

of status quo has been greatly enhanced. He therefore concludes that half-hearted policy has thus diminished the prospects for radical reforms in agriculture. This is a good pointer to our communist friends who clamour about progressive functions of Indian bourgeoisie. According to the Myrdal, evidence points the passing of an opportune moment for a radical reshaping of agrarian structure.

To my knowledge it is only Myrdal (p.1369) who convinces us that the perpetuation of serious inequalities has depressed production. Thus the issue of inequality is relevant to prospects for economic advance contrary to assumptions of academic economics. (p.1369). He boldly asserts (and it is here that his emphasis is on institutional approach is more manifest than anywhere else in his treatment) that the promotion of social and economic equality is a pre-condition for attaining substantial longterm increases in production. (P.1369). Though, of course, he does not and cannot visualise a scheme wherein within the prevalent social fabric this pre-condition can be realised. He does not say that complete overhauling of this social structure is itself a *conditio sine qua non* for realization of this pre-condition. In a quite original fashion he castigates the extant agrarian policy for ignoring the issue of inequality and concludes that such a policy is not likely to achieve major and especially lasting results. He regards this as the gravest defect of the prevailing institutional approach. (p.1369). He urges for a frontal attack on the equality issue which necessitates a much more radical approach than has yet been seriously attempted. He urges for the adoption of a hard look at institutional restructuring of agrarian society.

This is by way of prefatory remarks. Now in my opinion, Myrdal's utility lies in his attempt to prepare an excellent brief for a transitional programme or radical redistribution of land, of course, only later to reject it in limine on filialist grounds.

He treats each and every possible argument against the case for radical redistribution of land and meet it, in my opinion, convincingly. These can be reduced in essence to a few basic ones.

These are: (a) Radical redistribution would simply create small uneconomic holdings and jeopardize the efficiency of the present large units of cultivation.

Myrdal considers this fear as vastly exaggerated. The farm here is not an economic unit comprising a house for the operator, a garden and a collection of buildings for storing crops or sheltering animals and machinery. It is simply a piece of land or more often a number of scattered small strips, devoid of fixed investments other than perhaps a well or a few trees, some terracing and drainage or irrigation conduits.

Moreover where tillage is done by sharecroppers or landless labour or other tenants the transfer of title to the tiller would disturb very little the established pattern of operation.

(b) Re-shuffling of land ownership might cause diminutions in yields because the new owners would be less experienced than those who previously tilled it. Myrdal highly suspects the validity of this argument. Those who are to benefit from this measure are all experienced cultivators such as sharecroppers, tenants, landless labour. Moreover there is much scope for intensification of agriculture. Moreover redistribution would provide its beneficiaries with greater incentives to put heavier input—even traditional input—in tillage. Lastly much of such input is done on small farms than on large farms using hired labour. As farm management studies have shown output per acre is considerably higher on small units of cultivation than on those of medium to large size. This measure cannot remove all the obstacles to agricultural advance. Myrdal holds that it will on the contrary create a climate more receptive to the assimilation of these innovations. He gives two reasons for his opinion.

(1) The inequalities that have frustrated past experiment in co-operation would be minimized; (2) The newly landed might genuinely require the services of implements and work animals.

(3) It would reduce the volume of marketable food stuffs. Even at present this represents only a small fraction of entire production.

Myrdal says that from the view point of labour utilization, a radical land redistribution has an impressive recommendation (p.1371). It promises to create the basis for a major transformation in the psychology and attitudes of the rural labour force by cutting through the deterrents to work that have long been entrenched in the traditional pattern of inequalities.

Myrdal rightly observes that this measure has to be supplemented by an equally radical elimination of past debts to money lenders and a prohibition on any new borrowings from them and legislation prohibiting the mortgaging and sale of land.

Myrdal rejects this measure because he is more susceptible to the prolixities of those who wield power. (p.1375).

Myrdal discards communist theory also because for him it does not seem to provide a suitable treatment for the ills of south Asian Agriculture. (p.1377).

Myrdal stoutly vouches for a vigorous growth of capitalism in agriculture but not along laissez faire pattern (p.1380). His proposal centres round the criterion of functional use of land as a substitute. He stands for a limited redistribution of land where the inalienable and unrestricted right to own and use the land pass into the hands of the landless as individuals. Myrdal's solution, in his own words, represents a modified form of welfare capitalism for agriculture.

Dated 30th March, 1970.

(Sharad Jhaveri.)

Discussion Material on Transitional Programme of the Indian Revolution.
Discussion Notes on Party Programme No;-6.
Leon Trotsky ON T. Programme.

This material is compiled from the book : Writings of Leon Trotsky (1938*39))
(First Edition November, 1969).

This book is very rich in content and some of its thought provoking content represents most mature and lucid thinking of this great thinker.

Here however I propose to note down only his views on T. Programme, which are relevant for our aim of evolving a T. programme.

According to Trotsky, the programme should not be adopted to the mentality of the workers. Nor should it be predicated upon the exigencies of the situation. The task of the programme must be to express the situation as it is. The mentality is in general backward, delayed in relation to the economic development. Trotsky says that our task depends on the mentality of workers. The task is to develop the mentality of the workers. That is what the programme should formulate and present before the advanced workers.

But will the working class accept our programme? Trotsky refuses to give any guarantee for its acceptance by the workers. He refuses to undertake any responsibility for this. He says that we can only take the responsibility for ourselves.

Why our programme should be called a transitional programme? Because it contains demands which are not easily realizable within the capitalist framework. He replies that it is easier to overthrow capitalism than to realise demand under it. These demands create a bridge to the mentality of the workers and then a material bridge to the socialist revolution. The whole question is how to mobilize the masses for struggle. (That is why our demands by nature should be such as are impossible of realization under present regime.) Trotsky says that if we will only demand what they can give, the ruling class will give only one-fourth or none of what we demand. Transitional demands are not stop slogans; they are means of pressure on the bourgeoisie. Reforms and acquisitions are only a by-product of the revolutionary struggle.

According to Trotsky the programme is the instrument of the party. The T. programme of P.I. is not a complete programme, because a complete programme should provide a complete theoretical expression of the modern capitalist society. It is just a first approximation.

Trotsky sounds a note of warning against twin dangers to be guarded against while elaborating a programme:

- (a) not to remain on general abstract lines and to respect the general slogan without real connection with the trade unions in the locality and (this is precisely the case with our SWP programme.) This is sectarian abstraction.
- (b) On the other hand not to remain on and adopt too much to the local conditions, to the specific conditions, to lose the general revolutionary line.

The end of the T. Programme is not complete because nothing was said about the social revolution, about the seizure of power by insurrection, the transformation of capitalist society into the dictatorship, etc.,.

In evolving the programme the point that has to be borne in mind, is how to guide the different strata of the proletariat in the direction of the social revolution.

We therefore do not adhere to the time-worn tradition of 2nd International of dividing the programme into a maximum and minimum programme, postponing the socialist revolution to an indefinite future but directly pose the question of seizure of power. That is the main feature of transitional programme.

Dated 31 March, 1970.

(Sharad Jhaveri.)

Discussion Notes on Party Programme No:-7

A note on The Transitional Programme On Agrarian Question.

Marxists regard agrarian problem as the foundation of the unfinished bourgeois-democratic revolution in India. Still to this date, no comprehensive transitional programme on this crucial aspect of the India Revolution has been looked by any Marxist Party; a programme of transitional demands and slogans around which peasantry can be rallied to the banner of Indian Revolution.

In this connection attention of our comrades must be invited to a note worthy attempt made by Mr. H. D. Malviya, a rigorously logical and consistent exponent of radical reconstruction of Indian agriculture along American pattern in the Memorandum submitted to the new Congress President, Sri. J. Ram at the time of the Congress plenary session at Bombay in December 1969. Mr. Malviya's protestations sound socialistic, no doubt but in reality his proposals, if implemented, would pave way for a faster and smoother penetration of capital in India agriculture. Viewed from the point, it envisages an unadulterated growth of capitalism in agriculture.

The Memorandum printed in Mainstream (no. 17 and no. 18 of 27-12-'69 and 3-1-'70) in its first part depicts graphically the predicament in which bourgeois land reform measures find themselves now. By 1969 tenants constituted as much as 24% of the total cultivating households. The agriculture labourers constitute nearly 1/5 of the total labour force in India. Concealed tenancy has emerged on a massive scale as a sequel, as it were, to the land reforms. A little over two million acres of land have so far been declared surplus on imposition of ceiling and only about half of the area has been distributed. 604.22 crores were to be paid for compensation. Rs. 271.08 crores have been paid up-to-date. If it pertinent to remember here that 50% of tenantry own two acres and less of land which does not provide them and their family even a square meal all through the year, much less savings to purchase the land to become owner. Only thirty lakhs of Indian tillers could acquire ownership over just 70 lakh acres of land. The tillers of India did not become owners after land reforms. Mr. Malviya after a scathing and detailed critique of extent bourgeois policy on land question arrives at the conclusion that failure in implementation of land reforms is write large all along the time.

All this is of course an old story now for any student of a agrarian problem. But what follows by way of concrete proposals in the later part of Memorandum has much to commend itself for inclusion, albeit with necessary modifications, in any Marxist transitional programme on Agrarian Question.

These proposals are detailed below:-

- (a) Immediate abolition of all remaining intermediary tenures:
- (b) All existing tenancies to be declared permanent and non-resumable. (This is necessary to remove once and for all the extant discriminations amongst the tenantry.)
- (c) All surrenders not duly registered by the revenue authorities to be nullified. (This is new for all challenge the so called "surrenders" but non posits the solution which would rally the dispossessed round this issue against the landlords. This is good transitional slogan on a very vital and concrete issue-Sh.) Where the landlords has not taken possession of the surrendered land even if the surrender was valid, he should not be entitled to take possession of the surrendered land. (This is important to prevent manland ratio from further worsening and to prevent further concentration of land as well as for protection of weak from whom surrenders have been obtained by force or coercion or fraud-Sh.)
- (d) A moratorium to be declared on future payments of compensation. (while we stand for annulment of compensation provision, this demand presupposes an overhaul of present social structure. Meanwhile the regime continues its rule. What is to be done about instalments of compensation to be paid so long as this regime lasts? Hence the transitional demand be to stop payments forthwith. Since the State cannot do this, or implement this demand, because of constitutional provisions on property rights, we can explain to the people the class nature of this state and the need to make a revolution even for the demand which ensues therefrom. This demand would enlist support of somewhat affluent strata of Indian tenantry who find it irksome to pay the landlords. But it should be noted that there is nothing socialist in this demand as moratorium will enable the tenant to invest more in land and thereby enhance differential ground rent.-Sharad.)
- (e) The right of resumption by the landlords to be forthwith terminated for ever. Of course this demand does not touch the land already resumed. But this demand strikes at one of the vital potential powers of landed strata and prevent concentration. This demand does not tend to abolish landlordism. It has the effect of maiming it in no. of its crucial aspects.

- (f) Deterrent punishment for wrongful evictions and the ejected tenant to be restored the land from which he was rejected.
(This demand is predicated upon an effective and equitable judiciary and law enforcement machinery. Since in a class society, law is also biased in its incidence, this demand would enable us to explain the class character of law and its implementation in favour of exploiters-Sharad.)
 - (g) Credit facilities to farmers should not be property based but should be based on viability of production.
(This demand partakes of the Character of a transitional demand precisely because in a society based on cash-rent and right to own private property, a credit system having an adequate coverage and based on production is not at all possible. Hence this demand is not realisable within the present framework. Since ownership of land constitutes the basis of credit-worthiness, in order to make credit facilities available to all, abolition of private ownership not only from agrarian sphere but also from every other avenue of social life is necessary. This demand directly raises the question of property-rights and hence social revolution-Sharad).
 - (h) Complete and total elimination of non-residents as owners of land.
 - (i) Landlords who claim to be owner-cultivators be statutorily required to live in villages for the major part of the year. (I am afraid we cannot support this demand as it pre-supposes permanent stratification of agrarian society. We do not want landlords ultimately. Free peasant communes may be the transitional stage to a fully developed communist society.)
 - (j) Total and complete ban on leasing of land except in case of physical disability or defence services. (This will abolish the absolute ground rent and has the effect of facilitating greater penetration of capital in agriculture. See third Vol. of Capital by Marx and Lenin's notes on it.)
 - (k) Ceilings on landholdings to be imposed on the family rather than on the individual and there should be no resumption.
 - (l) All factitious partition of land among family members to escape ceiling laws to be inquired into by special tribunals comprising popular representatives and annulled.
(This is new and must be incorporated as a concrete demand).
 - (m) Lower ceilings than the existing ones already legislated to be fixed on all existing landholdings. Also lower ceiling to be fixed on future acquisitions.
 - (n) The definition of family to be modified to include only husband, wife, sons, unmarried daughters, grand sons, and unmarried grand daughters to ensure against clandestine partitions and transfers to escape ceiling legislations.
 - (o) The existing exemptions to be forthwith ended.
 - (p) Setting up of an effective machinery to enforce minimum wages in agriculture.
 - (q) Land records to be brought up-to-date;
 - (r) Article 226 of the constitution to be amended so as to exclude land reform legislation from the preview of court injections and stay orders.
- It is to be noted that Mr. Nalaviyads proposals assume the continued existence of capitalist property relations.

Dated. 27th March, 1977.

Sd. Sharad Jhaveri.

Critical Notes On;

Programme of the Communist party of India, (Left)
Adopted at Calcutta. Dt. 31st. November 7, 1964.

General Comments;

- (a) no logical structure; more descriptive than theoretical;
- (b) minimum programme provided; no provision for transitional demands;
- (c) Though it aims eventually at creation of a Socialist Society in India and therefore rightly emphasises the need for a socialist revolution in India, it postpones this task of consummating a socialist revolution to an indefinite future; meanwhile it proposes to strive for the creation of "people's democracy" headed by the working class.
- (d) It also divides the Indian bourgeoisie into big monopoly and foreign-monopoly oriented bourgeoisie and small bourgeoisie. But nowhere defines big bourgeoisie.

Detailed analysis:-

- (a) Its analysis of 1947. Dead is evasive and perfunctory. While it states the fact that national liberation movement was led by bourgeoisie, it silently passes over the Stalinist contribution to this state of affairs.
- (b) This programme recognises that the basic tasks of a bourgeoisie-democratic revolution

remain unfulfilled. But it does not define these tasks nor the motive forces of a bourgeois-democratic revolution in a backward country like India in precise Leninist terms.
(S.W.P. does it.)

- (c) In para(10) certain peculiar features of a backward bourgeoisie highlighted by Lenin in his Two Tactics and Trotsky in his celebrated theory of PIR. Such as its timidity, its compromising character, etc.; are emphasized. Here major tenet of Lenin and Trotsky is admitted but only as a vague generalization without any attempt having been made to draw theoretical description of the various social classes of the Indian Revolution is provided in this programme. S.W.P. does it.
- (e) The programme considers only the big monopoly section of the indigenous bourgeoisie as opposed to the democratic anti-imperialist tasks of the Indian Revolution.
- (f) Acc. to the programme "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".

Comments:-

- (a) Present state organ of 2 classes;
(b) Led by only big bourgeoisie; not the bourgeoisie as whole;
(c) And only big bourgeoisie collaborating with foreign finance capital.
(d) Analysis of Agrarian question:-
(a) Only Descriptive; and Factual;
(b) Not theoretical;
(c) Historical background not provided;
(d) Modest capitalist growth and adequately recognised;
(h) While the programme declares as its ultimate aim the creation of communist society for the present it postpones this task for the following reasons:-
(1) The degree of economic development;
(2) The degree of the political-ideological maturity of the working class and its org; out and out menshevik programme; both regarded mechanically materialistically. See Trotsky's criticism of Menshevik separation of the 2 stages of the Revolution.
- (g) Programme of the people's democratic Government;
(1) does not strike of blow at the roots of extant constitutional and state structure based on existing capitalist property relations;
(2) assumes naively that bourgeoisie will allow such a Govt; to implement this programme peacefully and democratically;
(3) aims at inculcating patriotism(1) in the army;
- (h) (viii) Building of people's democratic front;
(a) the term people is a non-class term; hence vague;
(b) based on the coalition of all genuine anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces headed by the working class;
(c) at present, extant Govt; to be replaced by a state of people's democracy led by the working class; not the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by poor and landless peasantry;
- (a) at present, nature of the revolution is anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and democratic, whose tasks:-
(1) Solution of the Agrarian question;
(2) Sweeping Reforms of the social system;
(3) Total eradication and summary expulsion of the foreign monopoly capital;
(4) Breathing the power of monopoly capital;

Which require; Opposition against big bourgeoisie only.

- (b) Leadership of this democratic front is to remain with the working class.
(c) The core and basis of the people's democratic front is the firm alliance of the working class and the peasantry. (entire C class).
Participation; by the different sections of the bourgeoisie is envisaged.
(d) I03; The rich peasants, by and large can also, be brought into the democratic front and retained as allies in the people's democratic revolution;
Why? Because heavy taxation; high prices for industrial goods; and inflation; constantly harass them.

Then urban and other middle classes:-

Broader sections of the national bourgeoisie having no links or no durable links with foreign monopolists. But its dual nature is emphasized. Every effort must be made to win them to the democratic front and by a diligent and concrete study of their problems no opportunity should be lost by the working class to render them support in all their struggles against both the Indian monopolists and foreign imperialist competitors.

The party keeps before itself the task of uniting with all the patriotic forces of the nation.

It strives to achieve the establishment of people's democracy and socialist transformation through peaceful means.

R.S.P.'s Criticism Of Both Right & Left C.P.I.

- (1) Neither the "rights" nor the "lefts" regard Socialism or a Socialist Revolution as the immediate historical or political objective before the Indian working class;
- (2) Both think that the main issue before the Indian people is first to complete the unfinished tasks of the bourgeoisie democratic or national democratic revolution. The question of moving forward to socialism or to take in hand the tasks of a socialist revolution cannot arise, in their view, before the tasks of the national democratic revolution in India are completed.
- (3) In their view, it will not be possible to move to the next higher stage i.e. to the stage of Socialist revolution, without completing the historic tasks of preceding stage.

Upon this point there is no difference between the two.

The Basic Difference Between The Two Is Not So Wide.

(4) For Left C.P.I.

Socialism of course is the immediate goal. But it cannot be achieved immediately under ~~worse~~ conditions obtaining in India to-day.

While Congress or the big bourgeoisie who dominate it will not be allowed to participate in the people's democratic front, wherever the Congress adopts progressive pro-people policy, Left C.P.I. will give its unflinching support to such a policy.

The difference between the people's democratic front and the national democratic front of Right C.P.I.

In people's democratic front the alliance of the "patriotic" and "democratic" classes is under the exclusive leadership of the working class, in the case of national democratic front and the State, the leadership of the alliance is shared between the national bourgeoisie and the working class.

According to Rightists:-

No question of building a general united front with the Congress as a whole arises because it includes reactionary elements also. But the party would make "Ceaseless" efforts to force unity with the progressive forces within the Congress directly and indirectly also through common mass movements.

The Government shall be a class coalition and shall include national bourgeois elements along with the representatives of the workers, peasants and other patriotic classes. It will implement the programme of national democracy in non-capitalist way.

In this process, it is envisaged, the political balance will continually shift in favour of the working class and the worker-peasant alliance, paving the way for strengthening of the leadership of the working class in the state and thus creating conditions for transition to the stage of construction of Socialism.

The perspective of both of Left C.P. and Right C.P. is thus orientated towards a two stage or three stage social and political transformation of India.

(1) Democratic stage unfinished tasks of a bourgeois-democratic Revolution to be finished.

(2) Transitional ; People's democracy or national democracy.

Objectives does not go beyond the limits of bourgeois social relations.

It paves the way for but does not directly lead to socialism.

(3) Final consummation of the whole process ; Socialism or so/Rev.

Both the Right and Left C.P. believe in a peaceful transition in all these 3 Stages-

So-Democratic Communism indistinguishable from Social Democratic Revisionism:

24-7-1968.

(18)

(Letter from Com. Somenra kumar to Com. Rajnarain Arya.)

Samstipur.
21-5-77

Dear Com. Rajnarain,

Received your inland letter of 16-5-77. Hope you have received copies of our handbill on Election of the State Assembly.

You have done a right thing by reducing the no. of copies of MKK to 50 copies from this month. Now that MKK is no more a party organ, its sale cannot be pushed. I am keeping its sale limited only amongst the political elements with a clear understanding that it is not our party organ but the effort of an individual Trotskyist. In absence of any official organ some informations on Trotskyist movement can be availed from MKK.

I am unable to agree with the manner in which you suddenly transformed the MKK into your personal journal. Even on the analogy of ICP it was expected that the full text of the CL Election Manifesto would appear in MKK along with your own dissenting view. Instead of that you completely blacked it out. From its very inception Vol. I no. 2 (Feb. '74) the MKK appeared as an organ of CL. It would have better if you would have offered to hand over MKK to the CL, and started your personal journal under a new title. Your conduct in this respect only demonstrates that in practice you never treated MKK as a journal of CL rather you always treated it as your own journal.

On going through your earlier letters once again, I find that in the past, on several occasions, you had accused me and CS members of giving lift to Rewa Shankar and of trying to run CL with Rewa Shankar, though we never did that. It is so envious that as soon as you left CL, Rewa Shankar has come close to you, the difference between you two have disappeared or reduced and both of you are working together. Is there any identity in the character and method of working of yours and Rewa Shankar that has ultimately brought you together? I think the identity lies in extreme individualism and hostility towards disciplined working under our organisation.

You can rest assured of remittance from me for 50 copies of each issue of MKK, so long as the official Hindi organ of CL does not appear. As regards booklets and even bringing new ones to propagate Trotskyism or to expose the class collaborationist policies of Stalinists or for educating the working class, you can surely expect my full cooperation.

Now on your proposal for unity with the ISP led by Bholasingh and Dr. Halim, must give you some informations on Bholasingh and his group (known at that time as S.S.P. Bihar) fully supported the emergency measures, praised Indira Gandhi and functioned as satellite of the Congress. Since then his group has lost its image. During the J.P. movement also this group remained allied with Congress and opposed to the J.P. movement. It had neither a working class base nor youth following anywhere in Bihar. The trend of the last Lok Sabha election and the anti-congress mood of the masses compelled Bholasingh to adopt the stance of building a Socialist party opposed to Congress and Janta. Bholasingh's carrier started as a rabid Lohiaite vehemently opposed to the concept of class struggle. His newly grouping is facing the electorate not on the basis of principles of class struggle but CASTE STRUGGLE. I have no information about the antecedent and role of the counter part of this group in U.P. led by Dr. Haleem. I presume both the groups must be of the same feather who have flocked together just to survive in the electoral battle. I have no reason to think that this group can in any way be termed as an alternative socialist grouping. By the way have you got a copy of the programme and policy statement of this party? To me this group is nothing but another reformist and opportunist group fishing in the current parliamentary turmoil. I don't think that any revolutionary Marxist can achieve anything by joining such a reformist, opportunist parliamentary party. Of course you can find some additional readers and circulation of MKK in this group.

You or anybody is force to join this S.P. or any other opportunist group but why should you drag the name of C.L. (U.P.). Rewa Shankar always dragged the name of C.L. even after his dissociation from C.L. and his expulsion by you. Must you also follow the same method to reestablish once again the identity in methods of yours & Rewa's.

With the end of emergency, I became too busy due to spurt in Trade Union activities. The jute mill union which was virtually smashed has become reviewed and has become very strong union. We have been able to capture a paper mill union run by the CPI. In another sugar mill we have succeeded in forming a union and to apply for its Registration. The patient working during the entire emergency is now showing the results. I am still busy consolidating them and in keeping them immune from pressure of Janta wave.

— END —

(19)

As a result, these days I find very little time for devoting to the other essential job like political reading and writing long letters to Comrades. It is for this reason that your earlier letters have gone unresponded.

In one of your earlier letters, you had proposed to bring out the English Journal. I would not be of any help to you in this project of yours. If the official English Journal of C.L. comes out, then my entire devotion must go for that journal.

By the way, CPI Hindi daily 'JANSHAKTI' reports that in U.P., Dr. Halcom's Socialist party, the dissident CFD and the RSP have formed an United Front and fielded 281 Candidates. According to this report, this front is also harping on the hackneyed phrases - "Progressive" and "Democratic" forces.

With greetings.

Yours Comradely,
S. Kumar.

Dear Com. Magan,

I can not write to you for various reasons; the main reason being mentioned in this letter. I suggest third or fourth week of June, '77 for CC meeting or immediately after the polls are over i.e. after the 15 June, '77. Hope by now, you might have obtained opinion from other comrades as well on the date of CC meeting. Try your best to secure the presence of Rashid and Kerala comrades. I think June being the Summer Vacation period com. U.N. Roy also will be able to attend.

Have you heard from Com. Mahendrasingh? Rajnarain says that com. Mahendra supports Com. Rajnarain's stand.

With greetings.

Yours Comradely,
S. Kumar.

N.B. Hope you have received the Book-Post packet containing a few handbills that we have issued on the State Assembly Elections.

(Report from Kerala Unit on Election and other activities).
To, C.S.,

In Kerala we tried our level best to give publicity about our election fight in Baroda. Some local Malayalam papers published it. Our election strategy in the state was 1) Support and vote C.P.(M) Candidates. Some of our comrades including myself actively campaigned for C.P.(M) candidates, we supported P.D.F. (K.P.R.) group candidates also. Between C.P.(M) and K.P.R. group our preference was K.P.R. group. 2) We have openly stated that we won't vote for ruling front, Janata party, ~~dissident~~ Muslim League. Where there is no C.P.(M) or K.P.R. group candidates we did not vote or campaigned for anybody. We got maximum publicity in Vernacular papers.

After election our State Committee met. We have chalked out a plan to build and activate our party. Decided to publish a Malayalam pamphlet entitled "A Marxist Critique of C.P.(M)". For this SC decided to request CS to grant some financial help.

We are co-operating with PDF (KPR) in the Journal "THIZILAI VARGAM" (working Class). That co-operation can be described as unity and struggle. Open ideological struggle in the pages of T.U.. Our Comrades are very active in the Civil Liberties Union and Social Science Society.

Through these organizations we are trying to get new contact. One of our SC member has been elected as the President of C.P.(M) led N.G.O. Union (Organization of State Govt. Employees)

We have decided to start News Bulletin in Malayalam (Most of our comrades don't know English). First issue will come before May day.

We want six copies of "IMPRECOR". Also we want copies of "MILITANT", D.A., S.A., Labour Challenge, Red Weekly, International etc. This will help our work in the "THOZHILALI VARGAM".

We are trying to form a Committee to defend Soviet dissidents. Most probably veteran Communist Leader KPR Gopalan will be the Chairman of this Committee.

Lal Salaams

M. Rashid.
10-4-77

P.S. We want one copy of the BOW/C SAMIZDAT.

Hope you will arrange some money for our booklet (Critique of C.P.(M)).
