

**MARXIST VIEW OF THE INDIAN STATE:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAMMES OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTIES**

Dissertation submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the award of the Degree of
MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

THANGAVELU S. P.

CENTRE FOR POLITICAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI-110067, INDIA

1987

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
CENTRE FOR POLITICAL STUDIES

Telegram : JAYEN

Telephones : 6522

6614

6613

New Delhi-110 06

DECLARATION

This is to certify that this dissertation entitled "MARXIST VIEW OF THE INDIAN STATE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAMMES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES", submitted by Mr. THANGAVELU S.P. in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY, has not been previously submitted for any degree of this or any other University. This is his own work.

We recommend this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.


(Dr. S. KAVIRAJ)
Supervisor


(Prof. S.N. JHA)
Chairperson

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Pages</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II THE COMMON PROGRAMMATIC HISTORY: COMMUNIST VIEW OF THE STATE BEFORE THE SPLIT	15
CHAPTER III CPI PROGRAMME AFTER THE SPLIT	46
CHAPTER IV CPI(M) VIEW OF THE INDIAN STATE	64
CHAPTER V CPI(ML) VIEW OF THE INDIAN STATE	104
CHAPTER VI CONCLUSION	131
BIBLIOGRAPHY	138

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to my Supervisor Dr. Sudipto Kaviraj, whose guidance and encouragement have made this research possible. I am also greatly indebted to Rajiv Bhargava of the Centre for Political Studies, for his valuable suggestions. I am very much obliged to Sugathan, Arun, Bishnu and Rajan Kanungo who have helped me a lot to have access to the necessary resource material.

My sincere thanks goes to ICSSR, for offering me a fellowship. To all my friends who have encouraged me a lot at various stages of my research I owe much. I would like to thank to the staff of JNU and Nehru Memorial Museum libraries for their kind cooperation. Last but not least I thank to Om Prakash for his neat and timely typing.



(THANGAVELU S.P.)

New Delhi.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

To understand the perceptions of the Marxists on the Indian state, one has to proceed from the general nature of the state. Why do we study the general nature of the state? What is the general nature of the state? Regarding this we get different answers from different quarters. The difference was due to their relation to and position in the production process. As the answers regarding the general nature of the state are varied they can be broadly classified into two—Liberal and Marxian. Though there is much variance among the liberals regarding the general nature of the state, at one point they all agree - that the state is a man made one and it is mediating between the various groups conflicting with one another. and it is a necessary evil.

Marx's perception was quite contrary to the liberals.

MARX ON THE GENERAL NATURE OF STATE:

According to Marx, the material conditions of the society are the basis of the state and social consciousness. It is the political expression of the class structure in production and it does not represent the common good. The state in the bourgeoisie society is the oppressive

arm of the bourgeoisie. It is in this sense historical.¹

Later, Friedrich Engels developed his and Marx's fundamental concept of the relation between the material conditions of society, its social structure and the state in his classical work, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State". According to him

The State arose from the need to keep class antagonism in check but also arose in the thick fight between the classes, it is normally the State of the most powerful economically ruling class, which by it means became also the politically ruling class and so acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class... the modern representative state is the instrument for exploiting wage labour by capital.²

After the death of Marx and Engles many Marxists had started pondering over this question. One of them was Lenin who faced this question at a practical level before the ^{Russian} revolution. To this 'professional revolutionary,' the following became important: How does the state maintain itself as a dominant authority; How

1. Martin Carnoy, State and Political Theory, New Jersey: Princeton University, 1984, pp.46-47.

2. Fredrick Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, New York: International Publishers, 1968, pp.155-57.

the State can be destroyed to establish socialism. This search led him to the following answers: The State exists to reconcile the contradictions but that can't be reconciled. The chief source of strength was *in* the public force and the state should be destroyed to establish socialism. In the place of bourgeoisie State, the proletarian dictatorship would be established to meet the challenges of the bourgeoisie.³

For more than two decades the Leninist view of the state as an oppressive instrument of the bourgeoisie prevailed in the Communist movement in Europe and elsewhere. Gramsci, an Italian Marxist who was inspired by Lenin, started reassessing the whole positions of Marx, Engles and Lenin regarding the state, in the wake of failure met by the revolt against the ^{Italian} Fascist regime. He felt that the state maintains its authority not just by material force alone but by ideological apparatus also. Establishing working class hegemony is a prerequisite to overthrow the bourgeoisie state and to capture political power.⁴ This position does

3. V.I. Lenin, State and Revolution, Moscow: Progress, 1977.

4. Martin Carney, op. cit., pp.57-59.

not mean that he had given more emphasis to the super-structure than to the material base. Rather, he shed more light on the ideological roots of the state lying behind the various institutions of society like family and others that appear at the outset as something not related to the state. His contributions are of far reaching strategic and tactical implications.

Since the state is historical, Marx classified states on the basis of mode of production. He wrote on despotic state, feudal state and capitalist state. Regarding the capitalist state he has given the following theses. First, "the modern representative state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie."⁵ Secondly, "the State is the instrument of ruling class"⁶ and thirdly, the state is autonomous from ruling class. These formulations were used by him to explain various forms of the state.

After the II World War, the States which had taken part in the war and their economies became

5. Marx & Engels, The manifesto of Communist Party, Moscow: Progress Publisher, 1975, p.44.

6. R. Miliband, "Marx in the State", in Socialist Register, ed., Ralph Miliband and John Saville, London: Merlin Press, 1965, p.293.

weak. To emerge from the ruins, the capitalist system adopted new methods. As a result the dynamics of the state have undergone many changes. For example, in the economic sphere the naked exploitation was replaced by a sophisticated form. Due to the changes in the economy the state adopted welfare activities to maintain its equilibrium. In this context, the old questions - How does the capitalist state maintain itself and what is the nature of the relation between the State and ruling class under the new condition - demanded new answers.

The thesis given by Marx regarding the nature of the relation between the State and ruling class had continued to generate a lot of controversy. Perceptive modern writers like Miliband and Poulantzas came out with 'instrumentalist' and 'structuralist' interpretations of the Marxist theory of the State.

The implication of the instrumentalist thesis is that the state is subservient to the ruling class. Miliband in his, 'The State in a Capitalist Society', argued that the capitalists are taking part in the deliberations of the state, so that the state favours the capitalists. Since the carriers of structures are primary, there are differences in its actual policy-functioning while the same state system is being operated

by different kinds of people say for example the social democrats, fascists, conservatives.⁷

The second position of Marx became important in the structuralist analysis. To them, state is not a subject or object. It is a relation. The state is a factor of cohesion.⁸ The structuralists challenge the instrumentalist position. They say that the characterisation of the state as a passive instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie ~~can~~ not help to explain the dynamism of the state. According to them the modern state apparatus absorbs the people from various classes. So how one can say that it favours the capitalists though it had people from all the classes.⁹ The state is also a terrain of the class struggle, and the State has relative autonomy from the ruling class.¹⁰

-
7. R. Miliband, "The Problem of Capitalist State-Reply to Poulantzas", in Ideology in Social Sciences, ed., Rabin Blackburn, Fontana, 1972, p.259.
 8. N. Poulantzas, "The Capitalist State: A Reply to Miliband and Laclau", New Left Review No.59, Dec.-Jan., p.64.
 9. N. Poulantzas, "The problem of Capitalist State", Ideology in Social Sciences, ed., Rabin Blackburn, London: Fontana, 1972.
 10. Ibid., p.72.

The relative autonomy formulation has been questioned from various quarters. According to Fred Block

the relative autonomy formulation of Poulantzas is a cosmetic modification of Marxism's tendency to reduce state power to class power. The reduction does not occur in the relative autonomy formulation as quickly as it does in orthodox Marxist formulation that the Centre of the state as executive committee of ruling class. But the reduction occurs because state power is still conceived as entirely a product of class relation. In Poulantzas phrase the state is the condensation of class relations. A condensation cannot exercise power.¹¹

In the view of Miliband 'Relative autonomy' has not been the characteristic of all forms of the capitalist states. In France the Bonapartist state came into existence because none of the social classes at the time had the ability to control the state. This form came into existence under the above-said specific situation.¹²

Skocpol's criticism to this formulation is that the relative autonomy formulation does not consider the State's or the State managers' interest,

11. Fred Block, "Beyond Relative Autonomy: State Managers as Historical Subjects" in Socialist Register, London: Merlin Press, 1980, p.229.

12. R. Miliband, op. cit., p.260.

which may be contradictory to all the classes in society.¹³

The capital logic or the derivationist school theorists developed an alternative approach to study the nature of the State. Offe tried to understand the state through the behaviour of the inner structure of the state itself. He says that the State has selective mechanisms through which it acts as a class state. In the behaviour of the state one can see three different kinds of selection, viz., positive selection, negative selection and neutral selection. Through positive selections it avoids the policies which create damages to the system. With the help of neutral selection it maintains the appearance that the state is a neutral one. The class nature of the State can be better understood only in the times of crisis. The State would not go for a solution but it often postpones the crisis.¹⁴

These theories examined the various aspects of the capitalist states of western origin. Even though

13. R. Miliband, "State power and class Interests", New Left Review No.138, March-April 1983, p.60.

14. David A. Gold, Clarence Y.H. Lo and Eric Olin Wright, "Recent Developments in Marxist Theories of the Capitalist State", Part 2 Monthly Review, New York, November 1975, pp.37-41.

the state is a universal phenomenon it is debatable, how far these theories can be helpful to explain the state in Third World.¹⁵ Though the Third World States have some similar features with the advanced capitalist States, they developed in a different kind of situation. They have a separate history and a different kind of development. Before the Second World War the Third World States were Colonial States, ruled by an alien power. After the Second World War the State power is changed from the colonial masters to native people of the respective countries. So any attempt to grasp the Third World State has to begin with the nature of colonial state and consequently it has to move to an analysis of the post colonial period.

Marx wrote on the colonial states.¹⁶ He took the colonial states in Ireland and India for examination.

-
15. Here the word 'Third World' is used to indicate the States which were newly liberated from the imperialist rule.
16. There is^a controversy among the scholars regarding the views of Marx on colony. Scholars Kurian, Bhatti held an opinion that in the writings of Marx there is a theory on the colonial economy. But Sudipto Kaviraj and others opined that Marx writings do not have any theoretical statement because all the writings of Marx are aimed to explain capitalism^{and} not of colonial economy. For a detail report on this issue, see Economic & Political Weekly, Bombay, 1980 (Dec.10), pp.2102-08.

Marx took Indian economy as a case of Asiatic mode of production. In his opinion this mode of production has a stagnant character that kept the flourishing of capitalism in this society at bay for a longer period. Marx wrote that the colonial state played a dual role.¹⁷ He believed that, on the one hand it destroyed the stagnant economy and on the other it laid the foundation of capitalist economy. He considered the role of colonial state as positive in India. Whereas in Ireland where capitalism developed already, it exploited the economy and arrested further growth. The question of stagnancy or dynamism of the original Indian economy has become one of controversy; and this debate in which many historians are taking part would be brought in the coming chapters while analysing the views of different parties.

Contrary to Marx's was Lenin's opinion. In his various works, he considered the colonial state as a parasite.¹⁸ Since it was parasitic in nature, he

17. Martin Corney, op. cit., p.174.

18. Lenin's general views on colonialism can be found in his various works like 'Imperialism, the last stage of capitalism', 'The colonial and national thesis', presented at 2nd Congress of Comintern at Moscow in 1920.

felt that the production relations remained pre-capitalistic, and the countries can develop in a non-capitalist way after overthrowing the colonial state. This notion of Lenin on the role of colonial state remained for a long time in Comintern, even after his demise.

M.N. Roy found himself fully agreeing with Marx, i.e., that the colonial state has newly developed capitalism. But he qualified his position by stating that the colonial state developed capitalism only to some extent, not fully.

Mao joined the discussion on the colonial states in the east. His views were very advanced. He characterized the Chinese society as semi-feudal and semi-colonial society. The colonial state, to him, was the political committee of the metropolitan bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie of the country were agents of imperialism who did not represent the interests of the classes, except theirs, within the country.¹⁹ Since the society was semi-feudal and semi-colonial, the development of working class was minimal and the bourgeoisie was also comprador. So, he advocated the new democratic revolution,

19. Martin Corney, op. cit., p.179.

an innovation done by Mao, taking peasantry as the main force of revolution even while working class is the leading force.

THE GENERAL ANALYSIS OF POST-COLONIAL STATE

After the IInd World War, the imperialist states became weak. Freedom struggles in the colonies reached their peaks. These developments as a whole led the colonial masters to leave the country in the hands of the bourgeoisie of the respective countries. This changed situation necessitated a new look into the nature of the post-colonial state. The world model theories came with their new analysis. They explained the Third World State in the context of world capitalism. A.G. Frank, Immanuel Wallerstein are the advocates of this approach. The point of departure of this analysis is the assumption that the whole world is under capitalist mode of production. Within this framework they tried to analyse the relation between the capitalist states and the Third World states.

But the problem with this kind of analysis is that they deny "the existence of the crucial local specificities ignore the role of the State and class

struggle."²⁰

As we have seen, most of the studies on the State from Western origin are basically theoretical, aimed to formulate broad generalizations. The questions posed by them are also different and are determined by the development and their requirements. For instance, their concern has been more about how the capitalist state remains or acts as capitalist state. Does it act as a class state because of class or of economy. Secondly they tried to find answers for the nature of the state power itself. Does the state has any power of its own? or Does it reflect only the class power?

Here comes the importance of the studies done by the Indian Marxists. First of all, they are specific. Though many Marxist scholars worked on this area, the communist parties in India have given considerable attention to understand the nature of Indian state. Among the communist parties, the views of CPI, CPI (M) and CPI (ML) are widely understood,

20. Patankar B. & Omvedt G., "The bourgeoisie State in Post colonial Social Formations", Economic and Political Weekly, Bombay, December 1977, p.2165.

and is being practised in the political arena.

In this study an attempt is made to examine very generally some of their perceptions on political economy of the country, the nature of the bourgeoisie in the structure and political tendencies, the class character of the state, strategies and tactics. All these aspects are examined since the inception of the parties to the present.

In the second chapter, while studying the Communist Party of India (CPI)'s characterization, importance is given to the post-independence period upto the party split in 1964. In the third chapter, the CPI's perception of the Indian state from 1964 to the present period, is examined. The fourth chapter examines Communist Party of India (Marxist)'s understanding of the Indian state. While examining, attention is paid to understand how this characterization evolved over the period, especially after the split of 1964, and how far it is different from that of CPI. In the fifth chapter the views of Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) on the nature of Indian state are analysed. After 1972 this party got divided into many splinter groups. As it is not possible to study all the groups within the time limit, one each, from those that still stick to the same old formulations of undivided CPI (ML) as well as from those that departed basically are taken for sample analysis.

CHAPTER II

THE COMMON PROGRAMMATIC HISTORY: COMMUNIST VIEW OF THE STATE BEFORE THE SPLIT

To understand the present characterization of the Indian state by the CPI, one has to proceed from its past characterizations of it. In the pre-independence period, we find two different stages as well as kinds of analyses being used by CPI in characterizing the state: one from 1920 to 1939, and the other from 1939 to 1942. In the latter period, contrary to the former one, we find that the international factors gain importance. In the post '47 period, upto 1951 one can see an attempt for a new characterization. Since 1951 to the first split in the party, CPI underwent an evolutionary transformation giving shape to a clear-cut line that dominated '64 onwards.

During pre-colonial times, the Indian sub-continent had been under the rule of various kings. It was constituted of societies based on agriculture, with self sufficient villages as their innumerable units, Agriculturists, village artisans and village officials were the major three social classes.¹

1. . Shankar Ghose, Socialism and Communism in India, Calcutta: Allied Publishers, 1971, p.96.

There was no private property on land.² Activities like that of promoting agricultural production were taken up by the king.

This pre-colonial society was transformed into a colonial one with the establishment of a colonial state in India by the British bourgeoisie who came here in search of market. Britishers introduced a new land tenure system. In addition to the changes in the land relations that it brought about, the introduction of the transport and modern communication system helped it in completely destroying the isolation of the Indian villages. The immense tension that these changes had brought in and the multilevel oppression that the various classes in India were facing, worked as the social basis of the anti-colonial movements that sprang up. Some of the socially conscious intellectuals who wanted to overthrow the alien and oppressive colonial state founded CPI in 1920 at Tashkent.³

2. Dutt and Sundaram, Indian Economy, New Delhi: Chand & Co., 1978, p.19.

3. Communist Party Publication, The Guidelines of the History of the Communist Party of India, New Delhi, 1974, p.6. M.N. Roy, Abani Mukherji, Rosa Eiling, T. Mohammad Ali, Mohammad Shafiq and M.B.P.T. Acharya together formed CPI. There is a dispute over the origin of the year of CPI. The present CPI holds the view that the CPI formed by M.N. Roy and his friends in Taskent
contd...

ANALYSIS OF THE COLONIAL STATE

The first analysis of the colonial state came from M.N. Roy in the form of an alternative thesis to Lenin's, which he presented in the Second Congress of Comintern in 1920, even before the foundation of CPI. To Lenin, in the colonial countries, the stage of social development remained pre-capitalist. The resultant absence of a significant industrial working class and the anti-colonial nature of the national liberation movements made Lenin to ask the Communists in those countries to join and work inside the national movements.⁴

To M.N. Roy, things were quite opposite to Lenin's observation. He held that there had been capitalist development and the working class in India had reached a number of 5 million. He saw that the bourgeoisie leading the movement against the colonial state would compromise in course of the struggle. So he advocated a different strategy, i.e., the Communists themselves should organise the working class movement against the colonial regime.⁵

contd...

was essentially an organization but not a party. Secondly, the then CPI did not enjoy the support of IIInd International. For these reasons, the CPI can not be considered as party, and naturally its date of origin ceases to be a controversy.

4. G. Adhikari(ed.); Documents of the History of CPI, New Delhi: PPH, vol.I, p.159, 1971.
5. Ibid.

The question of the nature of the colonial state came to surface once more in the 6th Congress of Comintern (1923). In the discussion, Marxists from Russia, Britain and India took part. The Finnish Marxist Kuusinnen and others - were of the opinion that the colonial state had hampered the development of India and converted it into an agrarian appendage. While presenting his views, he substantiated his arguments by the following facts: (a) the introduction of finance capital to India, (b) the absence of long term plans of industrialisation. From these they concluded that the colonial state had hampered the development. Since there was no development, the bourgeoisie might tend to collaborate with imperialism. On the political realm, the Congress party might collaborate, since it was considered as a bourgeoisie party.⁶

The Leftists within the Congress had reformist tendencies. The workers' and peasants' party cannot

6. According to Bhagwan Josh the Indian National Congress was not a bourgeoisie movement, rather it was an all class movement. For a detailed discussion, see Bhagwan Josh, "Understanding Indian Communists: A Survey of Approaches to the Study of Communist Movement in India 1920-1947", paper presented at the annual session of the Indian History Congress at Kurukshetra, 28-30 December 1982, p.27.

be considered as an alternative to Communist party.

So the strategical line developed from this understanding was that the Communists should organize the movement independent of Congress party.⁷

M.N.Roy, on the other hand had expressed through his draft - different view regarding the role of the state. According to him the reduction of the finance capital export to India was followed by allowing the native capital to invest in industries. He called this process as "decolonization". This may further lead to a dominian status due to the development facilitated by the colonial state, the bourgeoisie may cooperate with imperialism. So the Communists should join the Congress to lead the movement so that they can avoid the collaboration tendencies of the bourgeoisie.⁸

The point raised by Russian Marxists regarding the role of the colonial state in development was challenged by the members of the Communist Party of Great Britain. They held that the colonial state showed interest in industrialization. The reduction of capital export to India, they clarified, happened

7. John P. Haitheox, Communism and Nationalism in India: M.N. Roy and Comintern Policy 1920-39, New Jersey: Princeton, 1971, p.125.

8. Ibid., p.112

due to the general depression and not of the absence of future plans as pointed out by Russian Marxists. The appointment of agricultural Commission (1916) and constructions of rail roads, according to CPGB members, were some of the indicators of the colonial state's interest in development. CPGB members used the term "decolonization" to mean industrialization.⁹

Some of the Indian delegates had a different understanding on the role of the colonial state in British India. Usmani, was of the opinion that the colonial state hampered the development. He concluded that the communists should fight against the colonial state independently. Whereas another delegate from India perceived that the colonial state made development to a certain extent. Even then, he said, there should not be any temporary alliance with Indian National Congress while opposing to the colonial state.¹⁰

Finally, the Congress arrived at the conclusion that there was no development by the colonial 'parasite state'. M.N. Roy's position was called 'an imperialist lie'. Regarding the relation between colonial state

9. Ibid., p.125.

10. Ibid., p.125.

and other classes, it said, that the Indian National Congress as a whole had gone to collaborate with British imperialism and the so-called left wing within Congress acquired right reformist tendencies. The workers and peasants' party would not play the role of the Communist party. So it was advised that the Communists organise movements under the leadership of working class. It further did not lay any restriction to have temporary alliance with INC to implement the 'anti-imperialist strategy'.

The strategy adopted in the Sixth Congress of the Comintern (1928) was put into practice which led to the isolation of the Communists.¹¹

As explained earlier, there was a conflict of opinions in the 1928 Congress on the nature of colonial development in India. The Russian Marxists and the Indian delegates opined that there was no significant capitalist development, while M.N. Roy and CPGB members felt there was. But all these answers were based on the perception of different facts. When the Russian Marxists perceived the lack of finance capital export to India as an indicator to their conclusion of no

11. Ibid., p.126.

development, M.N. Roy took the development of indigenous capitalism and CPGB members took the development of railways and road, communications as indicators to their conclusion of development. Having different opinions on the nature of development, the Russian Marxists and M.N. Roy came to the same conclusion on the character of the Indian bourgeoisie. But, as the opinions were based on different facts, different strategies came out.

The failure, i.e., the isolation, forced the communists to go for a new assessment of the colonial state and its relation to the different social classes. This time, the United Front strategy was taken from Dimitrov, without considering whether this thesis would be suitable to this country or not. Thus, India became again a social laboratory, now to experiment with Dimitrov's thesis. Dutt and Bradley (1935), on the basis of the Dimitrov thesis (United Front Strategy) gave a new analysis of the political situation in India. According to them, within the bourgeoisie, there were two wings called right and left. The right was reactionary. The left wing was considered revolutionary. The thesis called for an anti-imperialist united front with the left wing Congress members. To put this line



TH-2294

4/18/81
DISS



into practice all the communists took membership in Congress Socialist Party (CSP). They operated within the CSP with this notion which brought them into conflict with the members of CSP. Consequently they were expelled from the CSP.¹²

In 1939 September Hitler declared war on Britain. The colonial regime demanded support from INC. Gandhiji was ready to give unconditional support to the colonial regime. The Congress working Committee rejected the position of Gandhiji. They held that the entry of the colonial state into the war did not have any relevance to the independence of India. It declined to support the colonial regime and was hesitant to do struggle against it also.¹³

On the other hand the communists took a different stand. They said that the war was between "two imperialist rivals, the Anglo-French imperialists and the Hitler and others" and the aims of the war were "selfish imperialist aims". So "it was an imperialist war" and they further said that capitalism was in crisis. The Communist party wanted to utilise the war crisis to achieve national

12. . G. D. Overstreet and Marshall Windmillar, Communism in India, Bombay, Perennial Press, 1960, p.101.

13. Ibid., P.196.

freedom. So it called for anti-war strike in which 1,50,000 workers participated. The strike continued for forty days and was finally crushed by the colonial state.¹⁴

In 1942, Hitler invaded Russia. During this period England and Russia became allies. The response towards the new development was not unanimous. The Communists who remained underground published a statement. According to the statement the attitude towards the war and colonial state would remain same. It opined that by waging a war against imperialism people of India can help Soviet Union.¹⁵

A different analysis came from the members of the Communist party who were in prison. According to them the attack on Soviet Union by Hitler and the entry of Japan into the war had changed the character of war; the two events were decisive events in the war. The entry of Japan in the war brought the war to our door and the eastern-side of India could be captured by the Fascists; The victory of Soviet Union will

14. P.C. Joshi, Communist Reply to Congress Working Committee Charges, Peoples Publishing House Bombay, 1945, pp.35-39.

15. G.D. Overstreet, op. cit., p.196.

change the alignment of class forces at the global level, which would be helpful to attain independence; Now the question was Fascism or Freedom; Since the imperialists were cooperating with Soviet Union in opposing fascism which was the common enemy to all, the communists should support the British in the war efforts. They clearly said that the participation in the war would not automatically bring freedom to India.¹⁶

The first position taken by the leaders outside the jail was a balanced position which considered both the internal and the external situations. Whereas the leaders inside the jail gave more importance to the international alignment of class forces (rather state forces), failed to give attention to the alignment of class forces within the country, and at the same time were unaware of the strength of the working class too. This position of theirs invited much condemnation from all quarters and still they are being condemned for this mistake.¹⁷

16. P.C. Joshi, op. cit., pp.45-50.

17. In 1975, during emergency Communists were condemned as betrayers of freedom struggle. Arun Shorie expressed the same in 1984 in an article published in Illustrated Weekly of India. To refute this CPI and CPM published articles. For a detailed discussion, see P. Ramamoorti, The role of Communists in freedom
contd...

In 1947, the 'Mount Batten Award' was announced. Political power was transferred to the Indian National Congress leaders. What was the reaction of CPI to the new development? The official response to this development was very optimistic. A CC resolution described this as 'new opportunity' and the governments as 'strategic weapons'. The relations between imperialism and the bourgeoisie was taken as hostile. So CPI called for "broadest front against imperialism" and other forces allied with imperialism. But both Adhikari and Ranadive considered the independence as sham and a manoeuvre of imperialism.¹⁸ According to this view imperialism and Indian bourgeoisie were not hostile.

The dissident view became the official view of the party, soon after. The political thesis adopted in the 2nd Congress (1948) characterized the transfer of power as 'fake independence'. The new government, according to CPI, was a government of "national surrender"

contd...

struggle, Madras: Tamil Pustakalayam, 1985; Gautam Chattopadhyay, Arun Shourie's Slanders Rebutted History has Vindicated the Communists, New Delhi: C.P. Publications, 1984.

18. Mohan Ram, Indian Communism, Split within a split, Delhi: Vikas, 1969, p.19.

and of "collaboration". There came a new formulation regarding character of the government. It said that the imperialists, bourgeoisie and landlords together share power; of the three, bourgeoisie is the active partner. So, the stage of revolution would be socialist one - taking working class as the main force of revolution. Peasantry, middle peasants and agricultural workers would be allies. Industrial strike was considered the major weapons of revolution.¹⁹

A Titoite model of single stroke revolution, supposed to have combined the two stages, was simply mimicked without giving serious thought to it. This again proved a big failure.

Since the Titoite model of revolution (confined to Bombay and some cities) met with failure, the party accepted the agrarian revolution model advanced by Andhra Secretariat that was under the influence of Mao's thought. The basic assumption, accepting this model, was that the material conditions that prevailed in India (1950) had similarity with ^{the} pre-revolutionary China's conditions.

19. M.B. Rao (ed.), Documents of the History of CPI, vol.III, (1948-50), New Delhi: PPH, 1976, pp.77-81.

According to the new analysis India was a semi-colony; Political power had been jointly exercised by the rural and urban bourgeoisie; This implied that the small and middle bourgeoisie can be won as allies. The stage of the revolution was democratic revolution; This will be an agrarian revolution. The working class and the petty bourgeoisie will be allies of the revolution. Peasants will be the main force of the revolution. According to this plan, partisan struggle started in Telungana, which was crushed by the Indian army physically.²⁰

After shuttling between the two models, the CPI was forced to think in a new way to formulate a new programme suitable to Indian conditions. The 1951 programme of CPI came as a result of its attempt in this direction. This was the first full programme that the party formulated in its history of three decades since 1920. The new programme was actually a compromise between the rightists and leftists who advocated different paths for Indian revolution.

20. Victor M. Fie, Peaceful Transition to Communism in India, Delhi: Nachiketa Publication, 1963, p. 25.

The 1951 programme said that the country's economy was under the 'death grip' of the British imperialism, which hampered the development of the country. While commenting on the leadership of the state, it said that the government was a government of 'financiers', 'landlords' and 'princes' and it was installed with the consent of British imperialism. The foreign policy of the state was nothing but the foreign policy of imperialism and its constitution cannot be called as a democratic constitution. Regarding the strategy of resolution, the programme said, the stage of revolution would be people's democracy. A broad general United Front under the leadership of working class in alliance with entire peasantry will perform this task. All the forces against imperialism would be admitted in this front. The policy statement said the party would participate in the elections to attain this goal.²¹

Regarding the character of the government and the nature of economic development and the foreign policy, the party adopted positions similar to that of 2nd Congress of CPI. Regarding the strategy and

21. CPI Programme 1951, New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1956.

tactics it abandoned the Chinese model of revolution for India. Participation in the elections, became the tactics in the 51 programme. Following this the Party took part in the general elections (1952) and got a considerable number of seats in the parliament and in the state legislatures.

But the 1951 programme generated a lot of differences within the party. There emerged three kinds of views regarding the character of the society and state as well. These views can be broadly characterised as rightists, leftists and centrists. While the views as a whole remained distinctly different, there was similarity with one another in analysing some aspects of reality.

Regarding the character of the society, while the centrists held that the country was economically free, the Rightists held that there was more influence of U.K. on Indian economy. But the Leftists went to the extreme. They characterised it as a 'semi-colony and semi-feudal' country. On the nature of independence Leftists opined that India's freedom was political in nature with no genuine economic independence. But the centrists considered it as generally independent; they argued the freedom or independence of the country depended upon not only on economy alone but also its

power of resistance to war. Besides this, the emergence of Soviet Russia was one of the factors that contributed for the independence of the country.²²

On the class character of government, the Leftists and the Rightists had differences of opinion. According to them the big bourgeoisie and landlords exercised the state power. But to the Centrists, their alliance was only political. The Rightists believed that the state power was with the progressive sections of the bourgeoisie, interested in independent capitalist development. On the nature of the foreign policy the Rightists and the Centrists held that Indian foreign policy was dependent on imperialism. The Leftists held that it would be wrong to characterise the foreign policy as dependent but it played between the two countries, i.e., U.K. and U.S.A.²³

The Rightists were led by leaders like Ravi Narayana Reddy, Bhowani Sen, Somnath Lahiri, P.C. Joshi, P. Thrimali and O.P. Sangal. The Leftists were led by P. Sundaryya, M. Basuva Punniyah, Hanumantha Rao,

22. Bipan Chandra, "A Strategy in Crisis", The Indian Left, New Delhi: Vikas, pp.296-339.

23. Ibid.

H.S.S. Surjeet and Prasad Rao. The Centrists were represented by Ajoy Ghosh, E.M.S. Namboodiripad and P. Gupta.

The Post-colonial State was a new thing in history. So was the systematic attempt of CPI to characterise the state. Since the post colonial state's nature was so complex, it became the ground for various opinions. The three opinions that developed within CPI were based on three different scales used for the measurement of reality. But from 1953 onwards a new trend developed. The Rightists' view became increasingly dominant after 1953.

During the year 1953, the third Congress of CPI was held in Madurai. The Congress resolution said that significant changes had taken place in the foreign policy of India. It said that "the Indian government's denunciation of the atom bomb, its help in ending the hostilities in Korea, its condemnation of the tactics of Syngman Rhee, its opposition to the American move to transform Pakistan into a war base are helping the cause of peace"²⁴. Friendship and cultural relations developed recently with the USSR,

24. C.P. Publication, Political resolution of CPI 3rd Congress Madurai, 27 Dec. 1953 to 4 Jan. 1954, CPI Documents 195 -56, p.286.

PRC and other countries, strengthening world peace.

The resolution further said that though there were some progressive features in the state, still it was subject to the influence of imperialism and it won't hesitate to make concessions to American imperialists. It pointed out that the government of India's silence on the colonial war waged by British imperialism in Malaya and Africa, on the military dictatorship established in Guenana by the British in violation of the constitution and about the war against the Vietnamese people. Further it allowed gurkhas to recruit in British army for the suppression of valiant Malayan people.²⁵

In the realm of domestic policies, the resolution said that the government had not even shown enough courage to take measures to prevent foreign monopolists who have invested capital in India from engaging in unfair competition and killing Indian industries. It had permitted a free flow of foreign goods which are running many Indian industries, not only small scale and cottage industries - but also several large scale industries.²⁶

25. Ibid., p.290.

26. Ibid., p.294.

It further said "as a result of this unequal trade, denial of much needed capital goods, increasing ruination of national industries due to foreign competition and growing penetration of foreign capital in fields, where Indian industries already exist, contradictions between imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie are becoming sharper and even sections of the big bourgeoisie have begun raising voices on these issues."²⁷

So the CPI decided to support the state in the realm of foreign policy, provided, government of India take positive measures, and at the same time it will pressurise the state for a consistent foreign policy. This government while giving concessions to big business, it puts all its burden on the people of India. So this government should be replaced. To realise this, a coalition of different parties and groups with a common programme should be formed.²⁸

After the third Congress P. Ramamooorthi came out with a new assessment on Indian state. In his view, the nature of Indian foreign policy, the Panch-sheel, the friendly relations with China were progressive

27. Ibid., p.293.

28. Ibid., p.306.

features. These policies were against the main enemy i.e., the U.S. imperialism. He felt that these policies should be used for the creation of a National Platform for Peace and Freedom to oppose American imperialism, which was a threat to independence of India.²⁹

A section of U.P. provincial committee members welcomed the new proposal of Ramamoorthi, and they demanded that the party should develop a tactical line on the basis of Ramamoorthi's proposal. In their opinion, there was a contradiction between the Indian foreign policy and the domestic policies and the contradiction *can not* remain for a long time. So the progressive forces must utilise the progressive direction of the foreign policy to change the reactionary domestic policies; otherwise the opportunity will be used by some reactionary forces to reverse the foreign policy.³⁰

In response to this demand, the Central Committee of CPI said that there was no contradiction between the foreign and domestic policy of the Indian State. While admitting the progressive features of the foreign policy it said that these aspects were the outcome of

29. Victor M. Fic, op. cit., pp.97-98.

30. Ibid., p.99.

individual steps; It pointed out still the Indian state had relations with British imperialism, which was a reactionary feature. The Central Committee concluded that the foreign policy of India was as a whole reactionary. Within the country the domestic policies represented the interests of landlords and monopolists who were collaborating with British imperialism. So the Central Committee decided to fight against the government, which was collaborating with imperialism.³¹

How did the leaders arrive^{at} different conclusion by looking at same phenomenon? P. Ramamoorti considered, war was the important thing that posed threat to the development of the country. Since the U.S. imperialism had more military capability, he thought India's main enemy was U.S. imperialism. When India adopted Panch-sheel and developed relations with USSR and PRC, he called the foreign policy of India as progressive.

But the Central Committee's thinking was entirely different. The Central Committee gave more importance to the presence of British imperialism in the economy

31. Ibid., pp.100-01.

of India it was considered more harmful for the development of the country; Foreign policy was looked as secondary importance. Though they accepted the progressiveness of the foreign policy of India, it didn't bring any disturbance to the domestic policies. So the C.C. considered, there was no contradiction between the external and internal policies.

In short one can say the former perspective (Ramamoorthi) gave more emphasis to the external policies to determine the class character of the state in a particular time. But the latter believed that the domestic policy was important which determines the essence of the state; this latter understanding seems to be more logical.

The U.P. provincial committee's unique method to change the reactionary domestic policies of the government by supporting the progressive foreign policy, remained without testing since the C.C. had denied the existence of contradiction between foreign and domestic policies.

In 1956 (within three years) there was a break in the understanding of CPI on Indian state; Indian state became an independent state and its foreign policy also.³²

32. CPI Publication, Guidelines, p.100.

The fourth Congress resolution said that in the realm of the domestic policies some significant changes come about; The Indian bourgeoisie wanted to develop capitalism in India; The Five Year Plans, which had many progressive features inevitably would bring conflict with imperialism and feudalism; Not only with the above said two forces, it would create conflict among the ruling classes also; In the international sphere the state opposed the war drives of imperialism and generally opposed to colonialism. It developed relations with Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries. The Nehru-Chou declaration of 28th June 1954, the Panch-sheela, the Bandung Conference, the joint-statement issued by India and Russia - all this contributed for the world peace. These were the progressive steps in the economy as well as foreign policy.³³

The resolution further said that the state at the same time maintained its relationship and continued its membership of the Commonwealth. This very act showed that the influence of British imperialism in the foreign policy of India was still strong. Not

33. C.P. Publication, Political Resolution of 4th Congress, CPI Documents, 1951-56, p.419, New Delhi: PPH.

only this, the state gave more concessions to foreign capital. The failure to confiscate and nationalize the British capital and refusal to abolish completely the feudal relations were some of the reactionary aspects of the Indian state.³⁴

The CPI thought that the above mentioned progressive trends in the foreign policy and domestic policy were in a dominant position in the state policies as a whole. The reactionary policies were in a secondary position. So the Congress resolution characterised Indian state as independent and its foreign policy also.

The positions taken by CPI in the fourth Congress (1956) on the nature of government, foreign policy, independence, ruling class and society were radically different from its earlier positions taken in 1948 and after. The characterisation of Indian society as a 'semi-colony' (in 1948) disappeared in the 4th Congress resolutions. It held that India was an 'independent' country in 4th Congress. Contrary to this, was the position of 1948, which held India's independence as 'fake'. In 1951, the party considered the foreign policy of India as a policy of imperialism. This position

34. Ibid., pp.421-22.

had undergone a change in 1953, which held it was anti-imperialistic. In 1956 the party characterised the foreign policy of India as a 'policy of peace'. Regarding the character of government, the party said (1948) that the imperialists, landlords and capitalists together share the power; Among these classes the capitalist was the strong partner. In 1951 it further said that the imperialists remained in the back. Quite contrary to these, in 1956 the party said that the state was a landlord-capitalist-state, in which the big bourgeoisie had a leading position.

Though there is change in the characterization of the state, no change was made regarding the party's political strategies. The establishment of a government of people's democracy as a strategy remained without any change. The party continued its tactical line - the parliamentary form of struggle, which the party followed since 1951. Another reason for the continuation of parliamentary form of struggle by the CPI was the resolutions of the 20th Congress of CPSU, which was held in 1956. This Congress was attended by a delegation of CPI. In that Congress, the CPSU put forward some new ideas. The essence of the new ideas were, that socialism can be achieved through

peaceful means. This 'peaceful transition to socialism' formulation had far reaching implications in the analysis of state, character of the bourgeoisie, strategy and tactics, epoch, nature of imperialism and class alignment in the national and international level. While communist party of China was criticising this line, the CPI was formally endorsed it in the fourth Congress (Palghat, 1956). Another incident which strengthened this kind of thinking was the election victory that came in Kerala in 1957. The CPI saw this victory as the product of this new line.

The peaceful transition to socialism formulation found its way more significantly in the 5th Congress of CPI (1958). The Congress added a programmatic statement in the preamble of the Constitution of the party. It said that the party's long term and immediate aims would be to "strive to achieve full democracy and socialism by peaceful means."³⁵ Though the CPI followed 'peaceful means' after the Telengana struggle, it was for the first time (1958) it openly abandoned the armed struggle as a means to capture state power and switched over to peaceful means as the primary

35. Mohan Ram, op. cit., p.105.

means to attain state power. The programmatic statement added in the 5th Congress made an impact in the tactical line of CPI.

During this time (1956 to 1958) the political resolution pointed out the development of the influence of the 'anti-national forces on the state'. The anti-national forces were trying to establish links with imperialism. The resolution further said that the 'anti-national' forces were getting more support from within the Congress party and less from without the party. In that situation, the resolution said to fight against the anti-national forces, to support the forces (progressive) within the Congress party, to defend the foreign policy, five year plans and to ensure maximum benefit for the people. This was the tactical line during that period.³⁶

Here, though the strategical aim was to replace the Congress rule at the centre, the tactical line of CPI supported the 'progressive forces' in the state and started correcting the bourgeoisie towards progressive development in the pretext of countering the anti-national forces having links with imperialism.

36. C.P. Publication, Guidelines, op. cit., p.106.

After 1958, the CPI started countering the anti-national forces and correcting the progressive forces within the state. How far did the CPI succeed in its attempt?

According to the party's own assessment during the period between 5th and 6th Congress (1958 to 1961) the monopoly section's influence was up among the ruling classes. Due to this, India decided to borrow Rs.2,000 crores, a major share for the Third Plan (1961) and to import food grains that cost Rs.601 crores from U.S.A. Besides these, foreign private investment was allowed to some extent. A major share of private investment came from Britain. In 1958 the total book value of foreign private investment was Rs.570 crores; 228 collaborations with foreign monopolies were approved by Government of India. The recommendations of Agricultural Committee were turned down. The fair price for the peasants remained the same.³⁷

The resolution further said, though the amount of foreign capital had increased within the economy the nature of the relationship between foreign capital

37. C.P. Publication, National Democratic Front for National Democratic Tasks, New Delhi: Vijayavada, 7 to 16 April 1961, pp.4-11.

and Indian state did not turn into a relation of subordinate, to the imperialists.³⁸ At the same time the resolution said that one section within the ruling class has successfully resisted the pressure of imperialists and their friends who wanted India to abandon the policy of building heavy industries and to weaken the public sector.³⁹ The public sector was built with the help of the aid from Soviet Russia, which actually helped to resist the imperialist and their agencies.⁴⁰

As it pointed out, the right reactionary forces got more grip over the Congress party, therefore, the anti-people policies and threat to independent development had come. So the CPI called for a general United Front to defend the progressive foreign policy, public sector, secularism and struggle against the anti-people policies. This was the tactical line.⁴¹

The above-said tactical line which was called the 'Unity and Struggle Strategy' was challenged by

38. Ibid., p.8.

39. Ibid., p.7.

40. Ibid., pp.3-4.

41. C.P. Publication, Guidelines, p.122.

some other members within the CPI itself. Bhupesh Gupta, E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Ramamoorti suggested a battle against the Congress government as well as the rightist parties because it allowed the penetration of foreign capital into the Indian economy. P.C. Joshi suggested full-fledged co-operation with Congress to fight against the rightist forces.⁴²

Both the lines were rejected. The line based on the principle unity and struggle was finally accepted by the party. In the view of Bhupesh Gupta, E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Ramamoorti, the division within the Indian bourgeoisie had some common interests. This made them to treat Congress party as a whole. Therefore they declined to support Congress completely. On the other hand P.C. Joshi considered Congress party as progressive force. So he came out in favour of complete support. But the official view was that the Congress party consisted of two wings. One wing represented the anti-imperialist interests and other represented pro-imperialist interests.

The differences regarding the understanding of Indian state surfaced again during the time of 6th

42. Mohan Ram, op. cit., pp.111-12.

Congress. By this time the problem of the Indo-China war was added to it. During the war period, the attitude towards the war within the Communist Party of India was not unanimous. The official view of CPI supported the policies of the Congress party against China during the war period. The official view was based on nationalism. But those members of the party who didn't agree with this position took a stand on the basis of principle of proletariate internationalism.⁴³ The long term ideological fight found its expression during this period and there occurred a split within the party.

43. For a detailed analysis regarding the attitude of CPI towards war with China, see Sudipto Kaviraj, The Split in the Communist Movement, an unpublished Ph.D. thesis submitted in JNU, 1979.

CHAPTER III

CPI PROGRAMME AFTER THE SPLIT

After the split, the two groups holding right and left orientations came to dominate the two parties. In 1964 the 7th Congress of the CPI was held in Bombay. A new programme was adopted in the Congress. The new programme was nothing but the summary of the understanding of CPI on various questions that developed from 1956 after the 4th Congress itself.

According to the programme, "the Indian state is the organ of class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole which upholds, and develops capitalism and capitalist relations of production, distribution and exchange in the national economy of India."¹ Regarding the place of the bourgeoisie in the central government it said the big bourgeoisie "wields considerable influence".² While commenting on the relations between the bourgeoisie and landlords in the capitalist^{state} the Programme observed that the national bourgeoisie compromises

1. Documents of the Seventh Congress, New Delhi: C.P. Publication, Feb. 1965, p.26.

2. Ibid., p.24.

with the landlords, and admits them in the ministries and governmental composition especially at the state levels; This facilitates the landlords to hamper the adoption and implementation of laws and measures of land reforms and further enables them to secure concessions at the cost of the peasantry.³ Though the fourth Party Congress (1956) talked about the capitalist leadership in the state, it *did not* clarify its views regarding the position of landlords in that. The Programme of 1964 made it clear that the landlords, though they had a share in the state power at the state level, their relation with bourgeoisie has become a subordinate relation.

The CPI was fully convinced that the state in India was a capitalist State. As a result it started finding all the characteristics of a capitalist state in the Indian state. The Programme further said that though the state by its character remained as a bourgeois-democratic state, it considered this state as a historic advance over the imperialist rule on this country. The state provided a parliamentary

3. Ibid., p.25.

democracy and fundamental rights. The constitution and the rights could be used to defend the interests of the people; The parliamentary democracy enabled people to fight against the monopoly and landlord interests to some extent. The States in India have been enjoying only a limited power; all the power was concentrated in the centre itself. The judiciary helps only the ruling class & works against the exploited class. The influence of executive has been more than the other branches of government.⁴

Regarding the foreign policy there was no change in the programme. The programme said that "the foreign policy of India as a whole is a policy of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism which suits to the needs of the national bourgeoisie and reflects the sentiments of the people; Though it suffered from various influences for a long time now it has changed; The capitalist path followed by the National bourgeoisie cannot make the people free from the miseries and it cannot be capable of following socialist path." The programme finally concluded that the state in India should be replaced by a government of National

4. Ibid., pp.25-29.

Democratic Unity consisting of workers, peasants, intelligentsia and national bourgeoisie. The stage of revolution would be anti-imperialist and anti-feudal.⁵

While the tactical line remained the same in the programme, the strategy had changed. The earlier strategy 'people's Democracy' was withdrawn. In this new strategy, the leadership would be shared by the working class as well as the national bourgeoisie. In People's Democracy there was no place for the bourgeoisie in the leadership. In this strategy the bourgeoisie was expected to bring changes in the development. CPI will assist the bourgeoisie and it will correct the bourgeoisie if the bourgeoisie fails to do so.

With this understanding the CPI was moving ahead. According to political resolution of the 7th Congress held in 1964, there was capitalist-economic development. This development had taken a step ahead in the process of industrialization between the 6th Congress and 7th Congress period. During this period Nehru died (1964) and Shastri

5. Ibid., pp.30, 36.

assumed office. The monopoly groups were successful in pressurising the government in a retrograde direction. Due to the pressures the input of U.S. private capital increased; the input of socialist aid was reduced. The government gave more importance for the production in agriculture and consumer goods, production of capital goods were given less importance. During this period foreign policy of India slowly started moving toward west. This was new trend.⁶

In these circumstances, the CPI resolution said

In the complex situation, the CPI sets itself the immediate task of going all-out to build and consolidate the unity of all democratic and socialist forces for the defeat of right reaction for reversing the anti-people policies of the government and bring about a shift to the left. It appeals to all left parties, to all progressive forces and personalities including democratic Congressmen, to join together to discharge their sacred, national task at this movement of peril and promise.⁷

Between the 7th and 8th Congresses, in the view of the CPI, capitalist economic development entered into acute crisis. It was believed the

6. Ibid., pp.63-67

7. Ibid., pp.76-77

whole crisis was the result of the influence of the monopoly groups on the state and its policies. The above-said influence not only spoiled the internal economy, it made a negative impact on the activities of the state in the international arena.

Due to the crisis and the anti-people policies of the state, in the next elections, Congress Party lost power in many state assemblies. In nine states, non-Congress parties assumed office. Some of the parties, according to CPI had right reactionary character i.e. Swatantra and Jana Sangh.

Since the non-Congress parties were in state governments, the CPI decided to oppose the Congress policies independently. Earlier CPI used to join with 'anti-imperialist forces' within Congress to oppose the monopoly bourgeoisie. Since the strength of the non-Congress parties increased, the party stood alone in accomplishing the task.

The CPI called for a common democratic platform, as an alternative to Congress, to battle against the counter offensive of reactionary forces and the policies of Congress government. The CPI put forward a six point programme:

(a) defence of democracy,

- (b) fight to protect the non-Congress government,
- (c) defence of national sovereignty,
- (d) struggle for national integration,
- (e) struggle for land reforms and wages, and
- (f) non-alignment.

"To escape from the crisis the ruling class took some economic measures," the political resolution of 9th Congress said. They were the nationalization of banks, the rise in trade relations with socialist countries, the reduction of concessions to the foreign monopolies, refusal to the monopolists' request to implement wage freeze and linking production and salary.⁸

The very measures, and the following reasons contributed to the split within the Congress party.⁹ The other reasons besides the economic policies were the radicalization of the masses and their affiliation towards the left, the rise of other parties and capturing of power in the states, the

8. Documents of the Eighth Congress of the CPI,
New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1968, p.15.

9. Documents of the Nineth Congress of the CPI,
New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1972, pp.120-22.

development of the medium and small bourgeoisie and kulak economy, the conflict between rich peasant, small and medium bourgeoisie on the ^{one} side and big bourgeoisie feudal interests on the other side, the realization of the need of the broad democratic forces among the small, medium and rich peasants, and the popular hate against the pressure of America and its tactics.¹⁰ The political resolution said, that the split as a whole occurred within the Congress party due to the conflict of interests between the pro-imperialist and anti-imperialist forces. The pro-imperialist group departed from Congress and formed a syndicate group. The resolution said, due to the departure of the pro-monopolist forces from Congress, the non-monopoly and progressive forces became strong and more in number.¹¹

In this national context, the CPI called for a 'Left and Democratic Unity'. The political resolution said that this unity could not be possible without Congress. The concept of anti-Congressism would no longer be meaningful after the split. The right reactionary forces can not be defeated without the

10. Ibid., p.212.

11. Ibid., p.219.

Congress. The basic aim of left and democratic unity was to carry out mass movements to struggle against imperialism, monopoly capitalism and feudalism to bring structural changes within the economy. The unity will be based on common actions on issues like anti-imperialism, war and communalism.¹²

During the period between the 9th Congress and 10th Congress the attitude of CPI towards the Congress remained almost same.

In 1974 the Bihar movement led by J.P. Narayan developed as a response to the crisis that developed in the country. The movement further intensified due to the following events. First, the refusal of Indira Gandhi to resign from office, after the Allahabad High Court declared her election victory as invalid (12 June 1975). The second incident was the victory of the Janata Front in the Gujarat State Assembly elections.

The attitude of the CPI towards the J.P. Movement was hostile. It characterised the movement as 'fascist' movement. The Political Review Report said that "the reactionary, Hindu communal and fascist forces rallied under the banner of JP's so called total

12. Ibid.

revolution". It further alleged that the movement tried to utilise the mass discontent to capture political power.¹³

The perception on JP movement had a relation with the CPI's assessment of the Congress rule. Since CPI perceived the Congress rule as the rule of national bourgeoisie which^{was} committed to independent development, the very opposition of Congress rule by J.P. was perceived as an obstacle to the development. So its inception was hostile to that.

Following these incidents, the emergency was imposed throughout the country. The attitude of CPI towards the emergency did not remain the same over time. It changed in the post emergency period. The CPI thought that the emergency was imposed to meet the Bihar based 'total revolution'. Since the party considered J.P. movement as a reactionary movement it supported that, though the state machinery came to the streets and restricted all the activities of the people, like the British raj, throughout the country. It justified emergency by the action taken by the state against a few black marketeers, and so

13. Documents of the Eleventh Congress of the CPI,
C.P. Publication, New Delhi, July 1978, p.53.

called 20-point programme. The party justified emergency because the state speed up the bureaucracy, but it *did not* give any attention that the state became a class above all the classes in India.

Later it felt that emergency was wrong. The state implemented D.A. freeze and Compulsory Deposit Scheme, curbed the trade union activities. It implemented compulsory sterilization programme to meet the conditions of the I.M.F. It gave concessions to the monopolists.¹⁴

Though it had awareness regarding the issues during the later period of emergency, it *did not* come out with any statement because CPI was also one of the victims of emergency.

In the post emergency period, its attitude towards the emergency became different. The CPI felt the support given to emergency was "wrong". According to CPI emergency was brought by the ruling class to overcome the crisis that developed due to the adaptation of the capitalist path of development. The another aim of the state was to change the form of government from parliamentary form to presidential

14. Ibid., pp.54-59.

form of government. The third aim was to make Sanjay Gandhi as a leader, after Indira Gandhi.¹⁵ But this realization was too late.

The CPI learned some lessons from the emergency. It understood that all the parties that opposed Indira Gandhi were not fascist parties. It understood that the split in the Congress party was not a split between the pro-monopoly and anti-monopoly as it conceived earlier. It understood that the so called progressive policy can be safeguarded only if there is any progressive domestic policy.¹⁶

While it realised that the branding of opposition parties as "fascist" was wrong, it did not see any fascist element in the actions of the state during the emergency period. The new understanding it reached in this period made an impact in its tactical line.

In 1977 the Janata party came to power. According to CPI, the Janata party was nothing but a combine of contradictory forces i.e. forces of secularism, communalism, forces of anti-imperialism, neo-colonialism

15. Ibid., p.55.

16. Ibid., pp.64-69.

and forces participated in freedom struggle and those who *did not* take part in the struggle were present inside the party. The party did not have any uniform economic policy. According to the party, the economic crisis was due to industrialization and excessive mechanization. The budget introduced by Janata Party was the worst budget in the post independence period. It wanted to be away with the planned economic development, public sector, self-reliance and industrial and scientific development.¹⁷

The economic policies of Janata Government were based on the notions of Gandhian Socialism which aimed at political and economic decentralization. In the name of decentralization, the government wanted to hand over the public sector to the private monopolists. Ultimately the policies were in tune with the line advocated by the World Bank and the IMF for third world. To realise this goal (do away with public sector) it gave "priority" to small scale industries to undermine the importance of public sector. FERA was strictly enforced only in consumer goods whereas in capital goods areas, it was not strictly enforced.¹⁸

17. Ibid., pp.26-33.

18. Ibid., pp.25-28.

The resolution further said that the Janata party's policies as a whole represented the needs of a segment of the bourgeoisie which was the junior partner of the foreign monopolies. In rural sector the policies were aimed for the promotion of big landlords and rich peasants. The resolution concluded that the Janata party's policies were nothing but the policies of Indian big bourgeoisie and landlords which tried to resolve the crisis by transferring the burdens to common people. The economic policies as a whole consisted of the worst features of the Congress regime.¹⁹

During the Janata period, the political resolution said, there was a clear-cut move towards the west. This can be seen in the attempts of the Janata party to play down the U.S. moves in the Indian Ocean. Another important development was equaling the USSR, the camp of peace with the U.S., the camp of war. As a whole there was a pro-western tilt in the foreign policy.²⁰

19. Ibid., p.30.

20. Ibid., p.29.

The Janata government in the opinion of CPI, was comparatively worse than the Congress rule. The opinion of CPI was based on its assessment of the economic policies of Janata party. The CPI did not say anything or ~~did not~~ take into consideration the Janata government mode of political activity. In fact Janata government was less oppressive than the previous rule. The CPI, rightly saw the forces within the Janata ^{which} had contradictory character, ^{and} after assuming the office it acted according to the needs of the system.

After making a thorough assessment on the nature of the state, the political resolution said, that the whole state of economic crisis was due to the capitalist path chosen by the bourgeoisie and no bourgeoisie party in the country could bring the country out of the crisis and save people from the danger of authoritarianism and destruction of democratic rights. A Left and Democratic Alternative can alone save the country from the crisis. From this perspective the CPI developed a new tactical line i.e. to fight against the anti-national and anti-democratic policies of Janata as well as Congress party.²¹

21. Ibid., p.35.

The tactical line it developed was a radical break from the line it had followed for more than one decade. Here the tactical line was similar to CPI (M)'s, though the parties have different strategical aims. The various forces in Janata that joined together against the oppressive emergency in 1975, could not overcome their differences in due course, which divided the Janata into many parties. Indira Gandhi assumed office again in 1980. During her second coming, the country remained in crisis. To overcome the crisis the state adopted a new industrial policy (1980). The new industrial policy undermined the importance of the public sector. Import of capital was encouraged. I.M.F. and World Bank investment increased. The budget it introduced and the 6th draft plan were based on the new industrial policy. In this budget, burdens were transferred to the people. Hundred per cent export oriented industries were encouraged. The economic policy, as a whole, can be called as "retrograde" policies, the CPI said.²²

In the realm of international relations, the foreign policy remained a foreign policy of peace and non-alignment. The new government had improved

22. Documents of the Twelfth Congress of the CPI,
New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1982, pp.45-57.

the relations with Soviet Russia. It had emphasised the urgent need to resume detente, voiced its protest against arms race, supported PLO and other Asian liberation countries, defended the demand of new international economic order for the third world countries. The state took a realistic position on Afghanistan, Vietnam, Kampuchea and West Asia. These were the positive steps in foreign policy.²³ However another trend also came up within the ruling party. It advocated the "superpower" theory. This theory equated the Socialist Russia, with U.S.A., the camp of war. There were vacillations, inconsistency and weakness in the foreign policy due to its bourgeoisie character of the state.²⁴

In this situation, where the economic crisis had reached a point where it affected the political stability, the CPI said, that by replacing the bourgeoisie state with democratic national alternative was the only way to come out of the crisis.²⁵

To realise this goal, the CPI said that the party will fight all the anti-people and anti-national

23. Ibid., pp.52-53.

24. Ibid., p.53.

25. Ibid., p.72.

policies of the state. While fighting against the state policies, it will fight against the right reactionary parties also.²⁶

In 1984, Rajiv Gandhi, came to power after the assassination of Indira Gandhi. It is too early to assess the character and its various features of the state and government headed by Rajiv Gandhi. An attempt was made by the CPI, National Council. According to its perception "the basic features of the economic policy of the Rajiv Gandhi government are a progressive lifting of the controls and regulations on the economy, raising the asset limits of the monopoly houses, squeezing and downgrading the public sector, privatisation of industry and services, substantial reduction in direct taxes on corporate and personal income, concessions in indirect taxes on luxury consumer goods, liberalisation of imports of manufactures as well as capital goods relaxation of controls on the import of technology, more and more open door policy to transnational corporations."²⁷

26. Ibid., p.85.

27. Draft Review of National and International Developments since the Varanasi Party Congress, Adopted by the National Council meeting on 18th December, 1985, New Delhi: C.P. Publication, p.14.

The importance of public sector is being reduced. Investment during this period was 1,54,000 crores which was less than the private sector. Besides this private sector was allowed to enter into core sectors like steel, minerals and oil. Delicensing of 25 industries will do more harm to public sector.²⁸

The foreign policy of the new ^{government} strengthened the movement for peace by conducting international conferences. The state voice against the Apartheid in South Africa, and struggled for the New International Economic Order for third world countries.²⁹ In this situation, the party, would give its support to the progressive features of foreign policy of the state. While it wants to give support to the accords (Punjab & Assam) it wants to oppose all the anti-people policies. There is no major change in the tactical line of the CPI from the policy it followed in the period of Indira Gandhi's rule since 1980.

28. Ibid., p.15

29. Ibid., pp.7-10

CHAPTER IV

CPI (M) VIEW OF THE INDIAN STATE

The year 1964 saw another Communist party, Communist Party of India (Marxist) enter into the political arena to defend the interests of working and other oppressed classes. Diverse opinions and analysis were offered by scholars and historians as to the cause for the split (1964) in the communist movement and consequently the emergence of the new party.¹

-
1. (a) In the opinion of Bhabani Sen Gupta, the split occurred due to the personal differences among the leaders like caste and age. He gave secondary importance to the split in the international communist movement for a detail analysis: Bhabani Sen Gupta, Communism in Indian Politics, New York: Colombia Univ. Press, 1972, pp.66-100.
 - (b) In the analysis of Alan D. Jay and Henry W. Degenhardt, the split occurred due to the attitude of the CPI members over Congress party and On Sino-Indian conflict. Alan D. Jay and Henry W. Wegnhardt, Political Parties of the World, Delhi: Longman, 1980, p.156.
 - (c) According to Harikrishan Singh Surjeet and E.M.S. Namboodiripad, the split was the culmination of the long inner party struggle regarding the attitude over the ruling party. Harikrishan Singh Surjeet, "CPI-CP (M) differences" in People's Democracy, New Delhi, Oct. 20, 1985, p.2.
 - (d) Indradeep Sinha held that the CPI (M) does not have any consistent stand on the split. She further said, earlier CPI (M) leader E.M.S. Namboodiripad had stated that the split occurred
contd...

The split occurred due to the differences in comprehending the political reality that prevailed in India since the period of independence. Although the differences within the party came to surface in 1964, it developed on the basis of different views on earlier political history, which was, at least partly, responsible for the split. One of the major ideological difference in the undivided CPI was the understanding on the nature of the state in India.

What is the perception of the CPI (M) regarding the question? It is necessary to start with the views of CPI (M) on development since the pre-colonial period.

The economy in the pre-colonial period, according to CPI (M) can be characterised as "pre-capitalist economy"²

contd...

not because of ideological questions. Recently they changed their stand. Now they say it was due to ideology Indradeep Sinha, "Marxism-Leninism and CPI (M) Leaders" in CPI's Struggle for Communist Unity, New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1985, p.9.

(e) According to Sudipto Kaviraj, the split was due to the ideological differences in understanding the political reality but it found expression during the time of Indo-China war 1962 and after. For a detailed discussion regarding the split, see Sudipto Kaviraj, The Split in the Communist Movement, unpublished Ph.D. thesis submitted to JNU (1979), pp.562-79.

2. CPI (M) Publication, Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), New Delhi, 1979, p.32.

This statement does not make it clear what sort of economy it was exactly; whether it was feudal or natural economy. After the establishment of colonial state in India, the state "superimposed" capitalist relations on the "pre-capitalist economy".³ There started the process of accomplishing its "double mission". The state destroyed the village communities, and it laid the foundation for a new economy.⁴ The capitalism introduced by the colonial state had a different character from the capitalism that developed in France, Germany and United Kingdom. The forces within the society gave rise to the capitalist development in France, Germany and United Kingdom, whereas in the colonial country (India) capitalism was imposed from the above, by an alien power. Colonial capitalism developed another feature also. The colonial capitalist development was limited to only some areas of production like sugar, cement and textile, but the stage of development was slightly more than other colonies under the British empire.⁵ The capitalist development

3. Ibid., p.32.

4. E.M.S. Namboodiripad, "Marx on India" in The Marxist, vol.I, New Delhi, July-Sept 1983, p.11.

5. CPI (M) Publication, Programme of the Communist Party (Marxist), New Delhi, 1979, p.4.

was introduced by the colonial state during the time of war (World War I) to meet the requirements of the war as well as their homeland. In the process contradiction developed between the native capitalists and the colonial state.

During the pre-independence period the bourgeoisie mobilised the people against the colonial state, through this the bourgeoisie was able to get some concessions. By this way he compromised also.⁶

The capitalist development that was taking place in the imperialist countries gave rise to newer contradictions, (i.e., between the different national states in Europe) were later resolved through World War. British imperialism was a major participant in the war and she lost many colonies. Coupled with the massive upsurges, the war took Britain to a relatively weak position.

Due to its weakness, imperialism found difficult to maintain the colonial state. Within the country mass struggle reached a new stage. In this context, the bourgeoisie - who were afraid of mass struggle - reached a "settlement with the imperialism. As a part

6. ibid., p.5.

of the settlement political power was "transferred" to India and Pakistan in 1947. Since then in India the big bourgeoisie heads the state.⁷ The programme of CPI(M) observes silence on two issues. First on the creation of Pakistan, second on the role of landlords during the freedom struggle.

After the big bourgeoisie got the state power, the state tried to build capitalism. The State which used a number of tools to shape the development, represented the monopoly bourgeoisie and landlords interests.

One of the tools, the state has been using was planning. Planning in India has been influenced by the bourgeoisie economic theories like Keynesianism.⁸ Planning does not have any relation with socialist ideology as is usually been propagated. The Five Year Plans depended upon the motive of the capitalists for industrialization. In addition to budgetary policies, taxation and the price policies have been

7. Ibid., p.1.

8. E.M.S. Namboodiripad, "Thirty Five Years of Indian Planning", The Marxist, New Delhi, July-Sept 1984, p.31.

erving the needs of the exploiting class.⁹

The very basis of the public sector, according to the CPI(M), was directed to help the capitalist development. Public sector was started only in heavy industries and machine building industry. It was limited to that, without which industrialization would not have been possible. Besides these, Life Insurance Corporation, Special credit institutions, National Development Corporations, Banks and Industrial Finances Corporations were set up to mobilise the capital for the exploiting class.¹⁰ The CPI's perception on these questions was totally different from CPI(M)'s perception on these important issues of Indian political economy. It said that "The state sector contributed... to the weakening of the grip of foreign monopoly capital and to a certain extent the Indian monopolies".¹¹ While CPI(M) perceives the relation of public sector to the capitalists as a totally cooperative one, the CPI perceives it as a

9. CPI (M) Programme, p.6.

10. Ibid., p.7.

11. Programme of the Communist Party of India, C.P. Publication, Nov. 1973, p.8.

mechanism to control the foreign and Indian monopolies.

According to CPI (M) in the agriculture sector the state took a lot of significant measures. It enacted the Zamindari abolition. This law had some provisions which helped the landlords to keep vast lands in the name of 'Sir, Khudkasht' or 'Pannai' lands; Ceiling laws were passed to supplement this first wave of legislations. This law only helped the landlords to transfer the lands into fictitious names. The tenancy laws came after this. The tenancy laws did not help the peasant to fix the rent. The three laws helped the landlord in removing the peasants from the lands. The landlords were - in addition to all these - given loans, grants to enable them to purchase oil engines, sinking tube-well motors, good quality of oil and fertilizers.^{11a}

The CPI (M) programme further said that landless labourers and peasants were refused the wastelands. Those who occupied the wastelands were rewarded with penalties. The minimum wages act did not take full account of the wage system that exists in the countryside. The wages fixed by the state in some states was less than the usual wages that the peasants were getting. In some places the wages fixed by the

11a. CPI (M) Programme, pp.13-15.

Government, was a little higher. In these places the law was not properly implemented.¹² In contrast to this view, in the opinion of CPI, the land reforms & the other measures had "substantially curbed the feudal vested interests".¹³ Here CPI had taken the land holdings as an indicator to measure the impact of land reforms whereas CPI (M) had taken the production relations as a pointer to measure the impact of land reforms that implemented by the state. Any true assessment, however, should be based on the both aspects.

According to the programme of CPI (M) the behaviour of Indian state in the international arena has been nothing but the reflection or the outcome of the domestic policies. Foreign policy reflects the class character of the Government.¹⁴ The model suggested in the programme explains how the ruling class interests are manifested in the foreign policy in the final analysis. Sometimes the state has to accommodate the people's interests in the context of ^{class} struggle.

12. Ibid.

13. CPI Programme, p.19.

14. CPI (M) Programme, pp.18-21.

The programme said that there are three phases in the foreign policy of India. During the first period - in the initial period after independence - the state developed closer relation with imperialism to get help for its developmental needs. Due to this it favoured imperialism by taking moderate stands in the international arena. This can be seen from

"allowing camps on Indian soil for the recruitment by the imperialists for the suppression of the Malayan war of independence, the granting of facilities for the French imperialists' plans on Indian bases on their way to fight against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the sending of help even though nominal medical aid to the American troops in Korea.. and the resolution branding North Korea as aggressor."¹⁵

In the second phase the Indian state developed relations with Soviet Russia for her domestic needs within the country. The foreign policy of India also reflected some changes. The relation it developed with Soviet Russia, though it had links with its domestic policies, objectively conferred upon it an anti-imperialist character. So CPI (M) maintained

15. Ibid., p.19.

that during the second phase it had an anti-imperialist character. It saw that anti-imperialist content in the following behaviour of Indian state in international arena. "India's role in the conclusion of peace in Korea, its participation and active role in the Geneva Conference for the conclusion of the agreements of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, with signing of the Sino-India Treaty on Tibet embodying the five principles of peaceful coexistence, and its role in the Bandung Conference of Afro-Asian Countries."¹⁶

During the third phase, the anti-imperialist content diminished. This can be seen in its "role in Congo, its refusal to recognise the Algerian provincial govt., its refusal to take a forthright firm stand in several anti-colonial issues, the equivocal role as a Chairman of the International Commission in Vietnam as in Laos, its stand and the Belgrade Conference of non-aligned

16. Ibid., p.20

powers in 1961, which put India in opposition to most of the Afro-Asian countries, its role in the recent Cairo Conference of non-aligned states and its approving recognition of imperialist inspired Malaysia."¹⁷

In the assessment of CPI the foreign policy of India is "a policy of peace non-alignment and anti-colonialism."¹⁸ It considers non-alignment and anti-colonialism as its dominant aspects. According to CPI (M) the state is led by the big bourgeoisie. What is the character of the bourgeoisie? The bourgeoisie has dual character in relation with imperialism. The whole character of the relation between the two can be called a love and hate relation, i.e. collaboration and opposition.¹⁹ The two aspects - collaboration and opposition - occur in two different realms. The former developed in the very production process itself when the bourgeoisie asked for technology, machinery and capital. The latter developed in the process of distribution (selling) while competing for control over the national market.

17. Ibid., p.20.

18. CPI Programme, p.33.

19. CPI (M) Programme, p.5.

The relation between the bourgeoisie and feudals also has two elements, i.e. opposition and collaboration. Though the bourgeoisie has contradiction with feudal interests in production process itself, the bourgeoisie collaborates with and tries to settle the problem by "pressure, compromise and bargain".²⁰ The landlords and the bourgeoisie are structurally contradictory to each other. The collaboration developed due to the opposition from the radical masses who challenge them both.

What is the nature of the Independence that India got in 1947? CPI(M) approach to the question of independence was very different from the CPI's. They conceived independence as a long and continuous process. Besides this they will not accept the distinction between formal and real independence. CPI(M) believes, that the independence will be determined by the character of the bourgeoisie, its path of development, and its political strength.²¹ To CPI, India is an independent country. It took its position on the

20. Ibid.

21. E.M.S. Namboodiripad, The Programme Explained, Delhi: CPI(M) Publication, pp.10-12.

basis of its external situation, and the absence of the direct colonial rule within the country. CPI (M) position gave more emphasis to the internal economic reality, rather than the political situation.

When the bourgeoisie got state power they made the central government very strong with more powers though it adopted a broadly federal set up. All the state governments have been increasingly depending on the centre. Even for the reorganization of states on the basis of language, there was lot of resistance from the bourgeoisie. Ultimately, the government agreed to reorganise the states on the basis of language, in face of the popular struggle. The underlying thing in this political conflict was the contradiction between the monopoly bourgeoisie at the national level and the regional bourgeoisie at the state level. This contradiction is reflected in the political realms, in the difficulties in centre-state relations.²²

The Indian state is a form of "bourgeoisie democracy" says CPI (M) programme. After attaining power the bourgeoisie developed a constitutional-legal structure; Though the Constitution gives some fundamental rights to people, the people would not be allowed to

22. Ibid., p.23.

enjoy the rights while they struggle against the state. Freedom of assembly is denied to the workers under the section 144 of the Criminal Code. Besides these, Preventive Detention Act, provisions of emergency etc. serve the purpose of the bourgeoisie. The parliamentary system represents the policies and economies and the power of the economically dominant.²³

CPI(M) understands the rights given by the bourgeoisie constitution are limited; It can not give rights beyond its structural limitations, which will shake the foundations of the bourgeoisie society.

When political power was transferred to the big bourgeoisie, the first stage of Indian revolution, directed against the imperialist rule came to an end. After that, the bourgeoisie failed to complete the task of the Indian revolution. A second stage of revolution is demanded, which has to be completed by the working class. This revolution will be the "second", "agrarian" anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and democratic in character. The people's democratic revolution will be done under the leadership of working class. The peasantry will be the main

23. Ibid., pp. 25-27.

ally. National bourgeoisie who does not have links with the foreign monopolies can be admitted in the revolution.²⁴

The tactical line will be combining both methods i.e. politics from the above (parliamentary forms) and politics from below (non-parliamentary forms). The unified CPI had adopted the 1951 tactical line. When it adopted it the party had not solved the problem of the relation between armed struggle and parliamentary form^{of} struggle. While commenting on the tactical line Bhabani Sen Gupta said, on the question of violence, CPI (M) did not have a "clear cut" and "unequivocal" position and did not differ from the CPI's position set forth by Adhikari at the Calcutta Congress.²⁵

The CPI (M) evaluated the role of the state in the economy as a whole; The Seventh Congress resolution said that the Congress party continued its attempt to

24. Ibid., pp.41-43. The strategy of CPI (M) according to Shibdas Ghosh doesn't have any fundamental difference from CPI; The differences are only in tactical. Shibdas Ghosh, Why SUCI is the only Genuine Communist Party in India, Calcutta, 1982, p.46.

25. Bhabani Sen Gupta, CPI (M)'s Promises, Prospects and Problems, New Delhi, pp.40-41.

build capitalism in this country. The Fourth Five Year Plan was drafted to accelerate the process of capitalism. The U.S. aid value Rs.2,000 crores and Rs.2,500 crores U.S. loans were allowed by the state to realise this. The whole way of building capitalism landed the state into a state of crisis.²⁶

During this period the state gave some financial concessions to the capitalists. They were allowed to take more profit from their concerns because the rate of depreciation, the rate of paid up working capital were increased; After deducting the above-said items from the surplus, the capitalist can give 40% profit to the workers as bonus. The state had imposed a ceiling on the bonus, i.e. the bonus should not go beyond 20% of their (workers') income. In agriculture the government failed to give fair price to the product of peasants and refused to take over the wholesale trade in food surplus, which ultimately would help the landlords, middlemen linked with the state. The policies as a whole contributed to a food crisis.²⁷

26. CPI (M) Publication, On the Tasks of the Party in the Present Situation, Trivandrum, 1969, pp.7-11.

27. Ibid., pp.23-27.

Any fight against the state depends upon the alignment of the class forces within the society. According to the Resolution, there was a factional fight within the Congress party and a 'section of the Jana Sangh and Swatantra party had joined with Congress since it declared its move towards socialism'. The Avadhi Socialism not only attracted the above-mentioned, it attracted a section of PSP and CPI as well. As a result the CPI, with its class collaborationist policies, joined the Congress. The remaining PSP and Socialist party were indecisive.²⁸

At this juncture the CPI (M), though it found itself isolated, wanted to fight against the anti-people policies and put forward the following demands: banning of food grain trade and establishment of monopoly of state in the same; 16 OZ food per adult per day at reasonable price, opening up fair price shops and guarantee for supply and popular committees to supervise the shops, Nationalization of banks, scrapping up the concessions given to capitalists, 10% bonus for all workers in all industries including semi and government departments, scrapping up the

28. Ibid., p.11.

ceiling imposed upon the workers and payment of bonus in single instalment.²⁹ The CPI (M) faced the state and fought for immediate goals as well as the long-term goals simultaneously.

The Seventh Congress of the Party (1964) adopted the party programme, tactical line and the political resolution only. It did not adopt any document on international ideological positions, rather it postponed the discussions on the ideological questions. After the party Congress between 1965 to 1966, most of the leaders and leading cadres were arrested and were in jail under charges of conspiracy and armed struggle to overthrow the government. These leaders and cadres were released in February 1967 on the eve of the general elections. The party had to respond to the situation. It participated in the election. In 1967 March, the party, in coalition with other left parties formed the United Front ministries in Kerala and West Bengal. The party in 1967 May adopted one resolution^{on} "the new situation and the party's tasks" to cope with the changed political environment. The party's very participation in the election process became the indicator of the future course.

29. Ibid., pp. 25-29.

In 1967, a Party C.C. resolution (the new situation and the party's tasks) said, that the country was in serious crisis. The economic crisis in India was entirely different from the crisis that occurred in the West periodically. It was the result of the contradiction between the productive forces and the outmoded production relations and the same crisis was reflected in politics. Due to the crisis, in the election Congress ministries were replaced in various states. The states were Tamilnadu, Punjab, Orissa, West Bengal, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Haryana. Keeping in mind all these developments the resolution said that a new situation had developed. So the party had to reappraise and reorient its policies to the new developments. After a detailed study of the situation, the CPI (M) came out with an analysis. The analysis classified all the non-Congress governments into four categories on the basis of the parties' programmes, policies and the class character. The D.M.K. in Tamilnadu came under the first category. The United Front governments in West Bengal and Kerala came under second category. Under third group, the governments of Bihar and Punjab ~~came~~ The Orissa, Haryana & U.P. state governments came under the last category.³⁰

30. Ibid., p.71.

In Madras, CPI(M) decided to give support to the government headed by D.M.K. because the government was first opposed to the ruling power in the centre and, second, the presence of the working class party in the state was weak. The governments in Bihar and Punjab in the opinion of CPI(M) were basically democratic and non-Congress. So CPI(M) decided to support them also. The question of support did not arise regarding the governments in U.P., Orissa and Haryana, since they were headed by right reactionary forces. In West Bengal and Kerala the left parties together participated in the government so it decided to support that. In West Bengal and Kerala the party said it will try to implement some measures for the welfare of the people. In rest of the states, the party will study all the policies of the state. The anti-policies will be exposed. The same thing will be done at the national level.³¹ Though the CPI(M) wanted to fight against the anti-people policies of the government, it could not do so successfully because the presence of the working class was very small. As a whole the response was very feeble in the states where the CPI(M) did not enjoy power.

31. Ibid., pp.72-75.

As it was known that CPI (M) participated in the governments in Kerala and West Bengal; what was their view regarding the participation in the state? They perceived the participation in the U.F. governments as instruments of struggle in the hands of people to give relief to the people. Yet the CPI (M) was not sure, the amount of relief that will give to the people in the long run.³² In short, one can accept participation in government as a tactical move. But in CPI (M) in the long run, this process became an increasingly dominant political form. Further, this tactical line is in the process of becoming a strategical line, as happened in the case of the CPI, long ago.

Since the adoption of the tactical line in 1964, which gave importance to the parliamentary struggle, some members were not happy about this new development in the party line. Charu Mazumdar, the Secretary of Darjeeling District Committee of the CPI (M) was one among them. He believed that Chinese path was the path of revolution in India. In 1967 under his and Darjeeling Committee's initiative struggles started within that area. The culmination was Naxalbari, which was later crushed by the United Front ministry.

32. Ibid., p.70. Regarding the participation in government R. Miliband takes a different position. He held, that when the revolutionary
contd...

Following this incident, in the party plenum (Madurai) in August 1967, the party adopted two documents. They were the following: 'on Left deviation' and 'on Divergent views between our Party and the CPC on certain Fundamental Issues'. The party criticised the Naxalbari's struggle as "adventurist" and "wrong".³³ It further offered a refutation of the position of China on the Indian material conditions. While refuting the CPC's positions, it upheld the position it took in the programmes and other documents. This incident made the elements who did not agree with the programme united.

Meanwhile the CPI (M) Politbureau prepared a draft document on ideological issues. This draft was made available to the members of the party. The response to this document was different in different units. In many states there was opposition against this draft. In 1968 the party conducted the Burdwan Plenum and formally adopted the draft. This document

contd...

parties taking part in the government their role cannot be destructive and wholly uncooperative. They have to help to run the government. For a detailed discussion, see R. Miliband, The State in Capitalist, p.53.

33. Manoranjan Mohanty, Revolutionary Violence, New Delhi: Sterling, 1977, p.75.

upheld the CPC's positions on the 'peaceful transition to socialism', 'peaceful co-existence', 'peaceful economic competition', 'the state of the whole people', 'the party of the whole people' and the issue of Stalin. While accepting many of the CPC's positions on the international level, it rejected others and said "the assessment of the current situation (in India) and the tactical line worked out on that basis completely incorrect and contrary to the realities and life".³⁴ Interestingly, the party accepted the CPSU understanding on the nature of the epoch and the main contradictions at the world level. It might seem that the party accepted the CPC's position in the international level and took independent positions on the internal conditions in India. But this is not true. In reality CPI (M) agreed with some positions of CPSU and CPC. In fact, it is beyond doubt that the party had begun to take some independent positions on issues like the character of the bourgeoisie, class character of the government, independence etc. The rejection on CPC's positions on the material conditions of India made the dissatisfied Left who accepted Mao's thought within the CPI (M) to start a

34. Stand on Ideological Issues, Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication, 1969.

new party - CPI (ML) in 1970, which will be discussed later.

In the 8th Congress resolution pointed out the hostility developed between the Centre and the party. The Centre had already toppled the governments in U.P., Bihar, Punjab and West Bengal.³⁵

Because of this class hostility, the Centre tried to topple the U.F. government in Kerala. So the CPM wanted to mobilise the democratic forces in Kerala and within the country to consolidate the U.F. government and carry forward the struggle for the defence of the democratic and autonomous rights of States and their people.³⁶

In the economic realm the crisis continued to exist. The political resolution of the 8th Congress said that the crisis in agriculture was the result of the semi-feudal production relations and the contradictions in the capitalist path of development. The food crisis was caused by the inability of the state to abolish the feudal land relations. Ultimately this made India to go for U.S. aid.³⁷ India imported

35. Political and Organizational Report - 8th Congress, New Delhi: CPM Publication, 1969; p.156.

36. Ibid., p.159.

37. Ibid., p.71.

huge amount of food grains and other commodities under the P.L. 480 aid. India got "assistance" from U.S.A. for Rs.544.81 crores during the Second Five Year Plan period. This further increased in Third Five Year Plan period as Rs.853.22 crores. Totally it became in 1967 Rs.1,779.83 crores.

The crisis in agriculture had an impact on industry. In this period industrial development had decelerated. Another factor contributing to industrial stagnation was the trade relation with west. As a result of all these developments, Indian rupee value was reduced. The crisis made India more closer to the imperialists; In the international arena, India took stands favourable to the imperialists. India did not condemn American aggression in Vietnam. General trade relations improved with all ECC countries. Anti-China and anti-Pakistan policies continued.³⁸

So the CPI (M) decided to build a People's Democratic Front to fight for the issues that affects the people and the nation. The CPI (M) placed the following slogans before the people: fighting for a National food policy, abolition of all foreign capital,

38. Ibid., pp.77-88, 110-16.

nationalization of Banks, more powers and revenue for the states, abolition of privy purses, fighting for friendly relations with Pakistan.³⁹

After the 1967 elections, the state was trying to come out of the political crisis in the political realm. Within the Congress party, two kinds of tactical approaches developed. According to the first approach, the crisis can be solved by having an alliance with rightist forces like Swatantra, Jana Sangh and others. This tactic was given by the syndicate leaders. The second approach came from the leaders headed by Indira Gandhi. According to the second approach, the crisis can be solved by having an alliance with Left forces. The whole party was divided over the issue, which represented different approaches of different groups. Finally the party split into two. Regarding the split in the Congress party, the political resolution said that split was not due to any basic difference in policies.⁴⁰ Whereas CPI held that the split occurred between the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie and anti-

39. Ibid., p.197.

40. E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Crisis into Chaos: Political India 1981, New Delhi: Sangam, 1981, pp.104-08.

imperialist bourgeoisie. Following this the state came out with new slogans like abolition of privy purses, eradication of poverty, Nationalization of banks etc. During the period between the 8th and 9th Congresses the government attempted to create an impression that food crisis was solved. The government adopted the "green revolution" strategy to overcome the food problem by increasing productivity. In fact after the introduction of "green revolution" strategy food production went up. The increase in the output of food was due to the introduction of machinery and other new agricultural inputs. The ninth Congress resolution further said, the state was not ready to introduce land reforms, but introduced modernity in the production forces. Due to this the food scarcity was transferred from city to villages. In the final analysis the landlords were the real beneficiaries.⁴¹

There could be two different kinds of thinking on the food problems. The food problem, according to the ruling class thinking, was due to insufficient production. It immediately devised a strategy to modernise the productive forces. Though CPI (M) did not

41. CPI (M) Publication, Political Resolution of 9th Congress, New Delhi, pp.22-23.

deny the insufficient production was one of the cause for food problem, the party emphasised the production relations as the main cause behind the problem.

The crisis ridden Indian economy was further affected by the Indo-Pakistan war that broke out during this period. As a result, resources were diverted from the developmental needs of the Five Year Plan. Due to the crisis, the flow of foreign capital to India increased. The state allowed 625 collaborations including 43 agreements in this period.⁴²

In course of the war, a part of Pakistan was liberated^{and} a new nation called Bangladesh emerged. During the war India entered into a treaty with Soviet Union. The CPI(M) felt that India got victory in the war with the "timely assistance" of Soviet Union. Since the relation became closer with Soviet Union, U.S.A. withdrew much of its aid and loans. Another change that developed in the behaviour of state in the international arena was that India condemned U.S. action in Vietnam and the anti-China policy was withdrawn.⁴³

42. Ibid., p.24.

43. Ibid., p.15.

In the next election (1971) the Congress party was able to win and got a stable majority in parliament. The CPI (M) was silent about the ideological factors that contributed for the victory of the Congress party. The Bangladesh war developed the spirit of nationalism and this dominated the minds of the voters, which made them to be blind to the economic policies of the state since independence. Nationalism as an ideology helped the state to maintain its power. But the CPI (M) had analysed the economic factor that contribute to the victory of Congress party.

Since the Congress party got a stable majority, there started the authoritarian trend in the party as well as the state. The political resolution of the Congress further said that since some authoritarian elements were visible in the ruling party there may be a new danger to the other democratic parties and movements. So the resolution exhorted "all the democratic and Left parties, all democratic groups and individuals to come together to battle against the rise of fascist trends of one party rule and protect civil rights and democratic rights of the people."⁴⁴

44. Ibid., p.61.

As it had anticipated, in July 1975 a state of emergency was declared. The immediate cause was not revolutionary challenge from the left. The threat came from rival bourgeoisie landlord parties, which utilised the discontent of the masses.⁴⁵

The rival bourgeoisie-landlord parties started some extra parliamentary activities. They tried to physically corner the state by appealing to the army and police to disobey the "illegal orders". The state used its oppressive machinery to queten them. It simply put aside democracy and curbed all the democratic activities of the parties and individuals.⁴⁶

To cover its increasing movement towards authoritarianism the Indian state announced an economic programme called the '20 point programme' with an intention to attract the rural masses. On the other hand it imposed the compulsory deposit ordinance and a wage freeze on the working class. It allowed the employers to take more money from the bonus of the workers. With an expectation of getting more aid from World Bank, it imposed sterilization programme

45. C.F.I.(M) Publication, 10th Congress Resolution, New Delhi, p.15.

46. Ibid., p.16.

within the country.⁴⁷

In response to all these developments the CPI (M) politbureau published a statement on 20th November 1975. The statement said that the Congress party had introduced emergency to stabilise one-party rule in the country. So it appealed to people to form a democratic alliance to press the following demands. These were the lifting of the emergency, scrapping of MISA and all other black laws, release of all political leaders and people who were in jail under MISA and DIR, lifting the restrictions on press, right to association, restoration of normal functioning of trade union and other organizations holding of elections.⁴⁸

Twenty months after its declaration, Indira Gandhi withdrew emergency. In the general elections (1977) Janata party got a large majority and came to power. What was the assessment of CPI (M) on Janata party?

47. Ibid., p.23.

48. CPI (M) Review Report adopted by the 10th Congress, 2nd to 8th April 1978, New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, p.33.

According to the CPI(M) it was a mixture of many parties, joined together against the threat of emergency. But it was yet to develop a cohesive ideology and organization.⁴⁹

The Janata government introduced two budgets after it assumed office. In the first budget it was depending upon foreign capital. In the second budget it gave more concessions to the monopoly houses; to the people it gave more taxes. The government continued the trend of getting aid ^{from} World Bank and implemented its directives. Following these, the multinational corporations entered. While the importance of public sector was reduced, agriculture sector was given more importance. The policies of Janata party were not radically different from the previous party.⁵⁰ CPI(M) also did not expect any radical change from the party since it considered basically Janata party also a bourgeoisie party. The CPI(M) by supporting this regime for the short term goals, completely neglected the long term goal.

49. CPI Publication, CPM 10th Congress Political resolution.

50. Ibid., pp.27-29.

In what way was the Janata regime different? According to CPI (M) the Janata party lifted emergency and restored democracy.⁵¹ So CPM had a friendly relations with Janata due to its defence of democracy which was closely related with struggle for people's rights.⁵²

During this period the CPM called for Left and democratic forces to force the Janata government "for implementing the electoral promises made by them regarding the democratic reforms, for dismantling the framework of emergency... and oppose the anti-people economic policies, attack on the rights of people which are mainly the handiwork of right forces within the party and government."⁵³

Within the Janata party after one year of assuming office there developed a serious crisis. The various forces which had formed it, by coming together got separated again. One of the forces led by Jagajivan Ram tried to assume office by having

51. Ibid., p.32.

52. CPI (M) Publication, Review Report adopted at 10th Congress, 2nd to 8th April 1972, New Delhi, p.10.

53. 10th Congress resolution, p.38.

support from Congress. So, since CPM has been opposed to Congress it withdrew its support and later supported the Charan Singh ministry.⁵⁴

In 1980 Indira Gandhi came to power again. During this period the relation between the Indian state and the I.M.F. reached a new stage although a move towards it had started since emergency. An I.M.F. grant of Rs.5,000 crores came to India. I.M.F. advised India to close down the food for work programme. Essential service Maintenance Act was allegedly the product of the advice. Besides that, they advised the government to revise the budget structure and passenger fares of the railways every year, computerisation by a multinational (IBM) and a longer tenure for Railway Board and expert oriented industries. According to the CPI(M) the I.M.F. influenced taxation policy, price policy, trade policy and exchange policy. It became a permanent feature in the Indian economy. The monopolies were given permission to expand the production capacity by 25%. It gave offers

54. M. Basavapunniah, On the political line of the CPI(M), Delhi: CPI(M) Publication, August 1977, p.8.

to start 100% export unit.⁵⁵

The increasing dependency on I.M.F. and its influence on domestic policies was the new development, which would hamper the independent development of the country.

In the realm of foreign policy though the government took many correct stands and the policy remained non-aligned. Its stand on Kampuchea, supporting Vietnam, and its readiness to settle the differences with Pakistan and Bangladesh which were in conferring with the interests of the people.⁵⁶ Another trend in foreign policy was treating Russia and U.S.A. as super-powers. This trend was emerging since the development of NAM.⁵⁷

In the period between eleventh and twelfth Congresses there was no change in the internal crisis. Economic dependence on imperialism had increased due to more import of technology. Unable to expand the Indian markets, Indian capitalism had to go for the world market and depended more heavily upon exports. The

55. CPI (M) Publication, Political Resolution of the Eleventh Congress of CPI (M), New Delhi, March 1982, p.20

56. Ibid., p.29.

57. Ibid., p.26.

present state tried to come out of the crisis by importing massive technology (in order to produce goods for export) which could not help as it expected, but actually intensified the crisis.⁵⁸ The import of technology helped only the monopolists and it had a detrimental impact on the public sector, the policy of self reliance and consequently on the political independence of the country.⁵⁹

The CPI (M) perception on the foreign policy of India changed slightly from its earlier perception. It characterised the foreign policy of India as "non-aligned" and said that it reflects the needs of people as well as the bourgeoisie. This characterization is similar to the CPI's position. This perception of CPI (M) is based on its assessment of the Indian state's stands on various issues in the international arena. According to the CPI (M), the character 'non-alignment' can be seen in the following actions of the state: The Indian state rejected the U.S. offers for arms; Besides this, it expressed strong opposition to the Russian stand on Afghanistan; Its stands on Vietnam,

58. Ibid., pp.33-34.

59. Ibid., p.24.

Kampuchea and Palestinian issue; all these help to maintain peace at the international level. India showed its readiness to improve the relations with her neighbours Pakistan and China. While the party was appreciating the government's foreign policy, it expressed its fears also: since the state accommodated the pressure from western countries, the foreign policy might change if ^{the} economic relation with western countries continued in the present fashion.^{59a}

Here a question arises: How a bourgeoisie state's interests and people's interests can coincide in foreign policy? Since the world had been divided into two camps, though the bourgeoisie took some action within its own class interests, the stand objectively serves the purpose of anti-imperialist forces of the world.

According to the CPI(M) the path of development followed by the ruling class led to the crisis in Punjab and Assam. The CPI(M) has been watching closely the developments in Punjab and Assam. The CPI(M) characterises the Punjab movement as a "secessionist", "fundamentalist" movements. Though the movement

59a. Draft Political Resolution of Twelfth Congress of CPI(M) in People's Democracy, Oct. 20, 1985, New Delhi, p.11.

represents some aspirations of the people of the state, CPI (M) disagrees with the solution that the leadership of the Punjab movement proposes. In the opinion of CPI (M) the movement cannot be called a nationality struggle, since it was based on religion; Religion cannot provide the basis for a nation. Moreover, this movement is backed by the imperialists and popular struggle should be directed against the anti-national forces to imperialist designs.⁶⁰ On this issue the CPI and the CPI (M) both have similar positions. The interesting point is that the undivided CPI supported for a brief period the idea^{of} Muslim and Sikh nationhood in 1943 and in 1945 respectively.⁶¹

Regarding the Assam problem the party's attitude is more or less similar to the one to the Punjab problem. It saw the origin of the problem in the capitalist path of development, which created underdevelopment in the state. The Assam movement instead of fighting against the bourgeois landlord rule, fights against

60. Political and Organizational Report of 12th Congress, CPI (M) Publication, Oct. 1982, pp.9-12.

61. The Guidelines of the history of the Communist Party, p.7. For a detailed analysis of CPI on Sikh homeland, see "On the question of Sikh homeland", Marxism Today, New Delhi, May-July 1986.

the religious and linguistic minorities, who migrated from the other parts of India to Assam. While it suggested an economic package for the development of Assam, it calls all popular forces to defend the unity and integrity of India, since the Assam movement had been helped by the imperialist agencies as well as the christian agencies. In the opinion of the CPI also, the Assam movement is a "secessionist" movement.⁶²

The state authoritarianism increased during the period, One-party rule put all the rights of the opposition under threat. The dismissal of N.T. Rama Rao ministry in Andhra Pradesh was one of the incidents which exhibits the character of the centre. Following upon this were the attacks on the West Bengal and Tripura governments. The Centre's method to deal with these U.F. governments were different. It created financial difficulties for them, refused to give money in time for administrative needs and withheld the legislative measures passed in the interest of the people. So the CPM called for the Left & Democratic front to fight against the inconsistencies in the non-aligned policy and fight against the dependency

62. Political and Organizational Report of 12th Congress, op. cit., pp.9-12.

on the west and to defend the integrity and unity of the nation, to defend the Left Front governments against the one-party dictatorship.⁶³

The whole strategy of CPI(M) in the recent years became 'ministry-centred' and then 'parliament-centred'. It does not mean that the CPI(M) has abandoned the struggles in parliament. The running the U.F. government itself became an activity which is considered a fullfledged form of class struggle in the prevailing political conditions in India.

63. Draft of the Twelfth Congress Political Resolution, pp.11-15.

CHAPTER V

THE CPI (ML) VIEW OF THE INDIAN STATE

The Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) - CPI (ML) - came into existence by the announcement of Kanu Sanyal on 22nd April 1969 at Calcutta.¹ Prior to this formal announcement lies a long process of origin that dates as far back as the Telengana movement. Since the inception of the CPI (M) the left within it tried to actualise the Chinese model of revolution within India. To lead the party in this direction an alternative draft was presented by the majority section of its Andhra Unit before the first Congress of the CPI (M) held in 1964.² This was not surprising. In the early fifties a section of the leftists within the undivided CPI made an attempt to realise the Chinese type agrarian revolution under the leadership of Rajeswara Rao, which failed for various reasons. In 1964 the CPI (M) adopted a new programme and a tactical line - combining the parliamentary as well

-
1. Manoranjan Mohanty, Revolutionary Violence, New Delhi: Sterling, 1977, p.110.
 2. Asit Sen, An Approach to Naxalbari, Calcutta: Institute of Scientific Thoughts, 1980, p.30.

as extra-parliamentary paths. This led to disappointment among the left within the CPI (M), who favoured an exclusive reliance on the path of armed revolution.

Charu Mazumdar, the Darjeeling district secretary of the CPI (M) was one among the first theorists to turn to the left. In 1965, he started a set of

pamphlets that later came to be called as 'Eight Documents'. In these documents he expressed his views regarding the nature of Indian economy, public sector, the nature of political power in India, the relation between Russia and India, character of the Indian bourgeoisie and the divisions within them. After explaining all these, he justified the need for a strategy of armed revolution. This process did not end at this level. The ideas advocated by Charu Mazumdar were put to test in Naxalbari - a village in West Bengal.

Naxalbari was seen by the CPI (M) as a stab on the back of the CPI (M) leadership that was one of the major constituent parties in the United Front government. On the part of left, especially those influenced by Charu Mazumdar's ideas, this move was a planned one to expose the hypocrisy of the CPI (M). Their plan was to demonstrate the untenability of a parliamentary road to socialism that, according to them, CPI (M) had already taken up.

Naxalbari was in an area plagued by ramnant decadent semi-feudal modes^{of} exploitation. The historical revolt took place in May 1967. The peasantry attacked big landlords followed by^{an} attack on Naxalbari police station. After the attack, land was captured, and all the records regarding land ownership and transfer destroyed. The captured lands were redistributed among the peasants. To defend the new power, the peasants armed themselves with traditional and modern weapons. The revolutionary committees took the area under their administrative control. According to their own report they tried to run the schools, eliminate the presence of bourgeoisie state and that way establish their own power by liberating the areas.³

The Naxalbari revolt generated a big hue and cry. The then United Front government took this revolt as a political threat as well as a law and order problem. Finally this movement met its defeat due to the suppression by the state.

Following this happening , the still-existed CPI (M) took up the matter for discussion. In a plenum

3. Kanu Sanyal, "Report on the Peasant Movement in the Terai Region", Liberation (Calcutta), vol.2, Nov. 1968, pp.28-42.

that took place in Madurai from August 18 to 27, the party adopted two documents in this regard. The party said that the Naxalbari revolt was adventurist and "wrong" in the first document titled "On Left deviation". In the second document it said that the party cannot subscribe to the views of CPC on Indian material conditions.⁴

Following the negative response of the CPI(M) leadership, the discontented left within CPI(M), who wanted to advance the Naxalbari type ^{of} struggles all over India, joined together and formed the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries (AICCCR) of CPI(M) in November 1967. The Naxalbari revolt in fact made them united under a common political platform. A declaration adopted by AICCCR in November 1967 said, the CPI(M) had "betrayed the cause of revolution" and it laid down the following as the basic objectives of the new group.

- "(1) To develop and co-ordinate militant and revolutionary struggles at all levels, specially, peasant struggles of the Naxalbari type under the leadership of the working class.
- (2) To develop militant, revolutionary struggles of the working class and other toiling

4. Manoranjan Mohanty, op. cit., p.75.

people, to combat economism and to orient these struggles towards agrarian revolution.

- (3) To wage an uncompromising ideological struggle against revisionism and neo-revisionism and to popularise, which is Marxism-Leninism of the present era and to unite on this basis and revolutionary elements, within and outside party.
- (4) To undertake preparations of a revolutionary programme and tactical line based on concrete analysis of the Indian situation in the light of Comrade Mao-Tse-Tung's thought."⁵

This declaration (November 1967) along with its organizational objectives, came out with some new theoretical formulations also. The document characterised Indian society as "semi-feudal and semi-colonial" and it advocated a new method for "seizing political power" which was basically contrary to the CPI (M) positions, adopted in the Seventh Congress of CPI (M) in 1964.

While the declaration characterised the present society as "semi-feudal and semi-colonial", they traced its historical development from pre-colonial society.

5. "Declaration of the Revolutionaries of the Communist Party of India Marxist", Liberation, December 1967, p.4.

When Marx wrote about pre-colonial India he said the mode of production in India was Asiatic mode of production and it was a stagnant one. AICCCR had a different position regarding the pre-colonial period. According to them, Indian society also underwent a similar line of development from primitive communist to slavery to feudalism, and was not basically different from the European model. Indian society had the internal elements to give rise the capitalist society on her own.⁶

Marx held that imperialist intervention had destroyed the stagnant economic structure and had sown the seeds of capitalist development. While the CPI and CPI (M) accepted the "double mission" theory of Marx, the Maoists took a different position. According to them, the role of imperialism in the Indian economy was not a regenerating one as pointed out by Marx, but of nipping in the bud/^{the}process of the capitalist development already going on. They held that imperialist intervention arrested the national economic development.⁷

6. Towards a New Phase of Spring Thunder, C.R.C. Publication, 1982, p.19.

7. Asit Sen, op. cit., p.2.

After the Madurai Plenum, the CPI (M) conducted another plenum in Burdwan in April 1968 to finalise its ideological positions on international issues, which had been pending since the inception of the party due to various reasons like the imprisonment of its leaders by the Indian state. The plenum, while upholding China's positions on the formulations of 'peaceful transition to socialism', 'peaceful economic competition', and 'peaceful co-existence' given by CPSU, rejected the Chinese assessment of the material conditions, and the strategy developed on the basis of its assessment as wrong. This development made the 'left' within the CPI (M) to think of making a formal break with the party.

In the second meeting of AICCCR of CPI (M) in May 1968, it branded the leadership of CPI (M) as revisionist. It evaluated the Burdwan plenum of CPI (M) and said that the CPI (M) had rejected Mao's thought which was the blue print for world revolution. The revisionist leadership had discarded the path of revolutionary violence and upheld the parliamentary path. Following this it expressed its wish to form a new party; As a result it renamed itself as "AICCCR".⁸ Within one year the "AICCCR"

8. "Declaration of the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries", Liberation, June 1968, p.7.

formed a new party called CPI(ML). On the formation (22nd April 1969) day itself the CPI(ML) adopted a political resolution. In the following year (1970) the new party came out with a programme. The programme was nothing but the ideas expressed by the left since 1964 on various occasions. This includes the major points of political resolution of 1969 also.

The left from Andhra Pradesh did not join the new party since they had differences with dominant CPI(ML) leadership. Their differences were on the nature of the relation between India and Russia, on the characterisation of Russia as 'social imperialist' and on the question of armed struggle and boycott of elections.

The Political resolution of the CPI (ML) said that "the Indian state is a state of big landlords and comprador - bureaucratic capitalism and that the government is a lackey of U.S. imperialism and Soviet social imperialism."⁹ The characterisation of the Indian state is thus entirely different from the other communist parties. While CPI held that the Indian state was "the organ of the class rule of the national

9. "Political resolution of CPI(ML)", Liberation, May 1969, p.4

bourgeoisie as a whole, in which the big bourgeoisie holds a powerful influence",¹⁰ the CPI(M) held it as a "landlord bourgeoisie state led by the big bourgeoisie increasingly collaborating with foreign capital".¹¹ In the CPI and CPI(M) programmes the place of the landlords was subordinate to the bourgeoisie. In CPI(ML)'s characterization this class is dominant. While CPI held that the bourgeoisie stands for independent capitalism, the CPI(M) believed that the bourgeoisie has been pursuing dependent capitalism. The CPI(ML) went to the extreme; it characterised the landlords and the bourgeoisie as lackeys of imperialism which stand in favour of continued colonialism. In the two programmes there was no mention about the Soviet Union. CPI(ML) used the 'Social imperialism' formulation for the first time in the Indian communist movement to characterise the Soviet Union. In the same way the formulation 'bureaucratic capitalism' was used to characterise the bureaucrats in the public sector as a new class. To the CPI(ML) the relation between the Indian State and USSR is not in the interests of the Indian people; and the establishment of public sector is not on the socialist lines.

10. CPI Programme, p.27

11. CPI (M) Programme, p.22

While analysing the causes of the domination of the landlords in the state the CPI (ML) found it was due to "the increasing concentration of lands in the hands of a few landlords, the expropriation of almost the total surplus produced by the toiling peasantry in the form of rent, the complete landlessness of about 40% of the rural population",¹² so that the government and the state represent the feudal interests of the big landlords.

Regarding independence, the programme of CPI (ML) said that the independence, India attained in 1947 was nothing but a "replacement of colonial and semi-feudal set up with a semi-colonial and semi-feudal one" and it was a "sham" independence.¹³ The position of CPI (ML) on independence is completely different from the CPI's characterization and it is closer to the CPI (M)'s position. CPI considered India's independence as full independence, a view to which CPI (M) did not subscribe. The views of CPI (M) and CPI (ML) on this issue were based on the economic structure, though they arrived

12. "Political resolution of the CPI (ML), op. cit., p.4.

13. Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) adopted at the Party Congress held in May 1970, para 9.

dissimilar conclusions.

The CPI (ML) programme considered the bourgeoisie in India as comprador who mortgaged the country to imperialism.¹⁴ Because of the comprador character of the Indian bourgeoisie, the freedom struggle was not taken to its conclusion; they compromised with the imperialists and hence the transfer of power to Indian National Congress, the political and organizational expression of the compradors.

The programme further said that the major contradictions were four. They were "the contradiction between imperialism and social imperialism on the one hand and our people on the other, the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the people the contradiction between capital and labour and the contradiction between the landlords and the peasantry."¹⁵

Among all these contradictions "the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of Indian people is the principal contradiction in the present phase".¹⁶ So the political resolution said "by liberating themselves

14. Ibid., para 11.

15. Ibid., para 16.

16. Ibid.

from the yoke of feudalism the Indian people will liberate themselves also from the yoke of imperialism and comprador bureaucratic capital because the struggle against feudalism is also a struggle against the two enemies."¹⁷

Hence the stage of Indian revolution "is the democratic revolution of the new type - the people's Democratic Revolution, the main content of which is the agrarian revolution, the abolition of feudalism in the countryside."¹⁸ Regarding this, Charu Mazumdar had earlier said that "the people's Democratic Revolution in India has to be directed against the bureaucrat and comprador bourgeoisie in the country and against feudal exploitation in the vast rural areas".¹⁹ He further said that "our revolution has to be directed against the Congress government which represents the bureaucrat and comprador bourgeoisie and which was frightened by the post-war upheaval, came to terms with the imperialists with the help of the feudal lords."²⁰

17. "Political resolution of the CPI (ML)", op. cit., p.4.

18. Ibid.

19. Charu Mazumdar, "The Indian People's Democratic Revolution", Liberation, June 1968, p.12.

20. Ibid.

Regarding the class alliance the programme said that the revolution would be carried by a democratic front of the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and even a section of small and middle bourgeoisie under the leadership of working class but the main force of the revolution would be the peasantry. The programme further said that armed struggle would be the main form of struggle. But to start armed struggle, Guerrilla warfare would be developed and this would remain "the basic form of struggle throughout the entire period of our Democratic Revolution".²¹ But the war was to be waged not to get economic benefits but to acquire political power.

Charu Mazumdar realised that establishing political power was a process. To begin the process the lands of the landlords has to be seized and it should be redistributed among the peasant masses. After this process the revolutionary committees should defend the masses with the help of the village army against the class enemies. While defending the new relations care should be taken to maintain a conducive environment for production. By establishing complete control on

21. CPI (ML) Programme, paras 34-36.

the situation the local class enemies should be eliminated by the method of physical annihilation.

Once the area is liberated, the repressive state machinery would be deprived of its 'eyes and ears'. The state cannot find out the records of the old land relations and it cannot identify the people who participated in it.²²

There was an onesided emphasis on the armed struggle in the overall theory and practice of the CPI (ML). To develop armed struggle, guerrilla warfare was considered as an initial step. This step further depended upon the physical annihilation of class enemies, which was considered the highest form of class struggle.

When the CPI (ML) was in favour of waging people's war everywhere, T. Nagi Reddy, an important Andhra leader of the party came out with a different theory. According to Nagi Reddy the people's war can be waged only in hills and jungles, which constitute the 'key' areas. But in the plains he advocated "limited guerrilla resistance". Regarding the annihilation theory also

22. Charu Mazumdar, "A few words About Guerrilla Warfare", Towards a New phase of Spring Thunder, p.126.

he had differences. He did not want to annihilate the class enemy if he accepted "reasonable" rates of interest for the loans.²³ Regarding guerrilla war T. Nagi Reddy had a different perception from that of CPI (ML). His critical assessment of the annihilation line of Charu Mazumdar was more economic than political. But the CPI (ML) perceived it as a way to develop guerrilla war and establish people's political power.

The attitude of CPI (ML) regarding elections is different from the rest of the communist parties. Charu Mazumdar gave the slogan for boycotting elections from the beginning. This can be seen in relation to their concept of political power. They wanted to get power through armed struggle since the country was semi-feudal and the democracy in the country was a "farce".²⁴

The CPI (ML) not only rejected elections, it rejected the possibility of taking part in government or the existing state apparatus. Their understanding regarding taking part in government, generally believed

23. "The Politics of Nagi Reddy", Liberation, Oct. 1969, pp.36-37.

24. S. Guna, "Is India really independent?", Liberation, August 1968, p.51.

to have its roots in the thought of Mao, was mainly shaped by the experience of the communist parties in participating in the state apparatus of Kerala (1957) and later in West Bengal. CPI (ML) saw capturing state governments as an extension of economism whereas the CPI (M) perceived it as capture of a part of state power.

According to the CPI (ML) the so-called United Front government was a negative product born out of the requirements of the ruling classes in India. Since the Congress party had lost its ability to maintain their rule in the states, due to the struggles directed against it. It wanted to maintain the existing system through a parliamentary farce that consisted of electoral exercises. In this way, the United Front governments serve the purpose of the reactionary ruling classes.²⁵ Besides, this would only develop illusion in the minds of the people in favour of the system and ultimately spoil revolutionary consciousness, and divert them to the parliamentary path.²⁶

25. Manab Mitra, "The Revolutionary Path is the only Path", Liberation, May 1968, pp.76-77.

26. "Political resolution of CPI (ML) adopted on 22nd April 1969", Liberation, May 1969, p.8.

Further the CPI (ML) challenges the idea of "giving relief to people" by participating in the governments which was put forward by the CPI (M). The CPI (ML) says that the United Front governments cannot remain silent while the workers' agitations^{go} beyond the limits of bourgeoisie freedom. And they could not provide any significant relief as they faced serious constraints because of the mere fact that they are in contradiction with the central government. Sufficient arrangements for supplies like rice and other essential items could not be effectively made while the U.F. government was in power, for instance, in Kerala.²⁷

Since the inception^{of} the party CPI (ML) believed only in armed struggle. As a result, it conducted armed struggles in many places throughout the country, the struggles in Srikakulam (Andhra) where the tribal peasantry of the so-called Agency area of Andhra, neighbouring the Koraput Hills of Orissa border took to arms and established "red political power" in at least "300 villages";²⁸ in Magurjan (Bihar) where "a

27. Partha Choudhuri, "Phrases and Facts About Kerala", Liberation, Dec. 1968, p.73.

28. Spring Thunder, p.92.

guerrilla squad of poor and landless peasantry attacked a police party... and snatched away their rifles" as "an attempt to break through the encirclement;²⁹ in Birbhum (West Bengal) that witnessed "the huge storm of peasant upheaval" in 1971, the march of PLA through its plains, and the severe air and terrestrial combing operation of the Indian army represent important landmarks in the CPI (ML) struggle.³⁰ Except these a few other struggles in most of the places, remained at the initial level i.e. at the annihilation level. Those *did not* go beyond that. The movements were finally crushed by the state, owing to their isolation in limited pockets and thus falling a prey to encirclement and suppression.

There was self criticism among the party members of the CPI (ML) regarding why and how the struggles remained only at the annihilation level and why it failed to establish people's political power. The general answer that the party reached was that it was a mistake in tactics, which emphasised only the annihilation of class enemies to the neglect of other forms

29. Ibid., pp.111-12. with the incident, Charu Mazumdar announced the formation of People Liberation Army (PLA).

30. Ibid., pp.114-15.

of struggle.³¹ In short, the need was felt to coordinate other forms of struggle with armed struggle while struggling to establish people's political power. According to Sushital Roy Choudhury, CPI (ML) understanding regarding the guerrilla warfare as the main form of struggle and other mass struggles as subordinate to that was correct but when it was implemented, the guerrilla warfare was emphasised while other forms of struggle were not taken care of.³² Charu Mazumdar himself admitted later, that though annihilation was a higher form of class struggle, the fundamental point of class struggle was seizure^{of} political power, not annihilation alone.³³

In 1971 one of the CPI (ML) leaders, S.N. Singh, left the party because of differences over strategy.³⁴ According to Vinod Misra, the split was because of the difference of attitude towards the rich peasants, which had serious implications in determining the class alliance, that in turn would have^{an} impact on the

31. Ibid., p.101.

32. Ibid., p.107.

33. Ibid., p.122.

34. .M. Mohanty, op. cit., p.XX.



strategy.³⁵ In 1974 S.N. Singh decided to support the Bihar movement led by Jaya Prakash Narayan. In 1975 emergency was imposed. During the period of emergency he formulated a three-tier united front as the main strategy, though practically nothing happened from his side. When in 1977, emergency was lifted S.N. Singh's attitude towards the Janata government changed. He said that the class character of the government remained same but the new government was "democratic and patriotic".³⁶ The attitude of S.N. Singh and the CPI(M) response to the Janata government were more or less similar, whereas CPI was against the government in 1977.

After the death of Charu Mazumdar, the CPI (ML) due to the crisis within the party became divided into many small factions. Prakash Karat classified the factions into three: anti-Charu groups, pro-Charu groups and independent groups.³⁷ To him, pro-Charu

35. Vinod Mishra, Report from the Flaming Fields of Bihar, Calcutta, 1986, p.XXIII.

36. M. Mohanty, op. cit.

37. Prakash Karat, "Naxalism Today: At an Ideological Deadend", The Marxist, Jan-March, 1985.

groups are CC CPI (ML) led by Vinod Mishra, CC CPI (ML) (People's war) led by Kondapalli Seetharamaiah, CRC CPI (ML) headed by Venu and second CC CPI (ML) (Pro-Lin Piao); The anti-Charu groups are CPI (ML) S.N. Singh group, CPI (ML) C. Pulla Reddy group, CPI (ML) COC groups, OCCR (Kanu Sanyal), UCCRI (ML) (Nagi Reddy D.V. Rao), Maoist Communist Centre, Liberation Front and Central Team. Besides these, the following also exist: Shantipal group (West Bengal), Kunnikal Narayanan group (Kerala), B.P. Sharma group (Rajasthan, U.P.), Chelapati Rao group (AP), Tamilnadu groups AOC and SOC, Communist-Ghadar Party of India (ML), Proletariat Party and Revolutionary Communist Party (Punjab). The classification of Prakash Karat only explains who are the groups that accepted Charu Mazumdar's line and who do not. But this classification does not help us to know the present position of the groups. Many groups accepted Charu Mazumdar, but they incorporated many changes of their own. This way, the groups can be classified into two: First the groups who still remain within the framework of the earlier programme, and second those who departed from the earlier programme's formulation on the nature of Indian society.

The CPI (ML) Vinod Mishra group was one of the groups which came under the first category. This group

believes that the characterization of Indian society as "semi-feudal and semi-colonial" as it was laid down in the '70 programme of the undivided CPI (ML) still remains correct. At the same time they say that due to the penetration of foreign capital, a market has developed all over India. The state is undergoing a process of centralization and became an "autocratic" one. It believes that the main enemy is "social imperialism" in this phase. So keeping all these in mind, the CPI (ML) led by Vinod Mishra wants to build a "National Political Alternative" to fight against the "Autocracy". The main form of struggle would be armed struggle and they still believe in area-wise seizure of power. While accepting the armed struggle as a main form of struggle they wanted to develop a democratic movement to respond to the developments that took place at the all India level. So they wanted to use "even parliamentary" forms of struggle.³⁸ Here though Vinod Mishra group accepted the semi-feudal semi-colonial character of the society their strategy had undergone a remarkable change.

38. "An Insight into the Ideological Political Line pursued by the CC led by Comrade Vinod Mishra", Party Unity, August 1983, pp.7-18.

Some of the groups have departed from the earlier (1970 programme of CPI (ML)) understanding on Indian society. CRC CPI (ML) is one of the groups which come under the second category. This group felt that the 1970 Programme of undivided CPI (ML) is not helpful to understand the present phenomenon. A serious attempt made to reformulate the programme. In the process of it, this group has reached a new understanding. According to the new perception of CRC CPI (ML) India is a 'neo-colony'; In the post war (II World War) period imperialism changed its mode of exploitation since they cannot exploit in the same way they did during pre- World War II period. Prior to the IInd World War imperialism protected feudalism. In the opinion of CRC CPI (ML) the relation between imperialism and feudalism had undergone changes. Now, imperialism is forced to destroy feudalism. It was successful in this direction.³⁹ The new methods of exploitation of imperialism are through finance capital and through institutions like I.M.F. and other international agencies.⁴⁰ The Multinational Corporation is also

39. "A Letter to All Party Comrades from CRC", Liberation, May 1984, p.20.

40. Ibid., pp.20-21.

one other device to reach this end. Since imperialism cannot exploit through feudalism, it developed dependent capitalism, through the above mentioned methods. To CRC, feudalism is a declining trend and capitalist development is the emerging and dominating trend. So in its opinion the 1970 programme's characterization of India as 'semi-feudal society' is invalid, as well as the main contradiction given in the programme.⁴¹

Due to the capitalist development (assisted by imperialism), the bureaucratic bourgeoisie becomes powerful. As the Indian state is directly owning the public sector, and as the public sector is indirect relation with many of the imperialist agencies that are in turn interested in keeping the Indian state just as a tool to squeeze the Indian people, out of the comprador and bureaucratic sections of the all India monopoly bourgeoisie. The bureaucratic bourgeoisie is privileged among the bourgeoisie. Their freedom is only to choose between different imperialist powers.⁴² According to the CRC CPI (ML) the major contradictions in India are the following: (1) The contradiction between

41. Ibid., p.21.

42. Ibid., p.24.

imperialism, social imperialism, bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie on the one hand and various people on the other, (2) the contradiction between feudalism and broad masses of people, and (3) the contradiction among the ruling classes. Among all these, the contradiction between imperialism, social imperialism and bureaucrat comprador bourgeoisie on the one hand and the people of India on the other became the principal contradiction. The stage of revolution is "basically anti-imperialist and anti-feudal which would be a New Democratic Revolution. In this agrarian revolution either the alliance of agricultural workers (in the places where agrarian relations had changed from feudal) and the rural bourgeoisie or the peasantry (in the places where feudalism remains strong) would be the main force. Imperialism and bureaucrat and comprador bourgeoisie will be the main target of the revolution. The slogan "land to the tiller" is still valid according to CRC as it thinks that the bourgeois democratic revolution is not yet accomplished.⁴³

Due to capitalist development in relation with the neo-colonial development the national question became important in this period. Nationality struggle

43. Ibid., p.24.

is part of the anti-imperialist struggle - a struggle against the present state imposed by the imperialists from above, suppressing all the nationalities while protecting an all India market for the sake of the monopolies allied with the imperialists themselves.⁴⁴

The strategy for the New Democratic Revolution would be people's war. Since the Indian state has centralised the state machinery, struggles have to be organised all over India, so that the forces of the Indian state will be dispersed and it will become weak in the process of struggle. Since India has been characterised by uneven development, each state should be considered as a socio-economic unit and programme should be developed on that basis, keeping all-India perspective in mind; In this process parallel power structures should be created.⁴⁵

The perception of CRC on the ongoing development of India has its theoretical roots in Mao's model of analysing a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country and his strategy of revolution in such countries. With certain innovations to this model (Mao's New Democracy)

44. Ibid., p. 25.

45. Ibid.

CRC developed its new analytical tool. The alliance of imperialism with feudalism that 'New Democracy' of Mao and the undivided CPI (ML) upheld, was questioned, taking into consideration the new post World War II situation ('decolonization' the rise of U.S. imperialism as a new and leading power and the realization crisis of imperialists that made them 'develop' and 'under-developed' countries). As far as the dependency of the capitalist development is concerned, the CRC line has similarities with the dependency theories. As far as pure economic relations are concerned the perception of CRC is similar to that of CPI. While the CPI is committed to 'non-capitalist path' of development of the Indian bourgeoisie, CRC considers the whole development as a 'lopsided' one. Another new thing that found place in CRC's analysis is their new stand on the question of nationality; while they give consideration in their new stand to the various regional economies, the particularities are given more importance, whereas the CPI and CPI (M) programmes give importance to the generalities.

The CPI (ML) came into existence because of the differences within the CPI (M) over the strategy and tactics as well as over the differences in assessing the material conditions in India. Since the inception,

the party rightly pointed out the pitfalls in one-sidedly following the parliamentary path to get political power. But while pointing out the mistakes, the CPI (ML) went to the other extreme of onesidely neglecting the mass line. In assessing the character of Indian society CPI (ML) borrowed all the formulations from the Chinese Communist Party taking for granted that present day Indian conditions were similar to that of pre-revolutionary China. CPI (ML) had less discussions on assessing the Indian situation. Rather it concentrated its energies on correcting the 'revisionist' mistakes of the Indian communist movement. But when the party realised this realization was not uniform, and hence the unnumerable splits which ensued.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Since the twenties Marxists in India have been influenced by the theoretical literature produced by the communist parties of various countries. Till 1947 the united CPI had been influenced by the theoretical lines of Communist Party of Great Britain and CPSU. In CPI, till now the tendency to be influenced by other communist parties, especially the CPSU, continues to exist. Like CPI, CPI (ML) was all through its brief history, under the influence of the CPC. This does not mean that the Communists in these parties just accepted the understanding of other communist parties. This was partly, at least due, to what they regarded as internationalism. Though CPI (M) claims to be an independent party, one can find various influences in its analyses too. The analyses conducted by the Marxists are part of their political practice. In a sense, they are pioneering studies of the Indian state. But they are not elaborate studies as far as the state is concerned.

State is an extremely complex phenomenon. To comprehend various aspects of the state it is necessary that different aspects of national and international spheres should be studied. The analysis of imperialism,

the general development at the world level, main contradictions of the present time, the general direction of history, have to be studied at the international level ^{and} the nature of the economy, the class character of the state, character of the bourgeoisie have to be analysed at the national level.

In the post independence period Marxists tried to understand the state in India. In the initial period the CPI was divided over its nature. There were Leftist, Rightist and Centrist groups inside the party who held different opinions on this issue. Till 1964 this problem continued. With the split this problem came to an end. The CPI arrived at a new understanding on the basis of the programme of the 20th Congress of the CPSU. This further developed, and culminated in the form of its party programme of 1964. Within CPI (M) the revolutionaries who were influenced by Mao, since 1964 expressed their differences, and finally left the CPI (M) and formed their own party in 1969.

According to CPI in India, capitalist development has attained a middle level. It is independent capitalist development. There are two kinds of capitalist enterprise, State capitalism in the state sector, private capitalism in private sector. Independent capitalist development in India was possible, because of the

emergence of the Socialist system and the crisis in the world capitalist system. To prove this proposition, the CPI compared the size of the capitalist productive sector in pre-independence period with post independence period. It found the number of industries and working class have increased in the post-independence period, which is taken as an indicator of the capitalist development. By contrast, the CPI (M) takes a different position. According to CPI (M) the Indian state took the path of capitalism, when the capitalism was in crisis and on the decline on a world scale. So the capitalist path chosen by the bourgeoisie was historically outdated and it will remain ⁱⁿ a permanent crisis. The kind of capitalism that has been developing here is dependent on imperialism. According to CPI (ML) there is no independent or dependent capitalism; all capitalists in the third world is comprador capitalism. Among the CPI (ML) groups, there is some difference of opinion on how exactly to interpret this general idea.

Since the state is a capitalist state, it took measures like land reforms to abolish feudalism: says the CPI. After the introduction of land reforms, the number of landholding increased. CPI (M) also accepts that the state in fact brought limited land

reforms and other measures; but in the CPI(M) view, they were not aimed to abolish feudalism and free the peasantry, but were meant to transform the landlords into capitalist landlords, since the state is a capitalist landlord state. CPI(ML) says since the landlords were sharing power it protects landlordism in many ways. Besides, this arrangement was helped by imperialism. This was the most important factor in protecting feudalism.

According to CPI, the bourgeoisie in India is a national bourgeoisie. They have anti-imperialist character. The CPI further says that the national bourgeoisie had fought against the imperialism. Among the bourgeoisie there are two sections. One is pro-imperialist and another section is anti-imperialist. The pro-imperialist section often influence state policies to an extent. The CPI(M) believes that the bourgeoisie in India has a dual character; In the pre-independence period also the behaviour of the bourgeoisie demonstrated this dualism. On the one hand they mobilised people against imperialism, on the other hand they compromised with it. In the post independence period the bourgeoisie collaborated with imperialism for its production needs and opposed imperialism while selling its products in the national market. The CPI(ML) has a different view.

To them, Indian capitalists are basically compradors. There are two kinds of compradors, i.e. bureaucratic bourgeoisie and comprador bourgeoisie. The former controls the large public sector. In the post-independence period the input of finance capital is increasing more and more.

Now we come to the question of class character of state. CPI says that the state is the organ of national bourgeoisie who has 'links' with landlords. The nature of relationship between the bourgeoisie and landlords is described as their being 'linked' to show that landlords do not share state power. The CPI analysis underemphasised the presence of landlords in state and so describes them as having links with it. In the same way it explains the relation between the bourgeoisie and state. According to this analysis the monopoly bourgeoisie has only 'influence' on state power, which is wielded by the bourgeoisie as a whole. The CPI(M) perception is quite different. It says the state is a capitalist-landlord state. The implication of this statement is that state power is shared by the landlords and capitalists (monopolists). The big bourgeoisie is dominating the state and its basic policies. CPI(ML) looks at the state as being controlled by big landlord and comprador bureaucratic capitalists,

who are the 'stooges' of U.S. and Soviet Social imperialism.

The freedom, according to CPI, that India got in 1947 is real freedom. But CPM considers independence as a process. It depends upon the ruling class actions in the realm of socio-economic development. The CPI (ML) categorically says the independence is a 'sham independence'. This position holds that there is no change after 1947.

Regarding the foreign policy of India CPI and CPI (M), both, at present take similar positions though CPI (M) had some earlier differences in understanding the foreign policy. Both say that the foreign policy of India is a policy of peace and non-alignment, which suits the needs of the capitalists as well as the common people. CPI (ML) says it is a policy entirely subservient to imperialism.

The foreign policy analysis of the Communist Parties is based on their analysis of imperialism and main contradiction of the time. Since both CPI & CPI (M) parties consider Soviet Russia as a socialist country and U.S. and other western countries as imperialist countries, any action taken by India in support of the socialist country in international arena, is considered a policy of peace. So it further characterise

fundamentally 'reflecting' the needs of the people. CPI(M) says the foreign policy of India has its links with its domestic policy and class interests.

As far as the form of state is concerned, the CPI and CPI(M) by and large, consider it a 'bourgeoisie democracy'. Both parties agree that the rights and freedom given by the Constitution can be used as instruments for popular struggles. At the same time CPI(M) cautiously maintains that these freedom or rights will be curtailed if these go against the interests of the ruling class. This caution made CPI(M) to take a correct position during the emergency. The CPI(ML) rejects the possibility of the existence of democracy altogether. To them democracy in India is a farce.

The CPI wants to replace the government through a National Democratic Revolution. The CPI(M) wants to replace the state by a people Democratic Revolution. The undivided CPI(ML) opted for a New Democratic revolution. The CPI(M) and CPI(ML) believe that the revolution would be accomplished by a coalition of classes under the leadership of the working class, whereas CPI wants to do it under the joint leadership of bourgeoisie and working class.

CPI aims to take power through peaceful means; After attaining state power it will change the state

according to the needs of the people, which is quite contrary to the understanding of Marx and Lenin, whose theory says that the bourgeois state cannot be used for working class interests. Till it comes to power, it decided to take up the role of correcting the bourgeois state by putting popular pressure on it. Only after emergency did the CPI change its stand. CPI (M) strategy seems to take power at the state level, and build towards a national alternative. To attain the political power it will use the parliamentary as well as extra parliamentary methods. Though the CPI (M) says it will try both methods, for more than two decades it is travelling and leading the masses predominantly in the parliamentary path.

The CPI (ML) saw the armed struggle as the only strategy to capture political power. The armed struggles were later reduced to a strategy of physical annihilation of the class enemy.

It gave more importance to building people's power in rural areas. It boycotted the elections and it considered elections as a process of legitimization of the bourgeois institutions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DOCUMENTS:

Programme of the Communist Party of India, New Delhi:
Communist Party Publication, Nov. 1973.

Documents of the Seventh Congress of CPI, Bombay, 1964,
New Delhi: February 1965 (C.P. Publication).

Documents of the Eighth Party Congress, Patna, New
Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1968.

Documents of the Ninth Congress of the CPI, Cochin,
New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1972.

Documents of the Eleventh Congress of the CPI, Bhatinda,
New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1978.

Documents of the Twelfth Congress of the CPI, New Delhi:
C.P. Publication, 1982.

Guidelines of the History of the Communist Party of
India, New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1974.

CPI's stand on Major Issues, New Delhi: C.P. Publication,
Dec. 1985.

Rao, M.B. (ed.), Documents of the History of the CPI,
vol. VII (1948-50), New Delhi: PPH, 1976.

Draft Review of National and International Developments
since the Varanasi Party Congress, adopted by the
National Council of the CPI, Dec. 1985 for Discussion
in the 13th party Congress, New Delhi: C.P. Publi-
cation, n.d.

Election Manifesto of CPI, New Delhi: C.P. Publication,
1971.

National Democratic Front for National Democratic
Tasks, New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1962.

On Centre State relations, New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication
Dec. 1983.

Central Committee Resolutions August 1968, Calcutta:
CPI (M) Publications, August 1968.

CPI (M) Constitution, Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication, 1968.

Election Manifesto, 1971 CPI (M), New Delhi: C.P.
Publication, 1971.

Fight Against Revisionism, Political Organizational
Report, adopted at the Seventh Congress, New
Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, 1968.

On Left Deviation, Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication, 1967.

Documents of the Seventh Congress of the CPI (M),
New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, 1964.

Political-Organizational Report of Eighth Congress
of the CPI (M), Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication,
April 1969.

Political Resolution Adopted by the Ninth Congress,
Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication, July 1972.

Political Resolution Adopted at the Tenth Congress
of the CPI (M), April 2 to April 8, 1978,
Jullundur, New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication,
Oct. 1978.

Review Report adopted by the Tenth Congress, Jullundur,
April 2-8, 1978, New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication
May 1979.

Political Resolution of the Eleventh Congress of
the Eleventh Congress of the CPI (M) Vijaywada,
New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, March 1982.

Political-Organisational Report of the Eleventh
Congress of the CPI (Marxist), Vijayawada,
New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, Oct. 1982.

Political Organisational Report of the Twelfth
Congress of the CPI (M), Calcutta, Dec. 25-30,
1985, New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, May 1986.

Draft Political Resolution for the Twelfth Congress
of the CPI (M), Adopted by the Central Committee
at its meeting in New Delhi, Oct. 1-4, 1985,
New Delhi: People's Democracy, Oct. 20, 1985.

Report on International & National situation, Adopted by the Central Committee meeting, August 4-6, 1986, New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, August 1986.

Resolutions of the Central Committee Nov. 1973, Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication, Nov. 1973.

CPI (M) Programme, New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, May 1984.

Stand on Ideological Issues, Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication, 1969.

CPI (M) Work Report (Political), Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication, 1972.

Basavapunniah, M., The 'Statement of Policy' Reviewed, New Delhi: National Book Centre, April 1986.

Tasks on the Trade Union front, Resolution of the C.C. CPI (M), Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication, July 1968.

"Communique of the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries" issued on 22nd April 1969, Liberation (Calcutta), May 1969.

"Declaration of the Revolutionaries of the Communist Party of India (Marxist", Liberation (Calcutta), Dec. 1967.

Declaration of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement, New Delhi: Mass Line Publications, May 1984.

"An Insight into the Ideological Political Line Pursued by the Central Committee led by Comrade Vinod Mishra", Party Unity (Central organ of the Central Organising Committee, CPI (M).

"It is time to form the party", Calcutta, Liberation (Calcutta), March 1969.

"A letter to All Party Comrades from CRC", Liberation (Organ of Central Committee CPI (ML), vol.10, No.2, May 1984.

Mazumdar, Charu, Eight Documents, New Delhi: Mass Line Publications, 1982.

Political Resolution of the CPI (ML), Liberation (Calcutta), May 1969.

"The Politics of Nagi Reddy", Liberation (Calcutta), Oct. 1969.

Programme of the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist), A Central Reorganisation Committee Publication, 1982.

Vinod Misra, Report from the Planning Fields of Bihar, A CPI (ML) Document, Calcutta, 1985.

Report on Peasants' Armed Struggle in Srikakulam, Liberation (Calcutta), May 1969.

Resolution on Elections Adopted by the All India Co-ordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries, Liberation (Calcutta), June 1968.

Towards A New Phase of Spring Thunder, Central Re-organisation Committee Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist), 1982.

BOOKS:

Adhikari, G., Communist Party and India's Path to National Regeneration and Socialism (New Delhi: CPI Publication, 1964.

Ahmad, Muzaffar, The Communist Party of India and its Formation Abroad, Calcutta, 1962.

Avineri, Shlomo, The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx, New Delhi: Chand, 1977.

Banerjee, Sumanta, India's Simmering Revolution, London: Zed Books Ltd., 1984.

Basavapunniah, M., On the Political Line of the CPI (M), New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, 1979.

Bottomore, Tom (ed.), A Dictionary of Marxist Thought, Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.

Brass, Paul R. and Franda Marcus, F. (eds.), Radical Politics in South Asia, Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1973.

Carnoy, Martin, The State and Political Theory, New Jersey N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1984.

- Chandra, Bipan, Indian Left, New Delhi: Vikas, 1984.
- Chattopadhyay, Gautam, Arun Shourie's standers Rebutted History has Vindicated the Communists, New Delhi: CPI Publication, 1984.
- Collinicos, Alex, Revolutionary ideas of Marx, London: Book Mark Publications, 1984.
- Das Gupta, Biplab, The Naxalite Movement, Calcutta: Allied Publishers, 1974.
- Datt, R. and Sundharam, K.P.M., Indian Economy, New Delhi: Chand, 1978.
- Desai, A.R., Public Sector in India - Controversies About its role, Bombay: C.G. Shah Memorial Trust, 1985.
- Desai, A.R., Recent Trends in Indian Nationalism, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1973.
- Desai, A.R., Social Background of Indian Nationalism, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1982.
- Desai, A.R., State and Society in India: Essays in Dissent, Bombay: Popular Prakashana, 1975.
- Dutt, Srikant, India and the third world: Altruism or Hegemony, London: Zed books, 1984.
- Engels, F., The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, New York: International Publishers, 1968.
- File, Victor M., Peaceful Transition to Communism in India, Delhi: Nachiketa Publication, 1963.
- Ghose, Sankar, Socialism and Communism in India, Calcutta: Allied Publishers, 1971.
- Ghosh, Shibdas, Why Suci is the only Genuine: Communist Party in India, Calcutta: SUSI Publication, 1982.
- Ghosh, Sunili Kumar, The Indian Big Bourgeoisie: Its genesis Growth and character, Calcutta, 1985.
- Gough, Kathleen and Sharma, Hari (eds.), Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia, New York N.Y.: Monthly Review Press, 1973.

- Gupta, Mermpath Nath, History of India Revolutionary Movement, Bombay: Samaiya Publication, 1972.
- Gupta, Bhabani Sen, Communism in Indian Politics, New Delhi: Young Asia Publication, 1978.
- Gupta, Bhabani Sen, CPI (M) Promises, Prospects and Problems, New Delhi: Young Asia Publication, 1979.
- Haithcox, John P., Nationalism and Communism in India, New Jersey: Princeton University, 1971.
- Jacob, T.C., India Development and Deprivation; New colonial Transformation of the Economy in a historical perspective, New Delhi: Mass Line Press, 1985.
- Jawaid, Sehail, The Naxalite Movement in India, New Delhi: Associated Publishing House, 1979.
- Joshi, P.C., Communist Reply to Congress Working Committee's Changes, Bombay: People's Publishing House, Dec. 1945.
- Kurian, Mathew K. (ed.), India - State and Society: A Marxian Approach, New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1975.
- Lotta Raymond, Szymanski Albert, The Soviet Union: Socialist or Social Imperialist? Chicago: RCP Publications, 1983.
- Lenin, V.I., Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975.
- Lenin, V.I., State and Revolution, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972.
- Marx and Engels, The Manifesto of the Communist Party, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1975.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F., Selected Works, vol.1&2, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1968.
- Miliband, Ralph, Marxism and Politics, London: Oxford Unvi. Press, 1977.
- Miliband, Ralph, The State in Capitalist Society, London: Quarlet Books, 1976.

- Mohanty, Manoranjan, Revolutionary Violence, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1977.
- Namboodiripad, E.M.S., Crisis into chaos: Political India 1981, New Delhi: Sangam, 1974.
- Namboodiripad, E.M.S., Economics and Politics of India's Socialist Pattern, Delhi: PPH, 1966.
- Namboodiripad, E.M.S., Fight Against Revisionism, Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication.
- Namboodiripad, E.M.S., The Programme Explained, Calcutta: CPI (M) Publication.
- Namboodiripad, E.M.S., On Organization, Calcutta: C.P. Publication, 1954.
- Overstreet, Gene D. and Windmiller, Marshall, Communism in India, California: Berkeley Univ. Press, 1959.
- Panikkar, K.N. (ed.), Prospects of Left Unity, New Delhi: Envee Publications, 1979.
- Parakal, Pauly K., CPI's Concept of Left and Democratic Alternative, New Delhi: CPI Publication, 1985.
- Poulantzas, Nicos, Political Power and Social Classes, London: New Left Books, 1973.
- Rai Choudhury, Satyabrata, Leftist Movement in India, 1917-1947, Calcutta: Minerva Publications, 1976.
- Ramamoorthi, P., Real Face of the Assam Agitation, New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, 1980.
- Ramamoorthi, P., The Role of Communists in India's Struggle for Freedom, Madras: Tamil Puthakalyam, 1985.
- Ram, Mohan, Maoism in India, Delhi: Vikas, 1971.
- Rao, Rajeswara C. et al, CPI's struggle for Communist Unity, New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1985.
- Ranadive, B.T., Centre-State Relations, Delhi: Janvadi Vichar, n.d.
- Ranadive, B.T., Two Programmes, Calcutta: CPI (M) Publications, 1968.

- Rao, D.V., Telangana Armed Struggle and the Path of Indian Revolution, Calcutta: Proletarian Path Publication, 1974.
- Reddy, Nagi T., India Mortgaged, Vijayawada, 1978.
- Roy, Ajit, India in the Seventies, Calcutta, 1978.
- Roy, Ajit, Monopoly Capitalism in India, Calcutta, 1976.
- Roy, Ajit, Politics and Economics of Garibi Hatao, New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House, 1972.
- Roy, Ajit, Political power in India - Nature and Trends, Calcutta, 1975.
- Sen, Asit, An Approach to Naxalbari, Calcutta: Institute of Scientific Thoughts, 1980.
- Sen, Bhawani, A Truth About CPI, Calcutta: C.P. Publication, 1972.
- Sen, Mohit, Aspects of CPI Programme, New Delhi: C.P. Publication, 1966.
- Sen, Mohit, Revolution in India - Path and Problems, New Delhi: PPH, 1977.
- Sen, Samar et al (eds.), Naxalbari And After, vol.1&2, Calcutta: Kathashilpa, 1978.
- Surjeet, H.S., Fight the Threat of Divisive Forces, Defend National Unity, New Delhi: CPI (M) Publication, 1986.
- Therborn, Goran, What Does the Ruling class do when it Ruie? London: New Left Books, 1978.
- Ulyanovsky, R.A., The Comintern and the East, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1979.
- Venu, K., Mao-Tse Tung and Three World Theory, New Delhi: Progressive Publications, March 1983.
- Venu, K., Philosophical Problems of Revolution, Kottayam: Vijayan Book Stall, 1982.
- Wilson, Jeyaratnam A. and Dalton, Dennis (eds.), The States of South Asia: Problems of National Integration, New Delhi: Vikas, 1982.

Unpublished Research Work:

Kaviraj, Sudipto, The Split in the Communist Movement in India, an unpublished doctoral thesis submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University, School of Social Sciences, New Delhi, 1979.

ARTICLES:

- Alavi, Hamza, "The State in Post-colonial Societies" in Kathleen Gough and Hari Sharma (eds.), Imperialism and Revolution in South Asia, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973.
- Bardhan, Pranab, "Abortive State Capitalism in India", Frontier (Calcutta), October 18, 1980, pp.11-14.
- Basu, Manish, "The Fraud of Bank Nationalisation", Liberation (Calcutta), Aug. 1969.
- Baru, Sanjaya, "Marx Centenary: Karl Marx and Analysis of Indian Society", Economic & Political Weekly (Bombay), 10 Dec. 1983.
- Bnattacharyya, Harihar, "Ralph Miliband's understanding of Marxism: A critique", Socialist Perspective (Calcutta), vol.13, no.3, 1986.
- Block, Fred, "Beyond Relative Autonomy State managers As Historical Subjects", The Socialist Register (London), 1980.
- Bose, Soumitra, "12th Congress of CPM", Marxism Today (New Delhi), vol.1, no.3, Feb. 1986.
- Chattopadhyaya, Subash, "Authoritarianism and Democracy - A comment", Economic and Political Weekly (Bombay), July 22, 1978.
- Choudhuri, Partha, "Phrases and Facts: About Kerala", Liberation (Calcutta), vol.2, no.2, Dec. 1968.
- Chattopadhyaya, Paresh, "State Capitalism in India", Monthly Review (New York, N.Y.), March 1970.
- Dass, Jyotirmoy, "CPI and CPI-M - Do the difference matter", Left View (New Delhi), Feb. 1986.

- David A. Gold, Clarence Y.M. Lo, & Erik clin Wright, "Recent Developments in Marxist Theories of the Capitalist state part II", Monthly Review, Nov. 1975.
- Dutta, Satyabrata, "The Left And India's Legislative Institutions", Socialist Perspective (Calcutta), vol.13, no.13, 1986.
- Engineer, Asghar Ali, "Marxist Theory and Nature of classes in India", Mainstream (New Delhi), March 31, 1984.
- Franda, Marcus, Radical Politics in West Bengal, Cambridge, Mass: The M.I.T. Press 1971.
- Guna, S., "Is India really Independent", Liberation (Calcutta), Aug. 1968.
- Habib, Irfan, "Marx's perception of India", The Marxist (New Delhi), July-Sept 1983 (vol.I).
- Josh, Bhagwan, "Understanding Indian Communists A survey of Approaches to the study of Communist Movement in India, 1920-1947", Indian History Congress, Kurukshetra, 1982.
- Karat, Prakash, "Naxalism Today; At an Ideological Deadend", The Marxist (New Delhi), vol.3, Jan-Mar 1985.
- Miliband, Ralph, "The Problem of Capitalist State", in Blackburn (ed.), Ideology in Social Sciences, London: Fontana, 1972.
- Miliband, R., "State Power and Class interests", New Left Review no.138, 1983.
- Mitra, Manab, "The Revolutionary Path is the only Path", Liberation (Calcutta), May 1968.
- Mazumdar, Charu, "Boycott Elections - International significance of the slogan", Liberation (Calcutta), vol.2, no.2, Dec. 1968.
- Mazumdar, Charu, "Develop peasants class struggle through class Analysis Investigation and Study", Liberation (Calcutta), Nov. 1968.

- Mazumdar, Charu, "A Few Words About Gurrilla Actions", Liberation (Calcutta), vol.3, Feb. 1970.
- Mazumdar, Charu, "Give priority to the Task of Establishing the peasants political power in the countryside", Liberation (Calcutta), Sep.-Dec. 1970.
- Mazumdar, Charu, "The Indian People's Democratic Revolution", Liberation (Calcutta), June 1968.
- Mukherjee, Subrata, "The Three Political phases of M.N. Roy", The Times of India (New Delhi), 15 Aug. 1986.
- Namboodiripad, E.M.S., "Marx on India", The Marxist (New Delhi), vol.I, July-Sept 1983.
- Pathar, Bhowani, "The character of the Indian bourgeoisie", Liberation (Calcutta), Dec. 1967.
- Parekh, Bhiknu, "Marx's Theory of the State: A Historical Perspective", in Roy, V.K. and Sarakwal, (eds.), Marxian Sociology, New Delhi: Ajanta Publications, vol2, 1979.
- Patankar, Bharat & Omvedt Gail, "The Bourgeois State in Post-Colonial Social Formations", E.P.W., (Bombay), Dec. 1977.
- Patnaik, Prabhat, "Imperialism and the Growth of Indian Capitalism", in Rabin Blackburn (ed.), Explosion in a Sub-continent, London: Penguin, 1974.
- Poulantzas, Nicos, "The Capitalist State: A Reply to Miliband and Laclas", New Left Review, no.59, Dec. 1968-Jan. 1969.
- Poulantzas, Nicos, "The Problem of the Capitalist State", in Blackburn R. (ed.), Ideology in Social Sciences, London: Fontana, 1972.
- Sabyasachi, "Theory and Practice of Para 112 of CPI(M) Programme", Marxism Today (New Delhi), vol.I, no.2, Nov. 1978.
- Sanyal, Kanu, "Report on the Peasant Movement in the Terai Region", Liberation (Calcutta), Nov. 1968.

- Surjeet, Harikishan Singh, "CPI-CPI (M) Differences", People's Democracy (New Delhi), 20 Oct. 1981.
- Satyakam, "P.L. 480 and India's freedom", Liberation (Calcutta), vol.2, no.5, March 1969.
- Sathyamurthy, T.V., "State power and class conflicts in India", Mainstream (New Delhi), June 4, 1983.
- Sen, Shankar, "Soviet 'Aid' to India - What does it Really mean", Liberation (Calcutta), Aug. 1968.
- Srivastava, H.C., "Neo-Marxian Paradigms of the Capitalist State", Social Science Probings (New Delhi), June 1985.
- Sudarshan, "Getting Rich", Frontier (Calcutta), vol.18, no.38, May 10, 1986.
- Thorner, Alice, "Semi-Feudalism or Capitalism?", Economic & Political Weekly (Bombay), Dec. 1982.

JOURNALS & PERIODICALS:

- Economic and Political Weekly (Bombay).
- Frontier (Calcutta).
- Liberation (Calcutta).
- Monthly Review (New York).
- Mass Line (Delhi).
- Marxism Today (Delhi).
- New Left Review
- People's Democracy (Delhi).
- New Age (Delhi).
- Times of India (Delhi).