

THE POLEMIC ON THE STAGE OF REVOLUTION IN INDIA

The Proletarian Path, in its inaugural issue (new series, vol. I, No 1, Nov - Dec 1992) published its stand on revolution in India calling it socialist. Comrade Vijay Singh, editor, Revolutionary Democracy (in its Vol. 3, No 2, sep 1997), challenging the stand of the proletarian path and advancing the stage as a democratic one published a long article "A critique of the contemporary Adherent of the views of M. N. Roy, Evgeny Varga and Leon Trotsky on the stage of revolution in India" on pages 40-60. Subsequently Alliance-ML of Canada also published an article in its organ No. 28, January 1998, in support of the democratic stage of revolution in India – though it criticized the arguments of Revolutionary Democracy.

A healthy dialogue on this vital issue was in the process of developing. Proletarian path was duty bound morally and politically to continue this dialogue defending its stand which it failed to do. This unpardonable lapse of the proletarian path is now (Jan - March, 2001) being rectified by meeting the challenges of the Revolutionary Democracy and Alliance - ML.

We must meet this challenge in two parts separately.

The stage of revolution and the journal "Revolutionary Democracy"

Introduction

There is a popular Bengali proverb – Dhan Vante Shiver geet (Shiva's song while husking paddy) meaning a quite unnecessary and irrelevant song on the occasion concerned. Our most learned critique Revolutionary Democracy , sang , likewise , a quite unnecessary and irrelevant song of 'real' or 'genuine' industrialization and programme of the 6th congress of communist international while speaking of the determination of the stage of revolution in India , in its rejoinder to proletarian path and its editor in Revolutionary Democracy , Vol. III, No. 2, Sept. 1997 in "A critique of the contemporary adherents of the views of M. N. Roy , Evgeny Varga and Leon Trotsky on the current stage of revolution in India " on pages 40 to 60 . Besides its irrelevant song of 'real' or 'genuine' industrialization and programme of the 6th congress of the Communist International it also tried its best to vitiate and turn a healthy Marxist polemic into an antagonistic warfare by using such filthy invectives which can only be used against the worst enemies of revolution and of the proletarian class. Proletarian path will try its best to avoid the path of hatred, enmity and revenge and will strictly follow the norms of comradely criticism in continuing this polemic.

The Proletarian Path stands firmly on its arguments put forward in its inaugural issue (New series, Vol. I, Nov-Dec. 1992) and as such, this article it will only show and prove Revolutionary Democracy's utter ignorance of the ABC of Marxism and the essence of the programme of the 6th congress of the Communist International.

The central point of the polemic between the Proletarian path and the Revolutionary Democracy (hence forth PP and RD) are not on the fake of genuine industrialization BUT on the political economy of India. All the Marxist Leninists know that the proper subject matter of political economy is formed by *Human Social Relation* that take shape during production of the material

things of life the SOCIAL SYSTEM OF PRODUCTION. BUT our critic RD, unfortunately, bypassing the political economy or the social relations of India sang the song of productive forces or machine making machine - completely extricating it from the relations of production. It has made capitalism synonymous with the manufacture of machine making machine, completely ignoring the emergence of *different types of capitalism* since the period of imperialism when export of capital, instead of export of goods and the process of globalization of capital and capitalism began. Though it referred to the programme of the 6th congress of communist international (hence forth only the programme) in its defence, it totally disregarded the programme in its assignment of capitalism in India. Whereas the programme says:

"The uneven development of capitalism, which becomes more accentuated in the period of imperialism, *has given rise to a variety of types of capitalism.*"

PP now will show and prove how childish and un-Marxist is the stand and interpretation of RD's first and foremost important subject matter under the sub-heading "productive forces, production relation and the determination of the stage of Revolution."

Productive Forces and the Relation of Production

The editor of Proletarian Path said, "In determination the stage of revolution Revolutionary Democracy's point of departure is machine making machine or heavy industry - not the relation of production in industry and agriculture. I consider this point of departure is quite an un-Marxist in determining in stage of revolution." (See Revolutionary Democracy, Vol. III, No. II, Sept 1997 issue, p. 34, in '*Marxist methodology and the current stage of revolution*' by Moni Guha).

In reply to above, Revolutionary Democracy, in its rejoinder, once again betrayed its ignorance about the ABC of Marxist conception on the indissoluble relation between the productive forces and relation of production and their character and role. Revolutionary Democracy, consciously or unconsciously violating the law of indissoluble unity and contradiction and analysis and synthesis of Marxism, extricated the productive forces from the relations of production and has made the productive forces all-in-all and thus has arrived at wrong an un-Marxist conclusion that without the manufacture of machine making machine or heavy industry, there cannot be any capitalism and capitalist relation. With a view to prove this gem our critique has said:

"Marx established that the level of development of the productive forces *determines* the economics system of society". (Ibid, pg. 41, under the subheading under discussion, emphasis on 'determines' is ours).

Proletarian Path most humbly, but quite resolutely challenges Revolutionary Democracy to show where and when Marx "established" this arrant nonsense.

On the basis of this arrant nonsense our critique Revolutionary Democracy, like that of Napoleon at waterloo shouts:

"Proletarian Path has liquidated Marxism in his methodology "(I bid p. 55, Para, 2)

We shall see now who has liquidated Marxism in its methodology - Proletarian Path or Revolutionary Democracy?

We are forced to begin from the beginning of Marxism and we appeal to the readers to excuse us.

What are the productive forces?

Productive forces are means of production and people who set the means of production in motion.

Describing the labour process, Marx noted that human labour and the means of production are interconnected and interdependent. Labour is inconceivable without means of production and the means of production is meaningless without labour. And human labour always has a definite social form. Lenin said:

"The primary productive forces of human society as a whole is the workers, the working people". (Lenin, C.W., Vol. 29, pg. 304)

Elsewhere Lenin said:

"...The development of human society IS CONDITIONED by the development of material forces, the productive forces". (Lenin, C.W., Vol. 2, pg. 21, emphasis on "is conditioned" by ours)

We would request our critique and readers to please note carefully Lenin's "is conditioned". Marx said that the productive forces are INDICATORS of man's position with respect to technology and natural forces of human society. What do then Lenin's "is conditioned" and Marx's "indicator" really mean? It clearly means that the productive forces DO NOT DETERMINE the economic system of society. It can help us to guess the level of development of human society.

So, the un-Marxist and banal theory of our critique that the level of the development of productive forces determines the economic system of society holds no water. Marx could not and in fact did not "establish" that nonsense.

What, then, determine the various economic systems of society? Marx, unambiguously categorically said:

"For production to go at all they (the labour and the means of production) must unite. THE SPECIFIC MANNER IN WHICH THIS UNION ACCOMPLISHED *distinguishes* THE DIFFERENT ECONOMIC EPOCHS OF THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIETY." (Marx, Capital, Vol. II, pg. 34, Foreign Language Press, Moscow, emphasis in capital letters ours).

Stalin, in his '*Dialectical and Historical Materialism*' explained Marx this "specific manner" in most brilliant way. The three system of class exploitation know to history differ from one

another NOT ONLY in the ownership of the means of production, BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY in the manner in which the labourers and the means of production are united. Stalin points out that the basic of the relation of production under the slave system was fully ownership by the slave-owner of the means of production - the slaves; the basis of the relation of production under feudal system was full ownership by the feudal lords of the means of production and the partial ownership of the workers in production- the serfs; the basis of the relation of production under the capitalist system was the ownership by the capitalist of the means of production but not the workers in production.

It is crystal clear from the above that Marx "established" NOT the level of productive forces determine the economic system of society, BUT the specific manner of unity between the labourers and the means of production determine the specific economic system of society. The above also means that our critique's assertion is nothing but arrant nonsense.

As the ownership of means of production plays so important a part in forming the relations of production, that is why relations of production are also called "property relations" - which is the "legal" term of relation of production.

Indissolubility of productive forces and the relations of production

Though the means of production and the labourers who set the means of production into action constitute the productive forces, yet to obtain vital material things, "for production to go at all" IT IS NOT ENOUGH to have productive forces only - whatever it may be level of their development. Men have to co-operate with one another TO ENTER INTO DEFINITE SOCIAL AND PRODUCTION RELATIONS. Hence the productive forces and the relations of production in their indissoluble dialectical unity form TWO ASPECTS OF SOCIAL PRODUCTION AND one cannot think one without the other.

But Revolutionary Democracy in its infantile over enthusiasm towards the productive forces has, unfortunately, made it all in all, as things without any soul, surprisingly enough, exactly like those of bourgeoisie and vulgar economists. Marx, in refuting such interpretation of capital in terms of productive forces said:

"Capital is not a thing (means of production) but rather a definite social production relations belonging to a definite historical formation of society which is manifested in a thing and lends this thing a specific social character". (Marx: Capital, vol. III, pg. 814, emphasis ours)

Unfortunately, Revolutionary Democracy has forgotten that the productive forces always function in a certain economic form WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION OF A SPECIFIC TYPE. No one can isolate and extricate the productive forces from the relations of production EVEN THEORETICALLY. Unquestionably the level of development of productive forces (means of production, technology, science, standard of knowledge and skill etc.....) of the past society predetermines the basis of relations of production corresponding to the given stage of history. In this sense, and only in this sense productive forces are primary and the relations of production are secondary. But THIS DOES NOT MEAN IN THE LEAST that the level of development of the productive forces determine the economic

system of society. Our critique has gone too far in his wild imagination and thus made the role of relations of production a passive bystander. But the fact is: having developed on the basis of the past society relations of production exercise an active and tremendous feedback influence on the productive forces either promoting their rapid of development or holding them back and inhabiting their growth. So, ignoring, isolating and extricating the active role of the relations of production and their exertion of feedback influence on the productive forces is not Marxism but a caricature of Marxism.

Endless caricature of Marxism has been performed by our critique. The Marxist understanding of political economy is so miserably betrayed. Thus our critique has made the "economic development" synonymous with the productive forces. It has brought Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin to the witness box in defence of this queer theory of productive forces. It has said: "in opposition to the approach of Proletarian Path Lenin took the level of economic development of Russia as his point of departure in determining the stage of revolution".

Then it quoted Lenin as under:

"The degree of Russia's ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (objective condition)... etc. Revolutionary Democracy, further wrote:

"The Leninist approach of taking the ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT of a country into account when determining the stage of revolution was the point of departure in drafting the programme of the Communist International which was adopted by the 6th congress in 1928....." (Ibid, pg. 42, under the same subheading under discussion, emphasis ours).

It is really unfortunate that our critique does not know about the basic difference between the "level of development of the *productive forces*" and "the degree of *economic development*", in spite of Lenin's "objective condition" in parenthesis.

Is "objective condition" or "the degree of economic development" of the Lenin synonymous with our critique "the level of productive forces"? Even a novice knows that the productive forces and "objective condition" or "economic development" are NOT the same thing. The two denote completely different things. One cow and man does never mean two cows or two men. "Economic development" or the "objective condition" are the sum total of the socio-economic condition of the society and it is the subject matter of political economy of which Proletarian Path spoke, whereas the productive forces are the subject matter of technology, science and skills of workers. What then, is political economy? In his "Anti-During" Engels said that the political economy, in its broadest sense, is the science of laws governing the production and exchange of material values in human society. Obviously, the productive forces do not cover the production and the exchange. To build up economy and to make economic development a certain *mode of production* is required. And what is mode of production? MODE OF PRODUCTION is constituted by the UNITY OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES AND THE CORRESPONDING RELATION OF THE PRODUCTION. Without taking all these into account and laws one cannot have any understanding of economy or objective condition. Do productive forces alone, then, be synonymous with the "objective condition"?

It is clear now that the Leninist approach and the point of departure of Lenin and the programme of determining the stage of revolution were NOT "the level of development of productive forces " or 'machine making machine' BUT the economy as a whole i.e., the science of political economy. The approach and the point of departure of Proletarian Path (see, Inaugural Issue) is also the economic development or the objective condition of India as a whole i.e., the science of political economy of India.

So it is not Proletarian Path but the Revolutionary Democracy, who has made caricature of Marxism and believes that Revolutionary Democracy will very soon realize its Himalayan drawbacks in grasping Marxist science and acquire the quality of Bolshevik modesty.

How Revolutionary Democracy reads and understands the programme of the 6th congress of communist International and Stalin?

The Proletarian Path has challenged Revolutionary Democracy besides incontestably proving that Revolutionary Democracy has misread, misunderstood and thus misinterpreted the question of relation between the productive forces and the relations of production. In Proletarian Path we will discuss and prove that our critique has once again misread, misunderstood and misinterpreted both Stalin and the programme of 6th congress of communist international so far the question of 'genuine' or 'real industrialization ' and the development of world capitalism and world proletarian socialist revolution and the dictatorship of proletariat are concerned.

Manufacturing of machine making is the soul of criteria of 'real industrialization' and the development of a society into capitalism from feudalism according to Revolutionary Democracy and asks us to wait up to that stage and meanwhile let the slogan of socialism be kept in the cold storage. Objectively and in last analysis it is a slogan betraying the cause of revolution and socialism. And the wonder of wonders is that Revolutionary Democracy referred to Stalin and the programme in its defence. But Lenin in 1921 thought of skipping over the painful developmental stage of backward countries directly to the socialism during the 2nd congress of Communist International. Besides, both Stalin and programme spoke NOT AT ALL of capitalist industrialization. Both spoke about socialist industrialization and socialist construction, as they very well knew that *since the complete division of the world amongst the imperialist powers there can be no question of 'real' or 'genuine' industrialization of the colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries. But that did not mean the stopping of the process of development and globalization of capitalism.* The programme said:

"The uneven development of capitalism which became more accentuated in the period of imperialism HAS GIVEN RISE TO A VARIETY OF TYPES OF CAPITALISM..."

Unfortunately, our critique hopelessly fails to understand these "variety of types of capitalism" as it understands only one type of capitalism, the classical type. To it, other types of capitalism is no capitalism at all as it does not manufacture machine making machine. A logic indeed!

Does the above quotation mean that the programme debated over the question of real and fake or genuine capitalist industrialization?

Elsewhere, the programme said:

"Colonial and semi colonial countries (India, China etc...) and dependent countries (Argentina, Brazil etc...) having the rudiments and in some cases, a considerably developed industry, in the majority cases inadequate for INDEPENDENT socialist construction..."

Does the above quotation mean that the programme debated over the question the real and fake capitalist industrialization? On the contrary, it recognized capitalism in backward countries as capitalism and even "considerably developed industry" despite the spectacular absence of 'machine making machine' in these countries. And lastly, it spoke of the "inadequacy" of independent socialist construction, NOT of capitalist construction.

Proletarian Path likes to know why, then this childish, unnecessary and irrelevant babble of Revolutionary Democracy and its reference to the programme?

Did Stalin speak and debate over the question of 'real' or 'genuine' capitalist industrialization in his speech on The First Five Year Plane? He spoke on socialist industrialization and its importance and significance of Department I, in this respect.

In this case also the reference of our critics is irrelevant and unnecessary.

Finally did the programme direct to the colonial, semi colonial and dependent countries to effect a bourgeois democratic revolution WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF WORLD BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AS APART OF WORLD CAPITALISM, AS A TRANSITIONAL STAGE, AS IT EXIST TODAY?

Definitely not. The programme placed the perspective of world proletarian socialist revolution and AS A TRANSITIONAL STAGE TO THAT WORLD PROLETARIAN SOCIALIST REVOLUTION. The programme directed to the colonial, semi-colonial, dependent countries to effect a bourgeois democratic revolution WITHIN THE FRAME WORK OF WORLD PROLETARIAN SOCIALIST REVOLUTION AS PART AND PARCEL OF WORLD PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY AND WORLD PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION. Or we may call it SOCIALIST GLOBALISATION.

Here is what Stalin said about The Programme:

"(3) the draft takes its point of departure NOT some particular capitalism of some particular country or portion of the world, BUT THE ENTIRE SYSTEM OF CAPITALISM counterpoising to it THE WORLD SYSTEM OF SOCIALIST ECONOMY...

"(5) Instead of slogan of United States Of Europe, the draft puts forward the slogan of a FEDERATION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS WHICH CONSISTS OF ADVANCE COUNTRIES AND colonies THAT HAVE DROPPED OR ARE DROPPING OUT OF THE IMPERIALIST SYSTEM AND WHICH IS OPPOSED IN ITS struggle for world socialism TO THE WORLD CAPITALISM SYSTEM....."(Stalin: The Programme of the Comintern, July 5, 1928, Works, Vol. 11, pp. 147-164)

Where, then, is the relevance of our critic in referring to the programme? Is there any relevance of the said programme in today's context? We do not expect that our critic friend Revolutionary Democracy becomes pedantic and academic one. Why then our critic advises us to effect a bourgeois democratic revolution within the framework of world bourgeois democracy and capitalist globalization and objectively erects a Chinese wall between the democratic revolution and socialist revolution? Why our critic advocates "Revolutionary Democracy" in words?

But the way, may the Proletarian Path ask Revolutionary Democracy why it abandoned People's Democratic Revolution of CPI(M) and others and why it embraced Revolutionary Democracy ?

Some Straight Questions to Revolutionary Democracy

Revolutionary Democracy first speaks that "nothing has changed since the transfer of power in 1947" and then speaks of necessity of an agrarian revolution as the axis of its bourgeois democratic revolution, of courses, under the leadership of working class. Proletarian Path likes to know, if 'nothing has changed since the transfer of power in 1947', how Revolutionary Democracy explains the spectacular onwards march of the productive forces in agriculture sector in post independent India which remained stagnant in the first half of this century? (Figures of spectacular onward march of the productive forces in agriculture will be readily supplied if and when demanded.)

This spectacular onward march of the productive forces in agriculture is due to the change of relations of production in agriculture. How does Revolutionary Democracy explain this change of relations of production and at the same time defend 'nothing has changed since the transfer of power in 1947'? What is bourgeois democratic revolution? Emancipation of the peasant serf from the stranglehold of feudal bondage so that the free peasants may freely sell their labour power in the market in both industrial and agriculture sector in order to develop capitalism and capitalist relations of production in both the sectors. Due to the bourgeois democratic revolution made under the leadership of Indian bourgeoisie (though incomplete and unfinished) the peasant serfs have become the free labourers. Do you agree that the relations of production in agriculture have changed? If so, how do you defend yours 'nothing has changed since the transfer of power in 1947'? What is the basis of feudal relations of production, feudal bondage? The basis of feudal relations of production, according to Stalin is "full ownership by the feudal lords of the means of production, the partial ownership of the workers in production - the serf"(Stalin: Dialectical and Historical Materialism). Peasants of India are no longer serfs. Is it a not change of fundamental nature in post-independent India?

Question 2. Why in spite of emancipation of the serfs from feudal bondage and in spite of the spectacular rise in agriculture production. Indian agriculture is facing a severe crisis of over production and at the same time agrarian population lives a life of utter poverty and misery and remain backward? Is it because of the peculiar character of the Indian capitalism? Who inhibits and hinder India's productive forces to go forward – Feudalism or Capitalism?

Question 3. What is the overall economy of India - Feudalist or Capitalist? Is the industrial sector integral part of the feudal economy and politics? Does feudalism lead capitalism or capitalism lead feudalism?

Proletarian Path is of the firm opinion that it is not feudalism BUT Indian capitalism which is holding back the productive forces of India.

Yes, the capitalist relations of production in India have turned into fetters – not the feudal relations of production and our task is to smash these fetters to march ahead. The incomplete and half finished bourgeois democratic revolution can only be completed as a by-product of socialist revolution.

Proletarian Path is quite aware of the tremendous influence of feudal ideas and practices IN THE SUPERSTRUCTURE, BUT THIS IS NOT IN THE REALM OF ECONOMIC BASE, IN THE RELATION OF PRODUCTION. Determination of strategic goal is one thing which is related to the relations of production, to the economic base, whereas the determination of *tactical line* is another thing which is related to the superstructure to the men's mind. Our critic Revolutionary Democracy seeing and feeling the tremendous influence of feudal ideas and practice forgets to distinguish between the base and superstructure and between the strategy and tactics.

Proletarian Path is quite aware also of the vastness and unequal development of Indian economics and politics. Concrete local condition should be kept in mind while concretizing the slogan and immediate tasks but they should always be based on over all condition of Indian economics and politics.

Proletarian Path's Reply To Alliance-ML

We give below the summarized view of Alliance-ML on the Proletarian Path's position in regard to the socialist stage of revolution in India to enable the readers to be quite acquainted with the stand of Alliance-ML.

Alliance on Proletarian Path's position

"Alliance disagrees with the overall conclusion [that the stage of revolution in India is socialist] but believes the thrust: 'that there has been a significant series of change since 1947' is accurate. But we would argue to Proletarian Path, that if Lenin's view determining feature of the democratic stage of revolution are considered, then it cannot be said to be at the socialist stage. Thus Lenin took as a determining feature whether or not one could take the peasantry as a whole."

"Yes our revolution is bourgeois revolution as long as we march with the peasantry as whole.... first with the 'whole' of the peasants against the monarchy, against the land owners, against the medievalism (and to that extent the revolution remain as bourgeois, democratic). Then with the poor peasants with the semi proletarian, with all exploited against capitalism including the rural reach the kulak the profilers and to that extent the revolution becomes a socialist one."(Lenin: proletarian Revolution And Renegade Kautsky, Nov. 1918; Selected Works, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1991, pg. 128-129 by Stalin: Foundation of Socialism, April 1924; pg. 105).

Moreover we argue to Proletarian Path that if they truly do feel that as they say, "we do not deny the existence of a certain incidence of debt bondage among agriculture workers" or "the

relatively considerable incidence of share cropping, then there are tasks left over. We presume to remind Proletarian Path of the advice to Engels to Turati:

"Evidently the socialist party is too young, too weak to be able to hope for an immediate victory of socialism.... what role must be socialist party play?.... They therefore take an active part in every phase of the struggle between two classes without losing sight of the fact that these phases are just so many stages leading to the first great goal the conquest of political power by proletariat. (Engels to Turati; Ibid, Selected Correspondence, pg. 444,446)

If Engels can advice in 1894 Italy, what amount to a "re-stepping of certain stages" in the condition of an "incompleteness" it can be argued that given the current subjective illusions and current objective strengths of imperialism it is necessary to do the same in India in 1997.

"We fully agree with the Proletarian Path that serious changes have occurred since 1947 in India. But we argue to Proletarian Path that despite the major changes in the country since 1947 it cannot be said that there are not any significant feudal remnants left; these have not been such an advanced as to remove the democratic first stage.

Besides, we argue that slogan appropriate to the democratic first stage will still mobilise more peasantry. But the possibility of the Proletariat taking the hegemony of the national democratic revolution means, there can be much shorter interim passage between the first stage and the second stage. In these sense that Proletarian Path is thereby skipping even a shorter interim gap-a-stage thus it takes the second deviation noted by Stalin:

"The second deviation lies in an over estimation of the Revolutionary potentialities of the liberation movement and is an underestimation of an alliance between the working class and the revolutionary bourgeois against imperialism....A deviation to the left ... fraught with the danger of the communist party becoming divorced from the masses converted into a sect." (Stalin: Task of the University of People of East, Ibid, pg. 154)

Proletarian Path's Reply

Argument 1.

"But we would argue to Proletarian Path that if Lenin's view of determining features of the democratic stage of revolution are considered we cannot be said to be at the socialist stage..."

Answer to Argument 1:

Unfortunately the above argument is quite irrelevant one as the Proletarian Path does not consider the slogan. "Together with the peasantry as a whole against medievalism is an appropriate slogan as "IT CLASHES VIOLENTLY WITH LIFE" of Indian situation.

Let us quote the whole passage from our inaugural issue (Nov-Dec, 1992), chapter "The Class Struggle in Agrarian Sector," pg. 64.

To many our friend, 'socialist' revolution means nothing other than admitting the progressive character of bourgeoisie [that is admitting that the bourgeoisie have effected the democratic revolution complete or incomplete]. Well friend, the Prussian path is the path of the most reactionary bourgeoisie landlord state. But all the same, we find today before us CAPITALIST INDIA and should not get dazzled either to the right (As the CPI-ML Liberation has) or the left (holding the impossibility of social development). Ideologically if we dogmatically stick to the stage of the democratic revolution and come face to face with reality we will definitely move to the right of Chequer board as Liberation has. It means **CONTENDING WITH THE REALITY** in a negative manner given to the opposite class (the bourgeoisie) moving right and invariably accepting the left democratic front CPI, CPM, SUCI etc. **THE CO-RELATIONS OF CLASS FORCES ARE THAT THE CALL OF DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION CLASHES VIOLENTLY WITH LIFE** and hence the democratic (in course of time) accepts the hegemony of the bourgeoisie (as the social democratic do). (Emphases Added)"

We are sorry, the Indian reality compels us not to consider the democratic stage as an appropriate one and our conclusion is in quite order with Lenin's determining features.

Argument 2.

"...We argue to Proletarian Path that if they truly do feel that as they say" we do not deny the existence of a certain incidence of debt bondage among agricultural worker "or" the relatively considerable incidence of share cropping "then there are tasks [of democratic revolution] left over..."

Ans. to Argument 2.

1) Bonded through indebtedness: If we take into consideration the rural urban migration during the period from 1971 to 1991, we find that during this period, 28 million rural people and during 1981-1991, 22 million rural people migrated from the rural area to cities. Thus a total of 50 million people have migrated from the country side to the cities.

What does it mean? It means that bonded are no longer bonded, they are free from the feudal and semi feudal bondage. The migration testifies eloquently to the reality of freedom. Besides, usurious money lending is no longer as lucrative and as safe as it used to be. It may be noted that the percentage of share of agriculture money lenders has gone down from 23.0% in 1971 to 8.3% in 1981. The rural rich have diverted their money into others sectors where the rate of return is higher and more secure.

So, despite the incidence of bonded labour (feudal and semi feudal) capitalist relations are growing more rapidly. Hence the Proletarian Path, which taking into consideration the incidence of debt bondage does not forget to take into consideration the process of change and its degrees.

2) Share cropping: Though share-cropping is a recognized semi feudal feature but it may please be noted that in absolute terms (India as a whole) the share-cropping arrangements account for only 3% of the total operational area (see NSS (National Sample Survey) report on the land

holding 1971-72 to 1982). This by no mean can be considered as a major phenomenon of Indian agriculture.

Lenin in his development of capitalism in Russia has shown that the share cropping system also bear a feature of capitalist relations. In India the share cropping is being reduced to a mode of surplus appropriation under the sway of capitalist relation is also clear from the fact that the surplus produced appropriated from the share cropper is increasingly being turned into commodity and is being realized in the market as a cash profit. The share cropping too has come under the cash nexus and under the market relation.

We would most humbly argue Alliance to take the dialectics of changing process into consideration.

Argument 3:

"...Then, there are task [of Democratic Revolution] left over."

Ans. to Argument 3:

Proletarian Path is quite aware that the Prussian path of the Indian bourgeois -landlord state has left over many vital task of democratic revolution. But we argue to Alliance:

- 1) Show us a single instance of bourgeois democratic revolution by the bourgeois, even by the American path where the tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution have been made complete?
- 2) Did Russian February revolution complete the tasks of democratic revolution or the October proletariat socialist revolution had to complete it as a by-product of socialist revolution?

In fact, the bourgeois democracy because of its very character cannot complete the task of bourgeois democratic revolution. It keeps as left over for the socialist revolution to complete it. Lenin said:

"The democratic republic 'logically' contradicts capitalism because 'officially' it puts the rich and the poor on an equal footing. That is a contradiction between the economic system and its political superstructure."(Lenin, C.W. Vol. 23, pg. 47)

Argument No. 4

"If Engels can advice in 1894 Italy what amount to a 'resteping of certain stage' in the condition of an 'incompleteness' it can be argued that given current subjective illusions and current objective strengths of imperialism it is necessary to do the same in India in 1997 "

Ans. to Argument No. 4

Proletarian Path thinks that Alliance M-L has misread Engels' letter to Turati. Engels did not ask Turati to "reshapes certain stage", on the contrary, Engels asked Turati to divide the stage of

"Conquest of power by the proletariat" into phase. The stage denotes strategic goal while the phase denotes tactical line in which leads towards the strategic goal. Does Alliance conclude that the Proletarian Path would launch a socialist revolution on the morrow of its announcement of the stage as socialist? Did Lenin launch a socialist revolution on the morrow of placing his April Theses? Socialist revolution as a stage is a strategic goal. All the tactical line of different phases of socialist goal must have a living link with the strategic goal so that the movement of all phases leads the people to its strategic goal. It means: ALL STREAMS TO THE SOCIALIST SEA.

In conclusion Proletarian Path likes to say that there are many examples in history that the stern reality has trampled down all the calculations of the wise men and has compelled the realists to abruptly change their line in order to successfully meet the exigencies of the reality. We quote below Lenin. Lenin said:

"That the transformation of our Russian revolution to a socialist revolution was NOT A DUBIOUS VENTURE, BUT A NECESSITY, for there was *no alternative*. Anglo-French and American imperialism will *inevitably* (Lenin emphasis) destroy the independence and freedom of Russia if the world socialist revolution, world Bolshevism does not triumph."(Lenin, C.W. vol. 28, pg. 188; emphasis added)

Proletarian Path also thinks that there is no alternative today. When American imperialism together with the Indian ruling classes are conspiring to destroy the independence, freedom and sovereignty of India other than socialist revolution. It is a dire necessity.

Addenda

[When the above paper went for DTP, we received a copy of North Star Compass, vol. 9, Dec 6, 2000(The organ of the international council for Friendship And Solidarity With Soviet People) published from Canada, in which we find a 'report' on "Labour Movement in India" send by com. Vijay Singh, the editor of Revolutionary Democracy. we reprint below the relevant portion of the said report and our comment.]

The 'report' *inter-alia* says:

"After analyzing the statistics it is a fact that the industrial proletariat accounts for less than 11% and it also implies that capitalist development is yet to displace pre-capitalist form of production and that socialization of production that forms the basis for socialist revolution is still a distant goal. In other words the overwhelming large segment of the labouring people of the India cannot be treated as having been objectively placed in the role of a vanguard of social change. It means that overwhelming 80% of the proletariat is engaged in non-factory sectors."

Our Comment on the Above:

The above "report" is a concealed challenge to Marxism-Leninism, above all, a challenge to Lenin and Stalin.

Firstly, because Marxism- Leninism never said that the "overwhelming large segment of the labouring people" will objectively play the "role of a vanguard of social change". There is a qualitative difference between the industrial proletariat and the "labouring people". Industrial proletariat and are the products of capitalist system of production relations and its natural "grave diggers". Whereas the labouring people may not necessarily be the products of capitalist relations of production, they may be the products of different pre-capitalist relations, which exists in spite of the dominating role of capitalist system of production.

Comrade Vijay Singh in order to revise Marxism-Leninism, deliberately forgets to make this fundamental difference between the industrial proletariat and the labouring people.

Secondly, Marx and Engels have clearly said that there are two categories of industrial proletariat viz: "class for itself" and "class in itself" - meaning the first as vanguard and the latter as "objectively revolutionary".

So, it is clear from the above that Marx and Engels did never speak that "the overwhelming large segment of the labouring people" should be "objectively placed in the role of a vanguard of social change". They said that the industrial proletariat *as a class* are objectively vanguard of the social change while a section of industrial proletariat is subjectively for the class i.e. vanguard.

Why then, this "overwhelming segment of labouring people" theory? Clearly to sow more confusion in the communist movement.

Thirdly, Lenin and Stalin clearly said that the proletariat of India is objectively in a position to play the role of vanguard and it is the tasks of the communist to educate and equip the Indian proletariat.

In 1921, at the second congress of the communist international, it was Lenin who on the amendment of M. N. Roy's supplementary theses emphasized on the need of preparing the Indian proletariat to be the vanguard of the liberation movement.

Did Lenin speak of the subjective preparation in absence of any objective basis?

In 1925, Stalin, in addressing the "University of the Peoples' of East" had distinguished three different categories of Colonial and dependent countries. The social factors were the relative strength of the working class, the degree of proletarianisation and potentialities of role of a vanguard (See: Stalin works, vol. 7, Moscow 1954, pg. 149). This classification of Stalin had very serious strategical and tactical implications for communist party of India. Stalin concludes that in country like India the proletariat *had the potential* to surge to the leadership of bourgeois democratic struggles:

"...in other words, in colonies like India it is a matter of preparing the proletariat for the role of a leader of the liberation movement... The task is to create an anti-imperialist bloc AND TO ENSURE THE HEGEMONY OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THIS BLOC...."(Ibid, pg. 150-151, emphasis supplied).

Did Stalin advise to subjectively prepare the proletariat for the hegemony in absence of any objective basis of its preparation?

Let Comrade Vijay Singh clearly and categorically say that the assessment of Lenin and Stalin was a fundamental mistake and need revision and then, we will deal with his statistics.