

neglect the task and problems of building the class struggle as it is developing, and to emphasize one-sidedly the forms of struggle in isolation from the actual movement is just petty-bourgeois revolutionism.

What does Marxism-Leninism teach us in this respect? When, under the impact of the economic crisis and general breakdown of the capitalist order, lakhs of people begin to move into the arena of struggle, the Party cannot convert it into a conscious revolutionary movement, moving in a single direction, unless the masses act under the guidance of their class organizations led by the Party. Unless the Party has close ties with these organizations, unless these organizations themselves possess influence over the masses, the task of guiding the movement is rendered difficult, and the masses, in spite of their heroic sacrifices, reap very little benefit even in the matter of heightening consciousness.

V

'Left' Tactics will Delink Party from Mass Struggles

BESIDES, IN THIS STRUGGLE, THE INFLUENCE OF reformists and revisionists, of compromisers and adventurists—all has to be eliminated by the masses and to act growingly under the banner of the Marxist-Leninist Party.

That is why when we find today that the class organizations are very weak with the resultant strong pull of the masses; when we find that in the existing class organizations pull of the reformists and revisionists is also strong, and that the Party's strength is far from commensurate with that required for successful leadership—we set rectifying the weaknesses by adopting tactics to tie the Party more firmly to the masses, to dis-

illusion the masses from the reformist leadership while unleashing their struggle.

No Marxist-Leninist worth the name can neglect this task; none can bypass it or fail to assess its proper importance and attack the Party for paying attention to it, as the 'Lefts' are doing. A group of persons writing a long document on the present situation and tasks devotes pages after pages to the imagined revisionism of the leadership, sings praises to the growing revolutionary atmosphere and devotes pages on organization of 'force', but disposes of in one or two sentences the real struggles of the masses, the problems of organizing them, the problem of Party leadership over them—can it be taken as a group of serious politicians?

Is it not clear that they virtually advocate militant action by a few in place of the mass battles out of which the revolutionary resistance and revolutionary groups will grow? Is it not clear that they advocate substitution of certain forms of struggle for the struggle itself, that, if pursued, their tactics will delink the party from the main struggle itself?

CLASS LINE ON KISAN FRONT

Our Party, concretely studying the class relationship in the rural areas, has produced a new document on the Kisan movement, eliminating the earlier wrong outlook and enabling the Party to turn its face towards the basic semi-proletarian masses in the rural areas.

Do these 'Lefts' believe that any organization of force, any genuine revolutionary peasant movement is possible without overcoming the present weaknesses in the peasant movement—not only organizational but also mistakes of relying on the wrong strata? But to them the attempt to develop a correct class line for the peasant movement is just nothing. They do not bother with such trivialities. For the sake of formality they might say, oh, organize the agricultural labour—that is all. The stage of the peasant movement, how to overcome its present weaknesses, how to train the consciousness of Party and peasant organizers and bring them to realize the correct approach—all this is not their concern. Is it not amazing that

these loquacious people who talk about fighting revisionism have nothing to say about the wrong outlook on the peasant movement which consists of failure to understand the differentiation inside the peasantry and which fails to take the agricultural labourers and poor peasants as the basis of the peasant movement? This is where reformism and revisionism in the concrete have to be fought and are being fought by the Party. But what do they care; they must attack the Party and its leadership.

The Party is not satisfied with relying on spontaneity as the 'Left' opportunists do. It says: "Despite the glorious record of our Party in leading the Telangana peasant uprising, the Tebhaga movement in Bengal, the Warli peasant upheaval in Bombay... the agrarian revolutionary movement on the whole remains extremely weak and disorganized" and, therefore, it demands a self-critical appraisal of the past.

Laying its finger on the spot, the Party wants the old reformist outlook of all-in peasant unity based on rich peasant leadership to be discarded and wants the peasant unity to be based on the agricultural workers and poor peasants. This needs an entirely new conception of struggles, demands, priorities, and the Party is asking its members to understand it so that in the coming days the agrarian movement attains its full sweep, basing itself on the correct classes—which alone will enable it to wield all forms of struggle.

Without this class basis all talk of militancy just becomes coffee-house talk which may relieve the dull monotony of a petty bourgeois' ignorant mode of life but will not change an iota of the class situation.

AND ON THE TRADE UNION FRONT

Similarly, our Party takes the present weaknesses in the trade union movement seriously. They hamper the growth of the class struggle and class consciousness of the working class. The Party has found that while the strike wave is rising and is bound to rise immensely in the near future because of the deepening economic crisis, the organized working class represents only a small minority, which betokens a low level of class

consciousness; that a large part of the organised working class is still under the influence of reformist and revisionist leaders and their ideology.

If this weakness persists the mass struggles may be fought but without immediately heightening the revolutionary consciousness of the workers; the laws of spontaneity will assert themselves and imprison the consciousness within its narrow frame. This will be the most dangerous weakness in the situation since the class which is supposed to lead the struggle itself will be unable to realize its responsibility and tail behind alien ideologies.

That is why the Party has asked its trade union cadre to overcome all reformist practices in the trade union movement, make a sharp break with economism, unleash working class struggle by developing united front tactics so that the strike struggle reaches its full sweep, and fight the reformist and revisionist ideologies, raise basic political slogans and the slogan of workers' and peasants' alliance so that the working class reaches the minimum socialist consciousness in the shortest possible time.

All talk of developing the hegemony of the working class in the struggle for People's Democracy is pure moonshine unless every step is taken to break the present ideological and organizational shackles of the working class and set it on the high road of class struggle—not only the advanced sections but the entire class.

But our 'Lefts' do not bother. They think this also is revisionism. People who do not know where the working class stands today, the level of its consciousness; people who are not prepared to take a single step to link themselves with the class and then move it forward; people who regard all this as revisionism, who say organization of force is the only thing to be done—what right have they to be called Marxist-Leninists?

Some of them are so 'revolutionary' that they will not affiliate trade unions under their control to the AITUC in spite of repeated Party decisions. They thus consciously disrupt the class unity in the name of revolution.

SUBSERVIENCE TO SPONTANEITY

Another thing to be noted about the tactical line of the 'Lefts' is that they have not a word to say about the ideological fight against the various bourgeois influences in the working class and the peasantry ; the influence of the national bourgeoisie over the people as a whole. That again is not their concern. Their main aim is to villify the Party and its alleged revisionism. Those who, like the revisionists, concentrate their fire on us and have hardly anything to say about the national bourgeois ideology—to which class do they belong ?

This neglect of the ideological struggle against the Congress, the PSP, SSP, and other bourgeois parties is not accidental. It directly follows from their subservience to spontaneity, from their conception that the State is a neo-colonial State and, therefore, its representatives do not exercise any ideological influence even on the backward sections of the masses ; that everyone is just waiting for the call of armed struggle, and that feudal and bourgeois influences do not sway the people at all. All that is required is show of militancy and more militancy by the Party, and the masses will forget their backwardness and the bourgeois influence will automatically disappear.

This childish conception brings grist to the mill of the big bourgeoisie and weakens the fight against their influence, prevents the revolutionary unity of the people and the rise in their revolutionary consciousness by failing to release them from backward ideologies. The 'Lefts' do not understand that, in the thick of mass struggle, very patient fight is necessary to remove the ideological influence of the bourgeois-landlord classes ; that without this struggle, without a struggle for ideological and organizational unity of the masses in the developing crisis, all plans to reach revolutionary conclusions will go awry ; all talk of new forces of struggle will be just so much phrases if the main bulk of the mass is not patiently brought to a stage where it can see the effectiveness of the new forms of struggle.

For them, however, such concepts as class unity are just phrases. In their long-winded document you will not once find them mentioned. Their revolution goes on, whether the working class is united or not.

SCIENCE OF LEADERSHIP

This 'Left' outlook violates the Leninist norms about tactics and forms of struggle ; in fact, the rules of the Leninist science of leadership. "The strategy and tactics of Leninism constitute the science of leadership in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat" (Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*).

"Strategy deals with the main forces of the revolution and their reserves. It changes with the passing of the revolution from one stage to another, but remains basically unchanged throughout a given stage" (Stalin). But our 'Lefts' do not bother about such trivialities as strategy. They are indifferent whether the classes that are the driving force of the revolution stand together or not, whether they are united or not. They leave all this to spontaneity ; and when the Party develops a line to get together these main forces of revolution, these vital classes, they call it revisionism and contrast it to the organization of 'force'.

What are tactics ? "Tactics deal with the forms of struggle and the forms of organization of the proletariat, with their changes and combinations. During a given stage of the revolution tactics may change several times, depending on the flow and ebb, the rise or decline, of the revolution." Stalin then says : "Tactical leadership is a part of strategic leadership, subordinated to the tasks and requirements of the latter." It means that tactical leadership must serve the aim of reaching the class combinations and disposition of revolutionary forces, which strategy considers to be necessary to achieve the objectives of a given stage of the revolution. Tactics cannot be pursued in isolation from this.

"The task of tactical leadership is to master all forms of struggles and organizations of the proletariat and to ensure that they are used properly to achieve, with the given relation of forces, the maximum results necessary to prepare, for strategic success." Mark these words of Stalin very carefully. Take the given relation of forces and achieve the maximum results necessary to prepare for strategic success. "What is meant by making proper use of the forms of struggle and organization of the proletariat ? . . . First, to put in the forefront precisely those

forms of struggle and organization which are best suited to the conditions prevailing during the flow or ebb of the movement at a given moment, and which therefore can facilitate and ensure the bringing of the masses to the revolutionary positions, the bringing of the millions to the revolutionary front, and their disposition at the revolutionary front."

"The point here is not that the vanguard shall realize the impossibility of preserving the old regime and the inevitability of its overthrow. The point is that the masses, the millions, should understand this inevitability and display their readiness to support the vanguard. But the masses can understand this only from their own experience. The task is to enable the vast masses to realize from their own experience the inevitability of the overthrow of the old regime, to promote such methods of struggle and forms of organization as will make it easier for the masses to realize from experience the correctness of the revolutionary slogans."

Master all forms—literally all forms—but put forward in a given situation those that will succeed in bringing millions to the revolutionary positions, which will enable the masses to learn from their own experience the correctness of the Party's slogans. The form of struggle is not abstractly conceived or imposed, but directly related to the task of moving the masses forward. Which form will dominate in a given situation depends on circumstances—but thus guided, the movement reaches the highest form—which must also be mastered by the Party and put forward when the conditions are ripe.

Stalin then gives two instances of wrong 'Left' tactics. He says that the vanguard would have been detached from the working class if the Party had decided to reject parliamentary forms of struggle and boycotted the Duma: "The vanguard would have become detached from the working class, and the working class would have lost contact with the masses if the Party had not decided at the time to participate in the Duma, if it had not decided to concentrate its forces on work in the Duma and to develop a struggle on the basis of this work, in order to make it easier for the masses to realize from their own experience the futility of the Duma, the falsity of the promises of the Cadets, the impossibility of compromise with tsarism and

the inevitability of an alliance between the peasantry and the working class. Had the masses not gained the experience during the period of the Duma, the exposure of the Cadets and the hegemony of the proletariat would have been impossible." He further adds: "The Party would have become detached from the working class, and the working class would have lost its influence among the broad masses of the peasants and soldiers, if the proletariat had followed the 'Left' Communists, who called for an uprising in April 1917, when the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries had not yet exposed themselves as advocates of war and imperialism, when the masses had not yet realized from their own experience the falsity of the speeches of the Mensheviks, etc . . .

"The danger of the tactics of the 'Left' Communists was that they threatened to transform the Party from the leader of the proletarian revolution into a handful of futile conspirators with no ground to stand on."

Does not this description fit our 'Lefts'—a handful of inane conspirators with no ground to stand on—munching revolutionary phrases but running away from the task of actual organization of the bursting class struggles, not caring a bit whether the main classes are standing together or the main class alignment is taking place or not.

Organization of force is the only panacea they find in the present situation. The protest strike of a lakh of engineering workers or two lakh jute workers organized by the Party in cooperation with others is just revisionism for them. That is their contempt for the developing struggles. □