

# Annexe to the Secy.'s Report.

## Some Misrepresentations Answered.

### Communist Party in its usual Role

We shall have to overcome a tremendous lot of difficulties to accomplish our task. We are ready for it and we do not mind facing any of them which the task demands. But there are some of them that seem to be not the real requirement of the task itself, but thrust upon us by some individuals and parties for their own purpose. All of them cannot be ignored without injuring the cause. For instance, the Communist Party of India has been preaching systematically that we have no difference with the Radical Democratic Party and yet we have a separate organisation for the same line of action. Sometimes it goes further and says that the R.D.P. has thrown out its own projection to be more effective than it could be without it. It is a pity that members of a party, which calls itself Communist Party, do not know what other political groups do stand for, and yet it makes itself ludicrous by giving assertive opinions on things it does not know or perhaps even without making any attempt to know. We venture to suggest to these friends that with a little more confidence in their own line, they should have closely studied the opinion of others. But when this confidence is lacking, they should follow the advice of the prudent - silence is golden.

### Radical Party Lins up

The R.D.P. again, has taken a similar line but with a different motive. Some of their members do say that we have no political differences with the R.D.P. This is done

with a view to extricate themselves from the inconvenient questions they are sometimes confronted with. To explain the differences would mean, if it is done without any distortion, propaganda against their own line as changed now. But our friends in other parties or unattached, may fall easy victims to this kind of false, misleading and malicious propaganda, in view of the fact that the Democratic Vanguard was started in the beginning by some friends most of whom, for some time or other, had been members of the R.D.P. It is necessary here to state clearly that the number of those ex-R.D.P. men has since been swelled by new men, mostly from the working-class.

We have the courage to call a spade a spade. Sometimes it becomes obligatory to do so, when the interest of the people is involved and it has to be done irrespective of personal considerations. It seems, Roy is now determined to undo what previous services he rendered. One, who was scarcely inconsistent in his writings and speeches, is now full of it. This is perhaps in pursuance of a new theory enunciated. It is his theory on scientific politics. He says, "If we see that in order to practise rational politics, we have to put it across with the help of an appeal to irrationalism, that is also scientific politics." While telling privately to his C. E. C. that in the coming elections after the war, there were little chances for them to win in this country, where demagogy may sweep, and that 'there is bound to be a coalition and we shall be in it,' he says publicly in the manifesto issued immediately after, on the basis of the calculation stated above, that they would be able not only to form Ministries in the Provinces being in the majority there, but also to form the Provisional Central Government being able to command the confidence of the newly elected members of the Provincial Legislatures. After stating in many places that the present state machinery cannot be broken, he holds out a threat that if power is transferred to the Indian rich, the people will be roused to break it. While Roy professes to have started a crusade against the vested interest, he wants "good relations with the British employers in this country."

### Can the State Machinery Collapse ?

It is necessary to understand, not through a process of wishful thinking but by an objective study, whether the state machinery can break at any stage. If it does not, power is bound to be in the hands of a few and that will not be revolution nor can it be real democracy. It is never possible to forcibly break the state machinery by a group of people however big or influential without the objective condition being ripe for it; for, at this stage, no non-official force can ever become stronger than the official one. Anybody who thinks of any action to break the state machinery with isolated application of physical force must be diehard romanticist, we agree; it is never possible. Only an outside force vastly superior, acting as an army of occupation, can do it. The state machinery breaks when it loses its social background, and through a process of crisis the system of production gets dislocated. The state machinery grows from out of the requirements of production, maintains its system, helps the system to grow and exists drawing its subsistence from it. When the system of production cannot be changed even for its own requirement within the limitations of its own structure, necessity of a revolution is indicated. It does not however mean a spontaneous revolution, for, counter-revolutionary forces are active. Nor does it mean that the state machinery will start collapsing immediately; much less will it be destroyed automatically. In a society where the necessity of a revolution is indicated, crisis after crisis brings the system of production to a state of collapse. The state machinery standing on it and maintained by it also comes to the very verge of collapse requiring a little push by an alternative system built by the producers—the toiling masses. If they fail, the personnel running the machinery, or even others, may behave as an army of occupation and after ruthlessly putting back the society including its forces of production, restore the old or bring into existence another machinery of state suitable to their purpose. Now, if the system of production can continue to function and as a result the state machinery remains unbreakable for all

time to come, there can be no revolution and there is nothing doing then; why should we then try to prevent the rich to come to power and propose ourselves to it only to swell the rank of the exploiters? In our opinion however, the system of production through the series of crises will receive such a rude shock that it would be almost collapsing, and the corrupt state machinery having lost its own discipline due to corruption cannot but be on the verge of collapse. People then will be faced with a condition of lawlessness. Should they try to do the impossible to maintain the collapsing order? We suggest that they should try to exist, and they can succeed to do so only if they combine their strength and with its help commandeer whatever material they can, and utilise them for the purpose. In a lawless situation, if and when it comes, people will have no other alternative than co-ordinate their organised local strength and thus remove whatever little obstruction there may be still persisting.

Such inconsistencies are too many. Instead of pointing these out we will do better to discuss some of our fundamental differences. Roy, like other renegades from the Marxist camp, has started by telling that the state machinery is not a machinery of coercion in the hands of a particular class, it is capable of being used as an instrument to serve the needs and wishes of the people. We believe that the state machinery which arose out of the need of coercion is an instrument in the hands of the ruling class, that throughout the history of all lands and all times it has served the ruling class in that capacity and our analysis shows that it will continue to play in the same role till a classless society is evolved, when in the absence of any need of coercion, the machinery itself will wither away. This is the Marxian point of view which stands on the lessons of history as well as on sound reasons not yet successfully repudiated by any body. After the enunciation of this new theory we found Roy one day declare that the state machinery cannot be broken, that this can be captured by the masses through elections under the present system with its arrangement of exploitations still in tact, that it is

capable of serving the needs and wishes of the people, and that for establishing genuine freedom of the people the old method is unsuitable and not a practical proposition in the world of our time. The new method proposed begins with, "We have to adjust ourselves to the mentality of the people who hold power, but are prepared to transfer it not out of fullness of their hearts, but because they also must adjust themselves to the changed world condition". We have considered and reconsidered it over and over again to understand this change of Roy, but have not been able to subscribe to his new attitude. We are also unable to understand why after the acceptance of the new theory, he proposes to go in favour of revolt against those who will hold power if they happen to be the Indian rich and will not pursue the same policy of adjusting themselves with the mentality of those who will then be holding power, and assuming that they will still retain parliamentary democracy, they will also offer a chance for transfer of power as Roy understands by it now.

Again, we find Roy saying that isolated National Freedom is a reactionary cult now. We agree, but any and every inter-national combination will not be a revolutionary cult either. A counter-revolutionary combination, namely the Axis Powers we have now been fighting against is a reality; in future also such a counter-revolutionary combination is not ruled out. Roy proposes India's combination with a similar type. He says, the British Empire has to be transformed into a Commonwealth of Nations and India is to realise her freedom within this combination. It is never mentioned why this combination alone and no other can be accepted. The only argument in favour of the British Commonwealth of Nations is that we have a history behind us to unite. We disagree and believe that from that history, we have very bitter feeling capable of liquidation only after the termination of the present relation with the British Empire and a new relation of friendship growing for the common interest of both. In our opinion, we must have an international combination in the interests of the Indian revolution; if Great Britain then

happens to be fit enough for such a combination, India will certainly welcome her. But one thing is quite clear, that in the near future there is absolutely no chance of Australia, South Africa and Canada being in the combination that is to come. So, our difference in this respect is vital, and we cannot go together.

We do not subscribe to their sectarian attitude pursued in the working-class and defence movements. Their I. F. L. is a disruptive move in the working-class movement, injurious to the immediate interest of the class and a danger to the cause of revolution.

Under the circumstances, we feel that to go with them will be to go against revolution and we refuse. There are other differences more or less important, but it is not necessary to mention them here. Things already mentioned are sufficient to show that unless we agree to serve the cause of counter-revolution, we cannot have any thing to do with the R. D. P.

## 1. Manifesto of the Democratic Vanguard

English & Bengali— -/4/- each copy.

## 2. গণ-পরিষদ

by—Jibanlal Chatterjee—

-/8/- each copy.

*To be had of:—*

Office of the  
DEMOCRATIC VANGUARD.

18, Mirzapore Street, Calcutta.