CHAPTER-IV

INDIAN COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND THEORY OF INDIAN STATE

PREAMBLE:

Commencing our 'long march' in the study of the State with a critique of the colossal works of the founders of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, and passing through the challenging intellectual land-scope of the 'perspectives of State' as derived by the other 'Classical Marxists', Lenin-Stalin-Trotsky-Mao, and as projected by the 'Neo-Classical Marxists', Gramsci-Lukacs-Marcuse-Althusser-Mandel; we now land, at the destination of our orduous and tortuous epistemological-journey; on the most-complex terrain of this 'wonder-land', for a study of "The Indian Communist Movement and The Theory of The Indian State". The complexity of this terrain gets evidenced in Hegel's interpretation of Indian Civilization: "The Hindoos have no history, no growth expanding into a veritable political condition... The people of India have achieved no foreign conquests, but have on every occasion been vanquished themselves";¹ and in Marx's well-known passage: "Indian Society has no history, at least no known history. What we
call its history is but the history of the successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society."² Hence in this epistemological travail, we have to traverse from 'No-known History' to Politics³ and then delve into the dynamics of the State.

We have designed the analysis of this chapter in three distinct but continuous and related units and we set our task with expounding the perspectives of 'Academic Marxists on the State' to begin with and then proceed to an over-view of the 'Practising Marxists on the State' and conclude with the perusal of the stand-points of the various Communist Parties in India as revealed in their official Resolutions, Pamphlets and Documents, regarding the State.

Before we embark on an analysis of these three aspects in our bid to understand the Indian State, certain clarification need be given and certain perspectives posed, in order to set the tune to the exposition of the directions set for our study. There are two main theories that could be adopted to the study of the State. One, Democratic Pluralist Theory, and the other, the Materialist Theory. While the Democratic Pluralist Theory, is for social harmony, Stability and persistence of social forms aimed at restoration of status-quo by ignoring the
dialectical need for change in the existing socio-political system and according reform and improvement to strengthen but not to change the structure, the Materialist Theory aims at the changing of social structure through social conflicts with a group of the Indian Political reality in the historical and socio-economic context. While Democratic-Pluralist Theory is an 'academic' strategy to counter and fight the Philosophy of Marxism being a counter-Philosophy to communism, The Materialist Theory is aimed at building the Philosophy of Marxism through historical and dialectical materialist approach. While Democratic-Pluralist Theory is aimed at reactionary Reformism, Materialist Theory is a strategy of revolutionary Marxism. In this context it is significant to note that the Political Scientists of Status-quo use the terminology "Reverse Dialectic" to designate the elements of a dialectic of history, which is the reverse of the "Marxian dialectic". As Marx said: "Philosophers have merely interpreted the world but our taks is to change it", we have based our analysis on the "Materialist Theory" and charter our course on the Marxian tenets.

It is needless to restate that the study of the 'State' is central to Marxian politics. To make this study meaningful and fruitful from the Marxian point of view, we pose a series of questions to set the frame for the analytic. What is a State? What is its composition and
what are its functions and purposes? What are the organs
of the State and what role do they perform? For whose sake
does the State function? Does it function for its own sake
or for the sake of somebody or at the behest of somebody?
What is its support base? Is its function instrumentalist,
interventionist, autonomous or integrative? Does it carry
only the apron-strings of somebody or hold its own reins?
What is the nature of Power in India and what is the class
character of the State Power? At what stage of development
of the society does it stand? Is it feudal, semi-feudal,
monopoly capitalist, comprador capitalist, late capitalist
or pre-capitalist? What stages of revolution has it
performed, if at all it has performed any? What has been
the impact of colonialism and are its remnants hanging
over? In the Indian historical context, how do castes,
classes and religions interplay? The analysis contained in
the following four sections contain answers to these and
other questions, though not in a neat and structured
pattern, but in a dialectical mould.

In analysing the State from a Marxian perspective
and in evolving a Marxist Theory of the Indian State, it is
necessary to take two important documents for a
guide-frame. Marx ventured on a purely political plan to
write on the 'State' but unfortunately his plan did not
materialise. And hence it is worthwhile to use his "Draft
Plan for a work on the Modern State" as a kind of
guide-sketch. Another important reference material that is desirable to be used is Lenin's *Marxism on the State,* which contains preparatory material for the Book *The State and Revolution.* With these serving as the "Mariner's Compass", the voyage-study of the Indian State is launched.

**ACADEMIC MARXISTS' VIEWS:**

The terminology 'Academic Marxist' appears a contradiction in terms and in what sense this expression has been used here needs a clarification.

Really significant is the fact that so much of what goes by the name of Marxism now-a-days has little or nothing to do with Marxism as Marx himself understood or practised it. Witness, for example, 'the theoreticist deluge' of academic Marxism in the West in recent years, or, more specifically the fast flourishing theoretical school called 'Post-Marxism', which has, in the name of openness, of updating Marx's supposedly antiquoted method and theories, virtually abandoned, via diverse routes or forms ('Analytical' or 'Neo-classical' or 'Game-Theoretical' or 'Rational choice' Marxism, etc.), even the basic or 'central' Marxist propositions. It may have served to light up and clarify many issues, but it has certainly defused Marxism of its revolutionary content and transformed it into so many safe, academic exercises.
This is not the 'Academic Marxists' that we are referring to here.

Gramsci envisaged a distinct role for the intellectuals and desired the emergence of 'organic intellectuals'. According to Gramsci there was a practical need for a well grown intelligentsia, which was vital for engineering an alliance between working class and peasants. "Intellectuals should integrate with workers" according to him and desired a "cadre of intellectuals of a new type" with responsibility of raising the mental activities of the entire class, giving personality to the amorphous element of the masses. Gramsci's vision was "the birth of labour intelligentsia, instead of an aristocracy of labour". This conception of "intellectuals" is also not the kind we have picked up for our classification as "Academic Marxists".

We have placed in this class, academicians connected with the various academic bodies with Marxian identification, without any direct linkage with political parties. In a sense they are non-practitioners in the professional political field. They have produced abundant literature on Marxian thought and hence their writings need to be examined for developing an appropriating theory for State in India.

We have one handicap in this category of
thinkers. Lukacs said: "A Marxist must be someone who plays a practical part in the movement that gives effect to theory, for the theory is itself nothing but self-awareness of the movement". As theory and practice coincide, the proletariat transforms the world in the process by which it arrives at a mature understanding of the world. Lukacs has a different visualisation of a Marxist and the thinkers whom we have chosen for an analysis in this part of the chapter, would not fall within the description of "Marxist" in Lukacs's sense.

Lenin had discovered the touchstone for testing a Marxist: "Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat." The Thinkers picked for our analysis are 'Marxists' in this sense. Hence our 'Academic Marxists' are not the proto-type 'Post-Marxists' but those who basically subscribe to the Marxist conviction.

We desire to affirm that the Political Scientists we have chosen for our study are only Marxists and the non-Marxists, anti-Marxists and the Status-quoists are left out from our perview. While there are quite a few Marxist Political Scientists in India, we have chosen only a representative section of them based on their work on the State in India.
Among the 'Academic Marxists', one of the Political Scientist offers "The conceptual Framework" of the structure and nature of the Indian State in understanding the Indian State: A Historical-Materialist Exercise" and hence we commence our analysis of the Indian State with an examination of his conceptual framework. This Political Scientist ignores almost all the vast and still growing literature that has accumulated around the Marxist Theory of the State, on the ground that it has been specifically focussed on the political problematic of advanced late capitalist society, and goes back to the works of the founding fathers, Marx and Engels, to formulate this "conceptual Framework" suitable for analysing the Indian State and Politics. He adduces two strong reasons for going back to the works of Marx and Engels. The first reason for doing so is that the State and Politics Marx studied, say, of France of the nineteenth century, are much closer to those historically evolving in the ex-colonial countries than those generated by theoretical reflections on the contemporary advanced capitalist State. Secondly, the Eurocentrism of Marx and Engels is more justified than the Eurocentricism of Marxists engaged in the process of coming to theoretical and practical terms with the advanced capitalist state. While the classical Marxists took the non-Western systems seriously, though in an unconsciously or sub-consciously
ethno-centric manner, contemporary Euro-American political theorists tend to consciously ignore the so-called Third World Policies.  

Marx's analysis of nineteenth century France can be taken as a model for analysing a post-bourgeois society in which the political and formal aspect of that revolution has reached a higher level than the economic level of development measured positively in terms of industrialisation or negatively in terms of the pre-dominance of an agrarian population. It is a classic case of a society in which there is a **structural dissonance** between the political superstructure and the socio-economic structure, between a bourgeois polity and a society in which the bourgeoisie suffers from economic and cultural underdevelopment. The theoretical and conceptual problem posed by this situation is: Can this be characterised as a system in which the bourgeois revolution has been completed? Or can it be described as one in which the bourgeoisie has attained a political revolution but has yet to accomplish a socio-economic and cultural revolution? Perhaps even more fundamental is the question whether class formation has adequately crystallized. Marx formulates the perception of this situation of a class-system-in-formation in terms of (i) internal intra-class conflicts between what he calls class fractions, (ii) Proliferation of intermediate classes such as the petty-bourgeoisie and the
lumpen proletariat, and (iii) continually shifting patterns of alliance between class fractions in terms of contingent and opportunist blocs or arrangements.\textsuperscript{11}

According to him, this model, simplified or simplistic class conflict is ruled out. The nature of the State cannot be abstractly conceptualized in terms of simple class dominance or rule. This is not to deny such dominance, but only to suggest that it is dominance that is as yet insecure, as yet uncrystalized, and therefore problematic. If this is so, both the content and form of the State are vulnerable - the characteristically bourgeois form of parliamentary democracy based on universal franchise stands a good chance or risk of pursuing a logic of self-destruction, leading to an authoritarian or fascist form, and the content of the State may shift from bourgeois political control to control by other classes or alliances of other classes or class fractions. In short, this is a bourgeois State that is continually in search of a full-fledged bourgeois society to sustain and strengthen it.\textsuperscript{12}

According to him this Model of his can accommodate reasonably well the post-independent Indian State, excepting for two special historical variables, with contradictory implications. Firstly, given the history of colonialism in India, the Indian bourgeoisie has not fully
rooted itself in an appropriate political culture and is not capable of displaying the necessary skills of political management. Since 1947, it has been learning fast in this regard though, in a sense, it has been a part of this political culture and its baggage of tricks and skills ever since it launched a modern Western type nationalist movement in 1885. Secondly, given the current integration of the World capitalist system through super-power presence and trans-national corporatism, this bourgeoisie gains access to resources manipulated by international or national agencies assembled under the integrative logic of international capitalism; but this facility has limits and the limits are set by the giver not the taker. How does one define such a State? Do we call it a semi-capitalist or semi-feudal State, a multi-structural State or a developing/underdeveloped bourgeois State? All these formulations capture aspects of the Indian State, but do not enable us to articulate it as a totality. One might well ask, why should they? Conceptually and theoretically, the nature of the Indian State, its form and content, cannot be grasped as a specific, total structure, not because of any theoretical problem but because of the nature of concrete historical reality. In such a situation, the key theoretical and conceptual task is not to determine a total structure but to specify the direction of structuration.13
The notion of structuration, in contrast to the traditional notion of structure, implies a focus on the concrete momentum of the historical process/event such that the so-called 'structure' comes to be perceived as a structure actually and consciously created by the historical agents in order to generate power or counter greater power. Of course, the notion of structuration appears to be identical with the traditional Marxist notion of 'reproduction of structure'. But this traditional concept leads us back to the deterministic trap. A pay-off of this model of structuration is that it creates some 'structural space' for structural manoeuvrability, or what is the same thing, 'structuration'. In such a model, we can accommodate temporary departures from a full-fledged bourgeois political superstructure and successive reinforcements of that superstructure. This is the reason why we find the system demonstrating sudden weaknesses and equally sudden strengths, manifested in frequent political crises. This is a situation which poses a real challenge to any revolutionary movement, even when it tactically retreats into parliamentarism. While the State frequently runs into crises of legitimacy of management, of physical control and of defence capability, it always manages to stabilise itself as a crisis State. This strength is derived paradoxically from the fact that it is strictly not a structure but a tenuously bounded process of structuration.
The preceding discussion suggests the need for a conceptual framework of structuration, that is, analysis of structures in historical motion, as an essential methodological off-shoot of historical materialism as practised by Marx. In terms of such a frame, the notions of both the structure and nature of the Indian Political 'system' or the 'Indian State' are not static, stagnant categories, but a series of flowing images. One reason why, but not the only one, the historical materialist frame goes this way is that it demands a framework in which men are to be understood as simultaneously knowing and acting beings. In other words, to put it cryptically, epistemology and ontology collapse into each other. Ironically however, even structuration must be specified in terms of its provisional and variable bounds as well as the content that is bound. We have to identify the direction of structuration.\(^\text{15}\)

This Political Scientist presents succinctly an analysis, from the historical-materialist angle, of the historical developments in India since the assumption of the Indian territories from the East India Company by the British Crown in 1858 till recently. He says that ever since the colonial period, roughly from the take over of Indian territorial jurisdiction from the East India Company by the British Crown, that is, from 1858, the direction in
fact turns out to be a self-contradictory bi-direction. On the one hand, British Imperialism in its own interest was forced to create in India an incipient State, partially and superficially taking on the form and content, of an industrially capitalist polity, especially with regard to the aspects of rule of law and bureaucracy. On the other hand, since consistently logical forward movement in this direction would destroy the logic of imperialism, there was a structuration in the opposite direction. The result is a system of self-contradictions between a rational bureaucracy and an irresponsible bureaucracy, between rule of law and a system of lawful suppression of the rule of law principle. While the historical bourgeois polity was riddled by the contradiction between an undemocratic civil society and a democratic polity, the colonial system was riddled by a polity perpetually battling between a bourgeois polity and a bureaucratic autocratic polity.

According to him, this historical legacy was formally negated by the Indian Constitution in 1950, but it became strengthened in some respects in the post-colonial polity, leading eventually through a tortuous route to 1975. After analysing the course of history from 1947 till post-1984, he comes to the conclusion that: "one can describe such a historically complex and fluid State as bourgeois democratic capitalist State, simultaneously in the making and unmaking, but without providing a
 theoretical clue to the timing or the conditionality of either situational possibilities — making or unmaking! Both from the perspective of epistemology and praxis, this is a baffling phenomenon. The 'bafflingness' of the historical situation arises — precisely because we fail to distinguish between 'structure' and 'structuration'. The crisis-ridden history of the Indian State is a history of its structuration, a process that defeats a simple structuralist epistemology. Structuration as an analytical tool as well as an empirical phenomenon, enables us to notice a broad structural possibility which is systematically complicated by non-structural contingencies. If we try to operate merely with a 'structure' we will find it historically and concretely never fully realized or determined. It is in this interstices between 'determination' and 'non-structural contingency' that the reality of structuration takes place. The dialectical dynamism of historical-materialist epistemology, once purge of its structuralism, would reveal to us both epistemologically and politically, a structure struggling to structure itself!18

Randhir Singh presents a Marxist view of India since Independence under the caption — "Visions for the Future: One View", in his work of Marxism and Indian Politics.19 This volume also deals with other aspects like "of Marxism to-day", "Politics - The Dialectics of Science
and Revolution in Karl Marx", "Marxists and the Sikh Extermist Movement in Punjab" and "Theorising Communalism in India". This is a very significant volume which enables an understanding of the State in India from a Marxian angle. His concluding note of his analysis "Of Marxism today" indicates as to what is primacy in Marxism; "For Marx, on the other hand, philosophy had to be realized through politics, then and even afterwards. This indeed is the meaning and message of his famous pronouncement: 'The Philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it. Politics, for Marx, is the cutting edge of this change, of any and every social revolution. Hence the primacy of Politics, that is, revolutionary politics, in Marxism, at least in Marxism as karl Marx understood it and practised it." The direction of Randhir Singh is explicitly spelt out in this remarkable summing up of the philosophy of Marxism. In his analysis of 'Visions for the Future' his historical-materialist direction is indicated when he says: "central to my argument is an understanding of social reality as a historical process: Thus; the character of our national movement determined the nature of its outcome, the independence, which, in turn, became the basis for the development of India in the next forty years and more, providing us with the present for our future to grow equally 'naturally' out of it - unless, of course, a revolutionary break occurs, sometime, somewhere..."
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According to him: "In every historical process there is continuity and there are breaks, at times even revolutionary breaks, which involve a change in the economic basis the economic-structural relations of a society. In India, in our times, no revolutionary break has occurred, neither at independence, nor afterwards. The balance of social forces and ideals in the national movement resulted in the settlement of 1947 - its 'transfer of Power' involving no basic economic or social structural change, but putting new, now Indian ruling classes in control of the state power in India.... And these new rulers, subject to the necessity of the objective situation, soon set about using their newly won state power to facilitate the growth of a government supported capitalism, even as they maintained, with due modifications, the class (exploitative) structure of the Indian society as a whole. The logic of this structure, the new and the old in it well articulating with each other, is today writ large in the emergence of the now universally admitted 'two nations' in our country in the post-independence period." He exposes the contradictions that were generated with the emergence of independence till 1990 by stripping naked the dictotomy between precept and practice, of Mahatama Gandhi, of Nehru and the successive ruling powers and observes; "Today every aspect of social life in India bears the signature of this historically specific Indian form of capitalist development - its mark is there on our morality,
our culture, our politics, on everything, everywhere...... The fact to be deplored is not that we are not integrated but that we are integrated the capitalist way, which carries within it strong disintegrative tendencies. It is not without reason that today especially in the absence of class-based people's politics, all the identities, all the divides and fissures of Indian society are simultaneously becoming significant and explosive.  

"He says: "it is not that the system has got 'distorted', rather, distortion is the system that Nehru built and presided over, only its dormant contradictions are now surfacing with explosive force." Concluding his analysis of the Indian State, Randhir Singh says, "....If India's 'national economy' has been anti-poor over these forty year, so has been India's 'democratic state'. It has been and continues to be a class-state. The state in India, far from being a part of the solution, is itself a part of the problem."  

Summing up his analysis concerning contemporary Indian Politics and the arena of decisive struggles for India's future, he feels that the ruling classes, through their dominant political formation, the Congress (I), faced with popular dissent, disruption and disorder in civil society and the deepening crisis of legitimacy, are increasingly seeking authoritarian, even fascit answers to their problems. He identifies the other reality of Indian Politics, the struggles of the common people and suggests
that these exploited common people must be made to shed their religions, caste, ethnic and other disruptive tendencies and getting infused with socialist concerns get articulated with a class-based politics, and launch common struggles. If the exploited people have to find a way out to India's under-developed capitalism and over-developed bourgeois Politics, they will have to come out of the 'weak and fragmented' condition of their struggles, resolve the complex problems of theory and practice, politics and organization. It is in these emerging struggles of our common people 'that hope for India's future lies'.

Randhir Singh thus diagnoses the maladies of the Indian State and finds a remedy for it in the "emerging struggles" of the common people.

Kandadai Seshadri is another important Marxist Political Scientist whose views on the Indian State need to be taken account of. Apart from the other writings of Seshadri we focus our attention to two of his important works. An Article entitled "Recent Approaches to the Study of Political Science and the Question of the State in India," and his semantic work, "Marxism and Indian Polity" deserve special attention.

Seshadri enunciates the concept of the State in the following terms: "State means, therefore, the whole
range of activities and structures that subtly operate in the final interests of the bourgeoisie." He laments that till recent times the Marxist Scholars confined themselves to what happened centuries ago or what is happening in the purely, economic sphere and asserts that it is not economics alone that matters but political processes.

In his analysis of the State, Seshadri pays special attention to identify the "Specificities" of the Indian development. Its main features may be summed up as follows: (i) The Indian bourgeoisie before independence was not very strong and capitalism in the very modern sense of the term had not developed in India. But this is not to be mistaken for lack of capitalist development in India. (ii) Most of these capitalists known as "Business Houses" were more or less joint Hindu family enterprises even as many International houses like Philips, Krupps, Hitachi, etc. But these Indian business houses were not like the Western ones fully developed in bourgeois culture but were inheritors of the old traditionalism of their ancestors. They were not as entrepreneurial as those in the West. Even though they made inroads into international markets in post-independent India, they were pygmies compared to the present transnational corporations of U.S., Europe or Japan. But they were big enough under the canopy of the Indial legal system. (iii) Though the pronouncements of the Congress, the ruling party under Nehru and Mrs Gandhi
were strengthening the public sector, in actual practice they strengthened the Private Sector and protected and preserved the interests of a handful of princes, landlords and foreign and Indian monopolies. Though under Mrs Gandhi, Privy Purses were abolished, their interests were not abandoned. Even the Industrial Policy, despite the slogan of nationalisation, the business Houses grew phenomenally. The closeness between business interests and the state power in India increased with the coming of independence. Further with the spill-over of lumpen capitalism, a number of smugglers, black-marketeers, contractors and intermediary businessmen also wielded political influence.

(iv) But unlike in the classical European situation, the rise of monopoly houses has not been over the graves of the feudal elements but side by side with the strengthening of the landed gentry. Enrichment of the traditional rural leadership which by use of caste and rowdyism has also got into political power. They are the support structure of the governmental leadership at the centre and state levels.

(v) The peculiarity of the interdependence of the agricultural and the industrial sections has led to a peculiar position in India. The 'mode of production' debate is inconclusive and different modes of production
also exist side by side. There is the emergence of a 'hybrid class', part-feudal and part-capitalist.

(vi) Another new feature of Indian political system is the emergence of regional level politics. There is the emergence of regional bourgeoisie also. This regionalism is now sprouting secession.

(vii) the emergence of 'Protectionism' and 'sons of the soil' concepts.

(viii) The springing of the dominant rural landlord element demanding price-hike for agricultural inputs, etc., is converting agriculture into capitalist methods. These contribute to economic distortion.

(ix) The trend to place reliance on charismatic readers. The "balance of forces" appearing to make the state autonomous as under Bonapartist France, cannot be taken as a parallel. But tendencies of dynastic rule through democratic means also was witnesses.

(x) There is a tendency to legitimise the rule of bourgeois-landlord combine. The bourgeois preference for a highly strong and centralised government witnesses during the Emergency in India.
Parliamentary politics has only distorted the working class struggles and their participation. It has removed from the agenda the left making and bid to take over leadership. Electoral Politics filters and colours class issues and makes them appear as contests between personalities and parties.

Seshadri concludes his analysis by stating that "other forms of Political mobilisation and participation than electoral one must be further strengthened and it has to be built from below. The oppressive nature of the state would be reinforced if this process of building a broad front of democratic forces is not worked out with the participation of working class in both industry and the agricultural sector and the middle classes, who have to bear the brunt of inflation and corruption which is going unchecked." He finally draws the curtain on the analysis relating to "Question of the State" by making a very significant direction: "The state has to be met not in its terrain, but in the terrain where the masses are strong."

The most tragic and paradoxical thing is that by chosing the Electoral front and the parliamentary path, the proletariat is playing the power game on the bourgeois wicket under the bourgeois rules.

Another important Marxist Political Scientist is Moin Shakir, who deals with the State and its politics in
his celebrated work, State and politics in Contemporary India. He deals with political power and classes, class character of the Indian State, Institutions and Repression, parties and Electoral politics, Religion and caste and communalism and Secularism, in this Book. We deal in the most significant parts of this work dealing with "Political Power and Classes" and "the Class Character of the Indian State", for the purpose of our study and only make peripheral observations on the other parts of this Book.

According to Moin Shakir, for understanding the essential nature of the Indian state one will have to analyse the form and content of the state, class formations, structural imperatives and the effect of the content on the different classes in Indian Society. He suggests that the politics and the state form in India have to be understood in terms of the role of the dominant class/classes and the control they exercise on the State. This explodes the myth of the autonomy instance of the state and its neutrality in matter of class conflicts in Indian society. This is one aspect of Indian Politics. Another aspect is the role, organization and assertion of the non-hegemonic classes in society. Shakir adopts the materialist theory of State and Politics for his analysis and exposition of the totality of the norms and processes and the inter-connections between politics, society and economy which reveal unity in separation.
Certain observations of Shakir in his analysis of 'Political Power and Classes' are quite significant and are summed up for the purpose of brevity and comparative evaluation:

(i) During the colonial rule, the steady growth of industries helped the Indian bourgeoisie to become economically and politically strong. The national movement after the First World War in a sense reflected the strength of the Indian bourgeoisie. Since the introduction of the colonial rule did not coincide with a full-fledged industrial revolution in India, traditional structures persisted, unlike Europe in India the bourgeoisie did not have any interest in the development of rationalism. This explains the unique capitalist development in India. The pre-capitalist consciousness by the exploiting classes explains the role of religion and caste in Indian politics.

(ii) The ideology of the national movement was in consonance with the interests of the propertied classes in Indian Society.

(iii) The Indian Constitution is the natural outcome of the socio-political ideas and economic thinking of the leaders of the national movement, who were pro-propertied classes.
(iv) The "independent" and "Socialist" government has never been hostile to the private sector or capitalist development both in industry and agriculture. A few big Industrial Houses succeeded in concentrating economic power.

(v) The government support of vested interests in the rural areas consolidated the sway of landlords and capitalist farmers.

(vi) The class nature of the Indian state does not permit it to effectively control the private sector.

(vii) Indian State has been performing a decisive role in the alignment and realignment of the urban and rural bourgeois classes, their unity and mutual relations and the role of foreign capital in Indian Economy.

(viii) The Green Revolution consolidated the position of the new rural bourgeois class.

(ix) The ideology of Farmer's agitation is clearly a capitalist ideology.

(x) These developments indicate the nature of the support structure of the political parties in Indian
(xi) To define the class character of the Indian state is a difficult and complex problem as one has to take into account the philosophical and historical foundations of the state; the existing economic and social classes, the prevailing mode/modes of production and relationships of domination and subordination in the social set up of which the political pattern is the ostensible expression.

(xii) In post-colonial societies or the newly independent states in the Third World countries, the situation is more complex; India is one such country.

(xiii) The State in India has not developed to the point of autonomy and is not the state of all the classes of people. It is the state which serves the interests of the propertied classes in society. It pursues policies which benefits the dominant classes.

(xiv) The Constitution of India instituted the political domination of division within the framework of the class-divided society in India.

Moin Shakir presents the characterisation of the State as follows: "The various characteristics of the State, the composition of the personnel of the State
system, role of ideology, policies pursued by the
government, and the relationship between the state managers
and the ruling class clearly underline the class character
of the Indian state. The attitude of the state is
'friendly' and 'helpful' towards farmers (rich),
industrialists, traders, transport operators, i.e., those
who are engaged in the productive process. The ruling
class maintains its hegemony of the System."

Apart from these Marxist Political Scientists,
the works of Mathew Kurian, A.R.Desai, Ajit Roy, Bhabhani
Sen Gupta are also significant.

A survey of the above thinkers reveal that while
there is insufficient theorising there is not unified
theory of State in India, concertedly projected, though
detailed historical materialist analysis of the
developments from pre-independent to post-independent
phases have been effectively presented.

PRACTISING MARXISTS’ VIEWS ON STATE IN INDIA:

In Marxian Theory, theory is meant for practice
and through practice theory has to be developed. This
concept of Praxis is central to Marxism.

It is in this light that the writings of
Practising Marxists' assume a place of high significance in the evolution of Marxian theory. In this section we focus our attention on the writings of a few Marxist Practitioners, who have spent their life in the practice of Marxism, of whatever brand, in evolving a theory of State in India. The representative writers we have chosen here are those who are leaders from the different Communist Parties, who have through their writings not only enriched the Marxian literary corpus in India but also practised those precepts in life and struggles.

One of the tallest of these practising Marxists is E.M.S. Namboodiripad, who had the unique privilege of being the first Marxist Chief Minister of a State, who ascended to power through hustings. He has more than three score books and hundreds of articles on various dimensions of Marxism to his credit and who can be reckoned as one the outstanding authorities on Marxism and in particular, to its Indian experiment of these many writings, two of his works and a few of his articles have been chosen here for a closer look. One such work is Selected Writings (Volume I) and the other is Crisis into Chaos. From the Selected Works, we have chosen four articles for our analysis. They are "The Communist Party of India (Marxist)", "The Strategy of Indian Revolution" and "Marxism-Leninism and the Bourgeois Judiciary". These articles along with "The Way Out of the Crisis" (from
Crisis into Chaos) have been selected as they have a direct bearing on the State in India and would help us in evolving a Theory for the Indian State.

While the article entitled "The Communist Party of India (Marxist)" deals elaborately with the background and the reasons for the split of the undivided Communist Party of India, it also lays down the Policies, Programmes and strategies of the CPI (M) and hence is of relevance to our analysis relating to the State in India. The basic programme of the Party is oriented towards developing the day to day struggle of the working people towards a well coordinated political struggle against three main enemies of the people - imperialism or foreign monopoly; feudalism or all the antiquated socio-cultural, economic and political institutions within the country and rapidly growing monopoly capital with its foreign collaborators. The leading force in this struggle is the working class; it however does not fight on its own, but together with all the exploited and down-trodden sections of the people, toiling peasantry above all. In developing such a combined force of the working people under the leadership of the working class, it joins with that section of the bourgeoisie which is opposed to imperialism, feudalism and monopoly capitals, it joins also with all other individuals and strata who, for various reasons, happen to take up anti-imperialistic, anti-feudal and or anti-monopoly
positions. Such a very broad front of struggle against the three enemies of the nation, however, has to be built under the firm and vigilant leadership of the working class and be based on the ideology of Marxism-Leninism. The CPI (M) fights and expects all genuinely democratic parties, organisations, groups and individuals to fight the bankrupt policy of the capitalist path which has been consistently followed by the congress and its central government. ....This path which has reduced the country to the position of a beggar going all over the world for "aid" on such terms as no self-respecting nation can accept."36

This article apart from highlighting the programmes and policies of the CPI (M) indicates to us the stand of this Marxist Party so far as the exploiting ruling classes and its instrument of exploitation the State is concerned. In this article Namboodiripad lays emphasis on a fight against ever-increasing prices, ever-deepening unemployment and the eroding character of the federal polity. The concluding note of the article says - "It is the effort of the CPI (M) to channelise this rising discontent of the people and to bring it along the path of joint struggle against the ruling classes."37

The second article on which we desire to focus our attention is "The Strategy of Indian Revolution". This is of highest significance in the understanding of the
Namboodiripad opens this article with a very important observation - "The fact that we are living in the epoch of transition to socialism applies to India as it does to other countries". As Indian Independence movement was part of the world-wide socialist movement, India's transition to socialism was also a part of the global phenomenon. According to Namboodiripad "this transition must take place in two stages: (1) Attainment of national independence in the sense of complete liberation from British domination and establishment of genuine democracy through a people's State by destroying the feudal - princely domination. These together constitute the first stage of the transformation. (ii) The second stage consists of building up a socialist society by establishing the political power of the poor following the successful accomplishment of the first stage."  

The author delineates the role of Communist Party of India (Marxist) for taking the stance of Proletarian Internationalism, being a party of the working class in India, as in any other country in the world, to rescue the working class State from attack of class enemies and justifies the stand of the Communist Party during the Indian National movement in going to the rescue of the Soviet Union and in 1962 to the rescue of the People's Republic of China. He spells a warning to the world working class movement: "Further, the imperialist forces
are waiting for a chance to destroy the socialist system in these countries and re-establish capitalism by any means. It would be a terrible set-back for the world working class movement including that of India, if they are successful in this effort even in one country.  

The salient aspects of the strategy of the Indian Revolution can be summarised as follows:

(i) Indian revolution is an integral part of the process of transition from capitalism to socialism that takes place on a world scale. But this does not mean that India is ripe for this transition. India has to go through another revolution as the main pre-condition for the transition from capitalism to socialism. Marxism-Leninism calls this "People's Democratic Revolution".

(ii) In certain parts of Europe bourgeois democratic revolution and in certain other parts "Socialist Revolution" have taken place. Indian revolution belongs to neither of these categories. For "capitalist development in India is not of the type which took place in Western Europe and advanced capitalist countries. Even though developing in the capitalist way Indian society still contains within itself strong elements of pre-capitalist society.
(iii) As neither the British rulers nor the Ruling classes that come to power in India smashed the pre-capitalist society, the Present Indian Society is a combination of monopoly capitalism domination with caste, communal and tribal institutions. Thus the working class and its party shall unite all the progressive forces interested in destroying the pre-capitalist society and to consolidate the revolutionary forces to facilitate the democratic revolution and prepare the ground for transition to socialism.

(iv) Before transition to Socialism is accomplished certain tasks need to be performed; (a) masses who have remained stagnant because of remnants of caste, religions and tribal systems have to be liberated from the fetters of the ideologies of this system. (b) The revolutionary spirit of the peasant masses who are fighting against the remnants of feudal system built on the base of this reactionary social combination and against growing capitalist landlordism has to be released. (c) The revolutionary struggles of the peasant masses must be linked with the struggles of the working class including middle class employees. (d) using the sharp weapon of the resultant fighting unity of the workers and peasants the existing bourgeois-landlord State and the growing foreign and Indian monopoly combination must be smashed." (v) The present task is to accomplish successfully the people's
Namboodiripad after laying out the logistics of the Indian revolution, exposes the reactionary designs of the Ruling classes led by Nehru, Indira Gandhi, etc., in aligning with the foreign and Indian monopolies and feudal lords who ought to be destroyed. He also points to the growing collaborations of Indian monopolists with the foreign monopolists and thus asserts that even task of the "bourgeois democratic revolution has fallen to the lot of the working class and indicates that a section of the bourgeoisie desiring a "People's democratic revolution" also join hands with the ruling power in suppressing the workers and peasant, but sometimes may join the masses against the State. He calls them as "National bourgeoisie" and says that they have also a place in the "unity-struggle-unity again" and that it is necessary for such a front to be led by the working class. He asserts that the stage for socialist social system is not mature and hence the agenda is only "anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, anti-monopolist democratic revolution".

The next article we propose to examine but only cursorily is "Marxism-Leninism and the Bourgeois Judiciary". This is a comment on the observation of the Supreme Court made in the appeal preferred by Namboodiripad against the Judgment of the High Court of
Kerala. In a part of this judgment, the judges observed that Namboodiripad has committed an "error" in understanding Marx and Engels, and Namboodiripad exposes the limitations of these judges in their observation, and in doing so quotes profusely from the celebrated works of Marx and Engels to expose the legal system as anti-working class and the "Justices of Peace" as themselves members of the bourgeoisie and really believe that the interests of their own class are the true corner-stone of law and order. In this article also Namboodiripad analyses the role of the State and its oppressive character.

We shall now proceed to analyse the concluding chapter "The Way out of the Crisis" in his work "Crisis into Chaos", which presents the political India - 1981. Namboodiripad unravels the crisis to which the national life, economy, polity, social relations, cultural life had been driven into and traces its roots to the developments 1947. This book rips naked the Indian bourgeois-landlord system and the crisis to which it had led into. He diagnoses two kinds of conflicts that have resulted: One, the conflict between the people at large and the ruling classes, Two, the conflict among various sections of the ruling class. There were two tendencies; one, the working class trying to unite to fight the ruling classes; Two, the ruling classes trying to unite to fight the working class. After giving various suggestions, like, ruling classes
abandoning their perspective of developing capitalism; keeping the perspective of developing socialism; fighting foreign capital - big landlords - Indian monopoly capitalists; unity of working class, peasantry, toiling middle classes to develop a united radical democratic movement; unity of working class with other radical democratic elements from all classes.

Namboodiripad suggests the emergence of "a new political force which will not be a single party but a combination of parties, in which the communist and socialist parties play a vital role. Failure to develop it will lead to the continued development of the all-round crisis with no possibility of a way out."

In these writings we find the class-character of the State exposed, the reactionary character of the judiciary set out, the repressive character of the bourgeois-landlord state ripped open, and the strategy of the Indian Revolution expounded. This presents in a capsule Namboodiripad's views on the State.

Before proceeding to analyse the views of B.T.Ranadive, another veteran leader and theoretician of the Communist Movement in India, we will make a passing reference to A.K.Gopalan who in his Reminiscences, In the cause of the People, expounds the mission of his life -
"For over four decades I have participated in and been moulded by the struggles of the people for freedom and social justice, and against exploitation. This has been the dominant theme in my life since I joined the Independence struggle in the 1920s. The struggle for socialism has pre-occupied me since and the experience of fighting with the people and learning from them has inspired me to go on. The story of my life is part of the history of the millions of my countrymen who will one day march decisively on the road to revolution and socialism."

The lives of these Practicing Marxists is the history of the millions and their thoughts, the fruition of their sacrifices, pulsating with revolutionary practice, and hence are invaluable in expounding and evaluating Marxian theoretical tenets.

In recalling the thoughts of Ranadive, we only take up one of his many works, "The Independence Struggle and After", as this Book is current and significant, for an analysis. In the last chapter of the first book mentioned above, he X-rays "Forty Years of Indian Independence" and his assessment is very forthright and self-critical. Ranadive states: "The CPI (M) had to pass through severe repression, semi-fascist terror and virtual illegality (emergency) it however succeeded in winning electoral successes in three states and widening its mass..."
influence. But its strength is as yet inadequate to discharge its historic task. In the absence of a revolutionary initiative of an alternative from the fighting masses led by the working class, the stage was occupied by the new rulers, the bourgeois-landlord alliance.\(^46\)

Ranadive presents an incisive analysis of four decades after Independence by exposing the highly reactionary and retrograde character of the Ruling classes - the bourgeois-landlord alliance, on the one hand and by also revealing the weaknesses of the Left and democratic forces, on the other. After discerning the positive features of four decades after Indian Independence, he lists the negative aspects before suggesting the tasks for the left and democratic forces.

According to Ranadive, India is in a very dangerous situation after 40 years of her independence. The dangers identified by him could be summed up as follows:

(a) Industrial progress under national planning is very slow and only prolongs the agony and sufferings of the people. The capitalist path did not require complete elimination of feudal land relations and freedom from the peasant. The life of the Indian Peasant has become akin to
a bonded labourer, and the working class faced greater misery through closures, lock-outs, mass dismissals and unemployment. The new economic policy with its emphasis on liquidation of the Public Sector and open invitation to multi-nationals, undermines self-reliance, and opens it to the exploitation of foreign capital and danger of foreign domination.

(b) The Second danger is to democracy. The parliamentary system formally remains but the rights of citizens are attacked. The ruling party defending the interests of capitalists and landlords, violates parliamentary and democratic norms. Within the class alliance there is tremendous push and pull, with landed interests increasingly becoming more assertive and going on the offensive.

(c) The third danger is to national unity which has been eroded by the congress rule. Today, every divisive, secessionist and sectional force is dividing the unity of the country, mobilising large sections in the name of religion, language and region. The Khalistan challenge in Punjab, the Gorkhaland agitation in Darjeeling and divisive movements in Assam constitute secessionist challenges to the unity of the country. Side by side the rise of Muslim and Hindu fundamentalism, the rousing of passions on issues like the Shah Bano case and the Babri
Masjid/Ram Janma Bhoomi controversy assail the unity of the country. All these agitations are heavily financed from abroad by U.S. agencies.47

After diagnosing the resultant maladies of the forty years of Congress (I) rule and the rule of bourgeois-landlord alliance, wedded to the capitalist path, and presenting the balance-sheet, Ranadive charts the 'historic responsibility of left and Democratic Forces'.

Ranadive concludes: "The experience of the last four decades show that the continuance of the capitalist path of the bourgeois-landlord regime means preparing for disastrous consequences for the country. The failure to complete the tasks of the democratic revolution is threatening the country with repression, loss of independence, unity and even neo-colonial enslavement. It will be ruinous if the CPI (M) and the Left Parties confine their attention to the demand for Rajiv's resignation48 and forget that the movement must gradually move forward to demand basic changes. A basis must be created in the course of a gigantic movement for the immediate resignation of Rajiv Gandhi, for a new correlation of class forces, a correlation favourable to the basic masses. The planned struggle against immediate dangers and for ousting Rajiv must teach the masses to look beyond the present frame-work and create an urge for moving towards a people's democratic
revolution based on the worker-peasant alliance. The failure to create this urge and mobilise the masses for this purpose has been the main weakness of the last four decades endangering the future of our country and our people."

This conclusion is in tune with the policy and programme of the CPI (M), but is self-critical in not only seeing the weakness of left and democratic forces, but also in projecting not only the immediate goal of ousting the then Prime Minister, who had become an embodiment of the Ruling alliance, but also the long-term strategy of achieving the People's Democratic Revolution, by transforming the immediate massive agitation into a basis for the reaching the long-term objective. However the ultimate goal of a socialist transformation has not been mentioned but has to be understood.

Ajoy Ghosh, was the General Secretary of the undivided Communist Party of India, during a very crucial period in the history of the party. It adds significance to note that it was during this period that the first elected government of the Communist Party of India headed by E.M.S.Namboodiripad, in Kerala, was dismissed by the Central Government headed by none other than Jawaharlal Nehru and it is not a mere coincidence that it took place when Mrs Indira Gandhi, daughter of Nehru, was the
President of the Congress Party. We just bring on record a few of the observations of Ghosh on this most undemocratic act of the Congress Government at the Centre, when Nehru, was enjoying the highest euphoria that he was a great democrat-Socialist, heading One of the largest democracies of the World. These details were incorporated in an article entitled "Kerala". This event took place on 31st July 1959, when the then President of India, Dr Rajendra Prasad, on the advice of the Union Cabinet, issued a proclamation, dismissing the Government of Kerala, dissolving the elected State Legislature, suspending even the limited autonomy of the State and imposing President's rule on the State. This brought to an end the first Communist led Government in an Indian State. For the first time in the history of the Indian Republic an elected State Ministry found itself dismissed at a time when it enjoyed the support of the majority in the State legislature. The Presidential proclamation of July 31, stated that the President is "satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the Government of that State (Kerala) cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of India." No charge was levelled against the Kerala Government, not a word was said as to how the Kerala Government had violated the provisions of the constitution or what the "situation" was and who created it.
Ajoy Ghosh says: "The very science was eloquently indicative of the guilty conscience of those who were responsible for the President's proclamation and of their unwillingness to come before the people with real reasons." Ajoy Ghosh lists the various achievements of this first Communist youth: a new police policy granting full freedom to the masses to conduct peaceful action to win their legitimate demands; Minimum Wages Act for workers in eighteen factories and for agriculture workers was passed to better the wages of men and women workers; contract labour in road buildings was handed over to forty-two labour contract societies, grant helped workers to secure higher wages; a comprehensive Education Act raised the status of Teachers and freed them from the arbitrary rule of corrupt and oppressive managers; special attention was paid to the basic problem of India - the land reform, etc., and remarks "The reactionaries in Kerala landlords, British plantation workers and big capitalists - resented these reforms.

Mr John Foster Dulles of U.S.A. had remarked: "Local election victories by Communists in India and Indonesia are a dangerous trend. It is a dangerous trend whenever Communists move towards Political Control." The then Finance Minister, T.T.Krishnamachari in an Interview to an American paper had said, "We have to try to explain to them (Americans) that the battle in India is a battle
against Communism too. We lost the State of Kerala to the Communists and one of the reasons behind it was that we could not spend enough money for development there."

According to Ghosh, the reasons for the offensive were: First, Kerala Government had started implementing the number of legislative measure - most important of them being Agrarian Relations Bill. Second, the religious, communal and caste passions and hysteria - the catholic church and the Nair Service Society, were whipped up to spearhead the agitation. Third, though they did not put any specific demand their tacit demand was to overthrow the Ministry and clamp central intervention. Fourth, active support and open backing was given to the agitation by the all India leaders of the Congress, and the role played by Nehru and Mrs Indira Gandhi."

Ghosh characterised this dismissal as: "All in all, this was a striking manifestation of the length to which the party of the bourgeoisie and landlords is ready to go and of their scant respect for their own principles whenever their class interest are threatened."53 This is a very significant remark as from then on till date we have witnessed countless instances of dismissal of duly elected State Governments, when they were not to the liking of the Central Government and also indicative of the attitude of the Ruling bourgeoisie-landlord classes towards left
parties in India and also the identification of the congress with the Ruling classes.

In another article, Ghosh stated: "one of the fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism is that Socialism can be established only through revolution, i.e., conquest of power by the working people led by the working class. During the last ten years, this lesson has been driven home to the people of our country - the lesson that the bourgeoisie and the landlord cannot establish socialism that there can be no Socialism unless the working people wield state power. To eschew Marxism-Leninism means, therefore, to eschew socialism itself." A seminal tenet of Marxism-Leninism spelt out in such simple terms, palatable to the common masses, was the achievement of Ajoy Ghosh, who steered the Communist Party during a very crucial decade.

Another 'Practising Marxist', who is also one of the Ideologues of the Communist Party, Mohit Sen, deserves mention. His work "Revolution in India: Path and Problems", needs to be given a look.

Without entering into a polemic with Mohit Sen, at this stage, we would cull out a few conclusions he reaches in the various chapters of this work. In the chapter on "Meaning of Revolution", he observes: "The
experience of Chile does not invalidate the Marxist-Leninist thesis of peaceful transition as a form of revolution. But it also confirms that being a form of revolution peaceful transition too has to obey its objective fundamental laws. "There is no reason to doubt that peaceful transition as a form of revolution would also display a similar variety of types. Peaceful transition in India, for example, can scarcely be expected to be same as that of France or all of these countries." He continues: "But whatever form, there can be no avoiding of the fact that the victory of revolution would require success in a series of desperate battles against counter revolution both before and after the capture of power. Any ideological disarmament of the revolutionary parties, classes and masses can lead to grave consequences and to defeat."

In his thesis "Perspective of Indian Revolution", Sen distinguishes between the Communist Party of India and the Communist Party of India (Marxist) as to by whom the State in India is being led: "while some would state that the present Indian state is a semi-colonial state, some others of the same movement argue that though India did achieve independence in 1947, the economy has become increasingly dependent, year by year, on the imperialists. This is because according to them, i.e., the CPM, the Indian State is led by and dominated by the monopolists who..."
are collaborating with the imperialists. The Indian state therefore is led by the collaborationists and the economy is being led by them to increasing dependence. According to him: "Neither of these two sections of the Communist movement would care to explain how this is so when the relative position of the imperialists has weakened in the present period. While private imperialist capitalist investment has gone up in absolute terms, its relative position vis-a-vis both indigenous private as well as state capitalism has sharply declined." 

Regarding the ideological stand on the Communist Party of India to the Emergency declared by Mrs Indira Gandhi, Mohit Sen elaborates as follows:

"The CPI, while supporting the emergency, made a clear cut class classification of it. It stated that the Emergency was the use of the capitalist state-power against the most reactionary, anti-Soviet and anti-Communist Sections of the vested interests. Thus it was not as if the CPI was of the view that the emergency was the use of the state power by the working class and other democratic forces in our country, it could not be forgotten for a moment that this state had a very definite class character - it was and remains a capitalist state. This naturally gave its own character, limitations and dangers to the emergency. Nevertheless it has to be emphasised that the
nec-colonialist, fascist and right reactionary take over of the country could not have been prevented without the declaration of emergency. At that moment of time in the third week of June 1975 it would have been impossible to have achieved this by swift mass mobilisation. That would have taken much more time and there was at that moment no time left - the sands had virtually run out. He further says: "the unity of the congress, the CPI and other patriotic and progressive parties and forces has yet to achieve the degree of cohesion and that level which would make it an invincible defender of the freedom, democracy and social progress of our country." Sen concludes his thesis by saying: "The immediate outcome and perspective of the Indian revolutionary process is still in the balance. It is on the anvil of struggle - a struggle in which none of us are spectators but participants and partisans. But it is a struggle requiring not only courage and militancy on the part of all revolutionaries but also tact, capacity to win over others and a scientific vision. And it is a struggle which the revolutionaries of our country can engage in with fully justified historical optimism." 61

The conceptions and perspectives of Mohit Sen need to be set and critically analysed in the backdrop of Marxian tenets. This theory based on class antagonisms and class struggle unambiguously present the state as an instrument of exploitation of the Ruling Classes and Marx
and Engels clearly lay down that every successive revolution only perfected the State apparatus while its task was to smash it. Similarly it stresses that violence is the midwife when the situation is pregnant with revolution. Apart from the founding fathers, even other classical Marxists and also a few Neo-Marxist stress the need for violence. It may be very alluring to say, "let us have peaceful transition to socialism", but historical experience evidences that this could only turn out to be a utopia, a non-realizable proposition. Chilean experience itself negates the prospect of a peaceful transition.

Regarding CPI's support to the Emergency clamped by Mrs Indira Gandhi in, Mohit Sen very effectually and emphatically proposes the ideological line of his party. This 'line' of the CPI led to prolonged and extended debates between the CPI Ideologues and the CPI (M) ideologues. In retrospect and after evaluating the after-effects of "Emergency" it could well be said that it was wrong to have classified the Congress as the "saviour" and as preventing a neo-colonial enslavement. In fact, this period witnessed the highest repression of the working class, the CPI (M) and democratic rights of the common masses, while the bourgeoisie was the biggest sole beneficiary. It was a naked authoritarianism and both Mrs Indira Gandhi, her party and her allies the CPI suffered the biggest defeat in the general elections that followed.
Hence the 'CPI line' so well propounded by Mohit Sen had its negation. Regarding the two-variant viewpoints of CPI and CPI (M) regarding class character of the Indian State, we shall revert to it while dealing with the respective political parties.

We conclude our analysis of the 'Practising Marxists' and proceed to take up an overview of the official documents of the Marxist Parties.

Official Resolutions, Pamphlets and Documents of Marxists in India:

A critique of the works of 'Practising Marxists' has already provided an insight into the policies and programmes as also the different paths on which the major Left Parties in India have been moving. However to get a clearer picture of the stands of these Marxist Parties, we examine their official Resolutions, Pamphlets and Documents. We propose to restrict our study to the important and recent developments that have transpired within the Communist Party of India, Communist Party of India (Marxist) and the Communist party of India (Marxist-Leninist). As there are countless Naxalite groups, operating sporadically in the various parts of the country with various nomenclatures and without a unified direction, they are left out from the perview of our...
analysis here. During this analysis we concentrate specifically on the issues pertaining to the State. We don't venture any historical details but concentrate on the following parameters pertaining to the State:

(a) The class character of the Indian State.
(b) The assessment of Indian capitalism and
(c) The nature of democracy.

(a) **Class Character of the Indian State:**

In the assessment of the class character of the State in India, the Left Parties have vital differences. The differences in the outlook of these three Parties, CPI, CPI (M) and CPI (M-L) are summed up here.

According to the CPI, "the state in India is the organ of the 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." The CPI points out that the system can be used for the ushering in socialism after overcoming the main difficulties in the way, namely, the strengthening of monopoly groups within national bourgeoisie and the operation of a "new set of reactionary vested interests" such as "the landlords, the owners and wholesale dealers" in the agrarian sector. This indicates that the CPI...
would be inclined to see revolutionary possibilities in the Parliamentary democratic system established in India.

The CPI (M) sees the Indian state as a reflection of the compromise between the bourgeoisie and the feudals, the comprador and oppositional wings of the bourgeoisie and the feudal-capitalist classes in India and the foreign monopolists. Explaining this kind of characterisation, CPI (M) says: "Neither the British colonialists whose rule continued for over a century nor the Indian bourgeoisie into whose hands power passed in 1947 delivered those smashing blows against the pre-capitalist society which are necessary for the free development of capitalist society and its replacement by a socialist society. The present Indian society is, therefore, a peculiar combination of monopoly capitalist domination with the caste, communal and tribal institutions. The CPI (M) would therefore characterise the state in India as "the organ of the class rule of the bourgeoisie and the landlords led by the big bourgeoisie who are increasingly collaborating with foreign finance capital in persuit of the capitalist path of development. The CPI (M) lays down a Two stage revolution; the first stage being national liberation, coupled with the establishment of the People's Democratic State and the second stage envisaging transition to socialism.
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The CPI (M-L)'s position on the issue differs sharply from that of the CPI (M) and much more from the CPI. According to CPI (M-L), through independence a colonial and semi-feudal set-up was replaced by a semi-colonial, semi-feudal set-up. When faced with the revolutionary upsurge of the people, "British imperialism pressed into service its tried agents - the leaders of the Indian National Congress, Muslim League and of CPI. CPI (M-L) further holds that the Congress administration represents the interests of the Indian Feudal Princes, big-landlords and bureaucratic compradore Capitalists", according to CPI (M-L). Thus instead of two mountains, British imperialism and Feudalism, the Indian people are now weighed down under four huge mountains, namely, Imperialism headed by U.S. Imperialism, Social Imperialism, Feudalism and compradore Bureaucratic capitalism.

(a) Assessment of the Indian Capitalism:

The CPI (M) makes the following important points in connection with its critique of capitalism.

(i) The inherent and inevitable contradictions, crises and serious limitations of the capitalist system far from developing itself will always be crisis ridden.

(ii) The efforts of Indian bourgeoisie to develop the
country along the capitalist path are bound to foil.

(iii) Even though developing in the capitalist way, "Indian society contains within itself strong elements of pre-capitalist society. Unlike in advanced capitalist countries where capitalism grew on the ashes of pre-capitalist society in India capitalism was super posed on a pre-capitalist society. The specific features of capitalist development make the crisis in India far more painful and protracted. Hence it is the duty of the working class and its party to unite all the progressive forces interested in destroying the pre-capitalist society and to so consolidate the revolutionary forces within it so as to facilitate the most rapid completion of the democratic revolution and preparation of the ground for transition to socialism.  

CPI holds out the perspective of uniting the same set to classes there is a sharp difference between the two parties on the question of the forces against whom the progressive elements are to be united. The CPI (M) adheres to the perspective of "the replacement of the bourgeois-landlord state and government by a state of people's democracy and people's democratic government led by the working class on the basis of a firm worker-peasant
The CPI on the contrary, sees a differentiation taking place between the monopolist and other bourgeois as a result of the crisis of capitalism and seeks to utilize the difference within the bourgeois class to strengthen the non-monopolists. The outlook is therefore, one of replacing the present government (instead of the present state power) by a government of the national democratic front.

The CPI (M-L) emphasises the negative aspects of the country's capitalist development. Even at the time of independence, the Indian bourgeoisie was "compradors in nature" and intervened to divert the national liberation struggle from the path of revolution to the path of compromise and surrender. Further, "during these years of sham independence, the big compradore bureaucrat bourgeoisie and big landlord ruling classes have been serving their imperialist masters quite faithfully. These lackeys of imperialism while preserving the old imperialist exploitation have also brought the U.S. imperialist and Soviet Socialist imperialist exploiters to fleece the country."
(c) **Nature of the Indian Democracy:**

The CPI holds that the bourgeois democratic state ushered in after independence "is a historic advance over the imperialist-bureaucratic rule over the country." The CPI (M) holds that all this to be contrary to a Marxist understanding, for only "a liberal can forget the historical limitations and conventional character of bourgeois Parliamentarism. The CPI (M) believes that the bourgeois-democratic constitution besides being a cover for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the working people "denies democratic rights even to the oppositional elements within the ruling classes. Hence the cry of bourgeois democratic parties against "the one party dictatorship of the congress". The CPI (M) claims that it does not take a negative altitude to the struggle on the electoral and legislative fronts. It wants the maximum use of the opportunity provided by the Parliamentary Institutions, including the use of majority in Particular Legislature when they are secured. It also stands for such an electoral line as "will inflict as big an electoral defeat on the congress and secure as substantial a victory for the left opposition parties as possible." 

CPI (M) Programme points out that "when the people begin to use parliamentary democracy, the reactionary bourgeoisie and landlords may not hesitate to
trample under foot Parliamentary democracy and even replace it with military dictatorship.

CPI (M-L) attitude towards Parliamentary democracy is as follows: "If the ruling power in India is only a puppet of one or more foreign governments and is without a base among the people of the country, obviously conditions are favourable for armed action. Once armed struggle starts, it would spread like wild fire ... since the ruling class has no popular base ... an ever increasing number of people would come forward and join the revolutionary struggle... To enter parliamentary politics, at a time people are ready to launch an armed struggle to overthrow the State power, is tantamount to betrayal ... Parliamentary activities at this moment ... would create illusions about bourgeois democracy and draw people away from the struggle."

CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, it appears very clear that there are a wide variety of views about the nature of the Indian state, both within and between the three groups, committed to a broadly Marxist theory and practice. Therefore it is difficult to talk about a unified Marxist perspective. In fact, what we encounter is a sharply fragmented landscape of theorisation and practice.
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