

Phrases And Facts: About Kerala

PARTHA CHOUDHURI

[From Liberation, Vol. II, No.3 (January 1969). It is the second part of the article, the first part of which, that appeared in the previous issue, is not being reproduced for lack of space.]

Tools Of Foreign And Domestic Reaction

We have already seen how the "Marxist"-led U. F. Government of Kerala robs the working people to fatten the landlords and other blood-suckers and how it tries ruthlessly to suppress the workers and workers' movements in the interests of foreign monopolists and the Indian big bourgeoisie. The anti-working class policy of the "Marxists", "Communists" and "Socialists" is only part of a larger policy - the policy of inviting India's big bourgeoisie and foreign monopolists to exploit Kerala's human and natural resources and thus one of strengthening India's neo-colonial fetters. They are playing the same game as the Congress Party - the game of the Indian reactionaries and their masters, U.S. imperialists and Soviet neo-colonialists.

To begin with, let us quote Namboodiripad himself on the Kerala U.F. Government's industrial policy:

"First, the coalition partners are united in their desire to get the process of industrialization accelerated. They are unanimous that the state should take a positive stand with regard to giving encouragement and assistance to those who are desirous of starting new industries...

"Secondly, after the statement of the industrial policy was adopted and published, it was subjected to scrutiny by different sections of public opinion both in Kerala and outside. *Industrialists were unanimous in acclaiming it. On the other hand, the trade union movement was highly critical of some passages in the statement which may well go contrary to the right of the working class for collective bargaining and their freedom of organization and struggle. Communists and Socialists felt that the incentives offered without any discrimination to all capitalists might end up in helping the rapidly growing monopoly capitalists (Indian and foreign) to allow them to strengthen themselves not only against the working people but also against the small and medium industrialists*" ("E.M.S. Answers the 'Washington Post,' " *People's Democracy*, Jan. 14, '68 - Our emphasis).

Namboodiripad claims that there is a basic conflict of approach between the constituent parties of the U.F. on the question of collaboration between Indian and foreign monopolies. But he adds that *"regardless of the particular method of industrialization (on which we may have our reservations), we unanimously demand that our State should get a legitimate share of India's industrial development; the same thing applies to the big or monopolist Indian capital.* Whatever our own views may be on the desirability of allowing these monopolists to grow and strengthen themselves, we would demand that a share of the industries that are to be set up in the country

should be located in Kerala" (Ibid - Emphasis ours). So, the "Marxist" Chief Minister is not opposed to any "particular method of industrialization;" his Kerala must have "a legitimate share of India's industrial development," even though it means the increased penetration of foreign monopoly capital and the strengthening of the Indian big bourgeoisie, even though it means further impoverishment of the working people and the ruin of small and medium industrialists!

Namboodiripad added: "It [the State Government] can certainly take the initiative in *creating the proper climate* for entrepreneurs either within Kerala or outside to embark on new industrial projects. *We can give various incentives for those who are willing to expand existing or establish new industries*" (Ibid).

This "Marxist" is quite aware that industrialization under the auspices of foreign monopolists or India's big bourgeoisie means further enrichment of these sharks and more fierce exploitation of the working people and greater ruin of the national bourgeoisie and their small and medium industries. This "Marxist" is also perhaps aware that this "method of industrialization" takes away more jobs than it creates.

In a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country like India this "method of industrialization" leads to intenser exploitation and oppression by the foreign monopolists and the native comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie. This is also the actual experience of the Indian people. The class or classes that hold state power plus the imperialist bourgeoisie, whose agents and props they are, thrive at the cost of the sweat and blood of the workers and the peasantry. The all-important question is: which class or classes hold state power? The emergence of the "Marxist"-led ministry in Kerala has in no way changed the character of the Indian state which is the organ of the class rule of the feudal class and the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie, an organ for the suppression of the workers and peasants in the interests of these exploiting classes. It is the ruling classes that have set down in the Indian Constitution that the rights of property of even the foreign monopolists are sacred and inviolable.

The neo-revisionist clique's own Programme states: "Experience of the three plans demonstrates beyond a shadow of doubt that in the period of the general crisis of capitalism, particularly when it has entered a new acute stage, it is futile for underdeveloped countries to seek to develop along the capitalist path.....it gives rise to ever-growing contradictions and is beset with imbalance and crisis. While it imposes unbearable burdens and inflicts misery on the common people, it gives them no hope of a better future and brings them into inevitable conflict with the capitalist path of development" (Para 33). So, the "Marxist" Party's *Programme* itself admits that this "method of industrialization," which they call "the capitalist path of development" and which the "Marxist"-led Kerala Government is following both in words and in deeds, is not only futile but also "imposes unbearable burdens and inflicts misery on the common people." In reality, the path followed by the ruling classes of India is not the path of independent capitalist development but one of preventing the long-delayed agrarian revolution, protecting and preserving the feudal elements, developing comprador-bureaucrat capital and thus strengthening the neo-colonialist stranglehold of the Anglo-U.S. imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists over India. Namboodiripad's "Marxist" Party has obviously become a party of the ruling classes: it is following the same path - the path of treachery to the interests of the Indian people - and feverishly implementing the policies of the ruling classes.

So, a grateful Birla, who is setting up the world's largest pulp factory in Kerala, in which he has invested Rs 20 crore, said: "I am very happy in Kerala. I do not mind the communists running the Government there.....Frankly speaking, I have got no problem in Kerala." Birla expected Jyoti Basu to create in West Bengal conditions similar to those in Kerala to induce him to invest more in West Bengal (*Statesman*, Oct. 24, '67).

According to a PTI report from Calicut, reproduced in *New Age* of Dec. 4, 1966, G. D. Birla said that the credit for bringing him to Kerala should rightly go to E.M.S. Namboodiripad. "Mr Namboodiripad [as the "Communist" Chief Minister of Kerala during 1957-59] gave me good terms which even a Congress Government would not have given," added Birla.

While declaring a war of words against India's big bourgeoisie, Namboodiripad and his men are literally grovelling at their feet. *Economic Times* reported: "Birlas have been approached by the Kerala Government to take over its cotton mills. This was disclosed by Mr G. D. Birla at the annual meeting of the Hindustan Aluminium Corporation Ltd, held here today [in Bombay on June 29, 1968]."

According to a UNI report from Bombay, dated Dec. 18, "Mr G. D. Birla yesterday paid compliments to the Communists and Kerala Government headed by the CPI(M) leader, Mr E. M. S. Namboodiripad, and said they respected the private sector. What is more, the Kerala Government has approached Mr Birla to take over the management of a State-owned cotton mill in pursuance of its policy 'to hand over public sector industrial units to private individuals' for running it efficiently. Mr Birla told the half-year meeting of the Bombay Industries Association here that whatever the Communists did in Kerala, they did not disturb industries providing employment to the people. *'They respect the private sector and industrial peace'*, he added" (*Statesman*, Dec. 19, 1968).

To save its face the Namboodiripad Government made a clumsy effort to deny the above statement of G. D. Birla. In a press note issued on Dec. 19, they described the statement that Birla had been requested by the Kerala Government to take over a "sick" textile mill as "absolutely contrary to facts." But the very next day Kerala's Industries Minister, T. V. Thomas, confirmed Birla's statement and declared at a Press Conference that the State Government had invited Mr G. D. Birla to take over the mill (*Statesman*, Dec. 22, '68). How ridiculous, vain and dishonest are the efforts of the neo-revisionists to hide their counter-revolutionary features from the people and from their own ranks!

It may not be irrelevant here to mention that India's Minister for Industries Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, told Lok Sabha on Dec. 18, '68, that the assets of the Birla group of companies went up by 49 per cent - from Rs 292.7 crore to Rs 437.5 crore - between 1963-64 and 1966-67, that is, in the course of only three years. These, of course, are the *known* assets. These figures give some idea of the fierce intensity with which the Indian people, especially the Birlas' workers, are being exploited. The revisionists and neo-revisionists are indeed vying with the Congress leaders in rendering every service to the Birlas, the Walchands and others in order to fatten them at the cost of the blood and tears of the people, whatever their *public posture* may be. In the name of maintaining industrial peace, they are ruthlessly suppressing the workers' struggles for better pay and security of service by placing the police at the disposal of these most savage tycoons. What

is rather amusing is that these revisionists and neo-revisionists, who equate socialism with the existence of the 'public sector' and wax eloquent on its virtues in their speeches and writings, respect the private sector in actual practice and take the initiative in handing over a public sector undertaking to the private sector - to the Birlas!

These lackeys of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords are also minions of the foreign capitalists and Soviet neo-colonialists. On March 20, 1968, Kerala's Industries Minister, T. V. Thomas, informed the Kerala Assembly that there was no proposal to nationalize foreign-owned industries in the State. Answering a question he said there were 45 industries in the State owned by foreigners employing more than a lakh of workers. Mr Thomas said the Government had received complaints from some plantations that the workers were asked to work more without being given compensating pay (see *Indian Express*, March 21, '68). These revisionist and neo-revisionist renegades aid and abet every crime of the foreign and native oppressors and exploiters but they pounce upon the workers whenever the latter put up any resistance!

When Kerala's Industries Minister, Dangeite T. V. Thomas, returned from Japan after signing a number of very important agreements with the biggest Japanese monopolists for exploiting Kerala's natural resources and people, the neo-revisionists screamed out in sanctimonious hypocrisy. In an article entitled "T. V. Thomas Invites Japanese Monopolies," B. T. Ranadive wrote: "Mr Thomas wishes to appear as the saviour of the people, but in reality he is just selling the people of Kerala bound hand and foot to some of the biggest, most ruthless and avaricious monopolists in the world....Thus revisionist Thomas by inviting Japanese monopolist capital, by offering it concessions, is only playing the game of the Indian reactionaries and helping American monopoly capital to secure a tight grip over India. He has taken steps which facilitate the Congress game of forging an economic alliance with Japanese monopolists, an alliance for which the Americans are working - an alliance whose political objective will soon be seen as containment of China." Every word of this criticism is, no doubt, true. Ranadive also probes the root, the source, from which this treacherous policy arises. Full of indignation, he says: "It is useless, of course, to blame the revisionists for betraying their pledges and declared statements. *For revisionism will not be revisionism if it did not pretend to be revolutionary and betrayed every undertaking it gave.....*This is where repudiation of proletarian outlook, adoption of the bourgeois class-outlook leads. In the name of industrial development foreign monopoly capital is invited, people are offered for the loot of foreign exploitation - exactly in the same way as the Congress does. In the name of industrial development new chains are being created for the people who are being misled to believe that they will be able to develop Kerala's resources with the help of foreign monopoliesThe example of Thomas shows how the Congress outlook - how the outlook of the big bourgeoisie - has corroded revisionist thinking and how even on the question of fighting penetration of foreign capital they are succumbing to the pressure of the bourgeoisie. This is on par with their alliance with the Jana Sangh and their opportunist coalition agreements. [One is reminded in this connection of the neo-revisionist clique's own coalition agreements with Muslim League, D. M. K., P.S.P etc, and may recall Sundarayya's words: "In order to put down our biggest enemy (the Congress) it is necessary for us to cooperate with our smaller enemies like the Swatantra and the Jana Sangh" - see *Statesman*, Nov. 20, '68].The logic of revisionism must lead to a compromise with communalism and to actively help to promote foreign monopoly penetration in Indian economy" (*People's Democracy*, Nov. 12, '67). The case against revisionism has been ably stated.

But the question is: Do the neo-revisionists really differ from the revisionists on the question of foreign collaboration? Or, are they trying to make a scapegoat of Thomas and the other Dangeites, their partners in the U.F.?

The following facts may be worth noting. First, according to *Statesman's* special representative in South India, Mr Thomas was invited by a Japanese firm and *his visit was formally approved by the Kerala Cabinet*. Second, the aggrieved Thomas pointed out that "what inspired him to go to Japan was a speech delivered by Mr Namboodiripad sometime back while inaugurating a factory at Ankamaly in the State, which was a joint venture of indigenous and Japanese entrepreneurs. Then Mr Namboodiripad had extolled it as 'a precious gift' to Kerala and expected many more of that kind would follow" (*Statesman*, Nov. 5, '67). Third, C. Achuta Menon, Secretary of the Kerala unit of the Dangeites, said "that giant enterprises like steel plants in Bhilai, Durgapur, Rourkella and Bokaro, a second shipyard, an oil refinery at Cochin, hydro-electric projects of Sabarigiri and Iddiki and Toshiba Anand Lamp Factory in the State among many others were set up with foreign economic and technical aid. If foreign collaboration was something that should be avoided, why did the CPI(M), he asked, endeavour for the materialization of those undertakings?" (*Statesman*, Nov. 9, '67) A very inconvenient question, isn't it? Fourth, "asked whether the Marxists' opposition to Japanese collaborations did not conflict with their demand for setting up a shipyard at Cochin with Japanese assistance, Mr Namboodiripad contended that *his party was only against Japanese collaborations with private sector and not with the public sector ventures.*" Fifth, "answering criticism [in the Kerala Assembly] that the Marxists were deliberately undermining the industrialization of the State by taking a stand against Japanese collaboration, the Chief Minister said that *his party had not said any final word against collaboration with Japan. But as a matter of principle, his Government and his party would prefer aid from socialist countries for industrializing Kerala*" (Mark the word *prefer*).

Does not the above, read in the context of "E.M.S. Answers the 'Washington Post'", make it abundantly clear that the "Marxists" are a two-faced lot - with one face turned towards their ranks and the other towards their masters, the foreign monopolists and Indian comprador-bureaucrat capitalists, whose interests they are always serving very faithfully - in practice, if not in words. They pretend in *public* to fight the very policy they are pursuing. To quote once again the words of Ranadive himself, "revisionism will not be revisionism if it did not pretend to be revolutionary and betrayed every undertaking it gave." This bunch of revisionists headed by Sundarayya, Namboodiripad and Ranadive knows well what it is doing!

One may ask 'Comrade' Ranadive: When you rightly accuse Thomas and the other Dangeite renegades of "adopting a bourgeois class-outlook" and "playing the game of the Indian reactionaries and helping American monopoly capital to secure a tight grip over India", why do you unite with them in "United Fronts" throughout India, and divide the spoils of office wherever possible, instead of fighting and isolating these unashamed agents of imperialism and domestic reaction? And, when in office, why do you adopt and implement the same policies - the policies directed against the working class and the peasantry for the benefit of the ruling classes? How can you, true 'Marxists', work together with the Dangeites, whom you dub as agents of the reactionary ruling classes, in mass organizations like the A.I.T.U.C.? Has Dimitrov, whom you quote profusely, taught you that a United Front should be built up by the party of the working

class uniting with the agents of U.S. imperialism and the Indian reactionaries in order to serve imperialism and its henchmen? One can perceive the very real and close unity in action between you and these and other counter-revolutionaries and this 'unity in action' is growing!

What is the nature of the "aid" from the Soviet Union, which these sham *Marxists prefer* to "aid" from imperialist countries? We have already unmasked the nature of Soviet "aid" in this journal (see *Liberation*, November 1967 and August 1968). In brief, the Soviet revisionist renegades who have set up a bourgeois dictatorship in their own country and rebuilt the Soviet economy on the profit motive, have been dumping their goods often of very poor quality, in India at exorbitant prices, exporting along with these goods dubious experts on extravagant terms and buying the produce of our industries at prices subsidized by the Indian Government. All this they are doing in the name of helping to build India's heavy industries! Both the revisionist cliques - the Dangeites as well as Sundarayya, Namboodiripad, Ranadive and Co. are unashamed pedlars of Soviet 'aid', which the Soviet social-imperialists are using as an instrument of exploiting the Indian people and India's natural resources.

There are some friends who hold that Namboodiripad and his U.F. Government represent Kerala's national bourgeoisie, that they are fighting the foreign monopolists and the Indian big bourgeoisie represented by the Congress Party and defending the interests of the national bourgeoisie of Kerala. Unfortunately, the actual facts do not justify this conclusion. The policies that this neo-revisionist clique is implementing are the same as those of the Congress Party despite the war of words between them. Their policy of extending a warm welcome to foreign monopolists and the Indian big bourgeoisie is causing the ruin of the small and medium industries and of the national bourgeoisie who own them. It is the Birlas, the Walchands, the Canadian, Japanese and other foreign monopolists who are, and will be, flourishing at the cost of Kerala's national bourgeoisie. As we have said before, the neo-revisionists, like the Dangeites and others, have become a party of the ruling classes.

To soothe the conscience of their ranks, the P.B. and the C.C. of the neo-revisionists felt obliged to criticize the '*anti-labour and pro-monopoly implications*' (to use the words of Namboodiripad himself) of the Industrial Policy Statement. Let us quote Ranadive:

"It is known that the Industrial Policy Statement drawn by the same Minister [T. V. Thomas] and *adopted by the Ministry* really helps the capitalists and prejudices the cause of the workers. It was unfortunate that *our comrades also accepted the Statement at the time....* That Statement promises all kinds of concessions to the capitalists while it imposes on the trade unions the obligations to write an anti-strike clause in their constitution (adequate provision for industrial peace as if the workers are the breakers of peace) if they wish to secure recognition from the employers.

"The Statement does not guarantee the basic rights of workers even formally. All that is promised is that labour will be protected from 'unfair practices', that a penal clause will be added to the Minimum Wages Act to enforce the Act effectively. The Government will only 'uphold the legitimate rights of labour'. Dearness Allowance, Bonus, Wages - these vital issues are deliberately omitted from the Statement so that *the capitalists are lured to Kerala with the*

temptation of making high profits. No wonder Mr Birla recently said, 'I am very happy in Kerala...'

"After all this the workers are told, *'The State will favour recognition to trade unions having constitutions containing adequate provisions for industrial peace. This is the language and demand of a hardened capitalist and employer - the language of - Congress rulers and the former British rulers and not of the representatives of workers...*

"It is on the basis of these assurances that the foreign capitalists are being invited. It is not surprising that Mr Thomas said that he had been able to create interest and enthusiasm among the leading industrialists of Japan to help the industrialists of Kerala; that there was no anxiety in the minds of Japanese industrialists about the political developments in Kerala or about the atmosphere of industrial relations" ("T. V. Thomas Invites Japanese Monopolies," *Peoples Democracy* Nov. 12, '67 - Our emphasis).

So, foreign monopolists and the Indian big bourgeoisie are being lured to Kerala on the basis of certain assurances - assurances given not by the Dangeite T. V. Thomas alone but by the entire Kerala ministry headed by Ranadive's comrade Namboodiripad. While Namboodiripad or Jyoti Basu consistently carries out pro-imperialist, pro-comprador and pro-landlord policies, Ranadive, Gopalan or Promode Dasgupta shrieks out against the same policies, makes a scapegoat of some T. V. Thomas, Manjooran or P.C. Ghosh and shirks all responsibility for them! A nice division of labour! They must serve the foreign and domestic reactionaries and, at the same time, keep their Marxist mask on to hoodwink their dwindling ranks and the masses, for their service to imperialism and domestic reaction consists in hoodwinking the masses at a time when the Congress Party fails to do so!

Sometimes, at unguarded moments, the mask falls off and we are allowed glimpses of their true selves, for instance, on occasions like the following:

"Leading industrialists and businessmen of Calicut gave a reception to the Marxist Communist leaders who are here for the Central Committee meeting.

"At the dinner arranged in their honour at one of the leading hotels the General Secretary, Mr P. Sundarayya, said that, *though the interests of the Communist Party and the industrialists were supposed to be incompatible, he would request them to tend all help and suggestion to the party so as enable it to face the difficult days ahead.* [Mark the words *supposed to be.*]

"The Chief Minister, Mr E. M. S. Namboodiripad, found the dinner a pleasant one because there were no memorandums. [There was no need for one when Namboodiripad had already presented the Industrial Policy Statement to his hosts. That helped the dinner to be quite pleasant.]" (*Indian Express*, Nov. 1, 1967)

Time and again these shameless lackeys of the reactionary ruling classes urge the workers to maintain *industrial peace* when the workers are being ruthlessly exploited by foreign and domestic sharks. Presiding over an industrial economic seminar on January 25, 1968, at Kottayam, T. V Thomas "underlined the importance of maintaining industrial peace in order to

attract outsiders to invest more in setting up industries in Kerala." The "Marxist" -led Government's Industrial Policy statement contained the following clause:

"The State will favour recognition to trade unions having constitutions containing adequate provisions for industrial peace."

Is it accidental that the Kerala Government's memorandum to the National Commission on Labour made such recommendations on policy questions like code of discipline, recognition of unions, making workers shareholders, automation and the registrar's powers that even the AITUC led by Dange and Ramamurthy did not dare stomach them publicly? On the Kerala Government's attitude to dealing with strikes during conciliation, the AITUC pointed out in a note to the Chief Minister that the anti-strike clauses in the Industrial Disputes Act were themselves reactionary and the proposal of the Kerala Government to put more "teeth in this anti-worker legislation" would be greatly welcomed by the employers. On the proposal for making workers shareholders, the AITUC said: "It is difficult to understand how a Left-led government would now sponsor this move as an experimental measure." The employers are after the worker's Provident Fund and want to get it invested in shares of the companies. The trade unions have so far opposed this move. The AITUC note, referring to the Kerala Government's opposition to the proposal for giving legal sanction to wage board recommendations, said that "the Government has not evidently followed recent developments. The tripartite study group on wage boards of the NCL has unanimously recommended statutory enforcement of wage board recommendations accepted by the Government." The AITUC felt obliged to oppose the Kerala Government's view favouring the piece-rate system of wages. The piece-rate system, they pointed out, has been used by employers to increase the rate of exploitation.

Among other things, the Kerala Government recommended that the trade union activities of any leader or leaders taking part in any illegal strike [almost every strike in this country is declared illegal by the Government - even one day's token strike of the Central Government employees] should be seriously dealt with and such leaders should be debarred from trade union activities for three years! Even the reactionary Congress Government has not imposed any such penalties! On the question of automation, the memorandum shamelessly declared that automation was inevitable. It added that though automation would lead to unemployment it would ensure better and quicker production.

In the fifties, these revisionists and neo-revisionists and the All India Trade Union Congress dominated by them supported rationalization. The ruling classes then sought to solve the growing economic crisis and to earn superprofits through rationalization. It was a vicious offensive against the workers and threw hundreds of thousands of them out of employment. Today, as the crisis deepens, the ruling classes are resorting to automation which is directed mainly against white-collar employees and threatens hundreds of thousands of them with loss of jobs. As, in the fifties, the revisionists and neo-revisionists supported rationalization and disrupted the workers' struggle against it from within, so today their Government in Kerala has come out in open support of automation to ensure high profits for the foreign monopolists and the Indian comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie at the cost of the life and livelihood of a section of the petty bourgeoisie. Elsewhere, these double-dealers are mouthing militant slogans against automation and are, at the same time, trying to put down any effective struggle against it.

Minions of U.S. Imperialism

An impression has gained ground that whatever may be the crimes of the neo-revisionist clique, they are at least genuine anti-imperialists, at least anti-U.S. imperialists. Do they not often roar against U.S. imperialism in their writings and speeches? Don't they shed profuse tears of sympathy for bleeding Vietnam and other victims of U.S. aggression? Don't they warn us against the menace of U.S. imperialism to India's 'sovereignty' and 'independence'? Yes, they do all this and more. Yet one can hardly escape the conclusion that they are serving the interests of imperialism, headed by U.S. imperialism, faithfully, that their anti-imperialism is a sham while their service to imperialism is real. What leads one to this conclusion?

The "Marxist"-led Government, as we have seen, is not only generous to imperialist capital already entrenched in Kerala but also anxious to "create the proper climate" (to use Namboodiripad's words) for more of foreign monopoly capital - Canadian, Japanese etc., etc., - to flow into Kerala. Much of the foreign monopoly capital or Indian comprador-bureaucrat capital is linked with U.S. monopoly capital directly or indirectly. *In words*, they are great anti-imperialist fighters, but *in deeds* they are lackeys of the imperialists headed by the U.S. imperialists.

Even in words, they refuse to admit that the U.S. imperialists, together with the Soviet neo-colonialists, have *already* reduced India into a neo-colony of theirs. According to them, such a threat from U.S imperialism has been hanging over India for years but it is as yet only a threat. Thus, by refusing to recognize U.S. imperialism as the main enemy of the Indian people they deliberately sabotage the Indian people's struggle against this most ferocious enemy of mankind.

That is why the Kerala Government does not hesitate to flirt with U.S imperialism. The "Marxist" Food Minister, Mrs Gowri Thomas, shamelessly announced that she would like to have rice "even though it is from the U.S.A. that is bombing Vietnam."

About 1400 members of the U.S. "Peace Corps" have spread over Kerala. It is common knowledge that the "Peace Corps" is controlled by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Yet Namboodiripad came out as an apologist and protector of these hated international agents of U.S imperialism. On March 27, 1967, this neo-revisionist chieftain denied in the Kerala Assembly that members of the "Peace Corps" were engaged in espionage in the State. He described these U.S. agents as giving "technical help in development works in the fields of industry, health, animal husbandry and education."

Sometime ago, a delegation which included representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from Taiwan visited Kerala and was received by Namboodiripad. Though the Indian Government does not formally recognize the Chiang Kai-shek clique, leaders of the Indian Government and of various reactionary parties are occasionally visiting Taiwan and trying to build up friendly relations with the Chiang clique as a part of their rabid anti-China policy, as a part of the U.S.-sponsored policy of creating "two Chinas." By welcoming Chiang's men, this neo-revisionist chieftain displayed his hostility towards Socialist China and served the needs of the U.S. imperialists and the Indian reactionaries.

One more instance of servility of the neo-revisionists to their U.S. masters may be cited here. During their demonstrations on the Vietnam Day last year, the youth of Kerala, incensed by the brutalities of the American aggressors laying waste the whole of Vietnam, set on fire in Trivandrum a van belonging to the U.S.I.S. The "Marxist" Chief Minister promptly expressed "deep personal regret" for the incident in a letter to the U.S. Consul and promised to take severe action against the young men!

The Spearhead Of Reaction's Offensive Against The People

Recently, events of far-reaching significance have been happening in Kerala with a bewildering rapidity. During this severe crisis that is shaking Kerala, the "Marxist"-led U.F. Government, especially the "Marxists", are acting as the spearhead of reaction's vicious offensive against the working people.

The strike of Kerala's transport workers and employees now going on and the manner in which the "Marxist" Transport Minister is handling it are an ironical comment on the sham Marxists' loyalty to the interests of the working class and their claim of strengthening the democratic struggles of the working people. The CPI (M) Congress, meeting at Ernakulam, has described this strike, in which 95 per cent of the workers and employees are participating, as unjustified. Kerala's "Marxist" Transport Minister has been accused by the Secretary of the Kerala Council of the CPI (a constituent of the "United Front") of adopting 'despicable bourgeois tactics' to break the strike. Striking workers are being indiscriminately arrested; what is even more revealing is that the "Marxist"-led Government is trying to recruit black legs in large numbers to thwart the transport strike (See *Statesman*, Dec. 29, '68).

Even more despicable is the role the "Marxists" and their allies are playing as agents of the rich landlords and planters in drowning in blood the simmering revolt of Kerala's peasantry. Reporting on the developments in Kerala since the attack on the Pulpalli wireless station in the Wynaad forests, Ramji wrote in *Frontier* of Dec. 14, '68:

"And on top of all this, very much similar to the developments in Naxalbari, heavy concentrations of police here have become a terror to the lowly and have-nots among the inhabitants of the thickly forested Pulpalli hilly tracts. The police force have been billeted in the houses of rich planters of the region and are feted royally. In return, like grateful watchdogs, the police pounce on all and sundry pointed out by the planters and rich landlords. *A regular manhunt is going on in these areas to serve the interests of anti-communist vested interests in the name of re-establishing law and order.*

"The police raid houses at will at all times night and day, beat up inmates, molest women and play the role of goondas with a sense of unbridled licence. The young college student Ajitha was terribly molested after she was caught. She was made to stand half-naked in the midst of a jeering rabble, many of whom laid rough and insulting hands on her. All the others suspected of belonging to the party which raided the Pulpalli police wireless station have been cruelly manhandled. *The police are making a determined effort to scare away the tribals whose lands have been already snatched away by the migrants from Central Travancore and other sections, all adepts at encroachment. This Pulpalli incident has given the vested interests a rare*

opportunity to drive away with police help the tribals who had been resisting the land grab policy of 'civilized' settlers from the so-called forward, developed areas of the State. The Pulpalli area has been notorious for the cruel injustice meted out to the tribals who have been deprived of their lands and who are without any means of livelihood. And the similarity to Naxalbari is made more pronounced, since the Kurichians and other tribals are in the habit of carrying bows and arrows. This is now a crime, for which they are being hunted like animals.

"These developments in the name of law and order and security by a United Front Government headed by Marxists, are strikingly similar to the tactics adopted by Congress Governments. This has not been lost on a big section of the have-nots in the State. The impression has gone forth that in order to appease the vested interests and possibly to stave off Central intervention, the Marxists are ready to play a role, traditionally associated with Congress governments."

When these political managers of the domestic and foreign reactionaries have geared the entire state machinery to enrich and strengthen the Jotedars, the mainstay of feudalism in the countryside, and to crush the incipient revolt of the peasantry, they also threaten to unleash fascist hordes against the rebellious peasantry. According to a party source, the *Statesman's* special representative reported, the neo-revisionist chieftain, P. Sundarayya, said that his party was fully prepared to meet the extremists' challenge in Kerala and, if necessary, it would field its 35,000 - strong volunteer corps, including 10,000 women, to counter the extremists (See *Statesman* Dec. 4, '68). When Sundarayya was talking of meeting the challenge of the 'extremists', he was certainly not thinking of a few hundred Kunnikal Narayanans or Ajithas, whom the elite armed police of Namboodiripad might be able to tackle for the present. He must have had in mind the millions of peasant revolutionaries of Kerala who, inspired by Mao Tse-tung's thought, will in no distant future rise like a mighty storm, like a hurricane, smash all the feudal fetters that bind them and rush forward along the road to liberation. Then Sundarayya will be required to rush his fascist bands to the help and support of the various other fascist hordes, Indira's army and police and Namboodiripad's armed police. We know the counter-revolutionaries of all shades - from the Jana Sangh to the Sundarayya-Namboodiripad-Gopalan-Ranadive clique are feverishly preparing for those historic days. Let them prepare.

In the meantime in order to cover up the bitter civil war that is going on between the exploiting classes and the exploited, in order to hoodwink the cruelly exploited working people, the "Marxists" shamelessly prate about the virtues of the Indian Constitution and the parliamentary path and of law and order. On Nov. 26, '68, *Namboodiripad said at the Kerala State Assembly during question time that the Constitution contained many good ideas which were worthy of implementation. But these ideals were not being implemented by the Congress leaders faithfully* (see *Statesman* Nov. 27, '68).

Addressing a rally of his supporters on Nov. 10, '68, at Malappuram, Namboodiripad said that the present parliamentary system of government by itself would not usher in a revolution in the country. But there was no harm in using the system as an experimental measure to do some good to the common man (See *Hindusthan Standard* Nov. 12, '68).

Are these only momentary lapses on the part of an individual named Namboodiripad? No, these are no aberrations of an individual but part of a settled policy of the clique which calls itself

Marxist. This clique which speaks of "universal adult franchise and parliament and state legislature" as instruments of the people in their struggle for *democracy*, for defence of their interests, and asks them to uphold and defend parliamentary democracy, is consciously leading the working people into the trap carefully laid for them by the exploiting classes. Today, it is not for the working people to uphold and defend the parliamentary system - an instrument which the bourgeoisie has devised and uses to hide the real nature of its rule that is based on violence but to smash it by revolutionary violence and set up proletarian or people's democratic dictatorship in its place.

To talk of upholding parliamentary democracy in a country like India is a two-fold deception: first, because bourgeois parliamentarism is today a snare to lure the working people in a bourgeois democracy from the path of violent revolution; secondly, because India is not a bourgeois democracy. It is a semi-colonial semi-feudal country where the democratic revolution for the overthrow of feudalism is yet to take place. India changed from a colony into a neo-colony when the British imperialists granted India 'independence' by an Act of British Parliament. That is why the government here enjoys the *unfettered constitutional right* of detaining citizens without trial and trampling underfoot what are supposed to be democratic rights of the people.

These flunkeys of domestic and foreign reactionaries are tireless in proclaiming the sanctity of the existing law and order. The "Marxist" Chief Minister Namboodiripad insists from time to time that the struggles of the working people must not transgress the limits of law and order. Whether it is the question of *gheraos* strikes, organizations of volunteers, measures against the Central Government employees or withdrawal of cases against them, this "Marxist" always comes out as a defender of 'law and order.' He and the other members of the clique are terribly angry with the Union Law Minister, P. Govinda Menon, because Menon asked the people "to take the law into their own hands for protecting their democratic rights," and not because Menon was obviously inciting the counter-revolutionary violence of his followers. Asked by a Congress member in the Kerala State Assembly whether Namboodiripad himself had not made inflammatory speeches when he visited other states, Namboodiripad replied: "I have not asked the people to take up the stick." This, of course, is partly true. These neo-revisionists ask the people to take up the stick not against the class enemies but against the communist and peasant revolutionaries!

The whole pack of neo revisionists, like the Dangeites, has developed an exuberant love for 'law and order' - the same kind of love that overflowed the heart of Gandhi during the British colonial days. Lenin said: "According to Marx, the state is an organ of class *rule*, an organ for the *oppression* of one class by another; it is the creation of 'order,' which legalizes and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the conflict between the classes." So, 'law and order' in a state ruled by the landlords and the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie (or by the independent bourgeoisie) are meant to 'legalize' and maintain the system of oppression and exploitation of the working people by the ruling classes. But these agents of reaction dressed in borrowed Marxist robes would have us believe that law and order in this class society protect the interests of the working people and must be defended against the attacks of the ruling classes who according to them, are anxious to subvert 'law and order'! It is under the existing 'law and order' that the foreign monopolists increasingly plunder the wealth of the country; the Birlas increase their

assets by 49 per cent in the course of only three years; the Walchands employ bands of ruffians to wipe out all traces of their murdered workers; the rapacious tycoons cheat the public exchequer of hundreds of millions of rupees by evading taxes; the princes and kulaks mint gold out of the sweat and blood of the peasantry; hundreds of thousands of workers and white-collar employees are thrown out of employment and chronic unemployment is the lot of tens of millions of others; and tens of millions of peasants are driven out of their lands and become paupers. But the "Marxists" would have us defend this 'law and order' and this "parliamentary system which", according to their Programme, "embodies an advance for the people". The "Marxists" fly into rage when the peasant revolutionaries try to strike at the very foundations of the existing social system based on the oppression and exploitation of the working people. *Though they join Chavan, the Swatantra Party, the Jana Sangh, the P.S.P., etc., in the chorus denouncing revolutionary violence, they have no distaste for counter-revolutionary violence.* The blood of the martyred and other oppressed peasants of Naxalbari and Wynaad and of the workers and peasants in many other places, Sundarayya's threat and their unleashing of fascist bands against communist revolutionaries in different parts of the country are eloquent proofs of this fact.

We can depend upon Namboodiripad to tell us about the real significance of the 'United Front' Governments led by the "Marxists." The neo-revisionist chieftain says:

"I may now claim that one of the biggest achievements of our pre-election alliance and the post-election coalition Government is that we have shown that it is possible for the various non-Congress parties to come together and establish a relatively stable alliance on which a stable coalition Government can be built.

"This is of tremendous significance for the country as a whole. For, the main feature of the political situation in India today is the rapid decline in the influence and the power of the Congress, accompanied by the absence of any single party which can replace it. Only a combination of parties can meet the situation. Such a combination should necessarily include the Communists and Socialists and other secular democratic radical parties." ("E.M.S. Answers the 'Washington Post'.")

What, then, is the aim, the purpose, of the 'United Front'? It should not be confused with a United Front of revolutionary classes, groups and individuals for waging armed struggles to overthrow the present social system. It is a 'United Front' to replace the Congress when the ruling classes are in the throes of a deep political crisis and the influence and power of the Congress are rapidly declining. Its object is not to destroy the present oppressive system but to preserve and restore stability to it when historically that system has long outlived its utility and become utterly reactionary, when that system is inexorably proceeding towards its doom. So, the 'United Front' of this kind aims not at making revolution but at opposing it. Today, the "Marxist" Party has come forward to organize this counter-revolutionary front so that it may act as a dam against the rising tide of agrarian revolution. That is why the Namboodiripad-Sundarayya-Ranadive clique has discovered that the principal contradiction today is between the policies pursued by the Central Government and the welfare of the country. This contradiction, they claim, can be resolved by transferring more power from the Centre to the States, from Indira Gandhi to Namboodiripad, Ajoy Mukherjee or Annadurai! For the neo-revisionist clique, the contradictions

between feudalism and the peasantry, between imperialism and the people, between comprador-bureaucrat capital and labour, hardly exist. There is no need to overthrow feudalism and imperialism and to smash the existing state machinery of the landlords and the comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie. It is quite evident that this shadow-boxing with the Central Government does very little harm to the ruling classes while it distracts the attention of the people from the main enemies.

In his book (the name of the Bengali edition of which is *Natun Kerala*, published in January 1958), Namboodiripad, then Communist Chief Minister of Kerala, wrote:

"If, on the other hand, we fail, then there is the danger that the anti-communists, taking advantage of our failure, may split even further the country into communists and non-communists and push our country, too, into disunity and civil war as they have succeeded in doing in several other countries. So our success or failure in this state has an importance which is national in character" (Re-translated from the Bengali edition).

In his book *Kerala: a Report to the Nation*, the Congress leader H. D. Malaviya wrote:

"Strangely enough, the best advice to the Congress came from the Communist Namboodiripad. After Deviculum [a parliamentary by-election held in May 1958 and won by a Communist candidate], EMS advised the Congress to 'reconsider its policies and function as a party of constructive opposition.' In later amplification of this statement he said at Coimbatore that if, instead of a constructive approach, the opposition parties united only in somehow crushing the Communists, *it can only lead to a disastrous situation, and he referred to the example of China*" (pp. 113-114).

To these "Marxists" the prospect of a revolutionary civil war is alarming, the civil war in China and the victory of the epoch-making Chinese Revolution are a disaster! They are afraid of this 'disaster' being repeated in India.

Lenin said: "In the long run we know that the problems of social life are resolved by the class struggle in its bitterest and fiercest form - civil war" ("Constitutional Illusions", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25). The age-old production relations have long been acting as fetters on the productive forces in this country and the exploiting classes are using the state machinery to keep in tact these relations of production. This contradiction, "the problems of social life", cannot be resolved without revolutionizing the relations of production, without overthrowing feudalism and imperialism and smashing their state machinery - without a civil war. The "Marxists" are fully conscious that this civil war, open or concealed, is raging in the country. The mass retrenchment in the factories and offices, the innumerable struggles of the workers, students and the petty bourgeoisie, the daily firings on the people, the imprisonment of thousands, the occasional murder of poor and landless peasants, the man-hunt now going on in the Wynaad forests, the burning alive of forty-two peasants in Thanjavur, the heroic revolt of the peasantry in Naxalbari, Srikakulam and other places and the military-type operations the reactionary governments have launched against them - what do all these reveal? But, in the name of preventing civil war, in the name of defending 'law and order' (which seek to conceal the most ruthless civil war), these "Marxist" lackeys of the exploiting classes want to preserve the old, putrid relations of

production and the rotten regime of oppression and exploitation and to render the working people defenceless in the face of the counter-revolutionary violence of the ruling classes.

When the revolutionary situation in India has long been mature, when Naxalbari and Srikakulam have lighted up the path of the Indian Revolution, the "Marxists" and their "United Fronts" are acting as the spearhead of reaction's offensive. In this crisis of Indian history they are playing a double role. First, together with Chavan and the other reactionaries, they proclaim their determination "to put down without mercy" the revolutionary violence of the brave peasantry of Naxalbari, Wynaad and various other places and act *as a wing of the reactionary state apparatus*. Secondly, *this bunch of contemptible counter-revolutionaries has taken upon itself the task of fighting the revolutionary forces politically. That is the historic task they have been allotted by the ruling classes.*

When Mrs Y. Reddy demanded in the Rajya Sabha a ban on the communist revolutionaries, Mr Chavan said that it was a suggestion for action, but added that it was difficult to ban ideas (see *Statesman*, Dec. 12, '68). Namboodiripad said the same thing at a Press Conference: "They have to be fought politically. You cannot solve it just by a ban" (*Statesman*, Nov. 29, '68). So, the *Blitz* wrote editorially on Dec. 14, '68 "*It is gratifying to see agreement on this basic point in quarters which otherwise are wide apart*. At his Trivandrum Press Conference Mr E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Chief Minister of troubled Kerala, clearly reaffirmed the need for a combination of police and political measures. Two days later, Mr Y.B. Chavan told the Home Ministry's Informal Parliamentary Consultative Committee that the extremists could not be tackled by police action alone."

A Political Correspondent of *Frontier* hit the nail on the head when he wrote in its issue of Dec. 7, '68: "But the many Naxalbaris building up in tribal tracts and among organized peasantry pose a challenge at once to Mr Chavan and the CPI(M)). *What Mr Nanda got the CPI to do for the Government to isolate those who later formed the CPI (M) is now sought to be got done through the CPI (M) to secure the isolation of the ultras.... The Centre has achieved its objective of stabilizing the CPI(M)'s anti-China stance so that the party is ready to call its recalcitrant extremists Chinese agents*" (Our emphasis).

To fight the communist revolutionaries *politically* at the bidding of the foreign and domestic reactionaries, the neo-revisionists are sparing no efforts. In the name of fighting 'left deviations', they heap all kinds of abuse on the communist revolutionaries and the great Chinese Communist Party. They are politically so bankrupt that they adopt the vilest methods to slander the communist revolutionaries and Socialist China. A Political Correspondent of *Frontier* wrote in its issue of Dec. 14, '68:

"Mr Namboodiripad's police machinery was responsible for planting the story that two letters from the Chinese Embassy were seized from one of those arrested in connection with the attacks on police posts. The story was subsequently denied by the Inspector-General of Police" (Our emphasis).

This is the kind of *political* fight the neo-revisionist scum is waging against communist and peasant revolutionaries! *Let them carry on this fight on behalf of the ruling classes of India till*

they and their 'United Fronts' are swept away like so much filth by the rising tide of the Indian Revolution.

December 31, 1968