

SOCIALISM

Under

CAPITALISM !

—NAGARJUN

FOUR ANNAS

Progressive Literature Publishing House

64, Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta—12.

Panditji's Socialism—To Outmanoeuvre The Socialist Forces

Panditji has taken to socialism. Abadi session of the Indian National Congress has adopted Socialist Pattern of Society as its aim. After that certain changes are taking place in the body politic of India. The leaders of the Marxist Forward Bloc have decided to join the Congress and have expressed the conviction that under the leadership of Pandit Nehru and Shri Dhebar they will be successful in helping to build up a Socialist Society in India with the help of the Congress and the Congress Government. Further on the defeat of the Communist Party in Andhra elections has brought one admission by the leaders of the C. P. I. that Panditji has stolen their programme. Queer though is the fact that the C. P. I. has abandoned the slogan of Socialism long before Pandit Nehru took it up. According to C. P. I. leadership there was something contradictory between the slogans for New Democracy and Socialism. Therefore the advancement of the slogan of New Democracy led them to the positive abandoning of the slogan of Socialism. It is true that New Democracy is not Socialism. But is it not doubly true that New Democracy creates conditions for Socialism and is not Capitalism at all, howsoever embellished it may be? Interpreting New Democracy in every day life as something rejecting Socialism for the time, permitted the opportunity to the intelligent representatives of the bourgeoisie to pose themselves to be more progressive and more apt to cater to the needs of the millions of India.

Panditji's Socialism—Its Past

Socialism is not something new, so far as our Panditji is concerned. Often and on, he has talked of Socialism, hoisted the flag of Socialism and then pushed it to the background. Our Panditji was a firstclass socialist, rather a firebrand between the years 1936-1939. After the defeat of the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1932, something fiery was needed to attract the masses to the Congress fold; something very progressive was necessary to draw the left, revolutionary parties and organisations inside the Congress. Not only that. During the years of the Meerut Conspiracy Case and after an independent proletarian movement had been consistently and steadily growing outside the Congress orbit under the flag of socialism. This proletarian socialist movement had been attracting the revolutionary nationalist intelligentsia and the lower middle classes towards itself and away from the Congress i. e. away from the bourgeoisie. This if permitted to grow would definitely become not only something menacing to British Imperialism ruling then the soil but also a challenge to the national bourgeois leadership. Roping these forces inside the Congress therefore was the sore need for the Indian bourgeoisie and soothing to British Imperialists. Thus Panditji's Socialism came to the fore with Mahatmaji's blessing. It fulfilled its purpose. The Socialist forces were beguiled into the Congress. This not only eliminated the independent proletarian socialism and submerged it into the cob-web of Gandhian Nationalism but also strengthened the bargaining power of the Indian bourgeoisie vis-a-vis British Imperialism. People would have been satisfied had this bargaining power been utilised for negation of Imperialism and ushering in the complete independence. But such was not to be. The politically and organisationally strengthened bourgeoisie first helped in

suppressing the revolutionary nationalism from Tripuri Congress onward, drove a powerful wedge in the ranks of the proletariat by various means and ultimately ended in a deal with Imperialism which resulted in the partition of our motherland and guaranteed the perpetuation of the economic loot of the soil by the Imperialist vested interests. During this whole period, the Tripuri phase, the second world war period, the post war and the first five years' rule of the Congress, where was Panditji's Socialism? It was shelved.

Why Socialism Again?—The Economic Reasons

It has come up again. Why? And how? India is passing through a deep economic crisis. The peaceful transference of power glorified on the blood-bath of the innocent and the subsequent Ram Rajya for seven years has brought no peace to the homes of the poor. Continuous retrenchment has thrown more than a million out of jobs. Multifarious taxes successively imposed from items to items and the continuous increasing of the rates of taxes already imposed has thrown many more from the middle strata to the ranks of the proletariat. The economic policy followed by the Congress Government with regard to the prices of agricultural produce has pauperised the middle peasants in increasing numbers. Deficit financing initiated and followed by the honourable Deshmukh from year to year has brought about further inflation reducing the purchasing power of the rupee. Emphasis on master plans and multi-million projects has added fuel to fire by not giving any immediate relief to the suffering of the people in the cities or villages. The cumulative result of all these was and has been further pauperisation of the people and concentration of wealth in the hands of the few. Simmering discontent had been giving way to mass outbursts of a seriously militant nature

not only in problem states like West Bengal but also in most unexpected places like Madhya Bharat. Opposition to Congress regime was gaining ground politically under the Red Banner—the flag of Socialism, despite the internal bickerings of the left or the lack of appreciation of the developing situation by the leaders of the left. Panditji like an able leader of the Indian Capitalist class realised the gravity of the situation and came into the arena with the slogan of socialism. The promise of socialism is a very big promise, specially when it comes from the party in power, specially in a land where the overwhelming majority of the people are still carrying on the tradition of following big leaders and specially when socialism has been embedded in their hearts as the panacea of all ills of to-day.

Socialism—The Word & Its Meaning

Before entering into the controversy whether Panditji's socialism is socialism or a deception as asserted by Acharya Kripalani, or whether the Socialist Pattern of Society as envisaged by the Abadi session of the Congress is socialism or something else, one must first understand what is socialism after all. Of course it is very difficult to argue with Congress leaders because they have taken the word socialism from Marx and Engels but they have attempted and are attempting to give it a meaning quite distinct from what was given by Marx and Engels. And, further, it is much more difficult to argue with them because none of them has given a clear-cut picture of what socialism according to them should be.

Panditji has said ofcourse that Marx is out of date. Maulana Azad, another high placed associate of Pandit Nehru in this respect has condemned Stalin's practice of

socialism as scepticism, while chuckling over the effects of the Abolition of Zamindari Acts in certain states of India. The idea was that Stalin had the opinion that real land reforms abolishing the feudal interests and investing the tillers of the soil with proprietary rights over the land could not be done under Congress leadership, but they have been successful in doing the same. But does not Maulana Saheb know in his heart of hearts that as a result of the implementation of Abolition of Zamindari Acts, peasants have only changed their masters from landlords to money-lenders as a huge compensation had to be paid in the process. Moreover, in Bihar the only change that has taken place is the fact that what the peasants were paying to big zamindars are now to be paid to the government. Thirdly, by such legislations the zamindars have usurped a good portion of the best lands into their own farms and evicted thousands of share-croppers from the right of tilling the land and thus transformed them into landless labourers. This, according to Maulana Saheb, is socialism in land and with this success he wants to advance to the industrial zone for bringing a socialist pattern of life and work in industry. So, one can easily understand the effect of socialism of Maulana Azad in the industrial sector.

Whereas Shri Dhebar, President of the Congress wants to give it a new ethical meaning which is again undefined. A far-fetched inference rather a supposition can be made that to the new ethical concept is the emphasis about the method to be adopted to reach the goal : non-violence as opposed to the theory and practice of class war. This last item is very clear.

Emphasis—Production Or Distribution ?

Socialists of yesterday as well as today lay more emphasis on distribution. But Panditji has said that there is nothing

in India to distribute save and except poverty. So, Panditji's socialism can be presumed to be a socialism which begins with production and production.

The Capitalist Support And The Non-violence Fetish

Up-to-date whenever the slogan of socialism has been raised either by the reds or the pinks including the moderate laborites of Great Britain, it has been opposed by the capitalists under the plea of incentive for production being profit. But the socialism of Pandit Nehru has been upheld by the big capitalists of India. Their leader, Shri Birla, has asserted in an open press statement that the capitalists have nothing to fear from Congress Socialism. A Congressman may gloat over the issue saying that therein lies the charm of the non-violent method. What brought us freedom will bring us socialism. But is it not a fact that non-violent non-cooperation of 1920-21 threw British Imperialist masters into terror and violent opposition? Should one easily forget the terror let loose to suppress the civil disobedience movement of 30-31? What happened to the non-violent (?) August Movement of 1942? A new philosophy, a new aim, a new ideal naturally enrage the authorities of the time, the interests representing the statusquo. It is patent that future replaces the present that becomes past. So, the present becoming past resists. But the future breaks down the resistance and ushers itself into existence. Does Panditji's socialism represent something future to be brought about? Who will be replaced? At least not the Birlas. That is what Shri Birla says. Neither that is anywhere declared in Panditji's socialism nor Congress pattern of socialist society so far envisaged by the Abadi session in its adopted resolution. Nor can it be a wise

suggestion that Birla is a fool who does not understand wherein lies his best interests. So, this socialism will replace none but poverty, by production.

Production & Poverty of The Masses

A pertinent question arises why Indians are poor to-day? Is it because there is no wealth in India? What about the wealth that is being produced everyday in factories and fields? Before Congress came to power, a universal answer was always being given that the British Imperialist loot was pauperising the masses by taking away the wealth so produced by millions. The same people at least should explain why India remains so poor even after more than seven years of Congress Raj. Does the British loot continue even to-day? If the answer is yes, where is freedom? To save freedom, if the answer becomes 'no', the question repeats itself why Indians become poorer every day?

Nobody can suggest that during the Congress Raj production has stopped. On the other hand, there has been a gradual mechanisation and continuous rationalisation leading to relatively less men producing proportionately more wealth: Production and more production, industrial truce, no strike pledge, around condemnation of slow-down methods, association of labour representatives of all colours in tripartite conferences, agreements, settlements and assurances and what not and what not has been and is being experimented in every day life to produce more and more wealth. In many sectors of industrial production time rate has been replaced by piece-rate to intensify production. In many other sectors, state has taken upon itself the responsibility of production. Are they not producing wealth? What is happening to the results of all these?

Have they increased the happiness of Indian people? The common man says 'no'. Have they increased the wealth of the wealthy? Statistics say 'yes'. Would this observation not lead an impartial man, a scientist, to the conclusion that the root cause of the absence of happiness does not lie in production but firstly in the method of distribution today? Upto Pandit Nehru and the Abadi session of the Congress all socialists irrespective of any country they belonged said so. But Panditji says otherwise. That is novelty No. 1 in his socialism. But does it remain socialism still?

Socialism—Its Real Meaning

Whether Congressmen would agree or not we do not know, socialism has one accepted meaning, "*Social ownership of the means of production and distribution*". But Panditji nowhere has emphasised this fact. Neither Abadi resolution says so. What will be the economic content of socialism else than what is said above? If it is social ownership of the means of production and distribution, naturally it will disposses the owners of the means of production of to-day. Consequently, it will invite the opposition of Tatas, Birlas, Dalmias etc. etc. and the imperialist vested interests. But Panditji's socialism does the opposite. It brings in their warm support! Why so? Naturally because their ownership is assured of existence and further growth. Maintaining the private ownership of the means of production and consequently of their products, a socialist pattern of society is to be built up! Then does it not lose its aim? What is the aim of socialism? Is it not to end the exploitation of man by man? Is not private ownership of the means of production and its products the basis of exploitation of man by man and thereby the root of all evils of today—poverty, hunger, unemployment and destitution in the midst of

wealth all around? Panditji's socialism avoids this basic thing and thereby negates its aim. The form—the name of socialism is there but the content is not. Will then still it be socialism?

Marxism and Pandit Nehru

A simple assertion that Marx is out-of-date helps none. Neither it helps anybody to reach the truth. When Panditji says that Marx is out-of-date he must kindly mention what theories or what conclusions of Marx are out of date i. e. have proved faulty in course of advancement of human knowledge. Everyone and specially Pandit Nehru is full of praise of the achievements of U. S. S. R., New China East European Democracies and Indo-China under Ho-Chi-Minh. But what is the secret of success of all these achievements? Is it not true that these achievements have been guided by the cardinal principles of Marxism-Leninism? But still Panditji says, "Marx is out-of-date". With outworn theories so much achievements! Either the achievements are not achievements or the theories are not out-of-date. Panditji can't have both.

The Theory Of Surplus Value

The basic contribution to the world of human thought and specially to the socialist thought has been the Marxian theory of surplus value. Humanists of various grades and social workers working for removing the sorrows of man were groping in the dark and making wild experiments to build up a new world order based on justice, equality and brotherhood of man. It was Karl Marx who first scientifically proved that the root cause of the sorrows of human beings in the industrial age has been the exploitation of man by man in the concrete shape of exploitation of surplus value

produced by labour by the owners of the means of production, by the capitalists. Thousands of workers are producing every day in fields and factories and they are producing much more than what is paid to them. This extra, this difference between what is paid to them and what is produced by them, is usurped by a very insignificant minority of people, by a few. Thus wealth is being produced every day in million-fold but the ownership of these products is usurped by the few. The consequence is enrichment of the few and pauperisation of the many. This factor had not been grasped by earlier thinkers. Marx was the first to drive this truth home. Is this conclusion based on scientific observation by Karl Marx out-of-date? Panditji has not been bold enough to assert so in concrete. This theory of Marx has withstood the tempests of time and has been further corroborated by the experiences of the teeming millions.

When exploitation of surplus value is the kernel of truth regarding the cause of the poverty of man in the industrial age, the negation of this exploitation becomes the immediate solution of the removal of the *relative* poverty. One thing is poverty, one thing is social suffering ; another thing is want or social want. Even when all exploiters are eliminated, even when the classless society is established, even then social wants will remain and for the fulfilment of those social wants, human efforts will be made leading to further and further human progress. Is Panditji confusing the relative poverty of today with the social want of classless society ? If not, how does he say that Marx is out-of-date atleast in this context ?

The Aim Of Production

Socialism demanding social ownership of the means of

production and distribution hits at the very base of the exploitation of man by man to-day. So long as private ownership of the means of production and distribution remains, there will be no social control over production and distribution, neither any social aim for the same. The aim of production of the private enterpriser is profit and more profit. Whether a particular product meets the immediate needs of society or not is none of his consideration. Profit motive is his guiding star. He produces less or more, this or that, switches on from one production to another in search of his ideal, profit i.e., more money. Human welfare comes last or if possible at best as a corollary. Secondly, the world of private enterprisers is a world of competition. It is Darwinian theory of the jungle—survival of the fittest carried to the extreme. In this world of competition every enterpriser aims, plans and conspires to grab other's sphere of trade and influence. In this sordid competition of production for profit and elbowing the rivals out of existence and grabbing the booty, the production becomes planless—hectic productive activity negating itself periodically and leading to the crash of the activity or war.

So long as private enterprisers own the means of production, you cannot negate the profit motive. You can neither negate the so-called over-production, dumping of markets with finished goods, consequential crisis in production leading to retrenchment and then feverish activity again for production of armaments with a view to capture other's markets by force and the consequential war and the annihilation of man by man. Thus, it has been summarised by Karl Marx that the profit incentive and the private ownership of the means of production after some years of development

leads to the destruction of productive forces by retrenchment and then by war. Social ownership of the means of production and distribution is not only the only course to introduce a social aim in production, eliminate rivalry in production and the cut-throat tactics of the capitalists, but also it is the only method by which productive forces can be protected from the ravages of crisis, retrenchment and war and be further permitted to grow.

To bring in more and more happiness for man there must be more and more production. To achieve this aim not only the productive forces should be protected from the ravages of capitalistic production i.e., production for profit but also should be helped to develop. With the maintenance of the individual ownership of the means of production and distribution and the profit motive for production, this is impossible to be achieved. The role that private ownership was to play for developing production and productive forces has ended with the era of imperialism. In the twentieth century, capitalist method of production and distribution (i.e. individual ownership of the means of production and production for profit) has brought two devastating wars leading to the mass scale annihilation of man and is preparing for a third world war—an atomic war to give a final blow to human civilization. That is where private ownership and profit motive have brought the human society. Comrade Karl Marx could visualise this situation more than a century ago. Is his visualisation still out of date? Therefore, the socialists of all brands reached the conclusion that social ownership of the means of production and distribution is the only way out for saving the man from the horrors of capitalism and for ushering in of the millennium.

Socialism, Retrenchment And Law Of Competition

Panditji's socialism rejects this aim of the socialists in practice. His socialism is extension of the public sector as well as the private sector. The result is a queer situation. On one hand, there are multi-million projects promising happiness after fifteen years or more and on the other, immediate retrenchment of thousands of already employed workers. Furthermore, Panditji's Socialist Congress (of course after Abadi session!) Government has given the legal sanctity to capitalists to retrench provided they pay fifteen days' wages for a year of service. Whether workers so retrenched can sustain themselves or not is no consideration to the capitalists or the government as the government has no arrangement for alternative jobs or unemployment doles. While socialism is being practised by the party in power, retrenched workers are thrown to the wolves to struggle and survive—victims of Darwinian law of the survival of the fittest. Law of competition again! Will it be audacious to suggest today to Panditji that the entire trade union movement of the world has rejected this theory of the law of competition, long, long ago and Panditji as the President of the AITUC had been a leading co-operator in this struggle for rejection of this rotten theory? Pity is this that even a capitalist government now-a-days pledges more jobs and feels shy to retrench specially because of the rising tempo of the people against retrenchment. Even a conservative government in Great Britain sanctioned unemployment doles to those retrenched. But a socialist government of Panditji cannot do so. Will not thus conservatism of the Churchillian type prove more beneficial to the common man than the socialism of Panditji? Thus Panditji's socialism becomes in practice worse than conservative capitalism of the British order.

Private Sector And Public Sector

It may be said that austerity of the suffering of today is necessary for the socialist happiness of 15 years hence. Thus said it has an appearance of truth but like all appearances it is also deceptive. Deception is on two accounts. First of all the theory of austerity is being based on a premise which is not only not proved but has been proved otherwise. Happiness fifteen years hence has been presupposed on the basis of another presupposition that by implementation of the present method of the Congress Government i. e., extension of public sector and private sector of economic activity socialism can be achieved within 15 years or at least the problem of employment can be solved thereby. How baseless this supposition is can be easily gauged from the experiences of such activity in Great Britain specially during the rule of the Labour Party. Even during conservative rule and earlier liberal governments so many welfare schemes were brought into operation. If the extension of the public sector would have brought any tangible relief to the common man during the Labour Party rule one fails to explain how the laborites were defeated in the hands of the conservatives without uttering the nonsensical cry of defeated candidates that the people are ungrateful or the people do not know what is good to them. This is an absurd proposition from cent per cent parliamentarians who have faith only in the ballot box and reject all other methods, specially when again this is said with regard to the British electorate who are relatively very well-equipped to run parliamentary democracy. America, specially during the New Deal Roosevelt regime is another experiment in this respect where sorrows of the common man have been attempted to be removed by economic activities of the private sector and public sector for years

together. What has been the upshot of these classical experiments? Instead of the growth of the happiness of the man, the power of the capitalists has grown transforming them into world monopolists who in return are threatening the world with an atomic war. By the parallel development of private and public sectors there may be brisk economic activities for a period. But maintaining the private ownership of the means of production and the profit incentive, maintaining the exploitation of surplus value in the shape of profits in the private sector and in the shape of interests on bonds in public sectors, the economic ruination of the toiling millions does not cease. Consequently its opposite—happiness of man is not brought about. There is a causal relation between the exploitation of the toiling masses and their suffering. Maintaining the exploitation ends the suffering is an absurd proposition and becomes a positive deception.

One thing should never be forgotten. Individual ownership of the means of production and distribution intrinsically associated with the profit-motive ultimately restrains the productive use of accumulated capital continuously growing on the exploitation of the surplus value. Twentieth century is a century of safe deposit vaults where accumulated capital is engaged beyond use. Extension of productive economic activities to meet the needs of the man requires the release of this engaged capital. Is that possible without social appropriation, more brutally, without governmental confiscation? The history of the development of human society says 'no'. Panditji is experimenting against this negative experience of human history. But Panditji is a powerful Prime Minister running against the lessons of history! But is that a scientific approach? Panditji's

socialism becomes something else than science. This is a type of socialism which is called utopian. The beauty of a utopia is that it is full of promises without any fulfilment.

Lest our criticism suffers from rabid oppositionalism to Congress Party and its practices, let us examine a bit more in detail Panditji's theory and practice of extension of the public sector. Everybody will agree that the extension of public sector requires investment of huge capital. Whence would this capital come? Had there been a classical socialist government in India, it would have procured the capital by appropriating the wealth of the capitalists by state confiscation. But Panditji won't do that. It smells of violence and smells of Marxism which is again out of date. How then does Panditji procure it? By taxation? The rich dodge, rather evade; the poorer and the middle strata pay. But how much has the second sector of society the power to pay? Alas! it is already pauperised. Another method is used. Deficit financing that is, print more notes to meet the deficit. That creates inflation. A third method is loan from Indian capitalists. Over and above the factor that they have to be paid interests and being financiers try to mould the policy, they are shy. Enough is not coming. So the effective alternative becomes a fourth method—loan from Anglo-American Imperialists. This leads to further infiltration and further concentration of the influence of the imperialists in our national economy. In search of a novel method, something else than Marxism, in the name of building up socialism imperialist influence grows. Opposing the lessons of history, denying the scientific method India slowly and slowly is dragged into the catacomb of the imperialist octopus. But still it remains socialism according to Pandit Nehru and a nonviolent method to

construct a socialist pattern of society according to President Dhebar.

What to speak of confiscation of means of production by the government, Panditji and his Government are not prepared even to nationalise large-scale and key industries. In replying during the debate in parliament on the amendment of the constitution, Panditji said on the 12th April, '55,

"I am not against nationalisation. But to make this as the problem of progress has no meaning."

Panditji is opposed to expropriation of foreign capital also. So, there will be socialist development without even nationalisation of large-scale and key industries, foreign and Indian. When the P. S. P. leader, Acharya Kripalani said that the Congress Government by amending the constitution were not going to take over any property except of the "poor, helpless, downtrodden", he had been expressing the genuine apprehensions of all decent citizens of India. That is what happened really in the nationalisation of the road transport system practised by the Congress Govt. in different states of India. The nationalisation of the civil aviation was according to many responsible quarters taking over of outdated and outworn flying machines at a heavy compensation to the air line companies running with a grim prospect. The first one expropriated mostly middle classes while the second one heavily reimbursed the multimillionaires like Tatas and Birlas. That is in concrete the practice of Panditji's socialism—proletarianisation of the middle strata and enriching the capitalists.

The Class Concept

Panditji's socialism is above all classes. Marxian theory of class war, overthrow of the capitalists by the proletariat

and building up of socialism under a working class state are rejected by Panditji and the Congress as an outworn theory. So, Panditji's socialism does not require a working class power for its construction. The Congress party, however hotch-potch its composition may be, and howsoever influenced, guided and led it might be by the wealthier classes and specially capitalists in India, will construct socialism being disposed by considerations of human welfare and social justice. It is the theory of the supra-class, so outworn and rejected by the experiences of history. The National Socialist Party of Germany under Hitler had been talking like that. The output of those talks was bitterly experienced by the peoples of the world. Nobody would be audacious to suggest, naturally much less ourselves, that as a result of these glib talks of Congress leaders and their present practice, history would repeat in India what happened in Germany. So many economic, historical and social factors would obstruct such a course. But still there is a parallelism between the talks.

It is a matter of great regret that even so late as in 1955 we will have to repeat the conclusions of Marx that the present capitalist society is a class society where the state is in the hands of the capitalists and consistently being used as an instrument of exploitation and subordination of the proletariat by the capitalists. Even Panditji with his supra-class, socialist approach could not suggest that the present state of India is not a feudo-capitalist state where the influence of the capitalists has been increasing from day to day. Neither he is able to suggest that the present state is a non-violent state suppressing none and oppressing none. With a class state dominated by capitalists overhead whose very existence is exploitation of toiling millions for profit,

construction of socialism becomes a pure fantasy, worse than day-dreams and is bound to deceive the people in the truest sense of the term. This is deception No. 2.

Society And State

The very basis of human society is production relations. Men produce to meet their needs. In the process of this production they enter into definite relation with each other. That is how human society is built up. With the change of technique in production human relations change. This change is going through centuries. With the industrial revolution and machinofacture, these human relations have taken a concrete, new shape. On one side, there are a relatively few factory-owners and financiers. On the other side, there are millions of the proletariat working in these factories. In the course of years there has been a very high concentration of these instruments of production in the hands of a very few so much so that groups of world monopolists have emerged. This is the economic base of the present day society in all those parts of the world where the working class has failed to seize political power. The Government in these lands is in the hands of these monopolists run for their profits and for the suppression of their opponents. Such is the case in India too—a class state, a class power.

Human history is full of one solid experience that these exploiting classes have never permitted their state to be utilised to build up a system antagonistic to their interests. On the other hand, whenever any attempt has been made to change the status quo they have come out with the entire strength of their state against the persons and organisations advocating the change. Either Panditji's socialism represents

the status quo, has nothing antagonistic to the aims of the capitalist classes of India or it is something antagonistic to the interests of the profiteers. *If the first is the case, it is capitalism. If the second is the case, it must be resisted with the forces of the state at the command of the capitalists.*

It may be suggested that the capitalists of India have no command over the forces of the Indian state. In that case, who is permitting them to profit and enrich themselves which they are regularly doing as is evidenced from income-tax reports? If there is no profit, for whom is the supertax? Taxes may be dodged and are dodged. But the profits are admitted from all sides. If the state forces are not at the command of the capitalists, who come and suppress when the workers demonstrate or are on strike for the fulfilment of their most minimum demands? The class state of the present day society of India is experienced by every worker and peasant, by every social worker working for the emancipation of the pauperised masses. Who has ever heard that the police has come and prevailed upon the employers to meet the demands of the workers? Who has ever heard that the police and the military were out for securing land for the landless peasants or due share to the crop-sharers? Who has not heard that the same forces were out declaring an unlawful assembly of the demonstration of workers, peasants, teachers, students, petty-shopkeepers and so on and so forth, lathicharging them, teargassing them and shooting them down to silence for ever? This is the nature of our supra-class state. The state forces always intervene on behalf of the capitalists and landlords. The plea of maintenance of law and order is always taken. But the present law sanctions profit-making and retrenchment, eviction and starvation. The order is an

order of the same. The democratic set-up has sanctioned adult suffrage but the money-bags rule the polls. Under the circumstances to talk of a supra-class state is nothing but to hide the cruel class nature of the state and offer an ideological protection to the crimes of the worshippers of the Mammon.

Thus construction of socialism within the framework of the present set-up of society and the state, without the overthrow of the class power of the capitalists and without the establishment of a workingclass power based on the expropriation of the expropriators, is sheer nonsense—a master example of self-deception practised by able bodied politicians. Has Panditji forgot so early the episode of the Spanish Popular Front Government? The whole thing was purely non-violent in the beginning. The state power was captured by Socialists and Marxists through purely parliamentary method without any tangible bloodshed. But who started the blood-letting and why? What was the new government going to do? The new government was about to introduce certain socialistic measures. But it was not tolerated. The very fact of the workingclass power was not tolerated, much less the practice of socialism. The moment the progressive forces under the leadership of the workingclass came to power by non-violent parliamentary means, the propertied classes under the leadership of the Spanish multimillionaires opened attack against the democratic government. The result was bloody war for the defence of democracy. International reaction brought in their weight to actively support Franco and his Falangists and throttle the democratic babe in its very infancy. Spain went down fighting. Reaction consolidated. Dear Panditji, was it not because real socialism was going to be practised?

What to speak of practising socialism, a progressive government had been aiming only the other day to curb the unbridled profiteering of United Fruit Company, an American monopolist concern. But even this was not tolerated. Puppets were created, cannons were trained and Guatemala had to succumb before the armed teeth of the imperialist monster.

Our Panditji has nothing to fear from Tatas and Birlas of India. The Indian capitalists are one in nature with capitalists throughout the world so far as profit-making is concerned. But Congress wants us to believe that they are different from others of their class brothers throughout the world so far as their opposition to the construction of socialism is concerned. Instead of opposing it they will help it. Why so? Because of the non-violent method. But what is that? Is that changing the society by parliamentary means? But that was done in Spain. That was being practised by the Socialist Party of Germany also. Why did then Thyssen and Krupps bring in Hitler? A much earlier instance would be the Frankfort Parliament of 1848 Germany. Britain, the cradle of parliamentary democracy, had faced one of the cruelest devastations from 1648—1683 when the parties of the old order resisted the onrush of the new. About the annihilation of London levellers, the least said the better. This eternal, cruel and ruthless character of an exploiting class and of a class that is going to be ultimately eliminated on the construction of socialism—the Indian money-bags, will change because the Congress party has adopted a resolution for a socialist pattern of society is a thing most unconvincing. Either your socialism is no socialism, or bloody resistance from the money-bags is inevitable. In this bloody resistance the capitalists do

not fight simply with money but with the state machinery that is invariably percolated with their influence.

Howsoever sweetly a phrase may be couched, a thing remains a thing. A class that is shown the gate does not quit peacefully. It hits back. Secondly, in a class society where money rules, money has a captivating influence. Thirdly, in a class society the leading functionaries of the state, specially of its two great pillars, the police and the military, the officialdom comes from the class holding the vested interests. So when the class hits back, it hits with the police and the military and along with persons who are under the sway of money. Thus whether Panditji likes it or not, whether this would be a deviation from Gandhism and acceptance of the scientific tenets of Marxism, (it does not matter provided the aim is construction of socialism) for socialism change of the class character and the class power of the state is a basic requisite.

In fine, (1) maintaining a capitalist state structure you cannot have socialism; (2) If you want socialism you must have a working class state; (3) Howsoever non-violent your desires and practices may be you will have to fight back the bloody war of resistance by the capitalists.

Socialism—A Historic Process

Socialism in brass facts of life is a new method of organisation of production and distribution with a completely new aim fundamentally different from the capitalist mode of production and distribution. The capitalist mode of production reaches a stage of development

when production not only becomes highly social but the capitalists of earlier days become financiers and thereby surplus to the mode of production. What socialism aims to do is giving a legal stamp to this developed situation by formally eliminating the financier capitalists from having any say in production and distribution and establishing the social ownership of the same. This stage is reached through a process. The process is preparing the working class for fulfilling this task through consolidation and intensification of the class war.

Socialist mode of production demands a new type of technicians and supervisors and managers not only because the old supervisors etc. of the capitalist era come from the capitalist class and therefore are destined to sabotage the socialist mode of production, but also because new ideas require new men, a new class outlook to permeate production and distribution can come from a new class i. e. the working class in power. The struggle for the construction of socialism demanded this in USSR as well as in New China.

For preparing the working class for this task comes the basic role of class organisations and the organisation of the vanguard—the working class party, the co-ordinator and leader of the struggle for working class power and construction of socialism. Panditji's or Congress Socialism completely evades this basic task. It evades the question of preparing the working class for power by class war not only because class war smells of violence but also because if the class war is developed the vested interests that rule the Congress will be unseated from power. Evading the question of the imperative necessity of the working class party has itself evident reasons. The Congress party that

is led and predominated by the capitalist interests of India will necessarily try to confuse the people by posing itself as the party of the people and thus shrouding the question of the imperative necessity of the working class party for socialism.

Pity is this that socialism is not the philosophy of every class. Neither can it advance the interests of all classes. Socialism is the philosophy of the working class and advances the cause of the exploited millions in opposition to and negating the interests of the capitalist class. To overshadow socialism by posing it to be beneficial to both the capitalists and the workers will be a deliberate move to disarm the workers by discouraging it from building its own class party, without which again the workers can neither come to power nor construct socialism. The traditionally organised and politically and intellectually developed bourgeoisie will continue to maintain its sway over the ruling party in India. But the working class being swayed by these promises of socialism by Congress will neglect the work of construction of its own party and undermine class war and class organisations. What will be the net result? The benevolently disposed wolf will no more eat the lamb! How far this counsel will be heeded to by the pauperised masses is to be watched and seen with interest by all social workers.

One thing is certain. History never works according to the wishes of individuals or sweet wills of high personages. History has its own course. The development of history is an objective reality. Being an objective reality it is goaded by certain objective reasons—social and economic laws. These laws have the force of natural laws.

Class exploitation is objectively inherent in a capitalist class society. Opposition to class exploitation is a product of the same. First, class organisations of the workers were so organised to oppose the class exploitation bred by the system. Marx came much later. The particular contribution of Marx has been to build up a science evolved through the experiences of earlier class struggles. Marx really was a product of the working class but a master rebellious product with the talent of a genius. Enriched by the genius of this great man the working class fought with better skill and energy. Through victories and defeats of Paris Commune the world workingclass was enriching itself when another master mind Lenin intervened in the scene. This latter genius embodied in himself the experiences of the struggles of the world working class and the manoeuvrings of the bourgeoisie. The Russian workingclass guided by this consolidated intelligence of the world workingclass movement scored the first success in shape of October Revolution and under the able leadership of Lenin's disciple, Stalin, constructed socialism in USSR. Then came China with Mao Tse-tung. Now comes Indo-China with Ho-Chi-Minh, a next door neighbour to India. Have not all these achievements been taking place inspite of the wishful thinking of the leaders of the vested interests to the contrary? How does one dare to suggest that India is immune from such a historically inevitable pace of development of struggles and organisations?

The capitalist system of production and distribution exists in India. It cannot exist without exploitation. The exploitation generates its opposition. Individual opposition leads to organisational opposition creating class organisations on a mass scale. These struggles and organisations throw

up their own leaders who again consolidate themselves into the class party. As days pass on, exploitation is intensified. But so increase the arena of class struggle and the strength of the class party. Multifarious attempts from the ruling party to divert, bifurcate and suppress it only result in further steeling of the class party. Thus goaded by social and economic laws parties contend, the ruling and the ruled. A nodal point is reached. The ruled replace the ruler. Such are the objective lessons of history and such are destined to be the course of history in India too. Intellectuals attempting to stop this onrush of history will share the fate of the proverbial king mad with power ordering the waves not to further advance and will be submerged in oblivion.

Strengthen Nehru And Achieve Socialism !

A question is posed. Admitted that the Congress is a combination of hotch-potch elements swayed by the wealthier classes. But with all these defects Congress has adopted a socialist aim under the able guidance of Panditji. Why should not the socialist forces operating outside the Congress join it and strengthen the hands of Pandit Nehru and his associates to achieve this aim?

The question is very patent and the suggestion is seductive. Like all patent questions the answer would also be patent. One who has gone through what is written above will find the answer therein. But still we answer the question to make explicit what is implicit. If the Congress is admitted to be a hotch-potch organisation swayed by the bourgeoisie it cannot but advance the interests of bourgeoisie which are antagonistic to the interests of the toiling millions.

An organisation serves the interest of groups under whose sway it operates. The interest of the bourgeoisie is fleecing the people and making money. The interest of the people is emancipation from this exploitation. Socialism serves the interest of the people as it negates the exploitation of man by man by establishing social ownership of the means of production and distribution and a social aim of production to meet the needs of the people. Therefore, the adoption of a socialist aim by the bourgeois dominated Congress cannot but be a camouflage to deceive the people.

The history of adoption of socialist aim by the Congress shows further that Panditji had no difficulty to get the aim adopted. This is very interesting. It presupposes that Congress intrinsically was a socialist organisation from the very beginning. Panditji moved the resolution and gave it the legal stamp. But even the best supporters of the Congress would not say that Congress was a socialist organisation before Abadi session. Further, those Congressmen who wanted to have a softer type of socialism as their aim had no other way but to leave Congress and build up a socialist party outside it which ultimately developed into Praja Socialist Party. Socialism was simply not tolerated in the Congress even a few months ago. This anti-socialist Congress became changed overnight to socialism by Panditji's socialist appeal as if by a magic wand, forces us, all practical politicians to believe in miracles. But miracles are deceptive. Thus Congress socialism becomes a deception. *It is simply absurd to suppose that by an appeal, from howsoever noble or high a man it may be, an exploiting class will transform itself into its opposite.* People may join Congress and strengthen the hands of Pandit Nehru and raise a voluminous uproar in favour of Congress aim of

socialism. But socialism as proved above is not the resultant of volumes of uproar. Neither it comes as a result of appeal to the hearts of money-bags. Money-bags have no hearts. Money making is a very cool, calculated and heartless process. It is a question of struggle against the process or surrendering to the process. There is no scope for an appeal.

Strengthening the Congress by forces of socialism will undermine the struggle against the cruel process of capitalist exploitation and thus weakening the struggle for the negation of capitalism will advance the interests of capitalism. Therefore the suggestion is to seduce the worker away from the struggle for socialism. Either fools or knaves will be the carriers of the capitalist suggestion for socialism. Social workers working for the emancipation of the suffering humanity will refuse to be entrapped by such seductions.

Post Script

Socialism itself has a chequered history. The exploitation of man by money-bags has always been detested and protested by all great men. Jesus Christ was so angry with these blood-suckers that he prophesised that it was easier for a camel to pass through the hole of a needle but it was much more difficult for the worshipper of Mammon to reach the Kingdom of God. Still that was not an industrial age and Jesus had not the occasion to watch the much crueler exploitation of the capitalists of the industrial age.

To remove the inequities of maldistribution and the consequent sufferings of human beings Hazrat Muhammad dictated that whatsoever bread was available should be equally distributed.

Since then and years ahead through the development of world trade and commerce and manufacture in eighteenth and nineteenth centuries power of money over man and the exploitation of moneyed classes over the labouring population grew so much that the society became ultimately divided into two poles. On one pole stood the few with wealth and all the fortunes of life, happiness and luxury, while on the other were arranged the millions of skeletons with hunger, destitution, filth and squalor. Naturally this situation could not be liked and tolerated by any good thinking person, a man who feels for humanity. Accordingly, attempts were made by all decent people, saints and politicians alike, to remove this inequality and suffering of millions.

The Great French Revolution heralded the birth of the slogans of liberty, fraternity and equality. Under the banner of these immortal themes, millions sang and fought, smashed the old Bastiles and bastions of feudal order. Liberty came. But equality and brotherhood of man were lacking. They were forgotten by the upper classes, but were again upheld by the lower order. The base of the society, the labouring masses began to move with its own resources to resuscitate the common man. Attempts under the leadership of Baboef in 1795 and Blanqui in 1830 and 1848 in France were attempts in this direction. These attempts were too early. The class that was to bring about the new order was still then less equipped, less organised and was suppressed again and again. Millions perished but attempts went on.

In England too, first, the Levellers in the 17th century and then, the Chartists in the Nineteenth century opened and reopened the same chapters of struggle.

While these bloody struggles were going on, some thinkers were attempting to bring about a new social order removing the inequities of the capitalist order by other ways, by persuasion or even by construction of utopias in lands further away from the capitalist society and without any struggle with the capitalist state machinery. So were St. Simon, St. Fourier and Robert Owen. Friedrich Engels in his master book, "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific", analysed and showed in detail how and why these attempts failed or were foiled.

Karl Marx was the first genius to build up a science of economics and politics. By a master analysis of the development of the history and the course of the struggles associated

with the development, he found out the root-cause of the struggles and developments, the key points of exploitation and suggested correct ways and means for ending exploitation and establishing the new social order based on real equality and brotherhood of man and man. In the objectivity of Marx the dreams of saints and sages throughout centuries found a real fulfilment. The millennium, the Kingdom of God, the cherished aims of the negation of human sufferings can be and will be constructed in this world with the efforts of man channelised in accordance with the deductions of Marx. Socialism thus became scientific and no more remained a utopia to be jeered at by the sons of capital.

Socialism remained a utopia so long as it had to depend on the goodwill of good persons, rather so long as it was simply the expression of a wish or a desire. Socialism became a science the moment it was demonstrated beyond doubt that it is inevitable, it is bound to come. Marx did so.

Socialism remained a utopia so long as it was a purely ethical principle. It became a science the moment it was demonstrated to be a historical necessity for the development of productive forces and society. Marx did so.

Socialism was a utopia so long as people were thinking that it will be brought about by good thinking persons disposed in a humanitarian manner. It became a science the moment it was shown that the capitalist system itself was day by day producing more and more the forces of socialism, that the exploitation inherent in the capitalist system was automatically generating its own opposition and that the more the growth of the capitalist system, the more the concentration of capital in the hands of the few and the fewer persons, the more the pauperisation of the people,

the proletarianisation of masses of humanity, the increasing intensity and extensity of struggles, the nearer comes the doom's day for capital and capitalist power. This was shown by Marx.

This inevitability of socialism, this inevitability of the struggles and the strengthening of the forces of socialism by the growth of capital makes socialism a science and brings a conviction in the forces struggling in the dark. Moreover, learning this course of development of history, forces for socialism developed the technique of intensifying the struggles and bringing earlier the days of reckoning with the power of capital.

Naturally after Marx and even when Marx was alive, under his direct leadership, the struggle of the working masses for their emancipation became more and more organised, consolidated and menacing to the powers that were.

Humanity saw the first picture of the new working class order in Paris in 1871 though for a very brief period. It was really illuminating. But the forces of darkness brought it down.

Gaining from this experience, the Russian workingclass smashed the citadel of Czarism in October, 1917, and built up an impregnable fort for the new order against which all the conspirators of early twenties under the leadership of Lloyd George and Churchill or the organised fanatical bands under Hitler and Mussolini battered in vain and collapsed. The result was further extension of the new order into the heart of Europe, in East European countries and in Berlin. In the east, the same forces have installed themselves in power in China and Indo-China and have been shaping the

destiny of humanity of more than six hundred millions strong. Equality and brotherhood of man have been installed in their pristine glory.

Throughout the East and the West, the North and the South the same laws are operating. New forces of socialism are raising their heads while forces of capital decay.

In India while the forces of imperialist economy have been ceaselessly carrying on their economic loot for near about two centuries, a national capitalist force has been growing in the womb of the imperialist economy and the growth of their power has been tremendous during the last seven years of Congress rule. The concomitant result of these growths, both imperialist and Indian capitalist means of exploitation, has been the growth of the Indian working class, its struggles, its organisation and its party. The concentration of more power in the hands of the capitalists has accentuated the sufferings of the Indian people, has consequently intensified the struggle of the toiling millions for emancipation.

While the growth of capital is liquidating the middle strata of society and transforming them into the proletariat, the political manoeuvrings of the bourgeois party in power are aiming to liquidate the parties of the middle. They are breaking up. A minority is joining the Congress while the bigger half lining up with the proletariat and its class party.

The present day situation of India is very interesting. Out of the popularly accepted left parties Forward Bloc has cracked. A section of its leadership has joined the Congress. The rest and the rank and file left in the lurch are struggling for light and have no other way than to join the party of the proletariat.

The Communist Party of India after the^e Andhra election is really flabbergasted. Generally speaking their political programme has no fundamental variance with the political programme of the Congress and Pandit Nehru. Their method of struggle is really only meetings and demonstrations and speeches in Parliament and Assemblies. Intensification of class war has been given the go-by at least for the time being. A number of them utterly frustrated has gone to Congress, specially in Andhra—their fortress during the Randive period. Workers under them wheresoever they are, are really aghast at their ineffective methods.

The Praja Socialist Party is breaking horizontally on the issue of struggle vis-a-vis co-operation with the Congress party. While one section is being incarcerated in Manipur, the other section is hobnobbing with the Congress leaders. This struggling section will have to share the same fate as the rank-and-filers of the Forward Bloc.

Under the circumstances, while class exploitation is being intensified and millions are groaning under the tripple exploitation of vestiges of feudalism, protected imperialism and the accumulating forces of Indian capitalism, the only ray of hope of struggle and advancement comes from the class war line of the Bolshevik Party of India.

Bolshevik Party of India born from the womb of the workingclass in struggle and developed and steeled on the anvils of ceaseless class war against feudalism, imperialism and capitalism has been following a consistently correct class policy and mass policy.

The manoeuvrings of the bourgeoisie confuse the parties of the middle and the carriers of middle class vacillations

but batter in vain against the iron will of the class conscious proletariat. That is how the Bolshevik Party of India stands. That is how the struggling workers, peasants and the poorer middle classes under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party of India are arrayed against the forces of capital and are intensifying their struggles for social, economic and political emancipation. The middle classes hard hit and increasingly pauperised by the economic and political attacks of the bourgeoisie are and will continue to be the struggling allies of the proletariat and its party—the Bolshevik Party of India.

Incessantly roll the wheels of the history. Each opening day rings the death-knell for the powers that be. Through struggle and fire onward marches the history of humanity nursed and nurtured with the sacrificial blood of the proletariat and its vanguard—the Bolshevik Party of India.

Our Publications :

		Rs.	as.
1.	Revolution and India— Biswanath Dubey	1	4
2.	" Oriya— "	1	8
3.	" Hindi & Bengali— "	1	0
4.	Communal Carcass—A Post Mortem "	0	6
5.	" " Hindi— "	0	4
6.	" " Bengali— "	0	4
7.	Imperialism, Indian Fascism and the People—C. C., Bolshevik Party of India	1	0
8.	Indian Politics (1941—44)— —Do—	1	0
9.	French Revolution (Bengali)—Biswanath Dubey	0	8
10.	October Revolution & Bolshevik Party (Bengali & Hindi)— "	0	6
11.	Mazdoor-Inqulab & Lenin (Hindi)— "	0	4
12.	In Defence of Railwaymen and other Central Govt. employees— "	0	8
13.	The Congress Morass and the Way Out— "	0	8
14.	" (Hindi)— "	0	4
15.	A Critique of the C. P. I. Draft Programme "	0	4
16.	Political Statement, C.C., Bolshevik Party of India	0	4
17.	Why Bolshevik Party—R. C. Rai (Hindi)	0	4
18.	Why You Should Be A Bolshevik ? (Hindi & Urdu)—R. C. Rai	0	4
19.	The Great Mao Tse-tung : Sun of the East— "	1	8
20.	Bank Employees Face the Challenge—S. R. Bharadwaj	0	2
21.	Com. D. N. Pritt In Karudas Case —Biswanath Dubey	0	1

Head Office :

64, Chittaranjan Avenue,
CALCUTTA—12.

Bina Dubey

Secretary

Progressive Literature Publishing House

Published by Bina Dubey from 64, Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta-12
and Printed by her from Aryan Printers & Publishers, 1, British
Indian Street, Calcutta—1.