

Maintain and Strengthen The Solidarity of the United Front

S. U. C.'s PROPOSALS TO END THE PRESENT IMPASSE

[The Secretariat of the West Bengal State Committee of the Socialist Unity Centre of India in its meeting held on 23rd and 24th Jan. '70 reviewed the present crisis of the U. F. and the U. F. Government in West Bengal and adopted this draft, after thorough analysis, for the consideration of the constituents of the U. F. Feeling the serious concern of the common people on this issue and also recognising the necessity of making them conscious of our stand, the Secretariat decided to print this pamphlet.]

Dated January 28, 1970

TO ALL CONSTITUENTS OF THE UNITED FRONT

The present position of the United Front both in respect of the functioning of the U. F. Govt. and the U. F. as a body, and the question of preservation of unity of the U. F., as it stands today, can be described in short that it is passing through a serious crisis. And now the magnitude of the problem has reached to such a peak that even some partners of the U. F., if we are not mistaken, have become impatient and naturally the people have started thinking that the very existence of the U.F is at stake, that it is going to break. We do not, of course, consider so. But if such an eventuality at all arises, it will bring about a great disaster for the legitimate democratic movements of the people which will be obviously a matter of grave concern not only for us but also for all the constituents of the U. F. We have been so long observing with keen interest the various assessments, moves and counter-moves by different parties to resolve this problem. We do not intend to enter into any controversy relating to the merits and demerits of these assessments made by different parties as to how the present crisis developed. Neither do we like to give any reflection

about which party is mainly responsible and to what extent for the development of the present crisis, particularly at this stage when we are all seriously engaged in resolving this crisis and to find out ways and means to maintain unity of the U. F. intact. On many occasions, almost all the parties have expressed their views on this. We have also placed our opinion and if necessary we may again place it in future. But we feel that such discussions, at this moment will, instead of solving the real problem, complicate it further.

We thought that the different moves by some partners of the U. F. might help to cool down the prevailing tension when the suggestion of ours can best serve the purpose. And now when all these attempts have failed to achieve the desired results and when the things are taking worse turn, we can no longer wait but forward our proposals.

Of course, we are not sure whether our proposals would be accepted in toto or not. Nevertheless, we expect that these suggestions will at least provide a basis for starting a fresh negotiation and

(Continued to page 2)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
(Fortnightly)

Editor-in Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 3
No. 4

MARCH 9, 1970
MONDAY

PRICE
20 P.

Chandigarh Issue In Retrospect

The Central Government has, at last, decided on the Chandigarh issue. Without going into the merits and demerits of the Central award, this can be said with certainty that if the Central Government took a pro-people attitude and decided to settle this question on the basis of linguistic principle without dilly-dallying and without being guided by political motives, parochial and communal forces could have been arrested and much casualty could have been averted. The origin of the dispute is to be traced from the decision of the Central Government to keep the previous bilingual Punjab state intact.

Keeping of Punjab as bilingual state caused violent demonstrations by Haryana Prant and Punjabi Suba which aroused keen communal sentiments both among the Sikhs as well as among the Hindus. At this stage the decision to reorganise the bilingual Punjab state was taken as per the recommendation of the Hukum Singh Committee and Shah

R. K. B.

Commission was appointed to demarcate the boundaries between the two proposed states. Present Punjab and Haryana came into being from the bilingual Punjab state with the demarcation of boundaries as per Shah Commission recommendation, modified by Central Government. Shah Commission declared the entire Kharar Tehsil including Chandigarh as Hindi speaking on the basis of 1961 Census report. But it is alleged

that it was not a Hindi speaking area and 1961 Census report in this respect was somewhat manipulated. The Central Govt. as such included Kharar Tehsil in Punjab, but Chandigarh was made a Union Territory. Soon after Sant Fateh Singh threatened fast and self-immolation if Chandigarh was not handed over to Punjab. But this threat was not executed after he got assurance that Prime Minister would arbitrate on the future of Chandigarh. Later on this arbitration was not made with narrow political consideration and then Rao Birender Singh declared that he would not accept any arbitration and demanded execution of Shah Commission recommendation in toto. In such a situation the Central Congress Govt. was put in a dilemma in view of the repercussion the Congress

(Continued to page 5)

Fulfil immediately S.U.C.'s Press Fund

IN CONDUCTING IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLES AMONG PARTIES

KEEP UNITED FUNCTIONING OF THE GOVT., U.F.

(Continued from page 1)

discussion. This draft has become a bit lengthy as the problem itself is very deep-rooted and complicated, that necessitates a thorough probe into it in details. Still we hope, that the constituents will show patience to go through it carefully.

We feel that at the very outset we are to lay down certain concrete principles, public pledges, code of conduct and norms of behaviour in regard to the functioning of the U. F. Govt. and of the U. F. as a body, not in vague terms, expressing only pious wishes, but in concrete terms. We shall also have to determine the principal outlook which should govern our attitude in the formulation of these principles and the code of conduct etc. also in concrete terms.

Everybody knows, that we have agreed to combine together to launch united democratic mass movements on the basis of the 32-point programme of democratic struggles against the vested class, bureaucracy, exploiters and the other anti-people forces and have formed the United Front in spite of our ideological differences and a p p r o a c h on many other important issues. This, at once, presupposes differences amongst us in angularity and approach even in case of implementing the agreed 32-point programme. When we agreed to form the U. F. and pledged before the people to implement the 32-point programme, did we not know it then that because of our different ideology, angularity and make-up, even in case of implementation of these agreed programmes, there will invariably often arise differences amongst us in approach and angularity as to how to put the programme into practice? We think, we knew it. At least we should

know it now that it is inevitable and there is nothing to be perturbed about it. That is the reality. Therefore, we would like to emphasise it here again that it is not these differences that have created the present problem; rather it is the lack of understanding as to how to resolve these differences, and for that how to conduct ideological discussions and struggles in various ways keeping, at the same time, the united functioning of the Govt., the U. F. and the united struggles outside intact. We, the constituents of the U. F. could not develop this practice, the practice of conducting ideological struggle among ourselves and at the same time maintaining unity in our fight against the common enemy. Because,

political views, have consciously, voluntarily and with our full conscience agreed to enter into this process of complicated struggle and united action amongst ourselves. And for this, we must have philosophical tolerance to the criticism of others if we ourselves are not ideologically weak. Theories and ideologies cannot be combated with physical violence. And no party should take recourse to it. If it is so, then what is there to be afraid of in conducting ideological struggles? When we, even being a small party, are not afraid of such struggles, then why a big party should be when they are professing to be correct? No party big or small, should be afraid of ideological struggle, but at the same time they must feel it to be their bounden duty to

will not help to solve the real problem; rather in the long run it will embitter our relations more and further accentuate the crisis as it happened many times in the past. We all know that previously on occasions, we have agreed to behave, formulated code of conduct, defined the norms of behaviour of individual parties. But all were in vain. But why they failed to achieve the desired objective? We think that a time has come to probe into the problem deeply. If we do not understand and appreciate fully the peculiarity of the present phase of united democratic struggle in the light of our above discussion and also fail to educate ourselves, our rank and file and to an extent the broad masses of democratic movement about the complex way of conducting ideological

and Unity of Mass Struggle Intact

most of the constituent parties have not only failed to differentiate the nature of the conflict between the U. F. as a whole and its common enemy from the nature of the conflict among the constituent parties themselves centring round their differences in approach and angularity as to how to implement the 32-point programme but also confused the nature of the latter conflict with that of the former one. As a result, struggles among the constituents very often took the form of physical assault, violence etc., as if it was a struggle against the enemy. Any attempt to resolve these two different struggles in the same method, being guided by the same outlook, is sure to create trouble, and this is exactly what is happening.

We must understand that we, the constituent parties of the U. F. with our respective

preserve unity in the united struggle against the common enemy. We call upon all sensible men to realise this complicated phase of unity and struggle in which we are all voluntarily committed to.

As these differences are sure to crop up because of our differences in the process of thinking and as we have also to resolve these differences and maintain our unity, we shall have to give shape, remould and pattern the style and language of our struggle centring round our differences, and also find out scientific method to resolve the differences, keeping our unity undisturbed.

We are of firm belief that a proper understanding of the above approach alone can help us to bring about a permanent and stable solution of the problem. Any other unprincipled arrangement, even if it succeeds in reducing the present tension temporarily,

struggle and at the same time maintaining unity among the constituents in the functioning of the U.F., the Cabinet and in their united struggle against the common enemy in fields and factories, no "model formula" whatsoever, will help us to resolve the present crisis on a stable basis.

And this is why we emphasize so much on these questions. There is no question of compromising one's political, ideological stand, neither we are asking anybody to do this. This is not necessary too. But we appeal to you all not to ignore or to take lightly analysis of ours as a mere and simple theory. It may sound theoretical; but it is our considered opinion that the real problem lies here and here only.

Here we like to remind you one thing more. In the past, whenever the "big five" parties

(Continued to page 3)

Follow the principle of equality and same standard towards all constituents

(Continued from page 2)

were able to reach an understanding among themselves, which they often attempted to, they discussed among themselves, developed formulas and then tried to impose that on the U. F. Very recently "big five" parties, in spite of our repeated opposition and request not to follow such an unprincipled method of resolving the problem bypassing the U. F. and reducing U. F. general body to merely an instrument of giving official stamp on whatever they decided amongst themselves, they developed a combination at the back of the U.F. We did never accept this method and it is well known that we criticised this move at the U.F. meetings at it was unprincipled. At that time everyone of them in defence of each other advanced the queer argument that when this method was intended to expedite the business and strengthening the unity of the U. F. then what was the harm in that? But what our experience says? Had it expedited the smooth functioning of the U. F. or strengthened the unity a bit? Or, these parties themselves are now engaged in mutual bickering, endangering the very unity of the U. F.? This is only natural because, that was an unprincipled way, a pragmatic expediency and opportunist arrangement among the five parties for mutual benefits and also an attempt to bypass the U. F.

It is very much clear now that, so long, we did not care to pursue any steady principle of equality. We worked simply on pragmatic considerations which can be better termed as one of our important colleagues once humorously put "যখন যখন, তখন তখন". In some sphere, of course, there is some difference on the question of importance of big

and small parties and that we have already recognised at the time of distribution of Assembly seats and allocation of portfolios. But it is our sad experience that even on questions like principle and policy matter the question of strength of a party is very often dragged into. But does the correctness or otherwise of a stand, related to the question of principle and policy depend on whether a party is big or small? Is it not a queer logic that, the justification of a stand becomes more, if it is suggested by a big party? Similarly, can it be accepted that the stand of a party is less logical, simply because the party is small? The big parties of the U. F., those who are now behaving as contending parties, never cared to follow the principle of discussion, giving equal weightage to the stand of different parties, big or small even in case of deducing principles. Nobody can deny this fact. But such an attitude is bound to jeopardise the very unity of the United Front.

It is often found that in the U. F. Committee meetings discussion sought by small parties on very important issues are shelved on flimsy grounds only because of the objection of the big parties, whereas, much time is spared in discussing some very minor issues as they are raised by big parties. Moreover, when the big parties can agree among themselves on any issue, decisions by them are posed as unanimous in spite of dissensions by small parties. Even the dissensions given by small parties are not recorded, not to speak of mentioning them while briefing to the Press. Thus the people are kept in the dark about the stand taken by different parties. This sort of disparity should go once for all.

In the light of the above analysis let us now discuss certain principles and procedural methods for the proper functioning of the U. F. "as a body" and functioning of the Cabinet as "one man".

On The Functioning of The United Front

(I) We have seen that much of the present trouble was created by some wrong procedures which, all of us, knowingly or unknowingly or being helpless allowed to continue. This particularly relates to the practice of maintaining no detailed proceedings of the U. F. meetings. This has created a lot of difficulties. This practice provides scope for different parties not only for distorting the decisions of the Front to their own advantage but also creates breeding ground for mutual apportioning of blames, creating tension in mutual relationship leading to further disunity and distrust.

In the absence of such proceedings very often press briefings by the U. F. on different occasions have not been able to express the reality and thereby have kept the people virtually ignorant of the different stands taken by different parties on different issues.

- (a) Therefore, keeping of proceedings in details including the deliberations of all the participants in the debate is a must;
 - (i) to eliminate the possibility of future distortions about who said what on a particular issue or on a general line,
 - (ii) to provide opportunities for the masses to judge by themselves in a correct way who is right and who is wrong and which parties are deviating from the de-

clared principles, policies, programmes and pledges of the U. F. and acting against them.

This practice of keeping proceedings in details and briefing the Press by the U.F. officially on it, if sincerely and strictly adhered to, will help eradicate various confusions that very often prevail in the mind of the masses being misled by the propaganda of different parties.

(2) The U. F. should follow the principle of equality and same standard at the time of discussion and taking decision on each and every issue and also at the time of briefing the press about the deliberations of the participants in the debate.

(3) In the matter of taking decisions on different issues by the U. F. no clear-cut procedure has yet been adopted—whether the decisions should be always unanimous or in absence of unanimity decisions are to be taken by majority. A clear-cut attitude and detailed procedure should be formulated regarding this.

- (a) We think that on questions of policy, principle and ideology decisions should always be unanimous. For, in matters of approach and angularity, policies and principles when fundamental differences crop up we should not take majority decision on them since that may lead to the rupture of the Front.
- (b) But in many other fields for ensuring the normal and regular functioning of the U.F.

(Continued to page 6)

Mr. PROMODE DASGUPTA'S REMARK—A DISTORTION & SLANDER AGAINST S.U.C.

A comment by Mr. Promode Dasgupta, the Secretary, West Bengal State Committee of C.P.I.(M) and a member of the Polit Bureau of C.P.I.(M) was published in Amrita Bazar dated Feb. 16th. 1970.

"He (Mr. Dasgupta) wondered how C.P.I., Forward Bloc and S.U.C. found progressive outlook in the action of Indira Congress. Deviating from their anti-Congress path of movement they had been extending their support, to Mrs. Indira Gandhi at a time when they should avail of the weakness of the Congress party in crisis and mobilise the people to fight against the reactionary power at the centre".

In the background of this comment of Mr. Dasgupta we feel it necessary to reprint the entire text of our party's Central Committee Statement on bank nationalisation which was published in Proletarian Era dated Oct. 3rd, 1969.

"The Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Centre of India notes that the C.P.I. and some other left parties in our country, on the question of bank-nationalization, are eulogizing Indiraji as progressive and has urged upon our people to rally round her. The C.P.I.(M) also is travelling on the same track under cover of different words and phrases only to pose that they are not on the same line with the "revisionists." These parties by this act have not only expressed their political bankruptcy but also exposed themselves in their true colours."

"The Central Committee likes to point out that it is one thing to support the demand for nationalization of key and large-scale industries by the toiling millions engaged in fierce revolutionary struggle for emancipation from the yoke of capitalist exploitation while it is quite a different thing to support and eulogize an act of the bourgeoisie nationalizing them. For, in a capitalist state when the bourgeoisie takes recourse to nationalization, it does so in

the aggregate interest of capitalism precisely to bring about a coalescence of monopolies with the state and thereby virtually subjugating the state to the interest of the monopolists. In this way the rock bottom foundation stone of fascism is laid. Hence, it cannot be the business of any progressive party or individual, let alone the revolutionaries, to extend support to or praise the act of bank-nationalization of the Indian bourgeoisie. On the contrary, it is high time to sound a note of caution to the working class and other exploited masses of the people that if they fail to step up their revolutionary struggle, overthrow the bourgeoisie and capture state power, the nationalized industries will be a constant source of more ruthless exploitation. The Central Committee, therefore, calls upon the workers and other sections of the people to close up their ranks and be more vigilant against the possible counter-revolutionary offensive of the bourgeoisie under various cloaks of so-called radical Social Democratic measures.

"The Central Committee is of the considered view that the present conflict inside the Congress, centring the Syndicate-group and the Indira-group, is not a struggle between the monopolists collaborating with imperialism and the so-called "progressive national bourgeoisie", a close ally of "people's democratic revolution", or, in general terms, between reaction and progress. It is nothing but a reflection of the contradiction between the conservative section of the bourgeoisie representing individual interests of the monopolists and the so-called radical section of the bourgeoisie representing aggregate

interest of capitalism. The correct stand, in this regard, would, therefore, be to take advantage of this contradiction, try to increase the rift between them and utilize it in developing mighty mass movements and accelerating the revolutionary preparation in our country."

In this context we are also giving below the views of C.P.I.(M) published in different issues of People's Democracy in this regard.

"The Polit Bureau of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) hails the victory of Sri V.V. Giri in the Presidential contest and views it as a political victory for the popular and democratic forces against the forces of extreme reaction in the country.

...Extreme vigilance and continued offensive of all those who stand for democracy constitute the only guarantee against the attempts of the reactionary combine to upset the popular victory in the Presidential election."

(People's Democracy, Aug. 31, 1969).

Then again in C.P.I.(M)'s note to the Prime Minister, published in People's Democracy, Feb. 1, 1970 it says :

"In the changed political situation when the threat from the Syndicate wing of Congress and its alliance with extreme right-reactionary parties such as the Jana Sangh and Swatantra had become imminent and when there were hectic attempts by them to take over the reins of the Government with the avowed objective of shifting the internal policies of the Government in a further right and reactionary direction, our party openly announced its support to your Government in so far as it is fighting the Syndicate and its allies, foiling their bid to take over the Government. ...Even today it is our party's considered opinion that the threat from the Syndicate's projected alliance and political line is far from defeated and it would be a grave error to underestimate these extreme rightist forces who are firmly entrenched in society, at different levels. The truth is that the fight has just begun against this menace, and only initial victory have been scored against it."

Again in C.P.I.(M) Central Committee statement published in People's Democracy, Feb. 15, 1970 it is stated.

"The Indira Gandhi wing also contains within its fold a healthy trend which hates big landlords and monopolists... It has raised certain slogans and taken certain measures which are in tune with anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people."

We leave it entirely to the readers to judge for themselves whether it is S.U.C., as attributed by Mr. Promode Dasgupta, or C.P.I.(M), his own party, which really has found out the "progressive outlook" in the Indira group of Congress. We would only like to add that a truly Marxist-Leninist party knows that ideological questions are to be combated ideologically.

But it is very much regrettable that Mr. Promode Dasgupta, the C.P.I.(M) leader, has taken recourse to wilful distortion of our well-known stand on this issue, which tantamounts to slander. It is quite natural to ask why Mr. Dasgupta has adopted this discredited method of distortion while combating our views? Is it due to the fact that while the political resolutions of C.P.I.(M) definitely reflect a pro-Indira attitude, the stand taken by S.U.C. on bank nationalisation and other important issues unambiguously exposes the reactionary character of Indira's Congress and it has raised questions even in the minds of their own rank and files which the leadership is unable to answer politically? It is perhaps due to this crisis in the party that the C.P.I.(M) leaders, being forgetful of their own stand, is casting blame on others and distorting other's views, only to camouflage the real character of their party from their cadres. Does it not signify the ideological weakness of a party, however powerful organisationally it may be vis-a-vis other parties, which takes this path of distortion and violation of democratic principles? We still hope that the leadership of C.P.I.(M) and its rank and file should renounce this path of distortion and uphold democratic standard while resolving all ideological questions, intensify ideological struggles among fraternal parties of the U.F. and build up its unity as an instrument of struggle of the masses against the common enemy.

Maintain unity of the peoples of Punjab and Haryana against the conspiracies of the communalists, the Central Government and the vested clique

(Continued from page 1)

party, in this state or that would suffer in case of adverse decision to a particular state. In the meantime the communal and parochial forces seized the initiatives and fanned up communal passion to a new pitch in both the states. Thus it is seen that it is because of indecision at every stage by Central Government the problem took such a dimension. Had it been resolved straight way on the basis of linguistic principle, and keeping intact the unity of the people of both the states these anti-people forces would not have the opportunity to do such harm to the unity of the people of Punjab and Haryana. Hence the role of the Central Government deserves strongest condemnation.

Such regional sentiments, or so to say regionalism as such has its origin in the history of the formation of Indian nation. Our leader, teacher and the General Secretary Com. Shibdas Ghosh has observed times without number that though we have attained nationhood politically, we are culturally still distracted by differences in religion, caste, race, language, psychological make up etc. Because of the weakness of our nationalist movement the democratisation of Indian society ended in a half-baked and truncated way. At a time when capitalism lost its progressive character and became absolutely decadent the Indian bourgeoisie carrying all the international reactionary trend was stirred into movement against the British imperialism. Secondly it is to be remembered that Indian bourgeoisie grew and developed under the tutelage of foreign finance capital which was responsible for its stunted growth. Thirdly,

“like all colonial bourgeoisie in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, Indian bourgeoisie was mortally afraid of revolutionary mass struggle against imperialism. For it apprehended that revolutionary struggle by the Indian people for national liberation, if successful, would not only end imperialist rule in our country but also, along with it remove the national bourgeoisie from the leadership of the struggle.....Antagonism with imperialism on the one hand and the fear complex of revolution on the other, made the nationalist section of the Indian bourgeoisie maintain a reformist oppositional role against imperialism. Its role against feudalism was also equally compromising...The result of this compromise was that the Indian bourgeoisie could not and did not carry out the tasks of social and cultural revolutions essential for the democratisation of the society and complete merger of the different communities professing different religions into a nation... During the centralised British administration of India, associated with the emergence of a national market and intercourse of trade and commerce on an all India basis and between the people and in the course of Indian people's fight for national independence against the imperialists, the different nationalities in India speaking different languages and different communities professing different religions, were in the process of merging together and forming a nation. Had the leadership of this national movement in our country been in the hands of the working class, it would have been possible to not only eliminate imperialism

completely but also take the country along the path of non-capitalist path of development and solve the national, communal, racial, regional questions, once for all” (Extracts from the Speech of Com. Shibdas Ghosh to the delegates of the National Democratic Convention held at Delhi on 29th and 30th November 1964). Thus it is clear from the statement quoted above why cultural integration of the people in the country was not accomplished. As such in a multilingual country like India linguistic and such other allied problems are likely to come up and people may genuinely feel concerned for their just solutions. No doubt that these problems require serious attention for solution. But the people must have clear cut vision about the way that is to be taken in solving these issues. People must realise that their main concern is to make themselves free from the yoke of capitalist exploitation. No basic problem of life can be solved unless this exploiting capitalist rule is overthrown and a new socialist state is established

in its place. So the struggle for achieving this objective is supreme and all other movements are to be conducted in such a way that these movements become conducive to the growth and development of the revolutionary struggle for seizure of power. Chandigarh issue is also to be viewed in this context. The inclusion of Chandigarh either in Punjab or in Haryana will not solve any of the problems of the people of the two states, let alone emancipating them from the capitalist rule. The people of both Punjab and Haryana will have to launch struggle against the ruling capitalist class, Jotedars, other vested interests and the bureaucracy. This requires the unity of people under correct revolutionary leadership. As such the unity of the people of Punjab and Haryana must be preserved and strengthened. The ruling class tries to drive wedge between the struggling people on the question of language, religion, race, caste etc. for perpetuating their exploiting class rule. Hence the people must be

(Continued to page 8)

Statement about ownership and other particulars

About newspaper

Proletarian Era

Form IV (See Rule 8).

1. Place of Publication—48, Lenin Sarani, (Dharamtolla St.) Cal-13.
2. Periodicity of its Publication—Fortnightly.
3. Printer's Name—Sukomal Das Gupta.
Nationality—Indian.
Address—48, Lenin Sarani, (Dharamtolla St.) Cal-13.
4. Publisher's Name—Sukomal Das Gupta.
Nationality—Indian.
Address—48, Lenin Sarani, (Dharamtolla St.) Cal-13.
5. Editor's Name—Sukomal Das Gupta.
Nationality—Indian.
Address—48, Lenin Sarani, (Dharamtolla St.) Cal-13.
6. Owner—Central Committee of Socialist Unity Centre of India.

I, Sukomal Das Gupta, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Sd. Sukomal Das Gupta

Create atmosphere for the functioning of the U. F. Committee as "a body" and the U. F. Cabinet as "one man"

(Continued from page 3)

majority decision may be necessary where unanimity is not possible even after decisive attempts. These are, for examples, matters relating to :

- (i) Implementation of all decisions and resolutions of the U. F.
- (ii) Adoption of directives, resolutions and measures relating to any violation of discipline, codes of conduct, norms etc.

Such resolution censuring any Party for their violation of U. F. resolutions and directives must not take the form of condemnation resolution but always be in the form of expressing regret till we have come to the final conclusion that no more unity with that Party is possible.

(4) Copies of the proceedings, directives, resolutions (including censure resolutions) of the U. F. Committee meetings should be sent in duplicate to each Party—one to be returned after ratification.

If these procedures are adopted we think no one should feel aggrieved, because it will apply equally to all the parties and every party will enjoy the right to place its own view-point before the people.

(5) It is observed that in most of the cases of inter-party clashes even diametrically opposite sets of facts are placed by the contending parties. But since we know that facts stand independent of human consciousness although the reading of facts may vary—it will be the task of the U. F. Committee to probe into such facts unbiasedly and also exhaustively in order to come to certain conclusions which will be at least nearer to truth, even if

they may not be always exactly true.

In such cases also the statements made by the constituent parties before the enquiry, and the details of the proceedings of the enquiry committee should be always annexed with the resolutions adopted by the U.F. after the enquiry is over.

We think that only if the U.F. can function on the basis of aforesaid principles and strictly adhere to the procedure mentioned above, then and then only it can function as a unified body in reality.

We do not think that any party can have any objection to such a practice if it has no real intention to violate the decisions of the U.F. and if it really wants to maintain the unity of the U.F.

Measures for the functioning of the U. F. Cabinet as "One Man"

Coming to the questions of running the administration of the U. F. Govt., we like to mention here again that due to our different make-up and approaches differences may very often crop up even at the time of implementing the programme of the U.F. and executing the directives and decisions of the Cabinet.

But to develop the functioning of the U.F. Cabinet as 'one man' it is, first of all, necessary to clarify one confusion which has been created by some quarters very recently. They are advancing the argument that since it is a United Front Govt. and since the portfolios were divided amongst the constituent parties through agreement (though these were agreements among the big parties and were virtually thrust upon the rest), the running of administration of each department should be the sole concern of the Minister of that department and therefore no interference

should be allowed under any circumstances.

This can in no way be the real understanding of the agreement through which the ministerial portfolios were allotted to different parties. It is true that in normal cases there should not be any interference into the day-to-day business of any department. But in case any Minister uses the administration for party interest, or acts in contravention of the U. F. policies, public pledges, directives and decisions or the officers under the department act in a partisan way or show disrespect to other Minister, then what is the remedy? How to check and stop such practices? Does not such a serious situation warrant interference by the U.F. Committee or the Cabinet as the case may be? Should the step be only a formal request to the Minister concerned? According to normal procedure, of course, the first step is to request the Minister by bringing the matter to his notice. But if he does not comply with the request then some way-out must be found out. Because, for such acts if any misapprehension is created in any quarter of the public then that misapprehension is created not against that particular Minister or his department or his party alone, but against the U.F. Cabinet, the U.F. Committee and all other constituents of the U.F. Naturally it becomes the concern of all. If the above thesis that in no case should interference in any ministry be allowed is accepted then how to check and stop such departure by a Minister from the declared principle, policy, programme and pledge of the U. F. Committee and the U.F. Govt? So this is a bad thesis, a very bad thesis, and must be rejected outright in clear terms.

To check such violation and to develop the functioning of the Cabinet as "one man" the following measures should be adopted :—

1. (a) Every Minister should carry on day-to-day work in his department according to the declared policy, principle, programme, pledge, decisions and directives of the U.F.
- (b) No Minister should behave differently to different parties on same and similar issues in so far as administration is concerned. There should not be double standard, one in dealing with his own Party and a separate one in case of other parties.
- (c) As long as a Minister (i) acts according to the declared policy and principle of the U. F. Committee; (ii) does not act in contravention of the decisions and directives either of the Cabinet or of the U.F. Committee; (iii) does not behave differently to different parties in administrative affairs; (iv) does not use the administration for petty party interest and (v) does not allow any of his officers or employees to violate the declared policy and principle of the U. F. or to behave in a partisan way and show disrespect to any other Minister, there should not be any interference in the day-to-day business of any ministry.
- (d) But in case any Minister or any Party feels that any Minister

(Continued to page 7)

U. F. must adopt concrete measures to end the present impasse

(Continued from page 6)

or his department has acted or is acting against the declared policy, principle, programme, pledge and decisions of the U. F. or using the administration for petty party interest, then other Ministers or other Parties, as the case may be, should have the right to refer the matter to the Cabinet. The Cabinet should at once probe into it and take decisions which should be implemented by the Minister of that department within specified period.

The Chief Minister on behalf of the Cabinet will see that the decision is implemented.

- (e) If that Minister does not implement the decision within that specified period then the Chief Minister should refer the case to the U.F. Committee.
- (f) The U. F. Committee will then at once take appropriate decision and according to this decision the Cabinet will again issue fresh directives to the Minister concerned.
- (g) And even then if the Minister does not act accordingly then the U.F. should by a resolution express public regret.
2. (a) The Cabinet should issue a general circular to all departments asking them to instruct in writing their respective officers and employees to strictly observe impartiality and maintain same standard where different parties are involved. It should be made clear therein that unlike the Congress regime, now

by serving one Party, greasing one Party and one ministry they cannot escape or build their career and that any office or employee guilty of partiality and partisanship and acting in contravention of the declared policy of the U. F. will be severely dealt with.

- (b) Any violation of the circular may be brought to the notice of the Cabinet by any Minister or Party and the Cabinet thereupon should take a decision on the nature of punishment that should be taken against the officer or the employee. The departmental Minister should implement the decision of the Cabinet within a specified period.
- (c) Any disrespect shown to any Minister by any officer or employee should be taken as an affront to the Cabinet as a whole. If any such complaint is brought to the notice of the Cabinet then the Cabinet at once will have to take decision on that and the decision of the Cabinet should be implemented by the Minister of that department within a specified period.

If the above mentioned procedures are strictly adhered to and the measures implemented in the light of our discussion, it will create a new atmosphere for proper functioning of the U. F. Committee as a "body" and the U. F. Cabinet as "one man". And then and then only we can fulfil our commitment and pledges to the public and keep the United Front alive on a stable basis as an instrument of united democratic struggle against our common enemy in spite of our

Kerala School of Politics

(By a Staff Reporter)

The successful completion of a School of Politics followed by the formation of a Provisional State Organizing Committee of the Socialist Unity Centre of India marked the emergence of the genuine revolutionary working-class party of India in the State of Kerala.

The School of Politics was held on the 10th and 11th January, 1970. About fifty party applicants and supporters representing different sections of the toiling people came from four districts, viz., Quilon, Kottayam, Alleppey and Trivandrum to attend the School, which was held, through morning and evening sessions, on both the days. Com. Sukomal Das Gupta, a member of the West Bengal State Secretariat of the Party conducted the School. Subjects dealt with in the various sessions included: (i) Dialectical and Historical Materialism; (ii) National and International Situation; (iii) Indian conditions, in particular relation to the phase of revolution; (i) Present political situation of India—with special reference to United Front Politics of Kerala and West Bengal.

After completion of the School, a Provisional Kerala State Organizing Committee of the S. U. C. I. was formed with the following comrades:-

Com. James, J.—Convenor, and Coms. Subhas B. P.; Dominique K. C.; Kamala Nath Pai; K. S. Baboo and Natarajan as members.

A nine-man Provisional State Organizing Committee of the All India D.S.O. has recently been formed for the State of Kerala with Com. S. K. Baboo as Convenor of the Committee.

differences in ideology, approach and angularity.

Comradely yours,
Sd/- Nihar Mukherjee
Secretary
West Bengal State Committee
S. U. C. I.

TEHRİK

The organ of the State Organising Committee of S. U. C. I. Haryana.

Contact : S. U. C. I.
48, Lenin Sarani,
Calcutta-13.

C.C. STATEMENT ON SUPREME COURT JUDGEMENT ON BANK NATIONALISATION

"The Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Centre of India has said in a statement that Supreme Court's majority judgement striking down the law nationalising the 14 major Indian Banks has, once again, exposed the capitalist character of the Indian Constitution and calls for immediate amendment of the Constitution with regard to the right to property which in no case should be a fundamental right.

"Our people should organise themselves so as to force the India Government to nationalise the Banking industry as a whole including foreign Banks operating in our country and the minor Indian Banks not touched in the impugned Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act."

Read

GANADABI

Bengali Organ
of S. U. C. I.

Regularly

Chandigarh

(Continued from page 5)

vigilant against these moves of the reactionary forces. It is to be stressed that solution of the issues like Chandigarh has got to be found unitedly by the people of the two states through mutual discussions, deliberations and understanding between the people of the concerned states. Such method would have arrested the reactionary and communal forces and a greater unity of the people of Punjab and Haryana would have been forged. United struggles involving the people of both states was the only way to isolate the reactionary bourgeois leadership from the masses and free the people from the influence of reactionary narrow nationalism. This would have helped them solve the Chandigarh question unitedly without keeping alive the seeds of future conflict. Not only the Communists, even persons with liberal outlook consider such methods to be the only way in solving these linguistic issues. Any other alternative to this course will lead to fratricidal war over such linguistic questions as has been evinced in case of the Chandigarh issue. But the tragedy is that the bankruptcy of the leftist parties like C. P. I. and C. P. I. (M) helped the arch reactionary parties like Akali and Jana Sangh to come to the limelight and they seized the initiatives and worked up mob hysteria to fight over this linguistic issue. Sant Fateh Singh who was never found with the struggling peasantry of Punjab against the ruthless oppression of the village Jotedars or with the workers struggling against the employers—on the contrary who has all along been found with the capitalists and Jotedars of Punjab, emerged as the champion of the cause of the Sikh and similarly Rao Birender Singh in spite of his anti-people activities was

Comment On Railway Budget

The railway budget of Indira's Congress has once again exposed the hollowness of the claim made by Indiraji that her Government is determined to carry greater benefits to the deprived and the poor in the society and establish socialism in a peaceful way.

It has also dealt a terrible blow to those 'progressive' political forces and pseudo Marxist-Leninists who have found Mrs. Indira Gandhi and her party as their new found ally in upholding the cause of common masses against the onslaught of Syndicate-Jana Sangh-Swatantra combine representing the arch reactionary in the country. The struggle of Indira against the Syndicate group for political supremacy in the country is a struggle for progress and all sections of progressive people must support Indira for winning the battle of democracy—such was the clarion call given by C.P.I.(M) and C.P.I. along with a host of 'progressive' political parties at the time of bank nationalisation and during Presidential election. Our party alone cautioned the people about the

posed as the savior of the people of Haryana. In this context the role of this impotency of the big left parties and their inability to demarcate clearly between "anti-Congressism" and genuine "leftism" accounts for the sweeping victory of Jana Sangh in Delhi in spite of the presence of "galaxy of luminaries" of the leadership of these two big left parties in palatial mansions in the heart of the capital. One can not but conclude from this that the failure of C.P.I. and C.P.I.(M) to provide an alternative leadership is due to the inability of these parties to emerge as working class party on the basis of correct Marxist-Leninist philosophy. It is S. U. C. I. which has substantiated its claim to be the only working class party by its correct stand on all the national and international issues and as such people must forsake all illusions that they might have, about these pseudo-Marxist parties and rally round S.U.C.I., the real revolutionary party in India, which can lead Indian people to revolution and socialism.

inherent danger which the requisitionist group of Congress carries forth in its radical utterances and pledges, only to gain support of the masses for consolidating the position of Indira and her group within Congress. The battle between the Congress wings is not a battle even remotely resembling the battle against capitalism, for progress and socialism. Our party correctly analysed the contradiction within Congress as contradiction between the conservative section of the national bourgeoisie and the radical section of the bourgeoisie both aiming at strengthening the position of the bourgeoisie against the toiling masses. Our party even asserted that the toiling

BIPLAB SEN

people even while supporting the measure of bank nationalisation accomplished due to prolonged mass movements of the working people must not be misled to believe that Indira's Congress is really standing for the socialist cause and leading a fight against the reactionaries and the capitalist ruling clique. It would be the height of folly and a disservice to the cause of the working class if this manoeuvre of Indira to hoodwink the masses and draw them on to her side for the benefit of the capitalists is not given a sharp exposure by the progressive forces and her attempts to exploit the masses through radical phrasemongering are not scuttled.

The Central Government's rethinking on bank nationalisation on the plea of adjustment with the recent Supreme Court Award on this Act, the present railway budget and many other measures of the

new Congress glaringly testify to the correctness of our party's stand as to the nature of the two Congress. Indira's Government is playing the old game of serving the monopolists, the bureaucracy and letting down the people on the way to further ruin and starvation. Instead of giving any benefit to the people and relieving their distress even a little bit which her Government promised to the people there is further deterioration in the economic position of the people. The increase in the railway fares for third class passengers, the increase in freight charges etc. will severely hit the masses, whose deliverance, Indiraji seeks to realise through her 'socialist' measures. The financial tycoons however are not even touched upon to fulfil her 'socialist' promises. Indira's Government is not embarking on any socialist step, which it cannot, but is faithfully executing the wishes of the monopolists although there is much clamour about socialist objective' of this Govt. from her side and her allies in the left camp. The progressive forces should not only unite and develop strong movement for nullifying this budget and introducing a new budget which will at least give certain reliefs to the people by preventing corruption of the railway administration and taxing the richer sections of the people but also expose the true class character, the capitalist character of Indira's Government. This is the only objective lesson that the working class and the masses should draw and close up their ranks against all attempts of the big business and their political parties, be it Syndicate Congress and its group or Indira's Congress and its group to frustrate the cause of the working class and perpetuate the capitalist class rule in the country. The working class and the toiling masses must understand that Indira's road is not a road to socialism. It is a road to further consolidation of capitalism, even when this same capitalism is breeding acute economic crisis in the society. It is only through revolutionary action of the toiling masses under the guidance of the revolutionary working class party, and overthrowing the power of the capitalist rulers, that the foundations of socialism can be really built and the way to progress and prosperity can be firmly laid for the people.