

REVOLUTIONARY TEACHINGS OF COM. LENIN

COM. GHOSH'S BRILLIANT ANALYSIS

(By a Staff Reporter)

Calcutta (13th May)—Today under the auspices of the Calcutta District Committee of the Socialist Unity Centre of India a well-attended public meeting was held at Saheed Minar Maidan to explain to the people the revolutionary teachings of Comrade Lenin, particularly in the context of the present-day international and national situation. Frankly speaking, the meeting was distinctly different from the meetings, seminars and *Melas*, which are all being held in our country to mark the birth centenary of that great revolutionary leader.

In fact, the latter functions organised by the 'Marxist' parties and other organisations in our country had come out, not unexpectedly of course, to be rendezvous where all sorts of trite trash (punched with 'cultural' programme) had been dished to the audience in the name of Leninism. As had been the case with other revolutionaries, Lenin also, after death could not be saved by the revolutionaries from the indignity of praise and platitude by rabid reactionaries and worst opportunists trying all the time to exploit popular feelings, distort the revolu-

tionary soul of his teachings and make them acceptable to the bourgeoisie. But in this meeting, which was presided over by Com. Ashutosh Banerjee, Secretary of the Calcutta District Committee of the Party, though the audience missed the atmosphere of entertainment and festivity associated with cheap claptrap oratory of so-called Marxian thinkers yet they were far more than compensated with something invigorating which had given them enough matters for serious thought and provided them mature guidance for

(Continued to page 2)



LONG LIVE LENINISM

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Editor-in Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 3
No. 6

JUNE 1, 1970
MONDAY

PRICE
20 P.

GLEANINGS FROM LENIN

"The fundamental question of every revolution is the question of state power."
(A Dual Power)

"Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement."
(What is To be Done)

"Since there can be no talk of our independent ideology being developed by the masses of the workers in the process of their movement, the only choice is : either the bourgeois or the Socialist ideology. There is no middle course (for humanity has not created a "third" ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or above-class ideology). Hence, to belittle the Socialist ideology in any way, to turn away from it in the slightest degree means to strengthen bourgeois ideology."
(What Is To Be Done)

"To forget the distinction between the vanguard and the whole of the masses which gravitate towards it, to forget the constant duty of the vanguard to raise ever wider strata to this most advanced level, means merely to deceive oneself, to shut one's eyes to the immensity of our tasks, and to narrow down these tasks. And it is just such a

shutting of one's eyes, it is such forgetfulness, to obliterate the difference between those who associated and those who belong, between those who are conscious and active and those who only help."
(One Step Forward, Two Steps Back)

"Marxism teaches the proletariat not to keep aloof from the bourgeois revolution, not to be indifferent to it, not to allow the leadership of the revolution to be assumed by bourgeoisie but, on the contrary, to take a most energetic part in it, to fight most resolutely for consistent proletarian democracy, for carrying the revolution to its conclusion."
(Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in Democratic Revolution)

"Revolutions are the locomotives of history, said Marx. Revolutions are the festivals of the oppressed and the exploited. At no other time are the masses of the people in a position to come forward so actively as creators of a new social order at a time of revolution. At such times the people are capable of performing miracles, if judged by the narrow, philistine scale of gradual progress. But the leaders of the revolutionary parties must also make their

(Continued to page 8)

ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF IMPERIALISM

(Continued from page 1)

social action for social progress. The more in number such meetings are organised, the better for revolutionizing the toiling millions of our country. One who had attended the meeting cannot but feel like this.

Before Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, leader, teacher and General Secretary of the Socialist Unity Centre, started his roughly three hours and a half long speech, the meeting adopted a resolution condemning the US aggression in Cambodia and demanding of the India Government to change its pro-US policy and set pressure on the Nixon administration for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all US troops from the Indo-China, especially Cambodia and South Vietnam. The resolution also urged upon the Indian people to carry on movements to compel the India Government to act according to the anti-imperialist tradition of our people.

Com. Ghosh started with the distinctive features of Leninism. He said that Leninism was Marxism of the era of imperialism and of proletarian revolution. It meant that Lenin did not rest with what Marx and Engels had said or written; he developed their doctrine in accordance with the new conditions that developed in the phase of imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism. When someone develops some idea according to the new conditions, he contributes to the idea. Lenin, by developing Marxism in accordance with the new conditions of imperialism, had contributed to the general treasure of Marxism and thereby enriched it. He warned the audience that Marxism-Leninism "does not teach us to find directions and instructions for our problems in historical analogies and parallels. We must make concrete analysis of concrete condition, which is

the living soul of Marxism-Leninism, apply the general principles of Marxism-Leninism creatively according to concrete conditions. We must determine the ways and means of realising Marxism that best answer the situation."

Com. Ghosh then explained what the new conditions were which had developed in the era of imperialism, conditions which were absent in Marx's time. He referred to the five essential features of imperialism, namely, (1) concentration of production and capital, resulting in the creation of monopolies which played decisive role in the economic life. While dealing with this question he reminded the audience to realise that monopolists developed from among the national industrial section of the bourgeoisie and not from the comprador section of the bourgeoisie collaborating with imperialism and working as foreign imperialist agents. The growth and development of monopolies in a country would always mean the growth and development of national capital, relatively powerful national bourgeoisie. To speak of monopolists and regard them as comprador bourgeoisie collaborating with foreign imperialists and acting as their agents in the same breath would be to abandon Leninist position—Com. Ghosh emphasised. The other features of imperialism, he said, were (2) merger of bank capital with industrial capital and creation of financial oligarchy on the basis of this finance capital, (3) export of capital as distinguished from export of commodities, (4) formation of international trusts and cartels, international capitalist monopolies sharing the world among themselves. Com. Ghosh pointed out that only monopolists and not foreign imperialist agents, compradores, became partners, junior or senior, of these international trusts and cartels. And

(5) territorial division of the whole world among big capitalist powers for market for their finished goods and source of raw materials for their industries.

Com. Ghosh said that while pre-monopoly capitalism was, by virtue of its fundamental economic traits, distinguished by its relative attachment to peace, freedom, and democracy, imperialism, i.e., monopoly capitalism was, by virtue of its fundamental economic traits, distinguished by the least attachment to peace, freedom and democracy and by the greatest and universal development of militarism. He then explained why imperialism generated wars and established why the Leninist thesis of inevitability of wars was still valid in spite of development of peace forces and significant victories of peace movements in some cases. The validity of the law that imperialism generates wars did not presuppose that wars would actually break up, while had the thesis been invalid, wars would not have taken place, he emphasised. The very fact that local and partial wars had been breaking out in different parts of the world would prove the validity of this Leninist thesis.

Com. Ghosh then took up the question of economic dependence vis-a-vis the question of national states. Some Communists, like Rosa Luxemburg, contended that economic dependence and status as a sovereign national state stood poles apart. Fighting this wrong assumption, Com. Lenin pointed out that economic dependence had nothing whatever to do with the question of national state. Com. Ghosh drew the attention of the meeting to this Leninist teaching and asked it to judge the character of the Indian state in the light of this Leninist teaching particularly now when capitalism was assuming cosmopolitan character. He stressed the important

point that the national state was the form of state that was most suitable for the freest, widest and speediest development of capitalism under conditions obtaining at the time. It was a centralised modern state as distinguished from mediaeval pre-capitalist state of loose character.

Following the law of uneven development of capitalism propounded by him, Lenin came to the conclusion that victory of socialism was possible first in several or even in a capitalist country taken singly. Com. Ghosh explained how Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, of simultaneous revolutions in different countries by the victorious proletariat of one country, which essentially tantamounted to export of revolution, had nothing in common with Leninist teachings. He also elaborated how bourgeois-democratic revolution, according to the deepening of the revolution and in proportion to the strength of the organised proletariat passed on to socialist revolution without any further armed uprising of the masses against the state, if the former was achieved under the hegemony of the revolutionary proletariat, thereby showing an example of uninterrupted revolution. In countries where new democratic revolutions or people's democratic revolutions (which are nothing but bourgeois-democratic revolutions carried on under the leadership of the revolutionary working class) such non-capitalist way of development would be the general pattern of development. Com. Ghosh elaborately dealt with the question of new democratic or people's democratic revolution, in what way it differed from the old bourgeois-democratic revolution conducted by the bourgeoisie and where it would take place. He explained why the strategy

(Continued to page 3)

Czechoslovak Problem—Child of Soviet Revisionism

(Continued from page 2)

of people's democratic revolution was not applicable to India.

Other points discussed by Com. Ghosh in his illuminating speech related to the present-day international Communist movement and the situation in our country. Whatever might be one's position with regard to the ideological differences that divided the Communists on international plane, it could not be denied that the dispute had started with the establishment of Khrushchev leadership in the C.P.S.U. Com. Ghosh one by one pointed how under the pretext of fighting the cult of personality Khrushchev demolished the authority-concept of Stalin and in the name of developing Marxism-Leninism to conform to the necessity of present-day changed situation began to actually revise one by one all the fundamental teachings of Leninism, thereby opening the flood gate of modern revisionism. Theory of peaceful co-existence of different systems, which according to Comrade Ghosh, was one of the very many complex processes for preventing the imperialists from interfering into the internal affairs of other countries and accelerating the revolutionary course, had become at its hands capitulation to the imperialists. He illustrated the point citing the instances of what happened in Cuba, Vietnam and other countries. Similarly, the Khrushchevite theory of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism in the present circumstances, when imperialism was armed to the teeth and rabid militarism noticed among the imperialist powers, was nothing but building castle in the air. The inconsistency between the idea that the Leninist proposition that "imperialism inevitably generates wars is no longer valid in the changed present-day situation" on the one hand and on the other hand

surrender to US nuclear blackmailing on each and every occasion by the Khrushchevite leadership on the ground that opposing the USA would lead to thermo-nuclear war typically expressed not only the anti-Leninist policy but also capitulationist attitude of the Khrushchevite leadership of the C.P.S.U. born of pacifist illusion and unscientific war-phobia. Com. Ghosh said: "War, far less thermo-nuclear war, cannot be prevented by capitulation to the imperialists nor by pacifist illusion. Until total and general ban on production of all types of nuclear weapons is established in actuality and produced nuclear weapons are destroyed, the only way, in the prevailing conditions, to prevent thermo-nuclear war lies in constantly maintaining superiority of the socialist countries in nuclear power over the imperialist capitalist countries. Nuclear weapons in the hands of the socialist countries are now real guarantees for world peace. Preparation of nuclear weapons by China, which has been necessitated by the weak-kneed policy of the Khrushchev leadership in the face of open U.S aggression in Vietnam and other countries and constant threat of aggression against China must be looked upon as a factor for the preservation of world peace and not as a threat to independence and territorial integrity of any country, not excluding India."

About Czechoslovakia Com. Ghosh said that what had happened there was the logical consequence of the revisionist political line enunciated by Khrushchev and still followed by the present leadership of the C.P.S.U. If Dubcek had not refused to acknowledge Soviet authority perhaps nothing would have happened. But a process when started would move in accordance with its own law of motion regardless of the intention or wish of its

initiator. The revisionist process of so-called liberalisation and democratisation started by Khrushchev could not remain strictly bound within the limits drawn by him. Thus, the Czechoslovak problem was its own creation, the baby of the revisionist leadership of the C.P.S.U. for which none but the Soviet leadership would be primarily blamed.

Com. Ghosh said "We are not in agreement with those who hailed the Soviet action in Czechoslovakia as a correct step to protect the fruits of revolution. Nor do we agree with those who compared Soviet action with Hitler's aggression in Czechoslovakia. The Soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia had at least prevented the country from being another Yugoslavia or a hot bed of imperialist intrigues and war-preparation against the socialist countries in Europe. This good thing has been done. But this insignificant good thing has cost communism a lot. The Soviet action has tarnished the nobility of communism in the eye of the peoples who so long believed, and believed correctly too, that communism, unlike imperialism, never foists its own system on others by military intervention."

Com. Ghosh concluded that on basic questions he was in agreement with the Chinese views about the Soviet leadership. They were fundamentally correct. But that did not mean that every thing what China had been saying about the CPSU and the Soviet Union were correct. Citing a point of difference with the Chinese leadership Com. Ghosh said: "It is true that the Soviet Union has deviated from the socialist path in some respects. For example, it has introduced the system of profit; it has expanded the sphere of commodity production and commodity circulation; it

has been following a revisionist path, so on and so forth. These are undoubtedly deviations towards restoration of capitalism. But it will be too much to conclude from it that the CPSU has become a fascist party and that the USSR has become a Social-Fascist state, as the Chinese leadership is saying. We all know that there is a gulf of difference between possibility and actuality. A nodal point separates possibility from actuality. Possibility becomes actuality when that nodal point is crossed. There is certainly the possibility of the U.S.S.R. becoming a capitalist state, if the deviations are not checked in time and she goes on practising revisionism as at present. But there is no proof that the nodal point has been crossed. Chinese leaders have not established it by reference to facts. So it should not be concluded that the C.P.S.U. has already become a fascist party or that the Soviet Union a fascist state."

Com. Ghosh elaborately dealt with the national situation. He emphasised the essential necessity of concretising Marxism-Leninism on Indian soil for the success of the Indian revolution. Historical analogies and parallels would not help us to make our revolution successful, he said. He thoroughly brought to light the differences between pre-revolution Chinese condition and the present-day Indian situation and explained, on the basis of the concrete Indian situation, why our revolution would be a socialist revolution and not a people's democratic revolution as had been in China. Profusely quoting from Com. Mao Tse-tung, Com. Ghosh showed that pre-revolution China had mediaeval, pre-capitalist "localised agricultural economy instead of unified capitalist economy" and "national capitalism had not become

(Continued to page 7)

IN THE LIGHT OF THE

TRANSFER OF POLITICAL POWER AND INDIAN REVOLUTION

ECONOMIC DEPENDENCE AND NATIONAL STATE

On the 15th August 1947 political power had been handed over by the British imperialists to the leaders of the Indian National Congress in our country. Has this transfer of power any bearing on the stage of our revolution?

Lenin in his 'Letters on Tactics' had stated: 'Before the February-March revolution of 1917, the state power in Russia was in the hands of one old class, namely, the feudal landed nobility, headed by Nicholas Romanov.

"Now, after that revolution, the state power is in the hands of *another* class, a new class, namely, the *bourgeoisie*.

"The transfer of state power from one class to another *class* is the first, the principal, the basic sign of a *revolution*, both in the strictly scientific and in the practical meaning of the term.

"To this extent, the bourgeois, or the bourgeois-democratic, revolution in Russia *has been completed*.

"At this point we hear the clamour of the objectors, of those who so readily call themselves "old Bolsheviks": Did we not always maintain, they say, that the bourgeois-democratic revolution is completed only by the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry"? Has the agrarian revolution, which is also a bourgeois-democratic revolution, ended? On the contrary, is it not a fact *that it has not even begun*?"

Following the above analysis of Lenin we reach the following conclusion. Before 15th August, 1947, the state power in India was in the hands of one old class, namely, the British imperialists who were then ruling our country politically.

Now, after the transfer of

political power by the then British imperialist rulers of our country to the leaders of the Indian National Congress the leadership of which was in the hands of the national-reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie (according to the colonial thesis of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International) on the 15th August, 1947, the state power is in the hands of *another* class, a *new* class, namely, the Indian bourgeoisie.

This transfer of state power from one class to another class, according to the Leninist teaching quoted above, is the first, the principal, the basic sign of a revolution, both in the strictly scientific and in the practical meaning of the term.

To this extent, therefore, the bourgeois-democratic revolution in our country *has been completed*, even though almost the entire economic and social tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution still remain unaccomplished.

The present task of the Indian revolution, therefore, is to overthrow the present bourgeois state and concentrate state power in the hands of the revolutionary alliance of workers, poor peasants and other exploited masses of the people under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat. Since the overthrow of a bourgeois state by a revolutionary alliance of workers, poor peasants and other sections of exploited masses of the people under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat is the political task of a socialist revolution and since the political question determines in the main the character of a revolution, the Indian revolution in social character is a socialist revolution; the unaccom-

Is the Indian state a national bourgeois state? According to Marxism-Leninism, "the tendency of every national movement is towards the formation of *national states*." (Lenin. **The Right of Nations to Self-Determination**) It is a fact that the present Indian state is the result of the national movement conducted in our country under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie against British imperialism for national independence. Besides, the national state is

plished tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution are to be completed under the programme of this socialist revolution. The November Revolution was a socialist revolution, even though the unaccomplished tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution were completed after it, precisely because its aims were to overthrow the bourgeois state and concentrate political power in the hands of the proletariat and poor peasantry under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat.

At this point, as Lenin faced the clamour of objectors stated above, we too are facing questions from so-called communists: Can there be a socialist revolution before the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in any country? Has the agrarian revolution, which is also a bourgeois-democratic revolution, ended? On the contrary, is it not a fact that it has not even begun? Can there be a socialist revolution before the saturation of capitalism?

It is a pity that questions long since answered by no less a Communist than Lenin himself are still being raised by the so-called Communists in our country.

the form of state "in which it can best fulfil its functions (*i. e.*, the function of securing the freest, widest and speediest development of capitalism." (Ibid) It is also an undeniable fact that only after the establishment of the present Indian state conditions for the freest, widest and speediest growth of capitalism have been created in our country and that this form of state is most suitable for present-day conditions of the bourgeoisie (in our country). In the circumstances, the existing Indian state, no matter what limitations it suffers from, is undoubtedly the national state of the Indian bourgeoisie.

But the so-called Communists in our country refuse to recognise the present Indian state as a national bourgeois state on the ground of its alleged economic dependence on the powerful imperialist countries of the West. These gentlemen forget that in the present era when the bourgeoisie has thrown overboard the banner of complete national independence, when cosmopolitanism is appearing more and more as a feature of capitalist economy, investment of imperialist finance capital of one capitalist country in another capitalist country is the order of the day. Is it not a fact that, let alone backward capitalist countries, even an advanced capitalist country like Great Britain has become the plundering ground of U.S. finance capital? But for this economic dependence on the U.S.A. will any sane man say that Great Britain is not a national state of the British bourgeoisie? Besides, economic dependence has nothing to do with the

(Continued to page 5)

TEACHINGS OF LENIN

Can there be a Socialist Revolution before the completion of the Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution, before the Saturation of Capitalism in a Country

In 1921, on the occasion of Fourth anniversary of the November Revolution, Lenin said; "The immediate and direct aim of the revolution (the November Socialist Revolution—Editor, P. E.) in Russia was a bourgeois-democratic aim, namely, to destroy the relics of mediaevalism and abolish them completely. * * The last four years have completely confirmed the correctness of our understanding of Marxism on this point and of our estimate of the experience of former revolutions. We brought the bourgeois-democratic revolution to *completion* as no body has done before." (**Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution**)

Stalin said: "...the October Revolution accomplished the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the transfer of power to the proletariat, but did not immediately lead to a) the consummation of the bourgeois revolution in general and b) the isolation of the Kulaks in the rural districts in particular." (**Party's Three Fundamental Slogans on Peasant Problem**)

Thus, it is incontestable that the bourgeois-democratic revolution was not fully completed before the November Revolution which was a socialist revolution. So, if in Russia before the completion of the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the successful socialist revolution, the November Revolution, could take place and after the November Socialist Revolution the unaccomplished tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution fully completed, why cannot that take place in our country?

It is also an incontestable fact that before the November

Socialist Revolution capitalism did not saturate in Russia. Let alone saturation, capitalism there did not develop much. In any event the development of capitalism in Russia then was much less than the development of capitalism in India as at present. Russia was then "a country little developed in the capitalist sense at that"—this statement by Stalin (**the October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists**) testifies to the undeniable fact that before the November Socialist Revolution capitalism in Russia did not develop much, not to speak of saturating. Yet the November Revolution, which was a socialist revolution, did take place there. Why then there cannot be a socialist revolution even if capitalism has not saturated here when the immediate aim of our revolution is to overthrow the present Indian bourgeois state and concentrate state power in the hands of the revolutionary alliance of the workers, poor peasants and other exploited masses of the people under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat which is the task of a socialist revolution?

Did not Lenin reject as "old" the conception prevailing at the time of the November Revolution that "the rule of the proletariat and peasantry, their dictatorship can and must come after the rule of the bourgeoisie" (**Letters on Tactics**)? Did not Lenin ridicule those who said that the workers should not try to capture political power unless capitalism developed and workers were majority in the country? Did not Lenin for the same reason reject the then prevailing idea that revolution would break out in the developed capitalist

countries like Germany and not in backward Russia?

Lenin severely criticised those who advocated the theory that before the saturation of capitalism, before the level of development of productive forces reaches a high mark, there can be no socialist revolution. He said: "Russia has not attained the level of development of productive forces that makes socialism possible." The heroes of the Second International, including, of course, Sukhanov, are as proud of this proposition as a chicken that has laid an egg. They keep repeating this incontrovertible proposition over and over again in a thousand different ways, for it seems to them the essential consideration in determining the character of our revolution.

"But what if the peculiar situation drew Russia into the world imperialist war, in which every in any way influential West European country was involved; what if the peculiar situation placed her development in close proximity to the revolutions that were beginning, and had partially already begun, in the East; what if the peculiar situation enabled us to achieve the alliance of a 'peasant war' with the working class movements which no less a Marxist than Marx himself wrote of in 1856, in reference to Prussia, as one of the possible prospects?

"What if the complete hopelessness of the situation, by intensifying tenfold the energies of the workers and peasants, offered as the possibility of proceeding to create the fundamental requisites of civilisation in a way different from that of the West European countries? Has that changed the general

line of development of world history? Has that changed the fundamental relations between the basic classes of every state that is being drawn, or has been drawn, into the general course of world history?" (**Our Revolution**)

Is it not really surprising that the so-called communists in our country are chewing the cud which the opportunists at Lenin's time munched and repeating the same questions as were raised by the then Mensheviks?

ECONOMIC DEPENDENCE

(Continued from page 4)

question of national state. Opposing Rosa Luxemburg, who was then advancing this wrong theory of economic dependence, Lenin said: "To teach Kautsky with a serious mein that small states are economically dependent on big ones, that a struggle is going on between the bourgeois states for the predatory suppression of other nations, that imperialism and colonies exist—savours of ridiculously childish attempts to be clever for all this is a lot together irrelevant to the subject. Not only small states, but even Russia, for example, is economically entirely dependent on the power of the imperialist finance capital of the "rich" bourgeois countries. Not only the miniature Balkan states, but even America in the nineteenth century was economically a colony of Europe, as Marx pointed out in *Capital*. Kautsky and every Marxist, is well aware of this, of course, but it has nothing whatever to do with the question of national movements and the national state. For the question of political self-determination of nations in bourgeois society, and of their independence as states, Rosa Luxemburg has substituted the question of their economic independence." (**Ibid**) Will the pseudo-communists in our country take lessons from this analysis by Comrade Lenin?

Lenin on State, Revolution and Dictatorship of the Proletariat

Lenin said: "It is often said and written that the core of Marx's theory is the class struggle; but it is not true. And from this error, very often, springs the opportunist distortion of Marxism, its falsification to make it acceptable to the bourgeoisie. The theory of the class struggle was *not* created by Marx but the bourgeoisie *before* Marx, and generally speaking it is *acceptable* to the bourgeoisie. Those who recognise *only* the class struggle are not yet Marxists; those may be found to have gone no further than the boundaries of bourgeois reasoning and bourgeois politics. To limit Marxism to the theory of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something which is *acceptable* to the bourgeoisie. A Marxist is one who *extends* the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*. This is where the profound difference lies between a Marxist and an ordinary petty (and even big) bourgeoisie. This is the touchstone on which the *real* understanding and acceptance of Marxism should be tested. And it is not surprising that when the history of Europe brought the working class face to face with this question in a *practical* way, not only all the opportunists and reformists, but all the Kautskyists (those who vacillate between reformism and Marxism) proved to be *miserable* philistines and petty-bourgeois democrats who *repudiated* the dictatorship of the proletariat." (State and Revolution)

Every genuine communist knows that the fundamental problem of Leninism, its point of departure from Social-Democracy, is the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of

the proletariat is a state concept, the concept of proletarian state.

* * *

What is State? It is a "power which arises from society, but which places itself above it and becomes more and more alienated from it. What does this power mainly consist of? It consists of special bodies of armed men" (Ibid) as also of "material appendages, prisons and coercive institutions of all kinds of which gentile society knew nothing." (Engels. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*)

Has the State existed from eternity? "The state, therefore, has not existed from all eternity. There have been societies which managed without it, which had no conception of the state and state power. At a certain stage of economic development, which was necessarily bound up with the cleavage of society into classes, the state became a necessity owing to this cleavage." (Ibid) "The state is the product and the manifestation of the *irreconcilability* of class antagonisms. The state arises when, where and to the extent that class antagonisms *cannot* be objectively reconciled. And, conversely, the existence of the state proves that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable." (Lenin. *State and Revolution*)

Does the state conciliate class? "...the bourgeois ideologists, and particularly the petty-bourgeois ideologists, compelled by the pressure of indisputable historical facts to admit that the state only exists where there are class antagonism and the class struggle, "correct" Marx in a way that makes it appear that the state is an organ for the conciliation of classes. According to Marx, the state could neither arise nor continue to exist if it were possible to conciliate

classes. According to the petty-bourgeois and philistine professors and publicists—frequently on the strength of well-meaning references to Marx—the state conciliates classes. According to Marx, the state is an organ of class rule, an organ for the *oppression* of one class by another; it creates "order", which legalises and perpetuates this oppression by moderating the collisions between the classes. In the opinion of the petty-bourgeois politicians, order means the conciliation of classes, and not the oppression of one class by another; to moderate collisions means conciliating and not depriving the oppressed classes of definite means and methods of fighting to overthrow the oppressors." (Ibid)

Does universal suffrage in Bourgeois Democracy express people's will? "The forms of the bourgeois state are extremely varied, but in essence they are all the same: in one way or another, in the last analysis, all these states are inevitably the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie*." (Ibid) "The omnipotence of "wealth" is thus more *secure* in a democratic republic, since it does not depend on the faulty political shell of capitalism. A democratic republic is the best possible political shell for capitalism, and, therefore, once capital has gained control of this very best shell (through the Palchinskys, Chernovs, Tseretellis and Co.), it establishes its power so securely, so firmly, that no change, either of persons, of institutions or of parties in the bourgeois-democratic republic, can shake it. We must also note that Engels very definitely calls universal suffrage an instrument of bourgeois rule. Universal suffrage, he says, obviously summing up the long experience of German Social-Democracy, is "an

index of the maturing of the working class. It cannot and never will be anything more in the modern state." The petty bourgeois democrats..... all expect "more" from universal suffrage. They themselves share and instil into the minds of the people the wrong idea that universal suffrage "in the modern state" is really capable of expressing the will of the majority of the toilers and of ensuring its realisation." (Ibid)

"The bourgeoisie, of course, like to call elections conducted under such conditions "free", "equal", "democratic" and "popular" elections, because these serve to conceal the truth, serve to conceal the fact that the means of production and political power still remain in the hands of the exploiters and that therefore there can be no thought of real liberty and real equality for the exploited, *i.e.*, for the overwhelming majority of the population. The bourgeoisie finds it advantageous and necessary to *conceal* the bourgeois character of modern democracy from the people and to depict it as democracy in general or as "pure democracy"; as the Schidemanns, and also the Kautskys in repeating this, *in fact* abandon the point of view of the proletariat and desert to the bourgeoisie." (Lenin. "Democracy" and Dictatorship)

For proletarian revolution is forcible destruction of bourgeois state necessary? "...the Kautskyan distortion of Marxism is far more subtle. "Theoretically", it is not denied that the state is the organ of class rule, or that class antagonisms are irreconcilable. But what is lost sight of or glossed over is this: if the state is the product of irreconcilable class antagonism, if it is a power standing

(Continued at page 7)

REVOLUTIONARY TEACHINGS OF COM. LENIN

(Continued from page 3)

the principal social-economic form" in China before the revolution whereas in India national capitalism had not only become the principal social-economic form, had not only developed but has developed highly, giving rise to *monopolies* and finance capital, achieving merger of industrial capital and finance capital, establishing supremacy of finance capital. Com. Ghosh cited that several years back about Rs. 100 crores of Indian finance capital was exploiting the South-East Asian and Middle-East countries. Not only that Indian capitalists had emerged as junior partners of international trusts and cartels, establishing beyond any doubt that the "ruling bourgeoisie here is not comparador bourgeoisie." India was on the process of emerging as an imperialist country—he concluded.

Com. Ghosh said that "the fundamental question of every revolution is the question of state power", as Lenin put it. The position in this respect was also different. China before revolution had a mediaeval loose state, not a centralised modern state. China was divided into different spheres of influence of different foreign imperialist powers which supported the various cliques of old and new warlords having their own armies, fighting with one another and sometimes against the central administration at Nanking. This central administration too was on paper only; parliamentary ideas and institutions were yet to grow and take root in the country. Could there be any comparison with India in these respects? asked Com. Ghosh. India had a modern centralised type of state like that in the West, with centralised administration, relatively highly developed system of communication, parliamentary ideas and institutions having taken deep root among the

people. In fact, the task of the Indian revolution, said Com. Ghosh, was to overthrow the bourgeois national state and concentrate state power in the hands of the revolutionary alliance of workers, poor peasants and other exploited masses of the people under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat. The political task of overthrowing a bourgeois state and capturing state power by the revolutionary alliance of workers, poor peasants and other exploited masses of the people under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat was the main political task of a socialist revolution under the programme of which the unaccomplished tasks of bourgeois-democratic revolution were to be completed. Com. Ghosh reminded the audience that this main political question and not the immediate economic programme determined, in the main, the social character of the revolution. He cited the example of the November Revolution in Russia in this connection.

In conclusion Com. Ghosh dealt with the concept of a Leninist party, a genuine Communist Party. He explained why the S.U.C.I. was a real revolutionary working class party. He explained why the C.P.I.(M) and the C.P.I. were not real Communist Parties. These parties were taking the character of national parties. Communists were internationalists, he reminded the people. He said that the C.P.I.(ML) was a misguided political force even though it had many a sacrificing militant worker in it. Militancy alone would not do. For, even fascists were militant. Militancy must be mellowed with revolutionary teachings. He appealed to all to make the S.U.C.I. strong by all possible means.

With slogans like "Long Live Revolution", "Long Live Leninism", "Long Live S. U. C. I.", "Long Live Comrade Shibdas Ghosh", reverberating in the silence of the Maidan, the meeting came to an end at about 10 at night.

LENIN ON STATE, REVOLUTION

(Continued from page 6)

above society and "increasingly alienating itself from it", it is clear that the liberation of the oppressed class is impossible, not only without a violent revolution, but also without the destruction of the apparatus of state power which was created by the ruling class and which is the embodiment of this alienation?" (Lenin. State and Revolution)

"One thing specially was proved by the Commune, viz. that the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes,"

(The Communist Manifesto)

"The proletarian revolution is impossible without the forcible destruction of the bourgeois state machine and the substitution for it of a new one which, in the words of Engels, is no longer a state in the proper sense of the word." (Lenin. Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky)

Is peaceful transition from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy possible now? It is true that Marx had conceded the possibility of the peaceful evolution of bourgeois democracy into proletarian democracy in certain countries, like Great Britain and America. He had good grounds for conceding it in the seventies of the last century when monopoly capitalism did not yet exist and when these two countries had not yet developed bureaucracy and militarism. Lenin in answering this question said: "Kautsky, the 'historian', so shamelessly falsifies history that he forgets the fundamental fact that pre-monopoly capitalism, which reached its zenith in the seventies of the nineteenth century, was, by virtue of its fundamental economic traits (which were most typical in England and America) distinguished by its relative attachment to peace and freedom. Imperialism, i. e.

monopoly capitalism, which finally matured only in the twentieth century, is, by virtue of its fundamental economic traits, distinguished by the least attachment to peace and freedom, and by the greatest universal development of militarism everywhere. To "fail to notice" this in discussing the extent to which a peaceful or violent revolution is typical or probable is to stoop to the position of a common or garden lackey of the bourgeoisie." (Ibid)

* * *

How long will the dictatorship of the proletariat be necessary? "The essence of Marx's doctrine of the state is assimilated only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a single class is necessary not only for class society in general, not only for the proletariat which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but for the entire historical period between capitalism and "classless society", communism. * * The transition from capitalism to communism will certainly create a great variety and abundance of political forms, but in essence there will inevitably be only one: the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Lenin. State and Revolution)

"Only in communist society, when the resistance of the capitalists has been completely broken, when the capitalists have disappeared, when there are no classes, i. e., when there is no difference between the members of society as regards their relation to the social means of production, (when through re-education and re-moulding in proletarian culture individual interests have completely identified themselves with social interests—this perhaps should be added; Editor, P. E.), only then does "the state cease to exist" and it "becomes possible to speak of freedom." Only

(Continued to page 8)

HISTORIC MAY DAY CELEBRATION AT ROURKELA

(By a Staff Reporter)

Rourkela, (10th May.)—A big May Day mass rally and meeting attended by about 2000 people from all walks of life was organised under the joint auspices of Rourkela Workers' Union and the Sundergarh District Committee of the S.U.C.I. Comrade Tapas Dutta presided.

The meeting was addressed by Comrade N. C. Roy, member of All India Steel Workers' Co-ordination Committee and Comrades B. Jena, Sk. Kasim and A. Rout Roy, local leaders of the Sundergarh Committee of the S. U. C. I.

Comrade N. R. Singh, member of the Bihar State Committee of the S.U.C.I., who was the main speaker of the meeting, in his lucid and spirited speech highlighted the great significance of the May Day and reminded the working people, of their revolutionary task and urged upon them to rally round the S.U.C.I., only genuine revolutionary working class party in India, in order to fulfil their long cherished emancipation form all sorts of exploitation,

economic, political, social and cultural.

He urged upon the working people of the country to thoroughly shun the pseudo-Marxists like the C. P. I., C. P. I.(M), C. P. I.(ML) etc. which not only will not lead the Indian working people in the path of revolution but, because of their petty-bourgeois class-character, are sure to betray the cause of the revolution and thus the emancipation of the working people will remain ever unrealised.

Among others, the meeting adopted resolutions demanding of the government to declare the May Day a paid holiday for the workers, to revise the pro-U.S. policy with regard to Vietnam and Cambodia and set pressure on the Nixon administration for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of U. S. troops from these countries, to set up one steel plant in Orissa under the 4th Plan and to pay need-based minimum wage calculated according to the norms fixed by the 15th session of the Indian Labour conference to the workers of the H.S.L.

US Aggression in Cambodia—Delhi Protest Rally

(By a Staff Reporter)

Delhi (14th May)—Local students and youths organised under the Delhi units of the Democratic Student's Organisation and the Democratic Youth Organisation staged a demonstration to-day in front of the United States Information Service in New Delhi in condemnation of the naked US aggression in Cambodia.

The demonstrators assembled at Tikona Park and therefrom marched towards the USIS shouting slogans, like "US war-mongers, Hands off Indo-China", "Down down Yankee Imperialism" and carrying placards bearing "Imperialism inevitably generates Wars", "Bankrupt US

economy starting Local Wars to stave off Crisis", "Resist US export of armed Counter-revolution", etc.

An effigy of Nixon with "Nixon the Murderer" written on its breast was subsequently burnt before the USIS and a resolution adopted at a meeting at Tikona Park was handed over to an American official of the Information Service.

Read

THAJILALI JUGAM

Malayalam Organ of Kerala State Organising Committee of S U C I.

SUCI Fighting Two Assembly Seats in By-Elections in Haryana CPI(M) Openly Working for the Congress(R) Candidate

(By a Staff Reporter)

On the 7th of June next two by-elections—one from the Julana Constituency and the other from the Bahadurgarh Constituency—to the Legislative Assembly of Haryana will take place.

The Socialist Unity Centre of India has started its work in Haryana only very recently, but at the request of the poor people it is contesting in both the constituencies. The support for its candidates, which is forthcoming, seems to be quite satisfactory, particularly in view of the very short period of its activities in the state.

From the Julana Constituency apart from Com. Bharat Singh, S. U. C. candidate, four other candidates are contesting. While in the Bahadurgarh Constituency S. U. C. candidate, Com. Jaykaran, is fighting the Congress (O) and the Congress (R) candidates.

LENIN ON STATE & REVOLUTION

(Continued from page 7)

then will really complete democracy, democracy without any exceptions, be possible and be realised. And only then will democracy itself begin to *wither away* owing to the simple fact that, freed from capitalist slavery, from the untold horrors, savagery, absurdities and infamies of capitalist exploitation, people will gradually become accustomed to observing the elementary rules of social life that have been known for centuries and repeated for thousands of years in all copy-book maxims; they will become accustomed to observing them without force, without subordination, without the special apparatus for compulsion which is called the state." (Ibid)

The Jan Sangh is backing the Congress (O) whereas the C.P.I.(M) is working for the Congress (R) in Bahadurgarh. The open support by the C.P.I.(M) to the Congress (R) in this Constituency where there is only one Left Candidate has exposed the real character of the C.P.I.(M) to the democratic forces and elements in Haryana. It has once again established that, notwithstanding its lip service to Leftism and criticism of the C.P.I. for support to the Congress (R), the C.P.I.(M) too is toeing the same political line of supporting the Congress (R) in practice, making it crystal clear that the 'fire-eating' C.P.I.(M) has little political difference with the revisionist C.P.I.

GLEANINGS FROM LENIN

(Continued from page 1)

aims more comprehensive and bold at such a time, so that their slogans are always in advance of the revolutionary initiative of the masses, serving as a beaconlight, revealing to them our democratic and Socialist ideal in its magnitude and splendour, and showing them the shortest and most direct route to complete, absolute and decisive victory." (Two Tactics of Social Democracy in Democratic Revolution)

"The bourgeoisie needs lackeys whom a section of the working class could trust, and who would paint in fine colours, embellish the bourgeoisie with talk about the possibility of the reformist path, who would throw dust in the eyes of the people by this talk, who would divert the people from revolution by depicting in glowing colours the charms and the possibilities of the reformist path." (Tasks of the Third International)

MARXBAD O SANSKRITIK ANDOLAN

by Shibdas Ghosh

Price Rs. 3.00

Available at : PATHIKRIT
88/B, Bepin Behari Ganguly
Street, Calcutta-12.