

ANALYSIS OF SPLIT IN CONGRESS—A GLARING TESTIMONY OF BANKRUPTCY OF CPI & CPI(M)

The split in Congress, the ruling party of the Indian bourgeoisie, which so long served the interest of the national bourgeoisie and consolidated its rule over the toiling masses, is a significant event in the Indian political scene. There is no doubt that the broad section of the toiling people would watch with great eagerness this event of split in the Congress party, specially because, the Congress had hitherto suppressed the democratic movements and gagged the democratic voice of the people. People had a bitter taste of Congress misrule for more than two decades. As a result of Congress regime, the economic position of the labouring masses has further deteriorated, the problem of unemployment among the rural and urban population has further deepened, illiteracy, social insecurity and other basic problems of life of the common people are far from being resolved. Contrary to this, there is another picture where there has been further concentration of economic and political power in the hands of the ruling capitalist class, democratic rights of the people have been more ruthlessly curtailed, bureaucratic administration and militarism are increasingly being depended upon and have become the mainstay of the present reactionary ruling clique.

In the background of such records of Congress which all through since independence acted against the interests of the broad section of the masses, it is natural that the split in Congress which means the split in the most dependable political party of the ruling bourgeoisie is all the more welcome to the people. Congress itself has been divided into two groups, namely, the Congress (O) and the Congress (R). The ruling Congress which controls the Central Government headed by Mrs. Indira Gandhi has outwardly taken a radical posture and is raising a storm to defeat the reactionary policies of the Syndicate group. Its measure of nationalisation of 14 major Indian banks is a pointer in this direction. No doubt the progressive pledges of Mrs. Indira and some such measures as bank nationalisation have created a lot of confusion (thanks to the ideological struggle of the so-

called big communist parties) not only in the common mass mind but also in the minds of those who belong to the left camp. Leaving aside those who keep themselves aloof from political cross-currents, even those who are 'progressives' and call themselves as 'Communists' have been easily roped in by Indira's progressive plumage. Both CPI and CPI(M) have unequivocally extended their support to Indira (although the two parties have some difference in their revolutionary vocabulary) for her so-called progressive move and even regard the fight her party is waging against the Syndicate group as a fight between reaction and progress. The political thesis of CPI and its various resolutions leave little confusion in the minds of the pro-communist political cadres that it is building up a close alliance with the democratic section of Congress, now

(Continued to page 4)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Editor-in Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 4
No. 1

AUGUST 15, 1970
SATURDAY

PRICE
20 P.

15th AUGUST

PEOPLES' LIBERATION PLEDGE DAY

On 15th August 1947 political power was transferred by the British imperialists to the leaders of the Indian National Congress. This event signifies the political independence of our country in spite of the fact that the broader masses of the Indian people have not achieved the objective for which they struggled against the British imperialists. Broader masses of the Indian people fought for the complete emancipation from the yoke of all sorts of exploitation—political, economic, social and cultural and for their unhindered development in all spheres of life. In spite of political independence, this aspiration of the people has not been fulfilled. On the contrary the present Indian state has appeared as a great stumbling block for realising the same in their life. As such, in spite of political independence, peoples' liberation is yet to be achieved and this is why SUCI has been observing 15th of August as peoples' liberation pledge day.

No body can deny that our society is class divided. The existence of the exploiter and the exploited class (broadly speaking) is an objective reality. All the working people of India, the manual labour and the intellectual labour belong to a definite category, i.e. all of them are nothing but wage earners and they have no other alternative but to sell their labour power and thereby earn their livelihood. The means of production through which this wealth is being created is not in their possession also. They only sell their labour power which is utilised for the creation of wealth. On the

other hand there exists another class which owns all the means of production. Through the exploitation of the labour power of the working class the propertied class accumulates profit. In the cities there are the owners of the factories and the workers and employees and in the villages there are the Jotedars and the poor, the landless peasantry and agricultural labourers. Indian society is thus divided, in the main, into two opposite camps. In this class divided society the connotation of independence is different, to the exploiter and the exploited class. There can not be any common

(Continued to page 2)

Reformist Oppositional Role of Indian Bourgeoisie in Nationalist Movement

(Continued from page 1)

meaning of independence both to the exploiter and the exploiting class. To the exploiter class, independence means the freedom to plunder the resources of the country, ruthlessly exploiting the labouring people and to earn maximum profit and to the exploited class it means their emancipation from the yoke of all sorts of exploitation.

In the Indian independence movement both the national bourgeoisie and the exploited masses participated. Though these opposite classes came to a common anti-British platform their objective was diametrically different. The exploited masses struggled against the British rulers as they came to realise that unless the exploiting British rulers are driven out, they would not be able to establish a society in which the exploitation of the capitalists and the feudal lords would end and the foundation of all out development of the society would be laid. On the other hand the national bourgeoisie participated in the nationalist movement with a view to replace the British rulers to exploit the national market with cheap raw materials and labour, for freest, widest and speediest development of capitalism. Due to the failure of the emergence of a genuine revolutionary working class party the leadership of the nationalist movement was captured by the national bourgeoisie. At that time those who professed to be communists did not only fail to provide leadership to the nationalist movement but on the country, backstabbed it, thus lowering the nobility of communism in the eye of the Indian people. In the present epoch of imperialism

and proletarian revolution, bourgeoisie have lost all their revolutionary fervour and turned counter-revolutionary as a world social force. Besides, unlike in Western countries where capitalism grew and developed independently, capitalism in India grew and developed under the subjugation of foreign finance capital encircled by feudal relations. Moreover the impact of soviet revolution on the Indian people was tremendous. As a result the Indian bourgeoisie who were in the leadership of the nationalist movement were mortally afraid of revolution, as they were quite conscious that in a revolutionary upsurge not only the British rulers but the Indian exploiter class as a whole will also be overthrown. It was because of this fear complex of revolution, Indian bourgeoisie played reformist oppositional role. They compromised with imperialism and feudalism. With a view to capture power from the British imperialists Indian bourgeoisie waged struggle against them along with the Indian people but the moment this struggle took the turn towards a revolutionary upsurge this leadership intervened to check it and tried to get concessions from the imperialists through pressure. On the other hand as a result of compromise with feudalism the Indian bourgeoisie did not carry out the tasks of social and cultural revolution, essential for democratising the Indian society. Thus Indian people speaking different languages and professing different religions, in the course of conducting political movement have become a nation politically but for the failure of the Indian bourgeoisie to wage uncompromising struggle against feudal culture, feudal disunity etc. during the

nationalist movement, the task of democratising the Indian society is still unaccomplished. As a result, Indian people though politically a nation are disunited by religion, language, caste etc. Though it may sound curious, still it is a fact that those who professed themselves as Communists never incorporated these tasks of social and cultural revolution in their programme of democratic movement. But it is known that these unaccomplished tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution can never be fulfilled by the national bourgeoisie in the present epoch of decadent imperialism and proletarian revolution and it is the working class who must uphold this banner for completing these unfinished tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution. But the role of CPI as well as of CPI(M) exposes their callous indifference to these essential tasks of completing the social and cultural revolution. They are claiming that their sphere of influence is expanding but side by side it is found that the spread of degenerated culture, increase of religious ceremonies and the features like aimless desperateness, purposeless violence and the like of the rotten bourgeois culture are engulfing our whole social life. "Kali Mai Ki Jai" and "Inquilab Zindabad" can peacefully co-exist without any prick of conscience to the cadres of these left parties. With the increase in sphere of influence as is being claimed by CPI and CPI(M), is it not expected that the impact of newer revolutionary proletarian culture will be gradually felt in the society? But what is found is that the rotten degenerated bourgeois culture, the culture of the bourgeoisie in the era imperialism is rapidly gaining ground. This only proves the

utter bankruptcy of these left parties.

After the transfer of power, Indian bourgeoisie has been trying to consolidate their position through capitalist planning. Even at that time when Government of India was embarking on planning with the blessings of all the parties including the undivided CPI, SUC cautioned that these plannings were meant for the consolidation of Indian capitalism. Moreover our beloved leader and teacher, Com. Shibdas Ghose said at that time that these plannings were associated with a shadow of crisis. Due to crisis in international capitalist market in one hand and the growing pressure of unemployment within the country on the other, the national bourgeoisie are not in a position to introduce radical agrarian land reform. It is because of this, the purchasing power of the people is abnormally low and this is why the major problem of capitalism is to maintain the stability of capitalist economy. This stability can not be maintained without artificial stimulation. The ruling class, as such, has raised a hue and cry over national security in order to provide a ruse for increasing defence expenditure which will provide stimulation to the capitalist economy. Though the majority of the Indian people are half-fed, ill-clad and undernourished, a colossal amount of money has got to be diverted in defence to maintain the super profit of the capitalist class and at the same time to increase the military power to crush the revolutionary movement. In order to crush the consequent resentment of the people against this ruthless exploitation, the ruling class is relying more on bureaucracy and militarism and one by one

(Continued to page 6)

Protest Meetings and Demonstrations Against US Aggression in Indo-China

(By a Staff Reporter)

DELHI

Under the auspices of the Delhi State Organising Committee of the SUCI more than two hundred persons held a demonstration on 20th July last before the USIS office on Sikandara Road in protest against US aggression in Indo-China.

The demonstration was organised to commemorate the 19th anniversary of the signing of the Geneva agreement of 1954 on Vietnam as also to express firm solidarity of the Indian people with the people of Vietnam.

The demonstration burnt an effigy of US President Nixon. In a resolution handed over to an official of the USIS they condemned the barbarous war of aggression carried on by the US rulers violating all humanitarian norms and canons of established international law. It also condemned the Pro-US Vietnam policy of the India Government and demanded that the Government should recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and effectively move so as to compel the USA to imme-

diately and unconditionally withdraw its troops and satellite troops from South Vietnam. It further condemned the attempts by the stooges of America working in our country who are trying to spread confusion among the people about the heroic fighters of Vietnam.

The SUCI with a rally also participated at the reception given to Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, Foreign Minister, Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, at Sapru House by Delhi Citizens Council on the same day. It is strange that some of organisers of the reception tried their best to avoid the SUCI by not inviting our Party to attend the function. This sectarian attitude of these persons was foiled by our active participation in the reception ceremony.

KERALA

Quilon (20th July, 1970)—Today the Quilon District Committee of the SUCI organised a public meeting here to observe the Vietnam Solidarity Day. Red Flag badges were distributed to the workers and students throughout Quilon on this occasion.

Com. Natarajan, Secretary of the Quilon District Committee of the SUCI, who presided over the meeting, in his address discussed the history of the liberation movement in Indo-China, particularly in Vietnam, and its revolutionary significance for the preparation of world proletarian revolution. He criticised the present Soviet leadership for its capitulationist policy before nuclear blackmailing by the US imperialists in the name of pursuing the policy of peaceful co existence

of socialist and capitalist systems and for not rendering real effective help to the national liberation movement going on in Indo-China for giving early defeat to US aggression. Com. James, who was the main speaker of the meeting, condemned the pro-US Vietnam policy of the India Government and demanded that it should without delay recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and establish full diplomatic relations with the Democratic

Republic of Vietnam. He called upon the people to force the India Government by pressure of mighty mass movements to effectively move for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all US troops and of US satellites from Indo-China. In course of his speech he

showed the non-working class non-revolutionary character of the CPI, CPI(M) and the CPI(ML) and requested the people of Kerala to help the SUCI, the only *real Communist Party* in India led by Com. Shibdas Chosh, its General Secretary, by all means to make it organisationally stronger.

ASSAM

On the occasion of the 16th anniversary of the 1954 Geneva Agreement on Vietnam the Assam State Committee of the Democratic Students Organisation and Democratic Youth Organisation jointly held a public meeting at Gauhati on 20th July last. The meeting was presided over by Com. Indu Bhomick.

The meeting adopted a resolution which demanded that the India Government must revise its pro-US Vietnam policy, declare the USA as aggressor in Vietnam, Laos

and Cambodia and recognise the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam immediately. It called upon the people to set up pressure on the India Government for moving for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of US troops and satellite troops from South Vietnam. Besides the President, Comrades Kantimoy Dev, Sambhu Chakraverty and Vedamata Chakraverty also spoke. After the meeting a procession paraded the main streets of Gauhati shouting anti-US slogans.

ORISSA PEOPLE DEMAND SECOND STEEL PLANT

(By a Staff Reporter)

Normal life in Orissa was completely paralysed as a result of the Bandh on 27th July last organised by the all-party *Ispat Karkhana Sangram Samiti*. The Bandh is unprecedented in the history of the state.

Orissa should have another steel plant. There are good ground for it. Firstly because, the mineral reserves are enormous. A leading member of the geological Survey of India estimated about 20 years back that there might be as much as one-third of the total undeveloped mineral wealth of India. Secondly because, according to the opinion of the expert committee appointed by the Central Government itself, a second steel plant in Orissa would cost the state 30 per cent less than what it would cost, if it is set up in any other state. Thirdly because, Orissa being an industrially very very undeveloped state, to remove regional imbalance, a second plant should be established in Orissa, which would provide employment to some of the huge number of unemployed youths in the state.

But the Central Government has turned down most unjustly the reasonable claim of Orissa for a second steel plant. Com. Tapas Dutta, Secretary, Orissa State Committee of the SUCI, in a statement has thanked the people of Orissa for their all-out response to the call of the Bandh but urged upon them to realise at the same time that a protracted mighty mass movement would be necessary to wrest the demand of a second steel plant from the unwilling hands of the Central Government for which thousands of volunteers must be enlisted and people's committees, people's own organs of struggle, formed at all levels of the country. Unless the Bandh is followed by this organised mass movement to compel the India Government to concede the demand, the second steel plant in Orissa would remain as elusive as before.

BUILD UP UNITED FRONT OF LEFT AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES

(Continued from page 1)

represented by the breakaway group of Congress (R) on a national scale. As regards the CPI(M), it also in a similar manner, like CPI, has welcomed Indira for her bold 'progressive' steps and also hailed Giri's victory in Presidential election as indicating victory of democratic aspirations of the people. Like the CPI, the CPI(M) also does not lag behind in hobnobbing with the Congress (R) and this position of theirs is further affirmed in their various C. C. resolutions, and in actual practice even. In spite of their indictment and outward bitterness against Indira Government, their revolutionary phrase mongering and exercise in 'class struggle' and unceasing denigration of CPI for its pro-Indira stance, there is sufficient evidence that the CPI(M) also is sailing on the same boat with the CPI deeming Indira as a progressive force. In the Central Committee resolution of CPI(M), published in People's Democracy dated 15th February, it is said "...The Indira Gandhi wing also contains within its fold a healthy trend which hates big landlords and monopolists. Despite the support its leaders seek and receive from the foreign monopolists and Indian reactionaries, it has raised certain slogans and taken certain measures which are in tune with the anti-monopoly democratic aspirations of the people."

Our party on the other hand on the basis of correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism did not fail to analyse the contradiction within Congress, and clearly stated that it was a contradiction, not between a reactionary and a progressive section of the bourgeoisie or in general terms,

between reaction and progress, but a contradiction between the conservative section of the bourgeoisie representing the particular interests of the individual monopolists and a so-called radical section of the bourgeoisie representing the aggregate interest of Indian capitalism. Our party does not make any basic distinction between Indira-group and Syndicate group in so far as their class content is concerned and is also conscious of the nature of the contradiction that obtains at present between the two groups. Both these groups represent in their policies and actions the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie as a whole. In characterising the differences within Congress, the Central Committee of our party headed by our beloved leader and teacher Com. Shibdas Ghosh in its resolution on bank nationalisation has stated "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. *** In a capitalist state when the bourgeoisie takes recourse to nationalisation 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."

Both CPI and CPI(M) have a different outlook and created an impression of 'progressiveness' about Indira Congress for her radical posture. Both these parties find in the struggle of Congress (R) against the Syndicate group and its allies the struggle of the non-monopolist section of the bourgeoisie against the monopolist section or the struggle of the anti-imperialist progressive national bourgeoisie against the pro-imperialist comprador section of the Indian bourgeoisie. But such an analysis of these so-called Marxist-Leninist parties is wrong. First of all there is no such antagonistic contradiction between the monopolist and the non-monopolist section of the bourgeoisie. The non-big bourgeoisie has no basic difference with the big bourgeoisie so far as the class motive and class alliance are concerned. The medium and small bourgeoisie also strive to become monopolists themselves but in this process, the existing monopolists put in difficulties for their overriding control over administration and economy. So this conflict is not of any fundamental nature or that between reaction and progress, but conflict between two sections of the same homogeneous class, the national bourgeoisie. This conflict is confined within the constitutional limits and flows out of the mutually opposed economic interests which exist between individual bourgeoisie or different sections of the bourgeoisie. But this does not disturb their basic class unity and as regards the question of working class movement and other democratic mass struggles, they sink all their differences within themselves and put up an united face against their opposite class. It is also

not true that the nationalisation of banks is an anti-monopolist drive of Indira for giving protection to the small and medium industrialists. The state owned banking and other financial institutions, only helped to establish further control of the monopolists over the national economy, brought into being a coalescence of state capital and monopoly capital, thereby giving birth to state monopoly capital and always acted as a subservient instrument to the already developed monopolists. So the measure of bank nationalisation by itself, cannot be taken as a progressive step. It, no doubt, resembles the democratic demand of the people, which was raised for imposing restriction on speculative activities of the monopolists, mobilization of resources for development work, and also ultimately to establish quicker control over the entire national resources after the capture of state power by the working class. But in actuality, through this move, Indira's Congress had altogether a different motive to fulfil. As stated earlier this would only secure the position of monopolists and firmly lay the rock bottom foundation of fascism. Unless the progressive forces, and specially those claiming them as communists, expose this inherent class motive which Indira follows in her so-called forward steps, then the toiling masses would be misled, would harbour illusion about Indira's 'progressive' move and keep themselves aloof from the immediate task for developing revolutionary organisations in the country. But both CPI and CPI(M) along with a host of other left progressive forces have committed this mischief to the people.

Consequent on the split in Congress, a characteristic feature has developed in the Indian political scene. The trend for combination of all the extreme right reactionary

READ

মার্কসবাদ ও সাংস্কৃতিক আন্দোলন (Marxism & Cultural Movement)

by Com. Shibdas Ghosh

Price—Rs. 3'00

To be had from—PATHIKRIT OFFICE

88B, Bepin Behari Ganguly Street, Calcutta-12.

forces was there before the split, but this trend is almost taking a distinct shape now. Our party, viewing such a political development cautioned the big left forces, namely the CPI and CPI(M), and tried to persuade them to form a united front of the left parties on the basis of an agreed minimum programme on the eve of fourth general election. But the big 'revolutionary' parties were then busy making electoral alliance with the communal

OPPOSE RIGHT REACTION

and other arch reactionary forces in different states without having any programmatic basis and did not respond to this call. Then again, on the question of Presidential election, our party alone fought for sponsoring a left candidate, which would at least have created a left environment nationally, and helped to consolidate the left forces on the basis of a concrete programme, understanding and outlook. But this too was not given any serious consideration by them.

The communists in our country very often make an analogy with Russian or Chinese revolution in analysing our society. In this context it should well be borne in mind that the stable parliamentary system, like the western type of bourgeois democracy which is in vogue in India was neither present in Russia nor in China before revolution. In Russia the Duma institution was a loose type of democratic apparatus and restricted in character. In China there was total absence of any bourgeois democratic institution. Had there been any such well established parliamentary system in China, then the Chinese Communist Party according to Mao-Tse-tung would have participated in the democratic system, and organised and conducted the democratic movements till the ripening of conditions necessary for a revolutionary upsurge in that soil. But

the situation in our country is completely different. As the nature of parliamentary democratic system we are facing today in India, was present neither in Russia nor in China, the communists here cannot overlook the fact that in spite of severe weaknesses, a stable parliamentary system for a long period has been functioning in India. It would be wrong to conclude that the present instability of Government in different states and weakness in the position

of Central Government have developed an attitude in the minds of the Indian people to reject the present parliamentary system. What is evident and real is that the people have become more frustrated and lost faith in the political parties in general which form the Government. But it is oversimplification to read this frustration of people as their rejection of prevailing parliamentary democracy. In order to explode the myth of parliamentary system and unmask its hollowness to the people, the communists here have to organise and develop widespread militant mass movements on legitimate democratic issues, constantly try to free these movements from the influence of petty-bourgeois, social-democratic parties, and establish the revolutionary objective in the minds of the broader section of the masses. Without taking upon this arduous task of organising the masses and educating them in revolutionary ideology, and concretely analysing the situation obtaining here, but simply to copy the revolution in other countries or parrot the teachings of other Communist Parties, is nothing even scarcely resembling Marxism-Leninism.

Almost all the political parties (excepting the Naxalities) in India which are known as communist and profess Marxism-Leninism as their guiding philosophy admit

that for the successful completion of the revolutionary tasks of the Indian proletariat and other toiling masses it is premature to give call for seizure of power from the hands of the existing ruling class. To give an immediate call for seizure of power, would not only be a folly, but would cause a tremendous setback to the growth and development of the revolutionary forces in the country. In order to develop the revolutionary movement, a revolutionary party cannot bypass the present democratic phase of mass struggle but should actually organise and develop these struggles to higher and higher pitch, and unite the various sections of the toiling masses by means of ever intensifying legitimate democratic movements. A revolutionary party also conducts these struggles in such a way that the broad masses which are still under the influence of various social-democratic, petty-bourgeois, parliamentary parties can be won over and organised for fulfilling the revolutionary objective. On the one hand a broad democratic front with the forces which have still certain role in the democratic movements is organised and on the other hand, a fierce ideological struggle is launched by the revolutionary party to expose the actual class character of the allied forces in the front.

Expose Radicalism of Ruling Congress

A revolutionary party adopts this complicated process of struggle, as it is only thus it can increase its influence over the masses both ideologically and organisationally by giving a militant character to the democratic mass struggles, accelerate these struggles, make the masses conscious about revolutionary ideology and ultimately establish its leadership over the broader section of the toiling masses guiding them to revolution. So the parties which really stand by the working class and want to liberate the toiling

people from the yoke of capitalist exploitation cannot avoid the essential task in this phase of democratic movement, for building up a strong united democratic front of left and democratic parties, directed against the main class enemy. A revolutionary party also knows that the principle which should govern the relationship between the constituent forces in the democratic front is unity-struggle-unity. If there is no unity, the democratic forces become disunited, the struggles are weakened and the reactionary circles take the best advantage of it. The oppression on the people becomes more ruthless and there is no effective resistance against it. If, however, there is no ideological struggle within the democratic front, the pseudo-left and pseudo-revolutionary parties can never be exposed, and the masses under its influence freed from a reformist illusion. Taking the advantage of the lack of political consciousness of the masses, these parties very often pass on as truly 'progressives' and even 'revolutionaries' simply by throwing some militant slogans and programmes. In order to defeat this usual tactics of every social democratic party, which essentially serves the capitalist class but poses itself as pro-working class and pro-people, a revolutionary party while maintaining unity of the

democratic front, cannot but constantly expose their real character on every political issue.

Mr. Nizalingappa's scheme of 'grand alliance' with all the 'national and democratic parties' and specially with Swatantra and Jan Sangh, the two arch reactionary and pro-American imperialist forces, has temporarily suffered a setback, due to severe objections from the members of Congress (O). Although this alignment between ultra-reactionary forces has not

(Continued to page 8)

Help SUC in every possible way to achieve peoples' liberation

(Continued from page 2)

encroaching upon even the relative and limited democratic rights enjoyed by the people.

For the emancipation from the yoke of exploitation, the exploited masses must be freed from Parliamentary illusion. It has got to be realised that peoples' liberation cannot be achieved through reforms in Parliament. Parliament as an institution has been evolved in a bourgeois state to serve the interest of the capitalist class. So it will be futile to expect that the capitalist society can be radically transformed through reforms in Parliament which has evolved as a superstructure of the given capitalist economic base. It is to be borne in mind that the bourgeoisie also carry out reforms which are in conformity with their class interest. As such reforms which breed reformism will help the bourgeoisie to prolong their misrule by creating confusion in the mind of the people. Parliament, can, however, be used by the revolutionaries to unmask the hollowness of the dictum of the reformists. But for liberation of the people the present bourgeois state machine has got to be smashed through revolution and as the bourgeoisie is armed to the teeth to crush the revolutionary upsurge of the working class for the establishment of socialism, this revolution can not but be violent.

Now without a genuine working class party, there can't be any revolution, nor can there be emancipation of the people. The existence of so many parties professing to be Marxist-Leninist creates confusion. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that there can not be more than one real revolutionary working class party in a country. As such most of the parties professing Marxism-Leninism are in

reality forces of compromise between capital and labour. Since inception SUCI has been maintaining that the undivided CPI was a non-working class party as the process of formation of the party with the existence of various groups within the party was incompatible with a working class party. The present CPI and CPI(M) also suffer from the same defects. Their non-working class outlook in all their approaches and particularly in determining the stage of Indian revolution through concrete analysis of the present Indian society only reflects the utter petty bourgeois character of these parties. Notwithstanding revolutionary vocabulary and more militant postures than the CPI, CPM

In the issue dated July 15, last Com. Shiv Shankar of Basulpur in Muzaffarpur district of Bihar was reported to have been arrested by Bihar police. He has not been arrested. A warrant of arrest has, however, been issued. The error is regretted. (Ed.—P.E.)

has also been exposed as a typical parliamentary party. The use of administration and police for sectarian petty party interest, increasing police budget, certifying the police force as people's police, dependence on bureaucracy and police report by the CPM ministers in the last UF ministry in West Bengal, certificates by the Birlas, the general manager of Hindusthan Steel Ltd. and Mr. Dhavan to CPM are some of the instances which conclusively prove the utter non-working class character of CPI(M). Moreover in the present stage of democratic movement in India where the reactionary forces are sweeping, a really revolutionary party must strive for a broad based unity of the left

and democratic forces. But the recent happening in West Bengal clearly shows that CPM strikes at the very root of democratic unity to serve their narrow partisan end. These are only a few instances to show the non-working class character of CPM notwithstanding their revolutionary phrasemongering.

As regards the Naxalites this is to be pointed out that these youngmen are wasting their revolutionary zeal in a misguided way. Moreover the Naxalites have also inherited all the defects including groupism from their parent body. Their non-working class outlook in determining the stage of revolution, the focal point in any revolution and their left adventurism only show that that they are also pseudo-revolutionary. Hence arises the necessity of a genuine working class party which can concretise Marxism-Leninism on Indian soil to lead the Indian people to revolution and socialism. It is to be borne in mind that without concretisation of Marxism-Leninism on Indian soil, Indian revolution is impossible. In Russian soil Com. Lenin concretised Marxism and in China it has been done by Com. Mao-Tsetung. As such the struggle for this concretisation of Marxism-Leninism is very vital. SUCI is the only party that is correctly striving for the same and the analysis of SUCI, headed by its leader and teacher Com. Shibdas Ghosh on various national and international issues have been proved to be correct. The correct stand of SUCI on various issues and its able leadership to the working class have made deep imprints in the minds of the leftist masses. But yet organisationally, SUCI is not in a position to lead the people to socialism. As such

Letter to the Editor

Sir,

In Frontier issue dated July 4, 1970, in the article entitled 'Between the Lines' by N. K. Singh some facts relating to Sino-Indian border dispute have been mentioned. The writer of the article contends that these facts have been obtained in course of a conversation which he had with Pandit Sundarlal, the noted Gandhian philosopher. I am quoting below some relevant portions of this article.

"The Sino-Indian boundary runs along 2600 miles. At some places Indian and Chinese maps show differences thus creating about 50,000 square miles of disputed area. It should be noted that the Chinese maps were prepared by the Americans during the Chiang Kai-Shek regime while those of India were done by the British imperialists at a time when both Americans and British were competing in the power race taking Asia as their happy hunting ground. It is natural that both prepared their maps in line with the old imperialist expansionist policy. Out of these 50,000 square miles of disputed area, 12,000 was under Chinese occupation, 20,000 sq. miles was no-man's land and the remaining 18,000 square miles was under Indian occupation.

"The Chinese Premier Chou En-lai proposed to meet Mr. Nehru in India and decide the matter. The meeting took place at Delhi in 1960. Though the talks lasted six days, Mr. Chou En-lai declared on the very third day that there was a jungle of claims and counter-claims and the matter could

(Continued to page 7)

people must come forward to help and strengthen SUCI, the only real working class party of India, for achieving the complete liberation of the Indian people, from all sorts of exploitation—economic, political, social and cultural.

Durgapur Workers resent posting of Industrial Security Force

The management of the HSL has been carrying on slanderous propaganda against the workers for quite some time with regard to production, discipline, etc. in order to use it as a plea for carrying on repressive measures against democratic movement by the Durgapur Steel Plant workers. It has appointed Industrial Security Force at Durgapur Steel Plant and has already allowed the CRP to be posted there.

As a protest against this undemocratic measure by the management Com. N. Sarker, on behalf of the Durgapur Contractors' Mazdoor Union, has issued the following statement:—

"The Durgapur Contractors' Mazdoor Union strongly condemns the appointment of Central Industrial Security Force within the steel plant by the management of the HSL on the alleged ground of security. This is a deliberate attempt to curb the trade union rights of the workers and restrict legitimate democratic movements by them. We want to sound a note of caution to the management that this undemocratic measure will be resisted by the workers by all possible means.

"The Union at the same time vehemently protests against the stationing of the Central Reserve Force within West Bengal in general and at Durgapur in particular. This Force has been acting as an instrument for suppressing democratic movements of the workers, poor peasants, students, youths and other sections of the people and harassing innocent persons.

"The Union cannot but condemn the slanderous campaign which the management is carrying on against the workers of the Durgapur Steel Plant. For fall in production the workers are not responsible. Defective and obsolete machinery installed at Durgapur, still more bad technical management leading to breakdown of

and serious damage to equipments and plants for forcible increased production, huge stock of finished articles due to absence of market coming in the wake of economic crisis, etc., to mention only a few factors, account for the present low production. Refusal to implement agreements on the part of the management has been causing just unrest among the workers. Any impartial public inquiry will establish all the points.

"The Union urges upon the management to desist from carrying on anti-labour campaign, correct their own faults and mend the defects in the Plant if it wants to improve the situation."

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

(Continued from page 6)

not be decided easily by producing just a vast and varied amount of materials and documents. Since such boundary problems were natural enough between two neighbours, he proposed that the matter should be decided on a 'give and take' basis. China offered that out of the 50,000 square miles of disputed area, India might have 38,000 square miles while China would keep the remaining 12,000 square miles i.e. Aksai Chin which was under Chinese occupation at the time of the talks."

But this proposal was turned down. Thereafter "China gave a new proposal. She would give 12,000 square miles from her own territory

Kundara Sub-Station Treatment Yard Fashioning Workers in Kerala force employer to concede demand

(By a Staff Reporter)

The Fashioning workers of Kundara Sub-station Treatment Yard went on strike under the leadership of the SUCI when the contractor by whom the workers have been employed refused to make payment of wages to the workers and stopped work.

The workers were agitating for revision of wages according to the cost of living. The justness of the demand of the workers can be seen from the fact that when the NMR workers of the KSEB, the principal employer, was getting Rs 1.45 per day as wage, the Fashioning workers under the contractor was getting Rs 2.45 daily. Now the NMR workers are getting Rs 9.00 per day but the fashioning workers only Rs 4.50. Besides, as every one knows, the contractors' men do not get the facilities which the direct employees are entitled to under various labour laws, like leave, holidays, overtime, security of service etc.

It is to be noted that the

established parties functioning in Kerala and the labour unions controlled by them have not so far moved to remove the long-standing just grievances of the workers. At last, though SUCI is a new party in the state and has started functioning only recently, the workers approached us and led by Com. Thomas struck work and gheraoed the contractor. The Police rescued the contractor. But the undaunted workers marched to the police station and demanded settlement of their wages and guarantee of work. In the face of the organised movement by the workers, the contractor was forced to concede to the demands.

instead of the 12,000 square miles of Aksai Chin. Thus India was going to get a total of 50,000 square miles." But this proposal also was turned down. "It was decided that neither of the two parties would enter into the no-man's land (20,000 square miles). But on October 12, 1962, Nehru declared that he had issued instructions to the army to clear out the Chinese frontier guards from what he termed invaded areas. On October 14, the then Defence Minister Mr. Krishna Menon called for a fight to the last man and the last gun against China. China warned India three times against violating the agreement and intruding into the no-man's-land. But quite a few divisions under the command of Lt. Gen. B. N. Kaul were deployed."

The facts show that the Sino-Indian border dispute could have been settled

amicably and honourably. But the Indian ruling class did not do it for reasons best known to them. May be the motive for not settling the dispute by the Indian ruling capitalist class was to take advantage of the situation, create war psychosis by exploiting the patriotic feeling of the people, develop its military might (whose ultimate aim is to crush the revolutionary movement of the people against the Indian capitalist class) and also to tide over the severe economic crisis of market from which the capitalist economy is suffering by means of an artificial stimulation of increased defence budget and military production. Be that as it may it was certainly not in the real interest of the people. It is high time that the Sino-Indian border dispute should be settled and for that an immediate dialogue with China should be opened.

Ardhendu Sen
Calcutta.

Mobilise all Forces to Defeat GRAND ALLIANCE

(Continued from page 5)

assumed any concrete shape even now, yet we cannot negate the possibility of emergence of a right reactionary alliance in full force in future. An interesting feature, however, is discernible in the policies and programme of Jan Sangh. Although a strong communalist party, and a rank hater of communism, it has adopted some social democratic programme in its economic resolution like nationalisation of all foreign banks, ceiling on urban property, provision of employment to all able bodied persons etc. It is quite obvious that such an alteration in their economic policies does not change their basic anti-people position but primarily aims at hoodwinking the masses regarding their real ties with the vested interests, both national and foreign.

It is true that in the present circumstances, the radical position of Indira with whatever might be inherent in this position, should be properly utilised by the revolutionary and other democratic forces in the country. We cannot lose sight of the fact that due to the impact of the democratic movement and Congress (R)'s dependence on the support of the leftist M.P.'s in the Parliament, there has been a certain shift in the home and foreign policy of Congress (R). This is for the first time that in the history of Congress since independence, the ruling party has openly declared the U.S. Government as aggressor in Cambodia and demanded withdrawal of its troops. So long Indira maintains this position and continues her fight against Congress (O), Swatantra, Jan Sangh combine, the leftist forces can take advantage of this contradiction, and consolidate their position in Indian politics. It would be a tragedy and black reaction will sweep over the country, if due to internal weakness in the leftist camp and if the leftist forces fail to

utilise the situation in favour of democratic struggles by a concrete analysis of the present role played by Indira and her party, the Congress (O), Swatantra and Jan Sangh, the extreme right reactionary camp gets hold of the administration of the country. It is our view that the reactionary alliance of Congress (O), Swatantra and Jan Sangh, the rabid anti-Communist and conservative parties, poses the most formidable and immediate danger to the prospect of developing democratic and revolutionary movements in the country. To the extent Indira is opposing these forces and depending upon the leftist M.P.'s in the Parliament, the left parties can utilise her position for weakening this reactionary alliance. But even while utilising the Congress (R), we cannot be oblivious of the fact that fascism in a capitalist country grows not out of conservatism but out of social democratism. The conservative parties can at best bring about naked military dictatorship, but not fascism. It is the social democratic parties like Indira's Congress, which by virtue of its radical posture, can win the confidence of the masses and establish fascism. So, in order to take advantage of the contradiction between the Indira group of Congress and the Syndicate group, strong united militant mass movements should be organised to set up pressure on Indira for carrying out democratic reforms and at the same time, the people must be made conscious of the fascistic tendencies which are inherent in the social democratic character of Indira Congress.

But notwithstanding this danger which Indira poses in the long run, it would be the height of folly and rank opportunism if by the action of some leftist parties, the hands of the extreme right reaction are more strengthened, for that would mean ruthless curtailment of democratic rights, even suspension of parliamentary democracy and imposition of military rule. The advocates of 'people's democracy' are

LENIN BIRTH CELEBRATION

Com. Banerjee appeals to Assam people to Build up SUC

(By a Staff Reporter)

Under the auspices of the Assam State Committee of the SUCI, two public meetings were held—one in Shillong and the other in Gauhati—on the 8th and 10th of August last in connection with Lenin birth celebration. The meetings were well-attended.

Com. Subodh Banerjee, who was the main speaker, began by saying that Lenin did not parrot what Marx and Engels had said or written. On the contrary, he made concrete analysis of the concrete condition obtaining in the era of imperialism of his time and thereby developed and further enriched Marxism. It is because of it that Stalin had defined Leninism as Marxism of the era of imperialism and of proletarian revolution. He said that Marxism-Leninism would provide with the general guiding principles only, which had to be applied differently to different countries according to concrete conditions of different countries. Concretisation of Marxism-Leninism i.e., integration of the general guiding principles of Marxism—Leninism with the actual practice of the revolution in a given country was a precondition for the victory of

the revolution, he added.

While dealing with the Indian situation Com. Banerjee again emphasized on the essential necessity of concretising Marxism-Leninism on our soil, pin-pointed the fundamental differences between present-day Indian situation and pre-revolution Chinese situation. He, by the way, mentioned the correct Leninist process through which and through which alone could a real Communist Party develop and explained why the parties moving in our country with the name, Communist, like the CPI, the CPI(M) and the CPI (ML), were not real Communist parties. He concluded his speech by appealing to the people of Assam to make the SUCI strong by all means.

The two meetings were addressed among others by Com. Ashit Bhattacharya, Secretary, Assam State Committee of the SUCI.

never tired of opening broadsides against the revisionist Dange clique for their hobnobbing with the Indira ruling group. We, of course, do not approve CPI's political line and their alliance with the Congress (R), and will strongly oppose any move on the part of any left party to form a coalition Government with the Congress (R) or make electoral adjustment with them at present. But the CPI(M) also like the CPI is behaving as a typical parliamentary party, the only difference being, it constantly sings the hymn of "revolution". In order to put pressure on Indira and break her alliance with the CPI, it can even go to the extent of joining hands with the arch reactionary parties, to bring downfall of Indira Government. If support to Indira by CPI is a reactionary step, would not the opposition of CPI(M) to Indira Government along with Congress (O), Swatantra and Jan Sangh for bringing no-confidence against Indira and thereby objectively helping at this stage the growth of right reaction, be a more reactionary move from the point of view of democratic struggles and the working class movement?

In conclusion the parties

which really want to build up the working class movement and liberate the masses from all sorts of exploitation, should immediately come forward for the formation of an united front of all left and democratic parties on a national scale on the basis of an agreed minimum programme. Apart from the necessity to effectively counter the move of the extreme right reactionary forces to gain ground in Indian soil, such an united action on various issues of all left and democratic forces is necessary to make best use of Indira's present position and gain concessions from her for fulfilling popular democratic demands. Furthermore, to maintain unity and fighting zeal of the democratic people organised within this front, it is also an essential task to conduct ideological struggles within this front, on the basis of unity against the main class enemy, for keeping the democratic movements alive and free from both right deviation and left sectarianism. It would also be a crime on the part of the left parties, not to expose ideologically, the inherent danger of fascism in Indira's social democratic measures and keep the people unguarded about it.