

NOVEMBER REVOLUTION SPECIAL



*Proletarian
Era*

Proletarian Era

(Organ of SUCI)

NOVEMBER SPECIAL, 1980

“.....The proletarian who is not conscious of the idea that his class must be the leader, or who renounces this idea, is a slave, at best he is a slave who fights to improve his condition as a slave, but not one who fights to overthrow slavery.”

— Lenin

In this issue :

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh
on

- Some Aspects of Lessons of November Revolution
- Working class Movement

Editorial

Great November Revolution

Ten days that shook the world sixty two years ago heralded the first successful proletarian revolution—the Great November Revolution. It was the, revolution through which a working class state was born for the first time. It signified the historic task of accomplishing proletarian revolution in this era of moribund capitalism for the onward march of humanity. It was a fitting rebuff to bourgeois calumnies that the toiling and oppressed people are condemned to wage slavery and degradation and that they cannot hope to seize the state power and run the country's affairs. The Great November Revolution proved in concrete terms that the proletariat can break the chain of capitalist exploitation provided they have a revolutionary party that educates them with revolutionary theory and leads their struggle on a correct revolutionary base political line and on the edifice of higher proletarian culture and ethics. The lessons, this epoch making revolution provide, have meaning only to those who have been able to translate those into concrete actions in the concrete situation of their soils. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the great teacher of the proletariat, drawing the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, founded our party, SUCI and trained it up in all aspects to lead the proletarian revolution in our soil. SUCI alone provides the revolutionary theory encompassing every aspect of people's life as also the correct base political line of anti-capitalist Socialist Revolution. It calls upon the oppressed people not to pin their hope in the deceptive path of parliamentarism-legalism but to develop, instead, their own political power in the concrete shape of revolutionary People's Committees down to the lowest level on the firm footing of proletarian ethics and morality. Powerful democratic movements alone with the clear-cut direction of anti-capitalist revolution can give birth to this alternative political power of the people. And this alone can lead the people and the society to the cherished goal of emancipation.

Today, when the bankrupt bourgeois social order is tottering at its legs, the crisis-ridden bourgeoisie seeks frantically to defend it by mounting offensives against the people from all directions. Unbearable economic burdens, fratricidal caste and communal strifes, unbridled police atrocities and savageries of anti-socials, shocking degradation of basic human values and morals—all rolled into one, makes people's life a veritable hell. Unable to solve the crisis, the ruling parties are bringing down most authoritarian laws and measures with the hope of containing people's resistance by them. The social-democratic parties, true to their character, are working as the last prop of defence of moribund capitalism by trying to confine people's resentments within parliamentarism-reformism. At such a critical juncture, it is our party, SUCI that alone holds aloft the banner of struggle and people's emancipation. It has taken the bold initiative of organising the exploited people into mighty waves of democratic mass movements. It urges upon the people to realise that it is only by the strength of powerful democratic mass movements that they can defeat the bourgeois conspiracy of fostering all out fascism in the country. Therefore, no course is left open to them other than to join and strengthen the democratic mass movements that our party, SUCI has initiated. The all-important lesson of November Revolution carries this message to them.

Long Live Revolution !
Long Live SUCI !
Long Live the revolutionary thoughts of
Comrade Shibdas Ghosh !

“.....Revolutionary politics is itself an all-embracing struggle which grows only by integrating political, economic, social and cultural movement. It is possible to conduct the proletarian revolutionary movement correctly only when we can achieve this integration. Without the emergence of the political power of the workers and peasants and formation of people's own revolutionary organisations, the instruments of struggle cannot be built up despite hundreds of militant struggles”.

—Comrade Shibdas Ghosh
 ‘Why SUCI is the only Genuine Communist Party in India’

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

on

Some Aspects of Lessons of November Revolution

Marxism is not economic determinism

Lenin showed that with the overthrow of Nicholas Tsar from state power, the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution in Russia was attained. Politically, after the February Revolution there, in place of Nicholas Tsar, that is, in place of an old class, a new class, the Russian bourgeoisie had assumed the state power. Lenin, of course, knew that from economic aspect many of the tasks of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution remained unfulfilled till then in Russia. In the rural economy, despite infiltration of capitalism, feudalism still continued to exist as a powerful force. Economically, subjugation or subservience to imperialism and financial oligarchy of the rich European capitalist countries was very much marked till that time.

...Lenin made no mistake on those points. That is why Lenin never characterised the then state of Russia as a bourgeois-Tsarist state headed by the big bourgeoisie. Rather, it is he who pointed out that the state power in Russia, after the February Revolution had passed on from the old class i.e. Nicholas Tsar to a new class, the Russian bourgeoisie. What do we find therefore? It is evident, therefore, that in determining the stage of revolution the fundamental question is at the hands of which class is the state power.

...Those in our country who even at the slightest trace of feudalism in economy characterise our revolution as Bourgeois Democratic or National Democratic and say: how can we reach the stage of Socialist Revolution by a leap without completing the tasks of Bourgeois Democratic Revolution. November Revolution has left a valuable teaching for them. Those in our country, who are still thinking or pleading in a way, failing to understand the teaching of November Revolution, in tune with the leaders of the Second International, the Mensheviks, the Socialist Revolutionaries and even the confused section of the Bolsheviks at the time of November Revolution are, in reality, practising economic determinism which is alien to Marxism-Leninism and dialectical materialism and which refuses to accept the dialectical relationship of politics with economy.

...Lenin said that since politically the main question of revolution was connected with the question of seizure of state power—hence the moment the Russian bourgeoisie had captured the state power by overthrowing Nicholas Tsar, that is, a new class had assumed the state power in place of the old one to that extent and in that sense the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution was completed and Russia had entered the stage of Socialist Revolution.

Reactionary role of bourgeoisie at this stage of moribund capitalism

...In the present era of moribund capitalism when world capitalism had entered the stage of imperialism and turned out and out reactionary than the bourgeoisie as a class in all the countries, including those colonial countries which were in the phase of national freedom ceased to be revolutionary which it was as a class during the eighteenth or nineteenth century. For, the bourgeoisie of these countries are nothing other than part and parcel of international reactionary bourgeoisie....

...If the leadership of the freedom struggles remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie and if the working class cannot paralyse the instability of this class—instability i.e. sometimes making compromises with imperialism and sometimes fighting it, sometimes raising slogans against feudalism and sometimes making compromises, now coming to battle fields and again making dialogue through the backdoor, making compromises, sometimes remaining with the masses, supporting their radical slogans and sometimes coming in direct opposition to those—and fail to establish in its place their own leadership, they cannot give defeat to these double-faced policies and the national freedom movement cannot attain its logical culmination, it will end in half-baked, truncated way.

Muddle of 'three stage' revolution

...Now suppose, the bourgeois democratic revolution proceeds to some extent under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. Then it is found not proceeding a step further and that without the leadership of the working class it is impossible to complete the incomplete phase or remaining part of the bourgeois democratic revolution or even to successfully pursue the revolutionary programme of that phase in any

way. Then it is clear that the strategy and tactics to be adopted by the working class in completing the remaining part of the bourgeois democratic revolution under its leadership must be different from the strategy and tactics followed by the bourgeoisie, in providing leadership to the earlier part of the bourgeois democratic revolution. But from the perspective of the phase of social revolution the entire period belongs to a single phase—the phase of bourgeois democratic revolution.

...As these anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks remained unaccomplished before the November Socialist Revolution, as the November Revolution declared the programme for their completion and raised slogans on them, many confused it just as the revolution to accomplish the unaccomplished tasks of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution. Stalin replied to them—no, the November Revolution was surely a Socialist Revolution to that extent and in so far as the fundamental political question was concerned, that is to say, it was a revolution for overthrowing the bourgeoisie, and capture state power by the proletariat. And as the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution that still remained unaccomplished in the economic field they were incorporated as the derivative tasks or byproducts within the main programme of Socialist Revolution after the seizure of power by the proletariat. Till these tasks were completed, the Bolshevik Party had to raise these demands of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution, rally the support of the whole of the peasantry and had to continue this, not only before and during the November Revolution or immediately after it but even after the Constituent Assembly was dissolved in 1919.

...If we judge from this standpoint, then, in India, after its attainment of independence and the bourgeoisie coming to the state power—even if we do not understand well

the character of agricultural production and the land relation as they obtain at present but understand this much that the Indian state is trying to consolidate Indian capitalism, it would be obvious then that this is an independent national state. And in the terminology of Marxism-Leninism, a national state does not mean a semi-colonial semi-feudal state but means a bourgeois national state. And a bourgeois national state, according to Lenin, is nothing other than a capitalist state. So, the revolution to smash that capitalist state machine is the revolution to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power and to that extent and in that sense the Indian revolution will be a Socialist Revolution.

Under whatever pretext, under whatever cover of so-called theory, those who are bypassing this fundamental question, are, in fact, diverting the attention of the people to unnecessary details and are creating confusion on the base political line of Indian revolution.

...They have miserably failed to grasp the point from Marxist dialectical methodology. They contend, how can the stage of revolution be skipped over! And as it cannot be skipped over, so they add one more stage of revolution in between. For them, therefore, the stages of revolution are no longer the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution and the Socialist Revolution only. There is yet another stage of revolution, 'any intermediary' in between the two—which they name People's Democratic Revolution!

In this People's Democratic Revolution the progressive role of the national bourgeoisie is recognised. The advocates of People's Democratic Revolution do not intend to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power. They aim at overthrowing those whom they call the monopoly bourgeoisie.

...Without the rule of capitalism monopoly capital cannot wield state power. From any knowledge of Marxism, nobody can come to a conclusion contrary to this.

...To say that there is domination of monopoly capital and it is to be overthrown but to call the national bourgeoisie, at the same time, an ally of revolution means, in reality, denial of the existence of the bourgeois state itself and refusal of the fundamental task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie through revolution.

Real Meaning of advocacy of People's Democratic Revolution in our country

...If they consider that our revolution is People's Democratic then whatever slogans they may raise from platform speeches, however 'militant' struggles, they may conduct, it is sure that from the very class alignment of their People's Democratic Revolution, they will develop a sympathy for and unity with the rich peasants in the villages. Consequently, the peasant's movements they conduct, will inevitably come under the firm grip and influence of the rich peasants. To assume Indian revolution to be People's Democratic will lead them either to hobnob with the rich peasants this way or that way or to make adventure. This will not serve any purpose. Rather by this, the class struggle of the poor and landless peasants and the agricultural labourers against the rich peasants who are the mainstay of capitalism in the rural economy, will be weakened and the interests of the poor and landless peasants and the agricultural labourers will be sacrificed at the feet of the rich peasants. On the other hand, based on their fanciful theory of People's Democratic Revolution, on the assumed existence of progressive national bourgeoisie somewhere, they will be in search of them among the social

highups who are, in fact, the pillars of capitalism and by this the party and its leaders will inevitably develop and maintain close tie with them. May be behind the screen but happen it must.

Three Essential Tasks Before the Revolutionary workers

...To fulfil the task of revolution you must learn three things at a time.

First, you will have to study Marxism-Leninism thoroughly and deeply and do it not for acquiring just the knowledge of Marxism-Leninism in general. Remember realisation of Marxism-Leninism does not mean mere memorising the general and universal theories of Marxism-Leninism as propounded by Marx, Engels or Lenin. You must learn how to apply the general teachings of Marxism-Leninism in the concrete political situation of India and also how far, to what extent and on what specific questions it needs further enrichment, elaboration and concretisation. You will have to clearly understand exactly where and how revolutionary Marxism differs from pseudo-Marxism, sham-Marxism or revisionism. You shall also have to concretely learn and realise, at the same time, where lies the difference in angularity, approach and tactical line between the genuine revolutionaries and the sham-Marxists, even though their slogans and programme of movements may at times appear identical.

...By ideology we do not mean, therefore, some jargons borrowed from outside and some high sounding words. Sense of ethical values and culture, morals and principles of movement, sobriety and decency of character—ideology connotes all this.

...Secondly, you must be courageous, determined and prepared for supreme sacrifice.

Thirdly, you must have political initiative, must always be in the forefront and keep your initiative constantly alive. It means, you never lag behind in taking initiative.

...Keeping individual initiative at the fore and ensuring more and more the democratic style of functioning and style of work mean, in actuality, to consolidate centralism and not to counterpose or weaken it at all. It is all the more needed for freeing centralism from the evil effects of mechanisation and bureaucratic tendencies, developing efficiency of all cadres and for proper utilisation of all the resources at command. Its ultimate object, on the other hand, is to bring the collective efficiency of the party as a whole to a new height by improving the individual efficiency of each and every member and on the other, to go on strengthening centralism by conducting relentless struggle against bureaucratic tendencies.

Revolution—come it must

...How soon will come the change—it all depends on you. How soon will come the revolution, depends on how much time you will require to develop people's alternative political power in the concrete forms of revolutionary councils and people's committees like the Soviets through unitedly conducting movements organised on the correct base political line and ideology and under the leadership of real revolutionary party of the proletariat. But remember, you can never achieve revolution through deception, through shouting of slogans only, through tricks in the ballot boxes. You can achieve revolution only when you have been able to give birth to people's own political power on the basis of correct base political line and ideology and under the leadership of a genuine revolutionary party of the proletariat.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh On Working class Movement In India

[With the accentuation of crisis in the country's moribund capitalist productive system at an alarming pace, the bourgeoisie, aided and assisted by bourgeois and social democratic parties, are trying to pass the entire burden of the crisis on to the shoulder of the working people, crushed under the burden of galloping inflation and mounting taxes. In order to obstruct the growth of organised resistance of the working people against the autocracy of capital, draconian measures of blanket ban on strike and other forms of democratic movements in the shape of Essential Services Maintenance Ordinance, National Security Ordinance etc. have been brought in and are being put to effect, on the one hand, and on the other, a 'consensus' of 'left' parties is being evolved for voluntary surrender of workers' weapons in the interest of crisis-ridden capitalist economy.

The bourgeoisie as also their aides of various hue, have simultaneously let loose various heinous propaganda against the working people, accusing them for fall in production, 'indiscipline' so on and so forth. The outcries of 'produce or perish', 'law and order', 'national interest' etc. the pet jargons of the bourgeoisie are being echoed and re-echoed from the mouths of monopolists' spokesmen down to CPI(M)'s Chief Minister in West Bengal and other spokesmen—all with the single purpose of advising the working class and its movement to meekly submit to worst kind of slavery, in deference to the wishes of the ruling capitalist class, however abominable and intolerable it may be.

The social democratic leadership of the 'left' trade unions have let down the vital cause of the working class at this crucial hour by their shameful treachery and deception; they have trampled under foot all their tall talks of promise only to bargain for parliamentary power and pelfs. When the very rationale of organised trade union movement is under severe attack, when its distinct role of defence of workers' hard won rights and requirements is being tried to be negated, we appeal to working people to go through the revolutionary teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the great leader of the proletariat so as to draw not only a great inspiration but also to equip themselves with necessary ideological-political training and education, essential for meeting the challenge that faces them now. We reproduce portions of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's speeches, on working class movement, delivered on different occasions. Most of the portions have been rendered in English from Bengali, by us. The responsibility for any deficiency and shortcomings, therefore, will lie with us]

—Editorial Board, Proletarian Era,

Long history of trade union movement

.. The history of trade union movement in India is a long one. Various big central trade unions led by the rightists as well as by so-called revolutionary forces have grown since long. There have been ebbs and tides in the movement—sometimes advancing in strides and sometimes retracing a few steps. But what is worth noticing is the over all character of workers' movement as it stands today after all these years of struggle. Workers' movement started in our country, to be precise, since 1920. Many strikes have been organised since then.

Not for nothing these unions have been formed. Existence of these unions implies that there have been occasional struggles on various demands and in fact, many struggles have been organised. You have been fighting for long to get your demands realised. That you have the spirit to sacrifice and the capability to conduct struggle, you have demonstrated many a time. But after all these years, your condition remains basically the same as before—there has not been any significant change. That is why, even today, the worker has still no job security. He does not get a just wage for his labour for the wealth it creates. A band of parasites lives in pomp and grandeur on the wealth his labour creates. And it is they who wield power and influence and they are the 'honourable' men!

Indian Society—a class divided one

When we say that the Indian society is a class divided one, many may think that it is a fashionable talk of the Marxists-Leninists, or an invention by them. That the Indian society is not a unified whole, nor the country a unified nation and that it is divided into classes, is no invention of the Marxists. Indian toiling people, common men, from manual labour at the

lowest rung to intellectual labour constitute a distinct strata, a distinct class. They are not the owners—the wealth that is produced in the country as also the means of production by which it is produced—they own none. They only sell their labour, the labour that is engaged in production, operates the productive system, creates profits that are amassed into the hands of the owning class.

Law and order and prevailing concept of social justice based on exploitation of labour

....Those who produce, subsist somehow. But there is the other class, the capitalists, the owning class—those who own the means of production mills and factories, trade and commerce, fields and mines. The structure of law and order has developed in our country on the basis of social sense of justice subsuming the rights of the capitalist class to run mills and factories, fields and mines, trade and commerce is based on private property relation that is, the right to expropriate personal profit.

That is why those who oppose the legitimate struggle of the workers against the oppression of the owning class, the capitalists either do not know or deliberately hide the sordid tale of savageries and tyrannies that lie hidden behind the origin of private property and ownership.

Even today, the rational approach has not grown in the country which takes into cognition the fact that it is the toiling people, the teeming millions whose labour has created the wealth, the civilisation—the wealth we are proud of, the civilisation we boast of, the production, the increase of which means, we say, the advancement of the nation, is created in reality, by the workers and not by the owners.

Today it is the workers who produce and if production picks up tomorrow, it is again

the workers who will bring it about. It is not the owners' money that produces, on the contrary, the owner expropriates the value in production created by workers' labour, by cheating them and amass wealth. Therefore what is the burn and agony, the pain and anguish of that worker, what are the basic problems that afflict his life ought to be understood in the very interest of progress, in the interest of advancement of the whole society.

Country's Interest is not identical with the interest of the capitalist class

If by country we mean the vast mass of people then law and order, in the country, cannot stand against the interest of the people, cannot deceive people, repress them, suppress their legitimate movements, cannot call safeguarding the interest of the owners as that of the country, cannot construe gratification of unjust claims of the owners as meeting the interest of the country. By country is not certainly meant the capitalists, the owning class. But those who clamour so much for law and order in country's interest, their views, if analysed will mean, nothing but shameless advocacy of the owners' interest. Those who refuse to understand this simple truth, do in effect conceal the class character of judiciary in this capitalist society and guided by the ill-motive of confusing the public opinion, propagate the falsehood that judiciary is the 'Custodian of Justice and Public Conscience'. What is relevant here, in this connection, to bear in mind is that in a class divided society public conscience is not above classes or a supra-class concept, it reflects the outlook of this or that class.

Social Justice and humane behaviour denied to the workers

...It should be realised that in a capitalist society, to depend on law and law alone will not deliver any good to the people. Because whatever is legal is not necessarily justified, moral and humanistic. It is

more true in a capitalist society of the present day where order has become injustice. No class conscious worker can expect social justice in this system. What is the employer's attitude as regards the minimum need of the workers in this system? From the point of justice when the issue of workers' sustenance is raised, it is but natural to say that the workers should be paid that minimum which is fair and humane. But what do the employers think about this "just and humane" standard in this system of capitalist ownership? The principal point of consideration for the capitalists about this "just and humane" standard is paying the worker that much, short of which, it is difficult for him to survive, move his muscles, operate the machines in the factories and to get the profit extracted.

Wage increase brings no real solution

...It is true that those who are engaged in this or that kind of employment have their income, in terms of money, definitely increased since independence. But the rate of price rise of all essential commodities and other cost of living in general have been many times greater than the rate of wage increase of the working people. It is known to all that the economic condition of the common people was very precarious because of low wage compared to the then price index even before the independence. So today, when the gap between the wage and price index has inconceivably widened owing to the unprecedented rise of prices of all essential commodities and other costs of living compared to a very nominal wage increase, if any, it is not at all difficult to gauge the depth of hardship in people's life. The standard which any family could maintain previously with much less income in money terms is not possible to maintain in spite of earning more money today. So it is not possible to grasp the nature of the problem correctly, looking only at the increased salary. To have a clear picture of the problem we will have to examine

whether the increase in income of the working people in money terms has been commensurate with the price rise in essential commodities. We will have to examine whether there has been a proportionate increase in wage corresponding to price rise at every stage, keeping the ratio of the average income of the working people to price line the same as before. Judged from this point, it will be crystal clear that there has been a sharp fall in the real wage of the working people despite increase in wage in money terms.

Thus increase of salary in money terms has not only failed to improve the condition of the livelihood of the working people which existed during the pre-independence period but the condition of livelihood of the working people has further deteriorated owing to the unprecedented rise of prices of all essential commodities.

So, it is clear that the vital problems in people's life cannot be solved only by some increase in emoluments. It is true that both the workers and the agricultural labourers are engaged today in their grim battle for higher wages. Even if they become successful to increase their wage through these struggles for which, of course, they may have to shed much blood, sacrifice many a life—mothers may have to lose their sons and wives their husbands too, because of brutal firing, lathi-charge and all sorts of repressive measures adopted by the government, but one thing is certain that this wage increase will never be able to neutralise their wage erosion due to the evil effect of inflation or price rise that is surely to take place in the meantime.

Not only the increase in the amount of wage which the workers may get at the cost of their blood, can hardly be adequate but they are robbed more of money from their pockets due to rise of prices in all essential commodities and increase in other costs of living on the one hand and by fresh imposition of direct and indirect taxes by the government, on the

other. This is why increase in wage can no longer bring any real relief to the people.

...Under the circumstances, we will have to find out the root cause of all evils and know what is the main problem before the workers, peasants and people of the middle strata of both rural and urban areas. If we fail to realise these fundamental questions then any amount of anti-Congress slogans, any amount of fiery speeches against the Congress will reduce to useless exercises.

Main objective of struggle

...When such is the situation in the country, what should be the main object of your movements, your struggles? Against whom you will fight, why will you and how? What object and ideology will guide that struggle? You are to realise clearly and precisely what do you want really, what should be the objective that can bring change in basic condition and ultimate solution to your basic problems. Should that be movements on your day-to-day demands only. I say, these are, of course, there, but that should not be the main objective of your struggle. For pretty long years, you, the Indian workers have been fighting for wage increase, for reforms of laws and extension of democratic rights. Some rights, no doubt you have earned. I do not mean that they are of no worth. Significance, they have much. But that is for one and the only reason—to build up, using these rights, such an invincible revolutionary organisation in the course of strengthening the day-to-day democratic mass movements so that it becomes possible to pull down, one day, this exploitative capitalist system and establish in its place the rule of the working class, free from all sorts of exploitation.

Trade Union—School of Communism

...Lenin gave repeated warnings to the workers on one point. Right from Marx, all have dealt with this important question

on many occasions. All of them have pointed out that the workers, however militant movements they may conduct for the realisation of their economic and democratic demands, however much democratic rights and economic demands they may realise by shedding blood but by that alone they cannot bring an end to their slavery and they still remain wage slaves as before and the darkness in their life still persists. Their condition too cannot be changed simply by shouting slogans like "Long Live Marxism-Leninism", "Down with Capitalism", "Long live Revolution", during the struggle over economic and democratic demands. If their fight is for the extension of democratic rights alone, then however much democratic rights they may earn, that can never bring about emancipation of the workers. For their emancipation the workers must realise that these struggles built up on economic and democratic demands are nothing but struggles for their survival, protecting the minimum rights against exploitation, are nothing but means through which they are to give birth to their own political power capable enough to overthrow this exploitative system. They can achieve emancipation. Only if, through the process of these struggles they can gradually build up their political power in the concrete shape of 'struggle committees', can initiate and conduct protracted war or revolutionary battle for the overthrow of capitalism—the protracted war that will not collapse in the face of even thousands of onslaughts of the capitalist state machine.

This is why Marx had posed the question right from the beginning: Why should the workers join trade union movements? They should join, because trade union is the school of communism where they can learn the elements of communism. While fighting collectively against injustice and oppression from this platform daily, the workers get the opportunity to analyse events and search out truth, consciousness dawns on

them as to why there can be no emancipation without revolution. While conducting the day-to-day struggles, the revolutionaries alone and none else, want to educate the workers thus. Others, the pseudo-revolutionaries, ask the workers to join trade unions, to take active part but give rise to, on their part, bureaucracy in trade unions and get the workers used to it.

Trade union bossism

... The workers too approach only those leaders who, they think, can manage some concessions for them. So, we find, that the workers usually run after the bosses of those unions that are run by the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties with the hope that these leaders can make the managements hear their demands and they have a chance to get some concessions. And this is how bureaucracy takes root in trade unions. The leaders too, create the air that they are 'big people'. Their words carry much weight. The management fears and gives them platitude. Remember, fear and platitude are like cousins. These leaders need both. They want that the management should appease them and this is why they frighten them at times.

When the sole activity of the trade union leaders is to agitate the workers and get them into their fold by projecting a false image about this ability to wrest concessions from the management then know it for certain that this party or union leadership is practising moderate trade unionism or economism like the Labour Party in England, or the giant trade unions of the USA. You can very well see that these big trade unions in England and the USA, off and on, organise nationwide industrial strikes and paralyse the production. These forces, in reality, play the role of opposition in between the different monopoly capitalist groups and are controlled by the monopolists. A typical example is the Labour Party of England which stands for and defends the interests

of the British imperialism. When these parties bring the whole of England to a stand-still thus, by such nation-wide strikes, the general workers run frantically after them with the belief that the revolution has started here and now. But this does not even scratch the British imperialist interests a bit—rather the monopolists, the imperialists laugh in their sleeves, seeing that the shrewd union leaders have bound the workers, and have trapped them in such tricky manoeuvres. They are very much appreciative of the well served fun. The workers, thus trapped like cattle, tied in the noose, fail to realise that they have fallen victim to the devilish design of these leaders. That is why Marx as also Lenin have time and again cautioned that trade unions should be the school of communism. They said, the workers who come and join in thousands in the day-to-day struggles—don't agitate them by senseless fiery speeches just to draw their applause. Don't waste your time by loading your speech with hyperboles over the definition of the known enemy; say something concrete, something useful. Even in a movement, full of promises, make the workers conscious about the failings and deficiencies that might be there and when it meets a setback, educate them as to the reasons for this setback as also the elements of success that are there in the midst of apparent failures—this is the task of leadership.

But seldom do we find this in our trade union movement. To what ultimate political goal these day-to-day movements are to be led and what should be the style of these movements for that—the workers are not told, they are not educated either.

Trade union movement ridden with disunity and splits

...So, while taking part in trade union struggles you must make yourself conscious of all these serious questions. Give serious thoughts to all this while you are in your united movements. And while trying

to build up your united struggles, you are to understand why and where lies the difference between your organisation and those of others.....your sincere efforts should be to unite the workers in one union despite political differences. For this, what is necessary is philosophical tolerance for each other in political-ideological struggles. What is there to object if somebody can convince the majority about his superior politics and on the strength of ideology comes to the leadership? But if anybody curbs the freedom of expression of others, snatches away their right to criticism and imposes his leadership just on the strength of majority in the committee, factionalism is bound to arise. And factionalism entails avoidable wastage of time—and because of it we are to move against one another and cannot always devote ourselves to develop revolutionary consciousness and organisation among the workers correctly and whole-heartedly.

Therefore, the real hindrance to building up one unified union of the workers is this spirit of impatience or lack of philosophical tolerance. Splits cannot be avoided if we do not listen to the views of others, gag them and forbid discussions. Because any worthy ideology will refuse to condemn itself to servility. Just as you are a believer of your view-points so also another person, even if he is wrong has the belief of his own. There should be free scope for struggle between these two view-points. If you want to impose your opinion on me, I cannot accept it. So, if there is free exchange of opinions and open debates and discussions, criticism, counter-criticism, people at large get the opportunity to know, who is right and who is wrong. If you are correct you have no reason to be afraid of polemics, rather your victory is assured. Only those who are on the wrong track, who cling to untruth, have weaknesses, and are afraid of debates, discussions and ideological struggles, they only, on various pretexts—in the name of discipline and unity—keep

their cadres and supporters away from open debates and try to confuse the masses too. My appeal to you, never take this wrong course. Let exchange of opinions be your endeavour. And through this course, try to unite the working class in united struggles.

...You are also to bear in mind that the reason why splits occurred again and again in the working class movement and why splits could not be averted lies in the absence of the genuine revolutionary party in the leadership of the working class movement, democratic mass movement and it is the party that alone realises the significance of workers' unity with the requisite strength and power. Only the revolutionary party can keep others united provided it has the necessary organisational strength and power.

Social character of Labour

...In this connection, there is another point, you should grasp clearly. You produce for the society. But you are told that when you work you work simply for your own living, whereas the capitalists have set up industries and introduced the productive system to give you means of subsistence and for the welfare of the country. It is a downright falsehood. You should realise that your labour today is not, in the main, for your self-consumption though the aspect of personal need is behind every individual's labour. Today your labour has become social in character. You work for society, the production your labour creates is also social in character—it is for social consumption whereupon does advance the civilisation, does advance the country. All your labour is, therefore, for the country's progress.

Economism, Legalism—the main danger before trade union and mass movement

The fact that labour and production are social in character but ownership is private constitutes the basic contradiction in this society and the root cause of all social

injustice, exploitation and oppression. The worker will have to correctly understand this inherent law of class struggle in this society and its nature as also grasp the correct analysis of the socio-political-economic situation of the country, using his sole weapon or science, Marxism-Leninism.

...Therefore, those who drag workers cunningly into legalism under cover of revolutionary verbiage and train them with tacts and means as to how to realise the demands from the owner without waging a struggle, surreptitiously breed extreme opportunism in the working class movement, adopting both aggressive and defensive postures, and ultimately dampen people's fighting spirit. If influence of this kind of politics spreads further, the pernicious effect of economism and election-oriented politics will mar the possibility of development of the democratic mass movement and the revolutionary class struggle in India. These people raise only immediate demands in movements which, they too, are to conduct at times and in the fond hope of forming government in future, they limit their programme of action to fiery criticism and slogans against the ruling party and its government, cleverly bypassing the question of directing their movement against the capitalist state and economic system, the root cause of all problems. As an inevitable result of movements of this kind, over-long period, the fighting spirit of the masses against the capitalist state has not only not grown but a "genteel" parliamentary politics has been gradually introduced in the name of democratic mass movement. These people, too, cherish the hope of becoming one day, the caretaker of the whole capitalist state machine. And it is the reason why they are determined not to allow any democratic mass movement to go beyond the limit of a set pattern.

...Truly speaking, it seems to me that CPI (M) probably surpasses all other revisionists of modern times when, I hear Mr Jyoti Basu, the CPI(M) minister for police

(refers to the Second U.F. Government of 1969 in West-Bengal—E.J. P. Era) and his party's Polit Bureau declares with pride that the major proof of their party's success in running the government is to get so much bonus realised for the workers for which they had not to wage any struggle.

It follows, therefore, from their logic that without waging any movement, any struggle against the owners, there can be intensification of class struggle, there can be revolution without any struggle and ultimately emancipation too of the workers!

**Base Political line—anti-Capitalist
Socialist Revolution**

...You must, therefore, bear in mind that it is the capitalist state structure, the capitalist economy that are responsible for present exploitation and oppression of the people. Whether in mills and factories of towns and cities or in the agricultural economy of the villages it is the capitalist relation of production that is working everywhere, the production is being governed by the owner and wage-earner relationship.

That the character of production in mills and factories is capitalistic is not very difficult to understand. Even the nature and character of our rural economy today has been transformed mainly into capitalist economy based on capitalist relation of production. Although there are wide variations in view of relative backwardness which express themselves in diverse forms, depending on specific details of condition, still then it must be admitted that in rural economy also, everywhere the relation of production is basically capitalistic governed by profit making motive and owner wage-earner relationship. There are both owner and wage-earners. Some workers are getting their emoluments on monthly basis and there are some who receive their emoluments as daily wage. There are also some workers who get a portion of their salary in kind of food and the rest in money,

there are some others who get the entire wage as their share of crop. So, whatever the variations in form, all of them are nothing but wage-earners. If you approach the problem from another angle, you will find that it is the capitalist relation of production that is governing the rural economy today. In fact, what do we mean by the term capitalism? The fundamental law of capitalism is to get profit by investing capital (either in land or in industry). That is investment of capital for production and raising further capital by selling the produce in the market.

In the capitalist system, the capitalists invest capital in mills and factories and produce commodity by selling which in the market they earn maximum profit. They earn this profit by exploiting the workers, by appropriating the surplus value created by labour power, by depriving the workers of their legitimate due. This, we call capitalism.

Let us now examine the real picture of rural economy today. Is it a fact that those who own land today, produce, just like the feudal system, mainly for their personal consumption and in order to have some money to meet other expenses of daily life sell the rest of produce in local market which in turn is governed by the law of localised agricultural economy? Is it a fact that the prices of agricultural commodities are being fixed at the dictate of the law of localised agricultural economy which is mainly stipulated by the principle of demand and supply of a particular local market? Rather, the reality is that all agricultural commodities have been transformed into the commodities of national capitalist market. Peasants do know all this. Even a layman can understand by listening to radio news that the prices of all agricultural commodities are being controlled by Share Markets, Wholesale Market and Stock Exchange. The owners of land are selling their agricultural produce at price, fixed by these agencies and are

getting profit out of it. Thus land has been transformed into a means of investment of capital in the form of money, just as in industries, for earning profit. Investment of capital in land is turning out profit. In this regard we should also remember the Leninist teaching that it is the nature and character of trade and commerce governing the production of agricultural commodities that mainly determine the character of agricultural economy. Judged from that point of view, you will find that, first, the heavy concentration of land in the hands of the few, secondly, continuous increase in the number of landless peasants, agricultural labourers and semi-proletarian strata of peasantry having a small holding of land in rural areas and thirdly and finally, the transformation of agricultural products as the commodities of national capitalist market instead of being, commodities of localised agricultural market conclusively prove that our agricultural economy also is a capitalist economy. Only those who refuse to fight the existing capitalist system and overthrow it through revolution, only who are interested in shifting the burden of capitalist exploitation and bourgeois class rule on to the less significant and less important forces thereby distracting the attention of the masses from the real enemy to the fake one and those who move with a sinister motive to protect capitalism, who allow capitalism to consolidate, can only deny this truth. It is not important at all whether they talk of Marxism-Leninism or not, whether they speak against the Congress or not whether they shout slogans against monopoly or not, the revolutionary struggle of the masses have nothing to do with it.

....It is quite obvious, therefore, that the real motive of these parties does not fundamentally differ from that of Indira Congress in so far as the question of protecting the bourgeois class is concerned—making a few individual monopolists and not the capitalist system as a whole their enemy; only difference is this that these parties

are doing the same with red flag in their hand and in the name of either National Democratic Revolution or People's Democratic Revolution.

Three Fundamental Socio-economic problems

...You see, you have mainly three problems before you. First, the problem of unemployment; Secondly, the question of modernisation of agriculture and thirdly the problem of industrial revolution and unfettered development of industries with which, the first two questions are intimately linked up. Because if we cannot open up the flood gate of industrial revolution, it is not possible either to modernise agriculture and thereby create a continuous expansion of internal market or to solve the problem of unemployment.Plans are being taken, one after another, but the problem of unemployment goes on unabated. Why is it happening? The rulers say that the population increase is the principal reason. Whether this is so could be a matter for consideration only if they could prove, first, that there is no wastage of existing resources i.e. no wastage of the productive forces and labour power, no corruption, no wasteful expenditure and the installed capacity is not lying idle but is being fully utilised or at least there is a serious attempt to fully utilise it—nothing further is left to be done. So, even after fulfilling all these conditions, if the total work force could not be absorbed, then and then only, the problem of excess population could have been a matter for consideration. But what we see is just the reverse.

Even the existing installed capacity is not being fully utilised at present, corruption and wasteful practices are ever on the increase, they have even exceeded the limit, what is the reality then? Is it for excess population that the existing installed capacity cannot be fully utilised? Or is it the reason for which corruption and wasteful expenditure cannot be stopped?.....What

I mean is that the rulers and the ruling class are arguing in circle or are resorting to deceptive logic with the motive of concealing the real cause behind the unemployment problem. They are raising the bogey of excess population only to make it a scape-goat and sidetrack the main point....And we all know that for achieving these we will have to organise anti-capitalist revolution in our country.

..... But in India excepting the SUCI not a single political party which is known as Marxist-Leninist such as the CPI or the CPI(M) is clearly speaking for anti-capitalist Socialist Revolution.

Revolution to smash capitalist state machine

....The state power in our country, is in the hands of the capitalist class. Revolution will therefore mean in our country overthrow of the capitalist class from state power. You must clearly understand what is meant by the state power. You must realise that it is state power which is actually protecting and defending prevailing exploitative capitalist social system.

The state rests on three principal pillars or organs, with the help of which it defends the capitalist system. These three principal organs of the state are the military, the judiciary and the bureaucracy including police....Whether a government is changed by election, or by a coup or by realignment of parties in the parliament or by any means that does not bring about any change in these three organs of the state which have developed just like a machine with a definite form and structure and with a definite style of functioning. The very orientation and norms and regulations of the capitalist state machine, its concept of jurisprudence, concept of democracy, of nation, of people have all developed conforming to the capitalist class interest and to defend capitalism—its system and its class rule.

In order to change the world the proletariat need to change themselves first

The essential point is the correct revolutionary ideology and the correct base political line. We must grasp correctly the character of the state structure, the concrete social, economic and political condition of the country where we are to organise the revolution.

...So, correctness of base political line is one of the principal pre-conditions of revolution. Marx, Lenin, all of them highlighted this truth, although in different languages.It is Marx who pointed out that the proletariat alone can change the world. Does it mean that the proletariat, anyhow organised in thousands and raising slogan for revolution can bring it about? ...It is Marx who, with the help of knowledge of dialectical materialism showed for the first time, the scientific process to change the world but he cautioned at the same time that to say that the proletariat can change the world does not mean, they can change it just because of their position as proletariat. Only those proletariat can achieve it who have transformed themselves so as to be worthy of fulfilling the task of revolution.

Only those proletariat can change the world who have been able to develop the quality of revolutionary leadership, and that not in political battle alone or in slogans, but in behaviour and life style, in ethical and moral standard, cultural tone and taste, by freeing themselves from the narrow confines of the vile bourgeois culture. So long the workers are not freed from the influence and impact of bourgeois ideology and its decadent culture, acquired from the bourgeois society, they cannot organise revolution, however much their economic distress may aggravate. The evil influence of the bourgeois decadent culture reflected by the workers can by no means be called the proletarian culture simply

because workers are reflecting it. ...It is to be borne in mind that the opportunism of the workers—does not become justifiable simply because they are workers. The opportunism of the owner, the capitalist, since he robs, is worse no doubt. But the worker because he starves—his opportunism cannot be just and humane.

...I stand by that worker who possesses the sense of dignity and self-respect, who would court death rather than surrender honour, who fights till realising demands—who is a class-conscious worker. The worker who acts as an agent of the capitalists does not evoke my compassion just because he is a worker. The worker ought to bear it and be imbued with this consciousness, only then will he be able to get over his personal opportunism.

Proletarian culture—what it really connotes

Proletarian culture is for freeing the workers crushed under the burden of a wretched existence and rotten bourgeois culture, who have succumbed to this law of exploitation, being slipped into fatalism have taken for granted this miserable life, have fallen victim to vicious circle of economism-opportunism—and it is to instil in them a new ideology, make them stand erect with indomitable spirit of defiance and transforming them into communists.

Appeal to the workers

Workers should therefore, reflect, study and ponder seriously over all this; they should engage themselves in constant political activity even while attending their duties day and night. Those who advocate that workers should not indulge in politics or that politics should not be brought into trade union movement are simply rogues and hypocrites. They too are a band of parasites who make fortune out of trade union activity, whose habit is to boss over the workers, whose only passion and profession is to lord over others. It is these elements who propagate the myth that

politics should not be brought into trade union.

... You are the workers, the creators of the civilisation. The civilisation is in birth pang. It appeals to you for deliverance. Deliverance of the entire humanity and not of you alone is in your hands. If this consciousness does not dawn on you, the workers, if you are not imbued with this consciousness, then everything will be in vain

That is why, simply to speak of revolution is no revolutionary consciousness. So again, to speak for the working class, for the proletariat—this too, is no proletarian class-consciousness. The correct revolutionary consciousness is the correct proletarian class-consciousness and correct proletarian class consciousness is the correct proletarian party consciousness.

Out of the discontent of the workers and peasants in the society, time and again revolutionary tide will try to surge forth in waves following waves—in waves after waves it will try to burst out—the contradictions and conflicts brewed up within the society will time and again seek to express and demand a fundamental change of this order, will fervently appeal to human consciousness and demand revolution. But there will be no revolution. Again and again the revolutionary tide will recede, will go astray. Time and again reaction will gain. Revolution will have to wait until a revolutionary party emerges with necessary strength to lead it.

And your fight must be on a correct revolutionary line. Mere chanting the word 'revolution' will not bring you to the path of revolution. *Only if you can organise the workers under the leadership of a correct revolutionary party and educate them with adequate political consciousness, on the basis of a clear conception about the correct strategy of revolution and class character of the state, you will be able to*

give rise to people's own political power and establish their political hegemony.

And then will come the cherished moment when tens of millions of the down-trodden Indian people will behold the Revolution. Till then—only agitation and defeat, only outbursts and despair. The

road to emancipation from this, emancipation of the society, liberation of mankind lies in Revolution and Revolution alone. This is the way, the only way, and no other way.

Long Live Revolution !

Reference

- Speech at the West Bengal Engineering Workers Conference 14th May, 1967
- Speech at Durgapur Steel Workers Conference March 17-18, 1974
- Speech on United Front Politics, 1970
- Speech on 24th April 1967
- Speech at K. K. M. F. Conference March 10, 1974
- Speech at 15th August People's Liberation Pledge Day, 1967

“.....In the sphere of politics, revisionism did really try to revise the foundation of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the class struggle..... For, they said, since the “will of the majority” prevails in a democracy, one must neither regard the state as an organ of class rule, nor reject alliances with the progressive, social-reform bourgeoisie against the reactionaries”.

—Lenin,
'Marxism and Revisionism'

PROLETARIAN ERA

Organ of Socialist Unity Centre of India (Fortnightly)

Founder Editor-in-Chief : Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

Vol. 14	NOVEMBER 1, '80	PRICE 1 Rupee
No. 6	SATURDAY	Air Surcharge 5 P.

Editor-in-Chief : Nihar Mukherjee

Edited & Published by Sukomal Das Gupta from 48, Lenin Sarani and Printed by him
at Ganadabi Printers & Publishers Private Limited, 52B, Indian Mirror Street, Calcutta-13