

FREE EDUCATION, CULTURE, PRODUCTION FROM GRIP AND TENTACLE OF CAPITALISM

Com. Shibdas Ghosh's Clarion Call at All India D. S. O. Conference

The All India Students' Conference, organised by the All India Democratic Students' Organisation, held at Cuttack from 12th to 14th January, 1974 marked a turning point in the history of the student movement and opened a new era in our country and created great enthusiasm among all sections of the people particularly the intellectuals and the students.

The open session was held on 12th January at Gopabandhu Bag, Cuttack, under the presidentship of Com. Subodh Banerjee, former Minister of West Bengal.

Earlier, more than 2,000 delegates from all over India took out a colourful and well-decorated procession and paraded ten miles on different streets of Cuttack city with

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 7

21st JANUARY, '74

PRICE 20 P.

No. 10

MONDAY

Air Surcharge 4 P.

hundreds and thousands of enthusiastic on-lookers flanking both sides of the streets. The twenty-thousand strong

mammoth gathering the city has seldom witnessed in

(Contd. to page 4)



A view of Delegate Session of the All India Student Conference organised by the AIDSO at Barabati Stadium Hall, Cuttack on 13th & 14th Jan '74. Com. Shibdas Ghosh inaugurating the Delegate Session. Sri Nabakrushna Chowdhury, Sri Krishna Chakraborty, President of the Presidium, Sri Provash Ghosh, newly elected President of the AIDSO and other all India Student leaders on the dias. (2) Sri Nabakrishna Chowdhury addressing the gathering (3) Newly elected General Secretary of the AIDSO addressing the delegates. (Below) A section of the delegates. Picture of open session could not be given because of shortage space.

On The Latest C. C. Resolution of the CPI(M)

Any sensible man, if he goes through the latest Central Committee resolution of the CPI(M) published in the People's Democracy on Dec. 2, 1973 on the political and economic situation of the country and critically views the same in the background of the resolution adopted in the former meeting of the Central Committee (published in People's Democracy in its issue dated July 29, 1973) and resolution adopted in the last meeting of the Polit Bureau of the party (published in People's Democracy on Sept. 19, 1973, both of which have been thoroughly and critically examined by us (Prolet. Era. 1. 10. 73), would wonder to note a sheer self-contradictory and perhaps even hypocritical attitude being reflected by the CPI(M) on the question of the necessity of the political united front of the left and democratic parties.

In one part of the resolution on the political and economic situation adopted by the CPI(M) in its last meeting of the Central Committee, while discussing the reason that was responsible for the failure in developing an all-embracing democratic struggle in different fronts throughout the country, it has been stated, 'The reason was that a centralising force was lacking. Our party has always emphasised the necessity of a united front of left and democratic forces. Without this the mounting discontent cannot be led along the desired lines.' (Supplement to People's Democracy Dec 2, 1973, page 15).

Now, for the present, we would not like to go again in detail on the role and necessity of a political united front of the left and democratic parties with an agreed minimum common programme formed on the basis of greatest common measure of agreement among the parties in a given historical phase of development of struggle which only our party, guided by our leader and teacher, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has correctly grasped and we have repeatedly discussed the same from various angles in the past.

In reality the united

front of the left and democratic parties is the strong instrument of struggle in the hands of the fighting toiling people at this present phase of democratic movement against the ruling capitalist class including all reactionary forces the vested interests and their political stooges. If this instrument can be developed into a strong powerful weapon and correctly handled, then with the exhaustion of the present democratic phase, the movement can be lifted to a higher level, the different petty-bourgeois left and democratic parties, their role being exhausted, can be isolated from the masses by exposing their character through ideological struggle based on the principle of unity struggle-unity without disrupting the unity of the front engaged in its struggle against the main enemy, and in this way with the establishment of the leadership of the real revolutionary party over the masses, the emergence of a new and higher form of united front, the proletarian united front, as the instrument of the proletarian revolution, can be guaranteed.

It is solely for this reason that our party, the genuine Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party on our soil,

always strives not only for the formation of the united front of the left and democratic parties but also to preserve and strengthen its unity and make it work as the instrument of united struggles by the people against their enemies.

Nor would we like to go back to the past history how the CPI(M) with its big party chauvinistic attitude in its eagerness to expand the influence of the party began to carry on violent attacks on the fraternal constituents of the united front with the backing of police and administration, calling all the times such attacks as 'class struggles' and with a view to justify these cowardly violent attacks on the fraternal parties came out with its fanciful theory of "a new class-based front" in place of the existing united front of the left and democratic parties as the later was stated to have lost its reality in the context of 'new class-based front' and thereby acted as the force majorly responsible for disrupting the united front that emerged as a powerful instrument for democratic struggle in West Bengal out of the glorious, vigorous and mighty struggles of the fighting toiling people of the said state. From all these facts one question naturally arises. Can the CPI(M) rightfully claim that it has always emphasised the necessity of a political united front of the left and democratic parties? More over, if for the present we keep aside the old incidents and facts but still then we cannot help but observe that any sensible man if he goes through all the relevant current resolutions of the CPI(M) adopted in its meetings of the Central Committee and the Polit Bureau might pose the same question. Is it a fact that the CPI(M) has always emphasised the necessity of the united front which it has claimed in its last meeting of the Central Committee? We, however, apprehend

that any right thinking man would reply that the fact is just the reverse of it, and it will be a sheer travesty of truth if the CPI(M) claims that it has always emphasised the need for a political united front of the left and democratic parties.

Let us see what the CPI(M) observed in the last Central Committee meeting that was held earlier to that we have just mentioned. While expressing in the form of a pious wish that the requirements of the developing mass movement would bring the left parties together in united action leading to the formation of a powerful united front, what the CPI(M) stated clearly and unambiguously tantamounted to the rejection of the very idea of developing such a political united front. Let us quote the relevant portion of the resolution. 'The Central Committee wants to assure all left and democratic parties, groups, organisations, that the CPI(M) would make utmost endeavour to forge unity in action on specific issues and whenever possible political united fronts to fight the anti-people policies of the ruling Congress and its government. It is aware that every party, group or organisation has its own specific approach to the problems facing the country—an approach which is different from that of the other parties, groups and organisations. It would therefore be unrealistic to attempt the formulation of a common programme covering all aspects of the economic and political life of the people,' (People's Democracy, July 29, 1973).

It is quite clear from the above observation that while just mentioning once the formation of united front whenever possible what the CPI(M) particularly emphasised was the very rejection of the idea of developing the same on the plea that it would be unrealistic and at the same time urged to forge unity on specific issues.

(Contd to page 3)

CPI(M) C.C. rejects idea of developing united left and democratic front

(Contd. from page 2)

The argument put forward by the CPI(M) in defence of its observation that the idea of developing united front would be unrealistic is no doubt silly, for who denies that every party, group or organisation has its own particular approach to different problems of the people? For had all the parties the same approach to problems then there would not have been any necessity of separate existence of the parties and there would have been no necessity in that circumstances of a united front of the left and democratic parties. On the contrary at the present phase of the democratic movement the only form of the united front that can be visualised is the united front comprising the different left and democratic parties. Besides that, such a united front never presupposes "the formulation of a common programme covering all aspects of the economic and political life of the people." When different parties have not only different angularities and approaches to different problems of the people but also different programmes on the economic, political, social and cultural life of the people, there can only be a united front with an agreed minimum common programme formed on the basis of greatest common measure of agreement among the parties.

We have earlier examined in detail and exposed the real motive of the CPI(M) behind the proposed line of unity on specific issue in place of a political united front of the left and democratic parties having an agreed minimum common programme formed on the basis of greatest common measure of agreement among the parties (Prol. Era. I. 10. 73) when we have expressed our considered view

that this would not only disturb the objective process of formation of a political united front of the left and democratic parties having an agreed minimum common programme formed on the basis of greatest common measure of agreement among the parties but would deprive the masses of their cherished instrument of struggle against the enemy. Moreover, for legitimate reasons we hold the view and hope that any right thinking man would agree with us that the role of the issue-based unity being exhausted, with the entering of the democratic movement in the the phase of the comparatively more advanced form of the united front struggle, the issue based unity gave birth to the political united front of the left and democratic parties with an agreed minimum common programme formed on the basis of greatest common measure of agreement among the parties long ago in 1967 and the question of forming an issue based unity in place of the political united front of the left and democratic parties with an agreed minimum common programme formed on the basis of greatest common measure of agreement among the parties which at present is the only viable alternative to congress would be a going back into the past from the present phase of the more advanced form (compared to the phase of the struggle of issue based unity) of united front struggle. For obvious reasons a searching question might arise in the mind of the people. What motives led the CPI(M) to propose the said issue based unity? It is our experience that however revolutionary it might try to pose itself, the sole objective of the CPI(M) behind its revolutionary phrase-mongering is to emerge as the big alternative parliamentary force to congress and thereby

come to power in the government by defeating the latter in the polls. Now being guided by the pragmatic idea that the designed objective would only be realised if it can usurp the anti congress sentiment, gradually of a greater section of the people and thereby mobilise them behind its back to secure victories in assemblies and parliament, the CPI(M), like a bourgeois reformist oppositional party as it is, entered and is still striving to enter into all sorts of opportunistic alliances and understandings with parties like the CPI, DMK, Congress (O), Pragati party, Swatantra, Jansangh, Hindu Mahashava etc. Moreover, it is no more a secret that it even welcomes the revival of its old understanding with the Congress(R) that once developed during the time of election of Mr. Giri to the Presidential chair, as this might help it to create a bigger influence over the people that would ultimately help to achieve its sole desired objective of going into power in the government by securing victories in the polls.

Now solely with a view to shielding this opportunistic 'catch as catch can' policy of entering into any sort of opportunistic alliance or understanding with any political party whoever it might be that has been formulated solely to realise its petty, sectarian, narrow and pragmatic objective of emerging as a big parliamentary party alternative to Congress, the CPI(M) raised the slogan of the issue based unity and decided in favour of the said unity in its Central Committee meeting.

Now following its proposal of building up of the so called issue-based unity which is solely designed to achieve its opportunistic motive the CPI(M) perhaps faced questions from its ranks

and supporters and took note of the existing urge among the people for the growth of the united front of the left and democratic parties with an agreed minimum common programme formed on the basis of the greatest common measure of agreement among the parties that would act as the powerful instrument in their hands to fight against their enemy the CPI(M) had to revise its view and in its meeting of the Polit Bureau that was held in the month of September, assured that "The P. B. wants to assure the comrades and friends of all other left and democratic parties that it would be the endeavour of our party to see that the unity in action that has started developing is transformed into a political united front of the left and democratic parties consistently fighting the landlord bourgeois regime and the various parties and organisations representing the big landlords and monopoly capitalists. (People's Democracy 16th September 1973) In the latest Central Committee resolution the CPI(M) on the face of growing urge among the fighting people for the united front has further shifted from its original position, of course, without giving due recognition to the same and has claimed that it has always emphasised the need for the united front without uttering anything about the issue-based unity that it pledged in its former Central Committee meeting.

We are of the considered view that the CPI(M) by not giving due recognition to the shifting of its position which it has thereby surreptitiously made has violated the Leninist norms that guide the activities of any party in regard to changes in policy or view points of the same. Any party has the liberty to change its former position if the objective situation demands that. But it is always imperative on its part to put a

(Contd to page 6)

Anti-Capitalist Socialist Revolution is the Only Solution to All Social Maladies

(Contd. from page 1)

recent times earned deep appreciation from all sections of the people for its discipline, devotion and seriousness.

On this occasion, nine decorated arches were erected across the main streets in the name of martyrs and important literary personalities and the city was well-decorated with banners and flags all around.

Com. Shibdas Ghosh, one of the Marxist thinkers of the present epoch and the General Secretary of the SUCI, was the main speaker in the open session. In his long two hour speech, he made an elaborate analysis of the present-day situation and tasks ahead before the students.

Com. Ghosh explained eloquently how the crisis-ridden capitalist system in our country was incapable of mechanising and modernising our agriculture, removing the economic backwardness of our country, carrying out industrial revolution, solving the unemployment problem and opening the door of uninterrupted social progress.

Com. Ghosh made a critical analysis of the present state of moral crisis in our society and urged upon the students to actively cultivate and uphold the new sense of human values and ethical standard and carry forward the militant tradition of the students and fulfill their historical role and emphasised that to realise these noble values and ideals the existing capitalist state machinery and the bourgeoisie in power will have to be overthrown and a socialist order established through anti-Capitalist Socialist Revolution.

Sri Nabakrushna Chowdhury, former Chief Minister of Orissa and a humanist, as the chief guest

said that the capitalist system in our country had not only failed to imbibe the students with higher standard of ethics and sense of human values but also degraded them and created bands of cut-throats. He called upon the people in general and the students in particular to come forward to carry out the cultural revolution.

Com. Subodh Banerjee in his presidential address explained the educational policy of the Indian state and characterised the present-day education system as a weapon in the hands of the ruling bourgeoisie to consolidate and further strengthen the existing capitalist rule in our country. Com. Banerjee said that education had been the first casualty in independent India. In the name of reforms, students have been made scape-goats and on the plea of improving quality, scope for higher education had been curtailed and the so-called job-oriented education deprived the students of the real essence of education.

Coms. Provash Ghosh, General Secretary, AIDS, Chitta Behera, Convener, Reception Committee, Om Prakash Suman (Delhi), Chhaya Mukherjee (C.O.C.), Dwarika Nath Ratha (Orissa), R. Pavithran (Kerala), Lal Singh (Haryana), Kameswar Prasad Singh (Bihar) Kantimoy Deb (Assam) etc. also addressed the gathering.

The Delegate Session took place at Barabati Stadium Hall, Cuttack on 13th and 14th January with great enthusiasm and high spirit. The house, full with 2157 delegates—including 276 women students—representing 1,47,000 members from Delhi, Haryana, Bihar, U.P., Kerala, Assam, Orissa and West Bengal etc. elected a presidium of seven headed by Com. Krishna Chakraborty (other members of Presidium were

Coms. S. Chopra, Lal Singh, Mohan Kumar P. K., Bishnu-pada Das, Syama Prasad Das and Kameswar Prasad Singh. The session was opened with International anthem by DSO.

Sri Shibdas Ghosh, inaugurating the Delegate Session, in his historic and brilliant speech, laid down before the students the guidelines for their struggle to bring about a fundamental change in the entire education system as well as for their struggle for redressal of the immediate academic problems. He also urged upon the students to be equipped with the invincible weapon of Marxism-Leninism in their struggle to free the education, knowledge, morality, ethics, culture and production from the grips and tentacles of exploitative capitalist system and fulfil their historical mission.

Sri Nabakrushna

Chowdhury also addressed the delegates.

The Delegate Session paid homage to the martyrs and adopted one main political resolution, another resolution on students problem dealing, among others, problem of curtailment of education, fascisation in education and culture, bureaucratic control over education, unscientific curricula, technical bias, motive of job-oriented education, language problem etc. etc. and demanded, among others, the introduction of secular and democratic education system and free education for all at least up to school standard. The constitution of the AIDS was also unanimously adopted. The Delegate Session unanimously elected the All India D.S.O. General Council and Executive Committee.

(Contd. to Page 8)

JUTE WORKERS ON Heroic Continuous Strike

We congratulate the workers of the jute mills who, defying threats and intimidation by the jute barons, the Government and their hirelings and foiling the sinister game of the INTUC leadership, have resorted to a continuous strike with effect from 14th January last to realise their longstanding demands.

It may be recalled that the jute workers represented by different trade unions affiliated to the UTUC (Lenin Sarani) and other central trade union organisations have been agitating for a long time for the implementation in full of the agreement made in 1972 as also for the acceptance of the charter of demands submitted to the IJMA and individual jute mills several months back. Bilateral and tripartite talks and discussions have taken place times without number but due to adamant attitude of the jute barons and the government's dilly-dally tactics no settlement could be arrived at.

The demands of the

workers include the nationalisation of jute industry, complete take-over by the Government of the jute trade and monopoly purchase of raw jute by the Government at remunerative price to the primary producers. Other demands are, introduction of grades and scales of pay for the monthly rated employees and workers, upward revision of pay structure and piece rates for the time-rated and piece-rated workers, bonus at 20 per cent, additional bonus for the windfall profit made by the jute industry during the Bangladesh crisis, relief to badli workers, standardisation of pay and dearness allowance of workers of jute industry

(Contd. to page 5)

SUC Orissa State Committee Urges upon the People To approach election on Revolutionary base political mass line

The people of Orissa along with the people of whole of India have been passing through a most precarious condition. Ever rising prices of essential commodities, burden of extortionate taxation, acute unemployment, ravages of periodical flood and draught, chronic food crisis, grinding poverty, en-mass eviction of peasants from lands, unprecedented chaos in the field of education, steady decline in moral and ethical standard etc., etc., have become the order of the day pushing the lives of the people to ruination. If the causes of the present day situation in India are scientifically analysed then it leads one to unmistakably conclude that unless and until the present capitalist power-structure and the capitalist system are replaced by a socialist state and a socialist system, based on scientific socialism, through revolution, none of these problems can basically be solved.

Unless and until the condition for the final overthrow of capitalist system and the capitalist state machine is created through strengthening and intensification of mass struggles and organisations of the toiling masses on the basis of a clearcut revolutionary base political line, the masses will often be carried in election which comes from time to time in bourgeois parliamentary set-up. Under the circumstances in a class divided society like ours, there can only be two political class outlooks and approaches in regard to election. One has to approach the election on the basis of bourgeois class outlook and base political line of the bourgeoisie to anyhow grab as many seats as possible and aiming at strengthening and consolidating the existing capitalist system; while the other is the approach of the revolutionaries, of the toiling millions, that is, to approach

election on the basis of revolutionary politics and on the base political line of the proletariat and the toiling masses to strengthen mass struggle and to build up revolutionary mass organisations at all levels on the basis of a clearcut revolutionary mass political line and a programme of mass struggle with the ultimate aim of bringing about a fundamental change of the politico-economic and social structure of the society.

So in the absence of a revolutionary build up of the masses, when the masses at large will be carried in the election fever, the revolutionaries, in order to remain with the masses, to educate them and to lead them on the basis of a revolutionary politics and a base mass political line, take part in the election.

SUCI with this aim in view approached the CPI(M) and the other anti-Congress left parties to come forward and form a united front or unity of the left forces on the basis of an agreed common programme to provide an instrument of struggle to the toiling masses in the ensuing election battle. But we are constrained to state that the CPI(M) and the SP adopted a luke-warm attitude to such a vital question of the united front of the left forces and became busy to come to understanding with the Pragati Party with the sole aim of grabbing a few seats which is now no more a clandestine one but an open fact. Thus, in this way, only giving lip-services to revolution and united mass struggle, the CPI(M) and the SP actually frustrated the SUCI's move to forge a united front to help and guide the masses in the ensuing election battle on a clear-cut revolutionary base political mass line and a programme of united mass struggle.

Under the circumstances, when instead of forging a united front of the left

forces, the CPI(M) and the SP are hobnobbing with the Pragati Party and the CPI already gone to the side of the Congress, the SUCI is left with no other alternative than to face the election singly on the basis of a clearcut revolutionary base political line of the masses and a programme of mass struggle. We urge upon the people to mobilise themselves solidly, stand by the SUCI and make the SUCI candidates victorious; where there is no SUCI candidates, to vote for the candidates of other anti-Congress left parties. The SUCI further urges upon the people of Orissa to ensure that the Congress, the main enemy of the people is defeated at the polls. Though there is little to choose between the Congress and the Pragati Party—a combination of the Utkal Congress, Swatantra party, the former Rajas and some discredited leaders of Orissa. Both of them are the parties of the bourgeoisie and of reaction. Both are contesting the election with the bourgeois class outlook and the base political line of the bourgeoisie, and both are notorious for their anti-people misrule in Orissa. But since in the prevailing situation of the country as a whole, in between the two, the Congress poses the main danger and threat to the struggles of the masses for emancipation, it remains the main enemy and its defeat must be ensured at the polls having no illusion and with the clear understanding that if the Pragati Party comes to power, none of the basic problems of the masses will be solved, on the contrary the Pragati Party, too, will be the instrument in suppressing democratic movements and mass struggle.

The Orissa State Committee has decided to contest the following seats:—

Sukenda and Korai constituencies in Cuttack District, Anandapur in Keonjhar

JUTE STRIKE

(Contd. From Page-4)

throughout the country, implementation of those terms of the 1972 agreement which have not yet been implemented, revision of leave rules and holidays etc. etc.

Though the charter of demands was submitted jointly and the agreement of 1972 was jointly signed by all the unions affiliated to all the central trade union organisations a move was initiated by the Government and the INTUC and surprisingly supported by the CITU to settle the dispute to the exclusion of some of the central trade union organisations by referring the dispute to the Industrial Committee on Jute (which does not include representatives of all the central trade union organisations). It is really unfortunate that when in the interest of a united movement for the realisation of the legitimate demands of the jute workers, particularly in the context that the agreement of 1972 was jointly signed and the charter of demands was jointly submitted by all the unions, a united stand of the central trade union organisations was essentially necessary, the move to exclude some central trade union organisations was made. It is all the more surprising that the CITU was a party to it when it was incumbent on them as an organisation under the leadership of a left party, it was its duty to fight against any move to disrupt the unity of the central trade union organisations which would invariably affect the joint struggle of the jute workers. However, at the opposition of Com. Subodh Banerjee, Vice-President of the UTUC (Lenin Sarani), the move by the Government could not succeed.

(Contd to page 8)

District, Bhandaripukuri in Baleswar District, Jassipur in Mayurbhanj District, Rourkela and Raghunath Pali in Sundargarh District.

Issue-based unity slogan of CPI(M) exposes its opportunist character

(Contd from page 3)

thorough analysis and review of the objective condition and explicitly mention the reasons that demand a change in its policies or views and thereby give a due and correct recognition of the shifting or revising of its position to the people. We think that this is the only Marxist-Leninist way of one's approaching the issue. Even if a party commits a mistake and then subsequently corrects its earlier mistake still then it must not conceal its mistake not only from its ranks and supporters but even from the masses. Lenin clearly stated that "To admit a mistake openly, to disclose its reasons, to analyse the conditions which gave rise to it, to study attentively the means of correcting it—these are the signs of a serious party; this means the performance of its duties, this means educating and training the class and the masses." (V. I. Lenin—Left wing communism an infantile disorder). Some might observe that we are expecting the observation of some norms which a social democratic petty bourgeois party like the CPI(M), for obvious reasons, cannot basically reflect in its behaviour. Again not only that it has not followed the Leninist norms, it has done something worse than that. In its behaviour it has reflected an attitude that is self contradictory and hypocritical too. For, is it not a sheer hypocrisy on the part of the CPI(M) which though once closely resolved in one of its meetings of the Central Committee that the idea of forming a united front of the left and democratic parties was unrealistic has claimed in a subsequent meeting of the said Committee that it has always emphasised the need of a united front? Is it not a blatant lie? Again it might appear to any right

thinking man that in the resolution adopted in the last meeting of its Central Committee the CPI(M) has behaved most conspicuously. Not that it has not specified whether it has dropped the idea of the issue-based unity and henceforth it would endeavour for the formation of the united front of the left and democratic parties, it has not even mentioned a single word in regard to the idea of the issue-based unity once created by the party either in the resolution of the Polit Bureau or in its long sixteen-paged resolution on the political and economic situation of the country adopted in the last meeting of the Central Committee of the party. For obvious reasons, it has raised doubt in the mind of the people whether the CPI(M) would drop its opportunistic 'catch as catch can' policy and seriously efforts for the formation of the united front. Our recent experiences have, of course, shown that though the CPI(M) on the face of the people's urge for the united front has been forced to publicly state the necessity of the united front still it is not at all serious in this regard. For, if it would have been serious in building up the united front of the left and democratic parties with an agreed common minimum programme on the basis of the greatest common measure of agreement among the parties, then it would have at least supported our proposal for the formation of such a political united front of the left and democratic parties that we placed before all the parties in a meeting of the nine party combination in West Bengal.

But the CPI(M) leadership did not support us. Does this not clearly testify that even if the CPI(M) has felt (?)

the necessity of the united front it is not at all serious in building it up. On the contrary, we have already stated before that it is still striving to come into opportunistic alliance or understanding with parties including the DMK, Congress(O), Congress(R), Janna Sangh, Hindu Mahashava etc. It should however be mentioned that it is not our view point that under no circumstances there can be joint movement with these parties mentioned above on any specific issue. For, if situation demands, then joint movement can of course be organised along with the above mentioned parties on the issue of civil liberty. But apart from the fact that with the emergence of the political united front of the left and democratic parties in 1967, the democratic movement has entered the phase of the united front struggle to be conducted by the political united front of the left and democratic parties with an agreed common minimum programme on the basis of the greatest common measure of agreement among the parties and the question of building the issue-based unity a new does not arise at all, can unity with the above parties ever give birth to a political united front of the left and democratic parties with an agreed common minimum programme formed on the basis of the greatest common measure of agreement among the parties?

For obvious reasons, we are of the considered view that however revolutionary it might appear in slogans and jargons, the only objective of the CPI(M) is to usurp the anti-Congress sentiment gradually of a bigger section of the masses even by entering into opportunistic alliances or understanding with any party including the utter right reactionaries

which, for various reasons, still exercise influence over some different sections of the masses in different parts of the country and thereby play a more and more dominant role in parliamentary politics and ultimately come to political power in the government by winning election battles. This pragmatic opportunistic attitude of parliamentary politics is also being revealed on the part of the CPI(M) in the manners and attitude that are being shown by the party in the recent movements in different states and particularly in the movement against enhanced bus fare in West Bengal where our active and organised participation, the revolutionary enthusiasm of our comrades have been a source of inspiration to the fighting people of the State. However vocal it might appear in its talks and lectures from public platforms regarding the development of mighty legitimate democratic struggle, in reality the CPI(M) always attempts to keep the movement restricted within the limit that would only permit to keep arrested the anti-Congress sentiment of the people within a narrow and limited sphere that would help the party only in winning election battles by defeating the Congress in the polls. The CPI(M) out of the apprehension that following the growth of a mighty, vigorous movement in the correct path, a qualitatively different type of anti-Congress sentiment quite in conformity with the objective of accelerating the process of struggle for establishing a revolutionary leadership of the real revolutionary party develops among the people, and thereby makes its own existence at stake by completely isolating it from the masses, not only does not itself seriously participate in the movement but also by all possible means tries to obstruct the others' attempt to take the necessary steps and actions for leading the movement to its logical and desired

CPI(M) avoiding militant movement to build closer accord with Congress (R)

culmination. Apart from this there is another reason too. It is no longer a secret that the CPI(M) welcomes the growth of understanding with the Congress (R) and desires to come closer to Mrs. Indira Gandhi who too as we earlier observed (Prol. Era 1. 10. 73), to safeguard her own interest to keep her position firm in Parliament on the face of any possibility of her present secured position becoming any time endangered by groupism and future split in the party and to counter-balance the pressure tactics of the CPI likes to come relatively closer to the CPI(M). Obviously the CPI(M) neither likes to be a party in a vigorous mighty anti-government movement nor desires to take any step or action against the government as this may disrupt its growing understanding with the Congress (R) and Mrs. Indira Gandhi. But at the same time when a movement develops against the anti-people Congress government it cannot remain completely outside of it for that will lead to its complete isolation from the masses. Now with a view to meet both the ends, it participates in the movement but at the same time tries utmost to obstruct its possible growth into a vigorous mighty struggle against the Congress government. For that reason in the resistance movement against enhanced bus fare in West Bengal that has received huge massive support from the people, the CPI(M) has not only refrained itself from playing a responsible and necessary role but also trying utmost to obstruct us from taking the necessary steps and actions for leading the movement to its desired and logical culmination. More over it is not only the picture in West Bengal; throughout the whole country the CPI(M) is reflecting the same

attitude. The sole objective of the party is to any how emerge as the parliamentary force alternative to Congress (R) and thereby come to power in the government by winning election battles. No other objective greater than this can however be expected from a social democratic petty bourgeois party like the CPI(M) however militant it may try to pose itself being guided by political exigencies and pragmatic considerations.

ON CHILE

For obvious reasons the resolution adopted on Chile has drawn our attention. If any one critically examines the said resolution then he would have to conclude that however revolutionary the CPI(M) might appear in its slogans and arguments there is no fundamental difference between the CPI(M) and the CPI, whom the former always bitterly criticise for being utter revisionists.

In the said resolution while playing respectful homage to Allende and other leaders of the former regime and greeting the heroic people of Chile, the Allende regime has been hailed by stating that 'It was the formation of the popular unity Bloc consisting of the Communist party of Chile, the Socialist party and other revolutionary forces to win an electoral victory and to use the presidential regime to weaken US influence in Chile and to further advance the revolutionary movement, (Supplement to People's Democracy 2.12.73 page 28)

Now while condemning in unequivocal terms the US imperialist engineered coup, the activities of the military junta and hailing the heroic resistance put up by the fighting people in Chile we would like to ask the CPI(M) leadership, what is its assessment of Allende? Does it consider him to be a real Marxist-Leninist revolutionary

leader of the people? From the reports so far published in the press we however consider him to be a social democrat and we are of the considered view and hope that any right thinking man would agree with us that, not to speak of furthering its advance, no social democrat can even conduct any revolutionary movement.

Again if the CPI(M) considers Allende to be a genuine Marxist-Leninist revolutionary leader of the people, then naturally another question arises, does the CPI(M) then consider that it is possible to further advance the revolutionary movement by gaining electoral victory which it claims to have been made possible in Chile? Does the CPI(M) consider it to be possible in our country too?

Now let us draw the attention of our readers to another important section of the resolution where while discussing the question of transition from capitalism to socialism it has been stated that 'It showed at the same time that this advance of the revolutionary people would not lead to that "peaceful transition through the parliamentary path" which is held before the people by the revisionists. On the other hand the advance registered by the fighting people headed by the united front of all the revolutionary parties, groups and organisations would be countered by the reactionaries who will resort to violence to bar the advance of revolutionary forces' (Ibid).

Now it is no doubt an important lesson of the history that the ruling capitalist class including all the reactionary forces in their attempt to counter the revolutionary forces would resort to violence and no question would therefore arise of a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. At the same time it might be observed at least from theoretical stand point that if in some remote future, in a changed international

situation the ruling class including all the counter revolutionary forces with a view to counter the revolutionary transition fail to resort to violence then a peaceful transition following the smashing of the old state machine and its replacement by a new state structure might be possible. Now a pertinent question is whether this transition would be possible through the parliamentary path? It is a fundamental lesson of Marxism-Leninism that even if it is assumed that peaceful realisation is possible the transition would never be possible through the parliamentary path, as under no circumstances the parliament an instrument of the bourgeoisie serving the ruling capitalist class can be transformed into a genuine instrument of people's will. In this regard our party under the correct guidance of our leader and teacher Com. Shibdas Ghosh has been able to examine the issue from the correct Marxist-Leninist stand point in the light of modern developments. 'Parliament developed in a particular historical phase in development of production as the super structure of a given economic basis to serve the interests of a definite class as its political form of administration; had those theorists (referred to those who believe that transformation would be possible through the parliament-Ed.B) taken the trouble of understanding it they would have surely understood that Proletarian democracy, whatever be its form according to the objective conditions obtaining in different countries is fundamentally different in character from bourgeois democracy (all kinds of bourgeois institutions) and hence, the political institution of the one cannot serve as the political institution of the other. Parliament which is the super structure of capitalist economy, the basis of capitalist society, cannot serve as the superstructure of socialist society. It not

(Contd. to Page 8)

Does CPI(M) Contend—transition to Socialism Will be possible through the parliament ?

(Contd from page 7)

only cannot serve as superstructure of socialist economy, the basis of socialist society, but also is bound to obstruct the growth and development of the basis of socialist society. Thus elimination of the superstructure of the old basis is also an important condition for the growth and development of the new basis. To a Marxist-Leninist, peaceful realisation of socialist revolution in a capitalist country, if at all becomes possible means peaceful capture of power by the Working class, the bourgeoisie offering no resistance and peaceful destruction of the bourgeois state machine and establishment in its place a new type of state, the Proletarian state. It does not mean peaceful transformation of the bourgeois state into a Proletarian state through reforms, which can never be done. It also means peaceful dissolution of parliament and replacing it by the worker's democratic political institution and not peaceful transformation of parliament into an instrument of people's will which also can not be done'. (Com. Shibdas Ghosh.—On some international questions.)

But what is most is the fact that the CPI(M) in its resolution has not referred to this fundamental lesson of Marxism-Leninism. Rather it has conspicuously avoided it. For, not to speak of farthering forward any analysis of the reasons why the transition from capitalism to socialism would not be possible through the parliamentary path, even it has not unambiguously and categorically stated that under any circumstances the revolutionary transformation, be it peaceful or non-peaceful, smooth or unsmooth would not be possible through the bourgeois parliament. Now a pertinent question is why has it kept silent over this vital point? Why has it not

clearly expressed its observation over this issue? Is it not acquainted with the fundamental lesson of Marxism-Leninism that we have referred to above? If it is acquainted and we think it is, then what prevents it to refer to this historic lesson of Marxism-Leninism? For obvious reasons a searching question might arise in the mind of any sensible man! Does it accept this fundamental lesson of Marxism-Leninism? There is other vital reason for raising this question. Not only that it has not clearly and unambiguously stated that the transition from capitalism to socialism would not be possible through the parliamentary path, even from the ways it has argued like the revisionists in posing the issue as we have earlier mentioned it appears that what the CPI(M) contends is, that a peaceful transition through the parliamentary path would not be feasible as this would be countered by the reactionary forces and vested interests. For obvious reasons the question arises, what would happen if the reactionaries for some reasons fail in their bid to counter it?

It might naturally appear to any sensible man from what the CPI(M) contends that the transition would then be possible through the parliamentary path! Any right thinking man might ponder. Does the CPI(M) believe in the Khrushchevite arch revisionist thesis of capturing a stable majority in the parliament and thereby transform the latter from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of people's will though the possibility of the course of transformation becoming non-peaceful might not be ruled out as the ruling reactionary forces would try to prevent the left wing parties from establishing their control over the parliament?

Jute Workers Turn the Corner in Trade Union Movement

(Contd. from Page-5)

Thereafter, when due to the most unhelpful attitude of the jute barons who refused to even consider a via media formula suggested by the Union Labour Minister which excluded most of the demands of the workers and offered nothing more than the composition of some committees to go into the question of different demands, the talk failed.

The West Bengal Labour Minister then started back-door manoeuvres and at midnight on 13-14th January a fake agreement was signed by management of the jute industry on the one side and the leaders of the INTUC and some of its fellow travellers on the other.

But this game could not befool the jute workers this time. They stuck to the original decision of a continuous strike with effect from 14th January.

More than 2.5 lakhs of jute workers of West Bengal and about 50 thousands outside the state have turned the table squarely on the leadership of the INTUC and its two fellow travellers. The tremendous success of the strike can be gauged even from the admission of the Government and business circles. The jute workers are valiantly carrying on their struggle defying the crude tactics of brutal attack on worker, massing of strike breakers at mill gates etc. as were applied in the Hastings Jute Mill and the Union North Jute Mill, Beliaghata, where workers under the banner of Bengal Jute Workers Union affiliated to UTUC (Lenin Sarani), foiled such methods. In the Beliaghata mill, 5 workers sustained severe injuries in their bustees but this attack failed to cow down their militant spirit.

The workers in eleven jute mills organised under the banner of UTUC (Lenin Sarani), have joined in a grim battle with thousands others to accept the challenge thrown by the Government, management and

pet trade union leaders, and have turned the corner in the trade union movement in particular and democratic movement in general, in the state, since the dark fascist gloom cast its shadow after the rigged election of 1972.

It is for the first time that the jute workers of INTUC-led unions have refused to be blackmailed and bullied by their leadership. This is definitely a silver lining in the prevailing situation. We congratulate the workers for their heroic struggle and convey our struggling fraternity with their just cause.

AIDSO Committee

(Contd. from Page 4)

President—Provash Ghosh
Vice Presidents—
Bishnupada Das, Kantimoy Deb
General Secretary—

Chhaya Mukherji

Secretaries :

Omprokash Suman

R. Pabithran

Dwarikanath Rath

Treasurer :

Bhaskar Gupta

Executive Committee :

Sanjit Biswas ; Chitta Behera ;
Dulal Sanyal.

All India Council Kerala

R. Pabithran.

Vijay Kumar T

Haryana

Lal Singh.

Delhi

Om Prokash Suman.

Anil Kashyap.

Bihar

Kameswar Prosad Sinha.

Arun Kumar Singh,

Dulal Sanyal

Assam

Kantimoy Deb

Mohan Deca

Shyama Prosad Das

Broja Bhattacharya

Orissa

Dwarikanath Rath, Chitta

Behera, Bishnupada Das,

Binapani Das

West Bengal

Chhaya Mukherjee, Sanjit

Biswas, Bhaskar Gupta,

Ratan Mukherji, Chinmoy

Sengupta, Prosanta Ghatak,

Provash Ghosh