

On the Question of Peaceful Economic Competition Between USSR and USA

Since Khrushchev came to power in the Soviet Union, both in the leadership of the party and the state some thinking gained currency in the communist world. Not that all the Communist and Workers' parties throughout the world accepted his formulations but a 'great debate' ensued since then centering round these points raised by the then leadership of the CPSU. The most important points were as follows: Whether the present era, after the vital changes that have taken place since the second world war, is still an era of 'imperialism and proletarian revolution' as enunciated by Lenin; whether the law of inevitability of wars was still valid so long as imperialism existed in spite of the great possibilities of the mobilisation of the forces of peace in the changed situation to thwart the sinister moves of the imperialists to unleash global wars; whether possibilities of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism could become a reality in certain countries not ruling out, altogether, the law of violent revolution in capitalist countries and whether it was possible to transform "parliament from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of people's will". Last but not the least was the formulation—whether the socialist countries and particularly the Soviet Union should enter into a peaceful economic competition with the USA not only to prove the supremacy of the socialist economy over the capitalist one—but in this very process of peaceful economic competition between the two systems whether it was possible to bring about, as an impact of this competition, the doom of capitalism.

Our Party, under the leadership of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, an eminent Marxist thinker of the present era, our beloved leader and teacher has made brilliant contributions in this regard in holding high the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism in a number of valuable articles particularly in "War and Peace, Peaceful co existence and Peaceful transition to Socialism", written by him long ago, in the year 1959. We, therefore, do not intend to take up all these points for a fresh discussion except the last one since we have noticed that this point has, of late, made its appearance in certain journals known as Communist.

So the specific point of our discussion in the present article, is the "Peaceful economic competition between the USSR and the USA". It has come to our notice that 'People's Democracy', the Central organ of the Communist Party of India

(Marxist), in its issue dated 2nd November, '75 has laid much emphasis on this point. Not only the greetings of the Polit Bureau of the Party made on the occasion of the 58th anniversary of the Great October Revolution in Russia was loaded with statistics to prove the superiority of the socialist economy while remaining absolutely silent about the political role of the present Soviet leadership and the political standard reflected by the Soviet party for a long time, the same issue carried a special article on this very subject matter highlighting its immense importance. This article apart from being a chronicle of events depicting the most unfavourable position of USSR being an extremely backward country industrially at the very outset which faced with innumerable political odds that followed immediately after the establishment of the nascent working class state through revolution, has

(Contd. to Page 4)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 9
No. 13

1st MARCH '76
MONDAY

PRICE 30 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

THE STRIFE IN LEBANON

The internal strife that shook Lebanon a few days back may appear to be purely communal in nature, but one must not lose sight of the deeper imperialist designs and intrigues which aim at splitting the Arab unity and isolating the Palestinian guerillas. The U. S. imperialists are eager to keep Arab nationalists under the jackboots and with this sinister design they have propped up Israel against the Arab people. But it is the growing tide of Arab nationalism which is putting a stiff resistance against the imperialist design. So the imperialists have drawn up a grand plan to split the Arab unity and destroy the Palestinian guerillas and the events in Lebanon are nothing but a part of this grand plan.

After the Arab-Israel war in 1967, severe stresses and strains are observed in the internal political life of Lebanon. The Palestinian guerillas began their operations against Israel from south Lebanon after the 1967 conflict and Israel in retaliation bombed the Palestinian refugee camps and Lebanon villages. Even the Beirut International Airport was not spared and after the bombing on the Beirut International Airport there was a massive demonstration against the government for its utter failure to protect the life and property of the Lebanese citizens and the Palestinians. This crisis led to the fall of Yafi government in Lebanon.

Now the political parties of Lebanon are deeply divided over the question of the operation of the Palestinian guerillas from the Lebanese soil. While the Tripartite alliance comprising three pro-western parties like the National Liberal Party, the Phalanjist Party and the National Block Party opposed the guerilla activities in Lebanon, the left parties like the Communist Party, the Baath Party, the Progressive Socialist Party and the Arab Nationalist Movement not only supported the Palestinians but they even demand conscription to prepare the Lebanese masses for a protracted popular war against Israel and non-interference in Palestinian

guerilla activities. The Palestinian guerillas and Kamal Jumblat, the leader of the Progressive Socialist Party have given the call of turning Beirut into an Arab Hanoi. The Tripartite Alliance on the other hand wants to maintain 'strict neutrality' of Lebanon in the Arab-Israel conflict. It is needless to mention that this policy of neutrality is nothing but a pro-US stance of the Tripartite Alliance.

In Lebanon the Muslims constitute 65 to 70 per cent of the Lebanese population and the remainders are the Christians. But it is the Christians who control the entire economy of Lebanon and the Muslims are economically backward sections

(Contd. to Page 3)

Enhanced rates of Postal and Telegraphic Charges put additional burden on Common People

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee Secretary, West Bengal State Committee, S.U.C.I. in the course of a statement has said that, the Central Government declared on 25th February, 1976 its decision to enhance the rate of charges of Registration, Money Order, V.P.P. Telephone, Telex etc. which will inevitably put additional economic burden on the middle and poorer section of the people.

Comrade Mukherjee further said that enhancement of charges to meet the increase in wages and dearness allowances of the

employees cannot stand on its leg. Because the additional amount required for this purpose may be obtained by curtailing the wasteful top-heavy administrative expenditures alone.

Comrade Mukherjee in conclusion protesting against this decision urged upon the Central Government to revise its decision on enhancement of the charges of Registration, Money Order, V. P. P., Telephone etc., and to explore other additional economic means avoiding additional burden on common people.

[Continued from P. Era Issue dated 1st February 1976.]

The question arises: how is all this to be blended for the study of communism? What must we take from the old schools, from the old kind of science? It was the declared aim of the old type of school to produce men with an all-round education to teach the sciences in general. We know that this was utterly false, since the whole of society was based and maintained on the division of people into classes, into exploiters and oppressed. Since they were thoroughly imbued with the class spirit, the old schools naturally gave knowledge only to the children of the bourgeoisie. Every word was falsified in the interests of the bourgeoisie. In these schools the younger generation of workers and peasants were not so much educated as drilled in the interests of that bourgeoisie. They were trained in such a way as to be useful servants of the bourgeoisie, able to create profits for it without disturbing its peace and leisure. That is why, while rejecting the old type of schools, we have made it our task to take from it only what we require for genuine communist education.

This brings me to the reproaches and accusations which we constantly hear levelled at the old schools, and which often lead to wholly wrong conclusions. It is said that the old school was a school of purely book knowledge, of ceaseless drilling and grinding. That is true, but we must distinguish between what was bad in the old schools and what is useful to us, and we must be able to select from it what is necessary for communism.

The old schools provided purely book knowledge; they compelled their pupils to assimilate a mass of superfluous and barren knowledge, which cluttered up the brain and turned the younger generation into bureaucrats regimented according to a single pattern. But it would mean falling

THE TASKS OF THE YOUTH LEAGUES

Speech Delivered at the Third All Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League

into a grave error for you to try to draw the conclusion that one can become a communist without assimilating the wealth of knowledge amassed by mankind. It would be mistaken to think it sufficient to learn communist slogans and the conclusions of communist science, without acquiring that sum of knowledge of which communism itself is a result. Marxism is an example which shows how communism arose out of the sum of human knowledge.

You have read and heard that communist theory—the science of communism created in the main by Marx, this doctrine of Marxism has ceased to be work of a single socialist of the nineteenth century, even though he was a genius, and that it has become the doctrine of millions and tens of millions of proletarians all over the world, who are applying it in their struggle against capitalism. If you were to ask why the teachings of Marx have been able to win the hearts and minds of millions and tens of millions of the most revolutionary class, you would receive only one answer; it was because Marx based his work on the firm foundation of his human knowledge acquired under capitalism. After making a study of the laws governing the development of human society, Marx realised the inevitability of capitalism developing towards communism. What is most important is that he proved this on the sole basis of a most precise, detailed and profound study of this capitalist society, by fully assimilating all that earlier science had produced. He critically reshaped everything that had been created by human society, without ignoring a single detail. He re-considered, subjected to criticism, and verified on the working class

movement everything that human thinking had created, and there from formulated conclusions which people hemmed in by bourgeois limitations or bound by bourgeois prejudices could not draw.

We must bear this in mind when, for example, we talk about proletarian culture. We shall be unable to solve this problem unless we clearly realise that only a precise knowledge and transformation of the culture created by the entire development of mankind will enable us to create a proletarian culture. The latter is not clutched out of thin air; it is not an invention of those who call themselves experts in proletarian culture. That is all nonsense. Proletarian culture must be the logical development of the store of knowledge mankind has accumulated

V. I. Lenin

under the yoke of capitalist, landowner and bureaucratic society. All these roads have been leading, and will continue to lead up to proletarian culture, in the same way as political economy, as reshaped by Marx, has shown us what human society must arrive at, shown us the passage to the class struggle to the beginning of the proletarian revolution.

When we so often hear representatives of the youth, as well as certain advocates of a new system of education, attacking the old schools, claiming that they used the system of cramming, we say to them that we must take what was good in the old schools. We must not borrow the system of encumbering young people's minds with an immense amount of knowledge, nine-tenths of which was useless and one tenth distorted. This, however, does not mean that we can restrict ourselves to communist conclusions and learn only

communist slogans. You will not create communism that way. You can become a communist only when you enrich your mind with a knowledge of all the treasures created by mankind.

We have no need of cramming, but we do need to develop and perfect the mind of every student with a knowledge of fundamental facts. Communism will become an empty word, a mere signboard, and a communist a mere boaster if all the knowledge he has acquired is not digested in his mind. You should not merely assimilate this knowledge, but assimilate it critically, so as not to cram your mind with useless lumber, but enrich it with all those facts that are indispensable to the well-educated man of to-day. If a communist took it into his head to boast about his communism because of the cut-and-dried conclusions he had acquired, without putting in a great deal of serious and hard work and without understanding facts he should examine critically, he would be a deplorable communist indeed. Such superficiality would be decidedly fatal. If I know that I know little I shall strive to learn more but if a man says that he is a communist and that he need not know anything thoroughly, he will never become anything like a communist.

The old schools produced servants needed by the capitalists; the old schools turned men of science into men who had to write and say whatever pleased the capitalists. We must therefore abolish them, destroy them, does it mean that we should not take from them everything mankind has accumulated that is essential to man? Does it mean that we do not have to distinguish between what is necessary to capitalism and what is necessary to communism?

We are replacing the old drill-sergent methods

practised in bourgeois society, against the will of the majority, with the class conscious discipline of the workers and peasants, who combine hatred of the old society with a determination, ability and readiness to unite and organise their forces for this struggle so as to forge the will of millions and hundreds of millions of people disunited and scattered over the territory of a huge country—into a single will, without which defeat is inevitable. Without this solidarity, without this conscious discipline of the workers and peasants, our cause is hopeless. Without this we shall be unable to vanquish the capitalists and landowners of the whole world. We shall not even consolidate the foundation, let alone build a new, communist society on that foundation. Likewise, while condemning the old schools, while harbouring an absolutely justified and necessary hatred for the old schools, and appreciating the readiness to destroy them, we must realise that we must replace the old system of instruction, the old cramming and the old drill with an ability to acquire the sum total of human knowledge and to acquire it in such a way that communism shall not be something to be learned by rote, but something that you yourselves have thought over, something that will embody conclusions inevitable from the standpoint of present-day education.

That is the way the main tasks should be presented when we speak of the aim: learn communism.

I shall take a practical example to make this clear to you and to demonstrate the approach to the problem of how you must learn. You all know that following the military problems, those of defending the republic, we are now confronted with economic tasks. Communist society, as we know, cannot be built unless we restore industry and agriculture, and that not in the old way. They must be re-established on a

(Contd. to Page 6)

THE STRIFE IN LEBANON

(Contd. from Page 1)

of the society. The overwhelming majority of the Muslims extend their support to the cause of Palestinian revolution. The message of Palestinian revolution has fired the imagination of the oppressed and the downtrodden sections of the Lebanese people. It is their feeling that only through the fulfilment of the task of Palestinian revolution the social progress of Lebanon will hasten. It is because of this realisation that the entire downtrodden people of Lebanon have come forward to extend their whole-hearted support and cooperation to the cause of the Palestinian revolution. Though the Muslims constitute the overwhelming majority of this down-trodden sections of the masses, a section of Christians is also with them. The right wing Christian Parties cannot claim that they alone represent all the Christians as a section of the Christians is following the leadership of the Palestinians. But the western press is portraying the strife in Lebanon as a communal conflict between the Christians and the Muslims. As a matter of fact the imperialist powers are adopting all overt and covert tactics to turn the struggle between the right-wing reactionary parties and the leftist forces into a communal and fratricidal conflict which will divide the people much to the advantage of the imperialist powers. The imperialists have no doubt succeeded to a certain extent.

Now the rightist parties saw the latent danger in the operation of the Palestinian guerillas from the Lebanese territory. These parties realised that with the spread of the idea of Palestinian revolution the socio-economic structure of Lebanon would be in great jeopardy and their exploitative system might be overthrown in the mass upheaval. So these parties paid lip service to Pan-Arab line and what they did was nothing but a shameless treachery to the

cause of Arab nationalism. At first the Christian dominated army was deployed to suppress the Palestinian guerillas and the Lebanese leftists, but the Lebanese army is too weak to perform this task. So the CIA backed Phalangists whose avowed purpose is to fight the Arab National Liberation Forces, tried to do the same with storm troopers at its command. Incidentally, it may be recalled that this Phalangist Party was formed as a counter part of the Nazi and Fascist parties of Europe and this party is totally opposed to any change in the socio-economic structure of Lebanon.

Let us now turn a few pages of history to see how the U.S. imperialists have been interfering in the internal affairs of Lebanon. In 1958 when Camille Chamous, the leader of the National Liberal Party was the President of Lebanon, a serious crisis erupted as a result of the confrontation between the rightist parties and the leftist forces. At that time the U.S. marines landed in Lebanon at the invitation of Chamous in 1958. Again during the crisis in 1960, the US State Department had expressed concern over the integrity and security of Lebanon. At present the U.S. Sixth Fleet is watching the situation from the Mediterranean and may intervene physically if the situation goes out of hand.

In this context the role of the Soviet Union is to be properly assessed. It seems that the Soviet Union too has high stakes in the struggle between the left forces and the rightist parties. The Soviet Union is reported to have supplied arms to the Lebanese leftists via Syria. It is undoubtedly true that role of the imperialists and particularly the US imperialists is to be condemned and the imperialist design of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other countries is to be effectively resisted. But this purpose cannot be

served unless a correct revolutionary approach is there in providing all help including military help. Any help minus this revolutionary outlook might do more harm than good to the cause of revolution. It has been pointed out in our previous issues how the Soviet Union has been lacking the militant anti-imperialist tone and has been failing to give effective help to the cause of world revolution by effectively cornering the imperialists in all possible ways. The Soviet leadership instead of attempting to corner the US imperialists in all possible ways are, in reality giving it a fresh lease of life by adopting such policy which, instead of effectively stopping the imperialist intervention, paves the way for it. The Soviet arms aid has not sharpened class struggle in Lebanon but on the contrary it has been instrumental in inciting fratricidal carnage in this unhappy land.

The reactionary forces in Lebanon, who are backed by the US imperialists are eager to maintain their exploitative rule by crushing the progressive movements within the society. To them the unity of the exploited mass of Lebanon is a sign of extreme danger and so they sow the seeds of disunity and harted among the people to keep them divided on the basis of religion and this behaviour of the reactionary forces is quite natural in the era when the reactionary class is crisis-ridden. But it is the duty of the working class party of Lebanon to maintain and consolidate the unity of the Lebanese people for conducting revolutionary battles against the reactionary forces within the country and also against imperialism.

It is seen that an accord to end civil war in Lebanon has been reached

on the basis of 17-point programme. While not minimising the importance of such accord, one must bear in mind that such measures can only give temporary respite and cannot touch even the very fringe of the problem unless the root cause of communalism is tackled. It is the experience where communal frenzy broke out periodically in violent form that such measures on broad humanistic appeal for religious tolerance even by

great leaders could not stop its recurrence. It is only through the painstaking task of completion of social and cultural revolution in ... country that the root cause of the communal problem can be eradicated. So, these tasks have to be incorporated in the democratic movements and only in this way the unity of the Lebanese people can be cemented for the successful conduction of the revolutionary battles against imperialism and internal reaction.

All India DSO Registered A Unique Victory In Raghunathpore College

On 27th of February last All India DSO achieved a historic victory in the Regunathpore College Students' Union elections under Purulia District, WB in a tringular contest. In spite of threats and intimidations by vested interests, the DSO organisers fought relentlessly and secured victory in 21 seats out of 34 seats. In the direct contest for 9 portfolios, the General Secretary, Vice President, Asstt. General Secretary, Cul-

tural Secretary etc., DSO candidates won all the portfolios. Comrades Bhutnath Mahato, Comrade Bulbuli Banerjee and Comrade Monoranjan Banerjee were elected respectively General Secretary, the Vice-President and Asstt. General Secretary. A great enthusiasm has been created among the student community of West Bengal by such all-out victory of All India DSO in the Raghunathpore College Union elections.

Statement about ownership and other particulars about newspaper PROLETARIAN ERA to be published in the first issue after Last day of February.

Form IV (See Rule 8)

Place of Publication : 48, Lenin Sarani, Cal-13.
Periodicity of its Publication : Fortnightly.
Printer's name : Sukomal Dasgupta.
Nationality : Indian.
Address : 48, Lenin Sarani, Cal-13.
Publisher's name : Sukomal Dasgupta.
Nationality : Indian.
Address : 48, Lenin Sarani, Cal-13.
Editor's name : Sukomal Dasgupta.
Nationality : Indian.
Address : 48, Lenin Sarani, Cal-13.

Names and Addresses of individuals who own the newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one percent of the total capital.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE
SOCIALIST UNITY
CENTRE OF INDIA

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

Sd/- SUKOMAL DASGUPTA
Signature of Publisher.

ON THE QUESTION OF PEACEFUL ECONOMIC

(Contd. from Page 1)

described in detail how the Soviet economy has come today at par with the USA and what amount of advance awaits Soviet economy in future giving at the same time a passing reference to the crisis-ridden capitalist economy. Let us quote from the said article and pin point the issues we want to discuss. It has been stated :

"The USSR is now on a par with the USA in the overall volume of capital investments and has outstripped the latter in investment in industry and agriculture. This is significant. If in the past decades, the Soviet Union, investing much less in the national economy than the United States, has yet developed faster, overtaking and even overstripping it in many lines, how much faster still Soviet economy will advance in coming years—now that the USSR is investing as much in the national economy as USA."

It continued: "Relying on its powerful material and technical base and advantages of socialism, the Soviet Union is confident that it will win in the competition with capitalism in all fields."

Secondly, in 'proving' how much this laying of emphasis on economic competition is consistent with Leninism the writer of the article has quoted from Lenin where he emphasised on economic development as a matter of 'absolutely exceptional importance' immediately after the attainment of power by the proletariat. The article said, "In 1921 Lenin pointed out that after the proletariat had taken power into its own hands economics became the main arena of the struggle against capitalism and the economic construction became the main task before the country." He wrote: "The struggle in this field has now become global. Once we solve this problem, we shall have certainly and finally won on international scale. That is why for us ques-

tions of economic development became of absolutely exceptional importance.'" Curiously enough, the GOELRO Plan (the state plan for the electrification of Russia) then proposed by Lenin has been referred to in this article although the present context is entirely different.

Thirdly, it has been stated that "Thanks to the dedicated labour of the Soviet people led by their Communist Party, socialism, the socialist relations of production scored a **final victory**" (emphasis added).

Incidentally, it may be mentioned that the Supreme Soviet of the USSR which concluded its three-day session on 4th December, '75 "made a disclosure of the worst agricultural performance in more than a decade, obliging the government to trim growth rates for light industry".

(Statesman, December 6, 1975)

Further more, "the Gosplan (i.e. Russian Planning Commission—writer) Chairman, Mr. Baibakov, has painted a far gloomier picture than expected. He announced that next year's industrial growth target will be less than two-thirds of the average rate achieved in the last five years, the slowest rate of progress since World War II. The target for light industry, which produces consumer goods has been cut back to 2.7%, the lowest figure ever." (Statesman—editorial comment on 14.12.75)

Now, how far this reportedly "worst agricultural performance in more than a decade" or "slowest rate of progress" (in industrial growth target) since world war II is "symptomatic", or even "consistent" with the "final victory" of socialism—that is for the CPI (M) leaders to answer. But while recognising the necessity of finding out the root cause of this short fall in agricultural productions, if any, or of apprehension of a lower growth rate in industry, the fact "of coming on a par with the USA by the USSR in the

overall volume of capital investment and even overstripping USA in investment in industry and agriculture" cannot be denied.

Be that as it may, let us come to the main point. We all know that capitalism as a system is based on not only capitalist relations of production but also a motive force of production which is nothing but to earn maximum profit by the capitalist class. This motive force of earning maximum profit holds good both in privately owned and state controlled sectors. Even a lay man understands that this maximum profit can only be earned by putting maximum burden on the shoulder of the common people and by exploiting them more and more. It is known to all that this burden on the shoulder of the common people has become extremely heavy with capitalism attaining the character of monopoly and facing more and more crisis. And more they become economically exploited less becomes their purchasing power creating, in the reverse order, a serious problem of capitalist over-production. Whether a capitalist country is industrially highly developed or not, whether it is an under developed or so-called developing country, this problem is there although the intensity of the problem and the living standard of the people are bound to vary depending on the specific overall economic situation in which a particular country is placed. Now that capitalism has entered not only the period of monopoly but also the third phase of intensive international crisis of capitalist market—this maximisation of profit is ensured in most of the countries by selling the commodities at a very high price to a limited section of population. Thus the present inflationary condition or the price-rise of all commodities, from which all the capitalist countries are suffering more or less, are the inevi-

table outcome of the law of maximum profit of the present day capitalist economy which has been further accentuated by the anti-people, pro-monopolist and pro-capitalist policies of the governments concerned and due to failure in creating conditions for widening of internal market and augmenting production, particularly agricultural production. This has highly aggravated this crisis of capitalist market as the problem of "over-production" so to say, is gradually on the increase due to serious fall of purchasing capacity of the bulk of the population. Thus it is crystal clear that in all the capitalist countries the purchasing power of the people always lags behind actual production from which a stagnation is bound to follow in the economic field and there is no doubt, as the situation stands today, that this problem has assumed alarming proportion. So long as capitalism is there, capitalist relations of production is there with its motive force of maximum profit, this crisis of capitalist market, whatever may be its degree, is bound to chase the economy in the present era of imperialism irrespective of the technological advance made or antiquated condition of economy of a particular capitalist country. This is a problem from which even the USA, which is technologically highly advanced and with which country the economic competition is sought to be made by the USSR, is not free. The point of crisis of capitalist market is more true at a time when capitalism has lost its previous relative stability after the emergence of a parallel socialist world system and a parallel socialist market side by side with the imperialist-capitalist world system and the world capitalist market and after the emergence of a new phenomenon of resurgent nationalism when the newly independent bourgeois nationalist countries

have come out in the open as the powerful competitors to the traditional imperialist countries accentuating the crisis of capitalist economy in an unprecedented dimension. The present recession, stagflation (i.e. stagnation in economy even after adopting inflationary measure), dollar crisis etc. are nothing but the inevitable outcome of the inherent crisis of present day capitalism.

This does not mean that nowhere, in no single sector can capitalism show any advance, however temporarily, either in technology or in volume of production. But that is not the main point here. And leaving aside any detail about the economic planning in the USSR, its merits and demerits, if any, it is admitted that "Maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole society is the aim of socialist production; continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques is the means for the achievement of the aim" (Economic problems of socialism in USSR—Stalin).

Since the socialist economy is free from the motive force of earning maximum profit and as it tries to create not only abundance in production but also make the purchasing power of the people go ahead of actual production which alone can ensure maximum satisfaction of the requirement of the whole society, thus creating a constant urge for further production—the question of superiority of the socialist economy over the capitalist one was never doubted and nor was it a debatable point either. Com. Shibdas Ghosh, an eminent Marxist thinker of the present era, our beloved leader and teacher said, "Unlike capitalism, in a socialist economy the large portion of the social wealth produced, being continuously transformed into emoluments constantly

COMPETITION BETWEEN THE USSR AND THE USA

raises the minimum wage-level. It, therefore, induces a consistent, continuous and systematic raising of purchasing capacity and the standard of living of the people under the given condition, including the cultural and ethical standard which is continuously uplifted, so as to reach a level conducive to the fulfilment of the principal aim of socialist production. This continuous rise of the purchasing capacity of the people continuously raises the demand level. It is for this reason that in socialist economy, demand for consumption always outstrips actual production. This serves as a constant flip for continuous expansion and perfection of the principle of planned guidance in order to guarantee the creation of abundance of the products of social production for the people." (A few economic problems)

It should be kept in mind that creation of abundance of production in the economic field cannot be the sole criterion to judge the functioning and performance of any socialist country. A socialist country, being prompted by various reasons and in response to its overall political and economic interest may not always put utmost emphasis on the question of boosting production. Leaving aside this particular aspect of the question and given correct leadership, and a correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism, when a socialist country does not fall victim to revisionism and economism and in this process, does not open up the possibility of restoration of capitalism in any way or does not show any tendency of super-power hegemonism in international politics and assuming a higher cultural and ethical standard of the people who are dedicated to the cause of socialism—there is no doubt that a socialist country can become victorious in peaceful economic competition with any capitalist country, even with USA, to-day or tomorrow.

So what? Will it by itself solve the problem of international revolution? Will it automatically liberate the colonial and semi-colonial countries from colonial exploitation or revolutionise the economic, political or social set-up of the metropolitan countries? These are the questions which no genuine communist can afford to ignore. But we are constrained to note that the CPI(M)'s "People's Democracy" is silent on these points. It is clear that People's Democracy has faithfully echoed the Khrushchvite line of thinking which the present Soviet leaders are also so steadfastly following. The identity of view between CPI(M) and the present leadership of the Soviet Union on this particular point is clearly manifested when we look at the following comment of a Soviet writer: "Every advance in socialist...construction in economic competition between socialism and capitalism has immense revolutionising significance and a large impact on class struggle in the capitalist world. Each advance affects the position and role of the fraternal Communist Parties, and the World revolutionary process as a whole." (Certain questions of the economic competition between the USSR and the USA—By V.M. Kudrov published in the Supplement of Moscow News dated 29th November '75). But how this advance in socialist construction will create a large impact on class struggle in capitalist countries having revolutionising significance has not been explained anywhere in this article. So it is amazing that the common point made out both by 'Moscow News' and CPI(M)'s 'People's Democracy' is the great significance of this economic competition between USSR and USA.

In fact, this is not only an echo but also a continuation of Khrushchev's line of thinking. By giving too much stress on this question of economic competition in Russia, Khrushchev,

first of all, diverted the attention of the people from the task of upholding the cultural standard which Stalin so strongly emphasised in his booklet "Economic Problems of socialism in USSR." In order to pave the way for a real, and not declaratory transition to communism, Stalin laid down at least three basic preliminary conditions of which we quote the third one. He said, "It is necessary, in the third place, to ensure such a cultural advancement of society as will secure for all members of society the all round development of their physical and mental abilities, so that the members of society may be in a position to receive an education sufficient to enable them to be active agents of social development...." But it is a matter of great pity that CPI(M)'s 'people's Democracy' as well as the present Soviet leaders have forgotten even this preliminary condition laid down by Stalin.

Secondly, Khrushchev thought that if Soviet Union could prove its economic supremacy over the USA, common people of different capitalist countries would be more and more attracted towards socialism so much so that they would come forward to transform parliament from an "organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of people's will" thus enabling them to tread the path of non-capitalist way to socialism peacefully. There is no doubt that the spate of revisionism from which both the CPI(M) and the present Soviet leaders are so seriously suffering, has its root in such revisionist thinking of Khrushchev the flood-gate of which was opened up, according to Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, in the twentieth Congress of the CPSU.

Now we all know that the science of Marxism-Leninism has rejected the theory of spontaneity long ago and it does not suggest that any social, political and economic set-up can crumble down automatically out of its own crisis

even being accentuated by the emergence and presence of a world socialist system having a superior economic base and can yield place to a new system simply because it is crisis-ridden and chaos-discredited. What is of paramount importance, in order to bring about a fundamental change in the system already tottering in crisis is to strengthen the role of the anti-thesis, the role of the genuine working class parties in different countries for making the common people conscious about the indispensable necessity of revolution and make them participate in revolutionary battles. This has no option or alternative. Economic competition between the two systems cannot act as a substitute for these revolutionary battles. To miss this vital point under any pretext is to miss the living soul of Marxism.

Com. Shibdas Ghosh, an eminent Marxist thinker of the present era, our beloved leader and teacher raised certain pertinent questions in this regard. He said, "Socialism, no doubt, is to give defeat to capitalism in peaceful economic competition and establish its supremacy over capitalism. But will capitalism die a spontaneous automatic death without the conscious and active organised efforts of the forces of revolution, simply because of the supremacy of socialism over capitalism in the peaceful economic competition? If not, if the end of capitalism and establishment of socialism require the proletarian mass and other exploited masses to unite and progressively transform themselves individually, and, still more collectively into an army of revolution under the leadership of a working class party, wage revolutionary battles against the exploiting class and its state, overthrow the old exploiting order and establish, consolidate and maintain the new order, then should the peaceful economic competition between socialism and

capitalism be posed as an alternative to the task of actively intensifying the revolutionary struggle by the workers, peasants and other exploited masses of the people?" (An Appeal to the leaders of international Communist movement).

These are the questions about which 'People's Democracy' has remained absolutely silent. The tremendous economic progress of the Soviet Union may be a source of delight to the communists. But what great purpose will be served by it if it is not linked up with the question of international revolution? What is the context or purpose of the present discussion and how far this question has a bearing on the Indian working class movement is difficult to understand.

What astonishes us most is their practice of quoting Lenin absolutely out of context. Lenin, after the capture of power by the proletariat, just to emphasise the prime necessity of boosting production at that particular juncture once said that "electrification is communism". Does that mean that while raising this slogan Lenin rejected or negated the necessity of conducting the political and cultural battle for the consolidation and strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia? Or does it mean that the same slogan should be raised by the communists of the whole world irrespective of specific conditions? Or if anybody suggests that the whole world should take recourse to electrification in order to reach communism and quotes Lenin in his support then will it be Marxism or vulgarisation of Marxism?

There is another point. May we ask the CPI(M) leaders what answer will they provide if anybody quotes Lenin from his some other writings of the same year 1921 (mentioned in People's Democracy) where he said, "I said again in my speech that

(Contd. to Page 8)

(Contd. from Page 2)

THE TASKS OF THE YOUTH LEAGUES

modern basis in accordance with the last word in science. You know that Electricity is that basis and that only after electrification of the entire country, of all branches of industry and agriculture only when you have achieved that aim, will you be able to build for yourselves the communist society which the older generation will not be able to build. Confronting you is the task of economically reviving the whole country, of reorganising and restoring both agriculture, and industry on modern technical lines, based on modern science and technology, on electricity. You realise perfectly well that illiterate people cannot tackle electrification, and that elementary literacy is not enough either. It is insufficient to understand what electricity is; what is needed is the knowledge of how to apply it technically in industry and agriculture and in the individual branches of industry and agriculture. This has to be learnt for oneself, and it must be taught to the entire rising generation of working people. That is the task confronting every class conscious communist, every young person who regards himself a communist and who clearly understands that, by joining the Young Communist League, he has pledged himself to help the Party build communism and to help the whole younger generation create a communist society. He must realise that he can create it only on the basis of modern education, communism will remain merely a pious wish.

It was the task of the older generation to overthrow the bourgeoisie. The main task then was to criticise the bourgeoisie, arouse hatred of the bourgeoisie among the masses and foster class-consciousness and the ability to unite their forces.

The new generation is confronted with a far more complex task. Your duty does not lie only in assembling your forces so as to

uphold the workers' and peasants' government against an invasion instigated by the capitalists. Of course, you must do that; that is something you clearly realise, and is distinctly seen by the communist. However, that is not enough. You have to build up a communist society. In many respects half of the work has been done. The old order has been destroyed, just as it deserved, it has been turned into a heap of ruins, just as it deserved. The ground has been cleared, and on this ground the younger communist generation must build a communist society. You are faced with task of construction, and you can accomplish the task only by assimilating all modern knowledge, only if you are able to transform communism from cut-and-dried and memorised formulas, counsels, recipes, prescriptions and programmes into that living reality which gives unity to your immediate work, and only if you are able to make communism a guide in all your practical work.

That is the task you should pursue in educating, training and rousing the entire younger generation. You must be foremost among the millions of builders of a communist society in whose ranks every young man and young woman should be. You will not build a communist society unless you enlist the mass of young workers and peasants in the work of building communism.

This naturally brings me to the question of how we should teach communism and what the specific features of our methods should be.

I first of all shall deal here with the question of communist ethics.

You must train yourselves to be communists.

It is the task of the Youth League to organise its practical activities in such a way that, by learning, organising, uniting and fighting, its members shall train both themselves and all those who look to it for leadership; it should

train Communists. The entire purpose of training, educating and teaching the youth of today should be to imbue them with communist ethics.

But is there such a thing as communist ethics? Is there such a thing as communist morality? Of course, there is. It is often suggested that we have no ethics of our own; very often the bourgeoisie accuse us Communists of rejecting all morality. This is a method of confusing the issue, of throwing dust in the eyes of the workers and peasants.

In what sense do we reject ethics, reject morality?

In the sense given to it by the bourgeoisie, who based ethics on God's Commandments. On this point we, of course, say that we do not believe in God, and that we know perfectly well that clergy, the landowners and the bourgeoisie invoked the name of God so as to further their own interests as exploiters. Or, instead of basing ethics in the Commandments of morality on the Commandments of God, they based it on idealist or semi-idealist phrases, which always amounted to something very similar to God's Commandments.

We reject any morality based on extra-human and extra class concepts. We say that this deception, dupery, stultification of the workers and peasants is in the interests of the landowners and capitalists.

We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the proletariat's class struggle. Our morality stems from the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat.

The old society was based on the oppression of all the workers and peasants by the landowners and capitalists. We have to destroy all that, and overthrow them but to do that we had to create unity. That is something God cannot create.

This unity could be provided only by the

factories, only by a proletariat trained and roused from its long slumber. Only when that class was formed did a mass movement arise which has led to what we have now—the victory of the proletarian revolution in one of the weakest countries which for three years has been repelling the onslaught of the bourgeoisie of the whole world. We can see how the proletarian revolution is developing all over the world. On the basis of experience, we now say that only the proletariat could have created the solid force which the disunited and scattered peasantry are following and which has withstood all onslaughts by exploiters. Only this class can help the working masses unite, rally their ranks and conclusively defend, conclusively consolidate and conclusively build up a communist society.

That is why we say that to us there is no such thing as a morality that stands outside human society; that is a fraud. To us morality is to the interests of the proletariat's class struggle.

What does that class struggle consist in? It consists in overthrowing the Tsar, overthrowing the capitalists, and abolishing the capitalist class.

What are classes in general? Classes are that which permits one section of society to appropriate the labour of another section. If one section of society appropriates all the land, we have a land-owner class and a peasant class. If one section of society owns the factories, shares and capital, while another section works in these factories, we have a capitalist class and a proletarian class.

It was not different to drive out the Tsar—that required only a few days. It is not very difficult to drive out the landowners—that was done in a few months. Nor was it very difficult to drive out the capitalists. But it is incomparably more diffi-

cult to abolish classes; we still have the division into workers and peasants. If the peasant is installed on his plot of land and appropriates his surplus grain, that is, grain that he does not need for himself or for his cattle, while the rest of the people have to go without bread, then the peasant becomes an exploiter. The more grain he clings to, the more profitable he finds it; as for the rest, let them starve: "The more they starve, the dearer I can sell this grain." All should work according to a single common plan, on common land, in common factories and in accordance with a common system. Is that easy to attain? You see that it is not as easy as driving out the Tsar, the landowners and the capitalists. What is required is that the proletariat re-educate a section of the peasantry; it must win over the working peasants in order to crush the resistance of those peasants who are rich and are profiting from poverty and want of the rest. Hence the task of the proletarian struggle is not quite completed after we have overthrown the Tsar and drive out the landowners and capitalists, to accomplish that is the task of the system we call the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The class struggle is continuing; it has merely changed its forms. It is the class struggle of the proletariat to prevent the return of the old exploiters, to unite in a single union the scattered masses of unenlightened peasants. The class struggle is continuing and it is our task to subordinate all interests to that struggle. Our communist morality is also subordinated to that task. We say: morality is what served to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all the working people around the proletariat which is building up a new, a communist society.

Communist morality is that which serves this struggle and unites the working people against all exploitation, against all petty private property; for petty

(Contd. to Page 7)

PRESS CLIPPINGS

THE TASKS OF THE YOUTH LEAGUES

The twain—the CPI and the CPM—have not met yet. They are not even near a dialogue. But the impression going around is that there is already a thaw in their relationship.....

No doubt, in the same letter (to the CPI National Council members) Mr. Namboodripad has said: "I only wish that a time will come when you and we can work together in the same cause".....

What has given a fresh edge to the rumour about the CPI-CPM conciliation is the reproduction of Mr. Namboodripad's statement in a CPI Malayalam journal, Janajugam. This statement, relating to the CPM's decisions at its conference in Madras on January 28, first appeared in Desabhimani, a CPM daily from Cochin. There is no doubt that the very fact that Janajugam has reprinted the statement is significant because this is the first time that the paper has done so.....

Mr. Namboodripad, according to the Desabhimani, has sought the cooperation of "All those who speak of left and democratic unity, including right Communists and the young Congress", for "a minimum programme".

Probably, as days go by, both CPI and CPM may become less and less hostile to each other and may find more and more fields of cooperative endeavour. But what they must realise is that an ideology of today becomes the rhetoric of tomorrow. (From an article by Kuldip Nayar in Indian Express, February, 12 '76).

Madras, Feb. 15—The prohibitory order in the city has been extended for 14 days from today, says Samachar.

The order was issued on February, 1 by the Commissioner of Police banning procession and meeting in the city for 14 days. —Statesman, 16.2.76

Addressing a public meeting at the Marina

beach to mark the unity of the two congress parties in Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry, Mr. Gandhi said reports that DMK had planned agitations and demonstration early this month.

—Statesman, 16.2.76

Mr. Gopal (President of the National Students Union of India), who held the meeting at the Office of the National Labour Coordination Council on Sunday said that there was no room for those in the organisation who criticised the Prime Minister and Mr. Sanjoy Gandhi.

—Statesman, 24.2.75

Union agriculture ministry is of the view that state governments will not be able to complete the process of implementation of the revised land ceiling laws by June 30, 1976—the announced time schedule.

In its latest review of the progress of the implementation of land reform measures in the country since the proclamation of Emergency in June last year, the Agriculture Ministry has said that there has been "poor implementation of the ceiling laws almost all over the country."

The comprehensive review has dealt with all the factors which the state governments have pointed out on different occasions as responsible for hindering the course of land reforms.

The Agricultural Ministry has found no basis in these arguments on the whole. The crux of the issue, according to the review is the fact, that there is lack of —Economic Times. 14.2.76

New (land reform) laws which came into effect in 1971 and 1972 rendered an estimated 38 million acres surplus. According to information available as of December 9, 1975, some 5,41,523 acres had actually been declared surplus on the basis of returns filed

while less than half of this had actually been taken possession of. The amount of land distributed was only 90,205 acres. Under the old laws some 2.9 million acres were taken possession of and 1.8 million distributed.

—Indian Express, January 19.

About 4000 new small scale units have closed down because of recession. This is revealed in a quick sample survey done by the Industry Ministry. Most of these units were set up by technical entrepreneurs in the last three or four years. The total capital investment of the closed units is estimated at Rs. 66 crores.

—Financial Express January 18, '76

The Dilemma

"The Central Labour Minister, Mr. Raghunath Reddy, said recently in Calcutta ... that 3,00,000 workers and employees had been laid off in the last six months and several thousands retrenched. Compared to the same period last year, lay off, retrenchment and closure have increased considerably. Conversely strikes had been fewer in 1974, 40.2 million mandays were lost whereas the latest figure is 17 million mandays, so far.

These two facts in a way represent a fundamental feature of the present day economics and politics in the country.

... ..

The dilemma is, in fact, inherent in the situation. Therefore, 'discipline' is a must. The talk about discipline is just a repetition of conceptions which try to cover up class reality. From the view point of the poor the question is: which class interests does this discipline serve? Discipline to die of hunger in peace or the struggle for the abolition of hunger?

Frontier, February 21, '76.

(Contd. from Page 6)

property puts into the hands of one person that which has been created by the labour of the whole of society. In our country, the land is common property.

But suppose I take a piece of this common property and grow on it twice as much grain as I need, and profiteer on surplus. Suppose I argue that the more starving people there are, the more they will pay. Would I then be behaving like a Communist? No, I would be behaving like an exploiter, like a proprietor. That must be combated, if that is allowed to go on, things will revert to the rule of the capitalists, to the rule of bourgeoisie, as has more than once happened in previous revolutions. To prevent the restoration of the rule of the capitalists and the bourgeoisie, he must not allow profiteering; we must not allow individuals to enrich themselves at the expense of the rest; the working people must unite with the proletariat and form a communist society. This is the principal feature of the fundamental task of the league and the organisation of the Communist youth.

The old society was based on the principle: rob or be robbed; work for others or make others work for you; be a slave-owner or a slave. Naturally, people brought up in such a society assimilate with their mother's milk, one might say, the psychology, the habit, or the concept which says: you are either a slave-owner or a slave, or else, a small owner, a petty employee, a petty official, or an intellectual—in short, a man who is concerned only with himself, and does not care a rap for anybody else.

If I work this plot of land, I do not care a rap for anybody else, if others starve, all the better, I shall get the more for my grain. If I have a job as a doctor, engineer, teacher,

or clerk, I do not care a rap for anybody else. If I toady to and please the powers that be, I may be able to keep my job, and even get on in life and become bourgeois. A Communist cannot harbour such a psychology and such sentiments. When the workers and peasants proved that they were able by their own efforts, to defend themselves and create a new society—that was the beginning of the new and communist education, education in the struggle against the exploiters, education in alliance with the proletariat against the self-seekers and petty proprietors, against the psychology and habits which say: I seek my own profit and don't care a rap for anything else.

That is the reply to the question of how the young and rising generation should learn communism.

It can learn communism only by linking up every step in its studies, training and education with the continuous struggle the proletarians and the working people are waging against the old society of exploiters. When people tell us about morality, we say: to a Communist all morality lies in the united discipline and conscious mass struggle against the exploiters. We do not believe in an eternal morality, and we expose the falseness of all the fables about morality. Morality serves the purpose of helping human society rise to a higher level and rid itself of the exploitation of labour.

To achieve this we need that generation of young people who began to reach political maturity in the midst of a disciplined and desperate struggle against the bourgeoisie. In this struggle, that generation is training genuine Communists; it must subordinate to this struggle, and link up with it, each step in its studies, education and training.

(To be concluded)

ON THE QUESTION OF PEACEFUL ECONOMIC COMPETITION BETWEEN THE USSR AND THE USA

(Contd from Page 5)

politics is a concentrated expression of economics because I had earlier heard my 'political' approach rebuked in a manner which is inconsistent and inadmissible for a Marxist. Politics must take precedence over economics. To argue otherwise is to forget the ABC of Marxism". Lenin also said, "Without a correct political approach to the matter the given class will be unable to stay on top, and consequently, will be incapable of solving its production problem either." (Collected Works Vol. 32 pp. 83 & 84) No doubt, this is an issue which involves the understanding of ABC of Marxism. But it is a tragedy that CPI(M)'s 'People's Democracy' in the name of defence of Leninism asserted that according to Lenin "economics became the main arena of the struggle against capitalism." A true defence of Leninism indeed!

Now when the experience in Russia has proved beyond doubt that the cultural and intellectual standard of the people, starting from their philosophical outlook to the minutest details of individual life—could not be constantly lifted in order to keep pace with the tremendous advance made in the field of economy, military and technology thus creating a gap between the two and when this low level of consciousness proved a fertile soil for the breeding of revisionist thinking which in its turn is endangering socialism by the possibility of restoration of capitalism—then to quote Lenin not only out of context but also to support the contention of the present leadership of anyhow boosting production to win in the economic competition with the USA is simply baffling.

The Soviet people has been thanked, in this article, for their dedicated labour for being led by their Communist Party and for scoring a final victory of socialism and

socialist relations of production. It is of course true that dedicated labour of the people of any socialist country is a matter of pride and a much coveted thing to all communists. This dedication springs from a high level of consciousness where the workers after attaining state power not only strives to boost up production but at the same time show unique readiness to undertake any sacrifice voluntarily and happily and to identify themselves completely with social interest. But the very manner in which the present leaders of the Soviet Union are directly and indirectly encouraging all kinds of material benefits and material incentives suggests only one thing—there is a serious absence of what may be called proletarian revolutionary dedication among the workers. Who does not know that at a time when the soviet union was facing tremendous difficulties both internally and externally immediately after revolution, it was the Soviet workers under the able leadership of Lenin who set forth the glorious record of proletarian revolutionary dedication created through what was known as Stakanovite movement which was not achieved by any kind of material incentive? But at present we find that the Soviet leaders are in favour of even applying the bourgeois policy of material incentive because to them the basic aim of socialism is to raise production any how and to achieve abundance of production by any means. According to them socialism carries no meaning to the workers if it fails to provide them with material benefits more than what any developed capitalist country can provide to its workers. Pointing out this grave danger Comrade Ghosh warned us long before in a booklet entitled "Chiner Sanskritic Biplab" (Chinese Cultural Revolution—Writer) that in general, during the period of socialist construction, the

workers are apt to develop a tendency to secure more and more material benefits and individual gains. They, therefore, fall victim to economism. In other words, the level of consciousness of the ordinary workers is such that to them, socialism stands as a set-up, where they can have more and more material benefits and privileges. That is, the ordinary workers with their level of consciousness simply equate socialism with a social set-up where one can gain more and more economic and other benefits. For this reason, it is their urge for having more material benefits and individual gains that act as the driving force among the workers engaged in developing production in socialism. To these workers, socialism, socialist economy, growth of socialist production—all these carry no sense at all if they do not provide them with individual gains, benefits and privileges. That this was no exaggeration, rather a timely warning that went into the deaf ears of the Soviet leaders becomes amply clear when we find them saying, "Today, the question of living standards has risen to the fore as the economic indicator of competition between the two systems." (Same article of 'Moscow News' Supplement).

Comrade Ghosh has observed that it is no doubt a fact that in socialism with the upward growth of socialist production and development of socialist economy, the workers enjoy more and more material benefits and their standard of living improves basically. But the workers engaged in developing production in socialism should never nourish such a mentality nor should they at all be influenced by such a process of thinking. The mentality of the workers should have to be developed in such a way and their process of thinking should have to be such that they

can realise that it is only for the consolidation and complete victory of socialism in their country and to serve the cause of international revolution that they have dedicated themselves to the task of accelerating the process of growth and development of production in their country. **Because, the consolidation and progress of socialism in a country is inseparably linked up with the progress of international revolution and it is only upon the mutual progress of these two that the progress and development of an individual self is basically depending, both materially and spiritually.** If such and only such is the mentality of the workers, then there will prevail among workers engaged in socialist production, complete sense of dedication.

But 'People's Democracy' has not taken the trouble of analysing these vital aspects without which the question of "dedicated labour of the Soviet people" as claimed by it is bound to become an empty assertion. And one thing is sure; that one of the vital conditions for final victory of socialism is to ensure proletarian revolutionary dedication among the workers and not mere assertion of a declaratory dedication among them. Moreover, although Lenin envisaged victory of socialism in a single country against the protagonists of permanent revolution, he never visualised final victory of socialism in a single country in a world where capitalism was still continuing as a world system.

Lastly, we like to recall a serious warning given by Comrade Ghosh about the policy of material incentive and all that. He said that although this may temporarily show a rise in the relative rate of production, but as this inevitably leads to the growth of the tendency of capital-

ist speculation and anarchy in all stages of production and the productive system, the socialist economy and the socialist system may become threatened with danger within a very short time. We would request the Soviet leaders to take this serious note of warning and ponder over these vital questions while trying to find out the cause of reported short-fall of production in Russia.

Now about the point whether politics should take precedence over economics or the other way round we hold the former position to be absolutely consistent with Leninism. But while adhering to this position, it should be kept in mind that one-sided and isolated emphasis on politics may also create, in the reverse order, a serious danger in the economy of any socialist country. Now putting economics over politics is prone to create all sorts of revisionist deviations about which Comrade Ghosh has given repeated warning. So the real question is to correctly correlate the two. This is a task which the Communist leaders of the socialist countries will have to perform in the economic field. Unless this can be done, the possibility of restoration of capitalism is bound to threaten the Soviet economy today or tomorrow.

We would appeal to the leaders and rank and file members of the CPI(M) to seriously ponder over these questions which are of vital importance to any person claiming to be a communist.

READ

1. Tasks Ahead of the Students & Youths.
—Shibdas Ghosh
2. A Scientific Approach to our Educational and Cultural Problem.
—Shibdas Ghosh
3. The Cultural Movement in India and our Tasks.
—Shibdas Ghosh