

Call Of The 'Peoples' Liberation Pledge Day'

Many a people of our country observes 15th of August as Independence day without realising its real significance. There is also confusion amongst a section of people who considers this Independence as fake. Under the circumstances a historical assessment is necessary in order to determine the real character of Indian Independence.

Broad masses of the Indian people participated in anti-imperialist struggle for driving out the British imperialists and making India free from colonial rule. No doubt they participated in nationalist movement with a view to building a new and sovereign India but their motive was not to make India free from colonial exploitation alone, but also to make Indian people free from all sorts of exploitation—economic, political, social and cultural. In short the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia took part in independence movement for the liberation of the masses in the truest sense of the term. Indian national bourgeoisie also took part in independence movement but with a different motive. Their desire was to make themselves free from the clutches of the British imperialists in order to build up a strong capitalist economy in India and to establish total control over Indian market. In short, the Indian capitalist class was desiring to replace the Britishers to exploit the cheap labour and raw material of this country for maximising their profit only. They only wanted the transfer of political power without disturbing all other institutions of the state as well as its socio-economic structure. Thus it is clear that the Indian people and the Indian national bourgeoisie were strange bed-fellows in anti-British platform. However unfortunate and regrettable it may sound still it is a hard reality that no genuine working class leadership emerged during Indian

independence movement. As a matter of fact these very people who professed Marxism-Leninism and declared communism as their cherished goal backstabbed the nationalist movement in all their activities. In consequence the Indian national bourgeoisie established their hegemony over the Indian nationalist movement. All this happened at a time when internationally the capitalist class as a whole lost all their progressive role and turned out and out reactionary. Indian capitalist class emerged as part and parcel of the world capitalist class and moreover the Indian capitalist class grew under the tutelage of the British imperialists. As such the Indian national bourgeoisie were lacking in the vigour and fervour as was envisaged in the rising bourgeoisie of the western countries. Thus they were not in a position to provide leadership for an uncompromising struggle as was done by the western bourgeoisie during the heyday of industrial revolution. Thus the bourgeois nationalist leadership adopted the tactics of struggle and compromise, characterising their typical reformist oppositional role. Ultimately the British imperialists transferred power to them on 15th of August 1947. Thus 15th August definitely connotes the culmination of Indian nationalist movement under the leadership of Indian national bourgeoisie. It also definitely denotes the end of bourgeois democratic revolution albeit in half-baked and truncated way. But like all

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 2
No. 1

AUGUST 15, 1968
THURSDAY

PRICE
20 P

Bihar State S.U.C. To Contest 20 Seats In The Mid-term Election

(By a Staff Reporter)

Bihar State Committee, S.U.C. in its two-day extended meeting has reviewed the political situation of the state after the promulgation of President's Rule in Bihar. The Party considers that although President's Rule is not generally a thing to be welcomed since it is nothing but a negation of normal democratic atmosphere, yet a situation has been created in Bihar when no other alternative was left. The Party further views with concern the growing tendency of the central Congress rulers and of the big bourgeoisie to throw overboard all the democratic principles and decorum and to instal a dictatorial rule in the country and to bring states one after another under President's Rule.

The S.U.C. firmly believes that the so-called non-Congress parties like Janata Party, B.K.D., Jan Sangh and even S.S.P. are wholly or partly responsible for creating pre-condition for President's Rule in Bihar. Under the circumstances, the Party demands an early mid-term election and the end of President's Rule in Bihar.

The S.U.C. has also reiterated its earlier stand that there should be a United Front of

the genuine left parties to build up and guide the mass movements in Bihar. The erstwhile alliances in the Ministries known as S.V.D. are not the United Front of our choice. The S.U.C. therefore, urges upon the parties like C.P.I., C.P.I.(M), S.S.P. and others to come forward to build up a genuine left United Front on the basis of a common agreed programme and objective. This Front may—if the situation demands, make electoral adjustments with other non-Congress parties during the mid-term election.

The State Party Committee has also decided to respond to the letter sent by the S.S.P. State Committee for having talks for adjustment of seats. The party has clearly mentioned that certain principles must be followed in allotment of seats to various parties—first of which should be organisational strength of a party in a particular constituency and secondly, the defectors' seats should not be allotted to those parties wherefrom defection have taken place. These seats should be distributed to those parties who have best organisational position there. The S.U.C. has tentatively decided to contest 20 seats in the next mid-term election.

other phenomena of this world, the meaning of independence is also relative. In a class divided society independence for all classes is a utopia. This class-division is not the brain-child of the Marxists Leninists. It is an objective reality—a historical event. As a matter of fact classes emanated even before the birth of Karl Marx. Class division in Indian society is also due to the historical movement of the society. So with the achievement of

national independence it is the capitalist class who became really free to make maximum profit. But the fate of the broad masses of the people remains as before excepting the fact that they are being exploited by the Indian capitalist class instead of by the British imperialists. So it is found that after twenty one years of independence the fate of the toiling millions is getting from bad to worse. In spite of execution of successive five year (Continued to page 8)

On Labour and Productivity

Mr. Chairman and friends,

The subject matter of today's discussion is labour and productivity. Though machine and raw material are intimately connected with production yet it cannot be denied that man's labour is the principal component of production. To be more precise, only when human labour acts on nature does production take place. Even the present developed machines are the results of thousands of years of this human labour; at the back of discovery of raw materials within the womb of earth and their exploitation for production has worked human labour. So, briefly said, it comes to this that at the root of production lies the application of human labour. Productivity depends on how and to what extent the development and application of labour power is taking place.

Different persons have expressed different views in regard to the question of productivity. The burden of their song is—workers will have to be made more responsible; they will have to realise that they are to work more hard for the progress and prosperity of the country; trade unions have special responsibility in this respect. There are others who speak of giving incentive to production by dangling before the worker the allurements of more monetary earnings. In other words, these so-called well-wishers of the working class want to take advantage of the worker's poverty, tempt the half-fed poverty-stricken worker to sweat himself just to earn a few more chips, impose heavier work-load on him and subject him to more exploitation. More exploitation almost to the degree of brutality under the smoke-screen of sympathetic utterances towards the worker is their stock in trade. There are still others who are recommending for rationalisation, improved machinery and even introduction of automation. These gentlemen deliberately but carefully try to avoid the fundamental question in this regard, the question of social-political-economic system of the country on which mainly rest the development of

labour power and productivity. Mr. Modi, Chief Guest in today's function, in his exuberance to parade his learning, has taken much pains to prove the superiority of capitalist system over socialist system and show that whatever exploiting character capitalism had 30/40 years back is now absent. It is but natural for an able representative of the exploiter capitalist class like him to advocate for capitalist order. But I must admit that he has opened upon opportunity for me to discuss the fundamental question. I shall fail in my duties if I do not take up the gauntlet thrown by him.

May I ask Mr. Modi a question? Is it possible now in the seventies of the twentieth century to make full utilisation of labour power and increase productivity by talking of country's interests and sermonising to the worker to produce more or by making some payment for incentive to production or even by rationalisation or automation, keeping in tact the existing capitalist order based on exploitation and social injustice? Social science replies to this question in the negative. Because the system which is based on social injustice, the system under which a handful of persons reap fabulous profit

at the cost of toiling millions, the system where the motive force of production is profit and not social consumption, the system which because of exploitation is increasingly contracting the market for the goods produced, can never free labour-power from bondage; under such a system there can never be uninterrupted advancement of productivity and proper application and utilisation of labour power.

Where is social injustice? You may very well ask this question. Does it require any reply? Is it not as clear as day light? Is not the system where production is social production but where the means of production are not socially owned but are under private ownership based on social injustice? The worker works for society yet it is said that he works for himself; yet the capitalist gives himself airs that by investing money he is doing great service to the country. Hon'ble Labour Minister who is presiding over

Speech

By

Com. Tapas Dutta
Secretary., Rourkela Workers'
Union

today's seminar is loud in his praises of the patriotic feelings of the employer class for capital formation and capital investment. May I with all humility ask the Minister a question? Does he know the black shameful chapter of brutal and barbarous plunder associated with capital formation? If he does not know, he should do well to go through those pages of dark days of history. Every student of history knows that brutal physical force, unrestrained plunder and piracy helped a handful of persons to accumulate huge wealth which in the course of economic development emerged as private capital. And as a result of the formation and investment of capital which took place on individual effort and in the long process of continuous development of the means of production and economic development, production today has become social production. If the

employer class is patriotic why then is it not voluntarily handing over to society its ownership of the means of production and its right to invest capital? It cannot do it though such an act is cent per cent logical. Because, behind all its talk of patriotism, country's interests, worker's cause etc. works its mechanism to exploit the working class, fleece society and earn profit to the maximum amount. In the circumstances what is the meaning of talks of development of labour power and increasing the productivity? Have these talks any relation with economic development and social progress in reality?

Secondly, capitalist economy based on exploitation and the law of maximum profit is primarily dependent on market. And the boom and slump of market take place according as the purchasing power of the consuming people rises or falls. In our country 65% to 75% of the rural population are peasants, a large portion of whom own land from 5 acre to 2 acres. The agricultural labourers have work only for 3 to 4 months in a year; and even when they are employed they earn very little. In short, the purchasing power of the rural population, at least by far the largest portion of them, is almost nil. In towns and cities the wages of workers and employees are very low; a substantial section of the urban population are unemployed and, hence, have very little purchasing power. As a result the purchasing power of our people as a whole is very very low. This is causing slump of market and consequently, many a concern is being closed, throwing more persons out of employment. This is further reducing the purchasing power of the people, contracting the market and accentuating the crisis of capitalist economy. This shrinkage of internal market could very well be compensated by foreign market. But foreign market is controlled by powerful imperialist countries. To oust these

(Continued to page 6)

Analysis of the May-June Situation in France

By : Subodh Banerjee

During recent months West Germany, France, Great Britain, Spain, Italy and other capitalist countries of the West have seen tremendous upsurge of student and youth movement in the form of strikes, demonstrations, occupation of school and university premises and violent clashes with the police. Of these countries, France holds a unique position in so far as the amplitude, depth, nature and character of this movement is concerned. In May and June last, thousands of French students rose in revolt demanding reforms of the education system and removal of the fusty atmosphere in secondary schools and universities there. They left their classes, brought out huge demonstrations and, when the police moved against them, occupied the premises of their schools and universities, erected barricades on the streets and violently clashed with the police.

After initial indifference, the French working class by and large came out in support of the student movement when the latter had spread to every corner of the country. Nearly six million workers, constituting more than one-third of the total fifteen million wage-earners in the whole of France, joined the struggle by striking work and occupying some three hundred and odd major industrial concerns covering factories mines, dockyards, railways, airports, petrol stations, electric supply centres, etc., thereby paralysing not only the life line of communication but also the economy of the country as a whole. This struggle by the people of France is indeed an example of their heroic and militant mood worthy of emulation by the working population of our country.

There is no denying that the aims of the student and youth movement in the West are not the same everywhere ; they are different in different countries. But notwithstanding the difference in the aims, the movement everywhere springs from a sense of burning indignation and resentment of the young generation against the existing capitalist social order with its concomitant evils of economic hardship,

insecurity in life, political persecution and moral degeneration which are eating into the very vitals of the peoples of these countries. The capitalist rulers of these countries, as their counterparts in the USA, are, of course, out to turn the attention of the young generation from these ulcers of capitalism and from struggle by encouraging easy purposeless Bohemian life intimately connected with sex, narcotics and crime, a life which makes one oblivious of one's duty and responsibility as a social being and develops indifference to and contempt for social action against social injustice. But, in spite of temporary success, even this strong dose of sex, narcotics and crime cannot destroy for good the finer elements in the youth. Bohemian life only adds to his insatiety and disgust for such a life, as soon the temporary excitement is over. The result is complete moral frustration, resulting in a desperate but mute spirit of revolt fretting and fuming within, which, when occasion presents, explodes like bombs against those who are responsible for creating such an intolerably hellish situation for common men. Behind the present ferment among the students and youths of the

Western countries is working this mental make-up of theirs. It goes without saying that there are others for whom is not the life of Bohemianism, who have found out the purpose of life, who are politically conscious and, so, determined to replace the present rotten society based on inequality, injustice and unreason by another where there will be no exploitation of man by man and where there will be equal opportunities for all to develop collectively. In the background of this composition and bent of mind of the younger generation the last situation in France should be studied.

A certain so-called nationalist newspaper in our country criticised the student and youth movement in France and extolled the conditions of education in secondary schools and universities and the education system obtaining in that country at the time of the last movement. The 'omniscient' writer of that article used the Indian yardstick in measuring the conditions and the system in France. And in doing so he committed a grave error. Even a school boy knows that the concept about goodness or badness is neither absolute nor universal. It is relative and varies not only from time to time but also from country to country. A standard which is regarded as very good now will in course of time be considered low. Similarly, what is covetable to a particular nation may be rejected as sub-standard by the people of another country. Hence, with the Indian yardstick the French standard should not be measured. The educational atmosphere in secondary schools and universities and the education system in France may be better than those in our country. But that does not make them up to the mark of and acceptable to the French people. According to the standard of living of the people in France in general and the rising taste of the student in particular,

the secondary schools and universities of that country are sub-standard. They are under-housed, under-staffed and ill-equipped. Stuffy class rooms, overcrowded and dingy, badly equipped laboratories and libraries, an education system highly expensive and having no living relation between the teacher and the taught and, above all, increasingly domineering attitude of the bureaucratic authorities at the helm of the educational world and more and more withdrawal of existing rights and facilities of the student community are some of the glaring instances of the backwardness and anti-democratic conditions prevailing in the secondary schools and universities in France which have provoked the French students to call their Alma Maters "teaching barracks", a term expressing closeness of the educational institutions with police or military barracks. As the Minister for Education has admitted—he has certainly not placed all the cards on the table—tuition fees in France are so high that not more than 10 per cent of the students can come from the workers' families, 40 per cent of the students are to work outside just to defray their educational expenses and even among the fortunate ones who can afford to be enrolled as students, three out of every four cannot complete their courses of studies. This is certainly not a happy state of affairs. But the last straw on the camel's back was the recent order taking away the rights of the students to hold political meetings inside the university campus and of the women students to receive their men friends inside their hostel rooms, rights so long enjoyed by the French students. The students of the Sorbonne University started movement for educational reforms. But the authorities, in place of favourably responding to the democratic demands for reforms, tried to suppress the movement with the help of the police. The brutal police

(Continuation at page 4)

Absence of Correct Revolutionary Working Class Leadership is Responsible for Failure of the Movement

(Continued from page 3)

repression had the effect of intensifying the movement till it became a country-wide mass student and youth movement militant in nature and character, throwing a challenge to the administration of de Gaulle himself. With the six million workers joining hands with the students, striking their work and occupying their factories, the movement gained further momentum and rose to a still higher pitch. It became a struggle for capture of power. The situation became so hot for the rulers of France that even the proud General once made up his mind to resign and even the bourgeois press could not suppress its anxiety at the possibility of the fall of the Fifth Republic. But the pity is that this mighty militant mass movement pregnant with so much tremendously revolutionary possibility with far reaching consequences to the advantage of the international revolutionary working class movement has ended in fiasco. Revolutionaries of every country including ours should draw correct lessons from this movement.

Some people are attributing the cause of the failure of the movement and left debacle in the last general elections in France to the "adventurist and irresponsible acts" indulged during the movement by the so-called extremist leadership. True that President de Gaulle has won a resounding electoral victory; inasmuch as out of a total of 470 seats for metropolitan France, the Gaullists have this time captured 350, thus improving their previous position by 119. While, on the other hand, the Communist Party of France and the Left Federation have got 34 and 57 seats respectively as against 72 and 118 seats held by them previously. From all counts it seems that the Communist Party expected to repeat the performance of 1936 when following strikes and occupation of factories,

mines, etc. by the French working class a Popular Front Government came to power. The debacle in the election has created a sense of discomfiture in the leadership of the Communist Party also. This has been evident from the all out efforts of Waldeck Rochet, General Secretary of the French Communist Party, to woo the voters by repeated assurances of "orderly and wise" conduct on the part of his party and his post-election reaction following the debacle. It is not correct, in our view, to attribute the reverses in the election entirely to the militant leadership of the movement. Even at the peak of the rising tide of any revolutionary movement in a country election results may be very bad for the party leading that movement. And at the time of decline of any revolutionary movement such a debacle is only to be expected. Let alone other countries, the history of France herself bears ample testimony to it. Thus there is nothing unusual or unexpected in the resounding victory of President de Gaulle and the crushing defeat of the Communist Party of France and the Left Federation in the last election. The political commentators of the bourgeois newspapers are further asserting, on the basis of election results in general and especially in Paris and its outskirts, acknowledged strong holds of the Communist Party, that the Party has lost its influence over the workers there. This betrays their ignorance only. Defeat, even utter defeat, in any election does not establish it. To cite one instance, our Party in the general elections of 1962 did not win a single seat when these so-called political *pundits* observed that our party had been completely wiped out from the body politic of India. But to the chagrin of these political commentators subsequent events proved that our Party had not only been not

wiped out but it had emerged much stronger than before. So it is foolish to conclude from the election results in France that the people there have become "disillusioned about the Communist Party of France."

In our considered view the movement has failed. For, it has failed to do what it could very well achieve, had there been a correct leadership. It is clear that the leadership of the student and youth movement viewed the movement as a struggle for seizure of power. The leadership of the Communist Party of France also, willynilly caught in the movement, visualised the movement in the like manner with the difference that while the former was for armed insurrection, the latter was preparing to "capture a stable majority in parliament with the backing of the mass movement and transform parliament, a bourgeois organ, into a genuine instrument of people's will", as Khrushchev in his thesis on peaceful transition to socialism had formulated and which modern revisionists are propagating even after the fall of that father of modern revisionism. And in that respect the leadership in both the cases is wrong. There cannot be any doubt about the validity of the law of violent revolution even in the changed international situation as at present. The law of violent revolution is still the general law of revolution in every country. So, given this condition, the revolution in France also will be violent. But revolution cannot be made to order. Nor does it take place at the dictate of some leaders. It takes place according to the law of development of mass struggles culminating ultimately in the overthrow of the bourgeoisie from state power. Revolution is impossible without a national crisis affecting both the exploited and the exploiters. In other

words, for successful revolution it is essential, first, that majority of the workers should consciously realise that the revolution is necessary and, hence, organise themselves as an army under the effective revolutionary working class leadership to carry on a protracted revolutionary battle against the reactionaries; secondly, that the millions and millions of the down-trodden masses of the people belonging to the middle forces must support the revolution or at least must not side with the reactionaries; thirdly, that the ruling classes also cannot continue in the old way and a national crisis develops; fourthly, that the rulers are divided among themselves, resulting in a split in the armed forces; fifthly, that the revolutionary forces have their own army or have sufficient support among the armed forces of the state so that they would join the revolution when it would be started and above all, there should be an effective genuine revolutionary working class party armed with revolutionary theory, dragging the people under its leadership with revolutionary politics and transforming them into an organised army of revolution. In the absence of this revolutionary leadership mass struggles are sure to take the form of ultra-left adventurist acts of sporadic movements without leadership or be diverted into the reformist-channel of parliamentary movement. Most of these conditions were absent in France in May and June last. Hence, to try to organise insurrection for capture of power was then the height of ultra-left adventurism and playing with insurrection.

While admitting that conditions for armed uprising and seizure of power by the people were not ripe, it cannot at the same time be overlooked that the mood of the people expressed in the movement indicates that, had

(Continuation at page 5)

Sporadic Militant Movement Without Leadership Cannot Lead People to Power

(Continued from page 4)

there been correct revolutionary working class leadership, the movement could be protected from both adventurism and parliamentarism, linked with the anti-imperialist, especially anti-US feelings of the French people and developed into a prolonged revolutionary struggle against the Gaullist regime. This anti-US movement, if it could be properly organised and conducted, would have drawn not only the vast masses of the French people but a section of the French bourgeoisie as well, paralysed to some extent the resistance of de Gaulle against the movement, taken out the wind from the sail of anti-Americanism which he is using to consolidate and strengthen his administration, isolated him from the bulk of the people who still harbour some illusion about his anti-US stand and accelerated the revolutionary preparation of the French people for ultimate struggle for seizure of power. This anti-US movement then would not have remained confined within the boundary of France. It would have unleashed a spate of anti-US revolutionary movements in all the capitalist countries of Europe now under the jackboot of US imperialism and, hence, suffering from a sense of national humiliation. In all probability this movement would have succeeded in forcing the USA to leave Europe. In any event it would have weakened the position of the USA, spearhead of international reaction and gangsterism, immensely and given a great fillip to the revolutionary struggle by the peoples of the metropolitan countries for socialism and in the colonial and dependent countries for national liberation as also the struggle for the preservation of world peace. But in the absence of revolutionary working class leadership, the militant mood

of the people against the administration and their readiness for a prolonged militant struggle, as expressed in the movement, could not be co-related with their anti-US feelings and the opportunities which the situation presented could not be utilised for revolutionary preparation for ultimate seizure of power by the French people. Thus the movement could not do what it could very well achieve. Herein lies the failure of the movement.

For the success of any revolutionary movement the establishment of correct leadership over the movement is an indispensable condition. And in the present era of disintegration of imperialism and proletarian revolution, correct leadership means one and only one thing—the leadership of the revolutionary working class exercised through a revolutionary working class party, that is, a *real* communist party. Facts have proved that the leadership of the Communist Party of France, as it is now, whatever might have been its revolutionary role in the past, is not that leadership. The leadership of this party has abandoned the lofty banner of revolutionary Marxism and picked up the condemned flag of revisionism. Otherwise how could it sabotage the movement by the French workers, students and youths by, first, condemning it in the beginning and, then, by diverting it into parliamentary politics? It is well-known to every genuine communist that when any revolutionary movement in any country is on the rise, the bourgeoisie of that country promises reforms and prepares the country for parliamentary election, in order to dampen the revolutionary fervour of the struggling people, create political confusion among the less conscious, less militant section among them, weaken the unity of the people and

their revolutionary struggle, channelise the revolutionary movement into parliamentary politics and, ultimately, give the movement an unceremonious burial, if the leadership of the movement swallows the bait of parliamentary election. A real communist party never allows itself to be caught in the trap of parliamentary politics, parliamentary movement and parliamentary election during the flow of the revolutionary movement. This is ABC of Marxism-Leninism yet the leadership of the Communist Party of France, in place of fighting both adventurism and revisionism and thereby raising the revolutionary tempo of the movement to higher and still higher pitch along the correct line, swallowed the bait of parliamentary election thrown by the foxy President, helped the bourgeoisie in diverting the attention of the French people from extra-parliamentary revolutionary struggle to parliamentarism and parliamentary movement and became, so to say, the model of 'orderly, wise and responsible' conduct befitting a truly parliamentary party. At the time of the rise of revolutionary movement such a stand means naked betrayal of the cause of the movement. Some so-called communists in our country in tune with the French Communist Party leadership are arguing that the leadership of the Communist Party of France, by deciding to turn the extra-parliamentary militant movement into a parliamentary battle of ballot box, has saved the French people from premature civil war, blood-bath and meaningless massacre of the revolutionary forces at the hands of reaction. Admittedly, in the interests of successful revolution it is necessary to fight adventurism and avoid untimely confrontation of the revolutionary forces with the forces of reaction. But then

adventurism should be fought not by reformism and parliamentary politics but by correct revolutionary theory and revolutionary proletarian politics. If the leadership of the student and youth movement had been adventurist as a result of which the movement suffered from petty bourgeois revolutionariness then the duty of the French Communist Party leadership was to fight its adventurist politics with correct revolutionary proletarian politics and lead the movement along the correct revolutionary line. In no case should it have worked to divert the extra-parliamentary militant mass movement into the revisionist channel of parliamentarism and parliamentary election. But it had done exactly this.

The leadership of the student and youth movement also was wrong. Because of the social condition, most of the students in France come with a petty bourgeois background. A large number of the students and youths have, no doubt, embraced Marxism-Leninism. But where the leadership of the Communist Party of France is so non-communist, it is doubtful how far correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism do the students and youths trained as Marxists under the aegis of that very non-communist leadership possess! It is likely that their understanding of Marxism is imperfect and they are apt to suffer from petty bourgeois revolutionariness. Besides, a lot others influenced by Trotskyism, anarchism and existentialism were in the movement under their respective group leadership. Such a hotchpotch combination can certainly feed the revolutionary movement if led by a really revolutionary working class party. But left to themselves, these forces cannot lead any revolutionary

(Continuation at page 7)

Full Utilisation of Labour Power and Increase of Productivity is Impossible in a Society Based on Exploitation and Social Injustice

(Continued from page 2)

powers and capture foreign market is an impossible task for the Indian capitalist class. Besides, after the last world war as a result of the establishment of world socialist market over one third of the globe, world capitalist market has shrunk to such an extent that it has lost even relative stability which it enjoyed till the war. The U. S. A., Great Britain, France and other powerful imperialist capitalist countries, because of it, are now faced with serious economic crisis. It has not been possible for them to get over this crisis even by taking recourse to artificial stimulation of increased defence budget and militarisation of economy. In the circumstances what would be the degree of acuteness of this crisis in case of a relatively backward country like India can easily be guessed. Hence, we find that on the one hand for increased profit rationalisation, automation and talks of increase of productivity are going on while on the other hand lock-out and closure of large number of industrial establishments and consequent large-scale retrenchment of workers and employees are taking place, resulting in further fall in the purchasing power of the people, further contraction of home market, further intensification of crisis and further slump in production. Most of the industries, especially in the Public Sector, are working much below their capacity for shortage of order and market. If any one wants to verify the truth of this statement of mine he may contact the order section of the Rourkela Steel Plant. Every one knows that steel produced from the steel plants is meant not for individual consumption but for industrial consumption. But the prospect of establishment of new industrial concerns is now extremely bleak; so is also the prospect of expanding the existing

ones. In Orissa, Kalinga Tube is now closed. 5000 workmen are out of employment. There are so many other concerns which have also been closed. But how many new concerns have been set up in the meantime! Kalinga Foundry at Dhanamondal works just for 3 to 4 months in a year—it can not work throughout the year for want of orders. Can proper utilisation of labour power and increase of productivity take place under such a condition?

The employers who are declaring lock-outs and laying off workers on the plea of recession are themselves increasing the work-load on their workers through incentive to production schemes; they themselves are introducing automation for increased production. Where due to the lowering of the purchasing power of the people effective demands for goods is falling leading to serious crisis, will not automation still further accentuate the crisis by throwing lakhs and lakhs of workmen out of employment and consequently lowering the purchasing power of the people? So those who are advocating for rationalisation or introduction of automation on the plea of increasing productivity and bringing prosperity of our country are doing so not for the welfare of the country, which cannot but mean welfare of the people, but for increasing their profit by reducing the cost of production at the cost of the toiling people. There cannot be any shade of doubt about it. It goes without saying that automation is a significant contribution of human labour of scientific invention of man, which under suitable social condition reduces man's labour and increases production.

Such an innovation could have been a blessing but now it is curse and our people are looking at it not with admiration but with fear. Under

capitalism automation is associated with tears with retrenchment and increased unemployment, with intensification of economic crisis, particularly in relative backward capitalist countries like India. Now in the existing economic system it is like a demon that sucks the life blood of society only to inflate the bank balance of the exploiters. Late Prime Minister of India, Lal Bahadur Shastri, when advised to mechanise and modernise our out-moded, back dated agriculture, excitedly rebuked his advisers by saying that he was not a fool that he would mechanise agriculture, render millions of people now engaged in agriculture unemployed and bring the economy of the country on to the verge of collapse. Capitalism today in our country has been caught in the horns of a dilemma. Solution of the acute food problem calls for mechanisation and modernisation of our agriculture: automation also can increase production manifold. But they will throw out of employment millions of persons to absorb whom in industries, existing and new, is an impossibility, tremendously reduce the purchasing power of the people, still further aggravate the crisis of market and force many of the existing industrial concerns to close down. And if mechanisation and modernisation are not done then food problem deteriorates, industrial backwardness prevails, economic and consequent military might is not established and the present state of appalling poverty, hunger and privation continues. Capitalism at present is faced with such a situation that it is impossible for it to overcome its crisis. If one crisis is solved with great difficulty a new crisis comes in.

In the face of this stern reality some persons in tune with the U.S. death-merchants are parroting that

even today capitalism is progressive. They are loudly proclaiming that at present there is no exploitation under capitalist system. History, of course, says just the reverse. In the first half of the nineteenth century when capitalism had not emerged as monopoly capitalism, when capital had not yet taken the shape of finance capital and assumed imperialist character, even then competitive capitalism, in spite of its exploiting character, had an overall progressive role in the matter of development of production and social progress. But in the present epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution capitalism as a social force has lost its progressive role and become a reactionary force opposing social progress and development of production. Not only has capitalism now become more brutal in exploiting the people in its own country and the peoples of colonial and dependent countries. It has also not the power to carry on industrial revolution because of further intensification of capitalist crisis resulting in total absence of even the relative stability which world capitalist market used to enjoy prior to the last world war. Abraham Lincoln as the representative of the progressive bourgeoisie raised the banner of equality, fraternity and liberty in the USA but that banner is now trampled under in his own country. Racialism, to remove which he had to sacrifice his life has now assumed alarming proportions in the form of Negro persecution in America. Only the other day Martin Luther King, leader of the Negro democratic movement, had been murdered. Export of counter-revolution in different countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, barbarous war of aggression in Vietnam, *en masse* murder of patriotic Vietnamese people fighting for

(Continued to page 8)

The Name, Communist, by itself, does not Make a Party Communist

(Continued from page 5)

movement. Sacrifice on their part, even sacrifice of life, may not be lacking but this spirit of sacrifice alone is not enough for leading a revolutionary movement. Revolutionary steeling, theoretical and practical, is essential. The student leadership lacked it. It is true that the leadership of the French Communist Party had exposed its revisionist character and betrayed the people in their movement. But that is no ground for being adventurist or anti-communist. The remedy of the damage done by the leadership of the Communist Party does not consist in starting sporadic militant mass struggles without any leadership. The remedy lies precisely in the building up of a *real* communist party in France. Scores of sporadic militant mass struggles will fail to improve the situation for revolution in France, tremendous sacrifice and militancy of the masses of the people notwithstanding, if the indispensable and primary task of building a *real* communist party in France is not performed. Such a party alone could save the last revolutionary movement in France from its ignominious failure and the catastrophe it had faced. Such a party alone can save the French students and youths and for that matter the people from the present unbearable situation. We do not know whether and how far the students, youths and workers of France have moved in that direction—the direction of building a *real* communist party in France.

We are deliberately adding the word 'real' before 'communist party'. For, one may like it or not, the reality is that many of the parties that are now moving with the name communist party are not *real* communist parties. Whether the communist party of any country other than our country is a *real* communist party or not is not for us to

decide. The people of that country will, of course, have to decide it. Nevertheless we cannot but draw the pointed attention of the peoples of different countries to the dry reality confirmed by historical experience of current international revolutionary working class movement that the name '*communist*' attached to a party by itself does not necessarily make that party a *real* communist party. For the growth and emergence of a *real* communist party are necessary the correct process of formation of a communist party, practice of Leninist organisational principle, dialectical methodology in

approach to problems, revolutionary working class process of thinking and process of movement and the correct revolutionary proletarian politics, that is, revolutionary theory. The name '*communist*', the sincerity of the members to build a communist party and their sacrifice are not sufficient for the emergence of a *real* communist party. It is ultimately the revolutionary theory, the revolutionary proletarian politics and the processes, principle and methodology mentioned above that matter. On them depends whether a *real* communist party or a petty bourgeois party falsely masquerading as a communist party will

emerge. Furthermore, the more organisationally strong such a petty bourgeois but nominally communist party is, the more difficult hurdles it creates in the revolutionary preparation of the masses of the people of the country concerned for seizure of power. Because, then more effectively it acts as an instrument of compromise with the ruling bourgeoisie. Without the liquidation of the influence of that party over the people there can be no revolutionary movement, let alone revolutionary struggle for seizure of power by the people. This is the lesson which our people must draw from the last movement in France.

Santhal Pargana S. U. C. Organises 2500 strong Demonstration Before Pakur S. D. O.

(By a Staff Reporter)

On 9th. July last Pakur Town has witnessed 2500-strong biggest Adibasi Kisan rally ever held under the auspices of S.U.C. Despite the torrential rains which was continuing for several days Adibasi Kisans and workers of nearby stone mines numbering 2500 beating Santhali 'War-Drums' and holding Red Flags and S.U.C. festoons converged in the town coming from different villages of Pakur Sub-Division, some even travelling a distance of 25 miles in the noon.

The demonstration after gathering in front of the Maidan near the S.U.C. Party Office proceeded towards the Sub-Divisional Court. It was led by Com. Shankar Singh Bihar State S.U.C. Secretary, Com. Pritish

Chanda, a C. C. Member and Comrades Amin, Pakur S.U.C. Secy, Jitu Soren, Adibasi Kisan leader.

The S.D.O. Court was heavily guarded by Armed Police contingents. The Kisans demonstrated before the Court for some time while Com. Pritish Chanda, Shankar Singh, Amin and Jitu Soren met the S.D.O. on behalf of the Rally and handed over a memorandum which listed several demands including—

- i) Immediate declaration of "Famine Area" of the Pakur and Maheshpur P.S.
- ii) Free distribution of Ration to the affected people ;
- iii) Ration supply in villages ;

- iv) Enquiry in starvation death of Sheikh Ali;
- v) Stop of mass retrenchment in Quarries,
- vi) Return of Adibasi Kisan lands to the actual tillers which have been grabbed by the Mahajans.
- vii) To protect the poor Adibasi Kisans from merciless tortures by the Mahajans and Bhakats etc.

The S.D.O. assured to fulfil most of the demands. A big mass meeting was held after the demonstration before the court was over in the evening which was presided over by Com. Shankar Singh and addressed by Com. Pritish Chanda, Amin and Jitu Soren.

ALL INDIA STATION MASTERS' 15th ANNUAL MEETING

(By a Staff Reporter)

The All India Station Masters Association held its 15th. Annual General Meeting in the Netaji Subhas Institute Hall, Calcutta, on 18th & 19th July last. On the 18th the Delegates' session was held

and the open session on the following day.

Com. Subodh Banerjee in his address on the 2nd day while supporting the demands of the SMs & ASMs said that the country was on the road of Fascism. Emergence of State monopoly capital,

concentration of economic powers, curtailment of democratic of rights, compartmentalisation of education, encouragement to all sorts of unscientific ideas & fads, were nothing but the symptoms of this trend. He said, that no move-

(Continued to page 8)

15th AUGUST

(Continued from Page 1)

plans the starvation and the resulting premature deaths are on the increase. But this is not due to any want of national wealth. National wealth has increased manifold but the bulk of this increased wealth has been appropriated by the ruling class. The steam roller of oppression has virtually reduced the masses to beggars. The purchasing power of the people has been drastically reduced. In consequence of inflation and low purchasing power of the people grinding recession has set in. But the capitalist class is shifting the whole burden of recession onto the shoulders of the working class. Retrenchment, closure, lock out and lay off are the order of the day. The train of unemployed army is swelling to an unimaginable size. This recessionary tendency can not be halted even by large scale defence expenditure. There is chaos and stagnation in every walk of life. In order to deal with the resulting mass discontent the ruling clique is curtailing even the limited democratic rights enjoyed by the people. Political opponents are detained without trial. Even the provision of P. D. act has become inadequate to them and so D. I. R has been resorted to in season and out of season. As a matter of fact the ruling class has let loose fascist oppression to gag the voice of the masses. In the economic field rapid economic centralisation is taking shape as is evident in monopoly commission report. In the field of culture the ruling class is trying to impose the culture of their choice thus exposing the society to cultural degeneration. The cultural degeneration of the present age has been deftly fanned and fostered by the ruling class. Further in order to create cleavage amongst the masses communal and parochial tension is being aroused in a subtle way thus throwing the question of social and cultural integration of India into the wind. These are all symptoms of fascisation of Indian society and in

reality fascism is growing in India under the patronage of Congress even within the frame work of Parliamentary democracy. So in order to check fascism and stop the process of degeneration and to open the flood gate of social progress this capitalist class has got to be overthrown and socialism is to be established. But this is impossible without the establishment of a genuine and effective working-class leadership in the country. S. U. C. is such a party which is slowly but steadily fulfilling that necessity. It is the task of the people to know the stand of our party on various national and international issues, to be acquainted about its leadership and help this party grow in every possible way. At present this is the real task which has got to be completed for the emancipation of the masses from the yoke of exploitation. With this end in view S.U.C.I. is observing 15th August as the "Peoples' Liberation Pledge Day."

STATION MASTER

(Continued from page 7)

ment should be judged from the point of view of legality alone. It should be judged on the anvil of legitimacy. On the basis of correct assessment of the enemy's strength, organisation for the movement was to be shaped out.

Com. Chitta Roy M.P. President of S.E. Zone of the Association in his presidential address in the open session expressed the same view and called upon the people to support this movement.

Others who spoke in the meeting were, Sree Bijoy Banerjee, D.L. Sengupta M.P. Nani Bhattacharjee, A.P. Chatterjee M.P., J.M. Biswas M.P. etc.

The Association will start 'work-to-rule' movement from the midnight of 18th August if their legitimate grievances are not redressed in the meantime.

Labour & Productivity

(Continued from page 6)

national independence and national re-unification—all these show the real colour of the imperialist USA. Not only in the USA even in Great Britain, bastion of liberalism and bourgeois democracy of the by gone days, is now in the grip of rabid racialism. In our country also communalism, provincialism, linguism, casteism and such other fissiparous anti-people cults are raising their ugly heads afresh; communal riots resulting in dastardly attacks on minority communities, murder of innumerable men, women and children, loot and arson are taking place more frequently than before. This is the real picture of capitalist social order all through the world.

It does not require much intelligence to understand that the capitalist class in order to disrupt the unity of the working class is encouraging the disruptionist forces in their separatist moves. The revolutionary united organisation of the working class which is the main instrument of anti-capitalist revolution is also the fundamental basis of productivity. But even though the employer class talks of raising the productivity yet it objectively tries to disrupt the unity and organisation of the working class by organising employer-sponsored unions and carrying on an anti-working class propaganda. The capitalist class does it precisely for its class character and its fear for revolution. A section of so-called intellectuals kept and nurtured by the employer class shamelessly condemn the worker's struggle against social injustice and exploitation as the greatest impediment to increase in production and productivity. It is high time for every patriotic democratic and honest citizen to realise that every struggle by the worker against social injustice for emancipation from the yoke

of capitalist rule is not an impediment to more production. It on the contrary, aims at overthrowing capitalism which is at present standing in the way of all out industrial revolution and uninterrupted development of productive forces and thereby freeing productive forces from its present bondage and opening the door of ever increasing production.

Thus it is clear that because of exploitation of the working class, the main force of production, it is not possible under capitalism to secure full utilisation of labour power and its development. It is also clear that because of crisis and constant shrinkage of market on which is based capitalist production demand for goods is increasingly falling which is working as a brake against rapid industrialisation and increase in production. This being the position, no amount of pulpit speech commencing increase in productivity nor any formula will be able to release production from its present bondage, substantially develop labour power and raise productivity under the existing capitalist system. It is only through the establishment of socialism by overthrowing capitalism and ending all sorts of exploitation of man by man and national oppression on grounds of religion, language, caste, etc. that social justice can be established in reality and industrial revolution with continuous and uninterrupted advancement of productivity and production carried on. There is no other way.

(Speech delivered by Sri Tapas Dutta General Secretary Rourkela Workers Union, Rourkela. In a seminar held on 16. 5. 68 at Barbil (Orissa) organised by Government of Orissa, Labour Department.

Labour Minister Orissa was the chairman and Mr. Modi (Director Tata Co.) was the Chief Guest.)