

THE 31st JULY EPISODE

POLICE, BUREAUCRACY AND VESTED CIRCLE IN LEAGUE WITH CONGRESS—ON WARPATH AGAINST U. F. GOVT.

The despicable rampage by a section of West Bengal police force in the State Assembly on the afternoon of 31st July last has shocked the democratic sections of the people in the country and evoked the immediate and strong condemnation for the sort of vandalism perpetrated by the police. The C.P.M. leader and the Minister-in-charge of Home portfolio Mr. Jyoti Basu had to admit that this was a shameful event and an unworthy act of the police which even violated the sanctity of the House. None can perhaps miss to recollect that at the time of distribution of portfolios among the different constituents of the U. F. C.P.M. doggedly fought for retention of this particular Home Ministry and advanced its case that since this party had to bear the major responsibility of fulfilling people's will in this state and as the 'champion' of class struggles wish to develop the democratic mass movements on a large scale, it could not leave this portfolio to any other party.

People naturally expected that after the demand of the C.P.M. was met, there would follow a radically different approach in the matter of running the police administration and the tempo of legitimate democratic movements on all fronts would attain new heights, being freed from the interference of police forces. In view of the above objective of carrying on a fierce class struggle, the broad masses of the people in the state had pinned much hope on the U.F. cabinet and specially on C.P.M. that they would spare no pains to control the police and deal with firmly their various acts of arbitrariness and misuse of power. It was also in the interest of sharpening class struggle and accelerating the legitimate democratic struggles for realising the just demands of the various sections of the people, the U.F. should have evolved, despite serious ideological differences within itself on various issues, a uniform standard of behaviour and singleness of approach in

ordering the police administration to cope with the new situation which favours the broad masses to mount struggle against the vested circle. Unfortunately, all these popular hopes of controlling the police force and the administration and putting a constant pressure on the police to behave neutrally and in a patriotic way did not come to fruition, thanks to the performance of the C.P.M. and its leader Mr. Jyoti Basu, in handling this important sector of administration.

BIPLAB SEN

The C.P.M. has been explaining the invasion of the Assembly House as a planned maneuver of Congress to embarrass and disrupt the U.F. Govt. We are completely in agreement with this observation that the Congress had definite connivance with the conspirators. But at a time when the U.F. enjoys so much popularity and has overwhelming majority in the House and when the

(Continued to page 4)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Editor-in Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 3
No. 1

AUGUST 16, 1969
SATURDAY

PRICE
20 P.

The Telengana Tragedy—

Slogan of formation of a separate state is a reactionary demand of the separatists

Starting from a very simple demand of the safeguard of the people of Telengana region—necessitated from a defective implementation of Gentleman's Agreement of 1956 (regarding the scope of Govt. Service, education etc.) between the Congress leaders of Telengana and Andhra region—the separatist forces of Telengana, under the leadership of Dr. Chenna Reddy & Co. have pushed today the situation of the state to a stage of grim tragedy. During the last six months the situation here has been allowed to turn from bad to worse, from worse to still worse without any hope of immediate solution.

Mass massacre of innocent lives, orgy of violence and vandalism, closure of educational institutions, loot, arson, molestation of women, assaulting of men, curfews and general strikes, all combined together, has practically paralysed the administration to a point of no return. The air dash of Prime Minister and on-the-spot enquiry by the Union Home Minister failed to bring home the points at issue. Apart from the so-called fundamental demand of the formation of a separate Telengana state within the state of Andhra, the demand of resignation of the Chief Minister Sri Brahmananda Reddy, imposition of President's Rule and selection of a Chief Minister from the Telengana region also came to the forefront from time to

time. Joint appeal by different political leaders on the question of giving adequate safeguard to the people of Telengana region etc. could hardly improve the situation.

It is really amusing that the Central Congress leaders who always wax eloquent on the virtues of national integration etc. have miserably failed to maintain even the minimum organisational cohesion on this issue. Two warring groups represented by Brahmananda Reddy and Chenna Reddy—both of these, belong to the same organisation, Congress, which is still at the helm of affairs of the Central and a number of State Govts. in the country. The Congress speaks against separatism in general but is hesitant to take strong measures against

(Continued to page 6)

S. U. C.'s suggestions on inter-party violent clashes among the constituents of the U. F.

Reports of violent clashes between different constituent parties of the U.F., leading to murder of local workers and supporters of these parties and the burning of their houses and the looting of their properties, are still coming, to the great jubilation of the Congress and other reactionary parties and forces and deep dismay of democratic and progressive parties, mass organisations and individuals in our country.

These violent clashes are weakening the solidarity of the U.F., tarnishing its image and giving a handle to its enemies to carry on anti-U. F. propaganda. Over and above these negative effects, these violent clashes between the constituent parties of the U.F. are creating positive conditions for the emergence of extreme right reactionary forces in increased strength in the State.

This being the situation, our Party cannot but feel grave concern at these incidents of violent clashes. We strongly feel that these clashes must stop for good. But we at the same time are convinced that mere expression of pious wish condemning these violent clashes and upholding the virtues of maintaining the unity of the U. F. will not solve the problem. Unless the problem of violent clashes between the constituent parties of the U.F. is scientifically analysed in a concrete manner, their root cause detected and effective steps are taken to eradicate the root cause and other factors that help the root cause, there will be no end of these violent clashes.

I

We have received a copy of the note circulated by five constituent parties of the U.F. in this regard. We thoroughly disapprove of the method of bypassing the U.F. and forming a front of five so-called big parties within the U. F. adopted by these parties in this case. Because firstly, there can be no denying the fact that the problem of violent

clashes between different constituent parties of the U.F. is of serious concern to the Front as a whole and not to the five parties only, as has been made to appear by the circulation of the five-party note. In the circumstances, there is no ground for these five parties to keep the discussion on inter-party violent clashes among the U.F. constituents confined among themselves to the deliberate exclusion of nine other constituent parties. Secondly, such a formation of a group within the Front obstructs free, frank and open discussion among all the constituents of the U.F., encourages back-stage manoeuvres, leads to cliques and coteries, undermines the solidarity of the U. F. and impedes the functioning of the U.F. as a team. Thirdly, combination of big parties to the exclusion of small ones reflects big party chauvinism cutting at the very root of the concept of equality of all the parties, big or small, in the U.F. in the matter of mutual relationship among themselves. Lastly, this reflection of big party mentality influences the administration machinery so much so that it tries to please

the big at the cost of the small. It also gives scopes to top bureaucrats and police officials to exploit this division between the big and the small and play one section against another. Our Party, therefore, takes serious objection to this practice of forming group within the U. F. and the attempts to by-pass the Front.

We cannot but note another very bad tendency on the part of these five parties. It has been reported in newspaper (the report still remains uncontradicted) that some leaders and Ministers of these five parties sat together to the exclusion of Ministers belonging to other eight parties to chalk out a programme of co-ordinated functioning of the U.F. Ministry. If the report is true then this move deserves criticism in as much as this is against overall co-ordinated functioning of the Cabinet. It is an attempt to drag the coterie-formation within the U.F. to the Cabinet level. It is an open encouragement to the bureaucracy and police to behave differently to different parties and Ministers. Is it not an instance of difference between profession and practice to talk of co-ordinated functioning of the Cabinet and moving against such a co-ordinated functioning?

II

Besides this objection to the method adopted by the five parties which has undermined the U.F. we have other objections against the content of the note itself. In our considered view, the five parties have discussed in their note the problem of inter-party violent clashes between different constituent parties of the U.F. most superficially without trying for once to find out the root cause that accounts for these clashes. Furthermore, when concrete

analysis of concrete condition is called for to arrive at truth, without which the problem cannot be solved, the five parties, by making a generalised statement, have avoided concrete analysis and helped the suppression of truth. We do not mean that the suppression is deliberate. But all the same the fact is that truth has been suppressed.

It will perhaps be helpful, if we illustrate it. For example, the five parties in their note have stated: "The anti-social elements who thrived under the Congress regime during the last two decades now feel insecure with the Congress and try to get support of the parties of the Front. They help in developing inter-party clashes in different areas." It is certainly not a concrete analysis of concrete condition. Had there been any attempt to have concrete analysis of concrete condition then the five parties would have asked the question—if the anti-social elements who thrived during the Congress regime now feel insecure with the Congress and, consequently, transfer their allegiance to some constituent party or parties of the U.F. then which party or parties will they choose? Science of probable logic would have then given them the reply that the anti-social elements would surely choose such parties in the U.F. as can provide them security and protection, because of their overall control over the administration in West Bengal in general and over the Home (Police) Department in particular. The small constituent parties of the U.F. are certainly not such parties. Local reports also confirm that the anti-social elements who thrived during the Congress regime are now turning majorly to a particular cons-

(Continued to page 3)

Lack of philosophical tolerance, blindness, party fanaticism and a mechanical sense of discipline

(Continued from page 2)

tituent party of the U.F. Why then make a generalised statement placing all the constituent parties of the U.F. on the same footing and thereby prevent truth from coming out? Without bringing truth to light the problem cannot be solved.

Similarly, take the case of jotedars, mahajans and other vested interests. These reactionary forces may pose as supporters of some constituent parties of the U.F. and try to foment clashes between the constituent parties of the Front. But can their attempt succeed if conditions for successful operation of this sinister game by these forces of reaction do not exist inside the Party? The answer is in the negative. Have the five parties made any attempt in their note to determine what these conditions are and how they should be removed? Unfortunately they have not done it. Then again, may we ask these five parties—which are the constituent parties of the U.F. where the jotedars, mahajans and other vested interests may seek refuge? Definitely they are not generally small parties. Why then make a generalised statement holding each and every constituent party guilty of giving shelter to jotedars, mahajans etc. when the reality is something different? Does such generalised statement withholding cognizance of truth and reality help anybody to correctly tackle so serious a problem as that of inter-party violent clashes among the U.F. constituents and solve it?

Similarly generalised and so incorrect, is their view that the constituent parties of the U.F. in order to expand their respective party by easy method, are accommodating all sorts of persons who want to join the party and using ministerial positions. This

may be true for some but certainly not for all the constituent parties of the U.F. We think that there is no need of giving any more illustration to establish our point that the five parties in their note have failed to recognise truth by making generalised statement in place of making concrete analysis of concrete conditions.

The five parties have also not cared to find out the root cause of these violent clashes. Some of their arguments are simply amusing. According to the five parties, one of the factors responsible for violent clashes between different constituent parties of the U.F. is the harping by the Congress on the differences among the constituents of the Front. It is true that the Congress to regain its position is harping on the differences

form the root cause of inter-party clashes

among the constituents of the U.F. banking on a possible rift among them. The U.F. has, no doubt, got to combat this campaign by the Congress. But we fail to understand how this harping by the Congress can inspire one constituent party of the U.F. to violently attack the supporters of another fraternal constituent party. How can the harping by the Congress be a factor responsible for inter-party violent clashes among the U.F. constituents? Can such an analysis be called analysis, let alone scientific analysis?

Take the next factor. The five parties hold the "CIA agents and other imperialist agents, agents of big industrial magnates and reactionary parties and groups in the Country" as another factor responsible for inter-party violent clashes among the constituents of the U.F. There is no doubt that these agents are there to disrupt the

unity of the Front. The menace of these agents especially of the CIA and other imperialist agents, should not be under-estimated. But is it possible for a handful of these agents to carry the entire party in any local area with them in causing violent clashes with another fraternal constituent party unless there exist favourable conditions within the party for successful operation of these agents or unless the party is just an assembly of motley crowd with a bureaucratic leadership rotten to the core at the top completely isolated from the rank and file at the bottom? In that case also the cause of violent clashes will not be the agents but the internal conditions of the Party.

III

Thus it is clear that the five parties have failed to detect

further sectarian party interest and rapidly expand the party by some parties has created conditions for intensification of these clashes.

It goes without saying that the U.F. is composed of parties with different and even diametrically opposite ideologies. In the circumstances, ideological differences on various questions cannot be ruled out among the constituent parties. Notwithstanding these differences there are grounds of unity among them which are no less real; otherwise the 32-Point programme of the U.F. would not have been there. But since there are ideological differences, there are bound to be ideological struggles between the constituent parties of the U.F. to resolve these differences, there being no other way of resolving

the root cause of these violent clashes. The root cause lies elsewhere, in our cultural life. Are we not seeing that the mind to examine with patience and without prejudice the point of view of political opponents is fast disappearing, with big party chauvinism, demagoguery and over-weening opinion of one's own intellect permeating the body politic in our country? This is increasingly giving birth to lack of philosophical tolerance, blindness, party fanaticism and a mechanical sense of discipline, cultural base of fascism. This is the root cause of violent clashes between different constituents of the U.F. Philosophical intolerance, blindness and party fanaticism had been in existence before the U.F. has assumed governmental power. Clashes between left parties used to take place even then. The unprincipled policy of using the administration to

ideological differences. It is not correct to avoid, neglect or stop ideological struggles either. Because, for proper political education of the masses of the people, for constant upgrading of the level of their political consciousness, for giving defeat to wrong politics inimical to their genuine interest, for removing misunderstanding and thereby developing better and proper understanding among the constituent parties of the U.F. and for cementing more solidly the unity of the Front open ideological struggles between the constituents of the U.F. on various questions are essentially necessary not only for the functioning of the U.F. as a team and correctly implementing its 32-point programme but also for creating favourable conditions for social progress. Hence, ideological struggles require to be encouraged. The only proviso

(Continued to page 7)

NEUTRALITY NOT PARTIALITY SHOULD BE THE GUIDELINE FOR RUNNING THE ADMINISTRATION BY THE U. F. GOVT.

(Continued from page 1)

Congress is immensely depleted in strength and ridden with factional feuds, it is natural to ask wherefrom the police got so much inspiration to stage such a degree of vandalism and recklessness? Is the observation that the Congress instigated the whole thing in order to discredit the U.F. regime sufficient enough to explain it?

Here we think a bit of heart-searching is necessary. Can we all claim that the men in administration have been strictly instructed to behave in a neutral manner irrespective of party consideration? Can the C.P.I.(M) leader and the Minister-in-charge of the Police claim that he maintains a uniform standard and does not indulge in double standard? Are his hands clean from all points of view? Is it not a fact that in spite of our insistence to institute a judicial enquiry to probe into the massive loot and arson in the village of Voleya in the Canning P.S. in 24-Pargs., done by the C.P.M. workers not even arrests of the real offenders have, as yet, taken place?

Is it at all untrue that the C.P.M. leaders found no words of condemnation against those who were involved in the killing of the Headmaster in Etheta village near Asansol? How could the same leader use so strong words of condemnation in case of Madhusudanpur knowing fully well that the incident took place after serious provocation by the jotedars in killing a peaceful demonstrator? Mr. Jyoti Basu has boastfully uttered that no peasant movement was involved in Madhusudanpur. But may we ask what type of class-struggle was involved in Etheta? How can he explain

that while the C.P.M. workers went unpunished in Voleya, serious police onslaught has been let loose in Madhusudanpur and Bharatgarh? Are those not glaring examples of double standard? Then again, at Alipurduar in North Bengal in the clash between R.S.P. and C.P.I.(M) workers did not this police take side with the C.P.M and arrest the R.S.P. workers only? What was the attitude reflected by the C.P.M in case of Kanki incident? While condemning others for assault on police, why did not C.P.M, condemn similar assaults on police personnels by their own party workers at Haroa?

Is it not a fact that the relation between the U.F. Cabinet and Administration is not clearly defined and is not run on correct lines? So far as the administration and its top officials are concerned, it is necessary that they, the bureaucratic officers, should put equal emphasis on decisions taken by any Minister irrespective of party or individual standing in the U.F. Each member of the U.F. Cabinet should be given equal importance and weight and the bureaucratic officialdom shall have no scope of discretion about it. Any breach on the part of officialdom to disobey some Ministers and misuse its power in favour of others should be severely dealt with in the interest of the U.F. and in the interest of toning up administration, in the line of accepted U.F. policy. But such a thing has not been done. Even more, the bureaucracy got a fine opportunity to raise its ugly head by playing upon inter-party squabbles of the U.F.

In this respect, the C.P.M. leaders bear the major responsibility by denigrating the

leading position of the U.F. over the administration and allowing bureaucracy to gain predominance over it. A number of instances can be cited where the C.P.M leaders in order to further its narrow party interests, guided the police administration in a partisan way, to the detriment of collective functioning of the administration, so very essential for launching legitimate democratic struggles. Further, since the assumption of office, the C.P.M leaders have been constantly finding out new virtues in the West Bengal Police force and shielding its manifold crimes. The incident at Kultali where the police attacked our workers and mercilessly beaten our M.L.A., and his 75-year old father along with many others; the event at Durgapur where not even the revered Professors of the Engineering College were spared and hundreds of students and professors bore unmistakable signs of police atrocities; the incident at Voleya where with the accompaniment of police contingent and its continuous firing on the panic-stricken villagers, the C.P.M volunteers wrought havoc in the village and set fire to 50 to 60 huts of the poor peasants—all denote the high-handedness and the most arrogant outlook of the police force regarding the people and their rightful movements. Not only this arrogance and misuse of power by the police were not severely dealt with by the concerned Ministry, but these were excused, since the police had after all become a faithful instrument in the hands of C.P.M to further their own political designs. It is this dual approach and petty selfishness on the part of C.P.M. which allowed the police to wield its mighty power unchecked.

It is our considered view that whatever might be the political differences among the different constituents of the U.F. which should be thrashed out ideologically, without fear or favour, in order to give concrete shape to the accepted U.F. programme, a co-ordinated approach is of utmost importance and an uniform pattern and mode of operation for handling the administrative machinery is the keystone for keeping the solidarity of the U.F. and carrying through the 32-Point programme of the U.F. But we have grounds to believe that the "big five" and specially the C.P.M, instead of focussing the interest of the U.F. as a whole and the people, have placed their own petty party interest in the forefront and are behaving in the crudest sectarian method with a view to exterminating others from the political scene. It is this narrow approach and role of double standard played by C.P.Mt that has lent the idea to the members of the police force that so long they keep the C.P.M and others of the "big five" satisfied, by acting as their meek agents, their nefarious acts of collusion with jotedars and other vested interests will go unchallenged.

It is against this background that the recent incidents where our Party, the S.U.C. and Khet Mazoor Federaton (K.M.F.) were involved should be studied. There is not a single instance where our Party has practised "adventurism" or supporters of our party started looting or arson and killed innocent people. The incident at Voleya at Canning P. S. was a confrontation between us and a joint front of C.P.M. and the police and the whole move was initiated by C.P.M. in order

(Continued to page 5)

Control police and bureaucracy and uphold the U.F. policy for developing legitimate mass movements

(Continued from page 4)

to oust our organisation from the locality. The C.P.M did not organise any powerful movement against jotedars in what case they would have received our solid backing. It was the "anti-social" elements of C.P.M, reportedly baptised as their rank and file, that started vandalism and set fire to huts of poor people of that village. Our demand for a Judicial Enquiry on the incident still remains unheeded.

Regarding the incident at Madhusudanpur, the C.P.M. leader Mr. Jyoti Basu has discovered that no question of peasant struggle was involved there and what actually happened simply harmed the cause of just struggle. All the Press reports and even the police report clearly state that the villagers staged a peaceful demonstration after negotiation with the jotedars regarding the issue of interest-free paddy loan, fixation of minimum wage for agricultural labourers and distribution of benami land of jotedars, failed to yield any settlement. The demonstration of the aggrieved peasantry organised by K.M.F. was, without any shadow of doubt, a legitimate democratic movement launched against jotedars in order to fulfil some just demands of the peasants. It was the jotedar-criminals who gave a violent turn to this peaceful demonstration by opening fire on the processionists. There is not even a single report which contradicts this position of the incident. What then made the C.P.M. leader in charge of Home to make a false picture of the incident and lie to the people? Was it not the class struggle of the bargadars and other poorer strata of the peasantry against the jotedar-criminals who declared war on the peasantry and were out to

teach them lesson with the big stick? Along with it how can he overlook the most significant feature of this incident that not a single case of arson or loot had occurred and only the jotedar-criminals had to face the fury of the people and pay with their lives the debt of blood?

It is at Bharatgarh under Basanti P.S. that the tragic death of an ordinary constable took place. It is tragic since the peoples' movement is not directed against ordinary members of the police force. The deaths of innumerable members of bargadars and others belonging to the fighting masses are still more tragic since they die for a just cause against the brutal repression of police and the vested clique. It is said by C.P.M. that the unfortunate death of the constable happened while he was on duty and who went to that village for an enquiry. The 'anti-social elements' meaning the fighting peasants forcefully prevented the enquiry and caused his death. But it is a travesty of truth. It was reported in 'Jugantar' a Bengali daily that there was a confrontation between two parties each figuring more than 700 or 800 people. It naturally follows what business the police could possibly have being trailed by more than 700 armed people. The most probable motive was anything but a simple enquiry. But anyhow the confrontation took place and in this confrontation a member of the police force succumbed to death. This is not an outstanding event nor the common masses of the people have seen for the first time the death of a police in an encounter between police and the people. There were countless numbers of such conflicts before when the people moving on their path

of struggle had to bear the brunt of the police force. We really grieve the death of the constable, but we feel ashamed to blame the poorer section of the people for asserting their right and not escaping the course of struggle.

But it is indeed very amusing to note the deep reaction of C.P.M and its leader Mr. Jyoti Basu on this incident who himself has created a history by an exaggerated move to please the police, while forgetting to even sympathise a bit for those luckless people, belonging to poor peasantry, on whom innumerable crimes have been committed before and even now, by jotedar-criminals ganging up with the local police force. What prompted the C.P.M leader Mr. Jyoti Basu to utter specifically in favour of police and their repression against people and their just movement? Why does he condemn the just acts of the people? Does it not look that the C.P.M is trying to curry favour with the police administration? Is it not an earnest attempt of the C.P.M to spread its influence over the police tribe?

We were taken aback by the posture of the C.P.M leader when he publicly declared that if such things, meaning the popular legitimate democratic movements of the peasantry, go on unabated, he finds no other alternative but to give full scope to the police to act freely. It is not only a step against the publicly declared policy of the U. F. where it is stated that the U. F. stands as an instrument of struggle of the people and shall, not only protect but encourage the legitimate democratic movements of the people, by preventing bureaucracy and police administration to interfere in these struggles—

but is further adding grist to the mill of repressive machinery of the police force against the people. The police, however, did not wait for the public sanction of Mr. Jyoti Basu, but demonstrated their defiant mood and notorious anti-people character by taking the law in their own hands and desecrating the Assembly House.

Further, one more point to be stressed upon is about the source of information on the basis of which administrative steps are being contemplated now. We are constrained to note that the same old practice which the Congress used to maintain while ascertaining the actual position of an incident by solely relying on the police reports is being closely followed even now. We request the C. P. M. leaders to ponder a bit whether justice can at all be rendered to the people if they also as in the past, recognise the police reports as gospel truth. Have they not like us experienced in the past that the police present a distorted picture of an incident in the report in order to make their hands clean about it? Have the C. P. M. not themselves demanded, on many previous occasions, for the institution of on-the-spot enquiry whenever there was a clash causing death or injury of the common people? It should be further pointed out that during the Congress regime in all democratic mass movements the police in order to harass a political worker used to implicate him in false charges or charges which far outweigh the actual offence committed by him. Such a practice and abuse of power on the part of police should be totally stopped.

We appeal to the leaders of the C. P. M. and other big parties of the U. F. to view

(Continued to page 8)

India though politically a nation, but culturally a conglomeration of different religions, castes, races etc.

(Continued from page 1)

the separatists when specifically required. These leaders were found to make no comment on the glaring question of massive destruction of public property—an occasion which they never miss when their political opponents are involved. But these are only the offshoots—but not the real problem.

The real problem goes deeper and hence a thorough and scientific explanation must be provided. It seems that the local bourgeoisie of the Telengana region was deprived of their due weightage in the matter of business and administration for a long time which has obviously created in them a feeling of deprivation and suppression. It is a struggle of this suppressed bourgeoisie against another section of the bourgeoisie who were relatively in a dominating position and hence, a struggle of power indeed.

It is the same feeling which we very often find among a section of the Bengalee industrialists against the "Marwaris" in West Bengal, among a section of the Assamese businessmen against the non-Assamese in Assam, so on and so forth. This is a typical phenomenon of underdeveloped capitalist countries in the period of decadence of capitalism. Being driven with the motive force of earning maximum profit but having very little scope at hand—the native bourgeoisie today is not only out to exploit the common people but is eager to oust its possible opponents. Thus a struggle automatically arises when the situation so develops that a section of the bourgeoisie by virtue of certain factors gets more advantages and thus assumes some sort of domination over another section of the bourgeoisie which is, in any way, deprived

of those advantages. This is a power struggle between the dominating and suppressed sections of the same bourgeois class. But this problem assumes alarming proportions when both of these sections of the bourgeoisie play upon and even exploit the regional and local feeling of the common men to their petty advantage and involve them *en masse* in such a fratricidal struggle. The concern of the common people becomes all the more evident, when economic issues like guarantee of employment etc. are involved.

But we strongly feel that this question of guarantee of employment is being approached in an absolutely superficial manner without going into the deep of the problem. It should be absolutely clear that "Mulki Act" (which promises that the sons of a particular soil, in this case a particular region, should be given absolute preference in the matter of service and employment etc.) is not the real remedy of this serious problem. The economic system in Andhra, being part and parcel of the centralised capitalist economy of India, is never free from its inherent crisis. So if one has to at all fight for security of service, that should be logically directed against the capitalist system as a whole and naturally the attempt for strict adherence of "Mulki Act" is no substitute for that greater struggle against capitalism. And this struggle can gain necessary strength only when the common people of the whole of Andhra including the people of Telengana region unitedly launch this battle. But we are sorry to observe that instead of developing this united struggle the people of one region is fighting against

the people of another region thus objectively helping in the continuance of their pathetic plight.

But the common people, due to their lack of political consciousness and inspired by their deep-rooted regional feelings and sentiments coupled with their economic grievances has become victim in the hands of the separatist political parties to further their own sinister designs. It is worthwhile to recall in this connection the history of formation of the State of Andhra. It is still in everybody's mind that in the post-independence period the demand of formation of states on linguistic basis (a rational demand no doubt) gained sufficient ground and it was due to the heroic battle of Andhra people and also as a sequel to the death of Ramaloo that the State of Andhra was given official recognition. Neither during the period of anti-British struggle nor during the subsequent struggle for the formation of states on linguistic basis—the demand of the formation of a separate state in Telengana was raised from any quarter. It is, therefore, a subsequent development arising out of fanning up of regional sentiment of the people from certain interested quarters.

This regional feeling, or so to say regionalism as such, which is acting at the very root of all separatist movement in the country, has its origin in the history of the formation of Indian nation. Our leader, teacher and the General Secretary Com. Shibdas Ghosh has observed times without number that though we have attained nationhood politically, but culturally we are still distracted by differences in religion, caste, race, language, psychological makeup etc. The reason entirely

lies in the weakness of the leadership that was at the helm of our national struggle for independence. So in order to get a correct picture of this urgent problem we must have a scientific idea as to the process of formation of a nation.

Every student of social science knows that the formation of nation is a historically conditioned process. In the epoch of rising capitalism one or more than one nationality or tribe living in a territory emerged as a nation in the course of revolutionary struggle by the rising bourgeoisie against feudalism and or imperialism for accomplishing national democratic revolution and against the church for freeing the people from the bondage of religion and thereby democratising the society. Since capitalism at that time played a progressive role against absolutism and monarchy it advanced the doctrine of "equality, fraternity and liberty" propagated the philosophy of humanism and fought against all sorts of disunity based on race, caste, sex, religion, language etc. It is this fervour of renaissance that helped in the coalescence of different social trends merging into one concept i.e. nation. It is through this process that the task of democratisation of the society took place along with the formation of nations. Man is supreme and should be recognised as a man, no question to which caste, race or sex he belongs, was the basic approach of the then bourgeois democracy. But we all know that since this bourgeois democratic revolution failed to uproot economic exploitation from the society the slogan of equality ultimately proved to be an

(Continued to page 7)

Some suggestions on inter-party violent clashes

A consistent Marxist approach is necessary to resolve all such national questions

(Continued from page 3)

is that these struggles must observe correct norms which preclude slander, unjust personal attack and distortion of opponent's political stand. The aim of ideological struggles also should not be to weaken but to strengthen unity of the U.F. Ideological struggles do not admit of violent clashes. For, questions of right or wrong in politics or epistemology, with which ideology is concerned, cannot be settled by breaking other's head or shedding other's blood, or burning other's Party office or any act of such vandalism. Every party has the inalienable right to try to expand itself. There can be no objection to it. But certainly expansion by physically annihilating the workers and supporters of another party or by the application of violent force is not permissible. It must be remembered that a party can expand through political persuasion of the masses of the people and giving defeat to the wrong policies of the opponent by conducting open ideological struggles. Unprincipled acts in the name of tactics may give temporary advantages but they are sure to fail in the long run. The rejection of the Congress by the people of West Bengal is a pointer in that direction.

When the moral and cultural standard in the country is sharply on the decline and there is an imperative necessity of constant upgrading of this standard of common men by relentlessly conducting ideological and cultural struggles, the policy of expanding the party by distributing loaves and fishes, among the masses avoiding the ideological struggles, is further lowering the moral and cultural standard and hastening the infiltration of extreme right reactionary ideas and

forces in society.

If ideological struggles are conducted according to the above-mentioned norm with the aim of strengthening the unity of the U.F. an atmosphere of mutual philosophical tolerance with conditions for judging without bias the viewpoints of political opponents will be created. This will take away much the bitterness, blindness and party fanaticism among the workers and supporters of the constituent parties of the U.F. that accounts for violent clashes between them. It must, however, be mentioned that for blindness, party fanaticism, philosophical intolerance and bitterness among the local workers of the constituent parties of the U.F. the leadership of the parties, where such blindness and fanaticism prevails, is responsible.

In addition to this basic cause some factors like lack of co-ordinated functioning of the U.F. and the U.F. Ministry and lack of united movement against vested interests and reaction under the leadership of the U.F. coupled with unprincipled acts of giving protection to the anti-social elements, jotedars, mahajans etc. on the part of some constituents of the U.F. have added to the intensification of the violent clashes.

IV

The violent clashes between different constituent parties of the U.F. must be stopped. There cannot be two opinions about that. And for that we suggest that over and above the measures suggested by the five parties in their note, the following measures also should be adopted:—

- (1) The U.F. should in no case be bypassed and formation of a Front within the Front must always be stopped;

(Continued from page 6)

equality written in the constitution but not achieved in practice. It is further known that with the growth and development of monopoly capitalism and imperialism—capitalism lost all its progressive character, acted just in the opposite direction, kept no stone unturned to sow the seed of disunity among the common people only to perpetuate their exploitation. Judged in this background it becomes very easy to

- (2) No U.F. Minister should move in a way which may appear as absence of co-ordinated functioning of the U.F. ministry;
- (3) No constituent party of the U.F. should take recourse to slander, unjust personal attack or distortion of the political stand of another constituent party;
- (4) In case of political differences every constituent party should have the right to conduct ideological struggles openly as a means to resolve the differences and strengthen the unity of the U.F.;
- (5) An organ of the U.F. to conduct polemical discussions on various questions should be published;
- (6) U.F. Committees should be formed down to the Block level to co-ordinate the functioning of the U.F. at different levels;

Given the necessary sincerity and seriousness of the constituent parties of the U.F. these measures will remove the grounds of violent clashes among them to a very large extent.

Nihar Mukherjee
Secretary
West Bengal State Committee
S. U. C. I.

understand why we witness racial riots in those countries where there had been glorious tradition of democracy.

But the case in India is absolutely different. At a time when capitalism lost its progressive character and became absolutely decadent the Indian bourgeoisie carrying with it the international reactionary trend—was stirred into movement against the British imperialism. Secondly, we cannot forget for a moment that the Indian bourgeoisie grew and developed under the domination of foreign finance capital which restricted its growth and was responsible for its stunted development. Thirdly, "like all colonial bourgeoisie in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, Indian bourgeoisie was mortally afraid of revolutionary mass struggle against imperialism. For, it apprehended that revolutionary struggle by the Indian people for national liberation, if successful, would not only end imperialist rule in our country, but also, along with it, remove the national bourgeoisie from the leadership of the struggle.

Antagonism with imperialism on the one hand, and the fear complex of revolution on the other, made the nationalist section of the Indian bourgeoisie maintain a reformist oppositional role against imperialism. Its role against feudalism was also equally compromising....The result of this compromise was that the Indian bourgeoisie could not and did not carry out the tasks of social and cultural revolutions essential for the democratisation of the society and complete merger of different communities professing different religions into a nation...During the centralised British administration of India associated with the emergence of a national

(Continued to page 8)

THE TASKS OF CULTURAL REVOLUTION SHOULD BE AN ESSENTIAL PART OF PRESENT DAY DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT

(Continued from page 7)

market and intercourse of trade and commerce on an all-India basis and between the people and in the course of Indian people's fight for national independence against the imperialists, the different nationalities in India speaking different languages and different communities professing different religions, were in the process of merging together and forming a nation. Had the leadership of this national movement in our country been in the hands of the working class, it would have been possible to not only eliminate imperialism completely but also take the country along the non-capitalist path of development and solve the national, communal, racial, regional question, once for all." (Extracts from the speech of Com. Shibdas Ghosh to the delegates of the National Democratic Convention held at Delhi on 29th and 30th November 1964). But unfortunately due to the failure of the C.P.I. to emerge as a genuine working class party the leadership of the nationalist movement were in the hands of the national bourgeoisie. And it has been already stated that the national bourgeoisie due to its reformist oppositional role compromised with feudalism, particularly in the ideological sphere and thus failed to bring about cultural integration of the people in the country.

Apart from this general background which was applicable throughout the whole of India some additional difficulties were discernible in the case of Andhra. It is known to all of us that a great part of Andhra was originally within the jurisdiction of Hyderabad. It before independence, was a native state and as such even the minimum current of nationalist movement could not have been felt

there. Naturally this region had to suffer from a serious setback even from the point of view of the consciousness of the nationalist movement. While discussing the present problem we should not ignore this factor at all.

The above general analysis shows us the main reason which explains the prevalence of regionalism, casteism, communalism and all sorts of parochialism even after twenty two years of attainment of independence. About the role of the Indian bourgeoisie to bring about national integration after independence—the less said the better. This problem has been further aggravated by the fact that not a single big left party—those who are the major partners in the U.F. Govts. and have numbers of representatives in the Parliament—has taken up the programme of cultural revolution as the essential task of democratic movement of the country. We strongly feel that this unfinished task of the bourgeois democratic revolution should be incorporated within the programme of socialist revolution and it is only through the establishment of working class leadership that the programme of cultural revolution can be carried to its logical culmination. But we are constrained to say that even the C.P.I and C.P.I(M) have not only failed to throw such a programme before the people but have also been found to make pathetic compromises with communal and regional forces only at the dictates of exigency.

In so far as the Telengana question is concerned the C.P.I has not yet categorically denounced the activities of the separatists. Not only that; in spite of generally speaking about the inviolability of the State the C.P.I

has practically lent direct support to the demands of the separatists viz a separate budget, a separate Chief Secretary, a separate cell in Accountant General's Office etc. This party has been found to be more critical about the callousness of Brahmananda Reddy than about the crime of Chenna Reddy. On this point we more or less agree with the observations of C. P. I(M). But we have observed that C.P.I(M) has most boastfully claimed to have taken a very principled stand on the question of Telengana. This claim on their part of the leadership might have received a general approval from their rank and file. But we like to pose few questions in this connection. We are of confirmed opinion that to tackle a problem like Telengana's, which is nothing but a national question, a party has to take a consistent Marxist stand everywhere and in every state. If a party takes different positions in different states then the sanctity of that party would surely be in question. How can C.P.I(M) expect to fight out the phenomenon of separatism in Telengana when we find this party to shamelessly yield to the demand of a separate Muslim district raised by reactionary Muslim circle in Kerala? How can C.P.I(M) even imagine to give a leadership to solve the national problem of India when the party has failed to adopt a uniform language policy in all the states? This party, in spite of its lack of clarity of thought and other allied drawbacks, has rightly denounced the demand of a separate state in Telengana. But can we afford to lose sight of the fact that the same party, C. P. I(M) has pleaded for a separate Hill

State in Assam and thus strengthened the hands of the Assamese separatist forces? How much this demand is consistent with their so-called principled stand in Telengana? Will it be wrong to think that this so-called Marxist posture of C. P. I(M), in case of Telengana, has been prompted by the necessity to gain control of its recently lost organisations in the state? Be that as it may, it should be also noted that even in case of Telengana the C. P. I(M) has failed to analyse the root cause of the problem other than vaguely reiterating certain theoretical stands of Marxism. This party has failed to pay due attention on the complicated nature of the national question and the urgent task of carrying out cultural revolution as part and parcel of the present day democratic movement. It is only through relentless ideological - cultural - political battle that the danger of regionalism, separatism etc. can be effectively fought out. The first and foremost thing is, therefore, to provide a clear-cut ideological leadership in the movement S.U.C. is the only party that has correctly analysed the national question in India. It is, therefore, the task of all right thinking and democratic minded people to rally round S.U.C. and to strengthen the leadership of this party with a view to giving a crushing defeat to this dangerous tendency that has permeated the body politic of the country today.

The 31st July Incident

(Continued from page 5)

our above criticism as a self-critical analysis in order to eliminate the evil practice prevailing now of influencing the administration for petty sectarian interest which ultimately weakens the U. F. and allows the monster of police administration to grow up in strength. We appeal to all democratic minded people and specially to the ranks of C. P. M. and others to study the incident of 31st July in this light. It is only thus that the solidarity of the U. F. can be strengthened, the declarations and the programmes that the U. F. still stand by can be given effect to and the conspiracies against the U. F. and the people can be unearthed and nipped in the bud.