



Long Live November Revolution

*Proletarian
Era*

*Organ of the SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
Founder Editor-in-Chief : COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH*

INTRODUCING THIS SPECIAL ISSUE ON NOVEMBER REVOLUTION

The Great November Revolution, led through to success 82 years back, by the Bolshevik Party of Russia under the stewardship of the revolutionary genius of Lenin, is an epoch making event, the lessons of which should be recalled by all genuine communists across the world in order to carry forward the revolutionary movement for the establishment of socialism in their respective countries.

Greater still is the importance today, now that we live in a world where the socialist camp, which had once achieved glorious triumphs and made bold strides one after another, has been dismantled and capitalism has been restored in Russia and in the former socialist countries of east Europe. This became possible through the pernicious attack of revisionism from within and the heinous conspiracy engineered by imperialism, US imperialism in particular, from outside in the absence of necessary political and cultural standard of the leaders and the rank and file of CPSU after the demise of Comrade Stalin. It was through the hands of the Gorbachev leadership that counterrevolution in Russia finally took place and capitalism was restored there. Events since then have proved beyond doubt how severe have become the crises of restored capitalism in Russia and how they are manifesting themselves in diverse forms in all spheres of life and activities. People in tens of thousands are coming to the streets to protest with vehemence against the present Yeltsin regime, the imperialist henchmen, and are raising slogans in favour of socialism holding to breast the portraits of Lenin and Stalin with all reverence and raising high the red banner of communism. They are

feeling pathetically from the sad experience of their life the hard and stark reality of how they were misled utterly by the revisionist and imperialist propaganda for which they are paying the price so dearly and deadly! Steadily is growing in them an urge for the real revolutionary leadership and not in vain. For they are hearing an echo of the teachings of Lenin and Stalin in some Bolshevik quarters, whatever the strength of those.

In this background, it has become imperative for all the genuine communists the world over, the Russian communists and Bolsheviks included, to try to fathom the great significance of this great revolution. It is well known in the communist circles that serious confusions prevailed even within the Bolshevik Party, let alone among the Mensheviks, the Socialist revolutionaries, the Narodniks and others during Lenin's time, that is on the eve, during and even after the revolution became successful. The April Theses, in which Lenin dealt with these questions from the basic class angularity stands out as the most important guideline. We have quoted here from the Theses only some portions where he fought the confusions incisively.

Also included in this issue are some portions from *Problems of Leninism* of Stalin in which he elaborated Lenin's Theses and defended Lenin's contributions with crystal clarity.

Knowing fully well the kind of confusions on the very same questions which are prevalent in our country within the parties bearing the name 'communist' or 'Marxist' we felt it would be of no mean importance to include some scientific analyses by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the departed leader, teacher and guide and an eminent Marxist thinker and philosopher of this era. For this purpose we have selected some portions from his speech at a mass rally on the occasion of the 57th anniversary of Great November Revolution.

We hope that these excerpts included in this issue will go a long way to clear the confusions and to instill in the minds of the revolutionary vanguard an unwavering confidence in the invincibility of the teachings of November Revolution to strengthen the revolutionary movement with a newer vigour and strength

— Editorial Board, Proletarian Era.

Historic Significance of November Revolution — Some Aspects



AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PRESENT POSITION

Marxism demands that we should make a most precise and objectively verifiable analysis of the relation of classes and of the concrete peculiarities of each historical situation. We Bolsheviks have always tried faithfully to fulfill this demand, which is absolutely imperative for a scientific foundation of policy.

"Our teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action," Marx and Engels always said; and they rightly ridiculed the learning by rote and the mere reiteration of "formulas" that at best are capable of giving only an outline of *general* tasks, which are necessarily liable

to be modified by the *concrete* economic and political conditions of each particular phase of the historical process.

What, then, are the precisely established objective facts by which the party of the revolutionary proletariat must be guided at present in defining the tasks and forms of its activity? ...

I ... considered the basic slogan, the "task of the day," at *this* moment to be: "Workers, you have displayed marvels of proletarian heroism, the heroism of the people, in the civil war against tsardom. You must display marvels of organization, organization of the proletariat and of the whole people, in order to prepare the way for your victory in the second stage of

the revolution."

In what does the first stage consist?

In the transfer of the power of state to the bourgeoisie.

Before the February-March Revolution of 1917, state power in Russia was in the hands of one old class, namely, the feudal nobility, headed by Nicholas Romanov.

Now, after that revolution, the power is in the hands of *another* class, a new class, namely, the *bourgeoisie*.

The transfer of state power from one *class* to another *class* is the first, the principal, the basic sign of a *revolution*, both in the strictly scientific and in the practical political meaning of the term.

To this extent, the bourgeois, or the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia *has been completed*.

At this point we hear the clamour of the objectors, of those who so readily call themselves "old Bolsheviks": Did we not always maintain, they say, that the bourgeois-democratic revolution is completed only by the "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry"? Has the agrarian revolution, which is also a bourgeois-democratic revolution, been completed? Is it not a fact, on the contrary, that it has *not even* begun?

My answer is: The Bolshevik slogans and ideas in *general* have been fully corroborated by history; but *concretely*, things have shaped differently from what could have been anticipated (by anyone): they are more original, more peculiar, more variegated.

If we ignored or forgot this fact, we should resemble those "old Bolsheviks" who have more than once played so sorry a part in the history of our Party by reiterating meaninglessly a formula *learnt by rote*, instead of *studying* the specific features of the new and living reality.

"The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the

(Contd on page 3)

(Contd. from page 2)

peasantry" has *already* become a reality (in a certain form and to a certain extent) in the Russian revolution; for this "formula" envisages only a *relation of classes*, and not a *concrete political institution giving effect* to this relation, to this cooperation. The "Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies" — there you have the "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" already accomplished in reality.

This formula is already antiquated. Events have transferred it from the realm of formulas to the realm of reality, clothed it in flesh and blood, lent it concrete form, and have *thereby* modified it.

A new and different task now faces us : to effect a split between the proletarian elements (the antifascist, internationalist, "communist" elements, who stand for a transition to the commune) *within* the dictatorship and the *small-proprietor or petty-bourgeois* elements (Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the other revolutionary defencists, who are opposed to moving towards the commune and who are in favour of "supporting" the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois government.) ...

The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry has already been realized, but in an extremely original form, and with a number of highly important modifications. I will deal with them separately in one of my next letters. For the present, it is essential to realize the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognizance of actual events, of the precise facts of *reality*, and must not cling to a theory of yesterday, which, like all theories, at best only outlines the main and general, and only *approximates* to an inclusive grasp of the complexities of life.

"Theory, my friend, is grey, but green is the eternal tree of life." (Goethe's expression)

He who continues to regard the "completion" of the bourgeois revolution *in the old way*, sacrifices living Marxism to the dead letter.

According to the old conception, the rule of the proletariat and the peasantry, their dictatorship, can and must come *after* the rule of the bourgeoisie.

But in actual fact, it has *already* turned out *differently* : an extremely original, novel and unprecedented *interlacing of the one with the other* has taken place. We have existing side by side, together, simultaneously, *both* the rule of the *bourgeoisie* (the government of Lvov and Guchkov) *and* a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, which is *voluntarily* ceding power to the bourgeoisie, voluntarily transforming itself into an appendage of the bourgeoisie.

For it must not be forgotten that in Petrograd the power is actually in the hands of the workers and soldiers : the new government is *not* using and cannot use violence against them, for there is *no police, no army* separate from the people, *no officialdom* standing omnipotently *above* the people. This is a fact; and it is precisely the kind of fact that is characteristic of a state of the type of the Paris Commune. This fact does not fit into the old schemes. One must know how to adapt schemes to facts, instead of reiterating now meaningless words about a "dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" in *general*.

State power in Russia passed into the hands of a new class, the bourgeoisie, in February Revolution. To that extent the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia is completed.

In order the better to illuminate the question, let us approach it from another angle.

A Marxist must not abandon the ground of careful analysis of class relations. The bourgeoisie is in power. But is not the mass of the peasants *also* a bourgeoisie, only of a different stratum, a different kind, a different character? Whence does it follow that *this* stratum *cannot* come to power and thus "complete" the bourgeois-democratic revolution? Why should this be impossible?

That is how the old Bolsheviks often argue. My reply is that it is quite possible. But, when assessing any given situation, a Marxist must proceed *not* from the possible, but from the actual.

And actuality reveals, the *fact* that freely elected soldiers' and peasants' deputies are freely entering the second, parallel government and freely supplementing, developing and completing it. And, just as freely, they are *surrendering* power to the bourgeoisie — which phenomenon does not in the least "contravene" the theory of Marxism, for we have always known and have repeatedly pointed out that the bourgeoisie maintains itself *not* only by force but also by virtue of the lack of class consciousness, the clinging to old habits, the browbeaten state and lack of organization of the masses.

In view of this present-day actuality it is simply ridiculous to turn one's back on the facts and to talk about "possibilities."

It is possible that the peasantry may seize all the land and the entire power. Far from forgetting this possibility, far from confining myself to the present moment only, I definitely and clearly formulate the agrarian program, taking into account the *new* phenomenon, i.e., the deeper cleavage between the agricultural labourers and poor peasants on the one hand, and the well-to-do peasants, on the other.

But there is another possibility; it is possible that the peasants will hearken to the advice of the petty-bourgeois Socialist-Revolutionary Party, which has succumbed to the influence of the bourgeoisie, has gone over to defencism, and which advises waiting until Constituent Assembly, although the date of its convocation has not yet even been fixed. (Lest my words be misinterpreted, I shall anticipate and state at once that I am absolutely in favour of the *Soviets* of Agricultural Labourers and Peasants *immediately* taking over all the land; but they should *themselves* observe the strictest order and discipline, not permit the slightest damage to machinery, structures or livestock, and in no case disorganize agriculture and the production of cereals, but rather *develop* them, for the soldiers

need *twice* as much bread, and the people must not be allowed to starve.)

It is possible that the peasants will *maintain* and prolong their deal with the bourgeoisie, the deal which they have now concluded through the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies not only in form but in fact.

Many things are possible. It would be a profound mistake to forget the agrarian movement and the agrarian program. But it would be equally mistaken to forget *reality*, and reality reveals the *fact* that an *agreement*, or — to use a more exact, less legal, but more class-economic expression — *class collaboration* exists between the bourgeoisie and the peasantry.

When this fact ceases to be a fact, when the peasantry separates from the bourgeoisie, seizes the land and the power despite the bourgeoisie, that will be a new stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution; and of that we shall speak separately.

A Marxist who, because of the possibility of such a stage in the future, were to forget his duties *in the present*, when the peasantry is *in agreement* with the bourgeoisie, would become a petty bourgeoisie. For he would in practice be preaching to the proletariat *confidence* in the petty bourgeoisie ("the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry, must separate from the bourgeoisie while the bourgeois-democratic revolution is still on"). Because of the "possibility" of so pleasant and sweet a future, in which the peasantry would not be the tail of the bourgeoisie, ... — because of the "possibility" of so pleasant a future; he would be forgetting *the unpleasant present*, in which the peasantry still forms the tail of the bourgeoisie, and in which the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Social-Democrats have not yet given up the role of an appendage of the bourgeois government, His Majesty Lvov's Opposition. ...

But are we not in danger of succumbing to subjectivism, of wanting to "skip" over the bourgeois-democratic revolution — which is not yet completed and has not yet exhausted the peasant movement — to the socialist revolution?

I should be incurring this danger had I said : "No tsar, but a workers' government." (An anti-Bolshevik slogan raised by Trotsky) But I did not say that ; I said something else. I said that there *can be no* government (apart from a bourgeois government) in Russia *other than* a government of the Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. I said that power in Russia can now pass from Guchkov and Lvov *only* to these Soviets. And the *fact* is that in these Soviets it is the peasants that predominate, it is the soldiers that predominate — it is the petty bourgeoisie that predominates, to use a scientific, Marxist term, a class designation, and not a common, or lay, or occupational designation. ...

Ignorant persons, or renegades from Marxism, like Mr Plekhanov, may cry anarchism, Blanquism, and so forth. But those who really want to think and learn cannot fail to understand that Blanquism means the seizure of power by a minority, whereas the Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies are *admittedly* the direct and immediate organization of the *majority* of the people. Work confined to a struggle for influence *within* these

(Contd on page 4)

(Contd. from page 3)

Soviets cannot, absolutely cannot, stray into the swamp of Blanquism. Nor can it stray into the swamp of anarchism, for anarchism denies the *necessity for a state and state power* in the period of *transition* from the rule of the bourgeoisie to the rule of the proletariat, whereas I, with a precision that precludes all possibility of misunderstanding, insist on the necessity for a state in this period, although, in accordance with Marx and the experience of the Paris Commune, not the usual bourgeois parliamentary state, but a state *without* a standing army, *without* a police opposed to the people, *without* an officialdom placed above the people.

The historical moment through which Russia is now passing is marked by the following main characteristics:

The class character of the revolution that has taken place

The old tsarist power, which represented only a handful of feudal landlords who commanded the entire machinery of the state (the army, the police and the bureaucracy), has been smashed and eliminated, but not utterly destroyed. The monarchy has not been formally abolished. The Romanov gang continues to hatch monarchist intrigues. The vast landed possessions of the feudal landlords have not been abolished.

The state power in Russia has passed into the hands of a new *class*, namely, the bourgeoisie and landlords, who had become bourgeois. *To that extent* the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia has been completed.

Having come to power, the bourgeoisie has formed a bloc (an alliance) with the openly monarchist elements, who are notorious for their exceptionally ardent support of Nicholas the Bloody and Stolypin the Hangman in 1906-14 (Guchkov and other politicians to the Right of the Cadets*). The new bourgeois government of Lvov and Co. has attempted and has begun to negotiate with the Romanovs for the restoration of the monarchy in Russia. While making a noisy play of revolutionary phrases, this government is appointing partisans of the old regime to key positions. It is striving to reform the machinery of state (the army, the police and the bureaucracy) as little as possible, and has turned it over to the bourgeoisie. The new government has already begun to hinder in every way the revolutionary initiative of mass action and the seizure of power by the people *from below*, which is the *sole* guarantee of real success of the revolt.

To this day this government has not even fixed a date for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. It is not laying a finger on the landed estates, this material foundation of feudal tsarism. This government does not even contemplate starting an investigation into, and making public, the activities of the monopolistic financial organizations, the big banks, the syndicates and cartels of the capitalists, etc., or instituting control

Cadets - The principal bourgeois party in Russia, the party of the liberal monarchist bourgeoisie. Under the cloak of pseudo democracy and calling themselves the party of "people's freedom", the Cadets tried to win the peasantry to their side. They strove to preserve tsarism in the form of constitutional monarchy.

From the point of view of science and practical politics, one of the chief symptoms of every real revolution is the unusually rapid, sudden, and abrupt increase in the number of "ordinary citizens" who begin to participate actively, independently and effectively in political life and in the organization of the state.

over them.

The key, the decisive ministerial posts in the new government (the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of War, i.e., the command over the army, the police, the bureaucracy and the entire apparatus for the oppression of the masses) are held by outright monarchists and supporters of agrarian landlordism. The Cadets, those day-old republicans, republicans against their own will, have been assigned posts of secondary importance, having no direct relation to the *command* over the people or to the apparatus of state power. A. Kerensky, a Trudovik, an "also-Socialist," has no function whatsoever, except to lull the vigilance and attention of the people with sonorous phrases.

For all these reasons, the new bourgeois government does not deserve the confidence of the proletariat even in the sphere of internal policy, and no support of this government by the proletariat is admissible. ...

The peculiar dual power and its class significance

The main peculiarity of our revolution, a peculiarity that most imperatively demands thoughtful attention, is the *dual power* which arose in the very first days after the triumph of the revolution.

This dual power finds expression in the existence of *two* governments; one is the main, the real, the actual government of the bourgeoisie, the "Provisional Government" of Lvov and Co., which holds in its hands all the organs of power; the other is a supplementary and parallel government, a "controlling" government in the shape of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which holds no organs of state power, but directly rests on the support of an obvious and indisputable majority of the people, on the armed workers and soldiers.

The class origin and the class significance of this dual power consist in the fact that the Russian revolution of March 1917 not only swept away the whole tsarist monarchy, not only transferred the entire power to the bourgeoisie, but also *directly reached the stage* of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. The Petrograd and the other, the local,

Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies constitute precisely such a dictatorship (that is, a power resting not on law but directly on the force of armed masses of the population), a dictatorship precisely of the above-mentioned classes.

The second highly important peculiarity of the Russian revolution is the circumstance that the Petrograd Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies, which, as everything goes to show, enjoys the confidence of most of the local Soviets, is *voluntarily* transferring the power of the state to the bourgeoisie and its Provisional Government is voluntarily *ceding* the supremacy to the latter, and, having entered into an agreement to support it, is limiting its own function to that of an observer, a supervisor of the convocation of the Constituent Assembly (the date for which has not even been announced as yet by the Provisional Government).

This extremely peculiar circumstance, unparalleled in history in such a form, has led to the *interlocking of two* dictatorships; the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (for the Provisional Government of Lvov and Co. is a dictatorship, i.e., a power based not on law, not on the previously expressed will of the people, but on seizure by force, accomplished by a definite class, namely, the bourgeoisie) and the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry (the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies).

There is not the slightest doubt that such an "interlocking" *cannot* last long. Two powers *cannot exist* in a state. One of them is bound to disappear; and the entire Russian bourgeoisie is already straining every nerve, is striving everywhere in every possible way to remove and enfeeble the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, to reduce them to nought, and to establish the undivided power of the bourgeoisie.

The dual power expresses but a *transitional* phase in the development of the revolution, when it has gone farther than the ordinary bourgeois-democratic revolution, *but has not yet reached* a "pure" dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

The class significance (and the class explanation) of this transitional and unstable situation is as follows: like all revolutions, our revolution required the greatest heroism and self-sacrifice on the part of the masses for the struggle against tsarism and moreover immediately *drew* unprecedentedly vast numbers of ordinary citizens *into the movement*.

From the point of view of science and practical politics, one of the chief symptoms of every real revolution is the unusually rapid, sudden, and abrupt increase in the number of "ordinary citizens" who begin to participate actively, independently and effectively in political life and in the *organization of the state*.

Such is the case in Russia. Russia at present is seething. Millions and tens of millions of people who had been politically dormant for ten years and politically crushed by the terrible oppression of tsarism and by inhuman toil for the landlords and manufacturers have awakened and reached out for politics. And who are these millions and tens of millions? For the most part small proprietors, petty bourgeois, people standing midway between the capitalists and the wage-workers. Russia is the most petty-bourgeois of European countries.

(Contd. on page 5)

(Contd. from page 4)

A gigantic petty-bourgeois wave has swept over everything and overwhelmed the class-conscious proletariat, not only by force of numbers but also ideologically; that is, it has infected and imbued very wide circles of workers with the petty-bourgeois political outlook.

The petty-bourgeois are in real life dependent upon the bourgeoisie, for they live like masters and not like proletarians (from the point of view of their *place* in social *production*), and follow the bourgeoisie in their outlook.

An attitude of unreasoning trust in the capitalists—the worst foes of peace and Socialism—characterizes the politics of the Russian masses at the present moment; such is the fruit that has *grown* with revolutionary rapidity on the social and economic soil of the most petty-bourgeois of European countries. This is the *class* basis for the “agreement” between the Provisional Government and the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies (I emphasize that I am referring not so much to a formal agreement as to *actual* support, a tacit agreement, a surrender of power inspired by unreasoning trust), an agreement which has presented the Guchkovs with a choice morsel—real power—and the Soviet with promises and honours (for the time being), with flattery, phrases, assurances, and the bowing and scrapings of the Kerenskys.

The reverse side of the medal is the inadequate numerical strength of the proletariat in Russia and its insufficient class consciousness and organization.

All the Narodnik parties, including the Socialist-Revolutionaries, have always been petty bourgeois. This is also true of the party of the Organization Committee (Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.). The nonparty revolutionaries (Steklov and others) have similarly drifted with the tide, or have not yet coped with it.

For the Marxist, who must reckon with objective facts, with the masses and classes, and not with individuals and so on, the peculiar nature of the actual situation as described above must determine the peculiar tactics for the *present moment*. ...

Our work must be one of criticism, of *explaining* the mistakes of the petty-bourgeois Socialist-Revolutionary and Social-Democratic Parties, of preparing and welding the elements of a *consciously* proletarian, Communist Party, and of *curing* the proletariat from the “general” petty-bourgeois intoxication.

This *seems* to be “nothing more” than propaganda work, but in reality it is most practical revolutionary work; for there is no advance for a revolution that has come to a standstill, that has choked itself with phrases, and that keeps “marking time,” *not because of* external obstacles, *not because of the violence* of the bourgeoisie (Guchkov is still only threatening to employ violence against the soldier masses), but *because of* the unreasoning trust of the masses.

Only by combating this unreasoning trust (and one can and should combat it only ideologically, by comradely persuasion, by pointing to the lessons of *experience*) can we set ourselves free from the prevailing *orgy of revolutionary phrasemongering* and really stimulate the mind both of the proletariat and of the masses in general, as

**The slightest concession
to revolutionary
defencism is treason to
Socialism and a complete
renunciation of
internationalism no
matter by what fine
phrases and “practical”
considerations it may be
justified.**

well as their bold and determined initiative on the *periphery* — the unauthorized realization, development and consolidation of liberties, democracy, and the principle of the popular ownership of all the land.

The world-wide experience of bourgeois and landlord governments has developed two methods of keeping the people in subjection. The first is violence. Nicholas Romanov I, called Nicholas Palkin, and Nicholas II, the Bloody, demonstrated to the Russian people the maximum of what can and cannot be done in the way of these hangmen’s practices. But there is another method, best developed by the English and French bourgeoisie, who “learnt their lesson” in a series of great revolutions and revolutionary movements of the masses. That is the method of deception, flattery, fine phrases, promises by the million, petty sops, and concessions of the unessential while retaining the essential.

The peculiar feature of the present moment in Russia is the transition at a dizzy speed from the first method to the second, from violent oppression of the people to *flattering* and deceiving the people by promises.... Milyukov and Guchkov hold power, they are protecting the profits of capital, conducting an imperialist war in the interests of Russian and Anglo-French capital, and trying to get away with promises, declaration and bombastic statements in reply to the speeches of “cooks” like Chkheidze, Tsereteli and Steklov, who threaten, exhort, conjure, beseech, demand and proclaim. ...

But from day to day trustful lack of reasoning and unreasoning trustfulness will disappear, especially among the proletarians and poor peasants, who are being taught by experience (by their social and economic position) to distrust the capitalists.

The leaders of the petty bourgeoisie “must” teach the people to trust the bourgeoisie. The proletarians must teach the people to distrust the bourgeoisie.

Revolutionary defencism must be regarded as the most important and striking manifestation of the petty-bourgeois wave that has overwhelmed “nearly everything”. It is precisely this that acts as the worst enemy of the further progress and success of the Russian revolution.

Those who have yielded on this point and have been unable to extricate themselves are lost to the revolution. But the masses yield in a different way from the leaders; and they extricate themselves *differently*, by a different course of

development, by different means.

Revolutionary defencism is on the one hand, a result of the deception of the masses by the bourgeoisie, a result of the trustful lack of reasoning on the part of the peasants and a section of the workers; it is, on the other, an expression of the interests and standpoint of the small owner, who is to some extent interested in annexations and bank profits, and who “sacredly” guards the traditions of tsarism, which demoralized the Great Russians by making them do a hangman’s work against the other peoples.

The bourgeoisie deceives the people by playing upon the noble pride of the revolution and by pretending that the *social and political* character of the war, as far as Russia is concerned, underwent a change because of this stage of the revolution, because of the substitution of the bourgeois near-republic of Guchkov and Milyukov for the tsarist monarchy. And the people believed it—for a time—largely owing to old-time prejudices, by virtue of which they regard the other peoples of Russia, i.e., the non-Great Russians, as something in the nature of a property and patrimony of the Great Russians. This vile demoralization of the Great Russian people by the tsarist government, which taught them to regard the other peoples as something inferior, something belonging “by right” to Great Russia, could not disappear *instantly*.

What is required of us is the *ability* to explain to the masses that the social and political character of the war is determined not by the “goodwill” of individuals or groups, or even of nations, but by the position of the class which conducts the war, by the *class policy* of which the war is a continuation, by the ties of capital, which is the dominant economic force in modern society, by the *imperialist character* of international capital, by Russia’s dependence in finance, banking and diplomacy upon the Great Britain, France, etc. To explain this skillfully and in a way that would be comprehensible to the masses *is not easy*, none of us could do it at once without committing errors.

But such, and only such, must be the direction or, rather, the contents of our propaganda. The slightest concession to revolutionary defencism is *treason to Socialism* and a complete renunciation of *internationalism* no matter by what fine phrases and “practical” considerations it may be justified.

The slogan “Down With the War!” is, of course, a correct one. But it fails to take into account the specific nature of the tasks of the present moment and the necessity of approaching the broad masses *in a different way*. It is, in my opinion, similar to the slogan “Down With the Tsar!” with which the inexperienced agitator of the “good old days” went simply and directly to the countryside—and received a beating. The mass believers in revolutionary defencism are honest, not in the personal, but in the class sense, i.e., they belong to *classes* (workers and poor peasants) which in *actual fact* have nothing to gain from annexations and the strangulation of other peoples. They are different from the bourgeois and the “intellectual” gentry, who know very well that *it is impossible* to renounce annexations without renouncing the rule of capital, and who unscrupulously deceive the masses with fine phrases, with unlimited promises and endless assurances.

(Contd. on page 6)



In the hands of which class, or which classes, is power concentrated; which class, or which classes, must be overthrown; which class, or which classes, must take power — such is “the main question of every revolution.”

Lenin says that “*the main question of every revolution is the question of state power.*” In the hands of which class, or which classes, is power concentrated; which class, or which classes, must be overthrown; which class, or which classes, must take power — such is “the main question of every revolution.”

The Party’s fundamental strategic slogans, which retain their validity during the whole period of any particular stage of the revolution, cannot be called fundamental slogans if they are not wholly and entirely based on this cardinal thesis of Lenin’s.

Fundamental slogans can be correct only if they are based on a Marxist analysis of class forces, if they indicate the correct plan of disposition of the revolutionary forces on the front of the class struggle, if they help to bring the masses to the front of the struggle for the victory of the revolution, to the front of the struggle for the seizure of power by the new class, if they help the Party to form from the broad masses of the people the large and powerful political army which is essential for the fulfillment of this task.

During any particular stage of the revolution there may occur defeats and retreats, failures and tactical errors, but that does not mean that the fundamental strategic slogan is wrong. Thus, for instance, the fundamental slogan at the *first* stage of our revolution — “Together with the whole of the peasantry, against the tsar and the landlords, while neutralizing the bourgeoisie, for the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution” — was an absolutely correct slogan, in spite of the fact that the Revolution of 1905 suffered defeat.

Consequently, the question of the fundamental slogan of the Party must not be confused with the question of the successes or failures of the revolution at any particular stage of its development.

It may happen that in the course of the revolution the fundamental slogan of the Party has already led to the overthrow of the power of the old classes, or of the old class, but a number of vital demands of the revolution, arising out of that slogan, have not been achieved, or their achievement has been spread over a whole period of time, or a new revolution may be required for their achievement; but this does not mean that the fundamental slogan was wrong. Thus, for instance, the February Revolution of 1917 overthrew tsardom and the landlords, but did not lead to the confiscation of the landlords’ land, etc.; but this does not mean that our fundamental

slogan at the first stage of the revolution was wrong.

Or another example: The October Revolution overthrew the bourgeoisie and transferred power to the proletariat, but did not immediately lead to: a) the completion of the bourgeois revolution, in general, and b) the isolation of the kulaks in the countryside, in particular — these were spread over a certain period of time; but this does not mean that our fundamental slogan at the *second* stage of the revolution — “Together with the poor peasantry, against capitalism in town and country, while neutralizing the middle peasantry, for the power of the proletariat” — was wrong.

Consequently, the question of the fundamental slogan of the Party must not be confused with the question of the time and forms of achieving particular demands arising out of that slogan.

That is why the strategic slogans of our Party must not be appraised from the point of view of episodic success or defeats of the revolutionary movement in any particular period; still less can they be appraised from the point of view of the time or forms of achieving any particular demands that arise out of those slogans. The strategic slogans of the Party can be appraised only from the point of view of a Marxist analysis of the class forces and of the correct disposition of the revolutionary forces on the front of the struggle for the victory of the revolution, for the concentration of power in the hands of the new class. ...

No one denies that one of the main tasks of the October Revolution was to complete the bourgeois revolution, that without the October Revolution it could not have been completed, just as the October Revolution itself could not have been consolidated without completing the bourgeois revolution; and since the October Revolution did complete the bourgeois revolution it was bound to meet with the sympathy of all the peasants. All that is undeniable. But can it be asserted on these grounds that the completion of the bourgeois revolution was not a derivative phenomenon in the course of the October Revolution but its essence or its principal aim? What then ... has become of the principal aim of the October Revolution, namely, the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war, the expropriation of the capitalists, etc.?

And if the main theme of a strategic slogan is the fundamental question of every revolution,

i.e., the question of the transfer of power from one class to another class, is it not clear from that the question of the completion of the bourgeois revolution by the proletarian power must not be confused with the question of overthrowing the bourgeoisie and achieving this proletarian power, i.e., with the question that is the main theme of the strategic slogan at the second stage of the revolution? ...

Moreover, the following important circumstance must be borne in mind. The completion of the bourgeois revolution cannot be accomplished at one stroke. Actually, it was spread over a whole period embracing not only parts of 1918; ... but also parts of 1919 ... and of 1919-20.... I am referring to the advance of Kolchak and Denikin, when the peasantry as a whole was faced with the danger of the restoration of the power of the landlords and when the peasantry, precisely *as a whole*, was compelled to rally around the Soviet power in order to ensure the completion of the bourgeois revolution and to retain the fruits of that revolution. This complexity and diversity of the processes of living reality, this “odd” interweaving of the directly socialist tasks of the proletarian dictatorship with the task of completing the bourgeois revolution, must always be kept in mind. ...

Can it be said that this interweaving indicates that the Party’s slogan at the *second* stage of the revolution was wrong, and that this slogan did not differ from the slogan at the first stage of the revolution? No, it cannot. On the contrary, this interweaving merely confirms the correctness of the Party’s slogan at the second stage of the revolution: Together with the *poor* peasantry, against the capitalist bourgeoisie in town and country, for the power of the proletariat, etc. Why? Because in order to complete the bourgeois revolution it was necessary in October *first* to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie and to set up the power of the proletariat, for only such a power is capable of completing the bourgeois revolution. But in order to set up the power of the proletariat in October it was essential to prepare and organize for October the *appropriate* political army, an army capable of overthrowing the bourgeoisie and of establishing the power of the proletariat; and there is no need to prove that *such* a political army could be prepared and organized by us *only* under the slogan: Alliance of the proletariat with the poor peasantry against the bourgeoisie, for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is clear that without *such* a strategic slogan, which we carried through from April 1917 until October 1917, we could not have had such a political army, and that, therefore, we could not have triumphed in October, we would not have overthrown the power of the bourgeoisie and consequently, we would not have been able to complete the bourgeois revolution. ...

He (Lenin) formulated the Party’s slogan in preparing for the bourgeois-democratic revolution as follows:

“The proletariat must carry to completion the democratic revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush by force the resistance of the autocracy and to paralyse the instability of the bourgeoisie.”

In other words: Together with the whole of the peasantry, against the autocracy, while neutralizing the bourgeoisie, for a democratic revolution.

As to the Party’s slogan in the period of
(Contd. on page 7)

(Contd. from page 6)

preparation for the socialist revolution, he formulated it as follows :

"The proletariat must accomplish the socialist revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the semi-proletarian elements of the population in order to crush by force the resistance of the bourgeoisie and to paralyse the instability of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie."

In other words : Together with the poor peasantry and the semi-proletarian strata of the population in general, against the bourgeoisie, while neutralizing the petty bourgeoisie in town and country, for the socialist revolution.

That was in 1905.

In April 1917, Lenin, characterizing the political situation at that time as the interweaving of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the

proletariat and peasantry with the actual power of the bourgeoisie, said:

"The specific feature of the present situation in Russia consists in the *transition* from the *first* stage of the revolution — which, owing to the insufficient class consciousness and organization of the proletariat, placed the power in the hands of the bourgeoisie — to the *second* stage, which must place the power in the hands of the proletariat and the poor strata of the peasantry." (*Lenin's April Theses* — *Italics Stalin's*). ...

Lenin repeatedly emphasized the profound difference between the first strategic slogan, in the period of preparation for the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and the second strategic slogan, in the period of preparation for October. The first slogan was: *With the whole of the peasantry*, against the autocracy; the second: *With the poor peasantry*,

against the bourgeoisie.

The fact that the completion of the bourgeois revolution, was spread over a whole period after October and that, inasmuch as we were completing the bourgeois revolution, the "whole" of the peasantry could not but sympathize with us— this fact, as I said above, does not in the least shake the fundamental thesis that we marched towards October and achieved victory in October together with the *poor peasantry*; that we overthrew the power of the bourgeoisie and established the dictatorship of the proletariat (one of the tasks of which was to complete the bourgeois revolution) together with the *poor peasantry*, against the resistance of the kulaks (also peasants) and with the middle peasantry vacillating. ...



Those in our country who even at the slightest trace of feudalism in economy characterize our revolution as bourgeois democratic or national democratic and say, how can we reach the stage of socialist revolution by a leap without completing the tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution — November Revolution has left a valuable teaching for them.

57 years back, in the year 1917, the first Socialist Revolution was successful in the world. The workers, the peasants, the proletariat were able to capture state power by overthrowing the bourgeoisie and its party under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party and its leader Comrade Lenin. This revolution which took place in Russia in 1917, to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power, is significant in many respects. ...

Before the Russian revolution the common people throughout the world could not even imagine that the ignorant workers, peasants and the illiterate toilers could ever overthrow the ruling bourgeoisie or the most autocratic monarchical rule like that of Tsardom from power. The February Revolution of 1917 which overthrew the Tsar or Tsardom from power marked in reality, the success of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution of Russia. But although the Tsardom was overthrown through the February Revolution the state power went into the hands of the bourgeoisie, the Russian bourgeoisie — which was a partner in the united struggle against Tsardom. Thus, through the February Revolution the Bourgeois Kerensky Government was no doubt established in Russia but the Soviets of workers and peasant, (Since it was a power resting not on law but directly on the force of armed masses, Lenin called it, again and again : "Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies".) also existed side by side almost in the form of dual power. The February Revolution of Russia not only failed to do away with feudalism-imperialism completely, but what is more, the ruling bourgeoisie was very much keen on maintaining a close understanding with

and carrying the legacy of old feudalism and imperialism in the administrative set up. As a result, although the bourgeoisie captured the state power overthrowing Tsardom through revolution — if we analyse the phase of social revolution from economic aspect, we find that the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of Bourgeois Democratic Revolution still remained unaccomplished.

This helped create a misconception, among many, who were known as Marxists in the revolutionary movement of Russia — the Socialist Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks and even some within the Bolshevik Party, who virtually reduced Marxism to economic determinism. From an old understanding of Marxian theory — i.e., the understanding that grew and developed following Marxism somewhat as a dogma and which far from reflected the correct dialectical materialistic understanding of Marxian science — they started saying that since in the course of progress and development of the society the phases of social revolution cannot be skipped over, it is impossible to reach the stage of Socialist Revolution unless all the tasks of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution were completed. They maintained that under such a situation, the Soviets of workers and peasants should cooperate with the Kerensky Government with the object of fulfilling the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist tasks of Bourgeois Democratic Revolution on the one hand and organize people's movements on the other, to mount pressure on the Kerensky Government to implement those programmes. So it was through the course of this movement that the workers,

peasants, the proletariat would have to and through this process the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution would have to be completed first. Till these tasks of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution were completed, it was futile to strive for socialist revolution. Such a notion strongly prevailed in Russia after the February Revolution.

Marxism is not Economic Determinism

But at that time the leadership of the Bolshevik Party was at the hands of the genuine Marxists. And a leader of Comrade Lenin's stature was at the helm. He was not a Marxist of the brand who took recourse to quotation mongering and picked up at random and out of context a few lines from here and a few from there whether to suit his own contention or to dupe his adversaries. He perfectly realized that the Marxism was not simply what were written in the Marxist classics. To him, realization of Marxism meant to acquire the scientific methodology and grasp the philosophical outlook with the help of which Marx, Engels and other Marxists came to those conclusions in the then conditions and to apply that in practice in the objective conditions of the day on the basis of this essential understanding. Quotation mongering, citing analogies, and drawing of historical parallels — none of these has anything to do with the Marxist methodological approach, i.e. none of these conforms to the dialectical method of analysis of Marxism. In the name of Marxism all these are vulgarization of Marxism. Lenin did realize it perfectly. That is why, he could courageously stand against and strike at the root of the mistaken ideas of Marxism so long prevalent among sections of Marxists through his famous treatise, *The April Theses*. He said and showed clearly to the communists all over the world that Marxism is not economic determinism; on it stands the valuable teaching of Lenin that politics always supersedes economy. Due to the uneven development of capitalism, the twists and turns, the zig-zags and the ups and downs of the revolutionary movements — sometimes going ahead and sometimes retreating — in the midst of such tussles politics and political events are influencing economic situations so much that these have become actually the determinant. Not to understand the mutual relation between politics and economy in this way, rather to think that as the economic situation changes so changes the political situation, i.e., political situation changes only as the reflection of the economic change — means to refuse to understand Marxism, to accept

(Contd. on page 8)

(Contd. from page 7)

something else in the name of Marxism. ...

On the basis of this analysis Lenin showed that with the overthrow of Nicholas Tsar from state power, the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia was attained politically, after the February Revolution, there, in place of Nicholas Tsar, that is, in place of an old class, a new class, the Russian bourgeoisie had assumed the state power. Lenin, of course, knew that from economic aspect many of the tasks of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution remained unfulfilled till then in Russia. In the rural economy, despite infiltration of capitalism, feudalism still continued to exist as a powerful force. Economically, subjugation or subservience to imperialism and financial oligarchy of the rich European capitalist countries was very much marked till that time. But still then Lenin said that since politically the main question of revolution was connected with the question of seizure of state power — hence the moment the Russian bourgeoisie had captured the state power by overthrowing Nicholas Tsar, that is, a new class had assumed the state power in place of the old one — to that extent and in that sense the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution was completed and Russia had entered the stage of Socialist Revolution. So under the circumstances, the old concept of the strategy and tactics of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution was no longer valid. To stick to the old ideas would mean subjugation to the bourgeoisie, throwing the entire fruits of sacrifice of the workers and peasants at the feet of the bourgeois class and hence a gross betrayal of revolution. ...

This important analysis as propounded in the April Theses was as yet unknown in the Marxist movement. Hence, at that time, this question was widely debated among the Marxists.

Be that as it may, the essence or the fundamental point which comes out of it should be clearly understood. Those in our country who even at the slightest trace of feudalism in economy characterize our revolution as bourgeois democratic or national democratic and say, how can we reach the stage of socialist revolution by a leap without completing the tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution — November Revolution has left a valuable teaching for them. Those in our country, who are still thinking or pleading in a way, failing to understand the teaching of November Revolution in tune with the leaders of the Second International, the Mensheviks, the Socialist Revolutionaries and even the confused section of the Bolsheviks at that time of November Revolution, are, in reality, practising economic determinism, which is alien to Marxism-Leninism and Dialectical Materialism and which refuses to accept the dialectical relationship with politics and economics. ...

November Revolution in Russia was accomplished in a situation when feudalism had a strong sway over rural economy, imperialism was still quite strong and the capitalist economy could not free itself from the bondage of imperialism. But despite all this Lenin showed that after the assumption of state power by the bourgeois Kerensky Government, since the working class in alliance with the poor peasantry had to capture power by overthrowing the bourgeoisie and since the object of revolution was the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, to that extent and in that sense, the revolution of Russia was Socialist Revolution politically. But as in the

**The November
Revolution was a
socialist revolution
even though many of
the anti-feudal and
anti-imperialist tasks
remained
unaccomplished after
the February Revolution
in Russia.**

economic and social fields many of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of Bourgeois Democratic Revolution still remained unaccomplished those tasks had to be incorporated as the derivatives in the main programme of Socialist Revolution. ...

Otherwise, peasants would get no land, there would be no end of kulaks' domination, no complete abolition of feudalism, the basis for independent development of the economy would not be established, no peace restored to the country and there would be no solution to the food problem. For, in the present era of imperialism and proletarian revolution or in other words or in the era when capitalism has turned out and out reactionary, it is not possible for the bourgeoisie unlike the bourgeoisie of the previous era, to accomplish all the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution. Therefore, even if the peasantry has to be completely freed economically from feudal exploitation — that too, makes the seizure of power by the proletariat indispensable, Socialist Revolution a must. So, although the principal strategic slogan and the concept of alignment of forces of the November Revolution, i.e., the Socialist Revolution was the revolutionary alliance with the poor peasantry, but from the time of seizure of power in 1917 till 1919, the revolutionary proletariat strove to move in alliance, not to speak of middle peasantry but with the whole of the peasantry in order to accomplish all those tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution. ...

After the seizure of power, the proletariat was to accomplish e.g., complete abolition of feudalism, redistribution of land, saving the poor and middle peasants from utter destitution, poverty and oppression and thus to proceed socialist reconstruction step by step, they had to continue with the slogan of alliance with the whole of the peasantry for quite some time even after the November Revolution. ...

So, although the national bourgeoisie will remain, in many cases, in the anti-imperialist independent struggles, they will, at the same time, make compromises with imperialism-feudalism out of fear complex of revolution. ...

Freedom will be achieved no doubt though the main object of freedom will not be attained. The country will not be totally free from the influence of imperialist capital, nor can feudalism be completely abolished to bring about revolutionary transformation of the agricultural economy. That is why, to lead these bourgeois democratic revolution to their logical culmination in the present era, what are essential, first, they are to be considered as part of world socialist revolution

and secondly, they must be led and conducted under the hegemony of the working class. It is after the Russian Revolution, i.e., the November Socialist Revolution, that the revolutionaries of different countries could properly give recognition to it and learn its real significance which so long remained a mere theory. ...

Let me here take up for discussion another related question. Since the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution was called national freedom struggle in the Second Congress of the Third International, any reference to such independence struggles as bourgeois democratic revolution is considered by some now as a deviation from Leninism and they would make it an issue for discussion. Those who think that to call this phase of social revolution as the phase of bourgeois democratic revolution in general is a complete deviation from Leninism and without taking into consideration the fundamental point at issue, would start a debate on such ticklish point, should know that in Stalin's 'Problems of Leninism' and later on in many writings of Mao Zedong, not of recent times, this phase of social revolution has been referred to as the phase of bourgeois democratic revolution time and again. It was recommended in the Second Congress of the Third International that the national independence struggles should not be termed as bourgeois democratic revolution but should better be termed as the national independence struggle, instead, because of the reason that these struggles differed from the old bourgeois revolution in certain respects. For the bourgeoisie in that era was revolutionary, it is no more so. In this era, revolution will suffer if the hegemony of the bourgeoisie is established over the national independence struggles and that is why the necessity of establishing the hegemony of the working class over these movements was emphasized. Taking note of these characteristics of the present era it was recommended at the Second Congress of the Third International that these national independence struggles should be freed from the influence of the bourgeoisie. But in any discussion relating to the determination of the stage of revolution everybody uses the terms bourgeois democratic revolution or socialist revolution. ...

In this regard, I would call your attention to an important observation of the Chinese Communist Party. The CPC is saying that when one fights against a particular trend, a particular deviation, another trend, another deviation may sometimes lie hidden within the struggle itself. This has been there for long in the Marxist movement. Take for instance, the Second Congress of the Third International that sought to remove a confusion — but see the result!

It is known to all that from social, economic and political aspects, the entire bourgeois democratic revolution constitutes a single phase in terms of social revolution. Now suppose, the bourgeois democratic revolution proceeds to some extent under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. Then it is found not proceeding a step further and that without the leadership of the working class it is impossible to complete the incomplete phase or remaining part of the bourgeois democratic revolution or even to successfully pursue the revolutionary programme of that phase in any way. Then it is clear that the strategy and tactics to be adopted by the working class in completing the remaining part of the bourgeois democratic

(Contd. on page 9)

(Contd. from page 8)

revolution under its leadership must be different from the strategy and tactics followed by the bourgeoisie in providing leadership to the earlier part of the bourgeois democratic revolution. ...

Otherwise, how is it, as is known to every student of history that when Lenin was drafting his April Theses for the November Socialist Revolution, all the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks were not completed in Russia? If anybody does not know it or if his knowledge is merely confined to certain points only which Stalin was referring to in his book, 'Problems of Leninism' while answering to certain confusions of others and even in that case if they fail to realize the underlying meaning of those answers, that is to say — what were the specific answers of Stalin against which of the specific confusions, — where lay the confusion, why the confusion, centring round which concrete historic event was such confusion and how Stalin has answered to all these — if they fail to grasp precisely all this, they will not understand as to why the November Revolution was a socialist revolution even though many of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks remained unaccomplished after the February Revolution in Russia. ...

So, this is an important aspect of the lessons of the November Revolution to the workers, peasants and youths of our country, who are fighting for their emancipation. The workers want to fight, the peasants, the youths they too want to fight but against whom is their fight? The question of determining the tactics of struggle, as to who is the enemy and who is the ally, all this is intimately connected with the fundamental question of strategy of revolution. If they consider that our revolution is People's Democratic, then whatever slogans they may raise from platform speeches, however 'militant' struggles, they may conduct, it is sure that from the very class alignment of their People's Democratic Revolution, they will develop a sympathy for and unity with the rich peasants in the villages. Consequently, the peasants movement they conduct will inevitably come under the firm grip and influence of the rich peasants. To assume Indian revolution to be as People's Democratic will lead them either to hobnob with the rich peasants this way or that way or to make adventure. This will not serve any purpose. Rather, by this, the class struggle of the poor and landless peasants and the agricultural labourers against the rich peasants who are the mainstay of capitalism in the rural economy, will be weakened and the interests of the poor and landless peasants and the agricultural labourers will be sacrificed at the feet of the rich peasants. On the other hand, based on their fanciful theory of People's Democratic Revolution on the assumed existence of progressive national bourgeoisie somewhere, they will be in search of them among the social high-ups who are in fact, the pillars of capitalism and by this the party and its leaders will invariably develop and maintain close tie with them. May be behind the screen but happen it must. ...

For, in this People's Democratic Revolution the progressive role of the national bourgeoisie is recognized. The advocates of People's Democratic Revolution do not intend to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power. They aim at overthrowing those whom they call the monopoly bourgeoisie. I have made exhaustive discussions elsewhere on this point many times before and

To assume Indian revolution to be as People's Democratic will lead them either to hobnob with the rich peasants this way or that way or to make adventure. This will not serve any purpose. Rather, by this, the class struggle of the poor and landless peasants and the agricultural labourers against the rich peasants who are the mainstay of capitalism in the rural economy, will be weakened and the interests of the poor and landless peasants and the agricultural labourers will be sacrificed at the feet of the rich peasants.

have shown that the rule of monopoly capitalism is nothing other than the rule of capitalism and that the hegemony of the monopoly bourgeoisie is the hegemony of the bourgeoisie as a class. Without the rule of capitalism monopoly capital cannot wield state power. From any knowledge of Marxism, no body can come to a conclusion contrary to this — as for myself with whatever little I understand Marxism, it is not possible for me to hold any other view. May be, there are theoreticians to whom this is comprehensible but this is simply absurd. This is beyond my comprehension. For, monopoly capitalism indicates a definite or particular stage of capitalism — a higher stage when capitalism develops to the stage of monopoly rule of the bourgeoisie which means rule of monopoly capital. To say that there is domination of monopoly capital and it is to be overthrown but to call the national bourgeoisie at the same time an ally of revolution means, in reality, denial of the existence of the bourgeois state itself and refusal of the fundamental task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie through revolution from the state power. ...

Judging from all respects you can see for yourself that the state structure in our country is capitalist in character.... The agricultural commodities have been transformed into the commodities of the national capitalist market and everything relating to this is governed by the laws of national capitalist market. It is now being debated as how to combat the impact of inflation on the agrarian economy. Taking all these into consideration if you examine then you will find that our agrarian economy is entirely guided by

the capitalist relations of production.

Even a common man can easily understand that an industrial worker produces on the basis of capitalist relation of production. But what are the characteristic feature by which we understand that capitalism has infiltrated in agrarian economy? Lenin has laid down clear cut guidelines in this regard. He has clearly shown that in determining the character of agricultural economy, it is not at all relevant whether the agricultural economy is backward or advanced or whether the cultivation is made with the help of machinery or by the age-old, outmoded method. Further, whether the cultivation is done in small holding of land or in big farming — this too, cannot be a relevant point in determining the character of agricultural economy — whether it is feudal or capitalist or socialist. (*The Agrarian Question in Russia towards the close of the Nineteenth Century* — Lenin) Then, what are the criteria for determining the character of an agricultural economy? Lenin has said that it is to be determined by the nature of trade and commerce of the agricultural commodities. That is, what has become the character of agricultural produce in the villages? What is the nature of trade and commerce of these produce? These factors mainly determine the character of agricultural economy — whether feudal or capitalist or even socialist.

Why our agricultural economy which is a capitalist one and not feudal, is not mechanized is a separate question. This question is related to the crisis of market of capitalism, is linked up with the various factors that stand in the way of uninterrupted industrial development and has relevance to the acute unemployment problem which is seriously endangering the state. I understand that some are advancing many queer arguments in this regard. I have heard that some have even gone to that extent as to argue that as because the bourgeoisie wants to perpetuate the unemployment problem, that is to say, as it is written in the Marxist classics that the bourgeoisie creates and sustains reserve army of unemployed to have a better bargain with the workers, so our argument that the Indian bourgeoisie, at this historical phase, is not in favour of mechanizing agriculture thoroughly as it will create crores of unemployed in the countryside threatening the existence of the state — according to them tantamounts to praising the bourgeoisie as if they do not want to create unemployed! It is simply preposterous! I would earnestly appeal to those who are dabbling in this manner and muddling these questions, better not to enter into such serious questions so prematurely. They should know, they should understand a little more. It is not that simple! The bourgeoisie wants to perpetuate the unemployment problem in order to have a better bargain — simply knowing this we cannot grasp the whole truth. Did not Hitler resolve the unemployment problem, even though temporarily in Germany, by militarizing the economy? History is replete with many such instances. However, that is not my subject of discussion here. Besides, here the problem is totally different. It is one thing to say that the capitalists will definitely perpetuate the unemployment problem because this is the general law of capitalist economy. But it is entirely a different thing to hold that when in the urban areas the burden of unemployment has already assumed such a gigantic proportion that the ruling

(Contd. on page 10)

50th Anniversary of Chinese Revolution Observed in States

At the call of the Central Committee of the SUCI, the 50th anniversary of the Chinese revolution was observed with due solemnity in different states of our country from 1st October to 15 October last. Reports received so far from different states are given here.

Orissa

In response to the call of the Central Committee, the 50th anniversary of Chinese revolution was observed in Orissa through different programmes. Hoisting red flags in the party offices, garlanding of the portraits of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Zedong and Shibdas Ghosh, sittings, study circles and group sittings were organised in different parts of the state.

On this occasion, Comrade Tapas Dutta, member, Central Committee of our party, hoisted the flag at Jashipur party office and garlanded the portraits of the international communist leaders. Addressing the comrades assembled he told that abysmal poverty, destitution and inhuman exploitation could not break the morale of the Chinese people for ever. Imbued with the noble ideology of Marxism-Leninism and led by the great leader Mao Zedong millions and millions of Chinese people in subhuman conditions of life rose as one man and successfully organised the epoch making Chinese New Democratic Revolution thereby setting in motion the establishment of a classless society in the erstwhile semi-feudal and semi-colonial China.

Comrade Dutta most fervently highlighted the legendary and epoch making Long March which formed the basis of the great Chinese revolution in 1949, which liberated Chinese people from the yoke of exploitation and laid the foundation stone for the establishment of a classless society in China. Comrade Dutta concluded his speech with call to the Comrades to take adequate lessons from this historic occasion and dedicate themselves to the revolutionary tasks volunteered by them surmounting all sorts of odds.

Apart from this fortnight was observed at different places of Orissa. Comrade Jagabandhu Baral, member of the State Committee of our party was the main speaker in the public meeting organised at Jajpur town Hall. This occasion was also observed at Cuttack, Angul, Rourkela, Bhubaneswar and different places of Puri district in a befitting manner.

West Bengal

In West Bengal the 50th anniversary of the Chinese revolution was observed in Calcutta and also in the districts. At the Central Office of the our party in Calcutta, Comrade Manik Mukherjee, the Central Staff of the party hoisted the red flag and garlanded the portrait of Comrade Mao Zedong, the great leader of the international Communist movement and architect of the Chinese revolution. The Central Office was decorated with 50 red flags for the fortnight.

An exhibition of quotations from the writings of Comrade Mao was also organised as a part of the programme. The quotation exhibition was inaugurated by Comrade Sukomal Dasgupta, member of the Central Committee of the party on 13th October last in front of the Esplanade Metro

station. In his inaugural speech Comrade Dasgupta urged those present not to make the observance of the 50th anniversary of the Chinese revolution a ritual but to take lessons from this great event and apply the teachings in life. Comrade Dasgupta recalled how Mao with grim determination and firm conviction about the invincibility of Marxism turned the situation in favour of revolution despite insurmountable difficulties and heavy odds. Comrade Dasgupta stressed that in the present international situation when after the dismantling of socialism in Soviet Union and East European countries, the international communist movement had suffered a serious jolt and the forces of reaction had gained an upper hand, we must be steadfast in our struggle along the path shown by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our departed leader, teacher and guide and one of the eminent Marxist thinkers of the world.

A mass meeting was held on 14th October in front of the Esplanade Metro station. Comrade Provash Ghosh, member, Central Committee of the Party and West Bengal State Secretary was the main speaker and Comrade Protiva Mukherjee presided over the meeting.

In course of his long speech Comrade Provash Ghosh said that the Chinese Revolution fired the imagination of the people of the colonial countries and inspired them to fight to end the imperialist rule. In this connection he referred to the Indian medical mission sent to China at the initiative of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose. Comrade Ghosh outlined how Mao emerged as the great leader in course of intense ideological struggle within the communist movement of China on the question of the correct path to be followed against the combined attack of the imperialists and the comprador bourgeoisie. He continued that Mao's unique contribution was the application of the general truth of Marxism-Leninism in concretised form on Chinese soil.

Referring to the recently held Lok Sabha elections in our country he said that immediately after the elections the Central government

increased the diesel price and state government of W. Bengal too increased the bus fare without any delay, thus subjecting the people to additional burden. This once again demonstrated that mere change of government through elections cannot in any way mitigate the sufferings of the people, and so what is required is the countrywide mighty mass movement against the capitalist onslaughts.

Tamilnadu

The District Organising Committee of Chennai Chengai, SUCI, Tamilnadu solemnly observed the 50th anniversary of Chinese revolution by gathering of party workers in the District Party Office on Oct. 1, 99 at Chennai. Comrade Narayanasamy, Secretary, Chennai-Chengai District Organising Committee hoisted five Red flags, indicating the five decades in front of the party office. The meeting began with garlanding the portrait of Chairman Mao followed by reading of quotations of Comrade Mao selected by Central Committee of our party. A discussion on Chinese revolution and Comrade Mao's works in general was conducted by Comrade Narayanasamy.

On 14 October the Tamilnadu State Organising Committee of our party held a meeting at the LLA Hall, Anna Salai, to observe the 50th anniversary of the Great Chinese Revolution led by the Communist Party of China guided by the great leader of the proletariat, Comrade Mao Zedong.

Comrade S Narayanasamy, a member of the State Organising Committee and the District Secretary of the Chennai-Chengai District Organising Committee, presided over the meeting.

Comrade Krishna Chakraborti, member of the Central Committee, who was the main speaker pointed out how in the annals of history, the Chinese Revolution stands next to the Great November Revolution of 1917 in Russia.

He said that Mao was a worthy disciple of the great Marxist authorities Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, who could apply their teachings to the

(Contd. on page 11)

November Revolution – Some Aspects

(Contd from page 9)

class is desperately trying to grapple with it — it will go in for modernization and mechanization of agricultural economy knowing fully well that it is sure to create crores of additional unemployed in the countryside at one stroke and further intensify the pressure on the state? It is such a risk which the bourgeoisie can ill-afford to invite. From this apprehension, they are obstructing modernization and mechanization of agriculture and instead are resorting to all antiquated methods and palliative like the Green revolution, etc. They are afraid of it very much and so are in no way inclined to modernization and mechanization of agriculture although there is so much scarcity of agricultural produce. Do all these mean that the bourgeoisie do not want to perpetuate unemployment problem? Contrarily does it mean that as because the bourgeoisie want to perpetuate the unemployment problem, it will by its own initiative, create, at one stroke, crores of unemployed in the countryside in

addition to the already alarming unemployment problem in the city, close their factories and thereby intensify the crisis so much so that it will hasten the process of revolution — simply because the bourgeoisie want to perpetuate the unemployment problem? Those who prattle like this, why do they at all enter into serious political discussions — I really fail to understand! Are they at all competent to enter into discussions and debates on these subjects? Such “irrefutable” (!) Marxist arguments are being trotted out nowadays, I hear! I would rather request them to carry on such “profound” discourses and try to prove that we understand not a whit of Marxism! It will do us no harm. We have full faith in the people. They have the power of reasoning. They will judge, they will examine, they will ponder over and ultimately will grasp the truth. But I must say that all these are due to their failure to correctly grasp the lessons of the November Revolution.

50th Anniversary of Chinese Revolution

(Contd. from page 10)

concrete conditions of China. He explained how, from the very beginning, Mao conducted an uncompromising struggle against both right and left deviations in the CPC, during the course of which he emerged as the leader of the Party and led the Chinese Revolution to success.

Comrade Chakraborti showed how among major achievements of Mao, the world proletariat cannot but remember the First Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution released by Mao in 1965 to protect the hard-earned gains of the Chinese Revolution from revisionist degeneration. It was an unprecedented event in the whole history of the communist movement involving not only Party cadres but the entire people in a complex and intense ideological and political struggle against

the danger of infiltration of revisionist ideas into the domain of ideology and culture of Chinese socialist society. It was to be noted that when nearly all the communist parties of the world denounced this great proletarian struggle, it was Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the beloved leader, founder and teacher of SUCI, who fully recognized the tremendous revolutionary significance of the Cultural Revolution and hailed it as 'magnificent'.

He lambasted the role the so-called left parties had played in the recent Lok Sabha elections when they had projected the anti-people Congress (I) as a secular, progressive force before the polls and after the polls had turned a somersault and found fault. He said these so-called left parties had betrayed the masses by

abandoning the path of movements and opting for the spoils of parliamentary politics. He also said that the fascist policies and ideology of the BJP could not be combated by the number of seats in parliament but through an intense ideological battle.

A well decorated photo-quotation exhibition was organised in front of the meeting spot. It was well appreciated by the people.

Bangalore, Karnataka

The Karnataka State Committee of the Party observed 50th anniversary of Chinese Revolution on 24.10.1999 in Gandhi Sahitya Sanga, Malleswaram.

Comrade K. Radhakrishna, State Secretary of SUCI was the main speaker. President of the meeting Comrade B. R. Manjunath, District Secretary of Bangalore explained at length the history of Chinese Revolution.

Bihar

The fiftieth anniversary of the great Chinese revolution was observed with profound enthusiasm in Patna on 9th October. A meeting was organised on this occasion. It was presided over by Comrade Shiveas Prasad, member of Patna District Organising Committee, SUCI. After floral tributes paid to the outstanding revolutionary and leader of the Chinese revolution Comrade Mao Zedong, Comrade Arun Kumar Singh, member Bihar State Committee, and Comrade Rabin Sajpati, a member Bihar State Committee, the main speaker elaborately discussed the history of the Chinese revolution, laying special emphasis on the role of Mao Zedong and his life struggle.

The meeting ended with the singing of the Internationale.

MP

50th Anniversary of the Chinese Revolution observed at Jabalpur

The Jabalpur District Organising Committee of our party observed the 50th anniversary of the Chinese New Democratic Revolution in a befitting manner at the district party office on 8th October evening. Comrade U P Biswas, co-ordinator of MP State Organising Committee was the main speaker.

AP

On the occasion of 50th anniversary of Chinese Revolution a public meeting was organised at Sunderayya Vignana Kendram, Hyderabad. The meeting was presided over by Comrade Ch. Murahari, Secretary, Hyderabad District Organising Committee, and Comrade K. Sridhar, Secretary, State Organising Committee, addressed the gathering as the main speaker.

Bhatinda (Punjab)

The Bhatinda Unit of SUCI held a meeting here on 24 Oct. 99 to discuss the role of Russian and Chinese revolution in the annals of human history and their lessons for the future Indian revolution of the toiling masses. In the meeting Comrade Narendra Sharma was present as the main speaker. Comrade Narinder Pal Singh also addressed. While remembering the teachings of Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong in leading the great November Revolution in Russia and Chinese Revolution of 1949 respectively, both the speakers highlighted how Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the worthy disciple of them, had shown the path of the future socialist revolution in India.

Protest against Diesel Price Hike

Reports of All India Diesel Price Hike Protest Day were published in our last issue. A few more reports received so far from different states are now given below :

AP

Responding to the call of All India Protest day, given by the Central Committee of our party, Hyderabad District Organising Committee organised protest street corner meetings at different places. At Erragadda while addressing mass meeting Comrade Murahari, Secretary, Hyderabad District Organising Committee, condemned the BJP caretaker government for increasing the price of diesel and called upon the people to develop mighty democratic mass movement to force the government to withdraw diesel price hike.

Bombay

SUCI Bombay-Thana Unit demonstrated against rise of price of diesel at Azad Maidan near V.T. Railway Station in the evening of 8. Oct. 1999, the All India Protest Day. After a procession, Comrades Om Prakash Mouraya, Y K Kulshreshtha and Anil Tyagi addressed the protest meeting.

Kerala

Under the auspices of the Ernakulam District Committee of SUCI a protest demonstration was held in Kochi city, Kerala, on Oct. 9 against the anti-people measure of the Central government which imposed a heavy hike in diesel price. A good number of party workers including women

participated. After the demonstration a public meeting was held. Comrades T R Sudhir Kumar and Francis Kalathungal, District Committee member of the party addressed the meeting.

Tamilnadu

Madurai

A dharna was organised near Madurai Railway junction by the party activists of Madurai, Theuri and Dindigul districts on 14th October last to protest against diesel price rise. Comrade V Venugopal, State Committee member led the dharna. Comrade P Maharajan, the local SUCI leader, addressed the gathering.

MP

The Jabalpur District Organising Committee of the party submitted a memorandum to the Addl. Collector, Jabalpur on 8th October last against the diesel price hike and demanding immediate withdrawal of the hike. Comrade Bhabani Ghosh led the delegation to the Addl. Collector and discussed the matter with him. Comrades Chandra Patva, Vinod Khare, Nilima Roy and Prabhat were in the delegation.

Bihar

Poor people of Haveli Kharagpur, Mungyr Bihar are now fighting a heroic battle against the police and administration since 5th Oct. last. People had to take resort to battle when three SUCI workers were arrested by the police at the instigation of local vested interest who were the leaders of RJD also. The arrested SUCI workers were implicated in a false dacoity case and were beaten up mercilessly in the police custody. This news spread like wildfire and the people under the banner of our party rushed to the police station in order to stage a demonstration there. But when the police officer promised them to release the arrested three after some time people on good faith came back to their villages. But when after 2 days it was found that the OC did not keep his word, rather he worked at the instruction of the local RJD leaders, people's wrath burst into conflagration. On 8th Oct. they blocked the

On 8th Oct. they blocked the



SUCI activists protesting against diesel price hike in Nagpur on 13.10.99

(Contd on page 12)

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee's Letter to the President

Mr. K. R. Narayanan

The President of India

Rastrapati Bhawan

New Delhi

Dear Mr. Narayanan,

15th October, 1999

With a heavy heart and deep anguish I, on behalf of India's millions upon millions of sane minds, draw your serious attention to the agonising news, already in the media, of the Vishva Hindu Parisad's and the RSS conducting a strident campaign against the visit of Pope John Paul II to India. This Sangh Parivar design will for sure blacken India before the eyes of the world.

Reportedly, the VHP-steered campaign against the Pope's visit to India is already afoot, inciting communal passions through country-wide agitations, pamphleteering, 'yatra' and 'havans' — among which one being held at Delhi's Hanuman Mandir. Ominous still — the RSS also has joined in the VHP-planned 'Yatra' which, starting from Goa and passing through Maharashtra, Gujarat and Rajasthan shall reach Delhi on November 4, a day before the Pope arrives, "demanding an apology from the Pope for the conversions carried out by missionaries in India."

All this leaves one not in the slightest doubt about the inescapable consequence of this design: communal frenzy exploding into a premeditated blood bath of religious minorities. This must be stopped at any cost.

The VHP and RSS must at once be restrained. They must not be allowed to spread hatred and shed blood.

Thanking you,

Yours sincerely,

Sd/- Nihar Mukherjee

General Secretary, Central Committee

S. U. C. I.

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee's Letter to all left and democratic parties

16th October, 1999

Dear Comrade/Friend,

You are aware of heinous hate campaign let loose anew by the Viswa Hindu Parishad and the RSS against the Christian religious minority. Their 'Yatra' from Goa through the states of Maharashtra, Gujarat and Rajasthan scheduled to reach Delhi on November 4, a day before the Pope John Paul arrives there, "demanding an apology from the Pope for the conversions carried out by missionaries in India." VHP and RSS also challenging the right of visit of Pope as a religious leader of the Christian community. Hope, you will agree that this is fraught with the danger of bloodbath of people belonging to minority communities in general and the Christian community in particular.

The VHP and RSS must be restrained at any cost.

With this request I have already faxed a letter to the President of India, Mr. K. R. Narayanan urging him to stop this programme.

This grave situation warrants a strong protest by people from all walks of life and by MPs in particular, throughout the country to create pressure on the BJP-coalition government to compel VHP-RSS to withdraw the 'Yatra' and the heinous hate campaign.

In this effort a united move of left, democratic and secular parties and forces, is urgently needed. Please meet the President individually and unitedly as it suits you, to pursue the President to use his good offices that can save the religious minority in general and the Christian community in particular.

Hope, you will promptly take up the issue and do the needful.

With greetings,

Faternally yours,

Sd/- Nihar Mukherjee

Protest against Diesel Price hike

(Contd. from page 11)

main road linking Mungyr and Haveli Kharagpur near Laroi village and fought a pitched battle with the police when they began to lathicharge to disperse the people. Hundreds of women also played a heroic role in this battle. At last police had to flee. People continued the blockade until the DSP and SP came with those arrested 3 SUCI workers and released them before the demonstrators. It was a unique victory.

But the police and administration could not digest this humiliating defeat and they issued an arrest warrant against the local SUCI leader and the member of the Mungyr District Committee, Comrade Bhola Tanti.

So, on 14th October last, under the auspices of Mungyr District Committee, SUCI, people

marched to the District Magistrate office to protest it along with their demands to withdraw the diesel price hike and the unprecedented rise in busfare throughout the state. The District Magistrate, however, assured the team of delegation which included Comrades Pranod Kr Mondal, District Secretary, Krishnadu Shah, Bhola Tanti, Bharat Mondol and Dipak Kumar — all members of the District Committee, that he would look into the matter.

Muzaffarpur, Bihar

The SUCI activists blocked national and state highways at Kanti, Saraiya, Minapore, Sahebgunj etc. in the district of Muzaffarpur on 23rd October with the demand for withdrawal of hike in diesel price and bus fare. People joined the road blockade spontaneously and enthusiasm among them ran high. A posse of police force came to every spot, but in view of massive participation they hesitated to take action and ultimately backtracked. Then the Divisional Commissioner came and assured to restructure the bus fare.

Another protest demonstration was organised at Muzaffarpur on 7th last. A well decorated procession led by Comrades Shibshankar, district Secretary, Kashinath Sahin, Ramnaresh Roy and others marched through the main thoroughfare of the town and went to the District Magistrate to submit a memorandum.

Quilon, Kerala

Under the auspices of the Quilon District Committee of our party SUCI, party activists picketed the National Highway in Quilon town on 21st October 1999. The picketing day coincided with the day of hiking bus fares in the state. Inaugurating the picketing Comrade Jyothy Krishnan severely criticised the biggest ever diesel charge hike brought about most undemocratically by a care taker government led by the pro-monopoly BJP.

He showed the people how pseudo left is the Left Democratic Front in Kerala which instead of protecting the people from the diesel charge hike by giving subsidy, hiked the bus charge heavily and openly sided with the bus owners.

Before the picketing there was a demonstration in the town led by Comrades S. Radhakrishnan, Shyla K John, G. Dhruvakumar, Sreejith Sudhakar, P.J. Prakash and K. Badaruddin. Police arrested the volunteers and took them to the police station. After charging a case they were sent on bail.

SUCI demands withdrawal of the Insurance Bill

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, SUCI, demanding immediate withdrawal of the Insurance Regulatory Authority Bill has said in course of a statement on 30.10.99:

"The BJP-led coalition government has introduced the Insurance Regulatory Authority Bill at the instance of the national and foreign capitals, to the glee specially of the Americans, evoking widespread condemnation of the opposition except the Congress and the employees of the insurance sector have observed a day's strike all over the country as a prelude to bigger movement.

"This scheme of privatisation and globalisation will undoubtedly aggravate the ruination of country's economy to the satisfaction of the monopolists. It will open up vast market of the country for foreign exploitation causing immense hardship and burden of the toiling people.

"We demand immediate withdrawal of the Bill and call upon the people of all walks of life to develop a sustained movement to compel the government to abandon the scheme."

Stand by super-cyclone hit people of Orissa

Expressing deep shock over the catastrophic cyclone in Orissa, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary SUCI, in a statement called upon the people and all medical associations of the country to stand by the super-cyclone hit people of Orissa with food articles, baby-food, medicine, money and all other relief materials at this hour of grave natural calamity.

The party also demands of the Central and State Governments to take all necessary steps at war footings for rescue, relief and rehabilitation.

The Central Committee instructs all the party and frontal units to collect relief materials from the people and send those immediately to the address given below:

Tapas Dutta

Secretary, Orissa State Committee

SUCI Office

VIR-17 Unit 6 Bhubaneswar Orissa

Phone: 0674-410272

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: NIHAR MUKHERJEE