



"...But theory, too, becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses.....And just as philosophy finds its material weapon in the proletariat, the proletariat finds its spiritual weapon in philosophy. And as soon as the lightning of thought has struck deep into the virgin soil of the people, they will emancipate themselves and become men."
—KARL MARX

Nationwide mass movement the only way out from the present impasse—Comrade Nihar Mukherjee

(Handout of the Press Conference addressed by our beloved General Secretary Comrade Nihar Mukherjee at Bhubaneswar on 13th March, 1991.)

The political crisis arising out of the resignation of the Chandra Shekhar Government is not an accidental phenomenon but a fallout of the peculiar circumstances created by the last Lok Sabha election, which for the first time in our country, resulted in a hung Parliament with the Congress(I), the most trusted agent of the Indian capitalist class, remaining as the single largest party.

Consequently, two minority governments—led by Mr. V. P. Singh and then by Mr. Chandra Shekhar had to step down within eleven and four months of their formation respectively, for different reasons although. The V. P. Singh Govt. initially aroused much hope in the people's mind but finally belied them as it pursued policies no different than the Congress(I)'s. Moreover, rather than trying to check communal, parochial and secessionist forces it pursued the line of fanning up casteism for its petty parliamentary interest of creating its own vote bank. On the other hand, the rabid communal forces like RSS, BJP, VHP, Bajrang Dal etc., whipped up a countrywide frenzy of

majority communalism centring round the Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid issue. When the National Front Govt. ultimately, even though belatedly, took a stand to stop the Rathayatra, the BJP withdrew its support and brought the fall of the Govt.

The Congress(I), thus provided with a golden opportunity to fish in the troubled waters, found a ready tool in Chandra Shekhar, a greedy power-seeker and old aspirant for Prime Ministership, who lost no time in splitting from the Janata Dal with a bunch of defectors, forming a government on Congress(I) support and was ready to submit to any extent to its wishes. Our party aptly called this Govt. a "Congress(I) Govt. by proxy." But we at the same time showed that this Govt. would be allowed only to stay in office so long as the Congress(I) finds it expedient.

It is well known that the Congress(I) has fully utilised this short span of Chandra Shekhar Govt.'s rule firstly, to destroy all evidence of its past scandals and shady deals and secondly, to prepare the grounds

for staging a comeback by toppling the elected non-Congress(I) Governments in Tamilnadu and Assam and by replacing senior officials in important places of the Central Govt., thus gearing up the machinery for an all-out administrative rigging in its favour, which has become a regular feature since the days of Indira Gandhi.

During this entire period, Mr. Chandra Shekhar had to swallow every humiliation and bow down to every dictate of the Congress(I). But to submit to the Congress(I) pressure on the Haryana issue would have been suicidal for him. He was therefore left with no alternative but to resign.

Thus within less than two years' time limitless greed for power of these bourgeois parties and their leaders have forced the people of the country already in suffocating condition with unbearable taxation, skyrocketing prices, huge unemployment and abysmal poverty, to have to bear the huge financial burden of yet another election. All bourgeois and social democratic parties are now claiming that midterm election is the only solution to this impasse.

Frantic efforts were made to reach some sort

of understanding so that instead of facing the uncertainties of an immediate election, they can continue to share their present privileges by keeping the Lok Sabha alive. This opportunist politics need to be exposed at all costs.

The people of our country has enough experience that whichever party or combination of parties was saddled on power through the elections—the Congress(I) or any other party or combination of parties—they not only could not solve any of their basic problems but aggravated them beyond all proportions.

Moreover, as an inseparable part of the world capitalist system, Indian capitalism is now passing through the third phase of intense worldwide economic crisis. This is also manifesting through the crisis in its political superstructure, i.e. the parliamentary system. Therefore, in their bid to stave off this crisis, the branded bourgeois as well as social democratic parties or combination of parties in power are more and more putting the entire burden of capitalist exploitation on to the shoulder of the common masses, curtailing democratic rights and conspiring to divide the people by fanning up communal, casteist, parochial and

secessionist feelings and tendencies to retain their hold on power. They are resorting to every unfair means in the elections—starting from the use of black money, muscle power and media to all-out administrative rigging. Democratic values and norms are not honoured even inside the Parliament which has of late become a place for horse-trading, intrigues and corruption.

Moreover, an industrial - bureaucratic - military complex has already grown as an extra-constitutional power which is governing the country from behind the screen. These are the characteristic features of the 'largest democracy' of the world!

Therefore, it is high time that in order to restore, preserve and extend democratic rights, norms and values and take up all burning issues of people's life including the demand for education and job to all and the right to recall the elected representatives, democratic minded people of our country came forward to develop a countrywide movement by building up the people's struggle committees from grassroots level and enrolling thousands of students and youths in Volunteer Corps.

(Contd. on page 12)

REMEMBERING KARL MARX

The epoch-making genius who armed the exploited with the invincible weapon to change the world

On the occasion of the 108th anniversary of the demise of Karl Marx, we recall his profound thought and teachings. We are Marxists, followers of Marx, not just because he was a genius, for other geniuses too have appeared in the history of mankind. We are Marxists, because Marx alone showed the correct, scientific path, not only to change the world for the better, but also to change ourselves in the process towards higher culture and ethics. Had anybody other than Marx accomplished this, we would have followed him.

In order to understand the epoch-making greatness of Marx, we have to bear in mind that all philosophies prior to Marxism had merely interpreted the world, and because they were mostly idealistic ones, that too subjectively and metaphysically. It was Marx who developed, for the first time in human history, the scientific philosophy of Dialectical Materialism by correlating, integrating and generalizing the particular truths about the material world discovered by the different branches of science as well as those culled by the social sciences. By discovering the laws of development of the material world as well as of social development, Marx developed the comprehensive scientific world outlook based on experimented truths not only to correctly interpret the material world and history but also to show, for the first time, the scientific, materialistic and historically determined course of changing the world. That is why Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action, the science of all sciences. True realization of Marxism makes one a real man who is free and fearless, thorough and sure about the future.

If we are to understand the relevance and validity of Marxism in the context of the questions thrown up by the recent developments in the Soviet Union and East Europe, we have to understand the life and struggles of Marx and the significance of his contribution. For Marx's emergence was not accidental, he was not ordained by God to revolutionise philosophy. He was the product of a life-long struggle, not the struggle of an individual in the bourgeois sense but the conscious struggle to articulate the social urge and fulfil the basic social need. Marxism emerged when it did because the social conditions for it had ripened, the necessary ingredients being the requisite scientific development, growth of capitalism, appearance of the proletariat and its contradiction with the bourgeoisie as the principal contradiction. When Marx penned 'The Capital', was it an individual thinking? No, as our leader, teacher and guide Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has shown, it was the best personification of the then social thinking through an individual. The dialectics that worked within Marx, in the context of the time and the struggles, assimilated all the best that was in erstwhile social thinking, and in continuity with it but at the same time by effecting a break with it, gave

birth to the new unified revolutionary philosophy as a guide to conscious action by the classes and the masses. Truly, Marx was an epoch-making pioneer. Later on when Lenin concretised, elaborated and enriched Marxism, he did so by assimilating the epistemological treasures developed by Marx and Engels and on its basis; subsequently, when Stalin did the same, he did so on the basis of the thoughts and works of Marx, Engels and Lenin and so on and so forth. But to Karl Marx belongs the unique distinction of being an epoch-making trend-setter.

EMERGENCE OF MARXISM

What, in a nutshell, is Marx's profound contribution to the treasury of thinking of the mankind? As put by Lenin, "Marx was the genius who continued and consummated the three main ideological currents of the 19th century as represented by the three most advanced countries of mankind: classical German philosophy, classical English political economy and French socialism combined with French revolutionary doctrines in general."

At that time, in the philosophical field, the German philosopher Hegel's thought reigned supreme. Hegel represented a very significant step away from old idealist philosophy. He built up the dialectical system to show that all changes and developments in the world come about through dialectical process of contradiction-synthesis between opposites. But in spite of this, Hegel remained confined within the orbit of idealism and for all his dialectics, nature and world had been to him but manifestation of the 'Absolute Spirit'. Feuerbach, a young German Left Hegelian, exposed the idealistic essence of Hegel's philosophy and upheld materialism. But in the process, he denied dialectics itself although Hegel's dialectics had been a decisive step forward. Feuerbach's materialism smacked of the earlier mechanical materialism and in the last analysis, was not totally free from idealism either as he viewed morality, ethics etc. to be unchangeable and eternal. In the words of Stalin, "Marx and Engels took from Hegelian dialectics only its 'rational kernel'" as they "took from Feuerbach's materialism its 'inner kernel'" and thus gave dialectical materialism a scientific foundation.

England at that time was the capitalist state, industrially most developed. Theories of classical political economy had been developed there by bourgeois economists like Adam Smith, Petty and Ricardo. Their economic thought had served as the basis for development of capitalist economy but was incapable of looking beyond capitalism.

In the political sphere, the contradictions, disparity and injustice inherent in the capitalist system had generated socialistic thought. There were many schools of socialistic thought, the most notable among

them being that of the French Utopian Socialists. They visualized, rather imagined, the socialist order as the panacea but had no idea as to how to concretely move towards it. For all their good intentions, their socialism was an unscientific proposition, a utopia. The lessons of French Revolution, a truly momentous historic event, were there. It had shown how human reasoning, thought and concerted and conscious actions would act upon existing reality and bring about a change in the social order.

Starting on these philosophical, economic and political bases, Marx was to expose their shortcomings and limitations, supersede them, tread new ground by effecting a break with them and through life-long struggles embracing all spheres like the natural and social sciences, philosophy, economics, politics etc. and participation in struggles of the oppressed against bondage, to build up the edifice of Marxism as a unified science and guide to action to fulfil the need of the age.

HISTORIC CONTRIBUTION OF MARX

Marx freed Hegel's dialectics from its idealist shell and at the same time overcame Feuerbach's inadequacies and limitations to found the science of Dialectical Materialism. In his words, "My dialectic is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life process of the human brain i.e. the process of thinking which, under the name of 'the idea', he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurge of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the idea'. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought."

The essence of Dialectical Materialism is this: Anything or any phenomenon in nature is not static but exists with contradiction of two opposites within it. It is the contradiction between the two opposites, the thesis and anti-thesis, that generates development and change. When the contradiction within a being develops to reach a nodal point then the two opposites within it can no longer remain in unity. A new being comes about, the synthesis, through negation of the old being. But negation of this negation lies inherent in it because the new being, that is the negation of the old being carries within it a new contradiction between a new thesis and a new anti-thesis which would eventually generate a new synthesis, that is, its own negation. This process goes on and on. It is not that some philosophers think like this but this is how anything and everything in the universe actually develop. This general truth is not anybody's wishful, subjective thinking but emerged from analysis, co-ordination and integration of the data provided by the

(Contd. from page 3)

different branches of science in Marx's time.

Marx showed that like nature, society and history too are dialectically lawgoverned. A written history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle which is the reflection of the contradiction inherent in society. Society moves forward through resolution of the contradiction between two opposites within it, a new socio-economic formation arises through negation of the earlier one and so on and so forth. Marx painstakingly investigated and analysed capitalist economy superseding the earlier classical bourgeois political economists in the process and by dissecting the capitalist economy and analysing its features in the light of reason, scientifically showed that its inherent contradiction is irreconcilable and therefore a new social order, Communism, would arise on the ashes of capitalism by negating it. Capitalism is historically doomed. In the social plane, this irreconcilable contradiction is seen in the contradiction between capital and labour which is the principal contradiction in capitalist society. Society can move forward from here only by resolving this contradiction through anti-capitalist socialist revolution led by the proletariat. Socialism would be an intermediate stage of transition from capitalism to the classless communist society and during this transitional period, the State can be nothing but the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx summed up his teaching in this regard thus: "No credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society, nor yet the struggle between them. Long before me the bourgeois historians have described the historical development of this struggle of classes and the bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of classes. What I did new is to prove: (1) that the existence of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production; (2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; (3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society."

Karl Marx built up the edifice of Dialectical Materialism as a comprehensive world outlook, a guide to action, brick by brick, through life-long struggles. To grasp the significance of his immense contribution, one has to understand his life struggles.

EARLY LIFE

Marx was born on May 5, 1818 at Trier in Rhine Province of Prussia (the united German nation or state had not yet emerged). It was a time when sweeping, capitalist developments were taking place in Western Europe although such developments started in Germany later than in England or France.

Along with the capitalist class had appeared the propertyless proletariat and their privations and misery under capitalism. Various trends of petty bourgeois socialism, utopian socialism were at work led by the thoughts of Saint Simon, Charles Fourier, Robert Owen, etc. There was an atmosphere of questioning everything including reli-

gious precepts and philosophy, of testing all precepts on the anvil of reason. Feuerbach had exposed Hegel's metaphysical mysticism and asserted that God was man's creation, a product of man's imagination. The idea had gained ground that if man had the power to create God, he surely had the power to create, change for the better his own economic, political and social condition. So, many young Hegelians shunned the realm of mere abstract philosophy and started participating in active politics.

Marx began as a radical democrat influenced by Hegel. In 1842, he became a contributor to 'Rheinische Zeitung' and then its editor. Through his articles, he became involved in the then economic-social-political problems and questions and began to test, sharpen and develop his ideas and reasoning on the anvil of reality. Soon he discovered that Hegelian philosophy did not provide for consideration of social-political problems and material, economic interests. Further, he found that in the context of the developing strifes and struggles between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in Europe, Hegelian system provided no guidelines in choosing a side. Moreover, his orientation and studies till then had not equipped him for critically examining and deliberating upon the thoughts of the then influential French socialists. Marx felt the need of thoroughly studying sociology, economics, political economy and politics.

The Prussian Government, incensed at the radical articles in 'Rheinische Zeitung', ordered its suppression in 1843. Marx refused to tone down the articles and resigned the editorship. He spent a month in intensive study. The outcome was the 'Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of the Right'. In this unfinished manuscript, Marx's ideas on democracy, class, state and its abolition as opposed to Hegelian outlook began to crystallize.

IN PARIS

Marx decided to publish a radical journal abroad for smuggling into Germany and went to Paris. Paris in those days had a glorious revolutionary past as well as a momentous revolutionary present with different radical and revolutionary forces active. There were strong underground organisations. A vigorous current of Republicanism prevailed. Many societies and associations including the German Exiles' League functioned. Paris seethed with various revolutionary and socialistic ideas. Among the different socialist trends, that led by Proudhon exercised the greatest influence.

Marx threw himself into the vortex of active politics but at the same time made intensive study of sociology, political theories and economics with all the youthful energy at his command. He studied the workers' lives first-hand, established contacts with secret societies of French and German workers, got to know the French utopian socialist leaders including Proudhon, struck up friendship with Heinrich Heine, made acquaintance with the Russian revolutionaries Bakunin and Botkin, studied Adam Smith, David Ricardo and other economists and the works of utopian socialists like

Fourier, Saint Simon, Owen, etc. and made a thorough study of the French Revolution,

'Deutsch-Französische Jahrbucher', a journal jointly edited by Marx and Arnold Ruge, came out in Paris but its publication was stopped after the first double number as Ruge was in total disagreement with Marx's radical revolutionary outlook. Two essays of Marx, 'On the Jewish Question' and 'Introduction to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of the Right', were published in this journal. In these, we perceive a clear break with the Hegelian idealism. Especially in the latter for the first time, the historical mission of the proletariat to lead revolution was outlined and revolution was viewed as the culmination of historical process. Marx perceived that the then prevalent trend of criticising religion isolatedly was not purposeful and the true task of progressive philosophy lay in turning the struggle against religion into a struggle against the objective conditions which nurtured religion. He declared: "The criticism of heaven is thus transformed into the criticism of the earth, the criticism of religion into the criticism of law, and the criticism of theology into the criticism of politics... The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace the criticism of weapons: material force must be overthrown by material force. But theory, too, becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses. . . And just as philosophy finds its material weapon in the proletariat, the proletariat finds its spiritual weapon in philosophy. And as soon as the lightning of thought has struck deep into the virgin soil of the people, they will emancipate themselves and become men. . . It (the proletariat) cannot liberate itself without breaking free from all the other classes of society and thereby liberating them also."

HISTORIC MEETING WITH ENGELS

Engels had first met Marx when he had visited the Office of 'Rheinische Zeitung' at Cologne in 1842. He had contributed the article 'Critical Sketches on Political Economy' in the only issue of 'Jahrbucher' that had come out. When Engels came to Paris in August 1844, the historic meeting with Marx took place. This was the beginning of long association and joint struggle by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels which would exercise momentous influence on the course of the world communist movement. Engels had just made a painstaking in-depth study of living conditions of the British proletariat in his article 'The Condition of the Working class in England'. They discovered that they had complete identity of views and had arrived at the same conclusions working independently. Now they started writing 'The Holy Family' jointly. Later on Marx completed it by contributing the bulk of the writing, and it was published in February, 1845.

In the meanwhile, Marx was in acute financial trouble and was deported from Paris under pressure of the Prussian Government. He left Paris and went to Brussels in February, 1845. Here, fearing an extradition demand by the Prussian Government, Marx renounced Prussian citizenship.

(Contd. on page 5)

(Contd. from Page 4)

DEVELOPMENT OF MARXISM

In the Holy Family, Marx and Engels effected a break, on general principles, from both utopian socialism and ideas of young Hegelians. The utopian socialists saw in the proletariat a helpless suffering mass on whom socialism was to be endowed. Even many young Hegelians abhorred mass contact and mass action and believed that only the chosen individuals, the elite, were capable of creating history. Marx and Engels showed that neither of these two was the correct reading and that socialism could come about only in the process of historical evolution through revolutionary transformation of society by the self-conscious proletariat acting as a mass social force independently. In this treatise, we find the inception of historical materialism as will be evident from passages like: "It is not a question of what this or that proletariat or even the whole proletariat momentarily imagines to be the aim. It is a question of what the proletariat is and what it consequently is historically compelled to do. Its aim and historical action is prescribed, irrevocably and obviously, in its own situation in life as well as in the entire organisation of contemporary civil society."

Earlier, in his Paris Manuscripts, Marx had succinctly drawn a clear distinction between bourgeois humanism and communism thus: "...communism is humanism mediated with itself through the supersession of private property." This concept that communism is humanism minus private property shows the remarkable clarity of vision of Karl Marx, which makes a clear distinction between humanism and communism giving unmistakable pointer to the fact that while the former stands on the basis of rule of capital and private property, whatever progressive role it had played during those days—the economic edifice of the latter lies in the abolition of rule of capital, private property and wage slavery leading to a classless society as its goal.

Now the development of dialectical and historical materialism as well-knit science went on apace. In close succession were written 'The Theses on Feuerbach' (Marx: 1845), 'The German Ideology' (Marx & Engels: 1846) and 'The Poverty of Philosophy' (Marx: 1847). In the 'Theses', Marx criticised Feuerbach's shortcomings and especially his mechanical sense of materialism and metaphysical thinking in order to pave the way for formulating dialectical and historical materialism. He said, "The materialist doctrine that men are products of circumstances and upbringing, and that, therefore, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed upbringing, forgets that it is men that change circumstances and that the educator himself needs educating. The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionizing practice... Feuerbach resolves the religious essence into the human essence. But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its

reality it is the ensemble of the social relations... Feuerbach, consequently, does not see that the "religious sentiment" is itself a social product, and that the abstract individual whom he analyzes belongs in reality to a particular form of society... Social life is essentially practical. All mysteries which mislead theory to mysticism find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice... The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

In 'The German Ideology' we find concrete formulation of historical materialism for the first time. Regarding historical evolution of society, they showed that "...definite individuals who are productively active in a specific way enter into these definite social and political relations. The social structure and the state continually evolve out of the life-process of definite individuals, but individuals not as they may appear in their own or other people's imagination but rather as they really are, that is, as they work, produce materially, and act under definite material limitations, presuppositions, and conditions independent of their will... all struggles within the State, the struggle between democracy, aristocracy and monarchy, the struggle for franchise etc., etc., are nothing but the illusory forms in which the real struggles of different classes are carried out among one another... In the appropriation by the proletarians, a mass of instruments of production must be subservient to each individual and the property of all. The only way for individuals to control modern universal interaction is to make it subject to the control of all... Communism is for us not a state of affairs which is to be established, an ideal to which reality will have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the premises now in existence."

Marx developed Dialectical Materialism as the scientific, integrated world outlook of the proletariat through ceaseless struggle against idealist and utopian ideologies. When Proudhon's 'Philosophy of Poverty' came out (1847), he took up the pen and tore to shreds Proudhon's confused idealist, philistine-reformist views, establishing the correct, revolutionary ideology in the process. In a letter to the Russian journalist Annenkov, Marx criticised Proudhon and upheld the materialist viewpoint. One of its illuminating passages reads: "Are men free to choose this or that form of society for themselves? By no means. Assume a particular state of development in the productive forces of man and you will get a particular form of commerce and consumption. Assume particular stages of development in production, commerce and consumption and you will have a corresponding social constitution, a corresponding organisation of the family, of orders or of classes, in a word, a corresponding civil society." Later, in the same year (1847), Marx elaborated his ideas in the fullscale rejoinder to Proudhon's book in his 'The Poverty of Philosophy'. After detailed analysis, he concluded that: "The same men who establish social relations in conformity with

their material productivity also produce principles, ideas and categories conforming to their social relations. Hence these ideas, these categories are no more eternal than the relations which they express. They are historical and transitory products."

IN ACTIVE POLITICS

The foundation of scientific socialism had thus been laid. Now it had to be put to use as the guiding principle of revolutionary practice through working class organisation. Marx and Engels had already established numerous contacts with the organized proletariat of Germany and founded a German workers' society in Brussels. Moreover, they had established the Communist Correspondence Committee at Brussels in early 1846 to pave the way for a revolutionary organisation of the proletariat and to evolve identity of views among the revolutionaries from different countries "to shake off the limitation of nationality". The Committee, at its sessions, discussed matters regarding the communist movement which was then in its infancy. The Committee corresponded and maintained contacts with revolutionaries in different countries. On the initiative of Marx and Engels, a number of such committees or groups were set up in different parts of Germany and eventually in Paris and London. On behalf of the Committee, correspondence was carried out with workers' and socialist leaders and organisations of various countries and circulars were issued on important matters for a few years. At that stage, Marx and Engels advised the workers not to get isolated from democratic movement but to actively participate, along with the bourgeoisie, in the fight against absolutism on the bourgeois demands for democratic rights and civil liberties so that a favourable condition could be created for the proletariat's eventual struggle against the bourgeoisie. Till his death, Marx was to maintain close contacts with and be in correspondence with revolutionaries and socialist leaders of many a country, from whatever place he operated. For some time, Marx and Engels had been in close touch with the League. In 1836, the secret organisation 'League of the Just' had been formed in Paris by exiled Germans. In 1840, an associate body, the legally functioning German Workers' Educational Association, had been founded. Soon branches of the League and/or the Association were formed in many countries of Europe. In this way, the League, from being German, gradually became international body. Initially, the League activities were conspiratorial in nature. The inadequacy of conspiratorial orientation and the erstwhile erroneous concepts of socialism were being felt by the League members more and more. Marx and Engels joined the League. The first League Congress took place in London in 1847 where the League reorganised itself and henceforth became known as the Communist League. This Congress was attended by Engels. At the second Congress later in the same year, attended by both Marx and Engels, Marx expounded his new proletarian revolutionary theory at length. These new basic principles were unanimously adopted

(Contd. on page 6)

(Contd. from page 5)

and Marx and Engels were commissioned to draw up a Manifesto of the League. The outcome was the 'Communist Manifesto'. The old motto of the League "All men are brothers" was replaced by the new slogan "Working men of all countries, unite!"

This clarion call of Marx and Engels not only helped immensely to strengthen workers' movement all over the world, it carried in it a noble idea and a higher proletarian culture and ethics which showed the source of bond of unity of the workers of all countries as also opened up a new vista before them transcending the narrow confines of their own territorial boundary.

When the February Revolution broke out in France and elsewhere on the continent (1848), the League Central Committee (C.C.) in London, dissolved itself and empowered Marx to constitute a new C.C. in Paris. But immediately thereafter, the police arrested Marx and compelled him to leave for France. In Paris, a document titled 'Demands of the Communist Party in Germany' was drawn up by members of the newly formed C.C. It was distributed throughout Germany. But after the June 13 defeat in Paris (1849), the defeat of May insurrections in Germany and suppression of Hungarian revolution by Czarist Russia, the great period of 1848 revolution came to a close. Most of the League members who had lived abroad returned to their homelands and lost contact with the League. The conditions in each state, even province or town, were so different that the League was proving incapable of providing specific effective directives.

Hence, the League was organised afresh in 1850. But the industrial crisis of 1847 which had paved the way for the 1848 Revolution had been overcome. A new period of unprecedented industrial prosperity had set in. The League had been an excellent school for revolutionary activity but the prospects of a renewed upsurge of revolution receded. Marx and Engels declared, "With this general prosperity, in which the productive forces of bourgeois society develop as luxuriantly as is at all possible within bourgeois relationships, there can be no talk of a real revolution." This correct, scientific appraisal of the situation and warning not to play with revolution did not find favour with a large number of League members suffering from petty bourgeois romanticism and adventurism. The League was split and eventually dissolved in 1852.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

The Manifesto was a programmatic document which for the first time put together a concise, integrated and lucid exposition of Marxist world view, revolutionary theory and practice. It traces the course of social development and points out the historical inevitability of the doom of capitalism and its replacement by a classless society through a revolution headed by the proletariat, rejects bourgeois objections and slanders against communism, outlines the communist revolution, measures to be taken after the revolution and

the future communist society, presents a short but pointed critique of various brands of petty bourgeois and utopian socialism and sets out communist approach and tactics vis-a-vis other political forces. The whole work is permeated with vigour and enthusiasm, and is full of wide-ranging analysis and observations revealing deep insight into historical process. Some of these are: "(The bourgeoisie) has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment". It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value... The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-labourers. The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation... The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns... Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West... The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself. But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians... All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interests of the immense majority... The theoretical conclusions of the Communists are in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered, by this or that would-be universal reformer. They merely express, in general terms, actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes... You (the bourgeoisie) are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population; its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths... The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality. The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got." The validity of such profound observations has increased manifold in the light of further growth and subsequent decadence of capitalism during the last 150 years.

The 'Manifesto' ends with the historic declaration and clarion call: "The communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have

nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!" This marked the beginning of organised communist movement with proletarian class angularity. After the 'Manifesto', things would never become quite the same again. The message would spread from country to country and reverberate all over the globe and the concrete course of social development, development of capitalism, class struggle and socialist movement would historically corroborate the conclusions made in the 'Manifesto'.

IN THE VORTEX OF REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

It was a time when the process of bourgeois democratic revolution was still on-going. When the 1848 revolution in France began, Marx and Engels were in Paris. Subsequently, when the wave of revolution had swept across southern Germany and Austria and reached Prussia, they returned to Germany and started the 'Neue Rheinische Zeitung' at Cologne. Through numerous articles in the 'Zeitung', Marx and Engels had conducted relentless attacks on the governments, the reactionary forces and the policy of compromise of the bourgeoisie. They had attempted to form and strengthen workers' societies in different parts of Germany and organised mass meetings. The government had resorted to repression. There had been arrests and the 'Zeitung' had been prohibited. Marx had defied the ban and continued to publish the 'Zeitung' in collaboration with Lassalle. Marx, Engels, etc. had been prosecuted in February, 1849, but Marx's brilliant speech before the court in defence had moved the court and secured acquittal. Publication of the 'Zeitung' had continued. Marx and Engels had toiled hard and moved all over Germany in an endeavour to provide correct, bold and centralised leadership to the popular uprising that was on. But taking advantage of the cowardice and vacillation of the petty bourgeois democrats at the helm of uprising, the Prussian army had defeated the insurgents. The government had issued an order for deportation of Marx and the 'Zeitung', its funds exhausted, had had to close down. On expulsion from Rhineland, Marx had gone to Frankfurt and thence to southern Germany but finding the situation not promising, had left for Paris. In the meantime Engels had gone to join in actual fighting against the forces of counter-revolution. Persecution had followed Marx to Paris and he had to leave for London penniless. Here he was joined later by Engels and other members of the C.C. of the League. Eventually the League was dissolved as described earlier. Now began the long period of Marx's life in London as an emigre which would continue till his death.

IN LONDON: CLASS STRUGGLES IN FRANCE & EIGHTEENTH BRUMAIRE

In London, Marx and Engels started the monthly 'Neue Rheinische Revue'.

(Contd. on page 7)

(Contd from page 6)

But after four single numbers and finally a double number, publication of the 'Revue' had to be stopped. In these came out Engels' 'Peasant War in Germany' (1850). In 1852 was penned Marx's 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte'.

In February 1848, there had been a popular uprising in Paris in the course of which National Guard had gone over to the side of the insurgents and forced the King Louis Philippe to abdicate whereupon a provisional government with liberal and radical leaning had been formed. But in the summer of the same year, counter-revolution struck back. A spontaneous popular uprising was drowned in blood by the army and the National Guard and the Parliamentary government surrendered to reaction. These episodes were dealt with in 'Class Struggles'. Later on in December, 1851, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, nephew of the former Emperor, who had been elected President of the Republic at the end of 1848, arbitrarily extended his presidential term by another ten years through a coup d'etat and a year later consolidated his autocracy by declaring the Second Empire. 'Eighteenth Brumaire' analysed the background and significance of the coup d'etat.

Immediately on arrival in London, Marx living amidst poverty and hardship made a deep study of the 1848 revolution from historical, economic, social and political angles. Under Louis Philippe, a faction of the French bourgeoisie, the finance aristocracy comprising bankers, owners of stock exchanges, railways, coal and iron mines and forests ruled under the cover of monarchical form. The industrial bourgeoisie proper was in the opposition. The workers fought alongside bourgeoisie in the 1848 revolution in which Louis Philippe was overthrown and a provisional government formed. To the workers fighting in barricades it was a fight to establish a just social order with full rights to the workers. But to the bourgeoisie, the struggle was for completing the process of bourgeois democratic revolution by full establishment of bourgeois class rule through a fullfledged bourgeois republic. This is what they accomplished. The provisional government with a large minority of representatives of the bourgeoisie hastened to concentrate power in the hands of the bourgeoisie and drowned the workers' uprising in blood. The workers were vanquished because they had no clearcut revolutionary ideology before them, because the bourgeoisie could marshal the support of all the middle strata comprising the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry in their favour and above all, because the stage of capitalist economic development was not ripe for a proletarian revolution. 'Class Struggle' was the first attempt of concrete, living historical development. Through this study Marx developed and enriched his theories further and arrived at a number of important conclusions having bearing on further development of theory and practice of proletarian revolution, including those concerning

the relation between the proletariat and the peasantry in revolution and the question of statepower after revolution. In the words of Marx : "The French workers could not take a step forward, could not touch a hair of the bourgeois order, until the course of the revolution had aroused the mass of the nation, peasants and petty bourgeois, standing between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, against this order, against the rule of capital, and had forced it to attach itself to the proletarians as their protagonists. . . Little by little we have seen peasants, petty bourgeois, the middle classes in general, stepping alongside the proletariat, driven into open antagonism to the official republic and treated by it as antagonists. . . the proletariat rallies more, and more round revolutionary socialism, round communism. . . This socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionising of all the ideas that result from these social relations. . . By repudiating universal suffrage, with which it hitherto draped itself and from which it sucks its omnipotence, the bourgeoisie openly confesses, 'Our dictatorship has hitherto existed by the will of the people; it must now be consolidated against the will of the people.'"

The Brumaire shows that Marx had by that time done deeper economic studies and probed further into mechanism of historical process. By this time, the repressive character of the bourgeois state machine had become more marked and signs of historical inception of the trend of social democracy as a compromising force between capital and labour serving aggregate interest of capitalist class could be discerned by the genius of Karl Marx. In the 'Brumaire', by analysing the concrete process of history unfolding in France, Marx showed that ". . . And as in private life one differentiates between what a man thinks and says of himself and what he really is and does, so in historical struggles one must distinguish still more the phases and fancies of parties from their real organism and their real interests, their conception of themselves from their reality. . . From the social demands of the proletariat the revolutionary point was broken off and a democratic turn given to them; from the democratic claims of petty bourgeoisie the purely political form was stripped off and their socialist point thrust forward. Thus arose social democracy. . . The peculiar character of social democracy is epitomised in the fact that democratic-republican institutions are demanded as a means, not of doing away with two extremes, capital and wage labour, but of weakening their antagonism and transforming it into harmony. . . The bourgeoisie had a true insight into the fact that all the weapons which it had forged against the feudalism turned their points against itself, that all the means of education which it had produced rebelled

against its own civilization, that all the gods which it had created had fallen away from it. It understood that all the so-called bourgeois liberties and organs of progress attacked and menaced its class rule at its social foundation and its political summit simultaneously, and had therefore become 'socialistic'. . . bourgeois republic signifies the unlimited despotism of one class over the other classes". It is really amazing how could Marx make such a penetrating and brilliant analysis of social democracy in those days—which in today's perspective has proved itself as a rotten ideology working as not only a compromising force between labour and capital but also playing the last prop of capitalism spearheading severest attack against communism from within.

THE PARIS COMMUNE

After a gap of about twenty years Marx again studied first-hand a revolutionary battle during the Paris Commune. During the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, Marx, on behalf of the International, characterised the war waged by both Bonaparte and Bismarck to be predatory. Although himself a German, he stressed upon the difference between Germany's real interest and the reactionary, predatory war aims of Prussia. He jubilantly noted that the advanced workers in both France and Germany had taken a correct internationalist stand. "This great fact, unparalleled in the history of the past, opens the vista of a brighter future. It proves that in contrast to old society, with its economical miseries and its political delirium, a new society is springing up, whose International rule will be Peace, because its national ruler will be everywhere the same—Labour!"

Upon the defeat of Bonaparte in the war, a provisional government headed by Thiers was formed in Paris. Anticipating a sharpening of class struggle in France, Marx cautioned the French workers against an untimely unprepared uprising. But when the workers' rebellion against the Thiers government started on March 18, 1871 and thus the first battle in the world of the proletariat to capture state power, the glorious Paris Commune was on, Marx hastened to the aid of insurgent Paris workers. He sent hundreds of letters to branches of the International all over the globe explaining the significance of the Paris uprising and exhorting them to campaign in support of the Commune. By means of numerous letters and oral instructions through messengers, Marx and Engels counselled the communards and tried to caution them against mistakes. However, their advice and counsel did not always reach in time, surrounded in a blockade round Paris as the communards were. Moreover, the Proudhonists and Blanquists in leadership of the Commune hesitated and vacillated and pursued incorrect course. After heroic barricade fighting, the insurgent workers were defeated and the Commune was drowned in blood. But the Paris Commune is resplendent as a bright star in the history of world proletarian revolution, being the first battle

(Contd on page 8)

(Contd from page 7)

of the proletarian anti-capitalist revolution. Summing up and analysing the experiences of the Commune, Marx left his teachings in 'The Civil War in France', in the form of an Address to the General Council of the International, for future guidance of proletarian revolutionary movement. He showed that "At the same pace at which the progress of modern industry developed, widened, intensified the class antagonism between capital and labour, the state power assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labour, of a public force organized for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism. After every revolution marking a progressive phase in the class struggle, the purely repressive character of the state power stands out in bolder and bolder relief. . . in view of the threatening upheaval of the proletariat, they now used that state power mercilessly and ostentatiously as the national war-engine of capital against labour. In their uninterupted crusade against the producing masses they were, however, bound not only to invest the executive with continually increased powers of repression, but at the same time to divest their own parliamentary stronghold—the National Assembly—one by one, of all its own means of defence against the Executive. . . The civilization and justice of bourgeois order comes out in its lurid light whenever the slaves and drudges of that order rise against their masters. Thus this civilization and justice stand forth as undisguised savagery and lawless revenge. Each new crisis in the class struggle between the appropriator and the producer brings out this fact more glaringly. . . The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce. . . They know that in order to work out their own emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which the present society is irresistibly tending by its own economical agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men. . . But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes."

LONG EXILE IN LONDON

Marx's long stay in London spanning over three decades was an uninterrupted chain of vigorous strenuous activities for all-round development of revolutionary theory and practice amidst struggles. During some stretches of time he was feverishly busy in practical politics, organising workers' movements including the International, during some others, penning pamphlets and articles for journals claimed the bulk of his attention, during some others yet, he was engrossed in deep study of and/or fundamental researches on the sciences, sociology, economics, political economy, politics, philosophy to further enrich the treasure-house of Marxian epistemology; often enough, he was busy with all or a number of these simul-

taneously. But at each step, Marx and his family were dogged by want, privations, malnutrition and hunger, diseases and bereavement. Only his iron constitution, unshakable faith in himself and his life's mission and the historic destiny of the proletariat, the mankind and civilization propelled forward this genius into ceaseless struggles with unstinted and selfless support and help, financial and otherwise, provided by his dearest friend and comrade-in-arms Frederick Engels.

Marx arrived in London with his family in June 1849. They were penniless and without any means of livelihood. The money that had been obtained from sale of remnants of Marx's property at Trier was soon exhausted. In 1850 Engels took a job in Manchester and from then on bore a substantial part of the expenses for the upkeep of Marx's family. The two maintained almost daily correspondence. From 1851 to 1862, Marx penned a series of articles for publication in the progressive 'New York Daily Tribune'.

Engels took upon himself the task of helping Marx in writing many of these articles so that these did not make too heavy a demand on Marx's time and health and detract him from his more important and fundamental work. There were articles on British rule in India, the 1857 Sepoy Mutiny, Anglo-Chinese war and the Taiping Rebellion, the civil war in the USA, the Spanish war and revolution of 1854-56, the German situation etc. among others. Concrete and incisive materialistic analysis and marshalling of data and arguments, sympathy for the oppressed and the wronged, enthusiastic support for the revolutionary and progressive forces run through these articles.

Marx and Engels paid close attention to developments in British working class movement. During the fifties, they tried to help the progressive British Left-wing Chartist Leaders.

The economic crisis in 1857 made Marx concentrate on political economy and the outcome of the deep study was the 'Grundrisse Der Kritik Der Politischen Oekonomie' (Basic features of the Critique of Political Economy). This major work which can be regarded as the forerunner of 'Das Kapital', was left in the form of unfinished manuscript and was not published till 1939. In this, Marx first outlined his theory of surplus value. In 1859 was published his 'Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy' in which his theory of value and other profound contributions to political economy were methodically set out. Detailed exposition of these would later be made in 'Das Kapital'. The preface to this work contains a brilliant, concise statement of the principles of historical materialism developed by Marx.

After this, Marx was compelled to discontinue his economic studies for sometime and turned his attention to the political developments in the continent. The struggle for unification of Italy and her freedom from Austrian domination began. The movement for unifying the different parts of Germany was also on. Marx in his articles stressed upon intensifying the bourgeois democratic movements and making

them broad-based by including in their folds wider sections of the masses—the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the proletariat.

There arose sharp ideological difference between Marx and Lassalle. Lassalle supported the bid of Prussia to unify Germany by imposing the unity from the top whereas Marx was for achieving the unity from below through democratic revolution. Lassalle drew up a programme for General Association of German Workers as its head which radically differed from the 'Communist Manifesto'. Lassalle prescribed to the workers peaceful, legal form of struggle and solution of their problems through universal suffrage with the help and benevolence of the Prussian state and abhorred trade union movement, strikes and class struggle. To him, the peasantry was a reactionary force, not an ally of the proletariat. He entered into secret negotiations with Bismarck. Marx and Engels waged ideological battle against Lassalle's erroneous and harmful ideas and actions till Lassalle's death.

The struggle of the Russian peasantry against serfdom was supported by Marx. He hailed the civil war in the United States, at the beginning of the sixties as a major international event, seeing in it a struggle between the institution of slavery and the then relatively progressive capitalist system. He wrote to President Abraham Lincoln of the USA on the subject. He urged the North to conduct the struggle on democratic slogans making it broad-based by abolishing slavery and solving the agrarian question in the interest of the peasantry. He appealed to the European workers to see to it that their government did not help the Southern slave owners.

After this, Marx concentrated once more on his economic works. He decided not to publish the new works as a continuation of his earlier 'Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy' but as an independent work to be called 'Capital—A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy'.

'Capital' was written amidst great want, privations and hardship. Because of the American Civil War, Marx's income from articles contributed to the 'New York Daily Tribune' had dwindled and then stopped. As the family struggled with financial support from Engels as its chief sustenance, Marx toiled on and on for years at the reading room of the British Museum and even on his sick-bed when laid down with ailments. At last, Volume I of Capital was completed and published in 1867.

DAS KAPITAL

In this work, his magnum opus, Marx laid bare the character of capitalist production and capitalist economy in all their manifestations, discovered the basic law of capitalist economy and proved the historical destiny towards which the capitalist economy must inexorably move in accordance with its inherent laws.

With the works of earlier bourgeois economists like Adam Smith, Petty and Ricardo as the starting bases, Marx super-

(Contd on page 9)

(Contd. from Page 8)

seded them and the domain of erstwhile bourgeois political economy, broke new ground, rejected old theories that he found not reflecting the reality and advanced and substantiated new theories instead.

At every step, Marx made use of copious economic data from real life, checked and cross-checked the same, analysed the same objectively in the light of reason and on their bases marshalled his arguments rationally and reached his conclusions like physicist studying a phenomenon or a biologist dissecting an organism in laboratory and coming to scientific conclusions.

It is impossible to narrate here Marx's formulations and conclusions regarding capitalist economy embodied in 'The Capital' Vol. I. But we shall only mention the main points referred to by Engels in his appreciation of this work. As described by Engels, Marx showed that: "Surplus labour of the worker, over and above the time necessary to replace his wages is the source of surplus value, of profit, of the steadily growing increase of capital. The value of the labour power is paid for, but this value is far less than that which the capitalist manages to extract from the labour power, and it is just the difference, the unpaid labour, which constitutes the share of the capitalist, or, more accurately, of the 'capitalist class'...the oppressed class at all times has had to perform unpaid labour...The form has now been changed, but the substance remains and as long as a part of society possesses the monopoly of the means of production, the labourer, free or not free, must add to the working-time necessary for his own maintenance an extra working-time in order to produce the means of subsistence for the owners of the means of production...And just as it (capital) itself is reproduced on an ever greater scale, so the modern capitalist mode of production reproduces the class of propertyless workers also on an ever greater scale and in ever greater number...What becomes of this ever-increasing number of workers? They form an industrial reserve army, which...is paid below the value of its labour...but which is indispensable to the capitalist class...The greater the social wealth, the greater is the relative surplus-population, or industrial reserve army. But the greater this reserve army in proportion to the active (regularly employed) labour-army, the greater is the mass of a consolidated (permanent) surplus-population, or strata of workers, whose misery is in inverse ratio to its torment of labour. The more extensive, finally, the Lazarus-layers of the working class, and the industrial reserve-army, the greater is official pauperism. This is the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation". The concrete process of moving towards this next higher social formation from capitalism is laid down in Marx's historic conclusion: "The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This

integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated. The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation. This does not re-establish private property for the producer, but gives him individual property based on the acquisitions of the capitalist era: i.e., on co-operation and the possession in common of the land and of the means of production."

Work to complete the remaining volumes of 'The Capital' for publication was interrupted by Marx's deep involvement in the work of organising the First International as also major international events like the Franco-Prussian war and the Paris Commune. Only after 1870 could he devote time seriously for this purpose. He continued this work lifelong but death prevented him from giving the finished form to 'The Capital' Vols. II and III. After his demise, Engels edited and published these.

In Volume II, Marx studied the cycle of sale, profit and the ploughing back of resources for the next cycle of capitalist production and the complex factors leading to the endemic crises of capitalist economy.

In Volume III, Marx dealt in detail with ground rent, the conversion of surplus value into profit and thus the relationship between values and prices and the question of average profit in a capitalist economy taken as a whole. He summed up the inherent and irreconcilable contradiction in capitalist economy thus: "The last cause of all real crises always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses as compared to the tendency of capitalist production to develop the productive forces in such a way that only the absolute power of consumption of the entire society would be their limit." In Volume I, capitalist industrial production and wage labour had been the chief subject and so Marx had mainly considered the industrially advanced Britain as the model and had investigated British industrial economy. For the section on ground rent in Volume III, Marx investigated the different forms of land ownership and exploitation of agricultural producers in Russia.

'The Capital' was the pinnacle of lifelong work by the giant political economist, philosopher, thinker, scientist and revolutionary Karl Marx. It was a titanic work, the work of a genius. As Marx pointed out: "There is no royal road to science, and only those who do not dread the fatiguing climb of its steep paths have a chance of gaining its luminous summits."

THE INTERNATIONAL: MARX AS LEADER OF WORLD PROLETARIAT

It is amazing how Marx, amidst such intense and almost incessant study, re-

search and critical writing, could engage in practical organisational work. But the fact is, in the prime of his life, he put his best efforts for nine years at a stretch in guiding activities of the first international organisation of the proletariat being at the helm of its affairs. As an illustrious contemporary Paul Lafargue pointed out: "Karl Marx was one of the rare men who could be leaders in science and public life at the same time; these two aspects were so closely united in him that one can understand him only by taking into account both the scholar and the socialist fighter."

At a meeting at St. Martin's Hall, London on September 28, 1864 attended by English and French workers and members of proletarian and democratic emigrant organisations, the International Working Men's Association, to be known later as the First International, was founded. Marx wrote the Inaugural Address and the General Rules.

As the leader of the international communist movement, it was for Marx now to give a revolutionary orientation to the working class movement. He rose to the occasion at once to fulfil the historic need. In the Inaugural Address, he declared:

"In all countries of Europe it has now become a truth demonstrable to every unprejudiced mind, and only denied by those, whose interest it is to hedge other people in a fool's paradise, that no improvement of machinery, no appliance of science to production, no contrivances of communication, no new colonies, no emigration, no opening of markets, no free trade, nor all these things put together, will do away with the miseries of the industrious masses; but that, on the present false base, every fresh development of the productive powers of labour must tend to deepen social contrasts and point social antagonisms... To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes...Proletarians of all countries, Unite!" In the General Rules, Marx laid down: "...the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves; ...all efforts aiming at that great end have hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labour in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries; ...In its struggle against the collective power of the possessing classes the proletariat can act as a class only by constituting itself a distinct political party, opposed to all the old parties formed by the possessing classes. This constitution of the proletariat into a political party is indispensable to ensure the triumph of the social Revolution and of its ultimate goal: the abolition of classes. The coalition of the forces of the working class, already achieved by the economic struggle, must also serve, in the hands of this class, as a lever in its struggle against the political power of its exploiters."

Thus, by a stroke of genius, Marx provided guidelines for elevating amor-
(Contd. on Page 10)

(Contd. from page 9)

phous economic consciousness of the working class to proletarian revolutionary class consciousness and therefrom to proletarian party consciousness and held aloft the noble banner of proletarian internationalism cutting across the barriers of nationality and racial prejudices as epitomised in the new slogan "Proletarians of all countries, Unite!" The immense revolutionary significance of these concepts in the situation obtaining then, the deep understanding of historical process and farsightedness that went into these, are truly staggering!

On Marx's initiative, the General Council of the International provided moral and material support to workers' strikes in different countries of Europe.

At two General Council meetings in 1865, Marx delivered a special report on the theory of value, prices and wages. Its main portion was printed later as 'Wages, Price and Profit'—covering in gist some of the basic formulations to be embodied in 'Capital'.

Marx started the practice of sending General Council members to attend workers' meetings to spread the message of the International. Sections of the International were soon established in England, France, Switzerland, Belgium and some other countries on the continent. The difficulties in opening sections in Germany were that German law prohibited association of German workers' bodies with foreign organisations and that the association of German workers had a Lassallean leadership.

IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE FROM INTERNATIONAL FORUM

Marx decided to conduct ideological battle against the erroneous ideas and practices and contributed, on Proudhon's death, the article 'On Proudhon' to the Lassallean paper Social Demokrat of Berlin wherein he criticised Proudhon by name for his reformism, sectarianism and other shortcomings of his petty bourgeois socialism and criticised Lassalle too for such mistaken concepts; without, however, naming him!

It should be realized that the International was not a well-knit party but an international body maintaining liaison between and providing guidelines to workers' organisations in different countries which were often under the influence of various utopian, bourgeois-reformist and petty bourgeois socialist ideologies. Scientific socialism as propounded by Marx and Engels had not yet been ideologically established among the workers giving defeat to the various shades of utopian, bourgeois-reformist, opportunist and petty bourgeois socialist ideas. So from the forum of the international, Marx and Engels had to conduct, from the very beginning ideological and organisational struggles against such erroneous and harmful ideologies. The Proudhonists in France and Belgium, the Owenites in England, the Mazzinists in Italy and the Lassalleans in Germany were the adversaries.

Later on, Bakunin and his anarchism would have to be fought against too.

The struggle against Proudhonists at the London Conference (1865) continued through the Geneva Congress (1866). At the later, Marx briefed the General Council delegates proposing a programme of support to the workers' struggles on their justified demands, struggle for restoration of Poland on democratic principles and viewing the trade union not merely as an weapon in day by day economic struggles by the workers but also as a means for propagating socialism and organising the workers in the fight for socialism. The majority at the Geneva Congress voted for Marx's correct programme against opposition from Proudhonists. But at the Lausanne Congress (1867) the Proudhonists obtained a majority and got a number of their erroneous and confusing proposals passed. The Proudhonists were defeated at the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) Congresses where resolutions were adopted calling for socialization of land, transport, mines etc. in the face of opposition from Proudhonists who from their petty bourgeois approach, were defenders of small property.

With the help of Liebknecht, Marx and Engels strove to form a genuine working class party in Germany. At last, their efforts bore fruit. Gradually, some workers' unions in Germany got affiliated to the International. At last, in 1869, the Social Democratic Workers' Party was founded. Organisations headed by Liebknecht and Bebel joined it as well as some Lassalleans who had broken away from their parent body.

Soon after, Bakunin through his anarchist organisation, the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, tried to wrest the leadership of the International.

After Basle Congress, Bakunin and his group came out openly against the General Council headed by Marx. They tried to rally the Lassalleans and the moderate British trade union leaders against Marx's leadership.

The Franco-Prussian war (1870-71) put the International to a severe test. On behalf of the International, Marx and Engels exhorted workers of the two countries to rise above national and racial prejudices and propagated proletarian internationalism. Came the Paris Commune in March, 1871. Marx and Engels counselled the Communards how to avoid mistakes but were obstructed by the Proudhonists and Blanquists who led the Commune. Later on, brilliant generalization of the experience of the Paris Commune was made by Marx in 'Civil War in France' (1871) written in form of an appeal to all members of the International on instructions from the General Council.

After defeat of the Commune ensued a period of grave difficulties for the International. Reaction was on the ascendancy, governments in different countries stepped up persecution of sections of the International in their countries and conducted a slander campaign against Marx. Serious differences arose within the International. The Bakuninists were petty bourgeois

anarchists who denied the necessity of proletarian discipline, proletarian party and the dictatorship of the proletariat—all very essential as the experience of the Commune showed. At the London Conference (1871), Marx and Engels pointed out the burning necessity of political struggle and of forming revolutionary party. The resolution adopted reflected this outlook. The Bakuninists tried to erode discipline of the International and to convert the General Council into a mere information liaison bureau but a number of resolutions adopted reasserted the leading role of the General Council as the ideological and organisational centre of the International.

Struggle against followers of Bakunin came to a head at the Hague Congress (1872). After sharp debates the political resolution of the London Conference was incorporated into the rules of the International with only minor changes. On recommendation of the special committee set up to investigate the disruptive activities of Bakunin and Co., Bakunin and his associates were expelled from the International. Headquarters of the General Council was shifted to New York.

But in the period after the Paris Commune, the prospect of imminent revolution receded. In the changed situation, Marx and Engels advocated long preparation for proletarian revolution from country to country through formation of proletarian revolutionary parties. The International, under leadership of Marx, had done the necessary groundwork for this by ideologically and organisationally defeating the erroneous ideologies and by training up cadres in the countries who could form the core of the proletarian revolutionary parties in the days to come. Having done so, the International had exhausted its historic role. It was dissolved in 1876.

UNDIMINISHED ROLE AND STATURE

The International was dissolved, but Marx's role and stature as the leader of international working class movement remained undiminished. The main task now was to form and strengthen proletarian revolutionary parties from country to country taking into account the specific economic-political-social conditions and levels of consciousness of working class. Marx continued to work for this to the end of his days, conducting relentless struggle against all sorts of erroneous and opportunist ideologies. To combat the Bakuninist anarchist influence in underdeveloped countries like Spain, Switzerland and Italy, Marx and Engels made scathing criticism of the disruptive role of anarchism in their pamphlet Alliance of Social Democracy. In Germany, Lassalle influence was still strong and it affected even the Social Democratic Workers' Party which struck an unprincipled alliance with the Lassalleans at the unity Congress in Gotha. Marx subjected the programme adopted at the Gotha Congress to trenchant criticism in his 'Critique of the

(Contd. on Page 11)

(Contd. from page 10)

Gotha Programme' (1875) wherein, in course of countering Lassallean thinking, Marx tackled a number of important theoretical questions and drew up the outlines of future communist society and the concrete course to be adopted for transition from socialism to communism. He showed that in the socialist stage, the principle should be distribution according to the work done by an individual but "In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of cooperative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!" Regarding the form of state throughout the long transition period, he unequivocally declared: "Between the capitalist and communist society lies the period of revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

When Professor Eugen Dühring of Berlin University put forward his "socialist system" which was a hotch-potch of outdated reactionary eclectic views and pettybourgeois socialist theories, Engels, in close consultation with Marx, wrote 'Anti Dühring' (1878) with its chapter on political economy penned by Marx, to free the German movement from influence of such reactionary ideologies.

Even in Marx's closing years he, along with Engels, took active interest in working class movement in different countries including France, England and USA—always providing counsel and guidance and exposure of erroneous and harmful ideas and tendencies.

UNDAUNTED IN STRUGGLE AND HARDSHIP

The background of the unfolding of Marx's all-round genius was not a cozy, comfortable life but a life of hardship, privation and suffering. In 1850, he began his refugee existence in two small rooms in Dean Street, London. The living room, used by seven, was at the same time the kitchen, study and the place to receive the numerous visitors to Marx. Since such serious shortage of space continued for most of Marx's long stay of 33 years in London, he had to do the bulk of his intensive study and research in the reading room of British Museum from morning till night, day after day, year after year. Within a short time after arrival in London, the money received by selling his inherited property at Triers got exhausted as well as that obtained from sale of whatever personal belongings his wife Jenny

had. The meagre sums received for contributing articles to the 'New York Daily Tribune' petered out after a few years. After this, remittances from Engels at Manchester became the chief source of sustenance. From now on till Marx's death it would be an unbroken tale of malnutrition, debts, unpaid bills, fending off creditors, selling and pawning of household articles and even articles of personal use, ailments and diseases and bereavements.

But nothing could daunt him, detract him from his historic task. Sometimes, the family would have only bread and potatoes for food for days on end in the cold British climate and Marx's coat would have had to be given away to the pawnshop, but the epoch-making pioneer would keep on toiling away at the main task. From time to time, he was afflicted with a chronic disorder of liver, chronic stomach trouble, painful boils all over the body and such severe bouts of headache often lasting for a number of days at a stretch as would incapacitate him for any work and even seriously impair his vision and hearing. But this great proletarian revolutionary would continue working regardless, shaping the theory and practice of revolution, by even keeping on writing on his sick bed. Bereavements came one after another: the little daughter Francisca died of bronchitis and the coffin for her had to be purchased with money provided by a friendly neighbour; then Edgar, aged nine, Marx's only son who was talented and took after his father, died in his father's arms after prolonged illness; after sometime died a newly born child of Marx; Frau Marx fell sick, developed cancer and died in December, 1881; in January 1883, Marx's favourite daughter Jenny, now Mrs. Longuet, died suddenly. But this great teacher of the proletariat, a loving father and husband, withstood it all with rock-like determination, continued the political struggles and went on creating one momentous work after another culminating in 'The Capital'—diagnosing and studying the malady besetting the capitalist society and charting out the path of onward progress of human civilization by superseding the capitalist order through proletarian revolution.

THE DEMISE

But the hardship, suffering and shocks over the years took their toll. At the time of his wife's terminal illness, Marx was laid up with pleurisy and bronchitis. Finally, even his iron constitution broke down. He passed away in sleep on March 14, 1883. On 17th March, he was buried at the Highgate cemetery in London. In his graveside speech, Engels, the lifelong comrade-in-arms, summed up brilliantly Marx's immense contribution to mankind. Just to quote the salient points:

"On the 14th of March, at a quarter to three in the afternoon, the greatest living thinker ceased to think... Just as Darwin discovered the law of development of organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of development of human history.... But that is not all. Marx also discovered the

special law of motion governing the present day capitalist mode of production and the bourgeois society that this mode of production has created. The discovery of surplus value suddenly threw light on the problem, in trying to solve which all previous investigations, of both bourgeois economists and socialist critics, had been groping in the dark. Two such discoveries would be enough for a lifetime... But in every single field which Marx investigated—and he investigated very many fields, none of them superficially—in every field, even in that of mathematics, he made independent discoveries. Such was the man of science. But this was not even half the man. Science was for Marx a historically dynamic, revolutionary force... For Marx was before all else a revolutionist. His real mission in life was to contribute, in one way or another, to the overthrow of capitalist society and of the state institutions which it had brought into being, to contribute to the liberation of the modern proletariat, which he was the first to make conscious of its own position and its needs, conscious of the conditions of its emancipation... His name will endure through the ages, and so also will his work!"

EXEMPLARY COMMUNIST CHARACTER

Such was the man, his life and life-struggles. No obstruction, adverse situation, difficulty or privation could detract him from his historic task, from the mission of life he steadfastly pursued to his last breath. On the one hand, he developed and sharpened the ideology as a weapon in the hands of the working class for bringing about revolutionary transformation of society along the historically determined course giving defeat to the reactionary and erroneous ideologies in the process, while on the other he participated in every progressive movement, every struggle of the working class that he could and worked for furtherance of international working class organisation in constant battle with protagonists of wrong ideologies. And all the time, he maintained contacts with the revolutionaries of different countries through copious correspondence and came out against injustice and oppression and for progressive and revolutionary movement in any part of the globe through penning numerous articles.

Today, when the bourgeoisie are spreading canards against the nobility of Marx's and trying to brand socialism as a totalitarian system which negates freedom and liberty, it is worthwhile to recall Marx's lifelong struggle in support of freedom, liberty and freedom of the Press, the restraint he exercised even during heated polemics with political adversaries and the high standard of ethics, culture and nobility he reflected in all spheres.

Truly, Marx's whole life was identified with working class movement, he was a symbol of revolution. Coming from the middle class, he totally declassed himself through struggles, led at first an unsettled life moving from one place to another and then the long exile's life in London. He died stateless, a true proletarian internationalist.

(Contd on page 12)

(Contd. from page 11)

list. He died propertyless, symbolising through his own life his precept that communism is humanism minus private property.

HISTORY HAS VINDICATED MARXISM

In Marx's time, capitalism as a world force was younger, vigorous and flourishing. He did not see the rise of imperialism which came through subsequent growth and development of capitalism, not its present moribund, decadent character. Yet, even at that time, he analysed the basic contradiction of capitalist society to show that it is irreconcilable and showed that capitalist socio-economic formation is a transitory one historically doomed, to be superseded and replaced with socialism through anti-capitalist revolution in culmination of the process of class struggle present within capitalist society. By this, he struck at the very foundations of the edifice of capitalism that the bourgeoisie put up and proclaimed to be eternal. It is difficult to perceive now what a stupendous task it was and how difficult and arduous was the struggle Marx had to conduct to achieve it. In achieving this, Marx had to develop from the scratch the whole concept of scientific socialism with the then prevalent concepts of socialism, which were ineffectual or utopian, as the starting basis, in historical continuity with them but at the same time by effecting a clear break with them.

After Marx, Engels continued his work. Later on, the mantle of leading the world proletarian movement fell upon Lenin. It was Lenin who concretised, developed and enriched Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. He carried on incessant struggle against all sorts of deviations from Marxism represented by the leaders of the Second International like Bernstein, Kautsky, etc. and others who turned renegades, and defended and upheld Marxism. In this way, Marxism became Marxism-Leninism. Under his leadership, the Bolshevik Party founded the first socialist state of the world, the Soviet Union, through the Great November Revolution against heavy odds.

After Lenin's demise, it was Stalin who, as continuator of Lenin, protected the newly born Soviet state by defeating the armed intervention by imperialist-capitalist countries, upheld Marxism-Leninism through ideological struggle against the deviations of Bukharin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, etc., developed the Soviet Union into a mighty, modern, industrial state in an unprecedentedly short time through socialist construction in the extremely difficult situation of capitalist encirclement and animosity, gave a crushing defeat to Hitler's war-machine and in the post-Second World War period, rebuilt the war-ravaged Soviet economy to be on a par with that of USA, the most industrially developed imperialist country, in just a few years. People's Democracies were established in the East European countries.

The Chinese Revolution came, led by the great Mao Zedong. The wind of revolution swept the world from Cuba to Vietnam.

Marx did not live to see an anti-capitalist socialist revolution. Yet there was this upsurge of revolution, so many years after his death, in such far-flung areas of the globe. There have been many a trend, current or school of socialist thinking—in Marx's time and afterwards. But how is it that Marxism alone among all of them stood the test of time to provide ideological guidance to all such revolutionary movements? In the world of science, it happens that what a scientist theorises today, is experimentally verified later on. So has been the case with Marxism, that is, the ideology of scientific socialism. What Marx visualized with deep insight in his time about many an issue concerning the future, is being corroborated even now.

Since the time of Marx, science has developed with giant strides. Modern research in Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Physiology, etc. has more and more corroborated the truth that the material world changes and develops through the dialectical process. Bourgeois economists and sociologists have not been able to disprove any of the basic tenets of Marxism.

In spite of the great technological progress, capitalism still remains capitalism, its basic laws discovered by Marx still hold good. Capitalists still expropriate the surplus value created by labour power. So long as capitalism will remain capitalism, the inherent contradiction of capitalist economy will remain irreconcilable; the workers will continue to be exploited and the contradiction between capital and labour will remain the principal, irreconcilable contradiction. Revolutionary transformation of the society is the historically determined synthesis that will resolve this contradiction.

MARXISM : THE BEACON TO HUMAN DESTINY

The present setback in the Soviet Union and East Europe should not cause despondency. We have to bear in mind that ever since Marx's time, Marxism has always made headway through struggle against attacks from within the proletarian movement and from without. After the betrayal by the revisionist leaders of the Second International came the glorious Great November Revolution. Amidst the encirclement, animosity and attacks of capitalist-imperialists, the socialist system was consolidated in the Soviet Union and went from strength to strength. The barbarous attack perpetrated against Soviet Union by Hitlerite Germany on behalf of world imperialism-capitalism not only could not destroy Soviet Union, but on the contrary it was the fascist German war-machine that was pulverized into smithereens: the Soviet Union emerged stronger than ever and the tide of revolution swept East Europe and China freeing a third of humanity from capitalist bondage.

Although there is no denying the fact that the present attack by modern revision-

ists in collaboration with the imperialist-capitalists is the worst ever in magnitude and intensity faced by the movement, the process of history is bound to re-assert itself. Dialectical Materialism can never become absolute just as science cannot. So long as there are problems and contradictions, the science of Dialectical Materialism remains valid. Social development is law-governed. Society does not remain static, it changes. But the changes too are law-governed. Only if we can correctly understand these laws, can we concretely give expression to the social urge of the age. But if the understanding and application of Dialectical Materialism is wrong in tackling a problem, how can correct result come? It should be realised that the character of problems changes with time and hence proper understanding of them is possible only through creatively developing Marxism in the context of the changed situation. Following the great heritage of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the founder General Secretary of our Party in course of building up a genuine working class party in our soil concretised, developed and enriched the understanding of Marxism-Leninism to a new height.

So, only through creatively developing and applying Marxism can we realise that the relevance and significance of Marx is still undiminished and Marxism continues to be the beacon of human destiny.

Let us rally and strive in unison and take the pledge to intensify the class struggles, the battle against imperialism-capitalism and revisionism so that the process of history is accelerated and mighty social forces are liberated to pave the way for onward progress of mankind along the historically determined course!

—Long Live the Thoughts of Marx!

Long Live Marxism-Leninism!

—Long Live Revolution!

PRESS CONFERENCE

(Contd. from page 2)

This extra-parliamentary democratic mass movement should be integrated with the parliamentary battle in order to ensure the crushing defeat of the main enemy of the people, the Congress(I) and its allies and along with it defeat of the BJP and other communal, parochial and secessionist forces; and at the same time compelling under its influence all opposition parties and forces claiming to be secular, to observe strict adherence to democratic and secular values.

We appeal to the people to realise that democratic movement is the only guarantee for advancing people's interest and urge them to strengthen the course of this much needed movement by all means and to elect the SUCI candidates and those who are the tested soldiers of the democratic movement as conducive to this task.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : COMRADE NIHAR MUKHERJEE

Edited & Published by Sukomal Das Gupta from 48 Lenin Sarani, Calcutta-700 013 and printed by him at Ganadabi Printers and Publishers Private Limited 52B, Indian Mirror Street, Calcutta-700 013.