

Proletarian Era

Volume 50 No. 24 Organ of the SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (COMMUNIST)
August 1, 2017 Founder Editor-in-Chief : COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

10 Pages
Price : Rs. 2.00

LONG LIVE COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH



5 August, 1923 — 5 August, 1976

“...Marxism-Leninism is the only revolutionary theory, the most scientific and the loftiest ideology of this age, which alone can free man from this crippled capitalist society and give birth to a classless new society free from all sorts of exploitation of man by man. And we all know that a revolutionary ideology and revolutionary theory always give birth to a higher cultural and ethical standard. ... The Marxian science enables mankind to comprehend the inherent laws governing a given social system, its economy, politics and the state administration, as also the inherent laws of development of political principles of a given state...the laws, processes and course of social change and progress ...the basic cause of the social problems... the concrete law of social change whose operations may be beyond common knowledge. Once the toiling masses can correctly grasp this science, they will know the truth and come to possess the power of knowledge to change society. No longer will it be possible then to crush their struggle with cannon and bullets. That is why you can find, whatever the military might that the capitalists-

imperialists use against the revolutionary struggle of the working class, Marxism Leninism is the target on which they constantly concentrate their real attack....The tactical line of the bourgeois attack is to distort Marxism-Leninism, to misdirect it, to pass off such things in the name of Marxism-Leninism as would bury the true Marxian science and its concepts, by giving a burial to its quintessence. It is because they find that the influence of Marxism-Leninism is ever on the rise. This is inevitable, for, the irrepressible inclination and desire of people for emancipation draw them towards Marxism-Leninism.” ...“the essence, the living soul, the kernel of any great and revolutionary ideology of every age is ingrained in its higher cultural and ethical standard.” ... “So, whether a party talks loftily of ideology is not the main issue at all. Whether its leaders, workers and supporters reflect higher ethical and cultural standard in their personal life, in day to day behaviour and political conduct – that is the real proof of whether their ideology is truly noble...” (*Science of Marxism is the Scientific Dialectical*
Contd. on page 9

Doklam Stand-off

Demands immediate withdrawal of military by both China and India and dialogues-negotiations to start

Nearly a month and half back, in an incident between China and Bhutan, a well-equipped corps of the Chinese army started construction of a road in Doklam plateau on a land they claimed theirs. The Royal Bhutan Army (RBA) raised objection as they claimed Doklam belonged to Bhutan, pleaded for *status quo* as bilaterally committed and tried to resist, but without effect.

Stand-off leads to whipping up of war-psychosis by capitalist rulers of India and China

Reportedly at the request of the Bhutan government, the Indian government sent its armed force to that land, as if Bhutan was its protectorate. The Chinese government claimed that Indian army had trespassed into its territory. This led to a military stand-off between India and China. A few days later face-saving briefing in Delhi to envoys of other countries did not appear to have worked well for the Indian government. Thus the stand-off continued till date even after Bhutan, for whatever reasons, asked India to

withdraw its military. In India, the political parties or forces even in opposition did not care to explain the situation clearly to people. Rather they joined a chorus against China or threw lukewarm views. None raised firmly why the Indian army should be withdrawn immediately. Rather the RSS-BJP, with their governmental power at the Centre, did not lose this opportunity to attempt whipping up national jingoism centring round this issue and thereby diverting people's attention from the back-breaking thousand and one problems of their life.

The Chinese government, through its foreign ministry spokesmen or the party official media, did not fall back in being aggressive with their explosive rhetoric and unilateral action, such as deciding to construct a road in Doklam. They held India should not harbour any illusion of talks until Indian troops are withdrawn, making it a condition for withdrawal of their forces. They declared that the Chinese government is fully geared up for a long-term confrontation; and as if to prove the point, the Chinese government even moved huge

additional military vehicles and equipments afresh into Tibet. The Chinese government threatened that it could detain Indian army men, if necessary could kill them too, and so on. As in India, the Chinese rulers too with their rhetoric against New Delhi, fomented national jingoism among their people who are plagued with endless problems which their present capitalist system, established through counter-revolution, is breeding.

Thus the capitalist governments of both India and China moved in such a manner that despite their lip-service to peaceful talks, their actions and words tended only to foment war psychosis in the region among the people. Apprehensions are expressed in different quarters that unless the dispute is resolved quickly and amicably through diplomatic route, it might trigger virulent escalation leading even to another border war between the two capitalist giants of this region, obviously leading to grave consequences for their own people as also people of smaller countries in the region.

Contd. on page 2

Doklam standoff

China after turning capitalist through counter-revolution steeped in all-out crisis like India

Contd. from page 1

Why border issues are kept alive by the governments?

In any attempt at getting at the crux of the problem and try resolving it, the first thing essential is putting an end to the apprehension of any war by withdrawing military. Then it needs to be realized that for any kind of disputed borders between neighbours, kept unresolved for long, there always remains chance of cropping up of differences in views and approaches, debates to lead to hot exchanges, verbal to even armed conflicts and ultimately full-scale border war. All these come up in sequel. So it is imperative that the task of delimitation-delineation-demarcation of borders between countries be urgently taken up through discussions-dialogues-negotiations conducted in an ambience of patience, calmness and coolness with an open mind. This is all the more necessary for land-locked countries which had been colonies or semi-colonies. More than often, their borders stand as fixed or drawn by their past imperialist rulers to serve their own interests. To people of the concerned countries, it is an unavoidable task to do away with any unwarranted misunderstanding or enmity among them which simply causes hindrance to developing their struggle against their respective exploitative capitalist rulers. Their rulers, on the contrary, tend to keep the border issues alive, to befool people with a war psychosis. And they use this war-psychosis to justify their stepping up of expenses on their respective military-industrial complex built with people's money to buttress the agenda of militarization of economy, a last ditch attempt to somehow stimulate the gasping capitalist economy enmeshed in unsolvable market crisis generated by the system itself. This also exactly is the case with the two capitalist giants of Asia, i.e., India and China. None of the two governments are people's governments. Rather, to befool the people with an issue adverse to their interests, the capitalist governments of both the countries have kept the border issues alive only to whip up occasional war psychosis which lubricate their expensive war machine feeding their economy and disrupt their peoples' movements against the prevailing exploitative system. Doklam issue having

cropped up between China and Bhutan did not warrant, in fact, any Indian involvement. And yet India got involved. In any case the border at Doklam is disputed yet, and has near or remote bearing with larger scale Sino- Indian border disputes which still persist.

Socialist China had a different approach from the obduracy of Indian government

The situation was not the same earlier. That the Sino-Indian border is still undelimited is known to all concerned. Centring round it a border war took place in 1962 between the newly independent capitalist Indian state, with Jawaharlal Nehru leading the Congress government as the then most trusted representative of the Indian monopolists, and People's Republic of China making rapid strides towards full-fledged socialism led by the great leader Mao Zedong as the Chairman of the Communist Party of China. During the few years since the Bandung Conference in 1955 which preceded the war, the Chinese government, approaching it with the socialist ideology, made repeated attempts for bringing their Indian counterpart to the table for discussions and negotiations on the mutual boundary which had largely been unilaterally drawn by the past rulers, mainly the British imperialists in India and monarchic heads of small and weak hill kingdoms like Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan. Three sectors, Akshai Chin in the west, Sikkim sector in the middle including Sikkim-Bhutan-China tri-junction to which Doklam belongs, and the McMahon Line in the east were particularly identified as points of disputes. Notwithstanding the mutual claims, socialist China then made it clear that it was ready for negotiations on all disputes, maintaining *status quo* till decision, for the sake of friendly relations it had with India. The Indian government initially joined the talks, but in no time reacted with pronouncements like the boundaries are '*unchangeable*' and thus '*not negotiable*' and the '*traditional and customary boundaries have long existed*' '*geographically and naturally settled for ages*', and so on. Added to this rigidity, the Indian army started forward patrolling and erection of border outposts even crossing the McMahon Line which

was drawn unilaterally by the British imperialists and which the Indian army had claimed to be their boundary, naturally drawing protest from the government of China. At one stage of this process, the Indian Prime Minister Nehru, the head of the Indian bourgeois government, ordered the Indian Army to launch offensive to 'free our territory' to implement India government's claim and dragged the Indian people into frenzied war psychosis. When socialist China's repeated appeals for withdrawal from those outposts and for immediately sitting for resolving all disputes through discussion fell on deaf ears, on 20 October 1962, the Chinese People's Liberation Army (PLA) launched attacks to dismantle those illegal outposts. They demolished those outposts built beyond the Line of Actual Control (LoAC). After four days of fighting, the PLA stopped advancing. Here it is pertinent to note that the Chinese PLA advanced only upto those positions which they regarded as the India-China border line. In a statement the government of socialist China proposed that both sides, first, affirm peaceful settlement through negotiations, second, agree to respect the LoAC as per 1959 position, that is before the conflict started, and third, withdraw their armed forces 20 kilometres from LoAC and disengage. Then within a few days, the Chinese government declared a unilateral ceasefire, and without retaining any captured territory, its frontier guards withdrew in all three, western, middle and eastern, sectors to positions 20 kilometres behind the 1959 LoAC, as they had proposed. In the whole course of events, the obduracy of the bourgeois government of India, obviously monitored by the ruling capitalist class, rather the monopolists, had no bearing upon people's life, other than adding the burden of war and emergency upon the back-breaking load of extremely cruel capitalist exploitation.

Both Indian and Chinese governments step out with expansionist designs

Going by the arrangement for some time, the Indian government and its army went back to their earlier stance. Rather, Indian capitalism which assumed the character of imperialism long back

and stricken with aggravating internal market crisis began investing their highly consolidated finance capital in smaller and weaker countries to exploit their market and resources. Parallel to it, its attitude towards the neighbours also changed. Towards the weaker neighbours, a trend of expansionist approach became glaring with days. The hill kingdom of Sikkim was annexed to the mainland. Bhutan became virtually a protectorate, with its sovereign status largely impaired by Indian approach. This big brother attitude also affected other smaller neighbours, who became apprehensive of Indian moves. In the present case, too, the attitude with which the Indian government jumped into the Bhutan-China dispute does not reflect anything but this big brotherly approach, whatever be Bhutan's request, from which the latter finally retracted. However, the expansionist big-brotherly attitude of the Indian ruling class has developed with time into a craving for assuming the role of a regional superpower and in the context of Asia for containing China, the other Asian giant. For these, they are not hesitating to form military combination with the greatest war monger of the world, viz., the US imperialism and its accomplice Israel, as also Australia and Japan. But all this expansionist militarization of the rulers do not serve people's interests in any way, other than consuming an astronomical figure for military expenses adding further burden upon people.

For the Chinese government, the approach it took in the past from its understanding of genuine communist internationalism, with initial patient and calm endeavour to deal with border disputes, proposing graceful retreat for both sides on fulfilment of the end of aggressiveness and finally following its own proposal line by line without retaining any occupied territory, all these were as expected from a socialist country under a leadership of the stature of great Mao Zedong. But with counter-revolution overwhelming this country since 1978 and its rulers acting virtually in the same way as those of imperialist countries, the Chinese capitalist government today presents a totally different face acting without principle or ethics both internally and in relation to the outer world.

Contd. on page 9

NOVEMBER REVOLUTION AND GREAT LENIN

[On 11 June, 2017, Comrade Provash Ghosh, General Secretary, SUCI(C), briefly spoke on the contributions of great Lenin in November Revolution in a meeting convened by the Odisha State Committee at the 'Study Centre of Marxism-Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh Thought' in Ghatsila, Jharkhand. We are of the opinion that this speech would help all sections of people to understand the significance of November Revolution as well as the historic role of Lenin in this. Responsibility of translation error or inadequate expression, if any, lies with the editorial board of Proletarian era.]

Comrades,

I have not come here to discuss on any topic. I came to listen to your deliberations. During listening, it occurred to me that something needs to be said about the role of great Lenin in November Revolution. Comrades are well conversant with the valuable discussions of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our great leader, teacher and guide, on this issue. Later, there have been some more publications on this subject from the Party which comrades are also aware of. I would refer to some aspects of the historic role Comrade Lenin played in the pre-revolution period. You all know that great Marx and Engels had laid the foundation of dialectical materialism and based on that philosophy, made invaluable contributions to the fields of epistemology covering the entire gamut of knowledge—politics-economics-history-sociology-literature-culture. They had also provided educative analyses of the various problems and incidents of the contemporary period. Marx had established the First International as an organization to guide working class revolution. When the First International became degenerated, Engels built up the Second International. Engels was alive for 12 years after Marx's demise. The Second International properly functioned under his leadership. Even for sometimes after Engels' death, it was on the right track. Under the leadership of this Second International, many powerful working class parties were formed in Germany, Italy, France and England. When Lenin joined the Marxist movement, the Second International was a powerful organization. Lenin obeyed its leaders as his teachers. At the same time, Russian Social-Democrat Labour Party (RSDLP) was formed as the Marxist party on the Russian soil. Lenin was associated with that. The Second International had leaders like Bernstein, Kautsky and others. Plekhanov and others were in the leadership of RSDLP. In the later period, Lenin had to dauntlessly fight these leaders in order to safeguard the kernel of Marxism and provide its correct interpretation. He had played a historic role in this regard. At that time, he was virtually unknown in the Second International. Even in Russia, he was not that known. In age also, he was much junior to all of the leaders I have mentioned above. Just think, what high an understanding of Marxism he had acquired in that young age, what profound feeling he had for the oppressed classes, what level of truthfulness he had attained, what indomitable courage he had acquired, what firm grit and determination he possessed to conduct this historic struggle. I have already said that Lenin had earlier recognized them as his leaders and teachers. Those who have gone through the works of Lenin would find that how the leaders of the Second International were then distorting and misinterpreting Marxism.

How Lenin defended Marxism from misinterpretation

While discussing about these leaders and quoting them, he had qualified his references as "when they were Marxists". It means when they

were Marxists, their interpretations were correct. But, later these very leaders of the Second International had deviated from Marxism and had been saying wrong things. In the era of imperialism, the big imperialist powers had amassed huge wealth by plundering other countries. Using a part of those riches, they had bribed and purchased most of the working class leaders of the then Europe. Becoming members of the parliament, delivering speeches inside the legislature, seeing those speeches in print and earning fame by way of that provided a cosy environment of bourgeois parliamentarism in



Comrade Lenin addressing

which all these leaders of the Second International got sunk into, lost their revolutionary character and were virtually sold out to the ruling imperialists. As a result, proneness to compromise, aversion towards revolutionary struggle and corruption engulfed most of the leaders of working class movement of Europe. Lenin could realize that. Lenin had grasped the essence of Marxism and Marxist methodology of analysis and acquired through struggle the ability of applying the teachings of Marxism to arrive at the truth in correct appraisal of the objective situation. In a word, he had learned how to apply Marxism correctly and concretely in a concrete situation. So, he protected Marxism from the clutches of the deviators. This role of his in the international sphere has been outstanding. So far I know, Lenin was first to use the word 'revisionism'. He showed that those leaders having deviated from Marxism were seeking to revise Marxism and hence were revisionist. Lenin said, that by distorting, falsifying and stripping it of its revolutionary essence, these degenerated leaders were spreading a twisted version of Marxism which the bourgeoisie would

gladly accept. In other words, the bourgeoisie would find nothing objectionable in this distorted version of Marxism. So Lenin said that these leaders were presenting a revised version of Marxism by misinterpreting it. What is the revolutionary understanding of Marxism? What is the correct understanding of Marxism? It was Lenin who was the first to show that to the world at that time. This is where his role has been foremost and historic.

Lenin's exposition of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism

There is another area where also his role has been no less historic. Marx had applied dialectical materialism in the pre-imperialism period. Marx and Engels had not seen the era of imperialism. After a few years from Engels' demise, capitalism attained the stage of imperialism by giving birth to monopoly and finance capital and began plundering the underdeveloped countries by exploiting their cheap labour and raw material. Lenin showed that capitalism in course of development gave birth to monopoly and then had reached imperialism, its highest stage. That marked the moribund stage of capitalism. He also elaborated the nature and features of imperialism and deduced the line of revolution, revolutionary politics, strategy and tactics of revolution in the era of imperialism. It is for this reason that great Stalin showed through detailed analysis that Leninism is the Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. Marx was correct in his time to say that revolution would break out first in the advanced capitalist countries. But applying Marxist methodology of analysis, Lenin showed that after attaining the stage of imperialism, the advanced capitalist countries were plundering the colonies and distributing a part of the booty to the workers of their own countries as extra wage and bonus to bribe them. This had corrupted the workers to a great extent and destroyed their struggling spirit. Now, revolution would take place first in the relatively backward countries where the people are more oppressed and repressed. Thereafter, as crisis in the advanced capitalist-imperialist countries would intensify and assume severity, it would pave the way for revolution to break out. The leaders of the Second International charged Lenin of disobeying Marx. Lenin retorted by saying that they were not standing but lying down on Marxism. Lenin showed that in the backward countries only, the chain of world imperialism-capitalism would be broken first. More revolutions become successful in these countries, more crisis-ridden would be the advanced imperialist-capitalist countries and more and more would the working class of these countries be initiated towards revolution.

As I have already mentioned, it was Lenin who first enunciated the main features of imperialism as follows —

- i) development of monopoly capital
- ii) birth of finance capital through merger of banking capital with industrial capital

Contd. on page 4

November Revolution and Lenin

Lenin led First Proletarian Revolution to success with correct grasp of Marxism, profound feeling for the oppressed classes, truthfulness, indomitable courage and firm grit and determination

Contd. from page 3

- iii) exporting finance capital besides commodities to the backward countries
- iv) formation of international trusts and cartels of the imperialists (which have now taken the form of multi-national corporations) for plundering world market and
- v) division of the world market amongst the big imperialists-capitalist powers for limitless pillage.

Lenin showed that for capturing and recapturing the markets for unbounded loot and plunder, imperialism generates wars including world wars. He further added that finance capital is so powerful and decisive a force that it can control the economies as well as foreign policies of politically independent sovereign countries. He also pointed out another feature that imperialism manifested at its early stage. The imperialists used to invest capital in colonies, semi-colonies and backward countries to build up industries for reaping profit. But lest they should incur any loss on such investments, another avenue was opened up. That is, without directly investing capital, they were giving loans as promoters of usury or were indulging in speculation in share market. They found this usury less risky. Lenin branded this as rentier or usurious finance capital which was indulging in the business of giving loan at hefty interest and thereby making good profit with the least of risk. This usury business has flourished manifold today compared to what Lenin had seen. He also showed that in the pre-imperialist period, capitalism was more attached to democracy and individual freedom. But, at the stage of imperialism, it is more attached to bureaucracy and militarism.

Degeneration of Second International

Before the First World War, the leaders of the Second International had a serious difference of opinion with Lenin on the question of the role of the working class of the imperialist countries once the war would break out. Lenin was of the opinion that the workers of the different imperialist countries cannot point guns at each other to serve the interest of their respective imperialist rulers. Their task would be to oppose the imperialist war and

trigger civil wars in their respective countries to accomplish proletarian revolution taking advantage of the war. Though the leaders of the Second International verbally supported Lenin's view and agreed with his proposal, they, after the outbreak of the war, made a somersault and stood in favour of their respective imperialist rulers. Lenin called it treachery to the cause of internationalism and successfully accomplished revolution in his country by taking full advantage of the First World War. He thus proved the correctness of his vision. Also Lenin had a severe disagreement with the leaders of the Second International on whether socialist revolution could be accomplished in a backward country like Russia as well as on the imperativeness of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. Because of all these reasons, he branded the Second International as traitor and revisionist and severed his relationship with it.

On formation of a communist party

Another valuable contribution of Lenin is in regard to formation of a communist party. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had called it Leninist model of party formation and developed and enriched this concept further. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had elaborately discussed this issue in his celebrated work, "*Why SUCI(C) is the only genuine Communist Party in India*". If comrades go through this work meticulously, they would be acquainted with all the details in this regard. On the other hand, while being within the RSDLP, Lenin had a difference of opinion on some vital issues with its leaders like Plekhanov, Martov and Axelrod. One of such issues was the fundamental question in regard to the process to be adopted for building a communist party. Lenin said that there should first develop a unity of ideas through a course of ideological struggle. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh elaborated this concept of achieving ideological centralism. Lenin opined that a communist party cannot be formed just by accepting a resolution or making certain declarations. The imperative task is to first arrive at a unity of ideas through conduction of an ideological struggle. Next question that arose was who would be the members of the party. Lenin

held that no one other than professional revolutionaries can be party members. Others were of the opinion that whoever accepted the principles and analyses of the party could have membership. Lenin said, no. If this was accepted then anybody could be a member of the party. A revolutionary working class party could never grow like this. It is imperative to examine if the members are adhering to the norms and principles of the party and working under any of the party organizations observing party discipline. As a result, RSDLP was divided into two groups—the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. Later, in 1912, the Bolshevik Party was formally founded. So, it was Lenin who as worthy continuer of Marx and Engels provided elaborated guideline to the international communist movement in regard to a host of important questions like how should a communist party be formed, how democratic centralism would grow through fusion of proletarian democracy and centralism, how the various party bodies would develop at various levels and what would be their mutual relationship and how the party workers should conduct themselves in a disciplined manner obeying the party authority.

On dictatorship of the proletariat

There was a debate centring on the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat as well. Marx had said that the dictatorship of the proletariat would be a transitory phase between capitalism and communism. When Lenin tried to implement that, others accused him of butchering democracy. Lenin rebutted them by pointing out that the democracy they were so concerned about was nothing but bourgeois dictatorship, that is, democracy in favour of the bourgeoisie and dictatorship against the working class. On the contrary, socialism is democracy of the working class and dictatorship against the bourgeoisie. Lenin also developed this concept of Marx from various angles. It was Marx who stated that revolution could not be achieved through peaceful means. Based on the experience of Paris Commune, Marx also taught that the working class must smash the bourgeois state machine.

On continuous development of Marxian science

There is another field where Lenin's role had been path-breaking. In the post-Marx-Engels period, the bourgeois theoreticians were training their guns anew against Marxism, misinterpreting science in various ways. It was necessary to defend Marxism against these attacks. Lenin did that. And in course of that, he also developed the science of Marxism. He had to conduct intense ideological struggle against so-called Marxist theoreticians of Russia like Bazarov, Bogdanov and Lunacharsky as well as their foreign friends. Lenin did not accept Marxism as a dogma but as a creative and developing science, as a guide to action. His famous quote in this regard is, "We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life." ('Articles for Rabochaya Gazeta CW, Vol. IV, p.211-12) This task was brilliantly performed by Lenin after Marx-Engels in the era of imperialism. It was for this reason that great Stalin, his worthy student, said that "Leninism is the Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution." (*Foundations of Leninism*) Stalin was the first to use the word 'Leninism'.

As science is developing, Marxism is also developing in tandem as scientific philosophy. Its development is two-fold. One is the continuous development and enrichment of the understanding of its three fundamental universal principles, i.e. i) Unity of and Struggle between opposite forces, ii) From Quantitative Change to Qualitative Change and vice versa and iii) Negation of the Negation. To be illustrative, Newton had discovered the laws of motion of matter. The concepts in regard to motion of matter had developed and got enriched further with more and more developments of science. Similarly, the understanding of the three principles of Marxism is also developing and getting enriched with newer developments in the field of science and epistemology. The other development is in regard to formulating the political line and

Contd on page 5

November Revolution and Lenin

Lenin staunchly defended Marxism against all distortions and misinterpretations

Contd. from page 4

strategy of revolution in the emerging newer situations in national as well as international spheres. At the same time, as and when there is a fundamental change in the objective situation, newer revolutionary political line and strategy has to be evolved to illumine the path in the context of emerging newer problems. That is why, Lenin had not only deduced new political line and strategy to guide proletarian revolution to success in the changed international situation, he also made it amply clear that this general line cannot be exactly replicated in different countries. In his language, "We think that an independent elaboration of Marx's theory is especially essential for Russian socialists; for this theory provides only general guiding principles, which, in particular, are applied in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany, and in Germany differently than in Russia." (*ibid.*) So, it can be seen that Lenin had faced problems which did not arise in Marx's time. Lenin enriched Marxism in course of providing guideline on resolution of the newer emerging problems and brought its understanding to a new height. After Lenin, Stalin, Mao Zedong and Comrade Shibdas Ghosh developed and enriched Marxism further.

On organizing revolution

It also merits special mention as to how the genius of Lenin worked in organizing Russian revolution. On the one hand, he founded the Bolshevik Party by waging intense ideological struggle. On the other hand, he had to relentlessly expose the Mensheviks as well as the socialist-revolutionaries who had considerable strength and thereby isolate them from the workers, peasants and other sections of the toiling people. It was not that the November Revolution was accomplished by performing the tasks which we have been entrusted with today like developing party organizations in the urban and rural belts over a long period, intensifying class and mass struggles on various legitimate demands, undertaking ideological campaign on a large scale or setting up people's struggle committees since we are to organize revolution in a relatively advanced capitalist country. It is true that there was widespread impact of Lenin's revolutionary thoughts on Russian soil and most of the members of the

erstwhile RSDLP supported him.

It is to be noted that there was no scope for practice of long standing parliamentary politics in Tsarist Russia. Duma (parliament) was formed occasionally under pressure of people. But each of the Duma was temporary in nature and formed based on restricted franchise and undemocratic constitution. So, there was little scope for creating parliamentary illusion among the people unlike in other developed imperialist-capitalist countries. Working class in Russia was also not bribed, corrupted or carried away by economic opportunism to the extent the imperialist capital could do in other western countries. So, the Russian workers were relatively militant. Moreover, religious values were not fully exhausted in the then Russia and bourgeois humanist values had much influence. Russia did not face severe moral crisis at that time as all imperialist-capitalist countries including our country are facing today. In this background, there was a surge of industrial strikes over various economic and other demands broke out in Russia then and all these strikes were turned into political strikes due to the efforts of the Bolsheviks on the eve of the revolution in 1905. The revolutionary uprising was joined by the armed forces and naval fleet also. Soviets as the instruments of political power were developed spontaneously among the workers and soldiers and even among the peasants in some areas. Though the Bolsheviks at that time did not have much political or organizational strength to make revolution successful, it became evidently clear from their role at the time of uprising of 1905 that they were the most trusted force then. Lenin termed this revolution of 1905 as 'dress rehearsal' of future November Revolution and said that had there been no attempt of revolution in 1905, November Revolution could never have achieved victory in 1917.

The word "Bolshevik" means majority while "Menshevik" denotes minority. Hence, compared to other socialist forces, the Bolshevik Party was stronger. Pre-Revolution Russia was almost similar to what our country was before independence. Capitalism did not grow much in Russia. In fact, development of capitalism in Russia was weak compared to the growth of Indian capitalism during the period of our freedom movement. There was

Tsardom in Russia meaning serfdom under the feudal rule of lord Tsar. Feudal production relations of serf-feudal lord governed most of the agriculture. Only a few industries were established. Such was the situation there. At the same time, foreign imperial capital had made forays into Russian soil in collaboration with the Tsar. As a result, Russia was at the stage of bourgeois democratic revolution to a great extent.

Bourgeois democratic revolution means revolution to establish right to have individual property ownership over property. In feudalism, no one other than the feudal lord or monarch considered to be the accredited representative of god could own property. When mercantile capital was transformed into industrial capital, it raised the slogans of individual ownership, of setting up big industries by replacing cottage industries and freeing the serfs from land for working independently in the industries as labour. From the economic point of view, these demands were then progressive. Based on that, right to all individuals to have ownership on property emerged as a democratic demand. Indian constitution also grants in letters the right to own individual property. This right was given by the bourgeoisie only. In capitalism, every individual has the right to own property. This right was not granted in feudalism. Based on this right evolved the concept of individual freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of women, right to protest, right to form organization and the right to establish bourgeois parliamentary democracy in place of feudal monarchic system. All these concepts and rights came into being based on the necessity of individual ownership. From this perspective, bourgeois democratic revolution was progressive at that stage of history. The French Revolution, the Industrial Revolution of England and the Peasants' War in Germany were all progressive revolutions. The slogan of equality-fraternity-liberty was also raised in this period. Similarly were raised the slogans of establishing Republics, of setting up governments 'By the people, for the people, of the people'. The very slogan of individual freedom endowed the people with a new consciousness, a new sense of right. Hence, individual freedom then represented a progressive urge. No leader, cadre or martyr of our

freedom movement was a proletarian revolutionary. Their philosophical base was individual freedom in the bourgeois sense. Because, the very freedom movement of ours was anti-imperialist in character—a movement to establish bourgeois democracy. There was also a need to fight feudalism though the compromising leadership of our freedom movement did not raise that slogan. In any case, the anti-imperialist struggle was also a struggle for achieving bourgeois democratic revolution. The leaders and workers who were initiated into our freedom movement with the main objective of unshackling the country from the alien rule were also spurred on by the urge for achieving individual liberty.

Enriched concept of a true communist

When February Revolution took place in Russia prior to November Revolution, the main demand of the people was the right to have individual freedom. The Bolshevik Party too raised the slogan of individual liberty. The comrades should take proper note of it. In the celebrated novel titled *Pather Dabi (Demand of the Path)* by Saratchandra Chatterjee, Apurba, one of the characters, asked Ramdas Talwarkar, a freedom fighter of revolutionary trend, "Why have you involved yourself in this revolutionary movement when you are married?" Ramdas replied, "Bapuji, marriage is a *dharma*. But greater *dharma* is to work for the country's freedom. If I had known that a smaller *dharma* would pose obstacle before a greater *dharma*, I would not have married." It means the interest of the country was prior. The freedom movement had primacy over the need of the individual as well as the need of the individual family. In the Soviet Constitution also, it was written that individual interest was subordinate to the interest of revolution. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had shown that this, in the main, was a bourgeois humanist value concept. He had also pointed out that this bourgeois humanist value had worked in Russia during November Revolution as well as for a considerable period after revolution. It also worked during Chinese Revolution because that was a revolution against imperialism-feudalism. He had further added that though the

Contd. on page 6

November Revolution and Lenin

Lenin developed concepts of formation of communist party, dictatorship of the proletariat, defined revisionism and warned against immense danger it posed

Contd. from page 5

concept of individual interest being subordinate to the interest of revolution worked favourably in fulfilling the need of revolution during its preparatory stage, during insurrection for seizure of power and later upto a period of socialist reconstruction. In the later phase of gigantic progress and stability of socialist economy this very concept gave birth to a new phenomenon of 'socialist individualism' and endangered socialist system. What is needed at this phase are higher communist values which calls for not only complete abolition of private property but also freeing the self from 'private-property mental complex' and thereby identifying individual interest with the interest of class, revolution and party. I have just recalled this teaching as a passing but relevant reference.

Strategizing November Revolution

Coming back to what I was discussing, despite an important role of the working class in the February Revolution, it could not capture power. The power was usurped by the bourgeoisie because of Mensheviks' betrayal. You ought to know that earlier the Mensheviks controlled majority of the Soviets because of two reasons. The first one was that the Bolsheviks were busy taking on the Tsarist army in the streets but the Mensheviks were not. So the Bolsheviks could not take that much initiative in the various Soviets then being formed spontaneously everywhere. Seizing that opportunity, the Mensheviks established control over majority of the Soviets. Along with this, Lenin also drew attention to another aspect. He showed that those who had been working in the factories for long did develop some proletarian consciousness within themselves. But most of them were sent to the warfield as soldiers by Tsar. So, they were engaged in war. Those who were appointed in their place as factory workers were recent migrants from the villages. That means, they were earlier peasants but now transformed into workers. Since the peasants possessed petty-bourgeois mentality, these new workers also had influence of that. They were not proletariats of the kind the previous workers who were sent to war, were. In the Soviets, these new workers who came from

the villages formed the majority of the members. For these two reasons, the Bolsheviks initially had no majority in the Soviets. So, the Mensheviks had majority in the Soviets and they handed over power to the bourgeoisie in February. Even then, Lenin applied Marxism with deftness. While highlighting the major reasons behind success of November Revolution, he himself said that the opportunity November Revolution had obtained would not be available to the revolutions in other countries. There always exists difference among the revolutionary situations of different countries. In Russia, first of all, the First World War was on and the imperialists were divided into two warring groups. So, as explained Lenin, they would not be able to oppose Russian Revolution unitedly. This was one opportunity. Secondly, the Tsar was facing defeat in the war. The Tsar had a pact with British and French imperialism while German imperialism was their opponent. Alongside Tsar's defeat, the whole of Russia was in the grip of famine because of war. In such circumstances, the Russian people were demanding peace, not war. So, the slogan of Russian Revolution was—we want bread, we want peace, we want liberty and we want land to the tillers. The very slogans of individual freedom and land to the tillers are slogans of bourgeois democratic revolution. February Revolution was victorious based on these slogans. It was the workers, peasants and common people who fought for revolution. But due to the treachery of the Mensheviks, the bourgeoisie captured power. At that point of time, Lenin showed that after being in power, the Russian bourgeoisie was not withdrawing from the war but continuing it. The bourgeois rulers were not opting for peace. Lenin pointed out that the state was not confiscating food articles from the big food hoarders and distributing these to the hungry people. The bourgeois government was compromising with Tsar and feudalism. So, it was not distributing land to the tillers as well. Clearly, the bourgeois rulers were betraying people. Citing all these and waging an intense ideological struggle, the Bolsheviks gained majority in the Soviets by defeating the Mensheviks. Lenin also noticed that after February Revolution also, the fervour of revolution was very much

alive among the masses. Those who joined revolution with guns had not returned from the field. The weapons were at their disposal. They were also carrying the fighting mentality. So, he could realize that it was high time for insurrection of power. He convinced the Soviets that the bourgeois Kerensky government, the Mensheviks and the socialists had betrayed them, had worked against their interest. So, they ought to bring about the socialist revolution. The call was for anti-capitalist socialist revolution because the state power was in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Lenin explained that since "State power in Russia has passed into the hands of a new class, namely, the bourgeoisie and landowners who had become bourgeois. To this extent the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia is completed." (*April Thesis*) He also elaborated that the stage of revolution is determined based on the question as to which class will overthrow which class from state power. Since the bourgeoisie captured state power after February Revolution, revolution to overthrow the bourgeoisie from power would be an anti-capitalist socialist revolution. But this socialist revolution would not be similar to revolution in an advanced capitalist-imperialist country. This socialist revolution would have to complete the unfulfilled tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution. For that reason, in post-revolution Russia, Lenin adopted the policy of war communism to contain famine, confiscate the hoarded foodgrains from the food traders and distribute the same among the hungry and also to control trade. After completing this phase, he introduced New Economic Policy (NEP). In accordance with that policy, he gave some scope to the private capitalists to establish industries under control of the socialist state. This was the situation then. Trotsky and others opposed the policies of war communism and NEP. Trotsky even opposed socialist revolution by arguing that revolution could not take place in a backward country like Russia. Lenin said that at the first stage of revolution, there would be unity of workers and peasants. In the later stage, unity would be of the workers and poor peasants. Trotsky held that there could not be any unity between the workers and the peasants. The working class alone

would lead revolution. On such various questions, Lenin had a difference with Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev. On each of these controversies, Stalin stood firmly by the side of Lenin and played an important role. Another factor was also alluded to by Lenin for success of November Revolution. He showed that Russia was a vast country and the communication system was very poor. So, it was possible to continue civil war for a long period.

Lenin had assimilated the essence of Marxism

Lenin correctly grasped Marxism. Since he could correctly apply Marxism in analysing the obtaining international as well as Russian situation, he could in the process further develop and enrich Marxism. By fighting the bourgeois concepts, he could establish why Marxism was needed in Russia. At the same time, by fighting the wrong conceptions of Plekhanov, Trotsky and such others, he provided the correct understanding of Marxism. Comrades should understand this role of his as well. The issues that I have discussed in half an hour today were then not that easy to clinch and deal with. Starting as a student of the giant Second International leaders of Europe and Russia, Lenin could realize their deviations because he had assimilated the essence of Marxism. Hence, he had to fight them philosophically and point out their mistakes. In course of that, he provided correct revolutionary understanding of Marxism and how one should develop that understanding in the changed international situation and how should it be applied in the concrete situation of Russia. What an heightened understanding of Marxism was required to feel the pulse of the country, correctly sense the mood of the working class as well as people at large and above all to realize that after February Revolution, it was high time to accomplish socialist revolution. When the call of November Revolution was given, some persons argued: according to Marx, revolution would break out first in an advanced capitalist country. But capitalism in Russia is not developed. Then, how could revolution be accomplished here? Lenin told them that they had read

Contd. on page 7

November Revolution and Lenin

Lenin enriched Marxism in course of providing guideline on resolution of newer emerging problems and brought its understanding to a new height

Contd. from page 6

Marx's works as pedants but had not understood Marxist methodology of analysis. He pointed out that in the era of imperialism, capitalism in backward countries cannot develop in the manner witnessed earlier because of uneven development of capitalism. Moreover, the big imperialist powers today would not allow capitalism to flourish in the backward or under-developed countries. So, in this era, industrial revolution could not take place under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. It would only be under the leadership of the working class that industrial revolution could become a total success. Lenin had to conduct many such struggles in the theoretical field. In order to understand the significance of November Revolution, one has to comprehend this unique role and the invaluable contributions of Lenin.

Understanding of Marxism should be living, creative

How could Lenin be successful in providing correct interpretation and application of Marxism? Here comes the question of the role of an individual. This needs to be realized properly. Lenin was not born as Lenin, the genius. Nor was Stalin, Mao or Shibdas Ghosh. No great man was born and could be born as genius in any period. Genius is also product of a process. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in his tribute to Comrade Subodh Banerjee had elaborately discussed this aspect. He showed that no one is born as a genius or with talent. To what extent would one develop his talent, ability or competence depends on how best one conducts struggle covering all aspects of life by accepting correct revolutionary or progressive ideology. While his teachers failed, Lenin was successful in conducting the struggle appropriately and accomplished revolution. What seemed to be impossible to all in the world was achieved by him. He led the socialist revolution to success. This very task was not that easy, rather extremely difficult. It is never enough to just go through the books on Marxism. That is why, it is said that Marxism is a creative science. The scholars also read many books. But, mere memorizing what one reads does

not entail that creativity. Are you analysing based on Marxist outlook? Are you taking due note of the contradictions? Are you in a position to diagnose the disease of the society like a doctor? Are you able to identify the class contradictions? How is the bourgeoisie attacking with its ideology and culture? How should the proletariat conduct struggle to repel these bourgeois attacks? How would the Marxist science be creatively applied in a new situation? What are the natures of various contradictions within matter? How are these contradictions featuring in a country? What is the standard of consciousness of comrades within the Party? How are the contradictions working in the mental sphere of the comrades? How is a comrade vacillating in the contradiction between the bourgeois and the proletariat? How to help that comrade? How are the contradictions manifested every moment? What are the external and internal contradictions? What is the principal contradiction among them? What is the principal aspect of that contradiction? How are these contradictions changing with the passage of time? Creative living application of Marxism presupposes the ability to correctly note and understand all these aspects. Hence, understanding of Marxism ought to be living. And for that, Marxism has to be applied in life. To whatever extent one understands Marxism, one has to apply that in life. To the extent, one applies that in life, one acquires higher culture. To the extent higher culture is acquired, higher is the understanding of Marxism. This is how one has to advance. Which demand is to be raised at what point of time, which programme is to be adopted, which call for struggle would be given so that people respond—studying and realizing all these means understanding various contradictions and their nature. In other words, it means to have concrete understanding of the concrete contradictions of a specific time. Just like the way Lenin understood after February Revolution that people were asking for bread, peace, land and freedom. But the bourgeoisie was betraying them. It could neither provide nor deliver

what people were crying for. The Mensheviks also betrayed people. By that time, Soviets were established almost everywhere. Lenin and his compatriots had to explain these in details to the Soviets. In this process, the Bolsheviks who were earlier minority in the Soviets gained majority. Then he gave the slogan—'All power to the Soviets'. The bourgeoisie mounted attack with its entire arsenal. But at the call of the Bolshevik Party led by Lenin, the working class rose up and defeated the bourgeoisie. November Revolution became victorious.

Lenin cautioned about danger for socialism from within

November Revolution was accomplished on 17 November, 1917. But Lenin became seriously ill shortly after that and finally breathed his last on 21 January, 1924 at the age of 53 only. But within this short time, he took notice of the objective reality and cautioned about the probable danger socialism might face. He pointed out that the resistance of the bourgeoisie is increased *tenfold* by its overthrow (that is, after revolution). And not

only does the strength of the bourgeoisie (even in one country) lie in the strength and durability of its international connections with imperialist-capitalist powers but also in the strength of *small production* as well as in the *force of habit* (both *bourgeois and feudal*) Small production was then very, very widespread in the world, and small production *engenders* capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale. So, he held that the dictatorship of the proletariat was a most determined and most ruthless war to be waged by the new class (the proletariat) against a more powerful enemy, the overthrown bourgeoisie. In another place, he showed that the force of habit of millions and tens of millions is a most terrible force.

After Lenin, his worthy continuers like Stalin, Mao Zedong and Shibdas Ghosh had, based on his teachings, showed from various angles how and why socialism could be endangered by counter-revolution and unless the causes behind such endangerment are not properly thwarted, counter-revolution might score victory and dismantle socialism.

AIMSS protest against kidnapping of poor girl

On 23 May, a girl from a poor family of Luniavas locality of Rajasthan had been kidnapped. Demanding that the girl be rescued and in protest against the prolonged dilly-dally on part of police-administration in booking the culprits, a protest demonstration was staged at the Jaipur Police Station on 9 July by state AIMSS and a memorandum submitted to the government.

Protest Rally at Jamshedpur

Demanding repeal of Chhotanagpur Tenancy Act and that of amendment to Santal Pargana Tenancy Act as well as reintroduction of pass-fail system from class-I, and protesting against the opening of government-run liquor shops, GST and raging corruption, a protest demonstration was organized at DC office of Jharkhand, Jamshedpur on 7 July on behalf of our party SUCI(C).

AIUTUC writes to Prime Minister seeking effective straightening machinery to ascertain whereabouts of Indian labourers in Iraq

Referring to the Inter-State Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1979, Comrade Sankar Saha, General Secretary, AIUTUC has sent a letter to the Prime Minister on 25 July, 2017, demanding immediate steps to ascertain whereabouts of the 39 Indian workers reportedly abducted by IS in Mosul, Iraq three years back. AIUTUC also reminded him that the Government is legally bound to keep authentic information of the migrant labourers and hence must straighten government machinery to identify lakhs of migrant workers and ensure their safe livelihood.

AIUTUC attends 106th International Labour Conference of ILO in Geneva

The 106th Session of the International Labour Conference (ILC) of International Labour Organisation (ILO) was held at Geneva from 5th to 16th June, 2017. 9074 delegates and advisors representing workers, employers and government groups attended the conference from 187 countries. Comrade Shankar Dasgupta, member, All India Secretariat, AIUTUC attended the conference on behalf of the Organisation.

The conference observed that the burden of the deepening all-embracing capitalist crisis is squarely passed on the working people by the capitalist owners and consequently their lives are shattered across the globe. Violation of ILO standards are witnessed in all capitalist countries. It was brought to the notice of all that Government of India, as a member state of ILO, had ratified the ILO convention in 1949, yet it, in utter violation of the Labour Inspection Convention 1947 (No. 81), has radically reformed the labour inspection system in their motive to end the so-called 'Inspector Raj'. There is widespread violation of labour laws in India in respect of child labour, forced labour, working hours, occupational safety, health and SEZs. In the second recurrent discussion on the 'Fundamental

Principles and Rights at Work', focus was on global unemployment which stands at 200 million, growing recession, precarious working condition affecting 1.5 billion workers worldwide, growing inequality, alarming rise in stagnation of wages and job insecurity, forcible displacement of 65.3 million working people and utter destitution of 1.5 billion out of the 7 billion of global population. The committee opined that all national governments should promote national level tripartite dialogue to ensure compliance of the 'ILO Declaration on fundamental principles and rights at work, 1998'.

Comrade Shankar Dasgupta urged the worker delegates from different countries to impress upon the working class the imperativeness of emancipation from the yoke of capitalist slavery while exploring the ILO instruments, notwithstanding its limitations, to develop united, sustained and powerful movements throughout the globe against the increasing exploitation and barbarity of world Capitalism-Imperialism. Only such mighty conscious and organized movements can put an end to exploitative capitalist system ushering in a new society called socialism, free from exploitation and oppression of capital as shown by the great November Socialist Revolution of Soviet Russia, he emphasized.



Massive rally at Rewari, Haryana, on 17 July on burning problems of life.

All India Conference at Ranchi to build up protracted movement against repeal of right to land

On 29-30 June, an All India Conference was held at Ranchi, Jharkhand as part of the movement for right of land by tribals and repeal of Chhotonagpur Tenancy Act and Amendment Bill of Santal Pargana Tenancy Act which had been passed at the State Assembly in 2016. 340 delegates from 30 mass organizations of West-Bengal, Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, Odisha, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Haryana, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh participated. The conference held that it is a conspiracy of the BJP Government to grab the lands of the tribals by the land sharks. On the presidium during the first and third session of the conference, was Comrade Satyawar, President, AIKKMS and member, Central Committee,

SUCI(C), while in the second session, it was Comrade Bimal Das, Secretary, of AIKKMS, Jharkhand. Besides them those who spoke were Comrades Hannan Molla, General Secretary, AIKS, and others. On the 'Hool Diwas' on 30 June, Comrade Satyawar recalled the glorious Santal rebellion or Santal Hul against both the British colonial authority and zamindari system by the oppressed Santal people in the mid-19th century in which 20,000 people were martyred. The Conference decided to build up protracted movements demanding the withdrawal of anti-people CNT Act and Amendment to SPT Act. State-wide protest between 11 and 17 July during Jharkhand Assembly session and March to the Assembly on 12 July were undertaken.

AIDSO on government's view on introduction of Pass-fail system

AIDSO in a statement dated 25 July, 2017 stated that under pressure of countrywide powerful protest movement against no-detention policy, the central government has been compelled to announce amendment of Right to Education Act for re-introduction of pass-fail system and allow the states to conduct examinations in Classes V and VIII in March and those who fail in the exam will be given another chance to pass in the exam of May which will be retaken.

While hailing this partial victory of the movement, AIDSO pointed out that the demand for re-introduction of pass-fail right from class I has been cunningly bypassed. AIDSO demanded that the governments, both central and of the states, must honour the opinion of all walks of people including educationists, teachers, students, guardians and intellectuals for abolishing no-detention right from class I and stood for intensifying students' movement until the demand is achieved.



AIDSO observes 17 July as all India Protest Day against no-detention policy Jharkhand, and Delhi

AIDSO and AIDYO condemn recommendations of RSS-affiliated Shiksha Sanskriti Utthan Nyas for changes in NCERT textbooks

In a joint statement issued on 25 July, 2017, AIDSO and AIDYO strongly condemned the heinous recommendations of RSS-affiliated Shiksha Sanskriti Utthan Nyas headed by Dina Nath Batra for removing English, Urdu, and Arabic words, the thoughts of Rabindranath Tagore, a couplet by Mirza Ghalib and a poem by the noted progressive poet Pash, references to the Mughal emperors as benevolent and a sentence that "nearly 2,000 Muslims were killed in Gujarat in 2002", from the NCERT textbooks. These recommendations, the statement said, are purported to communalise education, suppress historical facts, wipe out the teachings and thoughts of the renowned Renaissance personalities and create a rift between Hindu and Muslim people. While calling upon all well-meaning people of the country to unequivocally condemn the motivated proposals, AIDSO and AIDYO pledged to resist any attempt to implement these atrocious recommendations of the RSS outfit anywhere in the country.



Doklam standoff**Powerful pro-active people's pressure is the only means to keep the rulers off from border conflicts***Contd from page 2*

Even after utilizing the newly built industrial infrastructure erected during those three decades of socialism and also retaining the banner of Communist Party or People's Liberation Army as the brand names for hoodwinking people of their own country and the world, the capitalist China could not avert the ever-mounting crisis of capitalism in this era of decadent capitalism, that is imperialism. Huge concentration of capital and power in the hands of a few all powerful monopolists, fast growing terrible income disparity among people, ruthless eviction of peasants from their land to serve the monopolists, both domestic and foreign, concomitant ever mounting unemployment resulting in saddening rise in migrant labour population, abominable cultural crisis with uncontrollable increase in crime-corruption-coercion and above all, perceptibly phenomenal rise in military expenditure and power—these are among what characterizes China today. And all this, more so the military might is giving birth to the big-brother attitude in the present Chinese rulers. Acting as nothing but capitalist rulers, the ruling capitalists and their government hanker for assuming the role of a giant economic-military superpower to cow down weaker neighbours and to contain and combat more powerful ones, like India. Doklam incident reflects it nakedly.

Both Indian and Chinese people are gripped by acute crisis of their capitalist states

People of both India and China, thus face their primary task of struggling against their respective exploitative capitalist rule. As in China, exploited people of India are faced with concentration of capital and power in the hands of a few monopolists, terrible discrimination-disparity, abject deprivation of poverty-stricken people, ever increasing unemployment accompanied by large scale eviction of peasants from their land to make room for MNCs, endless stream of suicides of debt-trapped peasants – petty shop-owners, frantic unemployed youth falling victim to organized crimes, mindless horrid atrocities upon women and children, and so on. Lest people get united against this heartless system, the rulers are precipitating all kinds of divisiveness like communalism-

casteism- ethnicity. At the same time, to keep people leashed to their designs, they are trying to whip up national jingoism, to fit in it with their aspiration for emerging as a superpower. For this purpose, livewire of border issues are thus mere tools to them to work with.

Common toiling masses of both India and China thus need to realize that attaining the status of economic-military superpower does not serve any interest of them, the exploited people. The handful ruling monopolists and their subservient agents are among those to earn benefit from it. And it is in their interest, that the rulers keep the border issues alive for creating the hype of war-psychosis to fuel their military industry complex, and whip up national jingoism to divert people's attention from the real cause of their plight, the capitalism. The flexibility that existed during socialism in China have all gone up into the thin air of the present capitalist regime there. It is replaced pathetically by arrogance, muscle-flexing and high-handedness, typical of an aspirant imperialist superpower. Needless to say that the Indian bourgeois rulers have been moving to the same end for long .

Only vigilant people of India and China can save their countries from debacle

So, people of both the countries must see through the game the ruling class is playing. They should judge with reasons incidents like Doklam stand-off. It will then prompt them to stand firm and exert pressure of powerful opinion and movement upon their respective bourgeois governments so that the two capitalist-imperialist powers do not venture further with their imperialist expansionist designs or may end up in lethal military confrontation over disputes. Militaries can bring no solution, so they must be immediately withdrawn. People of the concerned countries need also to recognize that boundary problems, disputes on borders must be resolved once for all through discussions and negotiations in an ambience of patience-calmness and coolness. Even if it may take some time, there is no choice other than this. And for such a just and lasting solution to the border problems, be it between India and China, or Bhutan and China, or others, negotiations must be carried on, on the basis of history and geographic factors along and around the borders, relating those to the

necessities of the reality, namely, administrative, economic, trade and commerce and other activities of the regions. Also to be taken into account are the mutual relationships of the people of the concerned countries around the border including their respective religions, customs, languages and such other features of culture and habits, that normally create deep-rooted sentiments and emotions etc. among other relevant criteria. These days no country can impose its decision

on another. Only a rational, patient and prudent attempt through discussions and negotiations can lead to a solution. It requires vigilant pro-active people of concerned countries to put pressure upon their respective rulers to adopt this line. With respect to the present case of Doklam, urgent need is immediate withdrawal of military. It is also very important for India under bourgeois rulers to desist from interfering into the internal and external affairs of Bhutan under this or that plea.

**LONG LIVE
COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH***Contd from page 1*

Methodology, SW, Vol. IV, p. 393—94; Why SUCI is the Only Genuine Communist Party in India, SW Vol. II, pp.251-52; 'Fascism and Moral Ethical Crisis in Left, Democratic Movement'—SW, Vol. IV p. 457-59, 466)

“...fascism is an all-out counter-revolutionary upsurge. On the one hand, it destroys the process of rational thinking in people, makes them self-centred, makes knowledge, learning and education technology-oriented, that is, it engenders a group of technocrats in the country who have completely abandoned all sorts of human values, who have no sense of responsibility towards people and society, to whom employment and wage slavery are simply everything, and who are ready to do anything and everything in exchange of money – and in this direction they channelize the cultivation of science and learning. On the other hand, fascism fosters all sorts of spiritualism, age-old superstitions, irrational mindset and blindness. Fascism is a peculiar fusion of spiritualism, obscurantism and irrational bent of mind with the technological aspects of science. When this happens in a country the reasoning faculty itself dies out in the country. So, speaking about the state of leftist movement I sounded a note of caution that the leftists who close the door of polemical discussions and resort to the practice of using physical force to increase their strength, get dividend for the time being because of their strength and numerical superiority; they do not allow anybody to express his opinion, do not pay

heed to any reasoning, their cadres themselves lose all inclination for reasoning and destroy the reasoning faculty in others too. Do they know the deadly outcome of this? Though it may sound incredible but the reality is that those who are speaking against fascism, who are talking of communism, of leftism, of struggle and revolution and who are fighting against oppression – they themselves are found 14 to be helping the growth of such an irrational mental make-up through their conduct and activities which, as a consequence, eventually will dig the grave of fascism. Because, when the reasoning faculty dies in the country, then that paves the way for infiltration of reactionary ideas in society. To make man fanatic with the poison of national chauvinism, on the one hand, and, on the other, to foster out-dated traditionalism while raising vague slogans of socialism, revolution and progress ... when the mindset for carrying on mutual discussions on the basis of reason and logic really ceases to exist in society ... if all these three can be combined, then the ground for ascent of fascism is ready in a country. This provides the golden opportunity for fascism to rise.”

“In this situation, the fissiparous groups and religious fundamentalists like the Jana Sangh are waiting in the wings. As soon as whatever attraction the people still have towards left movement evaporates, they would come out in the open.” (*Some Aspects of United Front Politics and Party Work*, SW, Vol. III, p.153 and *Fascism and Moral Ethical Crisis in Left, Democratic Movement*—SW, Vol. IV p. 457-59, 466)

November Revolution Centenary Celebration

Uttar Pradesh

A seminar was organized on 15 July at *Sramik Bhavan* in Allahabad on "Teachings of November Revolution and our tasks". Main speaker was Comrade Arun Singh Bihar State Secretary, SUCI(C), while Comrade Ajoy Bharti presided over. Among others who addressed were Comrades Bechan Ali, veteran member of Uttar Pradesh State Committee, Comrade K. Singh, member, Allahabad District Committee and others. Representatives of CPI and CPI (M) along with many individuals of leftist orientation were present at the seminar.

Jharkhand

As part of centenary celebration of November revolution, a day-long study camp was organized on behalf of Jharkhand State Committee of our Party at Ghatshila on 9 July. The camp was conducted by Comrade Swapam Chatterjee, Uttar Pradesh State Committee member, while Comrade Rabin Samajpati, Jharkhand State Secretary, presided over. The topics for discussion at the camp included "All-round development of Russia under socialism, debacle of socialism, its causes and teachings before us".

Haryana

Programmes were organized at Rewari and Jhajjar, Haryana to celebrate Centenary of Great November Revolution. A mass meeting was held at Jhajjar on 18 July.

Protest Demonstration in Gwalior

A five-day long programme was organized by the SUCI(C), Gwalior District Committee against spread of liquor shops all around the state, privatization of electricity and water, closure of not less than 1 lakh 8 thousand government-run schools and GST. The programme included taking out a five-day "jatha for consciousness". Those who addressed inaugural programme included Rajendra Lahadia, eminent litterateur, Comrade Rachna Agarwal, AIMSS MP State Secretary and others. The programme coincided with observance of the birth anniversary of Chandrasekhar Azad, the great martyr of the revolutionary trend of freedom movement

SUCI(C) vehemently protests withdrawal of subsidy from cooking gas by the BJP-led central government

Comrade Provash Ghosh, General Secretary, SUCI(C), issued the following statement on 31 July, 2017:

Today the central government has directed to all oil companies that within 18 March, 2018 subsidies on cooking gas will be withdrawn. It is a highly anti-people decision. This once again exposes how the BJP government is brazenly serving the class interest of the

ruling capitalists by sucking out the last drop of blood of the toiling masses.

We vehemently condemn this out and out anti-people policy of the central government and demand immediate annulment of this decision of withdrawal of subsidy on cooking gas.

We appeal to the people of the country to come out and force the government to rescind the decision.

SUCI(C) holds Central minister's declaration of partial re-introduction of pass-fail system as misleading

Comrade Provash Ghosh, General Secretary, SUCI(C), issued the following statement on 23 July, 2017:

It is known to all that abolition of pass-fail system from primary to class VIII by Congress and BJP governments at the Centre and by the governments of CPI(M), TMC, and other parties in the states caused immense harm to the millions of students of the country. This sinister policy has practically created two classes of students — the children of the rich who can afford English medium private schools and the children belonging to the middle-class and poor families who study in ordinary government schools where teaching is seriously compromised.

Naturally, our Party along with students, teachers, educationists and guardians have been launching

protest movements for long demanding reintroduction of the pass-fail system from class-I. Recently our West Bengal State Committee called a general strike on 17th July on this demand which got tremendous mass support. Facing mounting public discontent, the West Bengal government was compelled to write to the Central Government for permission to reintroduce pass-fail system from Class I level.

But we are astonished to learn that, after having caused such severe damage to the education system, the Central Government is going to introduce examinations only in Class V and Class VIII, just to deceive the people.

We condemn this anti-education policy of the Central Government and will continue and intensify our movements until the demands are fully met.

SUCI(C) vehemently protests withdrawal of subsidy from kerosene and sugar by the BJP-led central government

Comrade Provash Ghosh, General Secretary, SUCI(C), issued the following statement on 15 July, 2017 :

As part of its relentless pursuit of highly anti-people policy, the BJP-led central government has now, after slashing quota and withdrawal of Kerosene available to BPL category of people under various schemes except *Anthoday Yojana*, has announced similar reduction of quota and withdrawal of subsidy in respect of sugar. Consequent to this, prices of both these essential items would go up substantially hitting hard the poorer section of the toiling masses bleeding white day in day out by spike in prices of all items of daily need. On the other hand, this very central

government, in the name of growth and development, is liberally granting tax waivers, tax concessions, financial aids and bail-out packages to as well as condoning huge loan defaults of the big industrial houses, larges corporates and giant monopolists. This once again exposes how the BJP government is brazenly serving the class interest of the ruling capitalist class by squeezing out the last drop of blood of the toiling masses.

We vehemently condemn this out and out anti-poor policy of the central government and demand immediate abandonment of these decisions of subsidy withdrawal and quota reduction in respect of both sugar and kerosene.

SUCI(C) indicts the government for callous attitude in tracing and rescuing 39 Indian labourers reportedly abducted by ISIS in Iraq

Comrade Provash Ghosh, General Secretary, SUCI(C), issued the following statement on 25 July, 2017 :

It is highly despicable that the Indian government is showing most callous and casual attitude in tracing and rescuing 39 Indians who were engaged as immigrant labourers at a hospital construction site in Mosul city in Iraq and reportedly abducted by the ISIS way back in 2014. Except issuing press statement of "serious and sincere engagement" for locating the missing Indians seemingly to play to the gallery, no effective step has been taken so far in this regard.

Had any VIP or important personality been taken hostage, there would have been a flurry of activities including exploring all diplomatic channels and tapping all available resources. But for these poor Indians who, in absence of any job in the country, had to migrate to a foreign land to eke out a bare living leaving their families behind, the government feels no serious concern, nor does any other bourgeois petty-bourgeois parties.

We demand of the government to rise from the slumber and take immediate steps to locate the missing Indians and bring them back to the country.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : PROVASH GHOSH