

ANALYSIS OF SPLIT IN CONGRESS—A GLARING TESTIMONY OF BANKRUPTCY OF CPI & CPI(M)

The split in Congress, the ruling party of the Indian bourgeoisie, which so long served the interest of the national bourgeoisie and consolidated its rule over the toiling masses, is a significant event in the Indian political scene. There is no doubt that the broad section of the toiling people would watch with great eagerness this event of split in the Congress party, specially because, the Congress had hitherto suppressed the democratic movements and gagged the democratic voice of the people. People had a bitter taste of Congress misrule for more than two decades. As a result of Congress regime, the economic position of the labouring masses has further deteriorated, the problem of unemployment among the rural and urban population has further deepened, illiteracy, social insecurity and other basic problems of life of the common people are far from being resolved. Contrary to this, there is another picture where there has been further concentration of economic and political power in the hands of the ruling capitalist class, democratic rights of the people have been more ruthlessly curtailed, bureaucratic administration and militarism are increasingly being depended upon and have become the mainstay of the present reactionary ruling clique.

In the background of such records of Congress which all through since independence acted against the interests of the broad section of the masses, it is natural that the split in Congress which means the split in the most dependable political party of the ruling bourgeoisie is all the more welcome to the people. Congress itself has been divided into two groups, namely, the Congress (O) and the Congress (R). The ruling Congress which controls the Central Government headed by Mrs. Indira Gandhi has outwardly taken a radical posture and is raising a storm to defeat the reactionary policies of the Syndicate group. Its measure of nationalisation of 14 major Indian banks is a pointer in this direction. No doubt the progressive pledges of Mrs. Indira and some such measures as bank nationalisation have created a lot of confusion (thanks to the ideological struggle of the so-

called big communist parties) not only in the common mass mind but also in the minds of those who belong to the left camp. Leaving aside those who keep themselves aloof from political cross-currents, even those who are 'progressives' and call themselves as 'Communists' have been easily roped in by Indira's progressive plumage. Both CPI and CPI(M) have unequivocally extended their support to Indira (although the two parties have some difference in their revolutionary vocabulary) for her so-called progressive move and even regard the fight her party is waging against the Syndicate group as a fight between reaction and progress. The political thesis of CPI and its various resolutions leave little confusion in the minds of the pro-communist political cadres that it is building up a close alliance with the democratic section of Congress, now

(Continued to page 4)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Editor-in Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 4
No. 1

AUGUST 15, 1970
SATURDAY

PRICE
20 P.

15th AUGUST

PEOPLES' LIBERATION PLEDGE DAY

On 15th August 1947 political power was transferred by the British imperialists to the leaders of the Indian National Congress. This event signifies the political independence of our country in spite of the fact that the broader masses of the Indian people have not achieved the objective for which they struggled against the British imperialists. Broader masses of the Indian people fought for the complete emancipation from the yoke of all sorts of exploitation—political, economic, social and cultural and for their unhindered development in all spheres of life. In spite of political independence, this aspiration of the people has not been fulfilled. On the contrary the present Indian state has appeared as a great stumbling block for realising the same in their life. As such, in spite of political independence, peoples' liberation is yet to be achieved and this is why SUCI has been observing 15th of August as peoples' liberation pledge day.

No body can deny that our society is class divided. The existence of the exploiter and the exploited class (broadly speaking) is an objective reality. All the working people of India, the manual labour and the intellectual labour belong to a definite category, i.e. all of them are nothing but wage earners and they have no other alternative but to sell their labour power and thereby earn their livelihood. The means of production through which this wealth is being created is not in their possession also. They only sell their labour power which is utilised for the creation of wealth. On the

other hand there exists another class which owns all the means of production. Through the exploitation of the labour power of the working class the propertied class accumulates profit. In the cities there are the owners of the factories and the workers and employees and in the villages there are the Jotedars and the poor, the landless peasantry and agricultural labourers. Indian society is thus divided, in the main, into two opposite camps. In this class divided society the connotation of independence is different, to the exploiter and the exploited class. There can not be any common

(Continued to page 2)

Reformist Oppositional Role of Indian Bourgeoisie in Nationalist Movement

(Continued from page 1)

meaning of independence both to the exploiter and the exploiting class. To the exploiter class, independence means the freedom to plunder the resources of the country, ruthlessly exploiting the labouring people and to earn maximum profit and to the exploited class it means their emancipation from the yoke of all sorts of exploitation.

In the Indian independence movement both the national bourgeoisie and the exploited masses participated. Though these opposite classes came to a common anti-British platform their objective was diametrically different. The exploited masses struggled against the British rulers as they came to realise that unless the exploiting British rulers are driven out, they would not be able to establish a society in which the exploitation of the capitalists and the feudal lords would end and the foundation of all out development of the society would be laid. On the other hand the national bourgeoisie participated in the nationalist movement with a view to replace the British rulers to exploit the national market with cheap raw materials and labour, for freest, widest and speediest development of capitalism. Due to the failure of the emergence of a genuine revolutionary working class party the leadership of the nationalist movement was captured by the national bourgeoisie. At that time those who professed to be communists did not only fail to provide leadership to the nationalist movement but on the country, backstabbed it, thus lowering the nobility of communism in the eye of the Indian people. In the present epoch of imperialism

and proletarian revolution, bourgeoisie have lost all their revolutionary fervour and turned counter-revolutionary as a world social force. Besides, unlike in Western countries where capitalism grew and developed independently, capitalism in India grew and developed under the subjugation of foreign finance capital encircled by feudal relations. Moreover the impact of soviet revolution on the Indian people was tremendous. As a result the Indian bourgeoisie who were in the leadership of the nationalist movement were mortally afraid of revolution, as they were quite conscious that in a revolutionary upsurge not only the British rulers but the Indian exploiter class as a whole will also be overthrown. It was because of this fear complex of revolution, Indian bourgeoisie played reformist oppositional role. They compromised with imperialism and feudalism. With a view to capture power from the British imperialists Indian bourgeoisie waged struggle against them along with the Indian people but the moment this struggle took the turn towards a revolutionary upsurge this leadership intervened to check it and tried to get concessions from the imperialists through pressure. On the other hand as a result of compromise with feudalism the Indian bourgeoisie did not carry out the tasks of social and cultural revolution, essential for democratising the Indian society. Thus Indian people speaking different languages and professing different religions, in the course of conducting political movement have become a nation politically but for the failure of the Indian bourgeoisie to wage uncompromising struggle against feudal culture, feudal disunity etc. during the

nationalist movement, the task of democratising the Indian society is still unaccomplished. As a result, Indian people though politically a nation are disunited by religion, language, caste etc. Though it may sound curious, still it is a fact that those who professed themselves as Communists never incorporated these tasks of social and cultural revolution in their programme of democratic movement. But it is known that these unaccomplished tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution can never be fulfilled by the national bourgeoisie in the present epoch of decadent imperialism and proletarian revolution and it is the working class who must uphold this banner for completing these unfinished tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution. But the role of CPI as well as of CPI(M) exposes their callous indifference to these essential tasks of completing the social and cultural revolution. They are claiming that their sphere of influence is expanding but side by side it is found that the spread of degenerated culture, increase of religious ceremonies and the features like aimless desperateness, purposeless violence and the like of the rotten bourgeois culture are engulfing our whole social life. "Kali Mai Ki Jai" and "Inquilab Zindabad" can peacefully co-exist without any prick of conscience to the cadres of these left parties. With the increase in sphere of influence as is being claimed by CPI and CPI(M), is it not expected that the impact of newer revolutionary proletarian culture will be gradually felt in the society? But what is found is that the rotten degenerated bourgeois culture, the culture of the bourgeoisie in the era imperialism is rapidly gaining ground. This only proves the

utter bankruptcy of these left parties.

After the transfer of power, Indian bourgeoisie has been trying to consolidate their position through capitalist planning. Even at that time when Government of India was embarking on planning with the blessings of all the parties including the undivided CPI, SUC cautioned that these plannings were meant for the consolidation of Indian capitalism. Moreover our beloved leader and teacher, Com. Shibdas Ghose said at that time that these plannings were associated with a shadow of crisis. Due to crisis in international capitalist market in one hand and the growing pressure of unemployment within the country on the other, the national bourgeoisie are not in a position to introduce radical agrarian land reform. It is because of this, the purchasing power of the people is abnormally low and this is why the major problem of capitalism is to maintain the stability of capitalist economy. This stability can not be maintained without artificial stimulation. The ruling class, as such, has raised a hue and cry over national security in order to provide a ruse for increasing defence expenditure which will provide stimulation to the capitalist economy. Though the majority of the Indian people are half-fed, ill-clad and undernourished, a colossal amount of money has got to be diverted in defence to maintain the super profit of the capitalist class and at the same time to increase the military power to crush the revolutionary movement. In order to crush the consequent resentment of the people against this ruthless exploitation, the ruling class is relying more on bureaucracy and militarism and one by one

(Continued to page 6)

Help SUC in every possible way to achieve peoples' liberation

(Continued from page 2)

encroaching upon even the relative and limited democratic rights enjoyed by the people.

For the emancipation from the yoke of exploitation, the exploited masses must be freed from Parliamentary illusion. It has got to be realised that peoples' liberation cannot be achieved through reforms in Parliament. Parliament as an institution has been evolved in a bourgeois state to serve the interest of the capitalist class. So it will be futile to expect that the capitalist society can be radically transformed through reforms in Parliament which has evolved as a superstructure of the given capitalist economic base. It is to be borne in mind that the bourgeoisie also carry out reforms which are in conformity with their class interest. As such reforms which breed reformism will help the bourgeoisie to prolong their misrule by creating confusion in the mind of the people. Parliament, can, however, be used by the revolutionaries to unmask the hollowness of the dictum of the reformists. But for liberation of the people the present bourgeois state machine has got to be smashed through revolution and as the bourgeoisie is armed to the teeth to crush the revolutionary upsurge of the working class for the establishment of socialism, this revolution can not but be violent.

Now without a genuine working class party, there can't be any revolution, nor can there be emancipation of the people. The existence of so many parties professing to be Marxist-Leninist creates confusion. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that there can not be more than one real revolutionary working class party in a country. As such most of the parties professing Marxism-Leninism are in

reality forces of compromise between capital and labour. Since inception SUCI has been maintaining that the undivided CPI was a non-working class party as the process of formation of the party with the existence of various groups within the party was incompatible with a working class party. The present CPI and CPI(M) also suffer from the same defects. Their non-working class outlook in all their approaches and particularly in determining the stage of Indian revolution through concrete analysis of the present Indian society only reflects the utter petty bourgeois character of these parties. Notwithstanding revolutionary vocabulary and more militant postures than the CPI, CPM

In the issue dated July 15, last Com. Shiv Shankar of Basulpur in Muzaffarpur district of Bihar was reported to have been arrested by Bihar police. He has not been arrested. A warrant of arrest has, however, been issued. The error is regretted. (Ed.—P.E.)

has also been exposed as a typical parliamentary party. The use of administration and police for sectarian petty party interest, increasing police budget, certifying the police force as people's police, dependence on bureaucracy and police report by the CPM ministers in the last UF ministry in West Bengal, certificates by the Birlas, the general manager of Hindusthan Steel Ltd. and Mr. Dhavan to CPM are some of the instances which conclusively prove the utter non-working class character of CPI(M). Moreover in the present stage of democratic movement in India where the reactionary forces are sweeping, a really revolutionary party must strive for a broad based unity of the left

and democratic forces. But the recent happening in West Bengal clearly shows that CPM strikes at the very root of democratic unity to serve their narrow partisan end. These are only a few instances to show the non-working class character of CPM notwithstanding their revolutionary phrasemongering.

As regards the Naxalites this is to be pointed out that these youngmen are wasting their revolutionary zeal in a misguided way. Moreover the Naxalites have also inherited all the defects including groupism from their parent body. Their non-working class outlook in determining the stage of revolution, the focal point in any revolution and their left adventurism only show that that they are also pseudo-revolutionary. Hence arises the necessity of a genuine working class party which can concretise Marxism-Leninism on Indian soil to lead the Indian people to revolution and socialism. It is to be borne in mind that without concretisation of Marxism-Leninism on Indian soil, Indian revolution is impossible. In Russian soil Com. Lenin concretised Marxism and in China it has been done by Com. Mao-Tsetung. As such the struggle for this concretisation of Marxism-Leninism is very vital. SUCI is the only party that is correctly striving for the same and the analysis of SUCI, headed by its leader and teacher Com. Shibdas Ghosh on various national and international issues have been proved to be correct. The correct stand of SUCI on various issues and its able leadership to the working class have made deep imprints in the minds of the leftist masses. But yet organisationally, SUCI is not in a position to lead the people to socialism. As such

Letter to the Editor

Sir,

In Frontier issue dated July 4, 1970, in the article entitled 'Between the Lines' by N. K. Singh some facts relating to Sino-Indian border dispute have been mentioned. The writer of the article contends that these facts have been obtained in course of a conversation which he had with Pandit Sundarlal, the noted Gandhian philosopher. I am quoting below some relevant portions of this article.

"The Sino-Indian boundary runs along 2600 miles. At some places Indian and Chinese maps show differences thus creating about 50,000 square miles of disputed area. It should be noted that the Chinese maps were prepared by the Americans during the Chiang Kai-Shek regime while those of India were done by the British imperialists at a time when both Americans and British were competing in the power race taking Asia as their happy hunting ground. It is natural that both prepared their maps in line with the old imperialist expansionist policy. Out of these 50,000 square miles of disputed area, 12,000 was under Chinese occupation, 20,000 sq. miles was no-man's land and the remaining 18,000 square miles was under Indian occupation.

"The Chinese Premier Chou En-lai proposed to meet Mr. Nehru in India and decide the matter. The meeting took place at Delhi in 1960. Though the talks lasted six days, Mr. Chou En-lai declared on the very third day that there was a jungle of claims and counter-claims and the matter could

(Continued to page 7)

people must come forward to help and strengthen SUCI, the only real working class party of India, for achieving the complete liberation of the Indian people, from all sorts of exploitation—economic, political, social and cultural.