

HAIL! Reunification Of Vietnam!

People all over the world rejoice at the happy news of the agreement reached between the representatives of the North and the South Vietnam for the reunification of their Fatherland. Vietnam had been artificially divided into two parts through imperialist machination and all the previous attempts to reunify Vietnam were thwarted by the imperialists. The people of Vietnam fought with grim determination against the US imperialists and its puppet clique for liberation, reunification of their fatherland and for socialism. The history of the liberation struggle of Vietnam, in which the Vietnamese people attained total victory by giving defeat to the US imperialists and its puppets and created new history in the annals of the freedom struggles of the world, is now a source of inspiration to the toiling and oppressed people all over the world. Through the defeat of the US imperialists, the last hurdle to accomplish the cherished dream of the Vietnamese people for reunification of their fatherland has been removed and now practical arrangements for reunification of two Vietnams have been successfully worked out by the representatives of the North and of the South Vietnam. Thus the long-cherished dream of the Vietnamese people for which they paid dearly in blood is going to be fulfilled. On this happy occasion we, on behalf of the toiling people of India convey our revolutionary greetings to the people of Vietnam and wish them well in their future programmes of socialist reconstruction.

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 9
No. 7

1st DECEMBER '75
MONDAY

PRICE 25 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

UTUC (Lenin Sarani) Holds Successful Convention of Workers and Employees in Protest Against State Wide Retrenchment, Closure, Lay-off, Lock-Out, Bonus-cut etc.

In protest against state wide retrenchment, closure, lay-off, lock-out, bonus cut, premature forced retirement etc., a convention of workers and employees of the state was held on 17th November, 1975, at the University

Institute Hall, Calcutta. More than two thousand delegates from different industries and establishments in Calcutta and neighbouring districts attended the convention.

The convention expressed deep sense of concern

over the industrial situation of the state, mass-scale retrenchment, lock-out, closure, forced retirement, lowering of the retirement age, cut in bonus quantum and/or its total abolition and such other anti-labour policies and practices have



A section of the delegates at the Convention of University Institute on 17th November '75.

Above: Com. Pradip Mukherjee (Left), Fatik Ghosh (Centre) and Suresh DasGupta (right) on the microphone.

been set in motion in industries and establishments. The management are taking unilateral decisions to bring about onslaughts, taking advantage of the situation, while trade union rights and activities have been completely suspended.

Comrade Fatik Ghosh, General Secretary, West Bengal State Committee UTUC (Lenin Sarani) and a renowned leader of the working class in the course of his address said in support of the resolution that the convention was being held at a time when not only were the workers and employees throughout

Problem of Agrarian Economy and the way to Resolve it

Any one, whatever political opinion he may hold cannot but agree that the people in our country are being confronted with the basic problems of their lives. The condition of the people of our country at once becomes evident when one notes with deep concern that "...particularly during the last 25 years nearly half of our 50 million people have been below what is called the "poverty line" without sufficient food to eat. ... Another 40 percent are desperately poor, lacking other essentials like clothing, education, medical care and shelter". (Blitz, Independent Day special, Aug. 16, 1975).

In such a general condition of the working people prevailing all over the country, the condition of our rural working people engaged in rural economy, in particular is most distressing. This deserves special mentioning in a country where out of the total population of 550 millions 438 millions living in villages (79.6% of the total population of the country), at least seventy percent people comprising the agricultural labourers, landless and poor peasants along with their family members living below the poverty line, have had to starve throughout the entire period of the year.

So it is quite evident that our rural working people, like their counterpart of the urban and semi-urban areas are facing with the basic problem of securing the minimum requirements of livelihood that one must have to procure to maintain one's body and soul together. And in the case of the rural working people—be they poor and landless peasants or the agricultural labourers, this is to be had either by cultivating land or by earning the necessary wage through suitable employments and jobs throughout the entire period of the year.

But a question that often haunts our people is, how can this be achieved? Various solutions of this basic problem have been suggested by or are still being proposed from various quarters. Now, before entering into a comparative analysis of these various programmes, one should note that any search for the right solution of the problem, at the very outset demands a critical and thorough examination of the pertinent features of the agrarian economy of the country.

Let us try to concentrate our mind in that direction, first.

One of the basic and most important feature of the agricultural economy is that here too, like the agrarian economy of any country with capitalist relationship established in agriculture, with the growing concentration of land in the hands of the rural bourgeoisie, who in our country are commonly known as the 'Jotedars', the middle peasants and poor peasants are gradually becoming more and more transformed into landless peasants or agricultural labourers. Even a cursory glance to the statistical data will reveal the present picture of the relative concentration of land in the hands of the different strata of the rural people in our country.

"Top 1 percent rural households owned 16 percent of the land. Top 5% rural households owned 40 percent of the land. Top 10 percent rural households owned 56 percent of the land. Lower 50 percent rural households owned 4 percent of the land." (BLITZ, Republic Day special, Jan. 25, 1975)

Moreover, a little detailed and critical survey will help to reveal the dismal state that actually prevails in this lower 50% rural households that own

4% of the land, regarding their actual possession of land.

In 1960-61, according to the National Sample Survey (Main Stream, June 7, 1975) 12.98 percent of these households possess no land at all. In addition to this data supplied by the National Sample Survey one should not miss to note that "nearly 36 percent of the rural households did not cultivate any land or less than half an acre each. Households cultivating no land or less than 2.5 acres each constituted 57.59 percent of the rural households..." (V. V. Dandekar and N. Rath "Poverty in India-II: Policies and Programmes", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. VI, No. 2, June 9, 1971).

But such a dismal and deplorable state, as it stands now has not emerged in a single day.

Those who are well acquainted with teachings of Lenin as concretised by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, a well known Marxist thinker of the present era, our beloved leader and teacher, know that among the different features that the penetration of capitalism in agriculture reveals, two important features are:—

i). There is more and more increased concentration of large holdings, legal and illegal, in the hands of a few i.e. the rural bourgeoisie or the jotedar and ii). there is a gradual increase of the number of landless labourers, when more and more cultivators belonging to the sections of the lower middle and poor peasants by gradually losing the land they possess, become transformed into the landless agricultural labourers.

A clear picture of the increase of landless labour may be had from the following figures, which show an increase of landless labour households, at the cost of the simultaneous decrease of labour households who possess land.

Percentage of Agricultural Labour Households (All India)

	1950-51.	1956-57.	1963-64.
With Land.	49.93	42.87	38.83
Without Land.	50.7	57.13	61.17
Total.	100.00	100.00	100.00

[Source: Agricultural Labour in India (Labour Bureau, Department of Labour and Employment, Govt. of India), 1968, Table 2.12]

The comparative figures of 1961 pitted against that of 1971, has also revealed that "the number of cultivators has declined from 52.8 percent in 1961 to 43.4 percent in 1971, while there has been a sharp increase in the number of agricultural workers from 16.7 percent in 1961 to 26.3 percent in 1971. The biggest increases have been in Bihar (from 23 percent to 38 percent), Andhra Pradesh (from 28.6 to 38 percent), Tamil Nadu (from 18.3 percent to 30.4 percent) and West Bengal (from 15.3 percent to 26.6 percent)" (Mainstream, June 7, 1975)

Now in such a situation the distressed condition of the 70% of our rural population is glaringly clear to every one and perhaps no statistical data is required to reveal the state of affairs existing in rural area centring round the lives of the agricultural labourers, the landless and poor peasants constituting the major fraction of our rural people.

It is a lesson of history that agricultural productivity is inseparably linked up with the issue of implementation of radical land reform measures including modernisation and mechanisation of agriculture. And non-implementation of radical land reform measures including modernisation and mechanisation of agriculture in any country is bound to result in low agricultural productivity.

Now, in those countries, where the bourgeoisie has come to power in the present era when internationally capitalism has already become crisis ridden and moribund in nature, radical measures including modernisation and mechanisation of agriculture can not be

undertaken by the ruling bourgeoisie in agrarian economy. Because the bourgeoisie knows it well that under the prevailing conditions, if radical reform measures including modernisation and mechanisation of agriculture are implemented then this at one stroke will force millions of rural population surplus and make them unemployed. And in the existing third general phase of worldwide crisis of capitalism, no capitalist state which with its staggering industrial economy facing recession one after another has to maintain its production level below installed capacity, can withstand the pressure of such a huge army of unemployed. So, in these countries the bourgeoisie being mortally afraid of undertaking the task of radical reform measures in land has refused to modernise and mechanise the agriculture and this as its concomitant effect has resulted in low agricultural productivity which on its part has on the one hand seriously hampered the production of food and other agricultural produce and on the other sharply minimised the job opportunities of the rural workers in these countries.

In these countries, within their existing capitalist setup, this state of low agricultural productivity only helps the bourgeoisie, who with a view to realising their class interest, adopt all the tricks and measures to reap maximum benefit out of the existing situation. With a low agricultural productivity and high concentration of lands in their hands they can successfully create a vast sea of unemployed ill fed, ill clad, poverty tricken land-

Contd. to Page 3)

Growing concentration of land in the hands of jotedars create

(Contd. from Page 2)

less agricultural workers, forcing them to sell their labour at a very unthinkably low price. This state of affair in the agrarian field is quite in conformity with the attempt of the bourgeoisie, in general, to keep an army of the unemployed, so that labour may be available in the market at considerably low prices.

Now in regard to the agricultural productivity our country stands at the lowest level of the scale. (Blitz, Independent Day Special, Aug. 16, 1975). So, the plight of the agricultural labourers in such a country is within any body's guess—"the total annual income of an agricultural household in 1956-57 was observed to be Rs. 437 as against Rs. 447 in 1950-1951 or a per day per capita income of 27 paise in 1956-57 against 28 paise in 1950-51". (The Economic Times, August 7, 1975) And "the per capita per day income of a rural labourer in 1963-64 was as low as 42 paise".

(Mainstream, June 7, 1975)

... ..
... ..
... ..

The figures shown represent the average income of the labourers taking into account the incomes of the labourers of all the different states. And in certain parts of the country, in certain states the situation is far more pitiable. In West Bengal "The average annual income of an agricultural worker revealed in the 1972 survey..... works out 37 paise per day. The Survey in 1973 revealed that the..... per capita daily income was only 33 paise." (Ibid)... In the country the labourers do not have full fledged employment through out the whole year. Whereas, on an average the workers get employment only for 200 days in a year, in some parts of the country as for example in West Bengal ... they at best are provided with jobs for only 3 months of the whole year. This glaringly reveal the... worsening condition of the unemployed and under

more and more agricultural workers

employed... rural labourer of our country....

The plight of the poor peasants, the share croppers and to a great extent of the lower middle peasants is in no way better even if not worse. In a country with very low agricultural productivity, the distressed condition of the poor and lower middle peasants who possess land to a maximum of 2.5 acres is easily understandable. Not to speak of producing any surplus, even they can not produce their own necessities throughout the entire year. A survey has shown that the farmers holding 0 to 5 acres of land have often to incur losses in crop production. An actual survey report revealed that in Punjab, the farmers with 0 to 5 acres of land in average had to suffer loss of Rs. 39.33 per acre. [The figure represents an average of food production during 1953-54 and 1956-57.] This situation is bound to create huge and heavy rural indebtedness among these sections of the producers and according to a report 54 percent of the rural households (where 57.79 percent of the rural households cover the agricultural workers, the poor, lower middle peasants with holding upto 2.5 acres of land) are heavily indebted. As an inevitable outcome, these people are forced to sell their lands which thereby become more and more concentrated in the hands of the jotedars. So, the small farmers find it increasingly difficult to stay in farming and after selling their lands try to supplement their income through other occupations. In this way, they ultimately swell the ranks of the landless agricultural workers.

The fate of the sharecroppers is also no better. The rents paid by them amount in many cases to half of the produce. This means that they are left with too meagre a fraction of the produce to maintain themselves. Again they have no security at all. More often

they are being evicted at the sweet will of the jotedars. They are prevented from remaining on land for a length of time, as because this may create ground for them to claim tenancy rights. In certain parts of the country, as for example in West Bengal, these poor sharecroppers play a very important role in cultivation but in return they are to remain satisfied with an insecure livelihood.... In course of time, they too are gradually becoming transformed into agricultural labourers.

Moreover the impoverished and unemployed agricultural workers and also those lower middle peasants, poor peasants and the share croppers who are becoming gradually transformed into agricultural labourers have had to migrate from one place to the other, for employment or any kind of occupation, in their frantic bid for maintaining their livelihood.

Side by side with this picture there is an altogether different picture in the same agrarian field of our country. More and more the rural bourgeoisie, the jotedars who possess 56% of the land like the vampire smug are fattening their bellies at the cost of the agricultural labourers, poor and lower middle peasants and the share-croppers. Bulk of the agricultural income of the country is pocketed by them. They corner the benefits of any kind of public investment on land and adopt all possible means to evade taxes.

And as an inevitable outcome, like their counter part in the urban area, the rural people are becoming more and more engulfed in abject poverty. Report says that "In 1960-61, 38.03 percent of all rural households (consisting mainly of agricultural labourers and cultivators of small holdings) lived below the extreme poverty line, based upon a very conservative estimate of a minimum of Rs. 15 per

capita per month in consumption expenditure (on 1960-61 prices). The percentage rose to 44.57 in 1964-65 and to 53.02 in 1967-68. In other words, more than fifty percent of the rural population was barely managing to survive in 1967-68".

(Frontier, May 27, 1972)

In another estimate, on the basis of consumption expenditure of Rs. 15.18 (1960-61 prices). "Ojha has estimated that 184.2 million persons in the rural areas (51.82 percent of total population)... lived below poverty line... For 1967-68... Taking Rs. 40/- as the level of consumption expenditure per capita per month it is estimated that 289 million persons (70% of the rural population) lived below poverty line. Ojha therefore, concludes: Compared in 1960-61, the nutritional deficiency in rural area widened considerably in 1967-68. As compared to only 52 percent of the rural population in 1960-61, 70 percent of the population in 1967-68 was found to be below the poverty line". (The Economic Times Nov. 12, 1974).

One can easily understand the root cause underlying this abject impoverishment of the masses particularly the rural masses if he can remember what Lenin once observed: "the impoverishment of the masses of the people (that indispensable point in all the Narodnik arguments about the market) not only does not hinder the development of capitalism, but, on the contrary, is the expression of that development, is a condition of capitalism strengthen it. Capitalism needs the "free labourer" and impoverishment consists of in the petty producers being converted into wage workers. The impoverishment of the masses is accompanied by the enrichment of few exploiters; the ruin and decline of small establishment is accompanied by the strengthening and development of bigger ones; both

processes facilitate the growth of the market; the "impoverished" peasants who formerly lived by his own farming now lives by "earnings" i. e. by the sale of his labour power; he now has to purchase essential articles of consumption (although in a smaller quantity and of inferior quality). On the other hand, the means of production from which this peasant is freed are concentrated in the hands of a minority, are converted into capital and the product now appears on the market". (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works Vol. I, Moscow, 1963. pp. 102-103)

Now the question that we have raised earlier and the question that seriously haunts any sensible man, is, how can the rural people comprising the poor, lower middle peasants, landless peasants and agricultural workers who constitute the 80% of the population of the whole country be freed from their existing distressed condition? In this respect different programmes are being suggested from different quarters. And astonishingly enough the programmes suggested by some big parties claiming communists, except in their differences in terminology and style of expressions, are more or less identical with those suggested by the bourgeois political forces, who aim at consolidating capitalism for the realisation of the class objectives and class interests of the capitalist class.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, a well known Marxist thinker of the era, our beloved leader and teacher has given a thorough exposure to all these so-called programmes of 'agrarian reform' or 'agrarian revolution' as termed by many which are aiming at keeping our agrarian economy arrested or confined in the main, in small peasant economy. Comrade Ghosh has expressed: This main and sole programme of agrarian reform, be it agrarian revolution in

(Contd. to Page 4)

Abject poverty of the masses signify intensive capitalist exploitation

(Cont. from Page 3)

one's terminology, is the distribution of land to the agricultural labourers and landless and poor peasants. And some one, has gone a step further in raising demand for fair wages for agricultural labourers. But all of them in tune with the ruling bourgeois class are against modernisation and mechanisation of our agriculture—some of them openly preaching and advocating Japanese way of cultivation, either without knowing its implication in the present day backward capitalist economic system or deliberately committing this sin in the interest of protecting this reactionary and moribund capitalist system as long as possible. The very same thing is found in the programme of a section of the bourgeoisie although used in a different term—“Laghu Uddyog”. These people in utter disregard to the law of development of production are advocating in favour of giving more stress on small enterprises.....the ruling bourgeoisie has also discarded the idea of introduction of tractors and machines on a large scale and in the name of helping the small and middle peasants, is actually keeping and maintaining our small peasant economy as long as possible with the sole purpose of arresting the maximum number of rural population in a half-fed and half-clad condition in the land economy. While exposing the real nature and the objective of the agrarian programme of the CPI and the CPI(M), Com. Ghosh said: The main tasks outlined in the programmes of both the CPI and the CPI(M) for agrarian reform, or ‘agrarian revolution’ as they are very much fond of using the term, are the confiscation of surplus land by enactment or seizure of land as the case may be, of the big land owners and distribute the same to the poor and landless peasants and agricultural labourers and fixation of fair wages for the agricultural labourers.....They are also like the ruling bourgeoisie

opposed to the introduction of machines and tractors in our agriculture. Indeed the CPI(M) in their programme have declared that they will oppose any move for introduction of machines and tractors in our agriculture. Comrade Ghosh has further expressed that these programme of the so-called leftist are in no way basically different from the programmes of Bhudan movement which also aims at distributing land after recovering them from the big land owners through persuasion, among the poor and landless peasants. When the increase of the ratio of the people engaged in industry and in agriculture marks the advance development of any country, all these people are trying to keep the majority of the people engaged in agriculture but at the same time talking of development and advancement of the country!

All should agree that the distribution of benami lands to the landless and poor peasants is an indispensable task of democratic peasant movement, which has still remained unfulfilled. Now while giving due recognition to the programme of distribution of land to the poor and landless peasants which remains an important task of the democratic movement of the peasants, Com. Ghosh has raised a most pertinent question—can the agrarian problem of our country be solved only by distributing land amongst them? The total land he said, that may be available for distribution after acquiring all the benami lands and further by lowering of the ceiling, along with the total cultivable waste, cannot even cover the fifty percent of the rural population if we are to distribute land on the basis of “economic holding”. A simple glance to the statistical data will glaringly reveal that the observations made by Com. Ghosh is true to each and every word of it.

In one estimate, if barren and uncultivable waste are transformed into cultivable lands through land conservation, this

along with the land that may be available through lowering of ceiling and acquiring of benami lands will amount to 85 million acres, i.e., 25.7% of the present cultivable land (data taken from V. V. Giri's land colonisation programme referred to in the Economic Times Nov. 13, 1975). If 5 acre is considered to be what may be termed as ‘economic holding’ then this land may be distributed among 16.89 million peasant households out of the existing 65 million agricultural households having very meagre or no land at all. (In Giri's programme, the proposed allotment of land per household is 15 acre; if this be the actual quota, then the above mentioned land may be distributed among 5.63 million households only).

The fact is also clear from the following observation: “There is no sufficient land to provide family-size holding to all small holders, tenants and landless workers. There are 13.3 million share croppers and 47.3 million landless workers. In 1967, the size of the 39% of holdings forming 7% of the cultivable area was found to be less than a hectare. If a low ceiling is imposed the land acquired will be sufficient to give minimal holding either to the small farmers (number of such household with 5 to 2.5 acre of land is nearly 40 million—author) or to the landless, but not to the both. (‘Scope of land reform,’ B. M. Bhatia, Statesman, Sept. 5, 1975)

Moreover, in this connection it should also be noted that the population in the country is constantly increasing while the total acreage of land in a country can not increase—it remains constant and there is also a limit of the productivity of land at a particular time. So even if a quantum of land adequate enough to maintain a peasant household, which may be termed ‘economic holding’ can be allotted to a poor peasant; in course of time it will become subdivided among his grown up sons and daughters.

And the quantum of land that the latter will inherit, obviously will be far below than that is essential for the maintenance of a poor peasant family household.

That the land that may be available for distribution among the landless labourers and the poor and lower middle peasants is far below of what is needed is so palpably clear that even a section of those who are recommending small peasants economy has to recognise this fact, but yet the additional proposal that they put forward to solve this problem reflects only their lack of proper understanding of the root of the problem.

It has been stated that “Under the circumstances it would be better to provide minimal holdings to small owners to make them self-sufficient and simultaneously start a *rural works programme* (italics—ours) to give jobs to the landless, the aim should be to ensure that the latter earn the same income as minimal land holders by employing their won and family labour on the farm.” (ibid).

But the question is, will it ever be possible within the existing socio-economic political structure to start necessary rural works programme to provide all the landless agricultural workers of the country with employment? In a country where unemployment is more and more spreading its tentacles over the people, where according to one estimate the figure will reach 60 million by 1978, is it not unrealistic to think that the task of providing 47.5 million of the agricultural workers with jobs can be fulfilled within the existing set up? When during the last twenty seven years sufficient rural works centring round the lands cultivated in the country could not be created to provide jobs to the agricultural workers who were then far less in numbers (the figure was 15 million in 1961 against 47.5 million 1971), would it be at all possible to create necessary rural works centring round land that might at

best increase in size by 25.7% to provide employment to such a huge army of agricultural workers of the country?—Even a lay man with a little common sense can understand that such a task within the existing socio-economic political structure is utterly unrealisable. But as common sense is something which is becoming dear in the country and as there are so many ‘educated simpletons’ who try to understand the objective world around them not through experience and struggle, but only through the language of statistics, it is for these people that we put the following data which unambiguously supports our contention. According to an estimate, when at least 15 million man years of job are needed to be created, the Crash Scheme for rural employment has been estimated to create at best 3 lakhs man years of work and that too if the scheme works as per expectation. People often heard of some other similar schemes for rural employment. But do they at all demand any serious consideration in view of the uphill task to be fulfilled?

Moreover, there is another vital aspect of the issue of distribution of land to the poor peasants and landless peasants, the task of small peasant economy, which deserves the serious attention of all. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh an outstanding Marxist thinker of the present era, our revered leader and teacher has observed: Moreover, will the poor peasants be able to hold and retain for long the lands that will be distributed to them under condition of capitalism? In the same way it will go again out of their hand as it happened in the past in case of their forefathers. Because the same process following which land is constantly being concentrated in the hands of a few is still in operation within the society. Some people holds the opinion that this constant process of land being more and more concentrated in the hands of the few can some how

(Contd. to Page 5)

Small Peasant Economy Helps Maintain and Strengthen Capitalist Exploitation in Agriculture

(Contd. from Page 4)

be checked by imposing legal prohibition on the selling and purchasing of cultivable land. Comrade Ghosh has thoroughly and brilliantly dealt this question in his famous booklet 'Chasi Andolan Prasangey', where he has pointed out the harmful effect that this proposal will lead to. He has observed there that in a capitalist set up, such an act, instead of helping the poor peasants to the least, will seriously and badly affect the agricultural production of the country. Because, the small holding being unproductive and uneconomic, the poor peasants will fail to cultivate the same by adequate ways and means. Even, they will be forced to leave it uncultivated. And as an inevitable effect, the agricultural production will be hampered, the food production will be seriously affected and all these will ultimately badly react on the country's economy. So, within the existing set up, the economic reasons stand against the imposition of legal prohibition on selling and purchasing of land.

Some of the proponents of the small peasant economy, realising that small holding acts as a natural hurdle in introducing mechanisation in agriculture has observed: "It is not enough if land is just distributed and a small peasant economy is encouraged. The ultimate aim must be to pool small holdings into large co-operative holdings in order that mechanisation can be introduced. A SMALL PEASANT ECONOMY CAN THUS DEVELOP, WITH THE PASSING OF TIME, INTO A CO-OPERATIVE ECONOMY." (Blitz, Independence Day Special, Aug. 16, 1975).

Firstly, some people rightfully observe that since the government has begun to encourage co-operative farming, this has become a nice double-edged instrument in the hands of the rich peasants and jotedars i.e. the rural

bourgeoisie to realise their class interest. They, by distributing their holdings, that exist in excess of the ceiling law among the kinsmen of their own family, and then by pooling these sub-divisions in co-operative farming, have been able to 'legalise' and hold in their hand all the excess land they possess. Moreover, as they now belong to co-operative farming they are eligible for all kinds of government helps including long term loans etc. In this way, they are fattening their bellies at the cost of the public exchequer which is being created and maintained by people's hard earned money.

That apart, there is another vital and more fundamental reason to show that in a capitalist set up, co-operative farming can never work as a solution of the agrarian problem. And any one having the least understanding of the inherent laws of capitalism that at present is passing through the third general phase of world wide crisis would not have prescribed this formula for solving the problem of agricultural economy. In a capitalist set up, production in the co-operative farm, like productions in other fields is guided by the capitalist law of production. And the factors that give birth to recession, crises of over production, under production, production below installed capacities and all other uncertainties prevailing in industrial production in capitalism, will also have their evil effect and influence over the agricultural production.

On the face of such crisis, the small holders will find that their small holding is giving no dividend or benefit, rather the maintenance of such small holding is uneconomic to them. They, like the small shareholders of the industrial enterprises, on the face of growing economic crisis that is inherent in capitalism

will consider it more wise and profitable to sale their uneconomic and unproductive small share to the major share holders of the co-operatives. Thus, following the same process, which is leading to more and more concentration of land in the hands of the rural bourgeoisie and the rich peasants, the lands belonging to the small farmers of the co-operative will become concentrated in the hands of the jotedars and the rich peasants within the co-operatives and ultimately, one day, the small farmers who were once, the members of the co-operatives will be transformed into the agricultural workers of the same co-operatives.

Some others who prescribe nationalisation of land by capitalist state followed by mechanisation for resolving the problem, forget our observation that we have made earlier that in the present day, when the crisis in the capitalist economy has become an every day phenomenon, in the capitalist-imperialist world, any such attempt on the part of any capitalist state at present will force millions of rural population surplus and make them unemployed. And this huge army of rural unemployed will shake the very foundation of the capitalist economy.

It is therefore, evident, that small peasants economy, co-operative farming rural employment scheme nationalisation of land—none of them can work as a real solution of our agrarian problem. In fact none of these proposals is new and novel in its kind. The much talked of small peasant economy is also an age old formula of the bourgeois world. Long days back, Lenin in his famous article on the penetration of capitalism in agriculture had shown that in the pre-monopoly era, depending upon the different objective conditions obtaining in different countries the bourgeoisie

adopted either of the alternative courses of capitalist development, viz. the big land farming or small peasant economy, which he respectively termed to be the 'Prussian path' and the 'American path' of capitalist development in agriculture. To day, in the present age of moribund capitalism, when capitalist economy has become intensely crisis-ridden the bourgeoisie in different countries prefer the latter path of development to the former. The reason is obvious. One of the main problems confronting the capitalist economy in any capitalist country is to provide employment to the growing number of unemployed people. The big land farming invites mechanisation of agriculture and thereby produces a huge agricultural surplus to which no capitalist economy particularly that of backward and under developed capitalist countries in the present era can provide employment.

This therefore, shakes the very foundation of the capitalist state, a phenomenon that we have previously mentioned. But on the contrary, the small peasants economy, acting as a natural hurdle to mechanisation, keeps large number of the rural people, arrested in the agriculture in a half-fed, half-clad in-human condition and therefore, relatively acts as a check in the process of proletarianisation of the rural mass and of the creation of the rural surplus. So, the bourgeoisie hopes that the small peasant economy will provide relatively more stability to his capitalist economy and the capitalist state. It is solely for this reason that, not only the bourgeoisie of the underdeveloped capitalist countries, even the ruling bourgeoisie of the highly developed capitalist imperialist state which once adopted big landfarming, are attempting to switch over to the small peasants economy. So, one should remember of what once Com. Ghosh, observed in this connection. Com. Ghosh while exposing the

inner motive and intention linked up with the programme of small peasant economy, has expressed that those who in the name of either People's Democratic revolution or any other thing considered the distribution of land to the rural people as the main agrarian task are strengthening the efforts for consolidating capitalism and strengthening the capitalist economy.

... ..
... ..

It is being noted that in different capitalist countries and particularly in the underdeveloped capitalist countries, under the slogan of ameliorating the sufferings of the people different so-called programmes are being proposed by the ruling class. These programmes in particular include rural employment scheme and distribution of land to the landless and poor peasants, which is nothing but a long standing demand of democratic peasant movement. These proposals even if implemented, can never free the people from the yoke of capitalist exploitation, and the capitalist system the root cause of the sufferings of the people, remains intact.

... ..
... ..

Lastly, the question necessarily arises, What course should one adopt to solve agrarian problem in a country like that of ours.

In this regard we would like to refer to what Com. Ghosh many a time has observed in different occasions and particularly, what he has observed in his famous booklet 'Chasi Andolan Prasangey'. Com. Ghosh has amply made it clear that the main problem of the Indian agricultural economy is to modernise and mechanise it. If this can be done then and then only there will be an upliftment in standard of living of the people engaged in rural economy. Villages will be electrified and some ancillary industries will grow up there, where some more people also will get employment. The rest

(Contd. to Page 6)

Observe Week-Long Programme from 1st-7th Dec. 75 and Protest Day On 8th December

In accordance with the resolution adopted in a Convention of the workers and the employees held on 17th November '75 at University Institute Hall Calcutta, Comrade Fatick Ghosh, General Secretary, West Bengal State Committee, UTUC (Lenin Sarani) made again an appeal in a letter dated 20th November '75 to the five left and democratic Central Trade Union Organisations including CITU to sit together in a meeting on 24th November '75 for evolving a joint course of movement including the fixing up of the date of the state-wide

Protest Day, to be organised under joint initiative of all left and democratic Central Trade Union Organisations.

But as all other Central Trade Union Organisations did not come forward to stand by the side of the oppressed and exploited workers and the employees, even on repeated requests, the UTUC (Lenin Sarani) has been compelled to declare on its own, a programme to meet the offensives under its own initiative. The said programme is scheduled to be held from 1st December to 7th December 1975, will include among others, week-long

programme of squads, group sittings, meetings, deputations, conventions at the districts and the sub-division levels in working class centres to mobilise public opinion leading to the observance of the Protest Day on 8th December '75 throughout the state followed by a deputation to be led to the Governor of West Bengal. This programme has been announced on 26th November 1975.

All the Trade Unions affiliated to UTUC (Lenin Sarani) and its units are hereby asked to make the above programme a complete success; they are further asked to leave no stone unturned to evolve joint efforts to organise

this 'Protest Day' unitedly wherever possible with all the workers and employees in general, belonging to all other Central Trade Union Organisations.

The UTUC (Lenin Sarani) has appealed to all other left and democratic Central Trade Union Organisations of the state to show prudence even at this late hour for developing joint movement to counter this attack on the working class as a whole. If they do not find it possible to observe this programme jointly, they can help a lot to thwart the anti-working class activity of the vested class and at least to maintain cohesion, and unity of action among

the workers and employees in general if they come forward to organise similar 'Protest Day' programme on their own initiative on the very same day i.e. on 8th December, 1975.

Just Out

SUCI Publication

On Fascism

Price Rs. 2.00

Available at

48, Lenin Sarani
Calcutta-13

Uninterrupted Industrialisation, Modernisation and Mechanisation of Agriculture can only Resolve Agrarian Problem

(Contd. from Page 5)

surplus population of the villages will have to be employed in different industrial area, where there will then be ample scope for industrial development as a result of the regular and sufficient supply of raw materials. But in order to accomplish this gigantic task what is most necessary is first of all to open the gate of uninterrupted industrial development. But what are the hurdles standing in the way?

In each and every country where there is capitalism they are the capitalist mode of production and the capitalist relations of production. In the present era, when the capitalism is passing through the third general world wide crisis, where ever there is capitalism industrial development is bound to stagger and the industrial economy is to face recession one after another. In the underdeveloped capitalist countries where radical land reform measures have not been implemented in practice, as an inevitable effect the task of modernisation and mechanisation of agriculture has remained unfulfilled. Problem of

employment both rural and urban is becoming more and more acute. Production of food which is closely linked up with the task of modernisation and mechanisation of agriculture is seriously hampered.

So, in any country so long capitalism remains any proposal to bring about agrarian reform within the capitalist framework while keeping the same as intact tantamounts to nothing but palliatives. In any country, where there is capitalism these proposals of so-called reform instead of making the people politically conscious about capitalism and capitalist exploitation create illusion about capitalism among them and thereby deceive them.

So, in all countries where there is capitalism, to modernise and mechanise agriculture, to open the gate of uninterrupted industrial development, to solve the problem of unemployment and remove all the concomitant evils of capitalism, the genuine friends of the people should have to unite and try hard and leave no stone unturned to free the people from the tentacles and grips of capitalist exploitation and oppression.

UTUC (Lenin Sarani) Hold Successful Convention

(Contd. from Page 1)

the state...but trade union movement in general was faced with an unprecedented crisis.

... ..

By way of explaining the attacks.....on workers and employees, Com. Ghosh said that.....the employers have resorted to unilateral attacks upon the workers in various ways. In some cases factories and offices have been closed down. While in others workers and employees have either been retrenched or laid off. There are even cases, he said, in which neither the factory has been closed down, locked out, nor have the workers been laid off or retrenched but the workers have not been getting their due wages against their work for months on. On the question of productivity-linked wage structure, Comrade Ghosh said that in consequence of this proposal the workers will invariably lose both work and wages.... Lastly Com. Ghosh made an earnest appeal to all left and democratic central trade union to come forward without delay to evolve a common agreed programme of struggle in the interest of the workers and employees of the state. He even said that in case the left central trade unions were for any possible reason, unwilling

to step on the platform of UTUC (Lenin Sarani) we will not have the slightest reservation in joining them on their platform if they sincerely frame up a programme of joint struggle.

Com. Protiva Mukherjee, the renowned mass leader and a member of the State Committee of the SUCI said in her fervent appeal to the delegates that it is you who alone, with the sweat of your toil and blood built up this civilisation and all the wealth of the country. And yet it is a matter of shame to all humanity that you have to go unfed, unclad and your children are doomed to premature death for want of medical care. Hence it is time you realise the cause of this deep human tragedy. You must be able to locate the source of this shocking inequity and all its corresponding evils. You must realise that however much you may struggle for increased pay and bonus your sufferings will have no end so long this socio-economic system remains intact.

... ..

In the main resolution adopted at the convention, all the left and democratic central trade unions were urged upon to help develop a common platform with minimum agreed programme in defence of

workers' hard-earned rights and gains. The convention also called upon the employees not to loose heart in this difficult hour, but instead, to strive for forging unity at the base level in areas and localities in defence of their hard-earned rights.

... ..

The Convention suggested a minimum programme and expressed the hope that other left and central trade unions would come forward to evolve a common agreed programme on the basis of this suggestion for observing a campaign week by holding meetings, group meetings, deputations etc., culminating in the observance of a state-wide "protest day", the date of which was not announced from the convention in the hope of a possible joint initiative.

... ..

Other speakers in the convention were Sanat Dutta, Shankar Saha, Dilip Bhattacharya, Brojogopal Saha, Amal Kar Gupta and Madhu Sinha. The veteran trade union leader Com. Moni Chatterjee was in the chair. The main resolution was moved by Com. Sitesh Das Dupta.