

RAISE YOUR VOICE AGAINST THESE PEOPLE'S ENEMIES

Sreemati Indira Gandhi and some of her associates have been arrested under Prevention of Corruption Act. Some specific complaints of corrupt practices have been brought against them. People have witnessed with deep feelings of hatred and apprehension that during her long eleven year's rule, Sm. Gandhi involved herself in all sorts of corrupt and gross immoral acts and practices both in the economic and political fields with the help of administrative machinery, after throwing overboard all norms and decency, particularly in the matter of maintaining relative neutrality of administration. So, along with thorough probes into all these corrupt and immoral acts and practices, severe and deterrent punishment should be meted out to Sm. Gandhi and her associates. Viewed from this angle, the arrest of Sm. Gandhi is fully justified.

But the question that inevitably comes up in this connection is whether the crime of Sm. Gandhi and her associates was confined only to some corrupt deals? Whether or not their acts and deeds served the politics of the bourgeois class? Can their crime, therefore, be narrowed down to the charge that they were instrumental in bringing corruption in administration and fostering it? Is not their crime of political nature and of far bigger dimension in as much as it was against the people of the country?

Sm. Gandhi and her associates committed the crime of declaring internal Emergency to pervert the Constitution so as to concentrate autocratic power in the administrative machinery. They committed the crime of throttling the dissenting voice by introducing the obnoxious pre-censorship of the Press. They committed the crime of conspiring to bring an end to political activities of opposition parties by wanton application of draconian measures like MISA, DIR, by throwing thousands upon thousands of political workers and leaders behind the bars, by committing political murders within the jails, by destroying the hearth and home of thousands of our countrymen, by divesting the people of their means of livelihood and to cap all this, by perpetrating a veritable genocide within the country. It was, in fact, a perverse attempt to stop all political activities other than those of her chosen men. It was a

deliberate attempt to destroy minimum democratic atmosphere within

(Contd. to Page 4)

Central Committee Resolution

● On Farakka Problem ● On Price Rise and Abolition of Rice Zones

The Farakka problem which mainly relates to the distribution and sharing of Ganga water between India and Bangladesh should be viewed with all seriousness it deserves. We are of firm opinion that strengthening of amity, fraternity and unity of the people of the concerned countries and normal healthy relation between the states should be the guiding principle in determining our attitude towards a problem of this kind. Our party strongly feels that only an integrated approach and unbiased outlook can save us from submitting to illogical pressure as well as from sinking into narrow parochial interest under whatsoever cover.

There is no denying the fact that if the minimum requirement of water is not ensured through the feeder canal of Farakka, particularly during the lean period, it will greatly damage the navigability of the river and hence the future of the Calcutta and Haldia ports—the importance of which can hardly be over-emphasised.

But it seems strange that not only the previous Congress Government but also the present Janata Government at the Centre miserably failed to evolve

the well-conceived norm that should guide the question of sharing of Ganga water even within this country. Nobody can deny that the upper Ganga water cannot be used by the vicinal states in utter disregard to the interest of the lower ones. Had people's interest been at the top of consideration then such a serious question could not have been dragged so long and treated so callously. Nor the point of maximum exploration of all possible domestic resources of water could be left untouched so long, if the Government were really serious to solve this outstanding problem.

Coming to the question of Bangladesh we find that the normal flow of Ganga water which this country used to get prior to the construction of the Farakka barrage will be disturbed affecting their economic interest unless they get their minimum through necessary agreement with the Government of India. It is also obvious that if the Bangladesh Government similarly adopts short term and long term programmes—a country full of rivers and tributaries—it may very well get rid of its present dependence on Farakka.

(Contd. to Page 8)

We cannot but feel highly concerned at the soaring prices of essential commodities that have marked a steep rise throughout the country during the last few months. It is quite evident that this unusual price rise is the concomitant effect of the speculative manipulation of prices of essential commodities by the speculators, hoarders, blackmarketeers and the profiteers by various means which, in addition to the law of capitalism based on maximisation of profit of the capitalists, has made the life of the common people absolutely unbearable. We are fully convinced that so long as these blood-merchants are allowed to make free trade on essential commodities of the people all talk of curbing this phenomenal price rise is bound to end in fiasco.

Our party has, therefore, been consistently pointing out since long that such vital concern of people's life cannot be placed at the mercy of these private traders, rather it is the duty and responsibility of the Government to ensure regular supply of foodgrains and other essential commodities to the people at a fair price. We also hold that the real problem is not so much of production as of distribution.

We, therefore, demand that all-out State Trading including both the wholesale and retail trade, must be introduced and private free trading on foodgrains and other essential commodities must be banned forthwith.

But we are surprised that neither the Janata Government at the Centre nor the 'Left Front' Government of the state of West Bengal has come out with this essential step of all-out State Trading which is the only answer to the problem.

The recent decision of the Central Government to abolish rice zones and allow free movement of paddy throughout the country will, in the opinion of our party, act as a step forward for ensuring free play of the private traders for further manipulation of prices by creating artificial scarcity of such vital commodity causing incalculable distress to the people at large. We are at a loss to understand why the Central Government has not taken any lesson from its past experience when it adopted similar policy on wheat.

(Contd. to Page 4)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Founder Editor-in-Chief—COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

VOL. II

15th OCTOBER '77

PRICE 30 P.

No. 5

SATURDAY

Air Surcharge 4 P.

Marxism or Vulgarisation of Marxism ?

Any serious political worker upholding the cause of consistent leftism would admit that the political situation of our country today offers an excellent opportunity to further the cause of the working class movement in the concrete background of ever deepening crisis of the capitalist order and growing instability in the principal bourgeois parties, till now selected by the bourgeoisie as the national alternatives. The real problem lies in utilising the situation in favour of the revolutionary course of the working class movement by strengthening and establishing the revolutionary leadership.

But the situation is not free from complexity. At this stage of democratic movement, people's consciousness is generally confined to anti ruling party hatred and sentiment and is not firmly grounded on clearcut class-consciousness and revolutionary working class outlook. Taking advantage of this situation, the bourgeoisie will try to divert people's grievances and resentment now against this ruling party, now against another and thus install two-party system at the peril of genuine left movement. What is more serious, the situation offers an opportunity to the revisionist - opportunist trend within the working class movement to capitalise the situation in projecting itself as a national alternative backed by the bourgeoisie if the branded bourgeois parties fail in their role because of their internal looseness and lack of cohesion. If, therefore, the revisionist opportunist trend wins the favour of the bourgeoisie for playing the role as its national alternative, this can only happen by an act of gross betrayal to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat, to the cause of their emancipation from the capitalist bondage but nonetheless this danger can not be averted unless the working class can place before-hand its real revolutionary leadership at the helm of their struggles in order to chart out a revolutionary course by taking every advantage in between that the situation may offer. Both these possibilities are, therefore, open before the working people.

In the background of this concrete situation, we

offer to CPI(M) ranks for their most serious and unbiased consideration, the recent sayings, political stand and style of functioning of their leaders and ministers of the West Bengal Government so that they can judge for themselves which of the two trends, they are representing, which of the two courses they are propagating and advancing. The question of judging this basic issue and discharging their due role has assumed great importance not only to defend the revolutionary kernel of Marxism-Leninism but to decide the course of working class struggle with which is intimately connected the fate of millions upon millions of the oppressed masses of our country.

Equality between exploiter and exploited in a class-divided society means defending the exploiter

Can there be equality between the exploiter and exploited ?

On the very day of 'victory' celebration of the 'Left Front' on 27th June in Calcutta, Sri Jyoti Basu, the Chief Minister-designate told his audience who came to celebrate their 'victory' that although class differences and 'class conflicts' are natural in a capitalist society, "in the interest of West Bengal's economy", they would "seek to ensure that the 'conflicts do not intensify'". So Jyoti Babu, a Polit Bureau member of a 'Marxist' Party was telling his audience who definitely belong to class or classes that 'in the interest of West Bengal's economy', they as Marxist would "seek to ensure" that class conflicts "do not intensify" although those are natural for any

capitalist society.

The first point that inevitably comes up for consideration is: what is at the root of the present day "class differences" and "class conflicts?" Are they because of any personal enmity or jealousy? Or they are because of the fundamental law of capitalist production in which is reflected the fundamental contradiction between social nature of production and individual appropriation whereby the capitalists because of this illegitimate ownership of the means of production protected by the state, exploit the working class? Is it not a fact that because of this basic illegitimacy of the capitalists' so called right to exploit the working people the interest of the two opposing classes—of the exploiter capitalist class and the exploited working class—becomes antagonistic in nature? Do not the class differences and class conflicts centre round the fundamentally different class desires and class aspirations of these two principal classes? Is it not the fundamental law of

Bengal's capitalist economy, ensuring non-intensification of class struggles is justified then will this not be justified in other states and in India as a whole by the same kind of pleadings by the respective ministries? Is it not then a defence for crisis-ridden bourgeois economy, be it in West Bengal or in any other part and for that matter of the Indian economy as a whole? Is it a Marxist-Leninist outlook or a bourgeois outlook which tries to fool the people by talking about economy as also the state that protects and defends it, as something above classes?

Thirdly, Jyoti Babu is, on record, saying times without number that the reality of the workers as also the capitalists is to be accepted and that their government will make the endeavour to bring the conflicts in between the two 'to a minimum'. Does it not follow logically that it would be their endeavour to harmonise the interests of the workers and capitalists? What is the nature of contradiction between

capitalists at the same time, any talk of treating these opposing classes on the same footing of equality mean nothing else than defending the basic inequality of the system based on the so-called right of the capitalists to exploit the working people?

Fourthly, Jyoti Basu is putting up the defence at times that as there has been no revolution and the government is no product of it what further can be done than this? Doesn't he mean thereby that when the Marxist-Leninists are in a government which is within the bourgeois parliamentary system, they have got no other option than to look to the interests of the workers and capitalists alike and on the same footing of equality? Does this outlook and approach square with the fundamental class position of a Marxist-Leninist? Have they got any wee bit difference from those of a bourgeois government? Did not the Congress ministers talk in the same vein, the same thing?

The fundamental question is how the Marxist-Leninists should utilise the opportunity of their position in the government within a bourgeois system in order to advance toward a revolutionary objective.

Can this revolutionary objective be advanced if the government run by those who claim themselves 'Marxist' is confined to bourgeois legalism-reformism? Can anybody by mere change of laws bring any change in the life of the exploited people? Is it not true that even for bringing some relief to the oppressed people, which alone is possible in this bourgeois setup, the government, if it is really desirous, can not depend on the 'old machine' that is to say, the bureaucracy including the police which is meant for defending the class interest of the capitalists? What is therefore required is that a 'left' government, worth the name, must be guided by the legitimacy of the

social development that with the accentuation of crisis in the capitalist productive system, these class differences and class conflicts are bound to sharpen? Secondly, is not this law of social development valid for all capitalist economies including that of West Bengal? Can the 'interest' of West Bengal's economy be separated from that of India? Can there be anything 'special' for West Bengal where we find a high concentration of both national and foreign private monopoly capital? Is not the economy of West Bengal a part and parcel of Indian capitalist economy and the crisis here is also a part and parcel of the crisis of Indian capitalism? If, therefore, pleading for "West Bengal's economic interest" which in reality means the interest of West

these two opposing classes? Is it antagonistic or non-antagonistic in nature? Is it at all possible to defend and serve the interests of both the classes at the same time in a class-divided society? Will it not be as good as saying that the exploiter and the exploited will be treated at par, on the same footing of equality? Is it not the key content of Marxism-Leninism that equality between the exploiter and the exploited is a falsehood propagated by the defenders of capitalist class rule? Does not Marxism-Leninism point out the fact that in a capitalist society the exploiters being the ruling class, inevitably transform the state into an instrument of their class rule? Does not it follow then that any talk of serving the interests of the workers and the

(Contd. to Page 3)

Revolution means not Parliamentary majority and Change of Bourgeois Constitution but Smashing the State Machine

(Contd. from Page 2)

interests of the exploited classes and not by the so-called legality of the oppressive rights of the capitalist exploiters. It must free the democratic mass movements from the coercion of the police, and bureaucracy. Without relying on bureaucracy including the police it must encourage the people to take mass initiatives through concrete forms of their instrument of struggles, the people's committees. Backed by these mass initiatives and mass struggles and relying on people's instruments of struggle, if the government moves in the direction of bringing necessary reforms then and then only such a government can perform the task as an instrument of people's struggles and advance the revolutionary cause and objective of the proletariat. Further developing and concretely applying the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** the great teacher of the proletariat, stimulated the famous guideline for the Marxists when they are in a bourgeois care-taker government. **Comrade Ghosh** pointed out: "It should be realised that in a capitalist society to depend on law and law alone will not deliver any good to the people. Because *whatever is legal is not necessarily justified, moral and humanistic*. It is more true in a capitalist society of the present day where order has become injustice". So, it is legitimacy, not the bourgeois legality that should be the guiding principle for the Marxists. Because, "Every student of ethics and jurisprudence knows that what is legal may not be always justified and moral. Similarly, everything illegal in the eye of law is not necessarily unjustified, illegitimate and immoral". This in essence is the teaching of our beloved departed leader, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, the concrete expression of which came in the attitude

and approach of the Labour Ministry of the UF in 1967. Can there be any other attitude and approach for the Marxist-Leninist if he is to be consistent with revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, if he is to be true to his fundamental allegiance to the class, the masses and the revolution? This is, no doubt, the most relevant question here that no serious Marxist-Leninist can afford to gloss over.

The concept of 'silent revolution' is a bourgeois concept and is alien to Marxism-Leninism

Next comes the question, whether within this bourgeois system "a silent economic revolution" can occur? What is this 'silent revolution'? Is it anything different from what the Gandhites tell the people? What relevance has it got to Marxism-Leninism other than revising it by taking out the revolutionary kernel? Yet this is what Sri Jyoti Basu the Chief Minister and Dr. Ashok Mitra, the Finance Minister more especially, have been consistently propagating. Jyoti Babu has spelt out this thing in many of his speeches and interviews and Dr. Mitra did it while presenting his budget in the Assembly. What is to be taken serious note of is that he brings the name of Lenin in the same speech just to say something which is opposed to Lenin's teachings.

In his budget speech where he introduced tax proposals calculated to increase tax burden on common people and further increase in expenditure on police to the tune of Rs. 8 crores, he said: "economics, Lenin had once mentioned, is distilled politics. Till as long as there is no fundamental reordering of the Indian polity." Toward the end of the same speech, he promised to bring about "silent economic revolution". Does he mean to say that his "silent economic revolution" will follow the course of increasing the tax burden on

common people and adding grease to the repressive organ of the bourgeois state? Does he not also suggest that this silent economic revolution will be followed by a 'silent political revolution' because Lenin said 'politics is distilled economics'? Is it Marxism-Leninism or its gross vulgarisation? Needless to mention that this conception of revolution is no better than "green revolution", "wheat revolution", "ballot revolution" or such other "revolutions" of the bourgeois economists and politicians other than political revolution attained through smashing of state machine.

Can there be substitution of Revolution by Parliamentary majority and change of Bourgeois Constitution?

CPI(M) leaders and ministers are on and often saying in the public utterances that they want 'power' to do anything for the people but as regards the source of this 'power', they are pointing out the government at the Centre. Lest there be any doubt on the score, Jyoti Babu in his maiden speech of 8th October '77, in Calcutta, said in clear terms that the aim of his party was to go to the centre and change the constitution to bring 'fundamental change' in the society. Is it not a clear renunciation of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism? Marxism-Leninism teaches us that when we are in a bourgeois society, revolution is meant by forcible seizure of power after overthrowing the bourgeoisie and smashing the old state machine in order to place instead a new kind of organisation of the working class. Is it not therefore clear that the CPI(M) leadership is substituting parliamentary majority and change of the bourgeois constitution for revolution to bring a fundamental change in the society? Is it not clear also

that it is now for a peaceful transition to socialism and has renounced the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism?

Sri Promode Dasgupta, another member of the Polit Bureau, while speaking at a youth rally organised by DYF, the youth wing of the CPI(M), in Calcutta, took the name of Lenin and his famous saying that: It is difficult to achieve power but still more difficult is to retain it. Sri Dasgupta was using the name of Lenin and his teachings for what? Was it to convey any revolutionary thought for a revolutionary purpose? No, he was doing this to tell his audience that it was difficult for his party to come to governmental position within a bourgeois setup and it would be more difficult to defend this position. Is it not a wonderful specimen of applying the teachings of Lenin for such a purpose? For, did Lenin speak of the 'power' which is far more difficult for the proletariat to defend against the capitalists, to connote the power of a bourgeois care-taker government? Did not Lenin point out in his "State And Revolution" that 'power' for which revolutionary proletariat strives is not the 'power' of a bourgeois care-taker government because that is already the 'power' of the bourgeoisie, consisting of 'special bodies of armed men', 'a special repressive force' which arose from the society but has placed itself above it?

Did not Lenin teach the proletariat that "every revolution by destroying the state apparatus clearly demonstrates to us, how the ruling class strives to restore the special bodies of armed men which serve it and how the oppressed class strives to create a new organisation of this kind, capable of serving not the exploiters but the exploited?"

Instead of conveying this revolutionary teaching of Lenin in its entirety and with proper context why

the CPI(M) leaders are resorting to eclecticism or wilful mutilation of the whole truth? Is it to serve a revolutionary purpose and from a revolutionary objective?

They are saying that coming to government at the centre is all that matters. How far and to what extent it matters? Maybe, the sphere of activity or the jurisdiction of a government at the centre is more than that of a state government. But does this fact materially alter the position so far as bringing fundamental change in the society? Can anybody do anything other than defending and protecting the fundamental class interest of the bourgeoisie? Whether the government is at the centre or in the state does it materially alter its position as "an operator of the bourgeois state machine"? Where lies the 'power'? Is it in the cabinet or in the three permanent organs of the state viz. the army, the bureaucratic administrative system along with the police and judiciary? What is the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism in this regard?

Is it not a fact that from this basic loyalty to revolutionary essence of Marxism and to the cause of advancement of people's militant struggles that our party demanded and got implemented in the Labour Ministry of the UF in 1967, the policy of "non-interference of police in legitimate democratic movement" and today is demanding the declaration of the same policy from the 'Left Front' government which refuses to do that?

Do Promode Babu and Jyoti Babu stand on this consistent Marxist approach and outlook? Is it not a fact that to take any other approach and outlook means slipping to bourgeois legalistic approach and outlook? Is not it a fact that when Promode Babu

(Contd. to Page 6)

RAISE YOUR VOICE AGAINST THESE ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE

(Contd. from Page 1)

the country by robbing the people, one after another, of their rights and liberties, won through hard struggles. Fundamental democratic rights of the people were reduced to nullity. Anybody detained had neither the right to know the reason for detention nor had there the right to move the court. Minimum civil liberty including even the right to life was taken away and if a person was given capital punishment by a fiat, he had before him no constitutional remedy. In short, she and her associates hatched a sinister conspiracy to foist on the people and the country, the most hated authoritarian rule of a party so as to anyhow cling to power. Sm. Gandhi and her associates, therefore, are guilty of committing all this grave political crime against the accepted democratic norms and human moral values, against the people and the country.

People of our country, therefore, expected and rightly they expected, that the slogan of removing corruption would not merely be confined within the administrative field but along with this field, it would be concretely applied against all the manifestations of gross corruption of political power. They, therefore expected that simultaneous with lifting of the Emergency there would be withdrawal of the 42nd Amendment to the Constitution and MISA, DIR, unconditional and forthwith release of all political prisoners, withdrawal of false cases brought against the workers of the political parties and those connected with democratic movements, restoration of civil liberties and fundamental democratic rights as also steps for their preservation and further extension.

It should be borne in mind that the main issue in connection with the problem is not so much the individual roles of Sm. Gandhi and her associates

as it is in the fact that they were in the seat of power of the government backed by the monopolists the majority of whom came in direct support of their activities which were all calculated to defend the crisis ridden capitalism by declaring a state of Emergency. Again, She was dislodged from power and arrested with the consent and support of the majority of the monopolists. In other words, bringing the Janata Party to government in place of Congress, attempt to install two-party system and later all the dramatic episodes centring round Congress*Janata Party rivalries and contradictions at the national plane are nothing but the outer manifestations and outcome of contradiction within the monopoly bourgeoisie.

This internal contradiction within the ruling bourgeois class is finding its reflection in the contradiction between the Congress and Janata Party. The bourgeoisie is trying to distract the attention of the people who are being severely oppressed by crisis both economic and political.

Today, the state of Emergency no longer continues formally but all the authoritarian powers usurped through amendments to the Constitution during the Emergency are still with the government. Perverse amendments to the Constitution have not yet been set aside. MISA, DIR still adorn the statute book. Cases against political workers have not been withdrawn. The bourgeoisie is still active in its conspiracy to install Two-party system with the underlying motive of confining democratic movements within the narrow bounds of parliamentarism. In short, the Indira legacy is still continuing very much.

But the people fought against Indira Gandhi and her regime specifically for removal of all these affronts to their rights and liberties. People demanded steps against their corrupt

practices in financial matters too. But that was an integral part of their movement for restoration of fundamental democratic rights and liberties. It thus constituted a part of their major political demand of bringing an end to autocracy.

People's expectation was, therefore, that not only the acts of corruption in financial deals but mainly the gross corruption of political power that brought disaster in their life, would constitute the principal charges of crime against Indira Gandhi and her associates. Had it been so then a political ideological struggle of the people against vile trend in politics would have been set in motion ensuring congenial atmosphere for restoration, preservation and further extension of fundamental democratic rights and civil liberties within the country. This was the only way to keep the promise of restoration of rights and liberties of the people.

But people are observing, instead, with deep concern that the Janata Party at the Centre is very shrewdly avoiding this principal issue. As they have avoided this question of political crime in framing cases against Indira Gandhi and her associates so also they are sitting silent on the question of exercising the power of the government in restoring the rights and liberties of the people.

The people are greatly perturbed over this attitude of the government. People can not but note with great apprehension that let alone the Janata Government at the Centre even the 'Left Front' Government in West Bengal does not hesitate to apply the undemocratic and authoritarian provisions of the 42nd Amendment to the Constitution. The recent such application of Emergency provision to supersede the Board of Secondary Education in West Bengal by the 'Left Front' Government on the so-called plea that such provisions are still in the statute book is, no doubt,

a matter of serious apprehension also for the people. Our representatives in the West Bengal Assembly moved amendments to the non-official resolutions on withdrawal of MISA and 42nd Amendment to the effect that till their withdrawal by the government at the Centre, the State Government should at least ensure that those will not be used by it on any plea. But strangely enough, these amendment proposals were not accepted by the 'Left Front' Government. This brings to the fore the question of maintaining the minimum norm of honesty and sincerity of these parties to the cause of democratic rights and liberties of the people.

People may reasonably ask, is it because they do not want to part with the authoritarian powers of the provisions taken during the Emergency that the Janata Government is scrupulously avoiding to bring the charges of political crime and is trying to fix the people's whole attention on charges of corruption in financial deals alone that have been brought against Indira Gandhi and her associates? Is it because of the fact that if the Janata Government brings the charge of corruption of political power against Indira Gandhi then they will also similarly stand accused of enjoying the same autocratic powers and immoral privileges and the whole truth of defending the aggregate interest of monopoly capitalism by both the parties Congress and Janata will be clear to the people as daylight?

What is then the real situation today? Because of this very attitude of the Janata Government, not

only the rights and liberties of the people robbed of by the authoritarian steps and measures of Indira Gandhi have not been restored but what is more, those very authoritarian measures are being applied even by the present central and state governments. Emergency formally does not exist but Emergency measures are still continuing. The question of restoration of fundamental democratic rights and liberties of the people has therefore assumed a new dimension and a new urgency.

People, therefore, must be on the alert about these bunglings and diversionary tactics. They must heighten their political consciousness, they must take political initiative so that no party coming to government can use these black authoritarian powers, can bring again the dark period of worst kind of autocracy by gross misuse of administration as Indira Gandhi could do during the nineteen months of Emergency.

We appeal to the people to bear in mind that at this third phase of intense general crisis of capitalism, their rights and liberties can not be defended and protected other than by means of consistent and conscious political struggles and mass movements. That is why if they are to bring back and preserve those rights and liberties that have been taken away by the bourgeoisie then they will have to do that by the pressure of mass movements. They will have to wrest them from the unwilling hands of the bourgeoisie by mounting pressure of mass movements. We can not afford to miss this key point for a moment.

On Price Rise

(Contd. from Page 1)

We strongly feel that no Government can shirk its own responsibility on such vital matter and both the Central and the State Government should take immediate steps to introduce all-out State Trading in food-grains and other essential commodities to combat this menace of unprecedented price-rise.

We call upon the people to organise themselves and set up effective pressure on the respective Governments for immediate implementation of this demand.

Bihar UTUC (Lenin Sarani) Demands change in Labour Policy of Bihar Government

Patna : 5th October, '77

Bihar State Committee of the UTUC(Lenin Sarani) demands change in the Labour Policy of the Janata Government of Bihar to honour the legitimate aspirations of the working class after the change in government.

The Labour Minister of Karpouri Thakur Government of Bihar, Sri Samsher Jang Bahadur Singh convened a meeting of the Trade Union organisations of the state on 5th October at Patna to discuss the current labour situation in the state. The other issues for discussion were :

- a) the problem of intra-union and inter-union rivalries and way to resolve it ;
- b) the method and criterion to be adopted for recognition of trade unions ;

c) problems arising out of question of Bonus payment and wage revision as also

d) the code of conduct. The President and the General Secretary of Bihar State UTUC(Lenin Sarani) Comrades Pritish Chanda and Amar Kumar Pandey respectively, attended the meeting.

Comrade Pritish Chanda while welcoming the meeting said that it was long over-due and what is urgently needed is a change in the pro-capitalist policy so long pursued by the previous government. While condemning the police firings on the workers at Jitpur Colliery and Bokaro Steel City, he demanded an outright policy declaration from the Labour Ministry to the effect that 'Police shall not

(Contd. to Page 8)

Madhya Pradesh Prevention of Public Disorder Ordinance —How the Janata Party Restores Democratic Rights!

Both before the Lok Sabha poll and the Assembly polls in the States, The Janata Party promised to the people to restore democratic and fundamental rights, guarantee independence of judiciary and uphold all other political and economic rights and privileges of the citizens that Congress trampled down during its thirty years of misrule specially during the notorious Emergency. But since the elections had been over and the Janata Party came to power it is now not only dragging its feet in translating those pledges into action but also is doing many things against the people's interest and in fact is carrying the legacy of the past. As yet, it has not, despite repeated demands, repealed the 42nd Amendment of the Constitution including the MISA, and has not released all political prisoners of other parties but instead imposed humiliating conditions on such releases and even sentenced twenty SUCI cadres to life imprisonment. It has, on the other hand, ruthlessly suppressed workers' and peoples' discontent, killing them on various occasions. And lastly, it has set another mile stone in their way to betray their real anti-people class character to deny and suppress the fundamental rights of the people by recently extending, although in a different name and style, the power and scope of the black Act like the Preventive Detention Act (PDA) in Madhya Pradesh through the promulgation of an ordinance.

Called the Madhya Pradesh Ordinance 1977, the Madhya Pradesh Government promulgated an ordinance (Temporary Powers)

(Contd. to Page 8)

West Bengal UTUC (Lenin Sarani)'s Memorandum

[Below we give a gist of the Memorandum placed by Com. Fatick Ghosh on its behalf to State Labour Advisory Board in its meeting on 4.10.77.

—Ed. Board : P. Era]

We are meeting after a long period of three years at the State Labour Advisory Board. We are meeting at a time when the situation in the industrial field is quite dismal. The capitalists backed by the previous Congress regime let loose spate of attacks on the working class. Retrenchments, closures, lock-outs, lay-off, curtailment of work-strength, increase in work-load, non-implementation of agreements, denials of the legitimate dues and rights of the workers have been the usual features in the industrial field. The workers are being denied of their right to defend their position through movements and struggles. In short, the workers are still subjected to severe and all-sided attacks of the capitalists. And fact is that there has been no change in the situation when we meet here. So, the basic question before us is to determine the policy and attitude of the Government. We must apply our mind to this serious question if we are to discharge our obligation to the working people.

A change in the government, if it is to mean a change in the situation, must have its reflection in the change of attitude of the new Government towards workers' movement and industrial relation.

With the new Government coming to power, the working people naturally expect that this pro-capitalist attitude of the previous government will not be continued and, instead a genuine pro-working class policy and attitude will be taken in order to help developing working class movement.

Workers And Capitalists Are To Be Treated Not On Same Footing

How the government can live up to this

expectation of the exploited people? Workers being the weaker side in this capitalist society they can not be treated in the same footing with the management.

The Government can not plead neutrality between the exploiter capitalists and the exploited workers. It means in effect, defence of the interest of the capitalist class.

The Government To Be Guided By Legitimacy And Not By Legality

A government can not take the pro-working class policy and attitude if it is guided by the concept of legality and not by legitimacy of the demands and movements of the working class because law in a capitalist society like ours' defends and protects the interest of the capitalist class.

So, the Government should be guided by the legitimacy and not by the legality if it wants to uphold the interest of the working class.

Non-Interference Of Police In Legitimate Trade Union Movement

During the Congress misrule, police and bureaucracy were at the beck and call of the industrialists and police interference to break legitimate trade union movements became a general feature. Even now after the installation of the new Government police interference on some pretext or other is going on in legitimate trade union movements. Police is interfering to break strike, putting various obstacles in legitimate struggles, harassing and arresting the workers and even giving interpretation to labour law to determine who is a workman and who is not and on that basis obstructing the workers' entry to the factories. They are manufacturing cases and moving the Court on the basis of those reports to help the management. All

these instances have been brought to the notice of the Government.

So, we think, it is essential that government should unequivocally declare the policy of non-interference of police in legitimate trade union movement as was done by the Labour Ministry of U.F. Government in 1967.

No Protection Of Unscrupulous Employers On The Plea Of 'Law And Order' And 'Industrial Peace'

The Government should give a clear-cut declaration that when the workers are being forced to take strong mass action against those managements who are persistently denying the workers of their legitimate dues and are resorting to victimisation, retrenchment, lay-off, and closures etc, they will not be given the shield of protection from the government on the so-called plea of 'law and order' and that the government will stand firmly by the side of the workers in their legitimate struggle.

So, the government should declare its firm support to the workers when they take strong mass action against the defaulting and unscrupulous management without paying any heed to the so-called bogey of 'law and order'.

Bonus

The pattern of bonus settlement in West Bengal has never been done on the basis of the Act. Even before the Act, some pattern developed on the issue of bonus under various names and style. Bonus as deferred wage has been accepted on all hands. So, bonus should not be linked with productivity. Nor any management be allowed to avoid the obligation of its payment to the workers on the plea of sickness etc. Minimum bonus at the rate of 8.33% should be made obligatory to the managements. Besides, the right to determine bonus on the basis of collective bargaining without any ceiling should be guaranteed by the State Government.

(Contd. from Page 3)

is saying about the difficulty to 'retain power' he is meaning by that the difficulty just to stay on in a bourgeois care-taker government to practise bourgeois legalism? The difficulty, if any, is nothing other than the difficulty that may come from the rival bourgeois parties 'friendly' or otherwise for doing the same thing. Is it because of this that Jyoti Babu of the same party is always urging upon the monopolists for mutual recognition and co-operation? Is he not ensuring all co-operation to the monopolists both national and foreign and is expressing the hope that: 'In return we expect you to accept our reality and give us our opportunities for five years instead of conspiring against us'?

(Economic Times 20.8.77)

It is one thing to utilise Foreign Capital and expertise for speedy Socialist Reconstruction of economy in a Working Class State but it is an entirely different thing to invite them in a Bourgeois Economy

In the context of the well-defined distinction between the state and the government and more particularly between a working class state and a bourgeois care-taker government, will it not be the height of deception and a hideous distortion of Marxism if somebody places the two at par in comparison as if they are the same? Yet that is precisely what Dr. Ashok Mitra resorts to when in defence and justification of the 'Left Front' government's invitation to private monopoly houses and multinationals for investment in West Bengal, he observed in reply to debate on the budget in the Assembly that "even Vietnam would soon be sending trade delegation to India to explore the possibility of inviting private capital".

—(Economic Times 31.8.77)

Does he mean by this that the 'Left Front' government within the Indian bourgeois state Structure and therefore

nothing but a care-taker of the bourgeoisie is the same as the Socialist Republic of Vietnam which working people of that country have established after decades of heroic struggle, after overthrow of the exploiter?

Does he mean to say therefore that the repercussion on the economy and the people as also the political objective of utilising foreign capital and expertise on commercial basis under the firm control of the working class leadership in a socialist state is the same as invitation of private monopoly capital both national and foreign in the bourgeois economy of West Bengal? It should be well known to all who are acquainted with working class movement that after the Great October Revolution, Lenin invited foreign capital and expertise to utilise them under firm control of the working class state and within well specified commercial terms and conditions so as to speed up development and recons-

workers of their labour. Does it not therefore mean an invitation to the private and foreign monopolists to exploit the people and natural resources with all the help they want? Are not the objectives, both economic and political, in the two cases of comparison qualitatively different—in the former, serving the interest of the working class and in the latter that of the exploiting capitalist class? Then why this deliberate attempt to confuse the people? Why this heinous attempt to falsify the important teachings and experiences of the revolutionary working class movement? Whose interest does it serve? Does it help developing revolutionary consciousness of the exploited masses or in the reverse help the bourgeois interest of exploitation of the masses by creating confusion?

Again, if invitation to the multinationals or foreign capital for investment in West Bengal is not reprehensible to the 'Left Front' Government and more particularly to the

multinationals", "in the interests of the people, our country and the working class", the Chief Minister Jyoti Basu of the same party was asking the multinationals from the Ball room meeting of Grand Hotel that: "They are there, we cannot wish them away. Therefore they might as well invest here. We shall provide any help that may be necessary." He was supporting at the same meeting the British owned Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation's scheme for expansion by saying: "Whether they are British or Indian, the fact is that they supply power. If they have a scheme, why can't it be implemented?"

(Economic Times 20.8.77)

Is not Janata Party at the Centre taking the same approach and attitude with the same plea to foreign finance capital? Is not Biju Patnaik while defending the tie-up with Japanese firm in installing a new steel mill in Orissa, giving the same plea, the same line of argument? Then why does Ranadive

and mutual help between his government and the multinationals?

What can be more glaring an instance of double talks and double dealings?

To raise the slogan of ban on entry of foreign capital from the party forums, to give the assurance in the Election Manifesto of confiscation of foreign capital and nationalisation of private monopolies in order to project the party's image as a fighter against private monopoly capital of both national and foreign origins but when placed to government invitation, to foreign and national private monopolies for investment, giving them assurances of all help, are not all this a glaring instance of double talks and double dealings? If it is permissible in the name of Marxism then how can the people distinguish this kind of 'Marxism' from the political double dealings of bourgeois parties and leaders? Bourgeois and petty bourgeois opportunist parties are engaged in the game of deceiving the people. They say one thing from the party platform but do an entirely different thing when placed in the government. A party trying to outwit a rival party from the government may raise a slogan as a pressure tactics in bourgeois parliamentary politics which it will not follow when in government. This is the practice of bourgeois politics but surely not of proletarian politics. Can any serious Marxist have any doubt on this point?

Marxism Leninism or Bourgeois democratic gimmick?

Not only this, in defending his government's invitation to the private monopoly houses for investment in West Bengal, Dr. Mitra has gone on record saying that: "If we had the power, we would confiscate all the capital from the capitalists and distribute it among the poor people. The point is we do not have the power yet."

(Economic Times, 31st August '77)

(Contd. to Page 7)

In the Capitalist Society everything Legal may not be always Justified

and Moral

truction of the economy. Would anybody say that it was wrong and harmful to reconstructing the economy on socialist principles? The answer is obvious. The state power in Russia, after the revolution was firmly consolidated at the hands of the working class and the economy was under its firm control. But here in West Bengal the bourgeoisie is in command of the state and the economy. Mere accession of the leftists to a ministry which is no better than a care-taker of the same bourgeois class interest does not alter this fact in any way. So, the politics of invitation to monopoly capital both foreign and national and assurances of all kinds of help must be the distillation of the bourgeois economy, the economy of serving the aggregate interest of the capitalist class, its rights and opportunities of extracting maximum profit by robbing the

Chief Minister who is a member of the Polit Bureau of CPI(M), then how is it that his party is drafting resolution at the Polit Bureau and Sri B. T. Ranadive another member of the Polit Bureau is also voicing complete ban on the entry of multinationals in Indian economy? Ranadive was urging the CITU delegates to the General Council: "We must unitedly demand a ban on the entry of multinational in the interests of our people, our country and the working class. We must demand nationalisation of the foreign monopoly concerns, if the power of big money to control over our economic life is to be broken, if its power to impose economic misery on us to be done away with."

(Peoples' Democracy 4.9.77)

But while Ranadive is for "ban on the entry of

raise the slogan of ban on entry on foreign capital when Jyoti Babu is prepared to offer any help to the British Capital of CESC to install a new power plant at Titagarh because what matters to him is not "whether they are British or Indian" but "the fact....that they supply power"?

Why this contradiction? Why Jyoti Babu is saying one thing but Ranadive, his Polit Bureau colleague is saying a completely different thing? Is it because Jyoti Babu and Ranadive both members of the Polit Bureau of the same party have divided among themselves their mutual responsibilities? That is why while Ranadive is trying to project his party's image to the people as a fighter against multinationals or foreign capital, Jyoti Babu on his part, is conveying the party's approach to the multinationals by assuring repeatedly, good relation

(Contd. from Page 6)

Now by 'power', obviously, Dr. Mitra had in his mind as shown earlier, the prospect of his party's position as the ruling party in the government at the centre. When Dr. Mitra says that they have not this power yet, he means therefore that they have not yet the power of the government at the centre to change the Constitution.

Had they got this power they would "confiscate all the capital from the capitalists" and "distribute it among the poor people".

Now, what he is speaking about? Is there an iota of Marxism? Does the revolutionary proletariat strive for power meaning the state power and not the position in a bourgeois care taker government to distribute capital among the poor people? Has there any class approach in it? It is the elementary knowledge of Marxism that revolutionary proletariats fight for change of ownership of capital and all the means of production. Their aim is to do away with the fundamental contradiction in capitalist economy by bringing capital and all the means of production under social ownership. It is simply ridiculous to suggest that they fight for distribution of those among themselves. Marxism-Leninism has nothing to do with this anarchic thought of distributing capital to all the poor people like charity in the Alms House. This may be a gimmick of a bourgeois charlatan betraying his utter ignorance or deliberate perversion even of the law of bourgeois economics but it is surely not Marxism-Leninism.

What can be more crude a defence for capitalist exploitation?

After demonstrating his "revolutionary exercise" of "confiscating all the capital of the capitalists" in order to "distribute it among the poor people" and thereby bringing an end to their poverty, if they had the power, Dr. Mitra now says that as they have not yet that power, that is to say, the power to change the Constitution from the position of the

Ultimate Loyalty of a Marxist lies in the cause of Revolution

government at the centre—"In the circumstances, the capital generated in West Bengal should at the very least be reinvested in the state itself. What's wrong in asking the capitalists to do that? Should we ask them to invest in Malaysia or Indonesia?"—(His reply to debate on budget in the West Bengal Assembly—ibid)

Now where does this defence reduce itself? It tells the people that till that time Dr. Mitra's party gets 'power' meaning position in the government at the centre when by changing the constitution, they will distribute all the capital of the capitalists among the poor people to remove their poverty, let the capitalists exploit the poor people of the state of West Bengal and the government should give them all the encouragement and assurances of help so that they can do it more. Because unless the capitalists are thus persuaded to invest more for exploitation of the people by engaging them as employees they may select other people in Malaysia and Indonesia for the same 'holy' mission. So, what's wrong in it to request the capitalists not to deprive the poor people of the state from their blessing of expropriation?

No, absolutely nothing, if it comes from the defenders of capitalism. The bourgeois politicians always 'teach' the working people about their utter helplessness as wage-earners because their very existence depends on the mercy of the capitalists. Unless therefore, they say, the capitalists invest capital which they have extracted by expropriating the working people, they can not hope to survive. So, it would be the 'solemn duty' of the workers not to disturb 'peace'—the peace of this process of their expropriation by the capitalists. This peace is to be maintained as otherwise the capitalists will be angry

and take their capital outside to deprive the people here of being employed to be expropriated. Is there anything new in this kind of defence of capitalism and its exploitative rule? Did not the Congress leaders spread this piece of wisdom day in and day out among the exploited people? Will the Janata ministers have any disagreement on this line of argument?

Indeed, whoever defends the bourgeois system and stands for its perpetuation will stand on the same line of defence, will preach this piece of wisdom to the exploited people. But is it not a fact that this is a bourgeois stand-point as opposed to proletarian stand-point, the stand-point of revolutionary Marxism?

A revolutionary stand-point will not give any false hope to the exploited people that accession by the leftists to government at the centre in a bourgeois set up will bring an end of their slavery to capitalist exploitation. It will be a crime for the revolutionary stand-point to inject helplessness among the working people by begging the mercy of the capitalists for investment so that the workers can offer themselves to be exploited by them. It will on the other hand, tell the working class the plain truth that the capital, the capitalists invest has no altruistic mission but to rob them of their labour power. So, the capitalists are the best judge when, where and how much to invest. They hardly need any counsel of the ministers. Even if the ministers assure them of all kind of help, even if they assure the dumb submission of the workers to their exploitation through the trade unions under their control, the capitalists do not feel assured and still remain shy of investment. They are shy not necessarily because of any suspicion about the bonafides of the assuring ministers but

because of a far more deeper reason. This deeper reason lies in the third phase of intense general crisis of capitalism the manifestation of which is most in the severity of the crisis or market. Under the capitalist system, the people are being continuously robbed of their purchasing power as a result of which the internal market is squeezed also. It is very narrow in our country because of the specific socio economic reasons and chronic recession has become its permanent feature. There is no way out for its revival and expansion other than replacing the moribund capitalist productive system as a whole. That is why, despite all the coaxings and assurances of the ministers and the bounties of fiscal concessions, let alone reopening of the closed factories and establishments, the running ones are hard put to keep themselves running but are simply tottering. Closure, lockout, lay-off, retrenchment go on increasing despite mounting subventions and other fiscal concessions from the government. Can anybody deny this reality?

Despite this concrete reality, therefore, if the CPI(M) Chief minister and other ministers go on urging upon the capitalists, day in and day out for more investment of capital on the ostensible plea of easing the unemployment problem of the state, does it not mean telling the people that what was wanted so long was this piece of advice to the capitalists? Is it not a fact that Emergency was proclaimed precisely with the purpose of denying the working people to put up minimum opposition to the grinding exploitation of the capitalists? Is it not a fact that during the Emergency, plethora of fiscal concessions were given to the capitalists by the Congress Government with the hope that this would induce more investment of

capital? But what has been the result? Why despite all these concessions to the capitalists and subduing the resistance of the working class, there was no appreciable increase in investment of capital? Was it not due to the deepening crisis of the capitalist productive system? Are not therefore, the plea, of the CPI(M) leaders for more investment of capital and their exhortation to the working class for maintaining industrial peace, covering this fact of capitalist productive system and its crisis? Is not their whole attempt, in reality, a shrewd defence of crisis-ridden capitalism and the bourgeoisie? These are the real questions that any Marxist-Leninist must take into his serious consideration in order to find out the real clue to political development at the moment.

Our Appeal To Them

In fine, our appeal goes to the rank and file workers, organisers, sympathisers and supporters of CPI(M). It is true that they sincerely hoped and worked so that their party could play the due role as the defender and vanguard of the working people. Whatever might have been the actual worth and practical implication of that hope and their devotion, none can deny that many of them did so from an earnest desire to serve the cause of the working class and from an emotional attachment to the banner of Marxism-Leninism. Today, they are to judge as had to judge in the past, in similar situation by those having attachment to Marxism-Leninism: whether their leadership is playing sincere to their desire and emotion, whether it is upholding the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism or causing immense harm to that.

So, they are to make an unbiased appraisal of the political stand and behaviours of their leadership. Do all these utterances, political stand and behaviours of their leaders come anywhere near the accepted and well-defined basic

(Contd. to Page 8)

Organs of SUCI

Ganadabi (Bengali)	Published from Calcutta,	W. B.
Sarbahara Yug (Oriya)	„	Cuttack, Orissa.
Sarbahara Yug (Hindi)	„	Patna, Bihar.
Tehrik (Hindi)	„	Rohtak, Haryana.
Gana Mukti (Asamiya)	„	Gouhati, Assam.
Unity (Malayalam)	„	Quilon, Kerala.

ON FARAKKA PROBLEM

(Contd. from Page 1)

In fact, our Party strongly feels that the whole issue should have been approached in a way which would have guided all of us if the country were not vivisected as at present.

Without this integrated approach and principled stand from both the sides and without the mutual appreciation of the problem, which does not necessarily imply surrender of one's own minimum necessity—any over-emphasis from any quarter on any point may lead to a situation the benefit of which can only be reaped by those forces interested in creating and sustaining dissension among the people.

But we are constrained to note that the statements made by some Union Ministers are very much misleading and smack of hush hush politics and the agreement made jointly by the India and Bangladesh Governments miserably lack this comprehensive outlook. Nobody denies that there should be a spirit of accommodation and an attitude of "give and take" in order to reach an agreement on such issues of mutual interest as suggested by the Prime Minister. But the fact that the people of this country were not taken

Vulgarisation of Marxism

(Contd. from Page 7)

tenets of Marxism-Leninism? Are they not, on the contrary, those very pernicious trends and tendencies against which Marx, Lenin and all other great teachers of the proletariat had to wage most consistent, stubborn and life-long struggles? Is it not a fact that all this has been clearly pointed out

into confidence and were completely kept in the dark raise the basic question as to whether the agreement is really so innocuous.

Now to raise the demand of minimum necessity of the Calcutta port from a parochial approach, if any, will damage its very cause; but to show how the necessity of Calcutta port is linked with the economic interest of India as a whole as also of the subcontinent will strengthen its ground both moral and political.

We cannot forget for a moment that the defenders of the capitalist system and their hirelings may be interested in creating and sustaining dissension among the people—whether between those of one state and the other of this country or between the people of India and Bangladesh—but the Marxist revolutionaries who stand for their emancipation, value most the unity of the toiling people all over the world. Farakka problem, like any other problem, should also be approached from this basic angularity.

We call upon the people of India and Bangladesh to forge greater unity among them to foist all attempts of the ruling circles of these two countries to damage it.

by all of them as the line of betrayal to the cause of the working class?

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that ultimate loyalty of a revolutionary lies in the cause of revolution, the class and the masses. Can any genuine Marxist-Leninist disown it on any pretext, on any other lesser consideration?

How the Janata Party Restores Democratic Rights

(Contd. from Page 5)

on the 25th September last under which a person can be detained up to three months if the state government or the district magistrate is satisfied that such detention is necessary to prevent disorder. Just like the former Congress regime the Janata Government too has set up a lame excuse for this most anti-people move and said. "In order to meet the situations which endanger public security, peace, safety and tranquility in any area in the state it is necessary to take action to immobilise those elements which indulge in public disorder". Whatever be the wordings or so-called assurance of the government that this piece of enactment is not aimed at political workers engaged in democratic struggles, experience tells a different thing. One may recall that when MISA was first introduced some sort of assurance of not using it against political workers and organisers of mass movements was solemnly uttered on the floor of the parliament by the Congress Government. What followed later on is known to everybody. Then again in the original draft of MISA the period of detention without trial was limited and the scope and opportunity for review were there as also the detenu had the right to know the cause of detention and move the court. Subsequently all these provisions were withdrawn to give the government a blanket power of detention for an unlimited period without trial. That is why political circles apprehend similar may be the course for this legislation also and are calling it a 'mini-MISA.'

But in the face of intense public criticism, while defending the government, the Janata Party President Mr. Chandrashekar had to admit that the ordinance had been promulgated to extend the Preventive Detention Act which would otherwise have lapsed. May we ask Mr. Chandrashekar what

were their poll promises —was it to scrap all anti-people Acts including MISA and PDA or to extend them?

Common people and the supporters, sympathisers and workers of those parties which are 'friendly' to this Janata Party may wander at its persuing the same anti-people policies like the former Congress regime but the fact is that the Janata Party being the ruling party of the Indian bourgeoisie as an alternative to the Congress in the Two-party system introduced by the monopolist-capitalist class of our country can not but increasingly restrict and curtail the democratic rights of the toiling masses in this present stage of moribund capitalism. Long ago, our beloved leader, teacher and guide and one of the foremost Marxist thinkers of the era **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** taught us that today, in the era of imperialism and moribund capitalism the bourgeoisie are more and more attached to militarism and bureaucracy and less attached to democracy and liberty, however much they may clamour about democracy. Bearing this truth and teachings of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** in mind our Central Committee in a statement

just after the installation of the Janata Party Government at the Centre, cautioned by its resolution on the 6th April '77 that this new alternative to the Congress also "will make serious efforts to more and more squeeze the scope of the legitimate democratic mass movements of the people by arresting them within the bounds of parliamentary politics." So, it is but natural that this ruling Janata Party will also take every possible measure to suppress such movements in the name of containing 'disorder'. That is why retention of the 42nd Amendment to the constitution including the notorious MISA and extension of PDA in Madhya Pradesh.

The working class must take proper lessons from this concrete experience. They must understand that the crisis-ridden capitalism of today can't but encroach on democratic rights and liberties more and more. So, their struggle for defence of rights and liberties is to be inseparably linked up with the struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie for accomplishing the task of anti-capitalist Socialist Revolution in our soil. There is no other alternative and this is the task of the day.

Bihar UTUC (Lenin Sarani) Demands

(Contd. from Page 5)

interfere in the legitimate trade union movements' and in cases of workers' movements on legitimate issues the plea of 'Law and order' should not be brought.

Regarding high price in essential commodities like foodgrains and others, he demanded that the Government should immediately ban private trading in foodgrains and introduce all out State trading wholesale and retail both inclusive.

Deploing at the existing wage rate for the agricultural labourers in the state which on an average is being paid at Rs. 3/- per day and female

labourers even less, he emphatically pleaded for immediate introduction of the recommendations of the Minimum Wage Committee in this regard.

Regarding intra and inter unions' relations, he argued, it is entirely the prerogative of the trade union movements and trade unions themselves should solve the matter. Government need not intervene in the matter.

UTUC (Lenin Sarani) also demanded immediate reconstitution of State Labour Advisory Board and other Industrial Committees with representatives from all Central Trade Unions.

Editor-in-Chief—NIHAR MUKHERJEE