



Red Salute Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

WE VOW Comrade Shibdas Ghosh,

our Beloved Leader, that we will never fail in constant and unceasing cult of the rich treasury of thoughts, you have bequeathed to Indian revolution!

We vow, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, our Great Teacher that we will hold aloft the glorious banner of revolution you have handed down to us!

We vow, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, our Great Guide that like 'one man', we will defend, protect and further advance our Party, the noblest of your creations to ever more and more of victories!

We vow, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, our Great Teacher that we will guard like the apple of eye, the Collective Leadership and Proletarian Democracy in our Party that you taught us how to defend. We assure you Comrade, we will pass this test with credit and fulfil your behest!

We vow, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, our Great Guide that we will ever be steadfast as you taught us to be in our uncompromising battles against revisionism-reformism and all varieties of social-democratism in order to constantly uphold the Base Political Line of the proletariat which is anti-capitalist Socialist Revolution in our country and develop to

that end, the political power of the toiling masses. We assure you Comrade, that we will never be failing in our duties to defend the revolutionary kernel of Marxism as is your behest.

We vow, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, our Great Leader that we will ever be engaged in more and more identifying ourselves with Party and Revolution, in order to be the invincible and decisive force in the complex battles for the emancipation of our society from all sorts of exploitation of man by man. We assure you Comrade that we will win this supreme test with honour as you wanted of us!

We vow, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, our Great Teacher that while engaged in revolutionary work and activities we will always and continuously uplift our revolutionary morals and ethical standards which you taught us to do, in order to keep us in constant readiness to face any test, however hard. We, who have the proud privilege to be your disciples, assure you Comrade that we will not be failing in fulfilling this behest of yours, too!

We vow, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, our Great Guide that guided by your integrated and Great Teachings about Fascism which has appeared as the universal feature in all

the developed and underdeveloped capitalist countries at this post-war period of World Capitalism, we will never be unremitting in our fierce and all-round battles against Fascism, the worst menace to civilisation. We assure Comrade, we will stand this test also with credit as you wanted of us!

We vow, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, the Great and Outstanding Marxist thinker and Philosopher of the Age, our most Beloved Leader, Teacher and Guide that as taught by you, we will ever be guided by your revolutionary teachings about proletarian internationalism and shall always remain allegiant and loyal to the Class and World Revolution as a part of the revolutionary detachment of the International Proletariat.

*Proletarian
Era*

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
(Fortnightly)

Founder Editor-in-Chief:

COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

Vol. II
No. 23

1st August '78
TUESDAY

Price 50 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

Editorial

His Revolutionary Thoughts Guide the Indian Revolution

The 5th of August stands out in the history of our country's glorious struggle for emancipation as the day to pledge anew to be engaged more and more in the relentless struggle for identifying ourselves with the Party and Revolution, in order to be the invincible and decisive force of history, which alone can bring about emancipation of our society from all kinds of exploitation of man by man.

The 5th of August is the day of solemn remembrance that it was on this day that the Great Teacher, Leader, Guide and Living Embodiment of Indian Revolution, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, handed down to us with his parting, the glorious banner of revolution. The toiling millions of the country respectfully remember **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** on this day, as the giant Marxist thinker and philosopher who has bequeathed to Indian revolution a rich treasury of invaluable thoughts covering all aspects of life and revolution; as the great architect who has illumined the path of Indian revolution by concretising Marxism-Leninism on the Indian soil and enriching the treasure-house of this great philosophy in the process, and as an outstanding revolutionary personality who ever remains the undying source of revolutionary inspiration.

The 5th of August reminds us once again in the present political situation of the country of the searching analysis of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** regarding the two-party parliamentary system introduced in this country by the Indian bourgeoisie, and his note of caution to the people long back that it is a sinister device of the ruling bourgeoisie to confine the legitimate, democratic mass movements of the country within the narrow bounds of parliamentarianism and reformism in order to save and ensure a longer lease of life for this crisis-ridden, moribund capitalism. Time and events have proved beyond doubt that this is exactly the direction in which the Indian bourgeoisie has been moving ever since it installed the Janata Government at the Centre.

The 5th of August calls upon us, in this connection, to build up stronger than ever, our relentless struggles not only against the bourgeoisie whom we aim to overthrow to ensure ultimate victory, but also against the pseudo-Marxist parties of the country which stand as the main danger before our revolutionary task. With the teachings of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** before us, we must not forget for a moment that without successfully unmasking these pseudo-Marxist and social democratic parties which profess Marxism but in practice act as henchmen of the very capitalist system we aim to overthrow, it will not be possible for us to achieve the revolutionary goal before us. Recent experiences have proved all the more conspicuously the unflinching caution of the great teacher **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, that the pseudo-Marxist parties of our country are at the moment out to emerge with the backing of the Indian bourgeoisie as the third alternative in the very same arrangement of the two-party

parliamentary system at the cost of democratic mass movements of the country. It is imperative, therefore, that we should direct our main blow against these pseudo-Marxist, social democratic forces and isolate them from the main-stream of democratic mass movement of the country through ceaseless ideological and political struggles involving the masses.

The 5th of August reminds us his great teachings that no amount of sacrifice and bloodshed of the people can bring about their emancipation unless they can find out the correct base political line, the correct leadership and the genuine revolutionary party of the proletariat that has been able to integrate revolutionary politics with the firm foundation of high standard of proletarian culture, ethics and morality.

The 5th of August also calls upon us to be constantly engaged in the struggle to achieve a higher moral cultural ethical standard which is the indispensable foundation of revolutionary politics. As the great teacher **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** has taught us, '...revolutionary thoughts and ideology and revolutionary theory always give birth to higher cultural, moral and ethical values of life. People cannot bring about revolution in any country unless they acquire at least a minimum standard of this high culture, morality and ethics.' We must not for a moment forget his invaluable teaching that '.....it is impossible to acquire the capacity to judge revolutionary theories and to correctly grasp revolution without attaining a higher cultural standard, i.e., the high standard of proletarian culture and ethics.'

To conclude with the clarion call of the Central Committee of our party at this historic moment: 'Comrades, history has bestowed on us the great responsibility of carrying the Great Teachings of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** to the toiling people, organising them along the correct base political line of anti-capitalist Socialist Revolution based on higher moral values, ethics and proletarian culture, mobilising them in People's Committees to build up mass movements as a prelude to developing political power of the people.'

The historic 5th of August therefore bestows upon the toiling millions of the country, the revolutionary duty to strengthen SUCI, the only revolutionary party of the proletariat on the Indian soil, and forge ahead along the path shown by the Great Leader of the Proletariat, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, with the revolutionary mission history has set before us. The thoughts of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh** will ever guide us, ever remain a living inspiration behind our revolutionary determination to brave all odds before our onward march.

Long Live Revolution
Long Live Comrade Shibdas Ghosh
Long Live SUCI

Remembering the Revolutionary Teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

WHY ANTI-CAPITALIST SOCIALIST REVOLUTION?

What is revolution? By revolution, we mean not the replacement of a government but replacement of the very state structure. For, different governments may come and go within a definite state structure but that does not alter in any way the basic class character of the state....

.....The state and government are not one and the same thing. There are three principal organs of a modern state machine viz. the army, the bureaucratic-administrative system along with police and the judiciary. These are the three permanent organs of a modern state. These organs do not change along with the change of government—no matter whether the government is changed either by election or through adjustment between different parties or groups in the parliament or by a military coup. At best some personnels may be replaced from time to time. But this is no revolution. It does not replace the state machine which is a class system with a definite class psychological makeup, process of thinking and method of work.

.....The state is to be considered almost like a machine—the government's position here is just like an operator or a care-taker of the machine. It is a class instrument of coercion. Every state machine is closely linked up with a particular phase of history in the development of production. The modern state machine has its own characteristic features and its tuning and makeup is such that all its three organs always function as a composite whole and a centralised one, and each of them is designed to serve the political purpose of a definite class. The operator of a machine cannot perform any work by that machine other than the work for which the machine was solely designed.....

Similarly, the government, the operator, with all the efficiency and skill at its command, with a capitalist state machine cannot do, in the main, anything else other than coercing the people in the interest of capitalist exploitation. It makes fundamentally no difference whether the coercion and exploitation are made in a cruel, in a crude, a blunt way or they are done in a subtle and cunning way with a sweet coating..... So by mere change of government, the class character of the state is not changed.

.....About this change in government through parliamentary election we must bear in mind one cardinal point. When people are very much aggrieved and agitated against any government then through an election a new government may be installed. Common people hold certain persons in the

government to be dishonest and responsible for their miseries. They think replacements by some 'good' or 'honest' persons in the government will bring their well-beings. This type of falsehood is propagated by the bourgeois politicians to dupe the people under cover of their diverse political programme and ideologies in parliamentary politics. I must therefore warn the workers, peasants and other oppressed masses—the common people, not to be deceived by this bluff. They must remember that by a mere change of government the fundamental problems of their life cannot be solved—no, never. Whatever may be the changes in the rules and procedures in the parliamentary system, however much be the democratic rights and the plannings for giving relief to the people they may adopt—all this cannot bring people's liberation; rather with the passing of days, people's miseries will be mounting, their condition will further worsen.

What follows if instead of a fundamental change in the state structure there is only a change in the government? If the persons who come in the government are 'good' or 'honest' that only adds to the complexities. These 'good' or 'honest' people, confused though they may be, if they dare not advance to the path of revolution have before them the only alternative of subservience to the class interest of the bourgeoisie. They attempt at reforms and thereby actually help consolidation of the bourgeois class rule. But as the people have faith in them, this brings lull, even though temporarily, in people's grievances and agitation. This gives the opportunity to the bourgeois rule to be further consolidated under the government of the so-called 'honest' and 'able' administrators.

.....So, this 'good' or 'able' administrator, if he fails to stand up against this bourgeois class rule and motive on a clear-cut conception and on the contrary allows himself to be used as the instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie in pacifying the militant struggles of the oppressed masses against capitalist exploitation and helps the bourgeois class rule to further consolidate then he does, by all this, positive disservice and enmity to people's cause, no matter whether he is confused or sold out to the bourgeoisie.

We need to remember in this connection that even the bourgeois democrats also bring reforms—reforms that do not in any way, adversely affect or hamper the class interest of the ruling bourgeois class. Those reforms may even go against the conventional sense of legality. But whenever any reform or change is urgently called for in the interest of social progress and from the principles of

legitimacy but going against the class interest of the bourgeoisie, these bourgeois democrats raise the hue and cry that to be legitimate it must conform to legality, otherwise they hold, there is no meaning of the concept of 'rule of law'. They say this, not merely from their ignorance about the relationship between legitimacy and legality but out of their deliberate class motive.

Can they explain—if it is true that what is not legal is not also legitimate then why the word 'legitimate' has come into being in addition to the word 'legal' if not to carry a distinctly different connotation? Do they mean to say, then, that to serve or sing praise for the existing laws which have lost their role and character as the contributing factor to social progress and are no better than privileges at the hands of the ruling bourgeois class and instruments at the hands of the privilege-seekers will bring glory to legitimacy and justice? How can the new laws develop without new concept of legitimacy? How can new laws take shape to be conducive to newly emerging social urges, people's interest and human progress? That is why people's movement must develop and be organised so as to bring sufficient pressure to bear upon for discarding bad laws and replacements of those by new ones. This pressure of people's movement is very vital as it has its impact on all concerned—the administrators, the legislators, and even the judges. That is why even the laws containing progressive measures fail to deliver anything good if they fail to meet the ends of legitimacy in the absence of pressure of public opinion and democratic mass movement. *For this reason, those who talk loudly of democracy, progress and people's interest must stand four square in defence of people's legitimate movement even if it oversteps the prevailing concept of legality.* Otherwise, democracy loses all its relevance. *Otherwise, it means in actuality an unashamed advocacy for the existing exploitative capitalist order and to stand in loud defence of this law or legality without caring to analyse whether this conforms to the ends of legitimacy as, did all the despotic rulers in the past.....* According to this stand then, only they are 'good' and 'iron-like administrators' who can run this 'rule of law' like the grinding wheel and steam rollers, with all the ruthlessness, over the masses—whatever might be the character of the law of the country, be it the law of the despot or the most lawless law against people's interest. If this be the other name of running a government then I hold, need we have this kind of a government?

.....So you see, if the production and life of our people are to be freed from the yoke of capitalist exploitation and oppression, there is no other way but to overthrow the capitalist state machine through revolution.

.....The state power in our country is consolidated at the hands of the bourgeois class, the capitalists. Revolution is nothing but the struggle to overthrow the state machine. The working class fight and develop their organisation but all this can have but one ultimate goal and object—to overthrow this exploitative state machine. To be

(Contd. to Page 4)

(Contd. from Page 3)

precise, this means they are to compel a class to be dislodged from state power, they are to remove a particular socio-economic system by striking it a hammerblow. But which class is to be dislodged from power? Which class-economy and class-system they are to strike to remove? Is it anything other than the capitalist class, its class instrument of coercion, its class economy and social system? This is the fundamental political question which is being tried to be confused by many by raising the slogans against feudalism, imperialism as also monopoly capital. This slogan against monopoly capital is in the mouth of all. Even the Chhatra Parishad, Juba Congress the students' and youth wings of Congress also raise this slogan. CPI and CPI(M) too join in the chorus. They are all united to give the same bluff to the people. But the fundamental point at issue is whether the struggle against monopoly capital or for that matter individual monopoly houses of Tatas and Birlas is the struggle directed against individuals or against capitalism and the capitalist class? The slogan should have its direction against the class—the capitalist class. For, monopoly capitalists by themselves do not constitute a class. They form a group or section of a class. The owners of big industrial houses and banking institutions have a firm grip over finance capital and they form a group or upper layer of the class which is called the financial oligarchy that leads the capitalist class against which we want to direct our attack. To direct the attack, against the leading group or section leaving aside the class which is the main enemy of the people, means to shield the main enemy—the capitalist class. Can we remove the bourgeoisie by shielding it as a class? That is why you can very well see that from Marx, Engels down to Chou En-lai who the other day in the 10th Party Congress of CPC raised the same very question and spoke on it although with different ways of expressions. All of them said the same thing that our fight was not against individuals. Individuals may come and go but so long the capitalist class exists it is bound to give birth to monopoly capital. Monopoly capital does not mean individual monopoly houses like that of Birlas or Tatas. Monopoly capital is but the inevitable result of capitalist rule, of capitalist productive system.....

That is why unless the fights against individual monopolists like Tatas and Birlas or against individual factory owners are conducted from the basic class angularity of fight for the overthrow of capitalism, unless the people and the working class are organised on the basis of revolutionary class consciousness and ideologies conducive to the struggle to overthrow the capitalist class, these fights will never strike capitalism as such nor will these be able even to touch it in any way however much those fights be larded with pseudo-militant vocabularies and slogans.

So, you see that the motive behind raising this slogan against monopoly capital by all these pseudo-revolutionary and sham-Marxist parties is to shield capitalism, is to hide the basic truth of anti-capitalist

revolution and to that end they make a show of fight against individual monopoly houses like those of Tatas and Birlas. That is why they are persistent in their efforts to confuse the elementary and base question regarding the determination of the stage of revolution.

According to Marxist-Leninist terminology a revolution to overthrow the bourgeoisie from state power which is consolidated at its hands, is called a Socialist Revolution. It makes no difference so far as the stage of revolution is concerned even if there are a few feudal lords as the allies of the bourgeoisie in the state power. Anybody acquainted with the history of the Russian revolution can well appreciate this fact.

..... Lenin showed that with the overthrow of Nicholas Tsar from state power, the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution in Russia was attained. Politically, after the February Revolution, there, in place of Nicholas Tsar, that is, in place of an old class a new class, the Russian bourgeoisie, had assumed the state power. Lenin, of course, knew that from economic aspect many of the tasks of Bourgeois Democratic Revolution remained unfulfilled till then in Russia. In the rural economy, despite infiltration of capitalism, feudalism still continued to exist as a powerful force. Economically, subjugation or subservience to imperialism and financial oligarchy of the rich European capitalist countries was very much marked

Why Anti-Capitalist Socialist Revolution?

till that time. But still then Lenin said that since politically the main question of revolution was connected with the question of seizure of state power—hence the moment the Russian bourgeoisie had captured the state power by overthrowing Nicholas Tsar, that is, a new class had assumed the state-power in place of the old one—*to that extent and in that sense the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution was completed and Russia had entered the stage of Socialist Revolution.*

(In our country) those who speak of Peoples' Democratic Revolution are in the main refusing to take into cognition the objective reality of the capitalist state structure and capitalist economic system. They say that the first and foremost task of revolution in our country is to overthrow feudalism and imperialism. That is to say, they do not hold that the principal task in the present stage of revolution of our country is to overthrow the bourgeoisie which is in state power but to remove whatever economic exploitation of the foreign imperialist power is on our economy as also the feudal exploitation, of course, how and to what extent the latter remains is only known to them. Reality is this that in the land relation of our country feudal exploitation ceases to exist. I would tell them—if for want of scientific method of cultivation or for the reason that our agriculture is not mechanised you hold that feudalism still remains then you fail to understand how capitalism, when its growth is delayed, makes penetration in agrarian economy in the era of

imperialism and proletarian revolution and more so in the third phase of intense general crisis of world capitalism.

They have failed to grasp that due to inherent weakness of the leadership to uphold the banner of social and cultural revolution in the freedom struggle some of the customs, forces of habits and forms of the old feudal system remain as a hangover of the past in the superstructure. But whether the agricultural economy of our country is feudal or capitalist is not determined by whether there is big land holding or small land holding or by whether the agricultural economy is thoroughly mechanised or not. Lenin has laid down clear-cut guideline in this regard. He has shown that it is to be determined by the character of the agricultural commodities and the nature of the trade and commerce system of the agricultural commodities. In our case, concentration of major portion of land in the hands of a few, gradual transformation of the major sections of the rural population into proletariat and semi-proletariat, transformation of land into the means for investment of capital, owner-wage earner relationship governing agricultural production and above all transformation of agricultural produce into the commodities of the national capitalist market—all this conclusively prove that our agricultural economy is out and out capitalist in character.

In our country, the landless labourers, the share-croppers and the poor peasants are actually engaged in a life-and-death struggle against not only that section of the big land owners who have under their possession land much above the ceiling laws held by means of 'benam' transfer, but even against those who own 60 to 75 bighas of land and who belong to the rich peasant or jotedar class in villages. Whoever therefore, is serious about organising struggles in the interest of the landless peasants, share-croppers and poor peasants will have in reality to stand up and wage struggle against the rich peasants or jotedars, otherwise, despite phrase-mongering and tall talks of upholding the cause of poor peasants, they will subserve, in reality, the interest of the jotedars or rich peasants in villages. It is obvious that the rich peasants who were allies of Chinese revolution against the feudal lords are enemies of the Indian revolution as a class and stand as allies of the national bourgeoisie in power in our country who have transformed land into the means of capitalist production of agricultural commodities for the national capitalist market.

..... This is why if the agrarian programmes of all these parties starting from Congress to SP, CPI, CPI(M)—both the rightist and the leftist parties—are carefully and critically examined, it will be very much clear to anyone that except differences in terminology and style of expression; all other programmes, barring that of SUCI, are aiming at keeping our agricultural economy arrested or confined, in the main, in small peasant economy. The very same thing is found in the programme of BLD (now Janata Party—Ed. P. Era) also although used in a different term 'Laghu uddyog'. These people in utter disregard to

(Contd. to Page 6)

In the light of the teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

THE PRESENT LANGUAGE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENTS —THE SINISTER BOURGEOIS DESIGN UNMASKED

In recent times different State Governments and the Centre have been prescribing educational reforms for the people which seek, among other things, to minimise the role of English in education in our country. In Bihar the authorities favour a non-retention policy for school students upto class VIII—promotion will not be held up for failure to earn pass marks in English at annual examinations. The Haryana Government is also reported to have decided in favour of relaxing emphasis on learning and study of English at school and college levels. The Bombay University has virtually exiled English from its curriculum for the degree courses. Last year the University completely did away with English in the science and commerce streams. This year it has gone a step further by cutting into half the English course in the arts stream.

The CPI(M)-led 'Left Front' Government in West Bengal has taken a lead in this direction. Not only does it contemplate a spate of measures to dismantle English at different levels of education, it plans to restrict the study of vernacular languages even. If the schemes and contemplations of the different boards and committees charged with the job of conducting education at its several levels in the State be examined critically, and if the composition and character of these bodies are taken into account alongside, then the above is the inescapable conclusion from the 'Left Front' Government's language policy in education.

The proposal to abolish English by the 'Left Front' Government

The Primary Syllabus Committee of the State has proposed to withdraw English from the curriculum of the primary education. The 'Left Front' Committee has endorsed it by recommending only the mother tongue, and no other language to be taught at the primary level. It should be noted that the Primary Syllabus Committee consists of members whose majority belong to the constituents of the 'Left Front'. The Secondary Board of Education has come up with its proposal for relegating English to the optional status at the secondary level. The

Secondary Board was superseded by this Government, immediately after it had assumed power, in a totally undemocratic and bureaucratic way; and its administrator is one who belongs to the major partner of the Front. Then, at the other end, the Academic Sub-Committee of the Calcutta University Council follows with its recommendation for discontinuing the present system of compulsory study of language and literature in the arts and commerce streams at the degree level and making the study optional instead. The Council, which is the university's supreme body at present, was appointed by this Government in similar undemocratic and illegitimate way in supersession of all the previously elected bodies. It has on it a majority of members with affiliation to the Front's constituents. At the time of supersession the Government promised to hold early elections to the statutory bodies and hand over to them the charge of administering the university's functions. Caring least for the democratic norms, the Government now seeks to carry into effect its language policy through this subservient Council. In the face of severe public criticism against the Government's language policy in education, the Minister for Higher Education of the State held a conference with the Vice-Chancellors of the different universities.

It was decided there that a language group, including English, Bengali, Hindi, etc. would be introduced in the curricula for the arts and commerce streams at the degree level in all the universities of the State and the students would be required to select one language from this group and study it as a compulsory additional subject. Failure in the language subject will not debar one from obtaining the graduate degree provided one has passed in the other subjects. Evidently, the decision is the sequel to an after thought of the Government. But however shrewd a twist the Government may give its language policy to ward off the severe public criticism against the policy, language courses remain defacto optional in the proposed revised pattern of the degree courses. Moreover, it is significant that the scope of choice has not been restricted between English and the mother tongue only, but has been widened to include Hindi too within its ambit. The consensus arrived at this highest level conference at the Government's initiative further corroborates that the recommendations of the above-mentioned bodies at different levels of education are the translated forms of the 'Left Front' Government's language policy in education and that the Government plans to implement it upto the highest level throughout the State.

An all-India common pattern is discernible on language policy

The language policies in education adopted or conceived by the different State Governments have certain features that are significantly common. In the first place, these have all a common direction—the drive is to minimise the role of English in education. In

the second place, the arguments put forward in each case are almost identical. The grounds on which retention of English or emphasis on its study are disfavoured are: English is a bar to spread of education among the masses; since education has to be imparted in the mother tongue, the learning and study of English is not all that necessary—at least, it is not essential in the lower levels; the percentage of failure is high for English, causing frustration among the students; English proves to be a dispensable load, particularly at the primary level, where it helps only to jam the brains of the little children. Besides, it is also argued that English is a foreign language and its continuance in education in our country is only a colonial legacy. In view of this identity of character of the language policies in education of the States and the Centre, it cannot be construed as merely coincidental that the different State Governments and the Centre have been simultaneously contemplating measures which aim at the same goal. These are not really stray or isolated developments on the education front. These constitute an all-India pattern with a common direction and a manifestly common purpose. A critical examination of what have been advanced as arguments against English reveals that these have least affinity for logic. These are actually pleas for something other than what these seemingly aim at. Moreover, the education pattern and programme prescribed for the common people by these Governments, particularly the 'Left Front' Government in West Bengal, makes it clear as daylight that the ruling parties in the States and at the Centre which include all the major parties in the country do not recognise the necessity of English in the life of the

common people of our country. In short, while these parties do not admit the importance of English in the people's life and have quietly launched a programme to scuttle the role of the language, they are advancing all sorts of pleas to confuse the people and win their sanction.

Downgrading the role of English means positive discouragement to its study

It follows therefore that the moves by the ruling parties to relax emphasis on the study of English, make it optional at different levels, and even abolish it at some levels, do not simply mean downgrading the role of English in education, or slighting its importance. There is more in it. There is a positive discouragement to its study. They want the people to believe that their reforms are intended to make the education pattern conform to the needs of the people. But will abolition of English contribute in any way to solving of any of the countless problems infesting our educational system? Will withdrawal of English pave the ground for universal elementary education? If the study of English be made optional, will that help prevent the decline in the standard of education? Will that open the door to higher education for all? Will it solve the problem of the high percentage of failure in examinations? Or, will it on the contrary actually benefit those who view the issue from considerations of job opportunity alone? A close examination of these questions and a critical study of the issues involved in all their aspects would convince that the study of English and its continuance have nothing to do whatsoever with the problems plaguing our educational system. The language

(Contd. to Page 7)

(Contd. from Page 4)

the law of development of production are advocating in favour of giving more stress on small enterprises. In their programme, they declared that they would develop numbers of small and light industries in the villages and thereby strengthen agricultural economy through small farming.....The main and sole programme of agrarian reform be it 'agrarian revolution' in some one's terminology, is the distribution of land to the agricultural labourers and the landless and poor peasants. 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 the sin in the interest of protecting this reactionary and moribund capitalist system as long as possible.

.....**That is why I tell you that this political programme of people's democratic revolution, in our country, is nothing but a variant of neo-revisionist or national bourgeois reformist programme. Its object is to confuse the principal political object of revolution.**

The birth of national capital in India, the development of indigenous industries, the transformation of national capital into monopoly capital, the birth of financial oligarchy through the merger of industrial capital and banking capital, the exercise of control by the Indian monopolists over the industrial and even the agricultural produce and over the whole economic life of the country through stock exchanges and banks as also the birth of Indian finance capital and its export not only to the markets of Asia and Africa and different European countries but to the USA and UK even, that is to say, the attainment of imperialist character by the Indian capital—all these concrete facts are being stubbornly denied by the proponents of People's Democratic Revolution.

So, fallacy and self-contradiction are writ large in their arguments. You can see they are saying that India is an independent national state. If India is an independent national state, can it be other than a sovereign bourgeois national state? More so, if the type of state is modern, what else can it be other than a bourgeois state? So, overthrowing the bourgeoisie i.e. ruling capitalist class from state power, freeing the productive system from capitalist relations as also smashing the bourgeois state machinery—all these questions are interlinked with modernisation and mechanisation of agriculture and opening the door of uninterrupted industrial revolution on which depend the solution of people's miseries and destitution. And the question of solving the unemployment problem also hinges on all this.

.....So, under whatever pretext, under whatever cover of theory, whoever may try to bypass this fundamental question, are, in fact, diverting the attention of the people to unnecessary details and are creating confusion on the base political line of Indian revolution. Because of this, even when there

will be mounting surge of revolutionary movements of the people they will be wasting their energies by directing their fight against the imaginary enemies. Or in the reverse, as a reaction, they will seek shelter and security in safe parliamentary politics. Nothing can save them from either of these eventualities. Either going to the safe and secured shelter of parliamentary politics, joining in the bandwagons of revisionism-reformism or in the reverse, wasting the revolutionary fervour through adventure. Judge for yourself the class alignment of

Why Anti-Capitalist Socialist Revolution?

forces in the strategy of their so-called People's Democratic Revolution in our country. They hold the national bourgeoisie and the rich peasants i.e. the village jotedars as allies of their revolution. CPI(M) does a trick by differentiating 'the monopoly capitalist class' from the national bourgeoisie and holding the former as 'big bourgeoisie'. They direct their fire against this 'big bourgeoisie' and stooges of imperialism of their definition. But I have shown that this 'big bourgeoisie' whom they brand as 'monopoly capitalist class', the collaborators of imperialism are none else than the national bourgeoisie who in fact were transformed into monopoly capitalist class in course of the development of the capitalist economy of our country. Naturally, by holding the national bourgeoisie i.e. the class in power, to be an ally of their 'revolution', they in fact confine their revolution only in empty verbiage and continue to practise and remain totally engrossed in the parliamentary politics despite mouthing pseudo-militant, pseudo-revolutionary slogans at the same time—as you can easily see they are doing now.

I now draw your attention to another important point which is very relevant in this regard. Not only the Indian national capital is showing the distinct features of imperialism but the distinguishing features of fascism, namely concentration of private capital, development of state capital, fusion of the two into state monopoly capitalism thereby reducing the state subservient to the monopolists and reduction to the minimum of mutual competition between individual capitalists through planning etc. administrative rigid firmness, cultural regimentation are clearly discernible in our country. These characteristic features of fascism are to be found in all the capitalist countries, now, although in varying degrees including such countries in Asia and Africa. In the concrete background of all these developments what kind of a 'revolution' it will be with the ruling bourgeoisie as an ally is for you to judge!

This is the reason why those who evade the fundamental political question of overthrowing the bourgeoisie from state power through anti-capitalist socialist revolution but make a fanfare of their so-called militancy by raising loud slogans against monopoly capital, foreign imperialist powers and feudalism while scrupulously avoiding the task

of overthrowing the bourgeois state machine which has already been placed on the agenda of the day and who even deny the reality of Indian capital's growing imperialist characteristic features, are propagating in the name of political programmes of their phantom revolutions—be it people's democratic revolution or national democratic revolution, *nothing but bourgeois reformist programme from the point of view of strategic questions of a revolution. In the ultimate analysis, these programmes are nothing but programmes for grabbing governmental power through parliamentary election by fanning up in the course of day-to-day movements of the masses, the anti-ruling party sentiments and feelings and passing the movements for 'revolution'.*

If, therefore, the programmes of these fancied revolutions are carefully and critically examined it would be crystal clear that behind the smoke-screen of so-called revolutionary verbiages these are in reality programmes for certain reforms after coming to government through election. That is to say, if these parties can form government within the existing bourgeois productive system and state structure they will pass it for a people's democratic government and after having brought some reforms the government will claim to have brought about a transformation of the existing bourgeois state into a people's democratic state. And in this way, according to them a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism will be quite possible. But what have all these programmes to do with the revolutionary transformation of the state? *The political programmes of these parties are no better than election programmes and have nothing to do with overthrowing the existing bourgeois state machinery in order to bring real solutions to the fundamental problems in the life of the masses.*

.....It should, therefore, be remembered always that **Revolution and revolt or agitation for reforms are not one and the same. By revolution we mean the conscious, organised and armed uprising of the masses on the basis of definite base political aims and objects, a correct ideology and the genuine revolutionary political line of the proletariat.**

.....In the background of all this, I must say that we want a distinct ideology before our struggles and movement. What do we mean by ideology? **By ideology we do not mean some jargons borrowed from outside and some high-sounding words. Sense of ethical values and culture, morals and principles of movement, sobriety and decency of character—ideology connotes all this.**.....If we correctly grasp the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, we shall understand that *the ability to appraise Marxist-Leninist theories critically cannot be acquired at all unless we can attain the higher cultural standard, that is, the proletarian cultural standard.* So, when they say that "the party is correct since their theory of revolution is correct"—they forget that they cannot even properly ascertain the correctness or otherwise of their theory because of low

(Contd. to Page 7)

Why Anti-Capitalist Socialist Revolution ?

(Contd. from Page 6)

cultural standard. **This is one of the main reasons for the repeated mistakes these so-called Marxist-Leninist parties are committing in formulating their base political line, in ascertaining the stage of revolution in India and in determining the day-to-day tactics of revolutionary mass movements.** You are to bear in mind a very important thing in this connection. **Fascism is a peculiar fusion between spiritualism and science.** It is in other words a queer admixture of spiritualism, obscurantist ideas, illogical and fanatic bent of mind with the technological aspects of science ; when such a thing does really take place in a country then the logical and scientific bent of mind of the people to probe things critically, thoroughly, dies out. Can anything be more catastrophic than this for the progressive and revolutionary movement in a country ?

Under the circumstances, **if the three things viz, i) fanaticism based on nationalism, ii) traditionalism and spiritualism and iii) most superficial ideas of socialism and some vague and deceitful slogans of revolution and progress can be blended together then that becomes the most fertile soil for the rise and growth of fascism.**

In our country, as a part of their wider conspiracy, the ruling capitalists are doing everything within their means to inject cultural degeneration and pervert ethics and morality into our society. They are purchasing and hiring the youth, taking advantage of their abject poverty to form so-called voluntary organisations or storm-troopers and engaging them against democratic mass movements. In this heinous activity the pseudo-left and sham-Marxist parties are also not lagging behind. These parties have, so to say, become some sort of 'employment exchanges' to unemployed youths whom they recruit to engage in crude tactics of physical coercion on their opponents. Thus they are raising bands of fanatic supporters who are encouraged in lying and circulating canards against the opponents thus revealing a very low culture. By this act, these parties are in reality helping the ruling class in creating a breeding ground for fascism.

That is why it is all the more necessary and urgent to conduct ideological political

struggle constantly and consistently against any attempt whatsoever to pollute the logical bent of mind with irrationality, blindness and fanaticism, in order to create an atmosphere for constant cult of knowledge and science, discussions and polemics amongst different ideas conducive to the progressive and revolutionary movement in the country.

Let me remind you—our ideology is Socialism and Proletarian Internationalism. *There cannot be any socialism, true socialism, divorced from Proletarian Internationalism.* Socialism divorced from Proletarian Internationalism is worst opportunism—worst opportunism, perhaps worse than National Jingoism. *And we have among the 'leftists' this brand of socialists.* There are among them those who have no sense of obligation to Proletarian Internationalism. They do not feel any obligation. *They feel proud that they are nationally oriented only. Still they speak of socialism !*

But those who speak of socialism must be proletarian internationalist because socialism cannot but be proletarian internationalism. Whatever else is the brand is not true socialism but fake socialism either of Nehru or Moraji brand, Bernard Shaw brand, Nasser brand of Egypt or of such varieties which could never bring nor can ever bring socialism anywhere. What they brought instead, was capitalism-fascism as Mussolini and Hitler did in the name of socialism. They also uttered the catchwords of socialism but what they actually brought was fascism-militarism, ultra-nationalism-jingoism but never Socialism. So, this inseparable link of Socialism with Proletarian Internationalism is always to be borne in mind. **Wherever is there any brand of socialism that feels no obligation to Proletarian Internationalism, know it for certain, is a fraud on socialism. There can be least doubt about it and no compromise with it.** If you can show your political awareness and detect this fraud then it will not be very difficult for you to screen those among the so-called Marxist-Leninists who are guilty of committing this crime and isolate them.

.....I would like to remind you that whatever may be the situation today, a change is sure to come. How soon will come the change—it all depends on you. How

soon will come the revolution, depends on how much time you will take to develop **people's alternative political power in the concrete forms of revolutionary councils and people's committees like the Soviets through unitedly conducting movements, organised on the correct base political line and ideology and under the leadership of the real revolutionary party of the proletariat.** But remember, you can never achieve revolution through deception, through shouting of slogans, through tricks in ballot boxes. **You can achieve revolution only when you have been able to give birth to people's own political power on the basis of correct base political line and ideology and under the leadership of a genuine revolutionary party of the proletariat.** Electoral battles that you fight, the democratic movements on economic demands that you conduct—if you can view and conduct all these struggles conducive to your fundamental revolutionary struggles then and then only these will be purposive.The fundamental point is this—whether you have been able to determine and uphold before these mass movements, the correct ideology and principles, the correct political line, the correct stage of revolution i.e. whether you have correctly determined that the main political task of revolution is to overthrow the bourgeoisie that is now in the state power.*

*Compiled from the extracts of speeches of

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh :

1. Indonesia—an analysis of the background of the abortive coup of 30th September (Bengali), January 1966 (Prepared under **Com. Shibdas Ghosh's** guidance).
2. 24th April speech, 1975 (Proletarian Era).
3. People's Liberation Pledge Day (Bengali), August '67.
4. On Problems in Mass Movements (Bengali) December '75.
5. On the Working Class Movement (Bengali), March '74.
6. Cultural Degeneration And Where Lies The Solution To Unemployment Problem (Bengali), Nov. '73.
7. Present Situation And Our Task (Bengali), 24th April '66.
8. Proletarian Era, November Special '77.
9. 24th April speech, '73.
10. Why SUCI is the only genuine communist Party in India, March '69.

On the Present Language Policy of the Government

(Contd. from Page 5)
policies proposed or pursued by the Governments in the States and at the Centre would not help in any way to solve these problems. On the contrary, discouragement to the study of English, or its withdrawal in any form, will vitally affect our life in many ways. It is not difficult to follow then that at the back of these moves,

which have a common direction and a common object, a definite political motive has been lurking. The repercussion of the 'Left Front' Government's language policy in education is wrought with still graver implications. This Government has resorted to a conspiratorial move to not only dismantle English at the several levels of education, but discourage

study of languages in general. Otherwise how is it that it has decided to make the study of even the mother tongue defacto optional at the college level while it claims to be all for encouraging the mother tongue as the medium of instruction at all levels of education ? This Government has been making all its moves by shrewd and surreptitious means so

that the people may not be able to detect its covert design and oppose its plan to discourage the study of languages, especially of the English language.

The covert design is to push the students to opt out of higher education

A thorough examination of the issue would convince that the pivotal question is whether English has nece-

ssity or not in the life of our common people. Since the question has a very important bearing on our life we feel that everyone concerned with education—teacher, student, guardian, educationist—and the public at large should ponder over it seriously. Whatever pleas may the ruling parties be advancing to discourage the study

(Contd. to Page 8)

(Contd. from Page 7)

of English, the people should be conscious of the role English has been playing, directly and indirectly, in their life. They cannot afford to underestimate the importance of English and cannot hence view at the issue the way the ruling class and the various political parties like them to. It is essential and urgent therefore that they detect the real political motive working at the back of the language policies of the different State Governments and the Centre. Otherwise they would fall victim to the tricky manoeuvres of the ruling parties, and would unknowingly help these parties achieve their anti-people political object.

English played a very important role in our national movement

While proceeding to examine the issue in its entirety, it is felt here necessary to point out at the outset the absolute illogicality of viewing English as a foreign language. The ruling class has frequently advanced it as a plea in a bid to rouse public sentiments against English. We discussed the point over several times previously and would like to reiterate here that English, even though it has not originated in our country, has full claims to be regarded as one of the national languages of India. For, it is the mother tongue of a community of the land—that is one criterion by which to judge whether a language is foreign or not to a country. English has also been playing a vital role as the language of thought of the educated people of all the nationalities of our country. It has played a highly important and significant role in the freedom struggle of our country against the British imperialism. It was introduced by the British rulers to serve their imperialist interest no doubt, but it cannot be denied that in the course of history the language mingled with the cultural life and thinking of the educated people of the land. Our acquaintance

ENGLISH BEING THE MOST DEVELOPED LANGUAGE IS THE GATEWAY TO HIGHER THOUGHTS

with the Western philosophy, science and culture took place through this language and that undoubtedly contributed in a significant way to the ushering in of the renaissance in our country. It has to be remembered in this context that those who were the first to be imbued with the spirit of nationalism in our country and who initiated the freedom struggle to shake off the yoke of the British colonial rule were all educated in English; they were not the product of the traditional education catered in the 'tols' and 'madrasahs' of the land. It should therefore be realised that those who choose to denigrate the study of English as a colonial legacy disregarding the historical role of the language in our country try actually to conceal the real motive behind the measures to discourage the study of the language and to abolish it gradually in the education for the common people.

English still continues to play a very vital role in our educational system

The relevance and importance of English in the life of our people should be ascertained from various angles. We may begin by examining the role which the language plays in our education. There cannot be two opinions regarding the importance of the mother tongue as medium of instruction in education. It is common knowledge that comprehension as also expression of any idea or thought is best accomplished through the mother tongue. For, if the language in which one habitually thinks, or communicates one's thoughts, be the medium of learning, then comprehension and expression of the contents of learning become easy accomplishments. And no other language can compare with

the mother tongue in this respect. It is universally accepted therefore that the medium of instruction should be the mother tongue at all levels of education. But none of the nationality languages in our country has grown rich enough to be able to serve as the medium of instruction at the higher level of education. English is therefore still the medium of instruction in higher education. And it will necessarily continue in this role till the objective condition of a change over materialises. And that cannot happen overnight. Moreover, to switch over to the mother tongue does not require us to neglect English if it has other utility in our life. Nor does this neglect help to enrich the mother tongue. In fact the neglect of English has been creating a void in our education pattern and is inevitably lowering the standard of higher education where English still holds the key.

Retention of English is essential for access to advanced thoughts and learnings

This should be counted as but one of the several positive reasons for which study of English should be continued in our education. And should we learn the language, it is only best and most scientific that we should begin its course at the primary level where the children can pick it up with ease and speed. But it is astounding to find different State Governments, especially the 'Left Front' Government in West Bengal, particularly keen on withdrawing English at the primary level. They assert that their object is universal elementary education, but retention of English at the primary level proves to be a bar to the spread of education among the vast multitude of our illiterate people, particularly among those living in the country-

side. But where do they base their argument really? They want the mother tongue to be the medium of instruction in their programme for the spread of education. Nobody asks these enthusiasts for universal elementary education to employ some language other than the mother tongue as the medium of instruction in achieving their object. The question does not arise at all. But what has that got to do with the question of retaining English in the curriculum for the primary education? English is not proposed to be the medium of instruction for our illiterate masses or for any other section of the people. Whether English should be retained as a language to be studied seriously in addition to the mother tongue, or it should be withdrawn from our education will have to be decided against the utility and importance of the language in our life. And that in turn will decide whether the language shall be included, alongside the mother tongue and a few other vital subjects like Mathematics, History and Geography, in curriculum for the universal elementary education. It does not follow from any consideration whatsoever that English has been an obstacle to the spread of education, or to the anti-illiteracy campaign. If inclusion of a second language, particularly of English, be an obstacle to spread of education among the masses, then how is it that several underdeveloped countries which are not ridden by a complex language problem like ours—have each one and the same language as its national language, official language as also the medium of instruction—are yet beset with the problem of illiteracy of the same magnitude as ours? It is necessary therefore to be aware of the real causes

of the high percentage of illiteracy among our masses even after all these years since Independence. In the first place the anti-people, callous and irresponsible policy of the Government, particularly in the sphere of education, is responsible for this state of affair. In the second, the extreme economic crisis in the people's life born of the acute crisis of capitalism is responsible. The ruling parties and their Governments have been crying hoarse over the urgent need of making the elementary education available to all people of the land. But how much have they really tried in this direction? The number of schools is insignificantly small compared to the actual needs. And it hardly requires to be mentioned that those existing, especially in the rural areas, languish in a critical state for lack of the minimum requirements. Above all there is the rampant problem of child labour in both the organised and unorganised sectors in our country. The extreme economic destitution has been forcing the poor families in both urban and rural areas to send out their children of the school-going age to labour in agriculture, industry, and as servants or maids in homes and shops. Education, even the elementary variety of it, is quite beyond their dream. Even if some of them join school they cannot continue for long. Statistics shows that the drop-out rate is extremely high among them. It is the economic condition which actually forces them out of the school premises. Whereas this is the actual state of affair, a prominent leader of the 'Left Front' in West Bengal has singled out English as the culprit scaring out these children and causing the high rate of drop-outs among the poor village people. It will be evident that while the problem of spread of education and removal of illiteracy is actually an outcome of the anti-people policies of the Government and of this

(Contd. to Page 9)

(Contd. from Page 8)

extreme economic crisis in the people's life born of the acute crisis of capitalism the ruling parties have been seeking to make English a scapegoat. What does it tell? An exercise in abyssmal nonsense? Or actually a conspiratorial design to sacrifice English to solve their ulterior class motive? What really has the 'Left Front' Government, which is in the lead against retention of English, effectively done till now for the spread of education? How much provision has it made in its budget for education? And what measures has it taken or has contemplated to take to provide economic relief to the poor masses and freeing the children from the yoke of child labour? Actually this Government does not consider the learning of English all that necessary for the poor peasants and workers.

Bogus pleas of the Government to cover up the real design

It is however second to none in making tricky manoeuvres to hide its real design and confuse the people. So it does not stop advancing pleas. It has been argued that the retention of English at the primary level makes the curriculum heavy for the children. While advancing this argument the opponents of English seem to suggest that minus English the present curriculum looks all fine and is not heavy. But it is amusing to hear the self same people complaint often that the curriculum and syllabus are too heavy for the children. Leaving this point to be decided by themselves, we like to point out that this is again a matter to be decided against the basic question—whether the people should learn English or not and what subjects should be included, considered from the scientific outlook, in the curriculum for the primary education. If we admit the importance of English for the common people, then it follows from the discussion made above that English should be

there in the curriculum for primary education. It remains next to decide the pattern of load distribution in the entire structural pattern of education and that is where the question of outlook and object of education again step in. There are two other points pertaining to this context. One is the mode of teaching a language subject, particularly English. And the other is the task of making available a sufficient number of teachers to teach the subject. It follows therefore that if the necessary steps are taken to spread education among the masses, the necessity of English for the common people be recognised, the distribution of subject load be properly made at the several levels of education, and lastly if English be taught as a language should be, even the vast multitude of our poor and toiling masses can learn English—at least a working knowledge of it to begin with. And this humble beginning in its turn will create the ground for future spread of the language among the people and a more serious undertaking of its study. The question of jamming the children's brains does not arise at all.

Another plea advanced by these Governments for relaxing emphasis on study of English is that a large number of students fail in the language in examinations which means a huge wastage of our national energy. But the problem of the high incidence of failures is not confined to English alone, or for that matter to only the language subjects. The percentage of pass in mathematics, for example, is not at all flattering. Under the circumstance, do those who advanced logic of this sort mean to demand withdrawal of mathematics from the science stream? Or else, what are they actually driving at? It is indeed beyond our comprehension as to how the language policy may be linked to the problem of the high percentage of failure in our educational system, unless of course one is motivated to present it that

way. What is the actual picture of our educational institutions now? There is not a sufficient number of schools and colleges to meet the growing demand for higher education. The syllabus load is too heavy whereas the necessary arrangements for proper and adequate teaching and learning are lacking. The examination system is totally unscientific and, above everything, the proper academic atmosphere is very much absent. Moreover, the cultural degeneration which has engulfed our life has reduced the question of cultivation of knowledge through education into a mockery. The problem of failure is directly related to these aspects of our degenerating education system. And if the percentage of failure is any higher in English, it is simply due to the additional fact that the prevailing trend of discouragement to the study of this language and

Language Policy

the theory of its replacement has created a general psychology among the students who do not feel particularly encouraged under its impact to undertake a serious study of this language.

It will be seen from the discussion above that there is no substance in the argument advanced by these Governments, particularly the 'Left Front' Government in West Bengal. Actually, they do not want that the common people should learn English. But they cannot speak out openly their real intention. So, their design is to abolish English at the lower level and make it optional at the higher level, and thus to discourage effectively study of the language in education.

The real design is to restrict education

And precisely to conceal this real intention of theirs that they are raising objections against retention of English. If it were true that English had had no role in our life, or that its role has been exhausted at present, its

utility and importance have withered, its continuance proves harmful to us, then the Government's bid to do away with English would have been welcome. But none of these is true. And it is clearly evident from the shrewd and crafty manoeuvres of these Governments that they are also alive to the truth in this regard. Then what is the motive behind their design? The motive, or the reason why they want the people not to learn English, makes itself apparent when we consider, among other things, the role assigned to English in the revised education pattern for the common people envisaged by these Governments, especially the 'Left Front' Government, and also the schemes for employment or means of livelihood they plan to provide those who will be coming out of this reformed educational system. English is abolished at the primary level. So, a student may have his first lessons in English earliest at the secondary level where the language is optional. Now, since he is forced to start late, and since there is neither the outlook nor the arrangement for intensive training in languages in our schools in general, and also since the policy of discouragement produces the opposite of a conducive environment, his foundation in the language, in the general case, is bound to be weak.

Then, at the college level English becomes optional. It cannot be denied by any means that in the concrete situation of our educational system, the optional status means only discouragement in disguise. Or, seizing the hint of the 'Left Front' Government, the general student may as well be tempted to choose Hindi as his language subject since some incentives are held out by the Centre to lure him. At the higher levels, however, English remains the medium of instruction. The general student with his weak foundation in English has very little prospect of fairing in the higher

education. Circumscribed in this condition, he will both find himself and regard himself ineligible for higher education because of his weak command over the key language. This will erode his self-confidence and will beget a sense of inferiority as to his capacity. Consequently, he will himself opt out of the course for higher education. And this will be looked upon as a failure due to his personal incapacity. The upshot of all this will be that the door to higher education closes on him. This will be the case with by far the majority of the students. If they cannot have access to higher education, the responsibility will appear to be theirs, not the Government's. The Government's present language policy is an added measure to restrict higher education, but where it pulls the strings it remains behind the scene. It leads the students to a position wherefrom they will themselves opt out, but its game remains unnoticed. Evidently, the 'Left Front' Government has been scheming to implement the former Congress Government's policy of restriction of higher education, and doing so by cunning and surreptitious means. The Congress Government had tried to achieve it through administrative measures. The people could see the game of imposition and they fought against it. Now in the name of reforms the 'Left Front' Government has been seeking to achieve the same object but doing it through shrewd manoeuvres to hide its real intention from the people and win their sanction in its favour. History testifies that this is the typical tactics of the fascist forces. The 'Left Front' Government has resorted to this tactical line. But can it befool the people all the time?

The 'Left Front' Government is carrying through the class design of the bourgeoisie

The Government does not deny the necessity of

(Contd. to Page 10)

Language Policy

(Contd. from Page 9)

English in higher education. But it argues that since the majority of the common people will not go in for higher education, it is not necessary to retain English at the lower level which the Government intends to open to all. Does it not then mean that the Government intends to retain the common people's level of education at its present stage? What is the Government's concept of education for the common people? Evidently, it wants that the common people should be so educated as to be able to read, write and carry out their daily business. We know that this is the concept of the branded bourgeois parties with regard to the common people's educational requirements. The 'Left Front' Government claims to be acting to bring about radical educational reforms. But it is significant that its concept of the common people's educational requirements concurs exactly with that of the parties long known to be bourgeois in class character. No one can deny that the level of education which our common people may at best hope to reach at present is very low. But if an educational reform is claimed to have a pro-people direction, we will expect it to elevate the level of the people's education so that they can have access to higher education in course of time. But the 'Left Front' Government, by its plan to abolish English at the lower level and make it optional at the higher levels, is actually acting in the reverse direction and is blocking the common people's access to higher education. Clearly, by its schemes and contemplations the Government is actually negating the people's right to higher education.

The Centre's present language policy should be examined in the context of the language policies pursued by the different State Governments.

At the same time as the different State Govern-

ments carry into effect their policy of minimising the role of English in education, the Central Government is accelerating pace to replace English by Hindi as the official language in yet uncovered areas. It has issued recently an order extending Hindi as a court language. It has been reported that many Central Ministerial departments and Government offices have started working in Hindi, and many more are likely to follow suit. It is now almost certain that Hindi will be used increasingly for purposes of correspondence between the Centre and the States, whether the States concerned like it or not.

Surreptitious move to impose Hindi through the backdoor

The implication of all this is that the Central Government's object of subtly and surreptitiously dislodging English and extending the operational field of Hindi as the official language is now being pursued through a forward policy. In other words, the promise to continue English as associate official language so long as the non-Hindi speaking people wanted it, which the Congress Government in the mid-sixties had held out as a subtle manoeuvre to pacify the people's growing movements against its official language policy, has steadily eroded all these years. And the present Janata Government to all appearance is not only committed to the same language policy as of the Congress, it has been pursuing the same even more vigorously. The Centre argues that it does not oppose the study of the mother tongue and that its three-language formula is actually designed to patronise the development of other vernaculars also. But the virtual withdrawal of English as the official and link language and in education gives the priority, for all practical purposes, to Hindi in the matter of language study. The Centre has been trying to induce the people to study Hindi by insisting on the use of the language

in ever increasing degree in the Administrative work and by promising incentives in service for knowledge in it. The 'Left Front' Government's formula of a language group at the college level in which Hindi is included along with, among others, mother tongue and English is meant to serve as an encouragement to this end. This Government is thus objectively helping the Central Government in dislodging English as the official language and bringing Hindi in its place. It has raised a hue and cry over the Centre-State relations and does not miss an opportunity to try to convince the people that the Centre stands on its way to implement its various welfare schemes for the State. It is significant therefore that it moves hand in glove with the Centre on the language issue. Mr. Jyoti Basu, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, has expressed his view that Hindi should not be imposed in the manner it was being done now. It should be the link language only by the voluntary will of the people. "We want the three-language formula to continue", he said recently to clarify his Government's stand on the language issue (Statesman, 4.5.78). Mr. Basu does not really contest the Centre by his stand on Hindi. His Government contemplates to offer Hindi an equal footing with English and the mother tongue in its prescribed educational pattern for the people of the State. He is merely pleading for a go-slow by the Centre so that the people may not consider the Centre's enterprise as an act of imposition and his Government may meanwhile condition the people to accept their language formulation.

The language policy has a bearing on the mounting problem of the educated unemployed

The above outlines the role assigned to English in the Government's language policy in education. Now we should consider the Government's scheme for

providing employment to those who will be coming out of its reformed educational system. The Centre and the State Governments, including the CPI(M)-led 'Left Front' Government, have been trying to implement various policies of decentralisation of economy and self-employment schemes in a bid to reduce the enormous pressure of unemployment on the organised sector in industry and the Government. On many occasions previously we pointed out the futility of these attempts in the present stage of the capitalist economy in our country. The uneducated or semi-educated people who are encouraged to join these schemes have to blame themselves or their 'fate' when they fail in their enterprise. Obviously, that is how the Government plans to keep the people away from crowding for employment in the organised sector in industry and the Governments offices. But the Government is aware that it cannot disown its responsibility by tricks of this sort when it comes to providing employment to those who have received higher education. The language policy in education is therefore sought to be added to the other previously adopted policies to restrict the higher education so that the pressure of unemployment of the educated is less. The policy of the 'Left Front' Government in this regard is found to be in tune with that of the Central Government. The Government's immediate motive behind its language policy in education, as should now be evident from its attitude to higher education and its scheme for employment of the people, is to implement cleverly the policy of restricting higher education by withdrawing English and bringing Hindi in its place, and shield itself and the organised sector from the ever increasing pressure of unemployment.

But the motive has to be concealed from the public view. So there is no end to accusing English. It has been alleged, for

example, that the retention of English in education makes our education an elitist system in which the advantage has ever been seized by a handful of English-knowing people, whereas the vast majority of our people continue to be denied all opportunities in life. It is a queer logic indeed, for the argument disproves rather than prove the contention for which it is advanced. That the higher education and its consequent advantages are confined among a handful of English-knowing people is because the Government's education policy does not allow the vast majority of the people access to higher education. If education be made universal, if the door to higher education is opened for all, the elitist character of education can be done away with. But the critics of English propose to eliminate the language in order to free education of its elitist character. Does it not actually disprove their contention?

Retention of English is essential for the development of Hindi and other nationality languages

Considering the vital role English plays in our country it is not difficult to see that the language cannot be driven out at will. The Government may conspire to abolish English from the education for the common people, but the language will continue to play its vital role. Even the development of science and technology is bound to suffer today if English be withdrawn. The language is also indispensable in correspondence in trade and commerce. Attempts have been made several times to drive it out, but these have not been successful. Even those who disfavour retention of English in education know it well that the language is vitally relevant in our life. That is why their attitude to English is wrought in double standard. Their slogan for driving out English is meant for public consumption, they never underestimate the importance of the language when it comes to educating.

(Contd. to Page 11)

Language Policy

(Contd. from Page 10)

their own children. Examples are galore among the leaders of many political parties of their duplicity in attitude to English. It is also in the public knowledge that examples are not fewer among the so-called Left leaders who now contemplate to minimise the role of English in their proposed educational reforms for the common people. Consequently, whatever their advice to the common people, the English medium schools will continue to thrive. This will inevitably lead to the creation of two categories of citizens. One will comprise the English-knowing people—relatively fewer. The other will comprise the educated, semi-educated or illiterate people who have not had their education in English. Since the job opportunities will be severely limited, a discrimination will automatically ensue among the two categories in the field of employment and the English knowing category will undoubtedly be preferred in the selection for employment.

The grave implication of such an eventuality will have to be realised by the Hindi-speaking people also. For, whoever may be lured to think—whether he is Hindi-speaking or not—that knowledge in Hindi will be an advantage in the bitter struggle for employment will find to his cost that English will count first and knowledge in Hindi will count at best as a desirable qualification.

We consider that English should be studied by our people at all levels of education not for the reason alone that the language is essential in the higher education. English plays other vital roles in our life. For historical reasons, English has been serving as the official and link language in our country for about a century. It is the medium of exchange of thoughts among the educated people in all the States, is the link between our people and the advanced thoughts of the world at large, and necessarily is still the medium of instruction in higher education and medium of correspondence in trade and commerce. Imperceptibly, whether we liked it or not, the language has mingled with the life of our people. To dislodge English means to create a vacuum in the administrative work, education and cultural life in a large way. On the other hand, no nationality language in our country has yet grown rich enough to occupy the place of English as the official and link language. English, of necessity, has to continue as the official and link language. In the mid-sixties the Congress Government at the Centre replaced English by Hindi as the official language through a parliamentary enactment. This is an issue over which the people, particularly the non-Hindi speaking people, have strong feelings. The Government's language policy hurt their linguistic sentiments and sowed a seed of discord and disunity which resulted in strife and conflict among the people. The ruling class and its Government have all along been exploiting the situation to the best advantage of its class interest. If English be continued as the only official and link language the people's unity over the official language issue will be ensured. Besides, there is another reason why English should be continued in this capacity. There is an urgent necessity for the development of all our nationality languages. In fact, every one talks of this necessity. But which should be the course for this development? In the first place, the languages need an equal opportunity, and an equal encouragement and patronage from the Government. But if any of the nationality languages is arbitrarily imposed as the official language, it will automatically enjoy preference in many respects. People will be circumstantially forced to learn it to get jobs and this will result in a relative neglect of the other nationality languages. Their growth will definitely be hampered in the process. Consequently, all talks of equal opportunity for development of our nationality languages will be in vain. If, however, English continues as the only official language, all the nationality languages will be on a par and entitled to equal opportunity for development. However, apart from this condition of equality in respect of opportunity and encouragement, our nationality languages require, for their development, continued association with English for still greater necessity. Development of a language means development of its capacity to express developed thoughts with clarity, precision and beauty. English gives us access to the highly developed thoughts in modern science, technology, art, philosophy etc. The most important course to develop our nationality languages lies in cultivating them to express the most developed thoughts of the humanity at the present stage. Intercrossing and intermingling with English will also help in this direction. In fact, this process is already in operation in our country. When the British imperialist rulers had introduced English in our country to serve their imperialist interest, the official language policy neglected and obstructed the growth and development of our nationality languages. But, on the other hand, the presence of a highly developed language like English, the constant association of our nationality languages with

it, helped their development in a very large way. That process is still on. The continuance of English as the official language and in education will actually help the process onward. This is one more reason why it should be considered necessary to include English in the curriculum as the compulsory second language at all levels in school and college education. The Hindi-speaking people too cannot afford to miss this point because continuance of English is necessary in the interest of development of their mother tongue too. The question of the foreign origin of English can in no way be raised as a valid argument for withdrawing the language from its several roles in our life. Its continuance in our education is a demand grown over a genuine urge in our life. The foreign origin of something does not by itself make it unwelcome. Our acceptance or rejection of it must be guided by our genuine necessity for it. It is indeed strange that those who welcome foreign technical knowhow and so many other foreign things should really become vocal against English on ground of its foreign origin. We must also realise that if English be arbitrarily replaced by Hindi, or by any other nationality language for that matter, the development of Hindi too will be retarded. For this reason, our Party has all along been demanding adoption of a two-language formula—the mother tongue and English—instead of the three-language formula prescribed by the Congress and endorsed by all the bourgeois parties and the Left Parties like the CPI and the CPI (M).

As a matter of fact, it is not the English language alone, the language study as such, which is being disfavoured and discouraged by these parties. In their concept it suffices for the common people to acquire just as much language skill as may be required to carry on in their vocations and to make a little correspondence when needed. Acting from this outlook the CPI (M)-led 'Left Front' Government in West Bengal has been considering it necessary to teach the mother tongue at the school level and offer the first course in English at the secondary level and that too as an optional subject. Moreover, these languages will not have to be compulsorily studied at the college level. The few who will have access to the college level education may study the mother tongue and English if only they have a liking for it. Some pleas have of course been advanced to justify the scheme. Reducing the burden on students by scrapping the language course is one such plea. We have already discussed it and have pointed out that the primary consideration should be whether the needs of struggle in life necessitate language study at any level of education. The question of the curriculum load has to be viewed in this perspective and not the vice versa—that is let the axe fall on the language course since too many subjects are crowding the curriculum. We believe that everyone concerned with improvement of education would agree with us on the point that language is not really just another subject although it is customarily presented so in the curricula.

The warnings and teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

The teachings of **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, our great leader, teacher and guide, and an outstanding Marxist thinker of this era, illumine the role of language in the spheres of epistemology, education and the struggle in life. It is he who first made a scientific analysis of the language problem in our country and pointed to its correct solution. It is he who first clearly explained the vital necessity of English in the life of our common people. We have learnt from his teachings that language serves as the basis for learning all other subjects. Language encompasses the whole category of epistemology. It is the gateway to knowledge. But in utter disregard to this role of language, its study is sought to be discouraged by the Government. It has been argued that language courses are not offered as compulsory subjects at the university level in the developed countries. It has to be pointed out in the first place that the countries these people have in mind provide intensive training in languages at the school level—something not attained even at the graduate level in our country. More important, by arguing in this way, our educational authorities are actually proposing to copy the present educational pattern of the moribund capitalist system of those countries. The object of education in those countries is no longer to acquaint the students with comprehensive knowledge. The object has ceased to be guided by an outlook for the all-out development of the individual, which it was there in the educational system of those countries during the period of industrial revolution. In that era, science, technology, arts, philosophy—in a word, the entire sphere of human knowledge—underwent an unprecedented development centring round the development of capitalism. The object of education was to free the human mind from the feudal absolutist concept and the religious tentacles of the feudal educational system. To this end the bourgeois liberal

(Contd. to Page 12)

LANGUAGE POLICY (Contd. from Page 11)

education in that era sought to acquaint people with the advancement of human knowledge in all its aspects. The study of language was an essential and important part of this educational system. For thought and language are inextricably interwoven. The existence of one is not possible without the other. Language is the vehicle of thought. Or more precisely, language is the direct reality of thought. Thoughts arise and exist in the medium of language. The development of languages was necessitated by the advancement of thought. Because, developed thought requires a developed language for its existence and exchange. The modern European languages grew and developed through this process and out of this particular necessity. The study of language was therefore considered an integral part of the bourgeois liberal educational system in that era. But with the exhaustion of its progressive role, capitalism has not only lost its capacity to support the advancement of learning, it has been actively obstructing the progress of thought even. Consequently, the outlook on education too has undergone a retrograde change in the capitalist countries. Language study is no longer viewed as an indispensable tool for the acquisition and advancement of knowledge. It is valued and is considered necessary to the extent it pays in the vocational field, or in the matter of securing a superior position in life. Today, in this phase of the third acute general crisis of capitalism, the emphasis is on compartmentalisation of education. Because, the bourgeois social setup is no longer conducive to the all-out development of the individual. There has been an extra-ordinary development in the sphere of human knowledge. So specialisation in various fields by different individuals is called for in the interest of further advancement of knowledge. But if the specialisation is not attempted on the basis of co-ordination of all aspects of knowledge, the result is bound to be compartmentalisation in the sphere of education. As a consequence, social alienation among individuals will be aggravated. And that is exactly what we are witnessing today.

Our country has been suffering from the same worldwide acute crisis of capitalism and the educational authorities here are influenced by the prevailing outlook on education in the developed capitalist countries. By copying the system of those countries they hope to elevate the standard of education here. Time and again we have pointed out the futility of this effort in the present moribund stage of capitalism. The 'Left Front' Government's attitude to language study is evidently guided by the same outlook.

And for this reason this Government does not encourage the study of literature too. In its view, it is sufficient for the students to study elements of literature as part of the language course at the school level, but a further course in literature as an integral part of the college level education is unnecessary. The Government considers it enough to provide, in its reformed education, courses in literature for those desirous of specialising in literature. This again exposes the real character of the Government's total approach to education. In the name of specialisation, the Government and the educational authorities are acting contrary to the concept of comprehensive education and are compartmentalising the education. They refuse to admit, in reality, any role for literature in education. In their view, the emphasis, particularly in higher education, should be on subjects other than language and literature in order that students may have more time and energy at their disposal to progress in these subjects and specialise in them. For this reason the Government cannot think of students of science and technology studying language and literature. But no sphere of human knowledge can do without language. It is not possible to express and grasp the theoretical aspect of science without the medium of language. The scientist conceives his theory in the medium of a language and expresses it in the same medium. Whatever discipline may one be cultivating, one has to do it in the medium of a language. So, study of language—in terms of both grammar and composition—is essential for students of all disciplines. It is no less important for the students of science and technology. The languages of science, philosophy and literature are not one and the same. These differ in composition. The language and literature courses should be so framed as to acquaint the students with different types of composition of different disciplines. The students should study compositions by eminent scientists or educationists introducing advanced and intricate concepts of science and technology. They should also study literature because of the overriding influence of literature in our life. The development of knowledge in all its spheres form the basis of the philosophic outlook on life. The sense of values, morals and ethics in society are guided by the philosophic outlook and form the basis of the litterateur's portrayal of life. Literature is the reflection of life—reflection as it happens in the consciousness of the litterateur and this expressed in language of artistic composition. Our consciousness of life is enriched through the aesthetic pleasure literature offers

It acts on the frame of mind through its aesthetic impact. The impact is subtle, sustaining and deep on the individual's sense of values, on his outlook on life. If the various disciplines of science and technology, or any other branch of human knowledge for that matter, has any importance for life's struggle, literature has no less importance. So, if the object of education is the comprehensive development of the individual, equipping the individual properly for the struggle in life, making him conscious of his role in society, literature should be studied in all seriousness and should be an integral part of the curriculum for all fields in education even at the higher level. The litterateur is indebted to the philosopher and the scientist for the outlook on life which guides his artistic creation; the scientist and the philosopher need the litterateur for fulfilment of their urge for aesthetic pleasure. This is the teaching of our great leader, teacher and guide **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**. In the absence of this guiding outlook our educational system is bound to turn out dehumanised barbarians.

It is important to recall in this context that the academic stalwarts of the pre-Independence days who had framed the previous curricular pattern had introduced compulsory courses in language and literature even upto certain stage in the science stream with a view to imbibing the students with the democratic principles of ethics, norms and values. Experience corroborates that the elimination of these courses has not brought about any improvement in the learning and teaching of science and in the total development of the science students.

As the people persist in questioning the rationale and purpose of the Government's language policy in education the authorities invent newer pleas in justification of their stand. They have started arguing that if somebody needs English for higher studies, he can as well learn it himself. What does the advice really amount to? For as important and vital a matter as study of English the advice is to undertake a private study; then the suggestion should apply to other subjects also. Then what is the justification of maintaining such an expensive system of education on the public exchequer if the contemplated reforms relegate important subjects of study to individual discretion? If the idea is to encourage development of talents on personal initiative alone, then what is the necessity of an elaborate system of education like the one prevailing? There may be cases when something will have to be learnt on individual initiative. A student of Chemistry may have to learn German, or a researcher in linguistics may have to learn several languages outside the general courses of education. But needs of the sort can be effectively met only after one has acquired a certain standard in basic education. Otherwise, pleading for individual initiative as a general rule for courses of basic importance actually amount to evading the real issue and shirking the responsibility. The 'Left Front' Government has been clamouring for the use of mother tongue as the medium of instruction at all levels, but it has been discouraging at the same time the study of the mother tongue at the college level. It has been pleading for the three language formula, but is out to eliminate English effectively in education. It has been crying hoarse over democracy, but carefully avoided seeking opinion of the academic circle and the public before it decided on its language policy. It concedes that English is our link with the world, but is determined to snap this link between the common people and the world at large.

Our great leader, **Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**, an outstanding Marxist thinker of this era, explained long back the necessity and significance of English in the life of the people in the interest of their revolutionary aspirations. Today, the advancement in science, philosophy, art and literature has reached such heights that it is not possible to express the advanced thoughts through any language that is underdeveloped. And it is absolutely essential that we should link ourselves with the most advanced thoughts of the world today if we are willing to grasp correctly the anti-capitalist revolutionary theory. We shall have to study the Dialectical Materialism, Marxism-Leninism and the scientific socialism and practise the revolutionary politics. It is the historical necessity of the proletariat to know truth concretely and meticulously and to learn the most advanced thoughts in all spheres of human knowledge in order to accomplish the task of the proletarian revolution. Only English is capable of serving as the medium in our country to link ourselves with the most advanced thoughts of the world. None of our nationality languages has yet developed rich enough to serve in that capacity. If, therefore, an underdeveloped language is imposed replacing English, it will gradually estrange the people from the advanced thoughts and will push them backward. It will be easier for the reactionary forces, in that event, to avail of the opportunity to give birth to revivalism, fatalism, absolutism and religious fanaticism in society. This will lead to a widespread degeneration in culture and the consequences of isolation from the most advanced thoughts of the world will affect the whole nation. The development of the theoretical aspect of the anti-capitalist revolutionary struggle for the emancipation of the exploited masses in particular will be hampered, even if temporarily, in a large way.

And this is precisely the ultimate object of the Governments' language policy in education, particularly of the 'Left Front' Government in West Bengal. Their policy aims at keeping the people away from the advanced thoughts. Their ultimate motive is to obstruct the course of development of the revolutionary theory. This implication of the abolition of English and discouragement for the study of languages will have to be realised by the people of all nationalities. It is no less important for the Hindi-speaking people, for the ruling class and its parties are trying to exploit their sentiments for their mother tongue. The Government's design will hamper the growth of their mother tongue, will inevitably cause a deterioration in their cultural standard and will disrupt their cherished and most valuable unity with the people of all other nationalities of the land.

We call upon the people of all nationalities to rise to the occasion and build up a strong mass movement to defeat the anti-people language policy of the Government.