

Observe Lenin Memorial Day In A Befitting Manner



Memorial Day On 21st January

Proletarian Era

Organ of SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
Founder Editor-in-Chief:
COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

Volume 27 No 8
Price Rs. 1. 25

17th January, 1994
Air Surcharge - 5 P

LPG Price Hike Condemned

Strongly condemning the Central Government's decision to increase the LPG prices, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, SUCI, has issued the following statement on 12.1.94 :

"When the people are groaning under the wheel of soaring prices, unemployment and retrenchment the steep hike in the LPG prices is a severe blow to the common man.

"It is needless to mention that the Central Government has surrendered to the World Bank and IMF so that multinationals can earn maximum profit by parallel marketing of cooking gas. Moreover, on the eve of Budget session this administrative decision is also undemocratic.

"We strongly condemn this anti-people decision and demand its immediate withdrawal."

... Marx grasped this *essence* of capitalist democracy splendidly when, in analysing the experience of the Commune, he said that the oppressed are allowed once every few years to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class shall represent and repress them in parliament! ...

— Lenin

Lenin on Democracy, Dictatorship, Equality, Freedom and Bureaucracy

The 70th Death Anniversary of Lenin, the great leader and the teacher of the world proletariat, the architect of the Great November Revolution and the founder of the first socialist state in the world, is going to be observed on 21st January, the day of his demise. While paying our revolutionary homage to this towering personality on this occasion, we feel that it is all the more important to recapitulate his invaluable teachings which are, no doubt, very relevant in the present-day world situation in removing confusions created by the orchestrated propaganda by the capitalist-imperialists, particularly after the painful setback in the world communist movement. On this occasion, some excerpts from his teachings are given.

I have already said that the democrats and socialists plead democracy as the most common justification, the most common defence of the political stand taken against us. The most emphatic supporter of this point of view in European literature is, as you, of course, know, Kautsky, the ideological leader of the Second International, and to this day a member of the Berne International. "The Bolsheviks have chosen a method which violates democracy; the Bolsheviks have chosen the method of dictatorship. Hence, their cause is unjust," he says. This argument has been repeated a thousand and a million times, it occurs constantly in all periodicals, including the newspapers I have mentioned. It is being constantly repeated by all intellectuals, and sometimes the ordinary man in the street sub-consciously repeats it in his arguments.

"Democracy means freedom, it means equality, it means settling questions by a majority. What can be higher than freedom, equality, and majority decisions? Since you Bolsheviks have departed from this, and even have the presumption to say publicly that you stand above freedom, equality and majority decisions, you must not be surprised, nor must you complain, when we call you usurpers and tyrants."

We are not in the least surprised at this, for what we desire most of all is clarity; and the only thing we rely on is that the advanced section of the working people should really be conscious of its position. Yes, we said, and say it all the time in our programme, in the programme of our Party, that we shall not allow ourselves to be deceived by such high-sounding

(Contd. on page 4)

Birth Centenary of Mao Zedong

Fulfilling the preconditions of revolution in our country is to pay revolutionary homage to Mao : Nihar Mukherjee

[Below is the paraphrased speech of Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, our beloved General Secretary, delivered in the mass meeting at Subodh Mullik Square, Calcutta on 26th December last, the day that marks the birth centenary of the Great Marxist leader and teacher Comrade Mao Zedong.]

At the outset, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee said : This rally marks the beginning of the year-long programme of observing birth centenary of Mao Zedong, the great leader of the proletariat taken by the Central Committee of our party, the SUCI.

Continuing Comrade Mukherjee said: Mao was not only the architect of the Chinese revolution but a giant leader of the international communist movement. At a very young age, he entered into the life-long struggle, making Marxism-Leninism, the philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism, his weapon — a philosophy that had been evolved by generalizing coordinating and integrating the particular truths and knowledges culled from different branches of natural and social sciences. The task he set himself to was indeed stupendous. It was to carry the universal teachings of Marxism-Leninism to the vast masses of China in a form in which they could understand and assimilate the same, get awakened and participate enthusiastically in the revolutionary transformation of the society, to build up the CPC through ceaseless struggles against all sorts of rightist and leftist deviations as the correct revolutionary party of the working class fit to lead the revolution on the Chinese soil, to work out the correct revolutionary theory in the Chinese situation — the strategy and tactics of the Chinese revolution, and to put them into practice fearlessly and steadfastly, and through all these to lead the country and the people stage by stage along the tortuous path of ups and downs to the ultimate victory of revolution. In a word, Mao concretised Marxism-Leninism in all its aspects on the Chinese soil, enriching it in the process and applied it to lead the Chinese revolution successfully against insurmountable odds. There was a class of leaders in China too whose knowledge of Marxism-Leninism was bookish, as it was acquired by mere study of Marxist-Leninist classics. When they had tried to apply this bookish knowledge to the Chinese condition, they could not touch the people of China deeply and had failed in consequence. Mao studied hard to grasp deeply the situation in China — the country and its people and the class disposition in the society — a backward agricultural country with the people groaning under the combined exploitation-oppression of the feudal warlords, comprador bourgeoisie and foreign imperialist powers with a preponderantly peasant population where the working class was not yet numerous or strong because of lack of capitalistic development and where the bourgeoisie had not yet come into

state power and had, therefore, not yet exhausted its historically progressive anti-feudal, anti-imperialist role — and put forward the theory of New Democratic Revolution, a revolution in which the peasantry had a major role and the bourgeoisie excluding the compradors, that is the national bourgeoisie, could participate. Mao succeeded because this was the only historically determined course in the concrete Chinese condition which sharpened and brought to maturity the principal contradiction in Chinese society between the people and its main enemy and thus made for revolutionary progress there, by allowing the wrath of the people comprising the workers, the peasantry, the intellectuals and the national bourgeoisie to be concentrated against the main enemy comprising foreign imperialist powers, feudal war-lords and the comprador bourgeoisie.

Regarding the strategy and tactics of the Chinese revolution, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee said: The strategy and tactics adopted to attain the goal of People's Democratic Revolution were worked out and evolved by the Mao leadership on the anvil of history in response to the actual situation to meet the needs of the concrete conditions in China. The message of revolution was spread far and wide by the CPC and imprinted deeply on the hearts of the Chinese people, notably through the historic Long March which has become a saga in the annals of revolution. It is difficult for us to imagine the ordeal and the mountain-high obstacles in the Long March. The March was several thousand miles long and lasted about two years, through inhospitable terrain involving crossing of mountains, forests and big rivers, amidst series of battles with and attempted encirclement by hostile troops of Kuomintang (KMT) and the feudal war-lords, amidst bombardments by KMT troops. In whatever area the March passed through the CPC and the Red Army merged with the people to wage protracted and tortuous battle — thus spreading the message of revolution to and becoming a living source of inspiration for the people through the length and breadth of the vast country like China. This characteristic feature of involving the masses bears the hallmark of Mao and was to be repeated in the subsequent civil war and much later in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. In a sustained glorious heroism in the face of difficulties, hardships and death, the Long March had no parallel in history. Mao formulated the strategy of first encircling and isolating the cities, the main power bases of the enemy with the surrounding liberated areas and of finally capturing them and the tactics of guerrilla warfare adopted for the purpose — the only correct ones — in the context of the geography, existing communication system and degree of organization of the enemy, the government administration and its army. At each stage of

formulating and implementing these strategy and tactics, Mao had to painstakingly argue with his opponents within the party, convince them and carry the party with him. Subsequent history fully vindicated the strategy and tactics adopted.

Continuing, Comrade Mukherjee said: The Chinese revolution succeeded because the Mao leadership could, through ceaseless ideological and organisational struggle, fulfil the three pre-conditions of successful revolution enunciated by Lenin — correct revolutionary party of the working class with a correct leadership, correct revolutionary theory, that is, correct base political line comprising correct assessment of the stage of revolution, working out the correct strategy and tactics of revolution, and united front and the correct form of revolutionary struggle to achieve success in the revolution. Under the leadership of Mao, the CPC not only successfully organised the New Democratic Revolution against insurmountable odds but went on to organise successfully on its basis the Socialist Revolution. Through the revolutionary transformation the doors of all-round progress of the Chinese people were opened and China, a backward country plagued with famine, flood, epidemic and ignorance and decimated as a country of opium addicts, shook off its age-old lethargy and stood up and at one stroke leaped out of the medieval darkness into the brightness of modern world as a strong nation vibrant with new energy, hope and aspirations. After Lenin in Russia, Mao Zedong thus concretely and vividly demonstrated in China the truth of the saying of Marx that the ideology of Dialectical Materialism would find its material expression through the aroused working class, and the working class and its allies, by grasping Dialectical Materialism, would get hold of an invincible spiritual weapon that would vanquish the might of the enemies.

Referring to Mao's teachings on the cardinal necessity of conducting ceaseless struggle for continual uplift of the ideological-cultural standard within the party and among the masses, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee said: Before organising revolution, it is very necessary to free the working class and its allies from the influence of various feudal, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois thought and ideology, from the political, organisational, ideological and cultural influence of the various political parties seeking to pull back the masses, in order to bring them into the mainstream of the struggle for liberation by exhausting such hold and influence through intense and prolonged ideological-organisational-cultural struggle. Herein lies the significance of Lenin's saying that cultural revolution precedes technical revolution. But the necessity of such a struggle does not diminish but increases after revolution because the dispossessed bourgeoisie throws itself with multiplied determination and vigour to regain the lost paradise. So, class struggle intensifies and assumes subtle forms in the superstructure,

(Contd. on page 7)

GATT : DUNKEL PROPOSAL**Design for more fierce neo-colonial attack on the peoples of the world**

(The Concluding Part of the Article)

Safeguards

Before we end this part, we need adding a few words about safeguards. In the original rules of the GATT, provision for safeguards was there for a limited period though not expressly specified to a member country for the protection of indigenous industries. It was in the form of regulation as also imposition of duty on import of specific articles at a higher rate. Article 14 related to differential treatment in favour of LDCs in the code on subsidies and countervailing duties. The new prescription is that countries having \$1000 as per capita income will have to phase out export duties on non-agricultural goods within eight years and other duties within eight years since they attain that per capita income.

Balance of Payments (BoP)

According to the old rules of the GATT every member country had the prerogative to balance its foreign trade by regulation or control and even banning of import of specific items. Thus, Article XVIII allows developing countries to apply quantitative restrictions (QR) for Balance of Payment (BoP) purposes and to maintain sufficient flexibility in the tariff structure to be able to grant the required protection for establishment of a particular industry.

The Article XVIII-B while covering the first area leaves it unaltered but brings at the same time the commitment that all countries shall announce a time schedule for removal of restrictions imposed for BoP purposes. The preference is to remove the QR and bring instead tariffication meaning possible increase in tariff. Further, it restricts such regulatory measure like QR to only one product. The revised clause therefore covers both safeguards and balance of payments questions of any country. Obviously it will affect the poor countries most.

The DFA tightens the noose on the developing countries especially by appointing an Inspection Agency appointed by the GATT who would approve the commodities both for import and export of a member country. Further, the determination of the lowest price to be charged to avoid 'anti-dumping' provision for a commodity has been left to the trade department of the importing countries. This helps the imperialist countries and not the developing ones.

These are, in short, the salient features of the DFA, portentous enough to demand very serious attention and organisation of protest of every patriotic person let alone the workers, peasants and even small and medium industrialists, traders and businessmen. None of them is exempt from the grave danger lurking before them of utter slavery, destitution and ruin. This fate is awaiting the people if the neo-colonialists' dark design is allowed to pass.

India Government's Stand

Before we go into the question let us make ourselves aware of the fact uttered long ago by our revered departed leader Comrade Shibdas Ghosh that there had been a total identification of the

Indian state with the interests of the monopoly capital. The state is today subservient to the monopoly capital. See, how this truth is corroborated by even a foreign researcher. It has also been the consistent reading and observation of our party alone on this soil that Indian monopoly, particularly the top monopoly, had already acquired the imperialist characteristic features and that since it is today 'cosmopolitan' in nature it views the national market nothing but as a part of the global market. The so-called bogey of globalisation really means in class term as nothing but integration of finance capital into a global one. In other words, finance capital is organised today globally to thrust upon the international working people worst sort of

slavery reminding the days of colonial exploitation. The difference is this, the dominant finance capital in the world arena finds an ally in monopoly capital of different countries having the same class aim, aspiration and object. They are partners, albeit not equal. Here is what Prof. Michel Chossudovsky of the University of Ottawa, Canada, wrote just over a year ago (*Frontline* - October 9, 1992)

"The reforms (the so-called economic reforms with the slogans of 'globalisation', 'opening up' of economy and privatization or 'market rules' to prevail - *Ed. P. Era*) have ... the firm backing of India's largest business houses. ... The Tatas and the Birlas increasingly identify with foreign capital and the global market economy rather than with the national interest. ... The big business families in partnership with foreign capital are rapidly entering a variety of areas previously reserved for smallscale industry."

It seems even the monopoly houses are divided over the issue of liberalisation or 'opening up' of the economy to foreign capital and particularly to the dilution of FERA (Foreign Exchange Regulation Act) making possible by the foreign capital to acquire 51% share in joint ventures. This is clear from the Conclave of 10 biggest industrial magnates on September 22, 1993, in Bombay. Significant absentees have been the Birlas, the Ambanis and the Ruias. Birlas head a Rs. 3,500 crore international empire - mainly industrial concerns in South-East Asia. Their interests abroad are probably larger than their interests in the country. Ambanis and Ruias have different view about government policy. Even, the country's top monopolists' body Assochem (Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry) is divided. Its expert committee on company affairs opposed the freedom given to foreign companies to raise their stakes to 51% in joint ventures. It asked the government to undo the relaxation of the rigours of the 1973 Act to the foreign companies. Another section quickly dissociated itself from this view by dubbing it as a view of a section only and not of Assochem (*Frontline* : Nov. 19, 1993)

Naturally, therefore, political stands of different parliamentary parties sailing in the same boat of bourgeois thoughts though, are reflecting these contradictions and conflicts. The Congress (I) government at the Centre are reflecting the trend of thought of the dominant section of the monopoly houses as is obvious by their thorough overhaul of the economic, trade and tariff policies, just to

mention a few, quite in line with the conditionalities set down by the imperialist agencies like IMF, World Bank now being buttressed further by the DFA. In fact, the government tries in vain to allay the concern of the people when there are obvious and justifiable reasons for it.

See, how it defends skillfully the DFA. The government spokesmen say that the people need have no apprehension about the damaging effect on, say, agricultural subsidy. And Mr. Sutherland assured them about continuity of government's financial help and backing for safety net in food. They argue that the government subsidy to agricultural commodity does not exceed 10%, upto which the DFA has no objection. But they are reticent on the specifics, viz. whether the government will have the right to determine the percentage of subsidy or the GATT's body that will determine the actual percentage of subsidy. If it goes to the GATT, as it will go surely, then the percentage will attract deterrent to the peril of the consumers, that is the common people in particular inasmuch as food prices would definitely go up by leaps and bounds. Secondly, what about the clauses on agricultural sector as have been mentioned earlier, contained in the DFA? Why the government keeps mum? The reason is not difficult to understand.

See again, the government's stand on dilution of Patent Act in terms of TRIPs mentioned before to include both the process and product to the serious detriment of indigenous industries, researches, scientific and technological advancement, etc. Here is the newsitem published in the daily, *The Telegraph* (Nov. 27, '93).

"The Minister of State for Science and Technology, Mr. P. R. Kumarmangalam has hinted that India may move away from the present system on process patents to product patents as mooted in the Dunkel Draft.

"The statement" in effect, is a pointer to the present trend of thought in the government circle which seems to be in favour of the draft proposals."

And now let us listen to what Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, the Union Commerce Minister was saying to the Parliamentary Consultative Committee attached to his ministry. "There were sufficient indications from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade secretariat that in the light of the specific assurances and clarifications offered by GATT Director General Mr. Peter Sutherland, during his recent visit, India's current regime of production subsidies and food security would not be affected adversely in any manner by the Draft for Final Act of the Dunkel Text."

What was the assurance? Will the clauses set down, as mentioned hereinabove, be withdrawn? Or, was the minister simply referring to the transitional time or grace period offered? No concrete answer to either of these very relevant questions can be got from him. He is simply presenting a picture which does not reflect the truth, the whole truth: And he is not expected to do so either from the class interest he is defending.

Global Onslaught of Finance Capital**Against Working People of the World**

What then is the reality? Let us start from the US home front. There are two Americas - one of (Contd. on page 8)

Comrade Lenin on Democracy, Dictatorsh-

(Contd. from page 1)

slogans as freedom, equality and the will of the majority, and that we shall treat as aiders and abettors of Kolchak those who call themselves democrats, adherents of 'pure democracy, adherents of consistent democracy and who, directly or indirectly, oppose it to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Get this clear — you must get it clear. Are the pure democrats guilty of merely preaching pure democracy, defending it from the usurpers, or are they guilty of being on the side of the proletariat classes, on the side of Kolchak ?

We shall begin our examination with the question of freedom. Needless to say, for every revolution, socialist or democratic, freedom is a very, very important slogan. But our programme says that if freedom runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital, it is a deception. And every one of you who has read Marx — and, I think, even every one who has read at least one popular exposition of Marx's theories — knows that Marx devoted the greater part of his life, the greater part of his literary work, and the greater part of his scientific studies to ridiculing freedom, equality, the will of the majority, and all the Benthamites who wrote so beautifully about these things, and to proving that these phrases were merely a screen to cover up the freedom of the commodity owners, the freedom of capital, which these owners use to oppress the masses of the working people.

At the present time, when things have reached the stage of overthrowing the rule of capital all over the world, or at all events in one country; in this historical epoch, when the struggle of the oppressed working people for the complete overthrow of capital and the abolition of commodity production stands in the forefront, we say that all those who in such a political situation talk about "freedom in general", who in the name of this freedom oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat are doing nothing more nor less than aiding and abetting the exploiters, for unless freedom promotes the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital, it is a deception, as we openly say in our Party programme. Perhaps this is superfluous from the point of view of the outward structure of the programme, but it is most fundamental from the point of view of our propaganda and agitation, from the point of view of the principle of the proletarian struggle and proletarian power. We know perfectly well that we have to contend against world capital; we know perfectly well that at one time it was the task of world capital to create freedom, that it overthrew feudal slavery, that it created bourgeois freedom. We know perfectly well that this was epoch-making progress. And yet we say that we are opposing capitalism in general, republican capitalism, democratic capitalism, free capitalism; and, of course, we know that it will raise the standard of liberty against us. But to this we have our answer, and we deemed it necessary to give this answer in our programme — all freedom is deception if it runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital. [*Marx, Engels, Lenin on Democracy -*

Bourgeois and Socialist, pages 155-157 from V.I. Lenin's Speech "Deception of the people with slogans of freedom and equality" at the first all-Russia Congress on Adult Education, May 19, 1919 in Moscow]

* * *

Now the question is put somewhat differently: the transition from capitalist society — which is developing towards communism — to communist society is impossible without a "political transition period", and the state in this period can only be the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

What, then, is the relation of this dictatorship to democracy ? We have seen that the Communist Manifesto simply places side by side the two concepts: "to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class" and "to win the battle of democracy" [*Here Lenin is referring to Marx and Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, Moscow, 1973*] On the basis of all that has been said above, it is possible to determine more precisely how democracy changes in the transition from capitalism to communism.

In capitalist society, providing it develops under the most favourable conditions, we have a more or less complete democracy in the democratic republic. But this democracy is always hemmed in by the narrow limits set by capitalist exploitation, and consequently always remains, in effect, a democracy for the minority, only for the propertied classes, only for the rich. Freedom in capitalist society always remains about the same as it was in the ancient Greek republics: freedom for the slave-owners. Owing to the conditions of capitalist exploitation, the modern wage slaves are so crushed by want and poverty that "they cannot be bothered with democracy", "cannot be bothered with politics"; in the ordinary, peaceful course of events, the majority of the population is debarred from participation in public and political life....

Democracy for an insignificant minority, democracy for the rich — that is the democracy of capitalist society. If we look more closely into the machinery of capitalist democracy, we see everywhere, in the "petty" — supposedly petty — details of the suffrage (residential qualification, exclusion of women, etc.), in the technique of the representative institutions, in the actual obstacles to the right of assembly (public buildings are not for "paupers"!); in the purely capitalist organisation of the daily press, etc., etc. — we see restriction after restriction upon democracy. These restrictions, exceptions, exclusions, obstacles for the poor seem slight, especially in the eyes of one who has never known want himself and has never been in close contact with the oppressed classes in their mass life (and nine out of ten, if not ninety-nine out of a hundred, bourgeois publicists and politicians come under this category); but in their sum total these restrictions exclude and squeeze out the poor from politics, from active participation in democracy.

Marx grasped this essence of capitalist democracy splendidly when, in analysing the experience of the Commune, he said that the

oppressed are allowed once every few years to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class shall represent and repress them in parliament !

But from this capitalist democracy — that is inevitably narrow and stealthily pushes aside the poor, and is therefore hypocritical and false through and through — forward development does not proceed simply directly and smoothly, towards "greater and greater democracy", as the liberal professors and petty-bourgeois opportunists would have us believe. [*Selected Works : The State and Revolution. Page 323-324*]

* * *

I shall now pass from freedom to equality. This is a much more profound subject. This brings us to a still more serious, a more painful question, one that gives rise to considerable disagreement.

The revolution in its course sweeps away one exploiting class after another. First, it swept away the monarchy, and by equality implied an elected government, a republic. Proceeding further it swept away the landowners; and you know that the keynote of the entire struggle against the medieval system, against feudalism, was the slogan "equality". All are equal irrespective of social-estate; all are equal, millionaires and paupers alike. This is what the great revolutionaries of the period that has gone into history as the period of the great French Revolution said, thought and sincerely believed. The slogan of the revolution against the landowners was equality, and by equality was meant that the millionaires and the workers should have equal rights. The revolution developed. It said that "equality" — we did not specify this in our programme, for one cannot go on repeating the same thing endlessly; it is as clear as what we said about freedom — that equality is a deception if it runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital. That is what we say, and it is absolutely true. We say that a democratic republic with present-day equality is a fraud, a deception; here there is no equality, nor can there be. It is prevented by the private ownership of the means of production and money, capital. It is possible, at one stroke, to confiscate privately-owned mansions and fine buildings, it is possible in a relatively short period to confiscate capital and the means of production. But try to abolish the private ownership of money.

Money is congealed social wealth, congealed social labour. Money is a token which enables its owner to take tribute from all the working people. Money is a survival of yesterday's exploitation. That is what money is. Can it be abolished at one stroke ? No, even before the socialist revolution the socialists wrote that it is impossible to abolish money at one stroke, and our experience corroborates this. There must be very considerable technical and, what is much more difficult and much more important, organisational achievement before

(Contd. on page 5)

ip, Equality, Freedom and Bureaucracy

(Contd. from page 4)

we can abolish money; and until then we must put up with equality in words, in the constitution; we must put up with a situation in which everybody who possesses money practically has the right to exploit. We could not abolish the money at one stroke. We say that for the time being money will remain, and remain for a fairly long time in the transition period from the old capitalist system to the new socialist system. Equality is a deception if it runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital.

Engels was a thousand times right when he said that the concept of equality is a most absurd and stupid prejudice if it does not imply the abolition of classes. [Here Lenin is referring to *Anti-Dühring* by F. Engels.] Bourgeois professors attempted to use the concept equality as grounds for accusing us of wanting all men to be alike. They themselves invented this absurdity and wanted to ascribe it to the socialists. But in their ignorance they did not know that the socialists—and precisely the founders of modern scientific socialism, Marx and Engels—had said: equality is an empty phrase if it does not imply the abolition of classes. We want to abolish classes, and in this sense we are for equality. But the claim that we want all men to be alike is just nonsense, the silly invention of an intellectual who sometimes conscientiously strikes a pose, juggles with words, but says nothing — I don't care whether he calls himself a writer, a scholar, or anything else.

But we say that our goal is equality, and by that we mean the abolition of classes. [Marx, Engels, Lenin on Democracy — Bourgeois and Socialist, pages 160-162, from V.I. Lenin's Speech "Deception of the people with slogans of freedom and equality" at the first all-Russia Congress on Adult Education, May 19, 1919 in Moscow]

* * *

(8) Soviet state organisation alone has enabled the proletarian revolution to smash the old bourgeois state apparatus at one blow and destroy it to the very foundations; had not this been done no start could have been made on socialist development. Those strongholds of the bureaucracy which everywhere, both under monarchies and in the most democratic bourgeois republics, has always kept the state bound to the interests of the landowners and capitalists, have been destroyed in present-day Russia. The struggle against the bureaucracy, however, is certainly not over in our country. The bureaucracy is trying to regain some of its positions and is taking advantage, on the one hand, of the unsatisfactory cultural level of the masses of the people and, on the other, of the tremendous, almost superhuman war efforts of the most developed section of the urban workers. The continuation of the struggle against the bureaucracy, therefore, is absolutely necessary, is imperative, to ensure the success of future socialist development.

(9) Work in this field is closely connected with the implementation of the chief historical purpose of Soviet power, i.e., to advance towards the final abolition of the state, and should consist of the following. First, every member of a Soviet must, without fail, do a certain job of state administration; secondly, these jobs must be consistently changed so that they embrace all aspects of government, all its branches; and, thirdly, literally all the working population must be drawn into independent participation in state administration by means of a series of gradual measures that are carefully selected and unflinchingly implemented.

(10) By and large, the difference between bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism on the one hand, and Soviet or proletarian democracy on the other, boils down to this: the centre of gravity of the former is in its solemn and pompous declarations of numerous liberties and rights which the majority of the population, the workers and peasants, cannot enjoy to the full. Proletarian, or Soviet, democracy, on the contrary, has transferred the centre of gravity away from the declaration of rights and liberties for the entire people to the actual participation of none but the working people, who were oppressed and exploited by capital, in the administration of the state, the actual use of the best buildings and other premises for meetings and congresses, the best printing-works and the biggest warehouses (stocks) of paper for the education of those who were stultified and downtrodden under capitalism, and to providing a real (actual) opportunity for those masses gradually to free themselves from the burden of religious prejudices, etc., etc. It is precisely in making the benefits of culture, civilization and democracy really available to the working and exploited people that Soviet power sees its most important work, work which it must continue unswervingly in the future. [Collected Works vol. 29 : Draft Programme of the R.C.P.(B), page 109-110]

* * *

Then there is a question about the mouldiness, moss and red-tape that has grown in the localities and about the need to fight it. That is perfectly true. When the October Revolution kicked out the old bureaucrats it did so because it had created the Soviets. It turned out the old judges and made the court a people's court. The court could have been simplified; for this there was no need to know the old laws but simply to be guided by a sense of justice. It was easy to get rid of bureaucratic methods in the courts. In other areas it was much more difficult. We threw out the old bureaucrats, but they have come back, they call themselves "commonists" when they can't bear to say the word Communist, and they wear a red ribbon in their buttonholes and creep into warm corners. What to do about it? We must fight this scum again and again and if the scum has crawled back we must again and again clean it up, chase it out, keep it under the surveillance of communist workers and peasants whom we have known for more than a month and for more than a year. There is still another

question here, a note which says that it is a bad thing to give advantages to members of the Party because scoundrels will worm their way in. We are fighting against that and will continue to do so, comrades; we have passed a decision not to allow members who have been in the Party less than a year to be delegates to a Party congress; we shall continue to adopt such measures. When a Party is in power it has to give preference to its members — let us suppose that two men apply, one of them shows a Party membership card and the other has no Party card and both of them are equally unknown; it is natural that preference should be given to the Party member, the one who has the Party card. How can one really decide whether a person is in the Party because of his convictions or for gain? The date he joined the Party must be entered on his Party card, he must not be given the card until he has been tested, until he has been through probation, etc. ... [Session of the Petrograd Soviet - Collected Works. Vol. 29 pages 32-33]

* * *

We must work unremittingly to develop the organisation of the Soviets and of the Soviet government. There is a petty-bourgeois tendency to transform the members of the Soviets into "parliamentarians", or else into bureaucrats. We must combat this by drawing all the members of the Soviets into the practical work of administration. In many places the departments of the Soviets are gradually merging with the Commissariats. Our aim is to draw the whole of the poor into the practical work of administration, and all steps that are taken in this direction—the more varied they are, the better—should be carefully recorded, studied, systematised, tested by wider experience and embodied in law. Our aim is to ensure that every toiler, having finished his eight hours' "task" in productive labour, shall perform state duties without pay; the transition to this is particularly difficult, but this transition alone can guarantee the final consolidation of socialism. Naturally, the novelty and difficulty of the change lead to an abundance of steps being taken, as it were, gropingly, to an abundance of mistakes, vacillation — without this, any marked progress is impossible. The reason why the present position seems peculiar to many of those who would like to be regarded as socialists is that they have been accustomed to contrasting capitalism with socialism abstractly, and that they profoundly put between the two the word "leap" (some of them, recalling fragments of what they have read of Engels's writings, still more profoundly add the phrase "leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom". [Lenin is referring to and quoting from *Anti-Dühring* by F. Engels, Section Three, Socialism. Chapter II. Theoretical. — Progress Publishers] The majority of these so-called socialists, who have "read in books" about socialism but who have never seriously thought over the matter, are unable to consider that by "leap" the teachers of socialism meant turning-points on a

(Contd. on page 6)

Comrade Lenin on Democracy, Dictatorship, Equality, Freedom and Bureaucracy

(Contd. from page 5)

world-historical scale, and that leaps of this kind extend over decades and even longer periods. Naturally, in such times, the notorious "intelligentsia" provides an infinite number of mourners of the dead. Some mourn over the Constituent Assembly, others mourn over bourgeois discipline, others again mourn over the capitalist system, still others mourn over the cultured landowner, and still others again mourn over imperialist Great Power policy, etc., etc.

The real interest of the epoch of great leaps lies in the fact that the abundance of fragments of the old, which sometimes accumulate more rapidly than the rudiments (not always immediately discernible) of the new, calls for the ability to discern what is most important in the line or chain of development. History knows moments when the most important thing for the success of the revolution is to heap up as large a quantity of the fragments as possible, i.e., to blow up as many of the old institutions as possible; moments arise when enough has been blown up and the next task is to perform the "prosaic" (for the petty-bourgeois revolutionary, the "boring") task of clearing away the fragments; and moments arise when the careful nursing of the rudiments of the new system, which are growing amidst the wreckage on a soil which as yet has been badly cleared of rubble, is the most important thing.

It is not enough to be a revolutionary and an adherent of socialism or a Communist in general. You must be able at each particular moment to find the particular link in the chain which you must grasp with all your might in order to hold the whole chain and to prepare firmly for the transition to the next link; the order of the links, their form, the manner in which they are linked together, the way they differ from each other in the historical chain of events, are not as simple and not as meaningless as those in an ordinary chain made by a smith.

The fight against the bureaucratic distortion of the Soviet form of organisation is assured by the firmness of the connection between the Soviets and the "people", meaning by that the working and exploited people, and by the flexibility and elasticity of this connection. Even in the most democratic capitalist republics in the world, the poor never regard the bourgeois parliament as "their" institution. The Soviets are "theirs" and not alien institutions to the mass of workers and peasants... It is the closeness of the Soviets to the "people", to the working people, that creates the special forms of recall and other means of control from below which must be most zealously developed now. For example, the Councils of Public Education, as periodical conferences of Soviet electors and their delegates called to discuss and control the activities of the Soviet authorities in this field, deserve full sympathy and support. Nothing could be sillier than to transform the Soviets into something congealed and self-contained.

The more resolutely we now have to stand for a ruthlessly firm government, for the dictatorship of individuals in definite processes of work, in definite aspects of purely executive functions, the more varied must be the forms and methods of control from below in order to counteract every shadow of a possibility of distorting the principles of Soviet government, in order repeatedly and tirelessly to weed out bureaucracy. [*Collected Works, Vol. 27 : The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government — page 272-275*]

* * *

The next question which, according to the division of subjects, falls to my share is the question of bureaucracy and of enlisting the broad mass of the people in Soviet work. We have been hearing complaints about bureaucracy for a long time; the complaints are undoubtedly well-founded. We have done what no other state in the world has done in the fight against bureaucracy. The apparatus which was a thoroughly bureaucratic and bourgeois apparatus of oppression, and which remains such even in the freest of bourgeois republics, we have destroyed to its very foundations. Take, for example, the courts. Here, it is true, the task was easier; we did not have to create a new apparatus, because anybody can act as a judge basing himself on the revolutionary sense of justice of the working classes. . .

The employees in the other spheres of government are more hardened bureaucrats. The task here is most difficult. We cannot live without this apparatus; every branch of government creates a demand for such an apparatus. Here we are suffering from the fact that Russia was not sufficiently developed as a capitalist country. . . We dispersed these old bureaucrats, shuffled them and then began to place them in new posts. The tzarist bureaucrats began to join the Soviet institutions and practised their bureaucratic methods, they began to assume the colouring of Communists and, to succeed better in their careers, to procure membership cards of the Russian Communist Party. And so, they have been thrown out of the door but they creep back in through the window. What makes itself felt here most is the lack of cultured forces. These bureaucrats may be dismissed, but they cannot be reeducated all at once. Here we are confronted chiefly with organisational, cultural and educational problems.

We can fight bureaucracy to the bitter end, to a complete victory, only when the whole population participates in the work of government. In the bourgeois republics not only is this impossible, but the law itself prevents it. The best of the bourgeois republics, no matter how democratic they may be, have thousands of legal hindrances which prevent the working people from participating in the work of government.

But, in any case, our present situation in this respect is extremely difficult. Bureaucracy has been defeated. The exploiters have been eliminated. But the cultural level has not been raised, and therefore, the bureaucrats are occupying their old positions. They can be forced to retreat only if the proletariat and the peasants are organised far more extensively than has been the case up to now, and only if real measures are taken to enlist the workers in government. [*Collected Works, Vol. 29 : : page 182-184*]

Mao Zedong Memorial Day Observed in States

As per the decision of the Central Committee of the party the year-long celebration of Birth Centenary of Comrade Mao Zedong was taken up by the party in all states through various programmes. We are covering the news of celebrations so far received. In all the meetings wreaths were placed at the portrait of this great leader and Red Salute presented.

ORISSA

Cuttack: 28.12.93 : The Orissa state-level gathering was held yesterday at Sahid Bhavan, Cuttak, under the chairmanship of Comrade Mayadhar Nayak. A well-decorated demonstration of peasants, workers, students, youths and women from different parts of the state reached the venue of the meeting from Cuttack railway station.

Comrade Provash Ghosh, member of the Central Committee of the party, the main speaker, in his speech said that after the demise of Lenin and Stalin when revisionism under the leadership of Khrushchev appeared as the potential danger to the world communist movement, Comrade Mao Zedong, conducting ideological struggle on the correct line safeguarded the nobility of Marxism-Leninism and guided the world communist movement. Fighting against bourgeois thoughts and habits which still remained in the mental sphere of the Chinese people under socialist system Comrade Mao uniting the whole party, the class and the people and developing the ideological standard of them organised the Great Cultural Revolution and provided a developed understanding of Marxism-Leninism.

Comrade Mayadhar Nayak in his presidential speech called upon the people to make success the socialist revolution in India. Comrade Raghunath Das, member, State Secretariat, and Comrade Dhurjati Das, member, State Committee of the party, also addressed the gathering.

ASSAM

Guwahati, 26.12.93 : Under the auspices of the Assam State Committee of SUCI the year-long programme began today with a mass meeting and quotation exhibition in Guwahati. Comrade Kantimoy Deb, member, State Secretariat of the party, presided over the meeting at Guwahati District Library auditorium.

Inaugurating the celebration, Comrade Asit Bhattacharyya, member, Central Committee of the party, and the main speaker, in his speech said the Comrade Mao Zedong having successfully led the Chinese revolution by correctly applying Marxism-Leninism on the Chinese soil on the one hand enriched the treasurehouse of Marxism-Leninism and upheld the invincibility of Marxist ideology and on the other convincingly proved before the oppressed people of the world that the irreversible and inexorable course of history is the course of revolution.

Earlier, an exhibition of quotations taking excerpts from thoughts of Comrade Mao Zedong was inaugurated by Comrade Kantimoy Deb while the Red Flag was hoisted at the party office by Comrade Saradindu Biswas, member, State Committee of the party.

Proper integration of theory and practice is reflected in one's higher ethical standard : Mao Zedong

(Contd. from page 2)

that is, in the realm of ideology, thought and culture because old ideologies, thoughts, habits and culture persisting among the masses after revolution, if not fought out and eradicated dialectically, provide social support to bourgeois attempts for restoration of capitalism by nurturing revisionist thinking. Lenin thoroughly grasped the problem, analysed it repeatedly in detail after the November Revolution and cautioned that unless the legacies of the past in the superstructure could be rooted out by prolonged ideological-organisational-educational-cultural movement, the danger of revisionism and eventual restoration of capitalism would remain.

Mao had a deep understanding of the problem. That is why, even amidst the heat of the battles during and after the Long March, he founded a school in Yanan to thoroughly train up the vanguard detachment of the revolution, the Central Committee members, the leading party workers and the Red Army commanders organisationally, ideologically and culturally. The teaching that Mao had held aloft thereby is that before revolutionary uprising, the thinking, the mental make-up of the people, is to be remoulded in a way conducive to the revolution and for this, along with adopting necessary political, ideological and organisational processes and measures, the party has to advance through organising cultural revolution necessary precondition to the technical revolution which brings about a consciousness among the people about the new society they are going to build up after capture of state power. This is essential to protect the revolution, to consolidate the gains of the revolution and for the benefits of the revolution to reach the common masses. That is why, cultural revolution does not stop with a revolution but continues as an ongoing process after the revolution.

How to test whether our consciousness is based on adequate, correct understanding ? One of Mao's teachings is, being equipping theoretically, we should apply theory to practice; through each activity or struggle, we should sharpen our theoretical understanding and further develop the theory; again, through concretely applying in practice the new theoretical development, we should further strengthen our struggles and in the process further enrich the theory; if we move keeping our acquired theoretical knowledge and the experience gained in practice from the violent revolutionary struggles side by side, that is not adequate ; only through integration of theory and practice can we gain all-round knowledge, can we become good communists; whether we have succeeded in acquiring this all-round knowledge in attaining true communist character can be assessed only through its reflection on the conduct and life - whether the party leaders and workers in their life, conduct and behaviour reflect a higher ethical and cultural standard or not.

Recalling Mao Zedong's great contributions in the struggle against modern revisionism,

Comrade Mukherjee said: It is the inadequate level of ideological-cultural consciousness within the party and among the masses that provided the breeding ground of modern revisionism from country to country and this is therefore the root cause of the present setback in the communist movement. With the restoration of capitalism its ultimate aim, modern revisionism, through the long deleterious process of step by step dismantling of socialist structure for about thirty years, has brought about reversion to capitalism in the Soviet Union and in the states in East Europe through counter-revolution with the full support and backing of world imperialism. When the revisionist clique headed by Khrushchev taking advantage of the low level of consciousness of the communists after the demise of the great leader of world communist movement, Stalin,



usurped power in the party and the state in the Soviet Union and embarked upon the course of violating socialist economic laws and introducing economic measures of capitalist orientation, it was Mao Zedong and the CPC, who on the whole and in the main held aloft the banner of communism against onslaughts of modern revisionism in the world communist movement and waged heroic struggles against modern revisionism internationally and at home. Even in post-revolution period, a revolutionary party of the working class can slacken its vigil against bourgeois ideology and capitalistic tendencies only at its peril. Grasping it deeply the Mao leadership exhorted that class struggle against the capitalistic elements should be taken as the keylink in the policy even amidst socialist construction, conducted successive two-line struggles against capitalist roaders within the party and steadfastly fought against all deviations from Marxism-Leninism. Mao considered the correctness of base political line to be of paramount importance. This conviction of Mao is recorded in the *Report to the 10th Congress of the CPC* even. "Chairman Mao teaches us that 'the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything.'" If one's line is incorrect, one's downfall is inevitable even with the control of the central, local and army leadership. If one's line is correct and even if one has not a single soldier at first, there will be soldiers, and even if there is no political powers, political power will be gained. This is borne out by the historical experience of our Party and by that of the international communist movement since the time of Marx." That is why Mao always conducted struggle seriously and

uncompromisingly in order to uphold the correct line against those within the party advocating a wrong line. The culmination came in the great Proletarian Cultural Revolution when the Mao leadership, sensing that the seeds of revisionism lay within sections of the people, the party and even the top leadership, unleashed nationwide polemics and movement through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution involving not only the party but even widest sections of masses in order that the issues in question could be openly debated and thrashed out, erroneous thoughts and ideas persisting as hangovers from the old society effectively combated and unity of the bulk of the masses cemented on the basis of higher level of consciousness, of proletarian culture to provide a bulwark against revisionism. A life-long propounder of Democratic Centralism under which proletarian democracy is exercised on the basis of dialectical relationship between the leadership and the rank and file as a safeguard against bureaucratism and growth of blind allegiance, Mao now exhorted the masses to fearlessly criticise the mistakes and wrong ideas of even those in topmost positions in the party and the state. Those who now malign the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution as a left deviation of Mao, turning a blind eye to its great revolutionary significance, as the present Deng leadership of China or the CPI(M) in our country are doing, are in reality working for revisionism and capitalism

Regarding the present situation, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee said: In the *Report* presented to the 10th Congress of the CPC by Zhou Enlai in Mao's life time, it was declared that either there would be a series of cultural revolutions in China, or else China could not be freed from the evil of revisionism. Unfortunately, the latter has come true. After Mao's demise, the revisionist Deng clique has usurped power in China and it is step by step taking China towards free market economy, a euphemism for exploitative capitalist economy, although they have labelled it socialist free market economy to confuse and mislead the people. Internationally, after the overthrow of the socialist states in the Soviet Union and East Europe, the powerful socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union is no longer there to provide deterrent to the imperialist bloc and act as the guarantor of peace, security and sovereignty of the Third World countries. The resistance that the imperialists used to face from the Soviet Union even after it turned revisionist but continued as a super power, is also absent now. So the USA, the only super power, heading the world imperialists now has the other countries, especially those from the Third World, at its mercy. The present setback has given rise to many a doubt, many a confusion within the world communist movement itself.

Continuing, Comrade Mukherjee said: In the present difficult situation, the communists of the world have to close the ranks and steadfastly work pursuing the teachings of the giant leaders

(Contd. on page 8)

MAO ZEDONG DAY OBSERVED (Contd. from page 7)

of the international communist movement in order to foil the imperialist machinations and onslaughts. In our country, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, during his lifelong struggle to build up and nurture the SUCI as the genuine working class revolutionary party on the Indian soil, assimilated the teachings of the great leaders — Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong — to concretize Marxism-Leninism on the soil and in the process enriched Marxism-Leninism, raising the understanding of many a Marxist-Leninist concept to a new height. Analyzing different aspects of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in detail, Comrade Ghosh highlighted its many positive points and hailed it as a magnificent effort from which communists all over the world should take lesson. But at the same time, he offered some fraternal criticism and analysed the aspects of shortcomings and inadequacy of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to show that unless these could be rectified in time, the danger of rise of revisionism in China remained even after the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. He showed that the CPC had not been able to develop any adequate and comprehensive concept about the content and character of proletarian culture, nor to provide any theoretical formulation, confirmed by history and social science, as to the fundamental

difference between the moral values of bourgeois humanism and proletarian culture; the state, even though it is a socialist state, is after all an instrument of coercion; the contradiction that exists between the individual interest and the social interest is antagonistic in nature; and so long as the state exists as a reflection of this antagonistic contradiction, even in socialism, the individual must have to submit to the social interest, and the trend of revolt against the repressive character of the socialist state would appear repeatedly in individuals and, for this, the social objective would suffer time and again; in the socialist society, it is the old bourgeois concept of individual freedom and mental make-up that stands in the way of conducting a new struggle for the individual's freedom and emancipation; the individual's struggle for emancipation reaches a new and complex height and assumes a new character in the socialist society where to resolve this problem, a more intense and arduous struggle is to be conducted for complete identification of the self-interest with the interest of the society; the CPC had failed to incorporate this theoretical understanding as the focal point of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and if it failed to rectify this grave shortcomings well in time, the danger of appearance of revisionism remained in China despite the magnificent Cultural Revolution.

Regarding our present tasks Comrade Nihar Mukherjee said: The present setback is not the last word in history. We do not know about

many of the forces that are moving with true communist ideology in different countries of the world, nor have we yet established contact with them. But just because of this, it does not follow that efforts to build up true communist party and movement has been stalled from country to country. In the fight against the revisionists, the Deng clique in China, struggle by the forces within China inspired by Mao thought is the main factor because as Marxist-Leninists we know that the main determinant in every change is the internal contradiction, internal struggle — we can only play a role as an external contradiction. Our task in our country is to grasp the teachings left to us by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Zedong and Shibdas Ghosh and ceaselessly and steadfastly move on their bases. The wheels of history will again move forward. The imperialist-capitalists with all their propaganda will not be able to keep the people deceived for long, nor will they be able to crush the mighty revolutionary upsurge of masses with their cannons and bombs. The objective condition for revolution is ripe. If we can play our subjective role properly by moving resolutely towards fulfilling in our country the three pre-conditions for revolution formulated by Lenin, then that would be the best way of discharging our historical commitment to world proletarian revolution and the best revolutionary tribute we can pay to the great leader of the world proletariat Mao Zedong on this occasion.

Dunkel (Contd. from page 3)

the owners of trillions of dollars, a tiny microscopic section, and the other millions upon millions of Americans both white and black who have no home, no steady earnings, incomes falling, job vanishing — destitution writ large on their face. Now take for instance the NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement). It will create a major trade bloc, probably the richest one with Canada and Mexico along with the USA already and the Latin American countries likely to follow suit. The USA meaning the US multinationals would have a share of 84% of the combined market which the NAFTA would create.

The pact eliminates most tariffs at the border of USA, Canada and Mexico and opens the Mexican market to more US goods and in all probability shifting of US capital investment will be there to syphon out jobs to low-wage paying area.

That is to say, the US imperialist capital will exploit cheap labour and natural resources. But the US labour would suffer grievously and there is justifiable apprehensions about more lay-offs and golden handshakes to follow.

Similar is the case with the APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Council) with which the US imperialist capital shows its avid interest to associate. The reason is not difficult to follow. As *The Statesman* puts it succinctly: "The Americans have taken full note of the fact that during the current year, the economies of the so-called 'Asian Tigers' are expected to grow by 6.4% compared to 2.6% in the USA and a decline of 0.4% in the European Community. ...

"Both economic and political compulsions are behind Washington's move to associate it more closely with APEC." (Nov. 22, 1993)

Although it will not be a smooth sailing for the US capital as there is bound to have opposition from Japan and China against the absolute domi-

nance of the US capital in this area, the pertinent question is who gains — the working people or the handful of monopoly capitalists? Everywhere, be it the US economy, the European economies, or the Asian economies — the paramount question remains — what is the class motive and implication of the 'New Deal' of the imperialist-capitalists clinched on 15th December by the acceptance of the Dunkel Draft Act. The answer is: It is an open declaration of war to bleed white the working people in the interest of globally united finance capital under the leadership of the US imperialist capital.

The attack is so varied that it fails to avoid contradiction within capitalist camp, the government's assurance notwithstanding. The Merchants' Chamber of Commerce, for example, in a paper on the Dunkel Draft, as published in the Press (*The Statesman*, Dec. 1, 1993) had to accept and spell out the truth about India government's dubious role as also support to imperialist interests.

"The developing countries are looking up to India to take a lead on this vital issue. Regrettably, India is taking a myopic view of the DFA and seems prepared to accept it.

"Though India is trying to create an impression that the draft will not affect agriculture, prices of agricultural inputs such as highyielding varieties of seeds, agro-chemicals, agro-machinery and equipment they are expected to go up substantially because of trade-related intellectual property rights (TRIPs) clause. This stipulates that patent users will have to be given royalty. Not only is the problem limited to high-price, patent holders might also refuse to allow the use of such vital inputs at right prices, in right quality and quantity. This might place Indian agriculture completely at the mercy of patent-holders."

The paper had also to strike the note of caution as we have shown earlier, that as the West has an agricultural surplus, it is focussing on propping up

farm incomes, rather than ensuring food security. "Hence", holds the paper, "conditions of the Dunkel Draft would only flood Indian market and markets of developing countries with imports and curb domestic production." (*Ibid*)

It has repeated what we have shown earlier that the DFA will also limit domestic industry's access to new technology and delay the introduction of new products. International Patenting Rights will inhibit indigenous R & D since any other countries might claim earlier patent rights.

Another important point that we have shown here has also been stressed, i.e. the contradictory trends of attempts on the one hand, to bring all the countries under one economic globe and forming regional trade blocs or groupings on the other, to safeguard individual interests of imperialist capitals. The rivalry is ingrained in imperialism.

In sum, we must see through the developments taking place at a very acute stage of degeneration of capitalism as a world system. The deck is being cleared for a confrontation in the world arena of two antagonistic class interests between the working people, the overwhelming majority, and the exploiters. The clarion call of the *Communist Manifesto* "Workers of the World, Unite!" is becoming all the more relevant in today's objective reality.

Just Published

A CLARION CALL

(A Central Committee publication in the background of the recent elections)

Price Re. 1.00