

# Anatomy of Capitalism and Advent of Theory of Scientific Socialism

*Proletarian  
Era*

Organ of the SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE of INDIA  
(Fortnightly) Founder Editor in Chief:  
COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

*On the occasion of the 99th death anniversary of Frederick Engels which falls on 5th August, 1994 we pay our deep respect to this giant communist leader whose name goes along with Karl Marx as the co-founder of the scientific philosophy of Marxism. The following excerpts taken from different writings of Engels compiled together provides a penetrating analysis regarding the insoluble crisis of capitalism. This analysis made so long ago is very much valid even today which exposes at the same time the falsity of the claim of the bourgeois ideologues about superiority of capitalism.*

*In pursuance of the decision of the Central Committee of our party, we have chosen to publish these excerpts with this hope that all concerned will engage themselves fully in assimilating the teachings of this great communist leader which has become so urgent today.*

— Editorial Board, Proletarian Era



Frederick Engels  
1820-1895

*"...in spite of all seeming accidentality and of all temporary retrogression, a progressive development asserts itself in the end — the great fundamental thought... is now scarcely ever contradicted."*

Modern socialism is, in its essence, the direct product of the recognition, on the one hand, of the class antagonisms existing in the society of today between proprietors and non-proprietors, between capitalists and wage-workers; on the other hand, of the anarchy existing in production. But, in its theoretical form, modern socialism originally appears ostensibly as a more logical extension of the principles laid down by the great French philosophers of the eighteenth century. Like every new theory, modern socialism had, at first, to connect itself with the intellectual stock-in-trade ready to its hand, however deeply its roots lay in economic facts.

## Bourgeois Democracy — the Dream

The great men, who in France prepared men's minds for the coming revolution, were themselves extreme revolutionists. They recognised no external authority of any kind whatever. Religion, natural science, society, political institutions everything was subjected to the most unsparing criticism; everything must justify its existence before the judgment-seat of reason or give up existence. Reason became the sole measure of everything. It was the time when, as Hegel says, the world stood upon its head; first in the sense that the human head, and the principles arrived at by its thought, claimed to be the basis of all human action and association; but by and by, also, in the wider sense that the reality which was in contradiction to these principles had, in fact, to be turned upside down. Every form of society and government then existing, every old traditional notion was flung into the lumber-room as irrational; the world had hitherto allowed itself to be led solely by prejudices; everything in the past deserved only pity and contempt. Now, for the first time, appeared the light of day, henceforth superstition, injustice, privilege, oppression, were to be superseded by eternal truth, eternal Right, equality based on nature and the inalienable rights of man.

## Bourgeois Democracy — the Reality

We know today that this kingdom of reason was nothing more than the idealised kingdom of the bourgeoisie; that this eternal Right found its realisation in bourgeois justice; that this equality reduced itself to bourgeois equality before the law; that bourgeois property was proclaimed as one of the essential rights of man; and that the government of reason, the Contract Social of

(Contd on Page 2)

**Make the ensuing All India Plenum of the SUCI  
a grand success**

**4th—9th October, 1994: Cuttack, Orissa**

**Reception Rally: Balijatra Maidan : 4th October 4 p.m.**

**Delegate Session : Barabati Stadium  
5th—9th October**

(Contd from Page 1)

Rousseau, came into being, and only could come into being, as a democratic bourgeois republic. The great thinkers of the eighteenth century could, no more than their predecessors, go beyond the limits imposed upon them by their epoch...

We saw...how the French philosophers of the eighteenth century, the forerunners of the Revolution, appealed to reason as the sole judge of all that is. A rational government, rational society, were to be founded; everything that ran counter to eternal reason was to be remorselessly done away with. We saw also that this eternal reason was in reality nothing but the idealised understanding of the eighteenth century citizen, just then evolving into the bourgeois. The French Revolution had realised this rational society and government. But, the new order of things, rational enough as compared with earlier conditions, turned out to be by no means absolutely rational. The state based upon reason completely collapsed. Rousseau's Contract Social had found its realisation in the Reign of Terror, from which the bourgeoisie, who had lost confidence in their own political capacity, had taken refuge first in the corruption of the Directorate, and, finally, under the wing of the Napoleonic despotism. The promised eternal peace was turned into an endless war of conquest. The society based upon reason had fared no better. The antagonism between rich and poor, instead of dissolving into general prosperity, had become intensified by the removal of the guild and other privileges, which had to some extent bridged it over, and by the removal of the charitable institutions of the Church. The development of industry upon a capitalistic basis made poverty and misery of the working masses conditions of existence of society...

### Utopian Socialism

At this time, however, the capitalist mode of production, and with it the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, was still very incompletely developed. Modern industry, which had just arisen in England, was still unknown in France. But modern industry develops, on the one hand, the conflicts which make absolutely necessary a revolution in the mode of production, conflicts not only between the classes begotten of it, but also between the very productive forces and the forms of exchange created by it. And, on the other hand, it develops, in these very gigantic productive forces, the means of ending these conflicts. If, therefore, about the year 1800, the conflicts arising from the new social order were only just beginning to take shape, this holds still more fully as to the means of ending them. The propertyless masses of Paris, during the Reign of Terror, were able for a moment to gain the mastery. But, in doing so, they only proved how impossible it was for their domination to last under the conditions then obtaining. The proletariat, which then for the first time evolved itself from these propertyless masses as the nucleus of a new class, as yet quite incapable of independent political action, appeared as an oppressed, suffering estate, to whom, in its incapacity to help itself, help could, at best, be brought in from without or down from above.

This historical situation also dominated the founders of socialism. To the crude conditions of capitalist production and the crude class conditions corresponded crude theories. The

solution of the social problems, which as yet lay hidden in undeveloped economic conditions, the utopians attempted to evolve out of the human brain. Society presented nothing but wrongs; to remove these was the task of reason. It was necessary, then, to discover a new and more perfect system of social order and to impose this upon society from without by propaganda, and, wherever it was possible, by the example of model experiments. These new social systems were foredoomed as utopian; the more completely they were worked out in detail, the more they could not avoid drifting off into pure fantasies...

The utopians... were utopians because they could be nothing else at a time when capitalist production was as yet so little developed. They necessarily had to construct the elements of a new society out of their own heads, because within the old society the elements of the new were not as yet generally apparent; for the basic plan of the new edifice they could only appeal to reason just because they could not as yet appeal to contemporary history...

### Materialist Conception of History — the Basis

The materialist conception of history starts from the proposition that the production and, next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of all social structure; that in every society that has appeared in history, the manner in which wealth is distributed and society divided into classes or estates is dependent upon what is produced, how it is produced, and how the products are exchanged. From this point of view the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men's brains, not in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought, not in the philosophy, but in the economics of each particular epoch. The growing perception that existing social institutions are unreasonable and unjust, that reason has become unreason, and right wrong, is only proof that in the modes of production and exchange changes have silently taken place with which the social order, adapted to earlier economic conditions, is no longer in keeping. From this it also follows that the means of getting rid of the incongruities that have been brought to light must also be present, in a more or less developed condition, within the changed modes of production themselves. These means are not to be invented, spun out of the head, but discovered with the aid of the head in the existing material facts of production.

What is, then, the position of modern socialism in this connection?

The present structure of society-- this is now pretty generally conceded-- is the creation of the ruling class of today, of the bourgeoisie. The mode of production peculiar to the bourgeois, known, since Marx as the capitalist mode of production, was incompatible with the local privileges and the privileges of estate as well as with the reciprocal personal ties of the feudal system. The bourgeoisie broke up the feudal system and built upon its ruins the capitalist order of society, the kingdom of free competition, of personal liberty, of the equality, before the law, of all commodity owners, of all the rest of the capitalist blessings. Thence forward the capitalist mode of production could develop in freedom. Since steam, machinery, and the making of machines by machinery transformed the older manufacture into modern industry, the productive forces evolved under

the guidance of the bourgeoisie developed with a rapidity and in a degree unheard of before. But just as the older manufacture, in its time, and handicraft, becoming more developed under its influence, had come into collision with the feudal trammels of the guilds, so now modern industry in its more complete development, comes into collision with the bounds within which the capitalistic mode of production holds it confined. The new productive forces have already outgrown the capitalistic mode of using them. And this conflict between productive forces and modes of production is not a conflict engendered in the mind of man, like that between original sin and divine justice. It exists, in fact, objectively, outside us, independently of the will and actions even of the men that have brought it on. Modern socialism is nothing but the reflex, in thought, of this conflict in fact; its ideal reflection in the minds, first, of the class directly suffering under it, the working class.

Now, in what does this conflict consist?

### Capitalist Production — early Stages

Before capitalistic production, i.e. in the Middle Ages, the system of petty industry obtained generally, based upon the private property of the labourers in their means of production; [in the country,] the agriculture of the small peasant, freeman or serf; in the towns, the handicrafts. The instruments of labour-- land, agricultural implements, the workshop, the tool-- were the instruments of labour of single individuals, adapted for the use of one worker, and, therefore, of necessity, small, dwarfish, circumscribed. But, for this very reason they belonged, as a rule, to the producer himself. To concentrate these scattered, limited means of production, to enlarge them, to turn them into the powerful levers of production of the present day - this was precisely the historic role of capitalist production and of its upholder, the bourgeoisie. In Part IV of *Capital* Marx has explained in detail, how since the fifteenth century this has been historically worked out through the three phases of simple co-operation, manufacture and modern industry. But the bourgeoisie, as is also shown there, could not transform these puny means of production into mighty productive forces without transforming them, at the same time, from means of production of the individual into *social* means of production only workable by a *collectivity of men*. The spinning-wheel, the hand-loom, the blacksmith's hammer, were replaced by the spinning-machine, the power-loom, the steam-hammer; the individual workshop by the factory implying the co-operation of hundreds and thousands of workmen. In like manner, production itself changed from a series of individual into a series of social acts, and the products from individual to social products. The yarn, the cloth, the metal articles that now came out of the factory were the joint product of many workers, through whose hands they had successively to pass before they were ready. No one person could say of them: "I made that; this is *my* product."

But where, in a given society, the fundamental form of production is that spontaneous division of labour, there the products take on the form of *commodities* whose mutual exchange, buying and selling, enable the individual producers to satisfy their manifold wants. And this was the case in the

(Contd on Page 3)

(Contd from Page 2)

Middle Ages. The peasant, e.g., sold to the artisan agricultural products and bought from him the products of handicraft. Into this society of individual producers, of commodity producers, the new mode of production thrust itself. In the midst of the old division of labour, grown up spontaneously and upon *no definite plan*, which had governed the whole of society, now arose division of labour upon *a definite plan*, as organised in the factory; side by side with individual production appeared social production. The products of both were sold in the same market, and, therefore, at prices at least approximately equal. But organisation upon a definite plan was stronger than spontaneous division of labour. The factories working with the combined social forces of a collectivity of individuals produced their commodities far more cheaply than the individual small producers. Individual production succumbed in one department after another. Socialised production revolutionised all the old methods of production. But its revolutionary character was, at the same time, so little recognised that it was, on the contrary, introduced as a means of increasing and developing the production of commodities. When it arose, it found readymade, and made liberal use of, certain machinery for the production and exchange of commodities: merchants' capital, handicraft, wage-labour. Socialised production thus introducing itself as a new form of the production of commodities, it was a matter of course that under it the old forms of appropriation remained in full swing, and were applied to its products as well.

In the medieval stage of evolution of the production of commodities, the question as to the owner of the product of labour could not arise. The individual producer, as a rule, had, from raw material belonging to himself, and generally his own handiwork, produced it with his own tools, by the labour of his own hands or of his family. There was no need for him to appropriate the new product. It belonged wholly to him, as a matter of course. His property in the product was, therefore, *based upon his own labour*...

### Modern Capitalism

#### — concentration of Production

Then came the concentration of the means of production in large workshops and manufactures, their transformation into actual socialised means of production. But the socialised means of production and their products were still treated, after this change, just as they had been before, i.e., as the means of production and the products of individuals. Hitherto, the owner of the instruments of labour had himself appropriated the product, because, as a rule, it was his own product and the assistance of others was the exception. Now the owner of the instruments of labour always appropriated to himself the product, although it was no longer his product but exclusively the product of the *labour of others*. Thus, the products now produced socially were not appropriated by those who had actually set in motion the means of production and actually produced the commodities, but by the *capitalists*. The means of production, and production itself, had become in essence socialised. But they were subjected to a form of appropriation which presupposes the private

production of individuals, under which, therefore, everyone owns his own product and brings it to market. The mode of production is subjected to this form of appropriation, although it abolishes the conditions upon which the latter rests. This contradiction, which gives to the new mode of production its capitalist character, *contains the germ of the whole of the social antagonisms of today*. The greater the mastery obtained by the new mode of production over all decisive fields of production and in all economically decisive countries, the more it reduced individual production to an insignificant residuum, *the more clearly was brought out the incompatibility of socialised production with capitalistic appropriation*.

The first capitalists found, as we have said, wage-labour ready-made for them. But it was exceptional, complementary, accessory, transitory wage-labour. The agricultural labourer, though, upon occasion, he hired himself out by the day, had a few acres of his own land on which he could at all events live at a pinch. The guilds were so organised that the journeyman of today became the master of tomorrow. But all this changed, as soon as the means of production became socialised and concentrated in the hands of capitalists. The means of production, as well as the product, of the individual producer became more and more worthless; there was nothing left for him but to turn wage-worker under the capitalist. Wage-labour, aforesaid the exception and accessory, now became the rule and basis of all production; aforesaid complementary, it now became the sole remaining function of the worker. The wage-worker for a time became a wage-worker for life. The number of these permanent wage-workers was further enormously increased by the breaking-up of the feudal system that occurred at the same time, by the disbanding of the retainers of the feudal lords, the eviction of the peasants from their homesteads, etc. The separation was made complete between the means of production concentrated in the hands of the capitalists, on the one side, and the producers, possessing nothing but their labour-power, on the other. *The contradiction between socialised production and capitalistic appropriation manifested itself as the antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie*.

We have seen that the capitalistic mode of production thrust its way into a society of commodity producers, of individual producers, whose social bond was the exchange of their products. But every society based upon the production of commodities has this peculiarity: that the producers have lost control over their own social interrelations. Each man produces for himself with such means of production as he may happen to have, and for such exchange as he may require to satisfy his remaining wants. No one knows how much of his particular article is coming on the market, nor how much of it will be wanted. No one knows whether his individual product will meet an actual demand, whether he will be able to make good his costs of production or even to sell his commodity at all. Anarchy reigns in socialised production. But the production of commodities, like every other form of production, has its peculiar, inherent laws inseparable from it; and these laws work, despite anarchy, in and through anarchy. They reveal themselves in the only persistent form of social interrelations, i.e., in exchange, and here they affect the individual producers as

compulsory laws of competition. They are, at first, unknown to these producers themselves, and have to be discovered by them gradually and as the result of experience. They work themselves out, therefore, independently of the producers, and in antagonism to them, as inexorable natural laws of their particular form of production. The product governs the producers.

In medieval society, especially in the earlier centuries, production was essentially directed towards satisfying the wants of the individual. It satisfied, in the main, only the wants of the producer and his family. Where relations of personal dependence existed, as in the country, it also helped to satisfy the wants of the feudal lord. In all this there was, therefore, no exchange; the products, consequently, did not assume the character of commodities. The family of the peasant produced almost everything they wanted: clothes and furniture, as well as means of subsistence. Only when it began to produce more than was sufficient to supply its own wants and the payments in kind to the feudal lord, only then did it also produce commodities. This surplus, thrown into socialised exchange and offered for sale, became commodities...

### The Basic Contradiction of Capitalism

...with the extension of the production of commodities, and especially with the introduction of the capitalist mode of production, the laws of commodity production, hitherto latent, came into action more openly and with greater force. The old bonds were loosened, the old exclusive limits broken through, the producers were more and more turned into independent, isolated producers of commodities. The anarchy of social production became apparent and grew to greater and greater height. But the chief means by aid of which the capitalist mode of production intensified this anarchy of socialised production was the exact opposite of anarchy. It was the increasing organisation of production, upon a social basis, in every individual productive establishment. By this, the old, peaceful, stable condition of things was ended. Wherever this organisation of production was introduced into a branch of industry, it brooked no other method of production by its side. Where it laid hold of a handicraft, that old handicraft was wiped out. The field of labour became a battle-ground. The great geographical discoveries, and the colonisation following upon them, multiplied markets and quickened the transformation of handicraft into manufacture. The war did not simply break out between the individual producers of particular localities. The local struggles begot in their turn national conflicts, the commercial wars of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. Finally, modern industry and the opening of the world market made the struggle universal, and at the same time gave it an unheard-of virulence. Advantages in natural or artificial conditions of production now decide the existence or non-existence of individual capitalists, as well as of whole industries and countries. He that falls is remorselessly cast aside.

...The contradiction between socialised production and capitalistic appropriation now presents itself as *an antagonism between the organisation of production in the individual*  
(Contd on Page 4)

(Contd from Page 3)

*workshop, and the anarchy of production in society generally.*

The capitalistic mode of production moves in these two forms of the antagonism immanent to it from its very origin...It is the compelling force of anarchy in social production that turns the limitless perfectibility of machinery under modern industry into a compulsory law by which every individual industrial capitalist must perfect his machinery more and more, under penalty of ruin. But the perfecting of machinery is making human labour superfluous. If the introduction and increase of machinery means the displacement of millions of manual by a few machine-workers, improvement in machinery means the displacement of more and more of the machine-workers themselves. It means, in the last instance, the production of a number of available wage-workers in excess of the average needs of capital, the formation of a complete industrial reserve army...Thus it comes about, to quote Marx, that machinery becomes the most powerful weapon in the war of capital against the working class; that the instruments of labour constantly tear the means of subsistence out of the hands of the labourer; that the very product of the worker is turned into an instrument for his subjugation... machinery, the most powerful instrument for shortening labour-time, becomes the most unflinching means for placing every moment of the labourer's time and that of his family at the disposal of the capitalist for the purpose of expanding the value of his capital. Thus it comes about that the overwork of some becomes the preliminary condition for the idleness of others, and that modern industry, which hunts after new consumers over the whole world, forces the consumption of the masses at home down to a starvation minimum, and in doing this destroys its own home market... It establishes an accumulation of misery, corresponding with accumulation of capital. Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that *produces its own product in the form of capital.*" (Marx's *Capital*)...

...the ever increasing perfectability of modern machinery, is by the anarchy of social production, turned into a compulsory law that forces the individual industrial capitalist always to improve his machinery, always to increase its productive force. The bare possibility of extending the field of production is transformed for him into a similar compulsory law. The enormous expansive force of modern industry, compared with which that of gases is mere child's play, appears to us now as a *necessity* for expansion, both qualitative and quantitative, that laughs at all resistance. Such resistance is offered by consumption, by sales, by the markets for the products of modern industry. But the capacity for extension, extensive and intensive, of the markets is primarily governed by quite different laws that work much less energetically. The extension of the markets cannot keep pace with the extension of production. The collision becomes inevitable, and as this cannot produce any real solution so long as it does not break in pieces the capitalist mode of production, the collision become periodic. ...

In these crises, the contradiction between

socialised production and capitalist appropriation ends in a violent explosion. The circulation of commodities is for the time being, stopped. Money, the means of circulation, becomes a hindrance to circulation. All the laws of production and circulation of commodities are turned upside down. The economic collision has reached its apogee. *The mode of production is in rebellion against the mode of exchange, the productive forces are in rebellion against the mode of production which they have outgrown.*

### Basic Contradiction of Capitalism Irreconcilable

...On the one hand, therefore, the capitalistic mode of production stands convicted of its own incapacity to further direct these productive forces. On the other, these productive forces themselves, with increasing energies, press forward to the removal of the existing contradiction, to the abolition of their quality as capital, *to the practical recognition of their character as social productive forces.*

This rebellion of the productive forces, as they grow more and more powerful, against their quality as capital, this stronger and stronger command that their social character shall be recognised, forces the capitalist class itself to treat them more and more as social productive forces, so far as this is possible under capitalist conditions. The period of industrial high pressure, with its unbounded inflation of credit, not less than the crash itself, by the collapse of great capitalist establishments, tends to bring about that form of the socialisation of great masses of means of production which we meet with in the different kinds of joint-stock companies. Many of these means of production and of communication are, from the outset, so colossal that, like the railways, they exclude all other forms of capitalistic exploitation. At a further stage of evolution this form also becomes insufficient; the official representative of capitalist society — the state — will ultimately have to undertake the direction of production. This necessity for conversion into state property is felt first in the great institutions for intercourse and communication — the post office, the telegraphs, the railways.

If the crises demonstrate the incapacity of the bourgeoisie for managing any longer modern productive forces, the transformation of the great establishments for production and distribution into joint-stock companies and state property shows how unnecessary the bourgeoisie are for that purpose. All the social functions of the capitalist are now performed by salaried employees. The capitalist has no further social function than that of pocketing dividends, tearing off coupons, and gambling on the Stock Exchange, where the different capitalists despoil one another of their capital. At first, the capitalist mode of production forces out the workers. Now it forces out the capitalists, and reduces them, just as it reduced the workers, to the ranks of the surplus population, although not immediately into those of the industrial reserve army.

But the transformation, either into joint-stock companies, or into state ownership, does not do away with the capitalistic nature of the productive forces. In the joint-stock companies this is obvious. And the modern state, again, is only the organisation that bourgeois society takes on in order to support the general external conditions of the capitalist

mode of production against the encroachments as well of the workers as of individual capitalists. The modern state, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national capital. The more it proceeds to the taking over of productive forces, the more does it actually become the national capitalist, the more citizens does it exploit. The workers remain wage-workers--proletarians. The capitalist relation is not done away with. It is rather brought to a head. ...State ownership of the productive forces is not the solution of the conflict, but concealed within it are the technical conditions that form the elements of that solution.

### The Solution

This solution can only consist in the practical recognition of the social nature of the modern forces of production, and therefore in the harmonising of the modes of production, appropriation, and exchange with the socialised character of the means of production. And this can only come about by society openly and directly taking possession of the productive forces which have outgrown all control except that of society as a whole. The social character of means of the production and of the products today reacts against the producers, periodically disrupts all production and exchange, acts only like a law of nature working blindly, forcibly, destructively. But with the taking over by society of the productive forces, the social character of the means of production and of the products will be utilised by the producers with the perfect understanding of its nature, and instead of being a source of disturbance and periodical collapse, will become the most powerful lever of production itself.

[...With this recognition, at last, of the real nature of the productive forces of today, the social anarchy of production gives place to a social regulation of production upon a definite plan, according to the needs of the community and of each individual. Then the capitalist mode of appropriation in which the product enslaves first the producer and then the appropriator, is replaced by the mode of appropriation of the products that is based upon the nature of the modern means of production : upon the one hand, direct social appropriation, as means to the maintenance and extension of production - on the other, direct individual appropriation, as means of subsistence and of enjoyment.

Whilst the capitalist mode of production more and more completely transforms the great majority of the population into proletarians, it creates the power which, under penalty of its own destruction, is forced to accomplish this revolution. Whilst it forces on more and more the transformation of the vast means of production, already socialised, into state property, it shows itself the way to accomplishing this revolution. *The proletariat seizes political power and turn the means of production in the first instance into state property.* But, in doing this, it abolishes itself as proletariat, abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, abolishes also the state as state. ...

Since the historical appearance of the capitalist mode of production, the appropriation by society of all the means of production has often been dreamed of, more or less vaguely, by

(Contd on Page 7)



## The whole episode centring round Electoral Reform Bills a got-up manoeuvre to hoodwink people

Two Bills — one for amending the Constitution so that a change could be brought about in the composition of the Election Commission (EC) at the top level and the other for amending the Representation of People's Act (RPA) were scheduled to have been placed before the Lok Sabha by the Congress(I). The Congress(I) announced these bills with fanfare as if their adoption would make for "clean" election and resorted to hectic lobbying to obtain support of the opposition parties for the bills so that requisite majority in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha could be mastered in favour of them. But it failed to do so and eventually the idea of tabling these bills was dropped, at least for the time being. The informed people know that the ground of the two bills, their declared objectives and in what circumstances the proposal for the bills had to be withdrawn. Whatever might be the future developments, the present position is that the CPI has charged the CPI(M) of coming to the help of the Congress(I) whereas the CPI(M) has charged the CPI of strengthening the hands of the BJP by not supporting the proposed Congress(I)-sponsored bills. But in spite of such 'fundamental' difference, the unity of their Left Front would remain in tact, such are the exigencies of the election politics that guide these parties! But the intriguing point is that all the parliamentary parties starting from the Congress(I) to such leftists despite their arguments and counter-arguments, all pose as champions of free and fair elections.

It needs no telling that for long, elections in our country have virtually been reduced to farce. That is why, the people, especially all honest, right-thinking persons, have a sincere longing for electoral reforms for their experience of recent elections has been bitter. So if they find any effort or even declaration of intent for electoral reforms from any quarters, they have a natural feeling to welcome the same. Whether the role of the present Chief Election Commissioner (CEC) or his proposed steps, or the recent Congress(I)-sponsored bills could bring about genuine improvement in the situation, is another matter. To understand this question, we should have a clear idea about some features of the present election politics as pursued by the major parliamentary parties.

The Congress(I) is corrupt to the bones with even the top echelons of its leadership directly involved in corruption as can be seen from the scandals and scams that come to light almost regularly - the Bofors deal, the HDW Submarine deal, the stock market scam and the suitcase scandal and now the sugar scam. Is it any wonder that this party adopts corrupt practice of every sort for winning elections anyhow? The BJP, while in power in UP, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan and MP and during elections has demonstrated that it is adept in taking recourse to any foul and corrupt means. The same applies to the Janata Dal too in full measure as we have seen Bihar, UP, Orissa and other states. It is regrettable that the parties like the CPI and the CPI(M), who call themselves leftists, indulge in utter corrupt practice while in power and for winning elections. Experience in West Bengal and Kerala provide sufficient proof of this. All the

parliamentary parties are seriously affected with this malaise to a relatively lesser or greater degree.

At election times, these parties make extensive, naked use of money and organised muscle power, indulge in large-scale vote buying and lavish propaganda, employing hi-tech electronic media even, buying communication satellite time at fabulous cost for the purpose. Who provides money for all this? Certainly not the half-fed, half-clad tens of millions of toiling masses but the capitalists with huge fund of black money at their disposal. The ruling capitalist class thus promotes the parties serving it so that the election battle can remain confined between only the parties subservient to it. In fact, during the past two decades, the overriding determinant has been that the party or the combination chosen by the ruling class as the best bet under the circumstances to protect its interests, is put into power through concocted results in totally rigged elections, in utter disregard of people's will. This all-out centralised administrative rigging starts from the preparation of electoral rolls and continues through every stage of the election process to the counting and declaration of the results and involves large-scale substitution of ballot boxes and ballot papers between polling and counting to arrive at the pre-determined results. The masses are psychologically prepared beforehand for such result through orchestrated propaganda in the newspapers, radio and the TV, through discourses by 'learned' psephologists in the media to discover, project and fan up "sympathy wave" or "upsurge of support" in favour of the chosen party or combination. An industrialist-bureaucrat-military top brass coterie wielding real power on behalf of the ruling capitalist class from behind the facade of parliamentary democracy, masterminds and directs the whole operation.

All this is for artificially providing political stability in the interest of the ruling class. But the crisis of capitalism is so acute today, that it cannot but be reflected in the political sphere too. Added to this is the total lack of morality and ethics of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties and politicians, their selfishness and quest to gain power and pelf at any cost. The result is general destabilisation and a tendency of disintegration. Recently, we have been familiar with the experience how governments elected with enormous 'popular support' through such elections become unpopular in no time and torn up with dissension and squabbles from within. Such is the rampant divisiveness that the ruling class is even finding it difficult to get a single party elected with absolute majority through such election and governments run by a combination of parties or even a minority government are coming into vogue.

Gangsterism, violence, intimidation of voters, capturing of polling booths, etc., are crude methods that make rigging palpable and apparent. On the other hand, it has been made possible to doctor outcome of elections towards achieving a pre-determined result through silent, all out centralised administrative rigging even while the election may be peaceful, normal and fair on the surface. Hinting at this aspect,

Mr. Ganesan, who was a high election official under the then Election Commission, once commented that rigging could be of two types, violent and silent. By silent rigging he meant what our party had been calling administrative rigging in which the administration plays a big role away from public eyes.

Such being the magnitude and depth of the problem, the hindrance to free and fair elections cannot be removed by superficially viewing the situation nor through patchwork reform by legislation or administrative orders. Clean election, even in the relative sense, cannot be ensured through the pious pledges of the parliamentary parties "enshrined" in the new legislation - parties that are steeped in corruption and do not hesitate to adopt any foul means for even marginally improving their election prospects. Such parties once talked about impeaching the present CEC Mr. Seshan. But whenever Mr. Seshan's measures during a particular election benefitted any one of these parties electorally, it praised Mr. Seshan immediately.

There is urgent need for electoral reforms and the people desire

it. Long before Mr. Seshan's tenure as the CEC, our party, the SUCI, had put forward concrete suggestions in writing to the government from time to time. Salient points of these suggestions were:

Firstly, the CEC should be a man of unquestionable honesty and integrity who would strictly maintain democratic norms, without fearing or favouring anybody;

Secondly, the EC should be an independent statutory body neither under the central nor the state government which should start work from the preparation of electoral roles and continue work till the declaration of results and the staff associated with this entire process should be regarded as the staff of the CEC so that they may remain free as far as possible from their commitment or obligation to the governments or to the parties either at the centre or in the states.

Thirdly, identify cards with photographs should be introduced to prevent false voting;

It will be seen from the above that some of Mr. Seshan's recent measures are in accordance with our above suggestions but Mr. Seshan's measures are not as comprehensive as our suggestions, nor can we expect that from an out and out bureaucrat like Mr. Seshan. Our party never had the illusion that our proposed measures would be able to put a check to the whole gamut of corruption and rigging in the elections. But we felt that such measures, if honestly implemented, could be a beginning in the right direction if backed up by mass movements.

A section of the people may be under the illusion that the recent elections conducted with Mr. Seshan as the CEC have been free and fair. It should be remembered that the recent bye-elections in a number of states came at a time when the controversy about the measures taken or proposed by Mr. Seshan at its peak and when he had already clamped down measures like banning postering and writing on building walls for election purpose, restricting

(Contd on Page 6)

## Seshan reflects aggregate interest of ruling class to restore credibility of elections, although free and fair poll remains a far cry

(Contd from Page 5)

expenditure by the candidates to the permissible ceiling, etc.; the EC staff even shot video films on how the election was being conducted in the constituencies in West Bengal which showed that the election was peaceful and fair. But despite this, the experience of our organisation and that of the people was that the elections were far from free and fair and no serious dent had been made in the rampant corrupt practices and rigging. So, those who think that Mr. Seshan's measures can lead to better elections, are wrong. The problem cannot be understood from the outward look of things, nor can effective electoral reforms be adopted on the basis of such superficial understanding. What Mr. Seshan seeks to achieve is to reduce some palpable violations of laws by the parliamentary parties, ministers and other high ups in these parties, notably the Congress(I). This has a salutary effect though limited. But there also is a strong undemocratic aspect of Mr. Seshan's activities. Apart from the numerous examples of his unwarranted rude behaviour and high-handedness, there have been specific major instances of his undemocratic conduct. The way in which the names of lakhs of voters were summarily struck off the electoral role in Assam is but one glaring instance of the undemocratic conduct of the present CEC. The democratic people in their earnest desire for free and fair elections can overlook this aspect only at their peril and should be vigilant against misuse of power, high-handedness and undemocratic conduct of Mr. Seshan from the chair of the CEC.

The ruling capitalist class makes good use of the parliamentary parties subservient to it and must prop up this or that one or a combination of them from election to election as its chosen alternative to be put into power through totally rigged election. But the way in which these parties are reducing election to a farce openly, cannot but hurt the aggregate interest of the ruling class. In their unbridled desire to win elections anyhow, these parties take resort to utter corrupt practice of every sort and naked organised hooliganism; at election times hordes of cadres of these parties and mafias owing allegiance to them move about openly intimidating the voters and capturing election booths; notorious mafias are even being put up as candidates by these parties. Matters have come to such a pass that even an outwardly free and fair form of bourgeois election cannot be maintained. This clearly and palpably points out the farcical nature of these elections to the people. The ruling class desires to restore the semblance of democracy atleast on the surface so that the faith of the people in the bourgeois election press does not collapse because if that happens, that would do the ruling class no good and might eventually endanger the capitalist system itself. Mr. Seshan reflects this desire of the ruling capitalist class and a section of this monopoly process is spreading the illusion that he would clean up the election process.

The ruling class cannot but continue with the totally rigged got-up elections that are in vogue, but at the same time it desires that the

elections look relatively free and fair on the surface so that the people's illusion about them also continues. In pursuing this dual class objective, Mr. Seshan's popularity among a section of the people through his bid to issue identity cards to voters and to enforce ceiling of expenditure on the candidates and parties, etc., has come in handy. The ruling class seeks to utilise this popularity of Mr. Seshan to serve its aggregate interest and so the monopoly press projects Mr. Seshan as a messiah who has come to deliver the goods so that the people's, illusion about Mr. Seshan, and consequently about the bourgeois elections, is strengthened.

In this situation the ruling class desires that the position and image of Mr. Seshan as the CEC be maintained, even if that runs counter to the party election interest of the Congress(I), its principal political agent and the other parliamentary parties that were in support of the two Congress(I) sponsored bills. Unless we understand this, we cannot understand why the Congress(I) had eventually to drop the idea of moving these bills.

Mr. Narashima Rao is no novice in stratagems of parliamentary politics. Since he became the Prime Minister, he wriggled out more than once of a tight corner in Parliament even when his was a minority government. Before he called the special session of the Parliament expressly for getting the two bills passed, he must have had done his arithmetic and ensured support of the different parties to the extent necessary for marshalling the two-thirds majority required for amendment of the Constitution. What then went wrong at the eleventh hour? This can not be explained by anything else than the overriding influence of the ruling class which made the CPI, the Telugu Deshan Party and the Samajwadi Janata Party withdraw support from the two bills although in articles in its organ New Age, the CPI had earlier supported the concept of a 3-member EC. In the circumstances the Congress(I) government had no option but to drop the idea of moving the bills.

This overriding nature of the interest of the ruling class may not be apparent to the common people. But even if we leave aside many instances of this in the past we wish to remind them of the term "politics of consensus" that is much in use in Indian political parlance since the Rao government came into office. It is not a consensus of the people but a consensus of the parliamentary political parties in the interest of the ruling class to sustain the capitalist system. At that time, the aggregate interest of the ruling class demanded adoption of the new economic and industrial policy embodying measures but a hoax. Whether the EC is one or three-member, unless it diagnoses the basic malaise and moves along correct path to eradicate it, the problem would remain and go on increasing. But from the debate on reconstitution of the EC, it is clear that none of these participating parties are bothered with the problem or its solution - all they are concerned about is whether the EC, as of now or after reconstitution, would protect their sectarian

towards globalisation of Indian capitalist economy. Actuated by the politics of consensus, the two main opposition blocs, the BJP and the National Front- Left combine took good care not to queer the pitch. Very vocal in their opposition to the Rao government and its policies, they nevertheless arranged to never vote together against Rao on the floor of Parliament, thus safeguarding the minority Rao government from sure down fall; and the government went ahead with the new economic and industrial policy! That the very same opposition parties are now rending the sky with demands to scrap the Dunkel proposal, for public consumption, is another matter!

Viewed in this light, the drama enacted this time centring round introduction of the two bills can be seen as stage managed. Through the whole exercise, the "concern" of these parliamentary parties for free and fair election was demonstrated on the one hand, while the aggregate interest of the ruling class was safeguarded on the other. The fight among these parties on the issue is but a mock fight. Their controversy is not basic, nor do their arguments emanate from any fundamental difference in stand. Like characters in a drama, each of these parties first decided whether to opt in favour or against the bills and then framed its arguments to suit their respective roles!

Regarding the controversy about a one-member EC versus a three-member EC, we surely support the concept of a three-member EC as that could, generally speaking, ensure an in-built check and balance in the EC, but although the debate became confined to whether to have one member or three, we do not consider this to be the crux of the matter. The main point is that any Election Commissioner, whether they be one or three in number, would have to be a man of unimpeachable honesty and integrity as per the concrete measures proposed by us long back. If a three-member EC is not impartial but partisan, or its members represent vested interests, then it would not be a solution election interest or not at present. It may not be too farfetched to suggest that the three main factions in the Lok Sabha — the Congress(I), the BJP and the National Front-Left combine, could each have a member of its choice in a reconstituted three-member EC through a quota system, there would be no great quarrels among them!

Our party has been striving to build up democratic mass movements in different parts of the country. The people are rightly concerned at the rampant corruption and malpractices that beset the elections today and the need for genuine electoral reforms cannot be overstressed. But even if correct electoral reform measures are adopted in the legislature, they can be meaningfully implemented only through effective social movement in support. Movement for electoral reforms is a part of the wider mass movement for democratisation of society and against corruption of all sorts. We appeal to the left and democratic parties and forces, all honest, right-thinking people with the country's good in their heart to come forward and strengthen the democratic mass movement.

## Red Salute Comrade Sudhindra Kumar Pramanik



Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, the adviser of U.T.U.C.(Lenin Sarani) and General Secretary, SUCI, issued on 11.7.94 the following statement on passing away of Comrade Sudhindra Kumar Pramanik, an outstanding leader of Indian trade union movement :

I, on my behalf as well as on behalf of our party, the Socialist Unity Centre of India, express our heartfelt grief at the sad demise of Comrade Sudhindra Kumar Pramanik with whom I had the opportunity to work for decades in organising class-based trade union centre and the working class movement.

Once a legendary personality in Indian trade union movement in its early days of development and a person of integrity and honesty, rarely seen now-a-days, Comrade Pramanik sincerely strove throughout his life to strengthen maximum possible broader unity of the working people and free the trade union movement from all sorts of sectarianism and reformism.

I pay my deep respect to the memory of the departed leader.

Comrade Pritish Chanda, President and Comrade Tapas Dutta, General Secretary, of UTUC(LS) in a joint statement on 11.7.94 inter alia said :

A close compatriot of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, Comrade Sudhindra Kumar Pramanik in his early days, organised Tata Steel and colliery workers and also the workers of petroleum industry and led historic movements. His contribution towards forming the UTUC(LS) is no doubt immense. He was the first General Secretary of the UTUC(LS) and remained with the organisation till his last as one of its advisers.

He represented Indian working class in the founding congress of World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) in 1945 and was its Vice-President for a pretty long time. He also led several trade union delegations abroad. He struggled hard for working class unity and protecting the trade union movement from opportunism, economism and sectarianism.

While expressing our heartfelt sorrow at his sad demise, we keep the Red Flag at half-mast for two-days at all our offices.

## Frederick Engels

(Contd from Page 4)

individuals, as well as by sects, as the ideal of their future. But it could become possible, could become a historical necessity, only when the actual conditions for its realisation were there. Like every other social advance, it become practicable, not by men understanding that the existence of classes is in contradiction to justice, equality, etc., not by the mere willingness to abolish these classes, but by virtue of certain new economic conditions.

... in fact, the abolition of classes in society presupposes a degree of historical evolution at which the existence, not simply of this or that particular ruling class, but of any ruling class at all, and, therefore, the existence of class distinction itself has become an obsolete anachronism. It presupposes, therefore, the development of production carried out to a degree at which appropriation of the means of production and of the products, and, with this, of political domination, of the monopoly of culture, and of intellectual leadership by a particular class of society, has become not only superfluous but economically, politically, intellectually a hindrance to development. This point is now reached. ...The possibility of securing for every member of society, by means of socialised production, an existence not only fully sufficient materially, and becoming day by day more full, but an existence guaranteeing to all the free development and exercise of their physical and mental faculties — this possibility is now for the first time here, but it is here. With the seizing of the means of production by society, production of commodities is done away with, and, simultaneously, the mastery of the product over the producer. Anarchy in social production is replaced by systematic, definite organisation. The struggle for individual existence disappears. Then for the first time man, in a certain sense, is finally marked off from the rest of the animal kingdom, and emerges from mere animal conditions of existence into really human ones. The whole sphere of the conditions of life which environ man, and which have hitherto ruled man, now comes under the dominion and control of man, who for the first time becomes the real, conscious lord of nature, because he has now become master of his own social organisation. The laws of his own social action, hitherto standing face to face with man as laws of nature foreign to, and dominating him, will then be used with full understanding, and so mastered by him. Man's own social organisation, hitherto confronting him as a necessity imposed by nature and history, now becomes the result of his own free action. The extraneous objective forces that have hitherto governed history pass under the control of man himself. Only from that time will man himself, with full consciousness, make his own history — only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him. It is the humanity's leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom.

To accomplish this act of universal emancipation is the historical mission of the modern proletariat. To thoroughly comprehend the historical conditions and thus the very nature of this act, to impart to the now oppressed class

a full knowledge of the conditions and of the meaning of the momentous act it is called upon to accomplish, this is the task of the theoretical expression of the proletarian movement, scientific socialism.

### Towards Radical Transformation of Society

...In the history of society, ... the actors are all endowed with consciousness, are men acting with deliberation or passion, working towards definite goals; nothing happens without a conscious purpose, without an intended aim. ... it is not a question so much of the motives of single individuals, however eminent, as of those motives which set in motion great masses, whole peoples, and again whole classes of the people in each people; and this, too, not momentarily, for the transient flaring up of a straw-fire which quickly dies down, but for a lasting action resulting in a great historical transformation. ...the time of surprise attacks, of revolutions carried through by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is passed. Where it is a question of complete transformation of the social organisation, the masses themselves must be in it, must already have grasped what is at stake, what they are going in for with body and soul. The history of last fifty years has taught us that. But in order that the masses may understand what is to be done, long, persistent work is required, and it is just that work that we are now pursuing.... While I was in Manchester, it was tangibly brought home to me that the economic facts, ... are, at least in the modern world, a decisive historical force; that they form the basis of the organisation of the present-day class antagonisms; that these class antagonisms, in the countries where they have become fully developed, thanks to large-scale industry, hence especially in England, are in their turn the basis of the formation of political parties and of party struggles, and thus of all political history.

### The State

The State is a product of society at a certain stage of development; it is an admission that this society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself, that it is cleft into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to dispel. But in order that these antagonisms, classed with conflicting economic interests, might not consume themselves and society in sterile struggle a power seemingly standing above society became necessary for the purpose of moderating the conflict, of keeping it within the bounds of "order", and this power, arisen out of society, but placing itself above it, and increasingly alienating itself from it, is the state .... As the state arose from the need to hold class antagonisms in check, but as it arose, at the same time, in the midst of the conflict of these classes, it is, as a rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which, through the medium of the state, becomes also the politically dominant class, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class. Thus, the state of antiquity was above all the state of the slave owners for the purpose of holding down the slaves, as the feudal state was the organ of the nobility for holding down the peasant serfs and bondsmen, and the modern representative state is an instrument of exploitation of wage-labour by capital. ...The highest form of the state, the democratic republic, which under our modern

(Contd on Page 8)

## Frederick Engels

(Contd. from Page 7)

conditions of society is more and more becoming an inevitable necessity, and is the form of state in which alone the last decisive struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie can be fought out - the democratic republic officially knows nothing any more of property distinctions. In it wealth exercises its power indirectly, but all the more surely. On the one hand, in the form of the direct corruption of officials, of which America provides the classical example; on the other hand, in the form of an alliance between government and Stock Exchange, which becomes the easier to achieve the more the public debt increases and the more joint-stock companies concentrate in their hands not only transport but also production itself, using the Stock-Exchange as their centre. ...Hardly come into being, this organ (*the state —Ed., P.Era*) makes itself independent vis-a-vis society, and indeed, the more so, the more it becomes the organ of a particular class, the more it directly enforces the supremacy of that class.

### Revolution

The fight of the oppressed class against the ruling class becomes necessarily a political fight, a fight first of all against the political dominance of this class. ... Whoever declares that the capitalist mode of production, the "iron laws" of present-day bourgeois society, are inviolable, and yet at the same time would like to abolish their unpleasant but necessary consequences, has no other recourse but to deliver moral sermons to the capitalists, moral sermons whose emotional effects immediately evaporate under the influence of private interest and, if necessary, of competition. ...The gospel of harmony between capital and labour has been preached for almost fifty years now, and bourgeois philanthropy has expended large sums of money to prove this harmony by building model institutions; yet, ... we are today exactly where we were fifty years ago. ...These movements (*workers' movements —Ed.P. Era*) now presented themselves as a movement of the modern oppressed class, the proletariat, as the more or less developed forms of its historically necessary struggle against the ruling class, the bourgeoisie; as forms of the class struggle, but distinguished from all earlier class struggles by this one thing, that the present-day oppressed class, the proletariat, cannot achieve its emancipation without at the same time emancipating society as a whole from division into classes, and, therefore, from class struggles. ...it is our interest and our task to make the revolution permanent, until all more or less possessing classes have been forced out of their position of dominance until the proletariat has conquered state power, ... and that at least the decisive productive forces are concentrated in the hands of the proletarians. For us the issue cannot be the alteration of private property but only its annihilation, not the smoothing over of class antagonisms but the abolition of classes, not the improvement of existing society but the foundation of a new one....

### Dictatorship of the Proletariat

...a certain authority, no matter how delegated, and, on the other hand, a certain subordination, are things which, independently of all social organisation, are imposed upon us

together with the material conditions under which we produce and make products circulate. We have seen, besides, that the material conditions of production and circulation inevitably developed with large-scale industry and large-scale agriculture, and increasingly tend to enlarge the scope of this authority. Hence it is absurd to speak of the principle of authority as being absolutely evil; and of the principle of autonomy as being absolutely good. Authority and autonomy are relative things whose spheres vary with the various phases of the development of society. ... As, therefore, the state is only a traditional institution which is used in the struggle, in the revolution, in order to hold down one's adversaries by force, it is pure nonsense to talk of a free people's state: so long as the proletariat still uses the state, it does not use it in the interests of freedom, but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist. ...But the anti-authoritarians demand that the authoritarian political state be abolished at one stroke, even before the social conditions that gave birth to it have been destroyed. They demand that the first act of the social revolution shall be the abolition of authority. Have these gentlemen ever seen a revolution? A revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is it is the act whereby one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon - authoritarian means, if such there be at all; and if the victorious party does not want to have fought in vain, it must maintain this rule by means of the terror which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. Would the Paris Commune have lasted a single day if it had not made use of this authority of the armed people against the bourgeois? Should we not, on the contrary, reproach it for not having used it freely enough? ... Of late the Social-Democratic philistine has once more been filled with wholesome terror at the words: Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. ... the state is nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another, ...and at best an evil inherited by the proletariat after its victorious struggle for class supremacy, whose worst sides the victorious proletariat, just like the Commune, cannot avoid having to lop off at once as much as possible until such time as a generation reared in new, free social conditions is able to throw the entire lumber of the state on the scrap heap.

### History Will Assert Itself

Hanging together with this is the fatuous notion of the ideologists that because we deny an independent historical development to the various ideological spheres which play a part in history we also deny them any *effect upon history*. The basis of this is the common undialectical conception of cause and effect as rigidly opposite poles, the total disregarding of inter-action. These gentlemen often almost deliberately forget that once a historic element has been brought into the world by other ultimately economic causes, it reacts, can react on its environment and even on the causes that have given rise to it. ...Political, juridical, philosophical, religious, literary, artistic, etc., development is based on economic

## Red Salute Comrade Kim Il Sung



### Condolence Message

In a condolence message to the Korean Worker's Party, sent on 9.7.94, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary of the Socialist Unity Centre of India, has said:

We are deeply shocked at the sudden demise of Comrade Kim Il Sung, President, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the eminent communist leader, who stood like a rock in the struggle against world imperialism and in defence of communism.

We believe, the communists and the people of North Korea will stand like one man at this hour of grief in continuing the struggle to defend and for further advancement of socialism braving all odds and attacks.

development. But all these react upon one another and also upon the economic basis. It is not that the economic condition is the *cause and alone active*, while everything else only is a passive effect. There is, rather, interaction on the basis of economic necessity, which *ultimately* always asserts itself. ...So it is not, as people try here and there conveniently to imagine, that the economic condition produces an automatic effect. No. Men make their history themselves, only they do so in a given environment which conditions it and on the basis of actual relations already existing, among which the economic relations, however much they may be influenced by the other — political and ideological - ones, are still ultimately the decisive ones, forming the red thread which runs through them and alone leads to understanding. ...The great basic thought that the world is not to be comprehended as a complex of ready-made *things*, but as a complex of *processes*, in which the things apparently stable no less than their mind images in our heads, the concepts, go through an uninterrupted change of coming into being and passing away, in which, in spite of all seeming accidentality and of all temporary retrogression, a progressive development asserts itself in the end - these great fundamental thoughts... is now scarcely ever contradicted.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : NIHAR MUKHERJEE