

# RED STAR

PLATFORM FOR COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARIES

Vol. 7

No. 9

September 1998

Rs. 5.00

- **Politics of Price-rise**
- **Further Hardening of Social Democratic Positions Under Left Rhetoric**
- **Let The Doctor Treat Himself First:  
A Response to CPI (ML) People's War's Criticisms Against CPI (ML) Red Flag**
- **US Planted Gene Threatens World Food Security**
- **Resolution Concerning The Situation in The Balkans**

## Com: Souren Bose Memorial Meeting

Com: Souren Bose Memorial meeting was organised at Calcutta University Institute Hall from 5 P M on 17 August under the banner of Souren Bose Smaran Samithi. The well attended meeting started by all participants observing one minute silence in memory of the veteran Communist leader. Meeting was presided by Dr. Sajith Das and was welcomed by Prof. Sardendu Roy.

Representatives of various revolutionary organisations addressed the meeting remembering Com. Souren Bose's contributions and paying tribute to his memory, Com. K. N. Ramachandran paying tribute to the memory of Com. Souren Bose on behalf of the CRC of CPI (ML) Red Flag explained how he was a great Bolshevik who fought all through his life for creating a new

society. He played a significant role in the re-organisation of the party after joining Red Flag. In evolving the basic positions adopted by Fourth All India Conference of 1997 and in drafting the approach paper for building up agricultural workers and peasant movement he played an important role. Rejecting all sectarian positions he stood for a comprehensive rectification process in order to build Bolshevik style party. Com. K. N denounced those who are still prisoners of sectarianism who try to defame the memory of Com. S B and called for relentless struggle to defeat their line in all spheres. This memorial meeting which attracted people from different organisations concluded with the pledge to carry forward the struggle in which Com. S B was always a part.

## Condemn The Rejection of Sree Krishna Commission Report

The rejection of Sree Krishna Commission Report by the Shivsena-BJP government and the inflammable communal utterances of the Chief Minister in the Vidhan Sabha once again show that the Hindutuavadis are arrogantly pursuing the fascist path. Earlier itself through the obstructions to the functioning of the Commission, and then by delaying the presentation of the Report under various pretexts, the SS-BJP leaderships had exposed their heinous communal and criminal character. The Commission has rightly condemned them outrightly. It has also exposed the callous behaviour of the then Congress government and the police set up. As on the occasion of the criminal destruction of the Babri Masjid, during the Mumbai massa-

ces by the Hindutuava forces also the Congress leadership compromised with these fascist forces.

The Report once again reiterates the grave dangers faced by the Indian polity under the Hindutuavadi forces. And by arrogantly throwing the Report away, these fascist forces have once again declared their criminal intentions.

We appeal to all progressive, democratic and genuine secular forces to uncompromisingly condemn the SS-BJP forces, and to unite in the struggle against the fascist threat posed by them.

Mumbai,  
10 August 98.

Secretary,  
C. P. I. (ML) Red Flag.

## Condemn US Savagery in Sudan and Afghanistan

The US attacks in Sudan and Afghanistan violating all international principles and norms of sovereignty of nations are highly deplorable and we strongly condemn them.

These attacks are to be seen as a proclamation from the part of US imperialism that they are having an unquestioned hegemony over the world and they would act according to their

whims and fancies. The history of the last one hundred years shows clearly that it is the US which committed the maximum number of sabotages and political murders and promoted terrorism of the worst kind world over. Even today the US rulers claim that their attacks were to combat terrorist forces. In fact US rulers were committing the worst kind of terrorist acti-

## EDITORIAL

# Politics of Price-rise

Prices of all essential commodities are shooting up, especially during last few months. It is not the question of onions, potatoes or tomatoes, or of other vegetables alone. From iodised salt (which has become compulsory) to all essential commodities the case is almost same, steeply increasing the day to day expenses for mere survival for the common man.

According to the bureaucrats, political bigs, and wholesale dealers who alone are quoted in the media, onions, potatoes and tomatoes are costing more as production has gone down. Then the question automatically arises: so, are you paying the cultivators more? We know it is not the case. The cultivators, except in the case of rich peasants, are invariably paid same price or less. So it is the 'banias' who are patronised by the rulers getting benefitted.

But it is not the whole story. Authorities are concealing the fact all these items are exported in large quantities as all restrictions are removed under new Exim Policy. Plus the wholesale traders are provided funds at concessional rates to procure and hoard these items using new storage facilities.

It should be seen in the overall context of shooting up of inflation rates which is threatening to reach double digits soon. This inflation, increasing recession of industrial and agricultural production, constant fall Rupee prices plus the agricultural policy under liberalisation which promotes commercial crops production at the cost of cereals production are posing now threats for the masses.

When they attacked Sudan and Afghanistan. We call upon all progressive and democratic forces of our country to come forward to condemn the US attack strongly.

Secretary,  
Central Reorganisation Committee,  
CPI (ML) Red Flag.

With the liberalisation a new phase of 'exports first' policy has emerged. It is cutting at the roots of even the presently claimed food self-sufficiency, a self-sufficiency proclaimed by allowing 50 percent of population to go with average a single food per day. Production of commercial crops for exports is the catch-word. As a result for these and for aquaculture large acreages of rice and wheat fields are utilised. In former coarse grain and pulse cultivated areas soya, oilseeds and cotton are cultivated.

Look around and we can see that all the neocolonies are now made to compete with each other for exporting same agricultural products bringing down their prices continuously. At the same time grain prices are going up continuously in global market. And the grain trade is completely dominated by the imperialist countries. The scenario is very clear for all who wants to see. Once even the present food self-sufficiency is lost, even if cash-crops production goes, because of the adverse trend in their prices, India can never hope to finance adequate food imports by specialising in cash-crop exports. When the imperialists are clamouring for free trade and opening of markets their aim is to dominate by forcing grain purchases. Once it is started they will start raising the prices more. With that we are going to face the real price-rises, and starvation deaths. Side by side the suicides of the ruined cash-crop cultivators as we witnessed this year also will go up.

The IMF-WB experts, MNCs, the imperialist leaders, the comprador leaderships in the neocolonies, the comprador bureaucrats, and exporters' club very well know what is going to happen. They are already calculating the profits they can reap once a 100 billion is reduced to such a stage.

So what we are now witnessing in the field of prices of essential commodities is only a beginning. The politics of price rise is unfolding with all its brutality linked with the liberalisation process. So the fight against price-rise should

## Further hardening of social democratic positions under left rhetoric

The draft political resolution for the 16th Congress of CPI (M) now released by its polit-bureau gives a vivid description of the growing imperialist crisis at international level. It exposes the 'neo-liberal policies' now being pursued everywhere. It explains that it is the dictates of IMF and World Bank which are compelling the third world countries to open up their economies for unbridled entry of speculative capital which have led to the collapse of Mexican and now Southeast Asian economies. So it opposes the full convertibility of the capital accounts as demanded by imperialist agencies. It explains the growth of the working class movements even in imperialist countries against the imperialist policies. It has also noted the growth of numerous people's movements in the so-called third world countries. In short, a general reading without going in to a deep analysis of this rhetoric will give the impression that CPI (M) is taking an anti-imperialist stand and is even calling for, and working for the building of an anti-imperialist platform at international level.

But what are its real approaches towards the post-World War II imperialist policies and the response to them from the time of the Khrushchevite forces onwards, including the response towards the neocolonisation introduced by the imperialist camp starting with the so-called decolonisation?

Imperialist offensive against world people is not a new thing. With the growth of socialist challenge as proved by the emergence of a powerful socialist camp by early 1950s, the imperialist camp led by US imperialists had started intensi-

be a fight against the whole lot of plundering policies of imperialist system implemented through the native comprador forces.

What is required is to start with immediate general movements uniting as many progressive forces and mass organisations as possible against the sky-rocketing price-rise of essential commodities. Once the people are on the move the politics of price-rise will be easily understood by them. With this perspective, continuous movements against price-rise should be developed wherever possible.

ifying their counter revolutionary offensive including neocolonisation of former colonial-semi-colonial countries. What happened from 1970s was a further intensification of it in new forms with the beginning the new round of general crisis of imperialist system. What we are witnessing is the consequences of it.

It is proved in history as explained by Lenin through his great studies on imperialism that the proletarian forces can advance their movements and consolidate themselves only by waging uncompromising and ever-intensifying struggle against imperialist domination. And the working class should develop its theoretical positions continuously to combat every new offensive by the imperialist system. But what happened in the post-Stalin years under Khrushchevite revisionists in Soviet Union was just the opposite, starting the downward slide of the ICM. What is being done by the Chinese, Vietnamese like leaderships today is the final act of integrating what was once known as socialist countries with the global-imperialist system. The CPI (M) leadership violating even its own formative 1964 Tenali Conference decisions became advocates and apologists of these revisionist gangs and degenerated themselves to social democratic positions in this process. They abandoned the path of class struggle, became advocates of 'peaceful transition, parliamentarism. They are today champions of the theory of productive forces, the theory that advocates increasing productions through any means is the path of salvation. They refused to recognise the neocolonisation introduced by imperialist system and themselves became its apologists. So they and their similar fraternal forces who refuse to wage proletarian revolutionary struggle to overthrow the rule of imperialist system everywhere is reducing anti-imperialist struggle in to a mockery.

This is vividly proved when this draft resolution analyses the national situation. Once again they provide an elaborate description of the anti people consequences of the ruling class and people's growing miseries. They are even calling for launching a countrywide struggle against the liberalisation policies. But the whole

exercise is reduced to projecting the growing danger of fascism thrown up by the Sangh Parivar. But there is no effort to explain what role the CPI(M) and the Left Front could play in blocking the growth of these forces. An overview of the political developments during the period since 1989 Lok Sabha elections including the UF experiment on Congress shoulders show that CPI (M) cannot absolve itself from its own share of the responsibility for helping the Sangh Parivar to come to Power.

Without making any self-criticism for it, through this draft resolution CPI (M) leadership is trying to prepare its cadres through 16th Congress for another sell-out to Congress leadership in the name of fighting the BJP. What it talks against WTO, against liberalisation, against IMF-WB dictated policies ring hollow as it is implementing them in the states where it is ruling, and it is upholding China which has declared 'strategic alliance' with US imperialism as its model of a socialist country.

History has repeatedly proved that fascist forces can be effectively combated and defeated only when the left become capable of providing leadership to the popular forces, that is only when an independent left initiative is launched around which the democratic forces can be polarised. CPI (M) is not having any such left alternative to suggest at national level. Simultaneously, in neocolonies like India the threat of fascism is linked with growing neocolonial slavery. Can these twin threats be challenged by joining hands with Congress, DMK-AGP like regional parties, and JD-Mulayam-Lalu like forces? CPI (M) has nothing to offer beyond another UF with these forces supporting Congress from outside in order to help to form a non-BJP ministry because of its bankrupt policies, because it is reduced to social democratic positions, or is reduced to junior partners of the ruling class parties.

The draft political resolution irrespective of all its left rhetorics only exposes the further hardening of the social democratic positions of the CPI (M) leadership.

## US gains military base facilities in Bangladesh

The arms race and tension in South Asia provoked by the nuclear adventurism of the BJP government, and the near-rebuff she got when she visited Delhi to ease Indo-Pak relations have led Sk. Hasina the prime-minister leading the present comprador government in Bangladesh to another extreme. In the name of ensuring protection for her country she has signed a military agreement with US authorities. It includes provision for allowing US forces to land and stay in Bangladesh if it is 'in danger'. Like Fernandes and Advani in India, Bangladesh leaders have their own threat perceptions like the rulers of Nepal or Bhutan. So they easily go for US umbrella.

Whatever way the present limited agreement is justified by the authorities in Dacca it is a new beginning, a dangerous beginning for US forces to land in South Asian soil. Progressive forces in Bangladesh have already raised their voice against it. It is high time that the grave consequences of this "new beginning", its threat perception is correctly evaluated. The US move should be thoroughly exposed and resisted.

---

### The Red Flag

Theoretical quarterly of CPI (ML) Red Flag  
April-June Issue Published  
Single copy Rs. 5/-  
Back Issues No: 5, 6, 7, 8 are available  
Send MOs /Cheques/DDs in favour of

P. J. Baby  
Red Flag publications,  
Thykkattussery (P.O), Thrissur-680 322

### RED STAR

Single copy: Rs. 5.00  
Yearly Subscription Rs. 50.00

For copies send MOs to.  
Manager, RED STAR  
Thaikkattussery. PO, Thrissur,  
Kerala - 680 322

Note: We are reproducing below a chapter from 'Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique' by Alex Callinicos. First published in 1989 and reprinted four times the book tries to answer the various trends of postmodernists who are consciously trying to create shibboleths to attack Marxist philosophy and the struggles for socialist transformation. Though this book is an attempt to challenge the 'strange mixture of cultural and political pessimism and light-minded playfulness' put forward by many among Western intelligentsia it is very much relevant to present Indian scene also where aping their Western counterparts even many so-called Marxist intellectuals have started worshipping postmodernist concepts. The fundamental question involved is whether classical Marxism can illuminate and contribute to improve our present social condition, when not only the New Right but also the New Left intellectuals regard much of Marxism or all of it as terribly old fashioned and obsolete. In this context a serious struggle against the postmodernist concepts which is utilised to pollute revolutionary philosophical approaches is needed. We are reproducing this chapter with this perspective—RS.

## Against Postmodernism

The idea of postindustrial society is of course, nonsense. As formulated by Daniel Bell, for example, the concept denotes the latest stage in a progression: From traditional to industrial and now to postindustrial society. Each stage is differentiated by what might be thought of as a (rather crude) version of what Marx called the productive forces: traditional society is based on agriculture, and industrial, surprisingly enough, on modern manufacturing industry involving the scientific control of nature and the use of artificial energy sources. Postindustrial society is characterized by the shift from goods production to a service economy, and by the central role played by theoretical knowledge as the source of both technical innovation and policy formulation. Changes in social structure are then read off these technological changes. Postindustrial society is a 'knowledge society', dominated increasingly by a university-trained professional and technical elite. The big corporations are shifting from an 'economizing mode' of activity, in which all aspects of organization are single-mindedly reduced to becoming means to the goals of production and profit to a 'socializing mode', one 'in which all workers are guaranteed lifetime jobs, and the satisfaction of the workforce becomes the primary levy on resources'. Consequently, Bell argues, 'today, we in America are moving away from a society based on a private enterprise market system toward one in which the most important economic decisions will be made at the political level, in terms of consciously defined "goals" and "practices".'

It is easy enough to pour scorn on such

announcements of the death of capitalism, which reflect the circumstances of their initial formulation, during the long economic boom of the 1950s and 1960s. It is indeed hard to take seriously the alleged shift from 'economizing' to 'sociologizing' modes in the wake of the holocaust of manufacturing jobs at the end of the 1970s and the great bull market of the mid-1980s, in the era of concessions and leveraged buyouts, of privatization and greenmail, of Ivan Boesky and Gordon Gecko. Bell's argument was very much a development of the orthodoxy among English-speaking social scientists in the immediate postwar period, whose main themes were the separation of ownership from control, the consequent rise of a managerial technocracy, the fragmentation of social classes into clusters of overlapping interest groups, and - another of Bell's bright ideas - the 'end of ideology', of polarized politics whose stake was the global transformation of society. The formulation of the concept of postindustrial society can perhaps be best seen as an attempt - undergirded by a technological determinism which would make the most vulgar Marxist blench - both to give some coherence to these themes and to provide them with an economic rationale.

Commentators were quick to point out the misinterpretation of economic trends committed by theorists of postindustrial society. The rise in the proportion of output and employment taken by services which is indeed one of the major secular changes in twentieth-century capitalism has taken place primarily at the exp-  
(Contd P. 24)

# Let the doctor treat himself first: A response to CPI (ML) People's War's criticisms against CPI (ML) Red Flag

The May-June 1998 issue of *Proletarian Vanguard* published by CPI (ML) People's War (henceforth referred to as PW) has come out with a critic of CPI (ML) Red Flag (henceforth referred to as RF). The main content of the criticism is that RF is 'drifting to the right'. To substantiate it, this critic has quoted *Red Star* and *Red Flag* (published by RF) showing how RF has changed its approach towards PW during the last decade. According to PW it seems the criteria to gauge the revolutionary character of any organisation is its approach towards the PW. If it lauds and support the activities of PW it becomes revolutionary, otherwise it becomes revisionist or what not. Can things be so simple? Anyway RF should be happy that this critic concludes attack with some sound advices with the hope that "it (RF) returns to the revolutionary fold." When such revolutionary expectations are maintained by such well-wishers of RF, it becomes our responsibility to give a healthy reply to the criticisms raised against us though very often they are nothing but wild allegations so that all misunderstandings are removed.

In the critical situation our country and people are facing today RF has taken a two pronged approach: firstly, to develop a consistent and healthy ideological struggle among the revolutionary forces presently splitted to various organisations, in order to develop a correct ideological-political line based on Marxist-Leninist principles and for integrating the hitherto experiences of the Communist movement at international and national level, paving the way for their unity, and reorganisation of the Communists all over the country in to a Bolshevik-style party; and secondly, to develop slogan-based united activities with all revolutionary left organisations against the imperialist dictated economic policies pursued by central and state governments and against the growing threat of fascism now mainly posed by the Sangh Parivar. At such a time we are happy that PW has come out with this criticism so that we can once again make our positions clear.

In such a polemic one should be very careful in citing quotations. In the over-enthusiasm

to prove that revolutionary practice, not the theory it propounds is the criteria to judge an organisation, our critic has partially quoted Mao: "Only social practice can be the criteria for truth. The standpoint of practice is the primary and basic standpoint in the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge." But the critic avoids mentioning the relationship between this practice and the revolutionary theory as Mao always does. Especially in the present situation, when after four decades of great advances since the October Revolution the Communist movement as a whole has suffered series of setbacks during the last four decades making the socialist forces comparatively much weaker in the confrontation between imperialist system and socialist forces. It calls for great efforts to develop the Marxist-Leninist theoretical positions to combat present day imperialist onslaught. In such a situation this stand smacks of pragmatism. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that "these can be strong socialist party without a revolutionary theory" and that "without a revolutionary theory these can be no revolutionary movement." Mao emphasised "the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological political line decides everything" and that "to lead the revolution to victory, a political party must depend on the correctness of its own political line and the solidity of its own organisation." We hope PW will not say that the question of theory is settled already once for all, or that to combat complex problems of today no further efforts to develop Marxist-Leninist understanding is needed. By obstinately limiting the criteria for judging any organisation to whether or not it is emulating PW's Dandakaranya style actions it is imposing serious pragmatist constraints over the movement. We hope it will seriously ponder over this question. We shall show that in the context of the post-1947 developments and sharpening uneven development in all fields to universalise the practice of PW, MCC and PU as the sole revolutionary practice for leading the NDR to victory amounts to nothing but over-simplification of the whole revolutionary practice.

## On CPI (ML) Red Flag's 'drifting'

The *Vanguard* article talks about "a gradual change in the line of the CPI (ML) Red Flag" According to it during 1987-92 "RF stood basically with the revolutionary trend," during 1993-95 it "started drifting to right" and from 1996 it has "fallen deeper into the morass of revisionism." To prove this the critic has only one argument: during this period RF started distancing from PW and started going nearer to CPJ (ML) Liberation like organisations. How far this is true?

While making such a sweeping statement the critic is forgetting PW's own documents. *30 Years of Naxalbari* a *Vanguard* publication of 1997, has quoted from "Summing up the past let us advance..." to show how the rectification of the earlier main shortcomings were taken up. As a result incorrect understanding of the era, disregard for subjective factor, the line of annihilation, wrong approach to united front and to guerilla struggles in cities were corrected, and bureaucratic tendencies in the organisation was rectified, it says. All the organisations upholding Naxalbari or claiming to be part of CPI (ML) have taken up different types of rectifications, though their approach towards it much differed. During the process of this rectification some of these organisations like Liberation and COI (ML), who can be called the rightist trend, have drifted to the right. While others like PW, PU, MCC and the Lin Piaoist groups continue in their sectarian path in spite of the rectification. It is not difficult to understand this if one goes through the main shortcomings of earlier movement outlined in above booklet and glance through the present condition of PW.

For example take the case of correcting the understanding of the era. Till 1969 Ninth Congress of the CPC the recognised stand of the International Communist Movement (ICM) was that present era is that of imperialism and proletarian revolution. The 1969 Congress of CPC changed it into "era of total collapse of imperialism and worldwide victory of socialism." This was not just a cosmetic change limited to the definition of era. Alongwith this the whole Comintern and 1963 General Line concepts about party, class/mass organisations, utilising all forms of organisation (legal and illegal, open and secret etc.) and all forms of struggles etc. were basically changed leading to the setbacks

within the CPC and to the M L parties which originated during this period. Though 1973 Tenth Congress of CPC rectified this erroneous concept, the rectification carried out by PW like organisations are very partial sticking to many sectarian positions of the earlier years. It is evident from their 'secret' party concept, refusal to build broad-based-democratic class/mass organisations, one-sided approach towards arms-struggle etc. The consequences of this partial, half baked rectification shall become clearer when we take up other questions later.

But unlike these rightist and sectarian trends, the rectification process and political re-organisation taken by the RF (formerly CRC, CPI (ML) is of fundamentally different character. It is the ignorance about it which is behind the critics allegations about RF's drift.

The years following com. CM's martyrdom in 1972 and the split in the CPI (ML) movement were critical. In spite of the brilliant victories in Vietnam and other Indo-Chinese countries, usurpation of power in China by Deng clique, its counter revolutionary 'Theory of Three Worlds' (TWT) put forward as the general line of the international proletariat diametrically opposed to 1963 General Line, the degeneration of Albanian Party etc had created serious confusions among various groups. Almost all of them refused to take ML positions on these questions. It was at that time in 1979 the CRC, CPI (ML) was formed denouncing Deng clique and its TWT, the Albanian line and calling for reorganisation of the party. Alongwith these theoretical questions, during those years the transformations taking place in the agrarian sector and the emergence of Sharad Joshi movement like developments were creating confusions. Evaluating these the 1982 Conference decided to take up an all India socio-economic study. This study put forward an understanding on the neocolonial transformation in India. At this time taking alien positions regarding neocolonialism and other issues like nationality question a section led by K. Venu splitted the organisation. So CRC, CPI (ML) was reorganised into CPI (ML) Red Flag resolving to vigorously take up the political reorganisation. Following this, studies on imperialism and neocolonialism was further developed, India was characterise as "a neocolony, reorganisation of CPI (ML) and the ICM based on the teachings of Comintern and 1963 Great De-



bate positions was firmly put forward totally rejecting 1969 sectarian positions and building up of Bolshevik style party organisation and class/mass organisations were taken up. It is this process which has led to the 1997 Fourth Conference positions on ICM, party programme and constitution. What has taken place during these years was no drifting, but a comprehensive and conscious political reorganisation leading to development of the ideological-political line, party programme, a basic orientation regarding strategy and tactics of the NDR and party building. Unable to comprehend this process, the Vanguard article has put forward its shallow subjective evaluation from its own sectarian positions, dubbing it as a drifting.

### Approach Towards the ICM

The Vanguard article has criticised RF that it is taken opportunist positions at international level. It is a baseless, self-contradictory accusation. It is known to all that it was CRC, CPI (ML) which first took initiative at international level from the time of its formation itself in 1979 to play its role in bringing together all revolutionary organisations which had denounced the Dengist clique, its TWT, and the Albanian positions and which were upholding Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and proletarian internationalism. The first international conference was held in 1980. Though we continued our active involvement in this process of building a platform of ML organisations at international level, as the 1984 second conference took eclectic theoretical positions and hastily formed the RIM in the form of an international organisation, and as our struggle for three years to rectify these erroneous positions could not yield positive results, we left it in 1987. Later RIM's acceptance of most sectarian Lin Biaoist positions defining Maoism as the Marxism-Leninism of the new era, and its present survival as a sectarian fringe have proved the correctness of the stand we have taken towards RIM.

Now RF is an associate of the Joint Coordination Group of the M-L parties and organisations which holds international conferences bi-annually. This include parties like Communist Party of Philippines (CPP), of Peru (PCP), of Germany (MLPD) etc. From India besides us PW, CPI (ML) Janashakti, CPI (ML) New Democracy are also its associates. Besides we are regularly contributing papers to the annual May

Day seminar organised by the Belgian Party (PTB) even while we have differences with its line and its approach towards building a platform at international level. There is nothing contradictory in our approach towards any of these parties. We maintain fraternal relations with all of them based on the principle of unity and struggle, and on proletarian internationalism.

We have published the joint May Day statements and the statement distributed in Moscow on the 80th anniversary of October Revolution in *Red Star*. Like the approach of the CPC under Mao's leadership towards the Party of Labour of Albania (PLA) earlier, we do not consider acceptance of Mao Tsetung Thought as a pre-condition for signing such statements and for organising solidarity actions at international level with such organisations so long as they uphold the positive contributions of Mao.

Our approach towards the evaluation of the experiences of the ICM and present world situation is clearly put forward in the international document adopted by 1997 Fourth all India Conference. It has summed up our international tasks as: "The broadest possible unity at international level against the world imperialist system is needed today. To lead this struggle forward consciously in order to wipe out imperialist system as a whole, and to realise worldwide victory of socialist revolution a correct ideological political line and a polarisation around it are basic preconditions. For arriving at this Marxist-Leninist ideological political line healthy ideological struggle at international level should be developed.

"Considering the absence of an international for more than five decades and the gravity of the challenges faced by the ICM both at theoretical and practical levels no hasty efforts should be made to form an international organisation immediately. At the same time in continuation to the efforts initiated by Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations from late 1970s all attempts should be made to develop fraternal relations at international level leading towards the formation of a platform of Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations to begin with."

In line with this 1997 Conference positions we have established relations with a number of organisations from Communist Parties of Philippines and Peru to organisations like Bol-

shevik Party (North Kurdistan-Turkey) and Communist Party of Nepal (Mashal). This list includes MLPD, PTB like parties also. Utilising every opportunity for ideological struggle we are putting forward our perspective for developing Comintern and 1963 General line positions so that a General Line of the ICM Conforming to concrete conditions of today can be developed. There is nothing contradictory in this stand. Our international documents from 1979 to this day prove the consistency and development of our approach.

At the same time what is the record of PW regarding the international questions? Evaluating the positive and negative experiences of the struggle against Krushchevite revisionism Mao had called on Marxist-Leninist forces to come out immediately against the capitalist roaders if they ever succeed in usurping power in China also. But it took seven long years for PW to denounce the Dengists. Even then it continued to uphold the counter-revolutionary TWT put forward as the general line of the ICM by the Dengists, and uphold the 1977 Eleventh Congress which denounced the GPCR and initiated capitalist restoration. It took 13 more years till its 1995 Special Conference to resolve that China degenerated from socialist path immediately after Mao's death and to condemn the TWT as a "revisionist theory". Yet the 1995 Conference is silent on what steps PW is taking for rectifying the pernicious influence of this revisionist theory which was so far followed by it as the general line of the ICM.

Again, PW claims that it has rejected the Lin Piaoist sectarian line of 1969 and its new era concept. But it is moving nearer to the RIM which is pursuing Lin Piaoism in the name of Maoism. A glance through the RIM's latest documents prove the real nature of its sectarian line. A glance through the 1984 RIM Declaration on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism by RIM and comparing it with the reasons given by PW on pages 37-38 of *People's War* (Jan-June 1996 issue) for rejecting principal contradiction shall expose that both positions are contradictory. Still PW has started moving nearer to it as proved by Vanguard pages. If this is not opportunism, what else it is? Side by side, changing its earlier position now PW is an active participant of practically all types of international conferences and seminars. We are happy that PW has denounced TWT at least in words now. It has started active participation in internatio-

nal conferences also, but without any efforts to combat liberalism, though it had denounced all such international efforts till a few years back. We request PW that before starting to raise baseless allegations against RF, it is better if the doctor treats himself first.

### On the major contradictions at international level

In this context it is better to deal with one of the cardinal theoretical questions concerning the ICM. It is known to all that till early 1980s following Comintern and 1963 GL (general line) positions all Communist organisations had upheld four major contradictions at international level, viz. the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, between the oppressed nations and peoples and imperialism, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, and that among the imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups. The 1963 GL stressed: "these contradictions and the struggles to which they give rise to are interrelated and influence each other. Nobody can obliterate any of these fundamental contradictions or subjectively substitute one for all the rest."

But when China and Albania also degenerated from the socialist path and no more socialist countries were left, all the M-L organisations all over the world went against this GL stand, reduced the contradiction between socialist camp and imperialist camp to that between socialist countries and imperialist camp, and mechanically omitted this contradiction from among the major contradictions. In this way they were inadvertently strengthening the imperialist propaganda that socialism is dead and gone. Combating this and upholding the Comintern and 1963 GL positions the 1997 conference of RF resolved that "these basic formulations (regarding major contradictions) put forward by the CPC in 1963 in continuation to the positions of the Third International are still valid", and reinstated this contradiction among the major contradictions. Rectification of the pernicious influence of 1969 sectarian line and the TWT calls for reiterating these four major contradictions. We hope PW will rectify its 1995 position that this contradiction "disappeared with the degeneration of the last socialist base China, after comrade Mao's demise in 1976" (See also Red Flag April-June 1998 issue).

## On principal contradictions

The Vanguard article states: "In fact in its (RF) new party programme it is silent on the question of principal contradiction within the country (though at the international plane it gives emphasis to pin - pointing the principal contradiction)". It is nothing but a vulgarisation of RF position.

In the 1997 Fourth Conference in continuation to the process started in 1982 First Conference, the RF has reinstated all fundamental formulations of the Comintern documents and 1963 GL, and initiated their step by step development according to concrete analysis of the present situation. It is as a part of this comprehensive rectification process the concept of putting forward one of the major contradictions as the principal contradiction both at international and national levels was deleted in the 1997 Conference documents. The documents of the ICM and the Communist parties including CPC till 1968 show that till that time the concept of the principal contradiction was never put forward in any of them. After stating the major contradictions all of them have only analysed their inter-relation, inter-penetration and inter-action leading to the intensification of class contradictions at all level. This aspect is explained in detail by the international document adopted by the Fourth Conference. Rather than creating any confusion or lack of clarity this reinstatement of classical Marxist - Leninist position only emphasise and clearly put forward the clarion call of the CPC in its 1963 "Proposal concerning general line .....": "Workers of all countries unite; workers of the world unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations; oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries; strive for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the socialist camp; bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory; and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism, and without exploitation of man by man."

It was the Krushchevite revisionists for the first time one-sidedly emphasised the contradiction between socialist camp and imperialist camp reducing it to contradiction between Soviet Union and US, rejecting all other contradictions, and creating incalculable damage to the ICM. Later with the publication of Lin Piao's "Long Live the Victory of People's War"

in 1968 this sectarian trend one-sidedly emphasised the contradiction between imperialism and oppressed nations and peoples vulgarising the 1963 GL positions. When this trend dominated the 1969 Ninth Congress of the CPC and was projected by Peking Radio and Chinese publications, in the absence of an international to discuss these questions and in the then situation when Mao and CPC were considered the centre of world revolution in mechanical way by the newly emerging ML-forces, when the study of Mao's teachings were reduced to the study of Mao's quotations only, and when Mao's Thought was idealistically projected as the Marxism-Leninism of the 'new era', this sectarian line was embraced as Mao Tsetung Thought everywhere, and its concept of 'principal' contradiction was also mechanically universalised and embraced. Rectification of this sectarian line, as already pointed out, demand rectification of all erroneous positions adopted under its influence, not piecemeal efforts. It demand reinstatement of all classical positions and their development according to concrete conditions. That is why RF has deleted the concept of principal contradiction from both the international document and the party programme. (See also Red Flag article on this question in April-June 1998 issue).

While distorting RF position and making a wild allegation against it the critic should have gone through at least the documents of PW adopted in its 1995 Special Conference. The Jan-June 1996 issue of People's War (theoretical journal of PW) states: "Regarding the principal contradiction in the contemporary world the majority in the house opined that it was not necessary to specify any one contradiction as the principal..." On p - 38 it again says: "Although the ICM has correctly stressed the relative significance and the possibility of the democratic revolutions in oppressed nations and eventhough Asia, Africa and Latin America are called the stormcentres of world revolution *nowhere in the entire literature of the ICM a particular contradiction is named as the principal contradiction at any time. Com. Mao Tsetung also throughout his life time, only spoke of fundamental contradictions and has never characterised any single contradiction as the principal contradiction in the contemporary world.*" (emphasise ours-RS)

So far so good. It is positive that PW, unlike other organisations, has come forward

to this extent on the question of principal contradiction. The basic difference between the approach of RF and PW is that while RF has taken up this question as a part of the comprehensive rectification process, the approach of PW as in all other questions is hesitant, partial and often leading to eclecticism. This is clearly evident from its deletion of principal contradiction at international level, while faithfully sticking to it at national level in its party programme. What the critic wildly alleged, "the two stand points appear contradictory" against RF, rather perfectly suits to his own organisation. PW is totally confused and self-contradictory on this question.

### On principal contradiction in India

While upholding the four major contradictions in India put forward in the 1970 programme of CPI (ML) and by developing the understanding about them in the light of concrete changes that have taken place in last three decades, the programme adopted in 1997 Conference of RF has deleted the principal contradiction altogether from it. After stating the four contradictions, the programme states: "These contradictions are inter-related and their intensification create possibilities for the incessant growth of therevolutionary movement. There is no confusion in RF and "the contradiction between Imperialism and the people" is not "being treated as the most important" as once again wildly alleged by the PW critic. Neither RF "defacto negates anti feudal struggles" as he alleges. The utter confusion of this critic lies in the fact that he is not ready to recognise the basic difference between the viewpoints of RF and PW regarding anti-feudal struggles in present day India. We shall come to this point later.

After deleting principal contradiction at international level the programme adopted by 1995 Special Conference of PW states: "the principal contradiction ---- is the one between feudalism and the broad masses. The solution of this contradiction will lead to solution of all other contradictions." Again the Political Resolution says "..... feudal system which serves as the social prop of imperialism" (both emphasis ours RS). Here also the principal contradiction is mechanically repeated. This contradicts all the analysis made in a number of *Vanguard* articles as well as the analysis of Indian situation given in 1995 documents.

*Political Resolution* of PW says (p 63) "Indian comprador bureaucratic bourgeois - feudal ruling classes dependent on imperialism for their survival .....". Again (p - 70): "the peasantry will be further pauperised as a result of the NEPs in agriculture which places agriculture at the mercy of imperialists....." Again (p - 74) ".....imperialism and the comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie are protecting and moulding feudalism to suit their needs". Again in *Strategy and Tactics* (p-19): "..... capitalist relations are penetrating the feudal set-up in the Indian countryside and are partially remoulding it to suit the needs of imperialism" Scores of such statements can be reproduced from many *Vanguard* articles also. As Marx pointed out, in the middle of the last century itself "capitalism is recreating the whole world in its own image." So in spite of dogmatic repetitions that feudalism is social prop of imperialism and resolution of feudal contradiction will resolve all other contradictions, PW is compelled to accept the changes everywhere. Thus contradicts there own dogmas. It is compelled to accept that feudals serve imperialism at many places. In *Vanguard* Jan-Feb 1998 issue in the third and concluding article on 50 years of dependence (p.35) it is stated: "If the country is to progress ...we have to break the chains of imperialism that binds us ... and advance until India is genuinely free, truly independent from imperialist control." Again on same page: ".....the freedom struggle betrayed in 1947 must continue .....that washes away not only the imperialists, but primarily their agents within the country."

PW has changed the classification of comprador bourgeoisie as comprador bureaucratic bourgeoisie, and is compelled to point out the concrete changes taking place around us repeatedly even while faithfully sticking to earlier dogmas, and even while contradicting its own stand on principal contradiction at international level.

This is not accidental. The 1995 documents and *Vanguard* articles very clearly reflect its dilemma. Facts compel it to rectify its dogma that feudalism versus the broad masses is the principal contradiction. But once this is done it has to change its whole strategy and tactics. To avoid this it is 'cutting the legs according to the size of the shoes'. It has already accepted documentally that pre - 1949 Chinese conditions and

present Indian conditions are basically different (see paper presented to 1994 Hyderabad international seminar). But once the political approach is changed accordingly, the caste of tactical approaches it is building up and the pragmatic prospects claimed around Dandakaranya based on theory of feudalism will collapse. The reluctance to take up comprehensive rectification based on "seeking truth from facts", or based on "concrete analysis of the concrete situation" is compelling it to prolong its self-imprisonment surrounded by obsolete dogmas.

It will be incorrect to complete this part without mentioning the fact that in putting forward feudalism versus broad masses of the people as the principal contradiction and feudalism as the social prop of Imperialism PW is not alone. All its chronic enemies, the frequent targets of its attack, like Liberation, are also sharing its views on feudalism fully or partially. All these organisations like PW are finding it extremely difficult to break loose of the dogmas the movement embraced in 1969 and later. A consistent struggle is needed for this.

### On the changes in the Production relations

After going through the 'boredom' of glancing through the pages of Red Star and Red Flag the PW critic has come to the conclusion that "RF certainly gives the impression of capitalist relations dominating the Indian agriculture with feudal remnants existing merely in pockets." There is little truth and lot of vulgarisation in this statement.

As far as PW is concerned even while it is compelled to recognise the vast changes taking place in the agrarian sector especially after green revolution and present NEPs, it is under an obsession to immediately point out as a *mantra* that "still feudal relations are dominant." Even in present day India it mechanically repeats that the only possible alternative is to complete agrarian revolution based on 'land to the tiller.'

As already pointed out, facts are compelling PW to publish voluminous articles on the consequences of the NEPs and entry of MNCs and Imperialist capital in agrarian sector. Recently it also organised a convention and a big rally on May Day at Hyderabad with anti-imperialist

alist slogans in the context of suicides by the peasants in large numbers. But the still lingering dogmas prevent it from recognising the relation between anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggles, and the changes taking place in the agrarian sector. That the large number of suicides by middle or marginal peasants in many states is due to the devastation caused in new forms as a result of penetration of imperialist agencies and domination of market system is also not recognised by PW. It evaluates that changes in feudal relations means emergence of capitalist relations. For such forces there are only two possible schools. First school, which includes them, persist in denying all changes in the agrarian sector, and in mechanically repeating that semi-feudal relations are predominant and this situation will not change. For them still the contradiction between feudalism and broad masses of people is the principal contradictions, and by resolving this all other contradictions can be resolved and the NDR can win victory.

The second school claims that India has already become a predominantly capitalist country and the stage of revolution is socialist. For the adherents of both these schools it is impossible to recognise that there can be a third position. This position explains that India is neither a country where old pre-capitalist relations remain unchanged, nor a country which is predominantly capitalist. On the contrary it is a country where all old relations including the semi feudal relations are undergoing continuous and fast changes under the domination of imperialist and native capital, MNCs, and the comprador bureaucratic classes. But due to overall imperialist domination in practically every fields which is imposing neo-colonial slavery, these changes are not leading to independent capitalist development, to India becoming capitalist, but towards a distorted or neocolonial capitalist development.

Regarding these changes the 1997 programme of RF says: "Even five decades after the transfer of power semi feudal, pre-capitalist relations still continue in vast areas. Along with this under the NEPs land accumulation is promoted for agri-business, for integrating agrarian sector to international market. A new rich peasant class emerging from continuing state policies including the NEPs are serving imperialist interests. The number of agricultural workers are swelling with the devastation of landless and poor, and even a section of the middle peasants. The removal of subsidies

and increasing cost of agricultural inputs have also further sharpened the contradictions in this sector."

This is further explained in detail in the approach paper "On organising agricultural workers and peasant movement". It says: "As a result of opening agrarian sector to international market in more and more areas significant changes are taking place in this sector. Capitalist relations are getting strengthened. But this is not leading to the growth of independent capitalist relations, to the ever-increasing agricultural bourgeoisie or rich peasants becoming national bourgeois in character, or to India becoming a capitalist country as some of the petty-bourgeois trends try to explain. On the contrary, what is happening is that the agrarian sector has also come under increasing hegemony of the imperialist forces. Whatever self-reliance was existing is also disappearing. The agrarian sector is also reduced to an appendage of the imperialist industrial-trade interests. It is reduced to a source of resources for the imperialist capital" (see Red Flag, 6, July-Sept, 1997).

Who is seeking truth from facts and who is still sticking to dogmas is abundantly clear. In this world of dogmas PW is not alone. Practically most of the organisations claiming to uphold Naxalbari or CPI (ML) tradition are mortally afraid of recognising the significant changes which have already taken place and are taking place in the agrarian sector. As a result they are not ready to develop the perspective of agrarian revolution in accordance with the new situation. A healthy ideological-political struggle is needed to up-date the understanding about the concrete situation in the agricultural sector today.

### On neocolonialism

The PW critic claims that what is written in Sept-Dec 1994 issue of *people's War* is a reply to RF's position on neocolonialism. No, friend, rather it was a poor defence of the Krushchevite understanding of neocolonialism. It was the Soviet theoreticians of late 1950s and early 1960s who defined neocolonialism as a weaker edition of colonialism. According to them US imperialism started imposing sole hegemony in some of the former colonial / semi-colonial/dependent countries through indirect means, transforming them to neocolonies. The

Marxist - Leninist understanding is basically different on neocolonialism and neocolonies.

According to what is quoted by the critic from this issue of *People's War* "in a neocolony it (imperialism) wields control through its agents or puppets, i.e. through indirect means. In both cases (in colonies and neocolonies), however, the other imperialist powers are prevented from having any share in the state power." If this is the case what is his answer to the 1970 programme which says "Thus India has turned in to a neocolony of US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism?" We have repeatedly asked this question to so many of the 'ardent upholders' of 1970 programme who are today the staunchest opponents of characterising India as a neocolony. But none of them have so far answered. If it was a basically wrong position atleast they should say so. They are trying to bury this question by their silence. But we shall not allow them to enjoy that luxury.

This formulation in 1970 programme was not a sudden bolt from the sky. You can see the beginning of this characterisation in CM's *Eight Documents* and articles in earlier issues of *Liberation* (1967-69). And these are continuation of what CPC under the leadership of Mao analysed in "Apologists of Neocolonialism" (1963) and in later articles by Chinese writers in *Peaking Review* of that period. As these questions are explained in detail by us so many times we are only pointing out some salient aspects here.

In "Apologists of neocolonialism" (see Great Debate) it is said: "After World War II the imperialists have certainly not given up colonialism, but have merely adopted a new form, neocolonialism ... This neocolonialism is a more pernicious and sinister form of colonialism." The explanation given in this article is sufficient to convince PW, if it really upholds Mao's teachings, to see that neocolony is not a country where one imperialist power alone wields control. It is in line with this document that the 1970 programmatic position pointed out that (1) India is a neocolony and that (2) It is not under hegemony of one imperialism but a neocolony of US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism.

The problem with PW like organisations is that even after so many momentous developments during last 50 years, all of them do not

take the trouble for making a study of the ways and means through which imperialism is operating in the post-War period. From 1944 when IMF, WB and GATT were initiated, imperialist countries under US leadership had inaugurated a new phase of plunder through neocolonial methods utilising various economic, fiscal, political, military, cultural agencies. New technological advances and MNCs started playing a major role in it. As the CFC document says neocolonialism is operated by the imperialist countries under US leadership. As inter-imperialist, inter-monopoly contradiction is a real fact of life in this phase, imperialist capital and MNCs from various countries start operating in each and every one of these countries. The problem with PW like organisations is that they see these changes as only arithmetic progressions. They refuse to see the qualitative changes that have taken place in the neocolonial phase. So they come to the conclusion that India has gone back to the conditions of a semi-colony, to conditions similar to those of pre-1949 China. They see history as a mechanical repetition. What is sacrificed at the altar of dogmas is dialectics.

Let us hope what is happening around us with alarming speed shall convince PW like organisations to realise the qualitative changes taking place in the neocolonial phase of imperialist system and to recognise that all former colonies/semi-colonies/dependent countries of the colonial phase are presently under various conditions or stages of control and plunder by the various imperialist powers in this neocolonial phase necessitating their characterisation as neocolonies. There is no question of "making no distinction of the type of control the imperialists wield" as our critic fears. Like the colonies earlier, no two neocolonies are similar as the concrete conditions and historical development of these countries differ.

### On nationality question

On this question our critic is really angry against RF positions because we have already made a systematic exposure of PW positions. Due to this anger he has even confused and mixed up resolution of nationality question with the national liberation movements. The struggle of Vietnamese and other Indo-Chinese peoples was a struggle for national liberation against US imperialism and native comprador rulers and was led by Communist parties. As a

part of their contention with US imperialism, and in order to cover-up their social imperialist actions under socialist masks, and to win over Vietnamese leadership the Soviet leadership had supported this struggle. But this does not in any way minimise the significance of this struggle. At least when this struggle was advancing the Vietnamese leadership was uncompromisingly fighting against US imperialism and its agents, and the question of national liberation was in the forefront. The national liberation movements in countries like Vietnam are basically different from the nationality questions in countries like India. Our approach towards Vietnam like struggles should be basically different from what should be the Communist approach towards the resolution of nationality question *within* the neocolonial countries like India. Both should not be mixed up.

The nationality question in India, the Indo-Pak questions and the various border disputes are all left overs from the two countries of colonial rule. Under neocolonisation as uneven development become more marked the nationality question has also come to the foreground in a sharper form. Various movements based on nationality question also have come up or are coming up. In dealing with this question also like in dealing with many other cardinal questions of the NDR sharp differences are existing among the organisations claiming to follow CPI (ML) path.

Our critic has spent a good part of the article in 'criticising' the approach of RF towards nationality question. But the interesting aspect is that he could not contradict any of the basic positions put forward by RF. On all these positions "on this there is no dispute" he writes. But the dispute arises when RF criticises the opportunist approach taken by PW leadership towards the leaderships of various nationality connected movements. Our critic impatiently asks: "Is these a problem of national oppression in India or not? If yes, should we oppose it or not? And if these oppressed nationalities happen to oppose it, do we support them or not? Yes or No !!" This is a very good example for his mechanical approach to cardinal issues. In the same vein, if he is dealing with womens' question or caste question, or even the question of anti-liquor movement for example, he will repeat this mechanical performance asking Yes or No !! The cardinal issue is that raising such questions in this way in isolation itself is basically wrong

as all of these are inter-related and related to present state set-up and class-rule. Seeking solution to any of these questions in isolation will only lead to opportunist positions, or to tailing behind opportunist forces.

Pointing out what Red Star wrote in its Dec. 97 issue quoting Stalin that "support must be given to such national movements as tend to weaken, to overthrow imperialism and not to strengthen and preserve it", our critic angrily writes: "In India today imperialism derives its major strength from the comprador, semi-feudal government (I) at Delhi and the gigantic state machinery. As long as the nationality movements mainly target the government of India and its state machinery.....it is in effect weakening imperialism. So on that count too these movements should be supported." One can only wish if things were so simple in the complex world situation when the "sinister and pernicious" neocolonialism is at full play. Our critic would not have gone to such simplistic positions if only he had the patience to go through the 1970 programme position on nationality question where it is clearly stated as one of the major tasks of the NDR: "*Unify India and recognise the right of self-determination.*" It is quite self-explanatory.

PW's simplistic stand is that as the Indian state is the instrument serving imperialism, comprador-bureaucratic bourgeoisie and feudalism, and struggle against it, is positive irrespective of who is waging it, and should be supported. On the one hand this is originating from a mechanical position followed by the social democratic forces that 'enemy's enemy is our friend'. On the other hand this is originating from a basically erroneous understanding about the tactics employed by imperialism today to control and impose hegemony over the neocolonies. On the one hand while it is utilising all arsenals in its armoury to make the neocolonial states to serve market system and imperialist capital, on the other hand it is trying to develop to perfection its 'divide and control' policy. Thus both imperialist system and the comprador ruling classes are utilising '*Akandvad*' as well as '*Vikhatanvad*'. If '*Akandvad*' is utilised to centralise and fascise the state apparatus, '*Vikhatanvad*' is utilised to divide the people, to make them fight each other, and to divert the people's attention from all basic issues. It is utilised to make the people kill each other fomenting communal, casteist, racist, parochial, chauvinistic hatred among

them as we are today witnessing on a big scale in the Northeastern region. In this situation the basic ML stand that "nationality question can be progressively resolved only under the leadership of the proletariat and as an integral part of the NDR" may not be a "big discovery" for our critic, but it is a basic proletarian class stand we have to defend and fight for.

Supporting the right of all nationalities for self determination and fighting for realising it as a part of the NDR is basically different from establishing alliance with opportunist leaderships of many of these movements by claiming that "there are many paths to traverse before final solution." It will lead to most opportunist positions like PW sponsored Karnataka Vimochana Ranga (KVR) supporting the BJP sponsored 'Kudagu liberation front', or supporting the movement for separate Telangana state or keeping silence about imperialist and comprador links of some of them. It will also lead to keeping silence about these movements going against the basic interests of the working class and peasantry. Remember Khalistan forces supported the demand for raising land ceilings, moved down immigrant agricultural workers who were demanding better wages, and challenged all secular democratic rights from communal positions. See what is now happening to the democratic and worker-peasant movements in Kashmir and Northeast. That in the name of nationality movements the imperialists and comprador ruling classes are utilising the propagation of '*Vikhatanvad*' and the leaderships of many of them have degenerated to become stooges of imperialism and ruling classes is not "quite another matter" or "irrelevant to the issue under discussion" as our critic claims. After bitter experiences of repeated setbacks in all socialist countries, and weakening of Communist parties everywhere the people demand better theoretical understanding and higher level of practice from the ML forces today. All these questions were taken up in detail by us when we struggled against the petty-bourgeois anarchist line of K. Venu. What our PW friends are saying today is nothing but a repetition of K. Venu's old line.

PW cannot in any way justify the alliance it has built up with the ULFA like forces when it has never tried to consciously build-up a working class leadership in a country with nearly 20 crore organised and unorganised workers in the industrial and service sectors, and when even

(Contd. P. 19)



## U S PLANTED GENE THREATENS WORLD FOOD SECURITY

'Terminator-III' is not another Hollywood blockbuster as the name may suggest. It is a plant gene which allows seeds to "self-destruct" after producing a single crop. Terminator was developed by the US department of agriculture in collaboration with *Delta and Pine Land*, a seed company now under acquisition by the biotechnology giant Monsanto which has extensive economic interests in scores of neo-colonies including India. This terminator gene can destroy the seed quality of the crops in adjoining fields also.

From the days of Dunkel Proposals which proposed control of 'intellectual property rights' through patent laws itself the intentions of the MNCs in the agro-business were clear. Under WTO they introduced legal rights to control reuse of patented seeds. But these had loopholes. With the introduction of terminator they have solved the problem. They can cause "self-destruction" of seeds in massive scale including in adjoining fields. Within a short time the whole seed-sector can be brought under plundering MNCs.

A UNI press release on 20th July adds:

Union Minister of State for Agriculture Som Pal admitted in Parliament this week that the Terminator's self-destructive traits could spread through cross-pollination and cause the gradual extinction of India's traditional crop varieties.

"It has been concluded by a number of crop geneticists that there is a likelihood of pollen carrying the Terminator gene to crops in adjoining farmer's fields," Mr Som Pal said.

India, Mr. Som Pal said, has responded by banning the import of seed containing the Terminator gene and directed the quarantine office to ensure that no seed with "trans-genic material" be released with the approval of the plant protection authority

But the Director General of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) Dr R. S. Paroda said there is no way to ensure that the Terminator does not cross Indian borders as this can happen by accident or by design. "It is a customs problem," he said.

Mr. Devinder Sharma criticises the steps announced by Mr. Som Pal as "cosmetic." It is always possible for someone to smuggle in seed samples for whatever reason, he said.

Besides US seed companies have high stakes in replacing Indian seeds with their own. There are also obvious security issues since the country's hard earned self-sufficiency in food production is under serious threat.

For millenia Indian farmers worked independently and sustainably on their small plots of land averaging an acre or two in size and supporting the economy of this predominantly agriculture country.

But such independence is anathema to the US which has built up a huge biotechnology industry and wants to sell not only genetically engineered seeds but the tallor - made fertilisers and pesticides that go with it as cotton farmers in Andhra Pradesh have discovered so painfully.

So far, Indian farmers got by very well, putting by a part of their crops for seed in the time-honoured way and in the process maintaining the rich crop-diversity of their famed varieties of wheat and rice perfected to suit Indian agro-climatic conditions and to local tastes.

The Indian government which has so far been wary of the interests of US food lobby has become lax and last year even allowed Monsanto to set up a 25 million dollar research laboratory on the campus of the Indian Institute of Science at Bangalore.

If the Terminator gene does not help the US to destroy India's crop-varieties through cross-pollination it can certainly do it by manipulating market forces

According to Mr Devinder Sharma, once Indian farmers are hooked to genetically - engineered seed, the multi-national seed companies which produce them can programme them to produce more or less crops depending on how they want to play the global grain markets.

In any case, the multi-nationals can easily control the prices of their seeds and even deny them to Indian farmers-completely undermining food security in this country.

## Agricultural Workers' Minimum wages Bill Postponed Again

Right now Terminator technology is used to protect other desirable characteristics that a patented seed may have such as better productivity, flavour, size, pest resistance and even shelf life.

But the USDA has already announced that its priorities lie in protecting its rapidly expanding biotechnology seed industry rather than in protecting the interests of farmers in countries like India.

Accordingly, patents are being taken out for the Terminator gene in at least seventy countries and it has already been incorporated into non-cross-pollinated crops such as tobacco and cotton.

But the US now plans to introduce Terminator technology to cross-pollinated crops as well with serious consequences for Indian farmers who produce 200 million tonnes of wheat, rice and sorghum annually and to consumers.

That the US has scant regard for the rights of Indian farmers became evident when a Texas-based company was granted patents for Basmati rice recently.

The US has consistently attacked farmers' rights at international fora and instead actively supports the interests of privately owned biotechnology and food export lobbies.

"Farmer's rights are incompatible with the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) regime which the United States wishes to foist on the world," says Dr. Vandana Shiva.

According to her, agriculture based on globalisation, genetic engineering and corporate monopolies on seeds will eventually establish a food system and world view in which multinationals will control everything grown and eaten.

Presently Indian agriculture is characterised by diversity, decentralisation and focuses on improving small farm productivity using ecologically sound methods which are nature friendly and sustainable small ecological farms are far more productive than the large industrial farms of the US, although multi-nationals like Monsanto promote the idea that the world needs biotechnology to be fed.

Private biotechnology from the US spells doom for India's estimated 400 million farmers unless the issue is taken to the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and a moratorium obtained on the application of Terminator technology she said.

Today the agricultural workers in India number over 10 crores. They are the most exploited and pauperised section among the toiling masses. They are the rural proletariat who are denied all rights on land even while they are an indispensable part of farming. As a result of the consequences of the liberalisation policies in the agrarian sector their number is increasing also continuously.

Following many agitations by the agricultural workers, at the time of Rao government itself it was agreed that a comprehensive central legislation on minimum wages and other facilities and rights of them will be brought forward in the parliament. But the Congress government of Rao did not take necessary action to fulfill the promise.

In 1996 when the UF government took over, getting the farm workers' bill moved and passed was one of the important items in its Common Minimum Programme (CMP). But in spite of being in power for 18 months neither Dewagowda nor Gujral regimes could enact it even though the LF parties were among its main stays.

Once again when the BJP led government took over in 1998, moving the farm worker's bill was in its so-called National Agenda. In spite of it now the union labour minister Satyanarayan Jaitia has stated in parliament that there was no need for additional protection through any separate legislation for agricultural workers, as if all these workers are already well looked after where Ranavir Sena like landlords' mafias are imposing jungle laws over them. The BJP government fear that such a legislation may lead to eruption of violence in the countryside as if no such violence is there.

The BJP government's intentions are clear. Where UF government procrastinated, it has openly stated that it is not going to even legislate a minimum wages act for agricultural workers against the interests of the landlords. In this situation it is the responsibility of the genuine left forces to work hard to organise the agricultural workers into a mighty organisation and launch powerful mass movements for their basic rights.

(From P. 16)

preliminary steps are not taken to establish worker-peasant alliance. Its one sided emphasis to nationality, caste like questions have led it to tail behind individuals and organisations who are taking up these questions from non-proletarian positions.

## On building a Bolshevik style party

We are happy that our critic has accepted that "a Bolshevised party with professional revolutionaries as its core built along principles set by Lenin and Third International, which is in the forefront of class struggle, is a prerequisite for advancing revolution". But later portion of that paragraph where he says that it must necessarily be an underground party, that it must start armed struggle to prove its Bolshevik character etc exposes how "skin-deep" is his knowledge about Leninist party building. "Backward semi-feudal semi-colonial" is used as a *mantra* to justify the sectarian organisation built up more or less based on Che's *facothery* by the PW.

Explaining Comintern positions on party building, the 1963 GL document of CPC said: In order to lead the proletariat and working people in revolution, M-L parties should master all forms of struggle and be able to substitute one form for another quickly as the conditions of struggle change. *The vanguard of the proletariat will remain uncorquerable in all circumstances only if it masters all forms of struggle—peaceful and armed, open and secret, legal and illegal, parliamentary struggle and mass struggle etc.* (emphasis ours). Comintern and following it CPC like parties have repeatedly stressed the paramount importance of mastering all forms of struggles and building up all forms of organisations capable of working in all forms of situations. In a vast country with nearly one billion people and a multitude of complex problems if these teachings are not constructively applied and a really Bolshevised party is not built up, it cannot be saved however underground this party may be.

Lenin and Comintern repeatedly stressed that except in exceptional cases party members should be recruited from among those who have worked in class / mass organisations and tested repeatedly in the course of performing organisational tasks and in the fire of class struggle from among those who have worked in party

fractions, and from the members of the armed squads. Alongwith this Lenin also called for conscious building up of trade unions as "political schools" for transforming the working class from a "class in itself" to a "class for itself". On these lines Comintern developed guidelines for building up democratic class / mass organisations in all fields to broaden the party base, to involve the masses in the revolutionary process. In spite of being parties who have assimilated these lessons and who had built up party organisation based on these principles, we have seen that neither CPSU nor CPC like parties could prevent the emergence of capitalist roaders within the party and their usurpation of party leadership. This calls for serious attention of all ML forces.

Instead of taking lessons from these experiences PW like organisations confine Bolshevisation to mere words. They have not built up a single democratic class/mass organisation openly working among the masses. The sorry state of affairs about building up democratic class / mass organisations is very evident from the fact that even in 1995 Conference they were debating on whether ML MT should be in the programme of class / mass organisations or not. We are happy that at least the majority voted for deleting it. But PW has to go very far for assimilating the Comintern lessons. In spite of repeating about proletarian leadership, they have not built up a single democratically functioning trade union. All these things are justified in the name of secret party and armed struggle. The result is plain and simple. The class composition of the delegates participated in 1995 Special Conference as given in Jan-June 1996 issue of *People's War* is revealing. Out of the 37 delegates 10 were from rich peasantry, one from landlord class, one from national bourgeoisie, 22 from urban petty-bourgeois and middle peasantry and only one from urban poor and two from working class.

Our critic should understand that this is not Bolshevik proletarian party building capable of fighting against the repeated and severe setbacks suffered by the Communist movement during last four decades.

## On armed struggle

Our critic has posed a great challenge before all M-L groups in India. He writes: "..... with the growth of the real revolutionary forces

ded by the CPI (ML) PW, CPI (ML) PU and MCC the test lies in living practice .....all groups are forced to take a stand.....either to support them, ally with them, be part of them .....or to oppose them. All the other M-L groups are now faced with this dilemma." It would have been easier if our critic had advised us that which of these three groups we should support. As far as we know all the unity talks among them have collapsed. So in the last minute the proposed 9th Congress of PW had to be changed to Special Conference. MCC has broken away even from AIPRF. And even the last minute efforts for PW and PU unity also collapsed. It is once again proved that it is very very difficult for the sectarians to even work together, leave alone merger. We hope and appeals to them that they should not resort to settling of issues through bullets.

As we pointed out at the outset itself it is the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological political line which determines everything. But according to our critic it is armed struggle which determines everything "Put politics in command", "take class struggle as the key link", "revolution is the festival of the masses," and "It is the masses who create history" are all meaningless to him. And if our critic so fond of arms struggle, after Chinese revolution from Algeria to Vietnam and Nicaragua in as many as 35 countries power was captured through armed struggle enthusing the masses everywhere. But could any of them advance a single step forward along socialist path? So our critic should at least accept that seizure of power through armed struggle becomes meaningful only when it is led by a proletarian party having a correct ideological-political line. Will he claim that an organisation that took two decades to find out that the TWT is revisionist is capable to lead the ideological struggle in the present day world forward?

Now coming to the question of armed struggle, what are the achievements of PW so far in this field? The experiences of the last 30 years of struggle after Naxalbari has taught us bitter lessons. Neither PW nor PU nor MCC, for that matter none of the organisations have succeeded in reaching anywhere near the depth and spread of the undivided CPI in late 1940s and early 1950s. Including Telangana and Tebhaga, numerous powerful movements had spread all over the country then. The glorious experiences of this period is still a path - breaker

before us. We are not discarding or discrediting in anyway the struggles of the ML organisations during these decades or the sacrifices made for it. We consider them as our own struggles and uphold them. What we point out is that we should be humble enough to admit that we are nowhere near even old Telangana. Still no organisation has succeeded in forming even the rudiments of a people's army, leave alone liberated areas. The reason for these bitter experiences and the repeated setbacks is the sectarian line we have pursued due to which we failed to see the changes taking place around us internationally and within our country. Because of this though PW and some other organisations may continue to have *dalams* and their numbers may even increase, no real breakthrough is possible in leading the NDR to victory.

Today every ML organisation in India has directly or indirectly accepted that present Indian situation is basically different from that of pre-1949 China. So the Chinese line cannot be mechanically copied here. This is the hitherto experience of all revolutions. No revolution can be repeated mechanically. Assimilating the experiences of hitherto revolutions the ideological-political-organisational line and military line should be developed according to concrete conditions here. It also calls for a mighty ideological-political campaign to combat the counter revolutionary imperialist offensive in all fields including socio-cultural fields to prepare the masses for revolution. Strategy and tactics should be developed according to concrete conditions.

Instead of accepting these cardinal points and bringing all ML forces together PW is distancing from them arrogantly as the sole leader of Indian revolution, when considering the magnitude of the problems faced, the gains of PW are not even that of Lilliputian size, and when theoretical questions are considered they are still very backward.

We have many things to learn from Chinese revolution. And many more things from all revolutions from the days of October revolution. Learning from them and learning from the masses of people in our country, we have to make ourself capable of seizing the political power and creating a New Democratic India. With this objective we should develop our tactical line.

## On united front and joint activities

It seems the immediate provocation for this long tirade against RF by PW critic is the initiative we have taken to organise slogan based joint movements by the revolutionary left organisations. Though we were taking such initiative at local level from the very beginning, there is a background to our present initiative.

In 1991 when Rao-Manmohan team launched the NEPs under IMF-WB-GATT dictates and opened the gates for MNCs, under the banner of the trade union centre TUCI a joint initiative was taken which succeeded in mobilising the first workers' rally in Delhi against the liberalisation policies. Due to the sectarian approach of some of the constituents this joint initiative could not go forward. With the coming to power of UF government, the LF sponsored NPMO also became more or less defunct. At this juncture to oppose the intensifying neocolonial plunder and pauperisation of masses we wrote to all revolutionary organisations from PW, PU, MCC to Liberation and COI (ML) to come together for a slogan based joint movement. In spite of the fact that PW like organisations refused to become part of it, before every new step was taken in this direction we continued to write to them to join this move in whichever way they like. The anti-imperialist, anti-feudal orientation of this joint initiative is very much clear from the ten slogans and the joint statement adopted in 1996. Now selecting five relevant slogans in the present situation when neocolonisation is intensifying day by day and when Sangh Parivar is posing fascist threats, the 15 July parliament dharna was successfully organised as the culmination of a countrywide campaign. PW and other organisations not within the joint initiative also were once again invited. But they did not even reply to our letter.

It is a fact that we have launched bitter ideological struggle against Liberation, COI (ML) like organisations. What our critic is concealing is the fact that we are still persisting in these ideological struggles. Red Star and Red Flag pages prove this. Our approach is that even while continuing healthy ideological struggle, the left masses should be brought together based on joint slogans. The success of the parliament march proves the correctness of this approach. And the six organisations united in this joint initiative have decided to con-

tinue this effort and to continue to invite PW like organisations for future campaigns and struggles in spite of differences on various issues, and in spite of their repeated refusal. This joint move with Liberation like forces is the most important criticism raised against us by our PW critic as if RF has lost its chastity by joining hands with these organisations in this joint initiative. This is yet another proof of the sectarian approach of our PW friends. Hope they will overcome it soon so that they can also become part of this joint initiative at this critical time in the history of our country.

It will be an oversight if we do not mention at this time the approach followed by PW concerning joint action. While castigating RF for initiating joint efforts with Liberation like organisations, it will be better if our PW friends recollect and reflect for one moment the record of their friends who were and are selected for joint activity by them, and who were and are given the status of chief guests. From early 1980s for a long period George Fernandes was the chief guest to many programmes organised by PW. When friends like us pointed out George's record as an agent of the *Yellow International* and his rule in selling vital interests of BHEL (Bhopal) to German Siemens when he was industries minister in Janatha government, PW leaders did not bother. Again, when George started moving to BJP camp, Swami Agnivesh was invited as the chief guest to AIPRF rally at Calcutta. Soon Agnivesh's imperialist connections also came out. Not learning lessons from these, for the Hyderabad convention against WTO and May Day rally (report is available in the very issue of Vanguard in which RF is attacked) once again we are seeing an array of leaders starting with Tikayath, Nanjunda Swamy and BKU leaders from Punjab and Haryana. No doubt as our struggle advances a section of the rich peasants taking anti-imperialist positions may join our united front. But have we reached that stage? Has PW evaluated the negative experiences of its Maharashtra unit which went behind Sharad Joshi movement in early 1980s? So, according to PW leadership there is nothing wrong if ruling class representatives, imperialist agents and rich peasant leaders are invited and given pride of place in their programmes, and even if they have to sit silently when Nanjunda Swamy like leaders give sermons to them in public rallies to stop anti-feudal struggles and armed actions. Heavens will fall only if RF joins hands with Liberation like forces for a slogan based joint

move. Or, if fraternal organisations raise criticisms. Or, if other ML organisations decides to pursue a thoroughgoing rectification as RF does. This shows the extent of sectarianism and alien influence within PW.

### Conclusion

We have tried above to explain or approach towards the main theoretical questions. In that process we have tried to expose the real nature of the line pursued by PW and to reply to its main criticisms against RF. But replying to each and every small points they have raised will not go well with such a polemics. For example, take the case of their criticism of RF for paying tributes to com. K. P. R. Gopalan and com. Godavari Parulekar. It is a pity that our PW comrades do not have a proper understanding of the history of the Communist movement in India. Besides, it seems their understanding is that the Communist movement started with Naxalbari, or with their organisation. It will be a mistake on our part to reply to such criticisms.

The problem with our FW friends is that they consider their line, their organisation, their activities represent the correct approach to all problems. They view other organisations relating to them. At the same time they fail to see or refuse to see that their differences with organisations like Liberation, New Democracy, COI (ML) etc, (organisations whom they arguily derounce) are only regarding tactical line, in almost all strategic approaches there are no fundamental differences among them. All of them are one way or other still sticking to most of the sectarian positions of the early period, or some of them have deviated to rightist path as the rectification was not correctly carried out. But they represent, in the main, one general trend. On the contrary, firmly upholding Comintern and 1963 GL positions RF has comprehensively rejected the 1969 sectarian line including the concept of the new era, and has taken up a political reorganisation at all levels through a thoroughgoing rectification process. As a part of it, it has developed the ideological political line. Unless these aspects are not correctly assimilated, it will be difficult for the PW friends to comprehend RF positions and activities.

As we have already pointed out our country is passing through a very critical time in its history. All indications are that the neocolonial

slavery will get intensified and the fascist threat mainly from the Sangh Parivar will also be growing. It is proved that both BJP and Congress, as well as all other parties including regional parties serving comprador interests, and the traditional left parties who have degenerated to social democratic positions are all hands in glove to implement the imperialist dictated liberalisation policies. In spite of anti-communal utterances of many of them none of them is willing to challenge the communal fascist forces.

At this juncture only the revolutionary forces alone can inspire and unite the progressive, democratic, secular and patriotic forces and build up a people's alternative for democracy and socialism. A countrywide movement with this perspective has to be built up.

We should recognise that the differences presently existing among the various revolutionary organisations cannot be settled in one day or at one stroke. It calls for healthy ideological struggle, and meanwhile developing all possibilities for joint movements so that the left masses can be united against the class enemies. The contradiction among the ML forces should be dealt with in a non-antagonistic way, while the antagonistic contradiction with the enemy classes should be faced uniting all these forces.

The FW leadership very well knows that it is they who arbitrarily stopped the despatch of AP reports by late com. KVR to Red Star, and the top level discussions taking place till 1993 between delegations of the two organisations. We are happy that some of contentious issues like TWT are already resolved. At the same time the basic question to be resolved is that of a comprehensive rectification of the influence of the sectarian line that came to dominance during the 1969 Ninth Congress of the CPC and which caused serious setbacks to our movement. This also calls for reinstating the Comintern and Great Debate positions and developing our ideological political line based on them, and developing these positions according to concrete conditions at international and national levels.

While searching ways to develop dialogue on these questions, organisations like RF and PW should find out ways at least to start working together in slogan based joint initiatives

## News from States

### Kerala

#### Yuvajanavedi Fasts on Aug-15th

Yuvajanavedi, the revolutionary youth organisation observed one day fast on 15th of August at all district headquarters in Kerala to protest against the fascist policies of the ruling Hindutwa politics. The protest was organised with effective background work to expose the ruling BJP. It was quite ironical that the representative of a party, the predecessors of which consciously kept away from the freedom movement hoisted the tricolour on redfort on this August 15th the 'Independence day. Yuvajanavedi explained in many of its campaign materials that the BJP and its communal and fascist ideology have nothing in common with the glorious tradition of our freedom movement and stressed on the necessity to struggle against the anti-people policies pursued by them.

The one day fast was observed in all the 14 district headquarters and many hundreds of comrades and sympathisers took part in the fast and subsequent sit in protest. Apart from leaders of Yuvajanavedi prominent leaders of CPI (ML) Red Flag and other class/mass organisations like TUCI, KKTU, KVS, JVS and Janakeeya Kalasahithya Vedi spoke at the sit in protests organised at various district centres. They have exposed the pseudo 'swadeshi' rhetoric of the ruling BJP and its parent organisation RSS who are trying their best to make the

with other organisations. While ideological struggle is carried forward to reorganise CPI (ML) uniting all Communist forces, against neo-colonisation and growing fascist threat broadest possible unity of all toiling masses and progressive forces should be built up with the revolutionary forces as its core.

We hope this polemics shall help PW to overcome its sectarian positions and to play an important role in the coming people's movements against imperialists and the comprador state which is serving all forces of reaction.

—Karthik

country surrendered totally before the imperialist forces. The fast and the dharna of Yuvajanavedi attracted the attention of thousands of people.

#### School Elections: KVS stresses its presence

Eventhough the Kerala high court has ruled on year ago that no elections to school parliaments of the state are to be held on political basis the Kerala Vidyarthi Sanghatana (KVS) fought the school elections held during July '98 by putting forward its own slogans. The revolutionary students organisation KVS put up its own candidates in several schools at various parts of the state and succeeded to get elected in at least eight schools. Eventhough this is not a great victory there is no doubt that then is a significant step. Out of the total 400 plus seats it has contested the KVS won more than 200 seats. KVS comrades were elected as leaders in the above said eight schools. Through this not so insignificant victory KVS stressed its presence in the schools of the state and proclaimed that the organisational base of KVS among students is getting more and more broad.

#### Agricultural workers in struggle against retaining rice fields fallow

The struggle under the leadership of Kerala Karshaka Thozhilali Union (KKTU) in Vypeen (Eranakulam district) against the policy of keeping 'pokkali' paddy field fallow and of converting the same to permanent shrimp farms is getting advanced with increased peoples involvement. Evenwhile the left front government of Kerala is making loud proclamations of bringing more land under paddy cultivation and of observance of 'paddy year' (Ponmani Varsha), the govt. is allowing to convert the 'pokkali' paddy field to prawn farms.

As the govt. allows the land owners to keep the pokkali land fallow and to convert the same into permanent shrimp farms it makes hundreds of agricultural workers totally unemployed.

The land owners eager to reap maximum profit are conspiring with authorities to convert the land to shrimp farms.

It was against this policy that the KKTU and Matsya Thozhilali Aikyavedi (TUCI) came forward to struggle with the active support of hundreds of agricultural workers the organisation declared that it would not allow to keep the land fallow or to convert it for any use other than paddy cultivation were the present circumstances. The organisation pointed out that what the landowners were doing in the violation of Kerala Land Use Act.

Thus the struggling workers who came in hundreds including a good number of women marched on August 29th to the pokkali fields for transplantation work. However the huge police force blocked the march in the way and the workers squatted on the ground. Later all the workers who comes to more than 200 was arrested and removed by the police.

As the part of the struggle Revenue Divisional Office march, Jathas, and other demonstrations are also held.

Later the police intensified its suppressive measures and arrested many comrades on false charges. Against these measures indefinite fast was started and as the struggle got strengthened and the people's participation in it increased the Fisheries Dept. of Kerala Govt. was compelled to take action against the unauthorised prawn farm owners.

However the KKTU and Matsya Thozhilali Aikyavedi is taking steps to intensify the struggle in the near future after taking the issue to the people of a broader area.

### Orissa

#### Campaign to expose neocolonial slavery

The year long campaign to expose the neocolonial slavery of India for the last 50 years concluded on August 15th 1998. A number of public meetings, seminars, village campaigns, posterings, wall writings and cultural programmes including street plays were held all over Orissa under the leadership of CPI (ML) Red Flag and its class / mass organisations as part

of the campaign slogans like, "Patriots Unite. Fight against neocolonial slavery, Fulfil the dreams of martyrs of anti colonial struggle etc. were propagated widely. Thousands of people were contacted and addressed.

Eventhough the cadres engaged in the campaign had to face many hardships and physical attacks from the part of state machinery and the stooges of ruling classes and parties like the one at Bhubaneshwar court premises on 13th August 1998 they have made the campaign a success. The real meaning of the so called 'independence' celebrated by the ruling class parties were exposed and the revolutionary politics to transform the inhuman system was propagated. The campaign with the new politics was attracted by thousands of people.

#### Procession against Nuclear bomb and its politics

On 6th of August 1998, Hiroshima day a demonstration against the nuclear bomb and its politics was held at Bhubaneshwar under the leadership of 'Paramanu Boma Birodhi Prachar Abhiyan' (propaganda movement against Nuclear explosion) The participants of the well attended demonstration shouted the slogan like, "we want rice, peace and democracy, not nuclear bombs; No more Hiroshima and Nagasaki".

While the procession from Kalpana Square ended at PMG Square a street play by 'Janan- atya Vikash Parishath' Puri was staged. The procession comprising of students, youth, workers, women, and intellectuals was led by comrades Sivaram, Jayanta Kumar Jena, Dr Narayan, Saroj Dass and others

(From P. 6)  
ence of agriculture rather than manufacturing industry. Employment in manufacturing has in any case never accounted for a majority of the workforce: the all - time peak was achieved briefly by Britain in 1955, when industry accounted for 48 per cent of employment. The period since the early 1970s has seen a more pronounced shift away from manufacturing and towards services in the Western economies, but this trend requires far more careful analysis than it has been given by those left intellectuals who eagerly seized on them to announce



## Pokhran Tests are against Peoples interests A report of Delhi Seminar

Noted historian Dr. K. N. Panikkar said that India with the majority of its population living in utter poverty has squandered a huge sum of something like Rs. 20000 crores for the Nuclear tests conducted recently and that would lead the economy to shambles. He was inaugurating the seminar organised by the 'Progressive Cultural Organisation' at Delhi on 3rd of August. The subject of the seminar attended by representatives of various progressive cultural organisations was, 'Nuclear explosion and contemporary Indian politics.'

Dr. Panikkar pointed out that unemployment, poverty, illiteracy, malnutrition and human sufferings are getting increased. The huge amount spent for nuclear tests at pokhran was that to be spent for development of agriculture and industry. The Govt. claims that the tests were to make our security ensured. But they could not explain how the nuclear weapons are going to protect the people. The VHP is reportedly going to build a temple at the test site. If it is built up the most suitable deity to be installed in it will be a human skull. Some people are showering praises upon the scientists who conducted the tests successfully. But, Dr. Panikkar continued "I am sure that no scientist who developed a destructive weapon is to be praised". In the letter written by the school students of the Delhi to the prime minister, they have expressed their concern with respect to the possibility of the nuclear mushroom clouds getting spread over their future: Dr. Panikkar pointed out.

Mr. Joseph Edamaruku, the leader of athiest

movement who spoke in the seminar said that it is impossible to settle political issues in between India and Pakistan like that of Kashmir using nuclear bombs. It is used to divert the attention of people from the real problems like price hike. It is a part of the fascist agenda of BJP. He called upon the progressive forces to expose and oppose the real motives behind the nuclear tests.

Prof. Niveditha Menon of Lady Shri Ram College and of 'The Movement against Atomic Bomb' spoke next. She explained the experiences of the movement and the activities taken up by it. The fascist forces like Bajrong Dal of Sangh Parivar are threatening the activists, said Prof. Niveditha. She said that the propaganda of Sangh Parivar forces that the nuclear tests at Pokhran were anti-imperialist is sheer nonsense and it is the duty of the progressive forces to expose the true intentions of it and to tear off the smoke screen of their propaganda.

Com. Freddy K. Thazhath said that the BJP is all out to embrace the 'videshi' imperialist forces while talking loudly about 'Swadeshi.' The demolition of Babri Masjid and the nuclear explosions at Pokhran are parts of the very same fascist agenda of communal forces, he said.

Salim Divakaran presided over the Seminar held at Kerala Club was one of the first organised programmes against the nuclear arms race and jingoism and it has attracted the attention of progressive minded forces from various walks of life.

the disappearance of the industrial proletariat, a response summed up by Andre Gorz's book *Farewell to the Working Class*.

In the first place, this process of 'deindustrialization' typically involved in a fall in the share of employment and output accounted for by manufacturing. In other words, it was primarily a *relative change*—typically industry's share of the workforce fell rather than the absolute number of industrial employees. The sectoral shift from manufacturing to services

may in large part be accounted for by rapid rises in the productivity of labour in manufacturing industry, which meant that a smaller proportion of the workforce can produce a considerably larger quantity of goods; productivity growth in services is by comparison notoriously sluggish—in the United States between 1970 and 1984 it rose by only 0.8 per cent per annum in commercial banking, and actually fell at an annual rate of 0.4 per cent in eating and drinking places. It is perhaps significant that manufacturing's share of output has generally fallen less

(From P. 27)

gangsters, is trying to impose a certain opinion about the Balkans: it is presenting this region as a region inhabited by barbarous semi-savage peoples who are killing each other, by inferior men and women who can not do anything useful without a rigorous discipline and leadership exercised by the "civilized" nations. So, the imperialists are cultivating a singular type of racism against the peoples of the Balkans in general. At the same time, they take under their wings the representatives of one nation who are ready to sell-out the national independence and the very existence of one country, in order to be given the "right" to construct a controversial national entity, always under imperialist domination.

7. But all those forget something that we, communists, must not and do not forget: The peoples of the Balkans have a big tradition of liberation and revolutionary struggles, originating already in their common struggle against the ottoman yoke. Those traditions continued with the epos of the liberation wars against the nazi - fascist occupation against the interventions of the english and later of the US imperialism.

We are confident that this tradition will come alive again, in the fight against the modern totalitarianism of the New World Order. The peoples of the Balkans will construct their own international community, a genuine, fraternal International Community of the Balkanic Peoples, despite and against all difficulties.

- \* Down with the New World Order long live the peoples' struggles!
- \* The imperialists, out of the Balkans!

sharply than its share of employment: thus in the United States manufacturing declined from 25.8 per cent of employment in 1964 to 19.6 per cent in 1982; its share of GDP volume, however, experienced a much less pronounced fall, from 24.8 per cent in 1964 to 22.8 per cent. Taken together, these figures suggest a considerable rise in manufacturing productivity. Even the sectoral shift from manufacturing to services is not universal. Japan, the most successful post-war economy, experienced between 1964 and 1982 a fall in services' share of GDP volume,

- \* Down with national chauvinism, racism, anti-communism and subordination to the imperialists!
- \* Long live internationalism, long live the friendship of the balkanic peoples!
- \* Long live the united struggle of the peoples of the world against imperialism!
- \* Down with capitalism and revisionism! Long live socialism!
- Unified Communist Party of Azerbaidjan
- Liberation Party, Argentina
- One Party From Brasil
- Partiotic Front Manuel Rodriguez, Chile
- Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist), Dominican Republic
- Revolutionary Marxist Organization A/synechia, Greece
- Struggle for Peace and Socialism, Italy
- Union of Polish Communists "Proletariat", Poland
- Workers' and Peasants' Party of Russia

from 51.7 to 48.8 per cent, and a rise in manufacturing's share, from 24.1 to 39.9 per cent. The Japanese case indeed refutes the commonly held theory that the decline of manufacturing relative to services is a consequence of economic 'maturity' and rising per capita income. Japanese per capita income is considerably higher than British, but services take up a larger share (55.6 per cent in 1982) and service manufacturing a much smaller share (24.9 per cent) of GDP volume in the United Kingdom.

(Contd. in next issue)

## Resolution Concerning The Situations in The Balkans

1. The actual Balkanic crisis is a true-born child of the New World Order. It broke out directly after the Gulf war and the "collapse" of the "existent socialism". The fratricidal war in Yugoslavia and the partition of this country constitute the most evident outbreak of the new Balkanic crisis.

2. Its roots are to be found in the way that each and every country of the Balkans integrated the protracted international economic crisis, which started in the early 70's and continues up today. The nature and the quality of the productive mechanisms of every Balkanic country, their dependence by the policy of the imperialist or revisionist powers, and their mode of integration in the western or eastern "international division of labour", shaped the conditions for the crisis' development. The exception of Albania can not change this general picture of the Balkans during the 70's and the 80's.

3. Imperialism never stopped its efforts to completely restore its domination over the whole region. All the "concerned" imperialist powers rushed into filling the gap created by the "collapse": first-class imperialist powers (the USA and Germany) and also powers which traditionally had an influence in the Balkans (Italy, England, France). A new, modern balkanization is fastly developing. The imperialists are organizing direct interventions, redefining the borders, adopting this or the other nationalism, favouring the military "solutions" and the ethnic purifications, promoting an anti-communist hysteria. The peoples of the Balkans are feeling every day on their skin the results of this policy: destruction of the productive mechanisms, selling out of the wealth-producing resources to the international monopolies, cruel austerity, migratory flows, devastation of countries and regions. While using the most modern technologies in warfare, media, etc, the imperialists are reproducing in the Balkans a situation similar to that prevailing in the beginning of the century.

4. All, without exception, the local bourgeoisies and governments are aligned with the demands of the imperialist powers. They are subordinated to imperialism. They disorientate the peoples using and promoting chauvinism, racism and fascism. They are obediently applying

the orders of the international economic gendarmes of the capital, like IMF, WB, OCDE and the like. They are poisoning the good relations between the peoples. When they speak for peace, they mean an imperialist one; and they prepare themselves for war. The Balkans live under the threat of a new Balkanic war, which will implicate the main countries of the region and the main imperialist powers. This will transform the actual local internationalized conflict in a regional internationalized war.

5. But the actual dramatic situation is not owed exclusively to the criminal policy of the imperialists and their local lackeys. The destructive role of modern revisionism can not be hidden, and it must not be hidden. On the opposite, its unmasking and condemnation can make only good to the peoples and the working class of the Balkans and of the whole world. Revisionists of every kind (first Tito, then all those who followed Kroushevism and Brezhnevism) were in power in a big part of the Balkans. As the developments proved, their main "orientation" was the prevalence of their particular interests, and the capitulation in front of imperialism. Those characteristics, together with the quality of their "socialism", explain their quick transformation in to social-democrats, and their rapid integration in the new situation as governmental or main oppositional parties. Those former "communists" are accepting today the conditions imposed by the New World Order, they are wishing the integration of their countries in the EU and the NATO: their villainies have no end. But even in the countries that the revisionists were not in power, they committed no less harm: they fought against the consequent militant forces and the people's movements; they confined themselves within the context of the "national interests" policy; they helped the respective bourgeoisies in the critical moments; they had a liquidatory role within the people's movements; they even became part of governments led by the right-wing! Revisionism is co-responsible for the developing new Balkanic crisis. Those who would like to forget this lesson, pretending that it concerns "old stories", are making a serious mistake.

6. The propaganda of the so-called "international community", a bunch of imperialist

# RED STAR

Thrissur-680 322,  
Kerala, India.

September 1998  
Price Rs. 5.00

R. No. D 2. 9359/91  
KL/TC 206/98



Dr. K. N. Panikkar inaugurating the Anti Nuclear Seminar held in New Delhi

Printed and Published by P. J. Baby from Comrade Printers,  
Thrissur-680 322, Phone. 0487-355175. Editor: M. M. Somasekharan.