

RED STAR

PLATFORM FOR COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONARIES

Rs. 10/-

Central Organ of CPI(ML)

Volume 12

June 2011

Issue 3

English Monthly

*Ban All Iron Ore Export Forthwith;
Nationalise Bellary-Hospet Mines!*

Rail Roko Agitation by RYFI at
Raichur Rillway Station on 6th May



BIN LADEN KILLED, BUT WHAT ABOUT SAVAGE US IMPERIALISM, THE SOURCE OF TERROR?

HISTORY has repeatedly taught that terrorism and anarchism are not going to make any progressive changes in the society. On the other hand, it only helps the reactionary imperialist system and its lackeys to suppress the masses using them as pretexts and to perpetuate their brutal hegemony. The experience of bin Laden's last three decades of life and his end are the latest testimony to it.

Though the US and its lackeys and corporate media are working hard to hide facts, bin Laden was recruited and trained by the US Agency CIA in 1979 to throw out the Soviet forces from Afghanistan, spreading Islamic Fundamentalism as the ideological prop. In the course of fulfilling this mission, bin Laden and many others like him recognized how US and its allies are only using them to continue their plunder and domination in the countries where Muslims are in vast majority. They could also see that even after the Soviet forces were forced to move out, the US and its allies did not leave Afghanistan. All these led them to realize that US imperialism is their enemy number one.

So, using the same means of terror they were taught by the US agencies, they turned their guns and terrorist expertise against this savage enemy. But the dreadful events of the last decade till the present hunting down of bin Laden, have proved that the *September 11/2001* really became a godsend for the barbarous US establishment to commit most foul mass murders of Iraqi and Afghan people, and to commit thousands of other heinous crimes around the world under the banner of 'war on terror'. When US imperialists declared bin Laden as enemy number one and brutalized the whole world in the name of hunting him down, they were only continuing the savage history of the capitalist imperialist system of its colonization days, of hunting the black skins of Africa and plundering the whole world.

The hunting down and killing of bin Laden by his onetime mentors should convince the progressive, anti-imperialist forces all over the world, the masses of the people that US imperialism which is the most barbarous and terroristic force the world has ever seen, the source of terrorism around the world, cannot be defeated by pursuing the terrorist or anarchist path. It is an irony that bin Laden was savagely hunted down by the US imperialists when the people of West Asia and North Africa are trying to create a new history through the mighty uprisings in these regions

threatening the continuation and very existence of the oligarchies, monarchs and imperialist lackeys as well as the hegemony of the US led occupying fascist forces. If bin Laden was a negative teacher whose brand of terrorism only helped the US and their allies to extend their aggressions and plunder, the people's uprisings taking place are really threatening the very foundations of the US imperialists in the region.

When US president Obama is yelling that justice is rendered to the victims of 9/11 by killing bin Laden, the working class and the oppressed people around the world should ask him and his cronies, then what about rendering justice to the natives of the Americas who were hunted down and almost wiped out to make room for the white settlers? What about rendering justice to the black people who were hunted and exported to US for generations of slave work? What about rendering justice to the victims of the innumerable heinous crimes committed by the US imperialists around the world during the last two centuries or more? What about rendering justice to the people of Palestine, Afghanistan, Iraq and other countries in the region and around the world who are still bleeding under US and Zionist occupation and domination? What about the brutal bombing of Libya in order to hijack the people's movement there which was coming up against Gaddafi's rule? The US imperialists and their Lackeys have proved that they are the worst terrorists and murderers who have committed and continue to commit most vile crimes against the humanity. In the name of perpetuating the savage class rule of its country, they are waging a brutal war against the world people.

While bin Laden's advocacy of terrorism and religious fundamentalism should be criticized and opposed, in this hour of the propaganda blitzkrieg of US imperialists and their lackeys to celebrate the killing of bin Laden as the end of terrorism, it should be exposed ruthlessly and people should become conscious of the fact that it is US imperialism which is the source of terrorism and neo colonial slavery, and without wiping it out from the world's surface a humanistic society of democracy and social progress can never be achieved. ●

*K.N. Ramachandran
General Secretary
CPI (ML)
4th May 2011*

OSAMA OR OBAMA : WHO IS THE REAL TERRORIST?

OSAMA BIN LADEN'S kidneys had failed, was extremely sick and unarmed. According to many reports, he was under house arrest of ISI and/or Pak army for three years, a secret which the CIA and Pentagon came to know by last August, as the US administration admits now. Otherwise how this dreaded terrorist Osama, according to the international yellow media and its running dogs and collaborators in India who are crying hoarse to condemn him, could be found unarmed and without any powerful outfit of bodyguards. The option before the savage US state now run by Obama and company was whether he should be allowed to die due to his ailments or to kill him to militarise the whole world further and to get a convincing propaganda material for Obama to get reelected. It decided to pursue the second option without telling its running dogs who are ruling Pakistan. So the whole crime was planned and executed on the early morning of 2nd May in ruthless, criminal and sadistic way.

The hunting down and killing of bin Laden is a continuation of the ruthless planning they did to throw out the Soviet social imperialist forces from Afghanistan by promoting Islamic jihadists including bin Laden, then to throw out the Taliban regime for refusing to totally surrender to its wishes, to continue the decade long murderous occupation and aggression there and to wipe out Saddam Hussain and millions in Iraq to dominate it and the whole West Asia to plunder petroleum and other natural resources. US imperialism today is the most or worst ever ruthless, savage, sadistic and fascist power. And Obama as its CEO, the chief executive officer, is a true heir of Bush and many others before him.

When bin Laden is attacked, this fact, that Obama and the entire US state is a hundred times more ferocious terrorists and that bin Laden like thousands were mere pawns in their hands, who are disposed off whenever they want should not be forgotten. As US imperialism is the perpetrator and the source of plundering hegemony and terrorism in all its vulgar forms, the hatred of the whole world should be focused against it. It should be exposed and attacked everywhere, in all fields without any let up till this worst enemy of humankind and the imperialist system as a whole are wiped out.

Was not the killing of Osama an attempt not only aimed at helping a second term for Obama, but also an attempt to bury the gory details of how youngsters like him are lured in to the career of a terrorist by US imperialists with him? Will anyone in UN or from the bourgeois judiciary ask who gave the permission to kill summarily an unarmed, sick man, even if he is a vicious terrorist, without giving him an opportunity to defend himself in a court of law?

But what we are seeing and reading in the corporate media and hearing from the compradors, lackeys and running dogs of the imperialist system who are ruling this country or are in opposition is different version.

Contents

❖ Editorials	3
❖ Oppose The Posco Decision Of The MoEF	5
❖ Who Created Osama And Terrorism	6
❖ My Reaction To Osama Bin Laden's Death	7
❖ Obama, Osama And Politics of Oil Hunger	8
❖ Assassination Of Bin Laden: Its Use And Abuse	10
❖ Advance Struggle against Imperialist World System and Its Lackeys	12
❖ Nepal : An Interview With Member Of Constituent Assembly	15
❖ Nepal : A Revolution Compromised	19
❖ Post-Election Kerala Situation : Urgent Need Of Revolutionary Alternative	23
❖ On Assembly Elections In West Bengal	25
❖ The Writer In A Neo-Colonial State	26
❖ Karnataka: Struggle Against Iron Ore Mafia	33
❖ Peasant Struggle In UP	35

Our Web Site : www.cpiml.in

**Editor, Printer,
Publisher and Owner
KN Ramachandran**

**From:
C-141
Sainik Nagar
New Delhi - 110059**

**Phone : (011) 25332343
redstarenglish@yahoo.co.in**

**Printed at Everest Offset
Press, B-162, Okhla
Industrial Area, Phase I,
New Delhi**

They are competing with each other in congratulating US imperialists and their chief, Obama, for finishing off bin Laden, and is talking about aping US action to get those accused for 26/11 presumed to be hiding in Pakistan. Not a word is uttered against the US imperialists and allies who are killing thousands around the world continuously for decades or centuries. They celebrate marriage

of the grandson of a queen whose regime committed thousands of crimes like Jallianwalla Bagh on this soil shamelessly. While ruling Congress is intensifying state terrorism, BJP is calling for attacking Pakistan to catch the terrorists there, they are silent about the RSS bred terrorists like Narendra Modi and Pragya.

Only by waging uncompromising struggle against the inhuman imperialist system, especially the savage US imperialism, and its lackeys and running dogs whether in India or Pakistan or anywhere else terrorism can be wiped out. In order to achieve it, this struggle should be invariably linked with the struggle for a new society devoid of aggression and plunder, for a socialist society. ●

OPPOSE THE POSCO DECISION OF THE MOEF

THE DECISION of the Ministry of Environment & Forests to grant "conditional" permission to the POSCO project in Jagatsinghpur in Odisha is shocking and shameful. The project has been condemned by almost all the committees that have looked into this project including the Saxena committee, the POSCO Enquiry Committee (by its majority report) and the Ministry's own Forest Advisory Committee. The permission has been granted on condition that the Odisha Government should ensure that the affected people are not "forest dwellers". This has been done in the face of the proven fact that the Odisha Government has lied about this in the past.

The Central Minister for Environment and Forests, Jairam Ramesh, from the point of view of MNCs and corporate houses, talks loudly but carries a very small stick. Though projecting himself as a great defender of the environment, he has repeatedly held in favour of the MNCs and corporate houses, out to deplete the environment, putting enough "conditions" so as to cover his own back. He did the same with the Jaitapur Nuclear power plant in Maharashtra and has now done the same with the POSCO project.

The decision of the Ministry

imposes wonderfully meaningless conditions, such as the craven request that the company "voluntarily sacrifice" water which does not belong to it; and it violates the Forest Rights Act, the Forest Conservation Act and the Environment Protection Act.

We also condemn the sell-out by a section of the struggling people which has agreed to give up the betelvines in the area for acquisition. We declare our support for the just struggle of the people being led by the Posco Pratirodh Sangram Samiti. The question is not just one of land-grabbing and of the environment but also one of democracy. The Forest Rights Act makes it clear that the consent of the Gram Sabhas in the area is a pre-requisite for the project. However, the permission has been given even without this condition being fulfilled.

We call upon the people of Odisha and India to take up this struggle and to see that the project is not allowed to happen, not only to protect the poor peasants of that area from the loot of their land and to protect the environment for posterity but also in defense of a democratic India. ●

STRUGGLE FOR A REVOLUTIONARY LEFT ALTERNATIVE

THE DEFEAT of the CPI (M) led Left Front in Bengal after remaining in power for more than 34 years and LDF in Kerala is not a defeat of the Left or defeat of Marxist ideas. It is a defeat of the social democratic policies to which the CPI (M) has degenerated in a situation when the Congress and UPA government led by it have degenerated to worst levels and the whole neocolonial ruling system is opposed by the working class, peasants and toiling people through various struggles all over the country. In this situation, if the Congress or its allies like the Trinamool or others win in Bengal, Kerala or Assam, it is not because of the virtues of Congress or similar reactionary forces allied to it but because of the failure of various Left forces to put a revolutionary left alternative challenging the ruling system and effectively resisting the neoliberal policies imposed on the people. In that sense the results should be an eye-opener to all the Left forces. They should be prepared for a self-introspection and only through a reorganization of the genuine Left and democratic forces around a left revolutionary program, can the present situation be altered. ●

WHO CREATED OSAMA AND TERRORISM

Observer

THE prime minister of Pakistan, Syed Yusuf Raza Gilani, facing strong protests against the high handedness of US imperialists who organized an operation well inside its territory without any information to it to eliminate Osama bin Laden, has asked everyone to see their faces in the mirror of history before criticizing his country and its agencies. His words of anguish are mainly directed against US administration which is continuing to criticize the Pak government and its ISI and army for the security lapses which allowed Osama to live for a long time near the Pak military establishments. Gilani has sought to reply by asking who was responsible for the birth of Osama, al-Qaeda and the insurgency in Afghanistan. His words prove how US interfered in the most criminal way possible in this region utilizing the then Pakistan governments and other lackeys to create such horrific conditions devastating most of Afghanistan, a statement which substantiates what the anti-imperialist forces were repeating during the last three decades.

Addressing the parliament, he stated on 9th May that Pakistan *alone* cannot be held accountable for the flawed policies and blunders of others: "I talk of a bygone era. However it is necessary to remind everyone about that era, which has been so well documented, including in the CNN series on the Cold War showing video footage of high ranking US officials exhorting the Afghans and the Mujahideen to wage jihad, to go back to their homes, to go back to their mosques, in the name of Islam and as a national duty. It is necessary for us to remind the international community of the decade of the 1990s which saw Arab volunteers who had joined the Jihad mutate in to the al-Qaeda. Who was responsible for the birth of the al-Qaeda? Who was responsible for making the myth of Osama bin Laden? To find answers to today's questions it is necessary to revisit the not-so-distant-past. Collectively we must acknowledge facts and *see our faces in the mirror of history*".

But Gilani has stopped short of saying many more things. He was forced to say so much only to defend ISI and army which are viewed suspiciously by his 'strategic ally'. He does not want to go beyond that. Otherwise, what was the compulsion for the military regime of Zia ul Huq to make Pakistan the base for US operations against the Soviet army which had entered Afghanistan in 1979. It was because India had close relations with Soviet Union and 'hate-India' was/is the anchor stone of Pak foreign policy, like 'hate-Pakistan' is that of India government, as the imperialists wanted when they engineered the communal division of the sub-continent. India went to Soviet side not because the comprador regime here was having any liking for socialism, but because US had supported Pakistan. There was no third option for these lackeys in the then bi-polar world. Even now both Indian and Pakistan establishments, including the armies and intelligence agencies of both, thrive by pursuing the policies of hatred against each other as the imperialists want in order to promote their arms sale. If Gilani or his counterpart in India wants to rectify the

old mistakes and establish close relations which the people of both countries desire, they have to criticize the whole gamut of the past policies pursued under the dictates of imperialists, especially US imperialists.

Before the democratic forces with left leanings had thrown out the monarchy in Kabul and tried to establish a democratic regime with progressive policies like land reforms, it was the US-UK imperialists who were propping this reactionary rule. They started plotting against this progressive regime, as soon as it came to power, by promoting Jihad by Islamic fundamentalist, feudal forces and tribal chiefs. It was at this time the Soviet Union, which had embraced capitalist path and was contending and colluding with the other super power, US, for world hegemony, committed its greatest blunder by sending its army to Afghanistan, which finally led to its disintegration. This intervention helped US and its lackeys immensely to spread hatred against 'red army' and 'communist Russia' and incite all reactionary forces to wage a 'jihad' against Soviet forces as a cover to topple the popular government. Pakistan became the base for these operations and the Pak army and ISI were financed, trained and used for it. It was at that time, as the whole world know, Osama like cadres and Arabs were recruited in thousands, trained and sent to Afghanistan.

The Soviet army was withdrawn in 1988. As desired by US, the Taliban came to power after ousting the government by annihilating all the progressive forces. But as Taliban refused to be a puppet of US, it had to be thrown out using 9/11 as a pretext. For this also Pakistan was used as a base. For a decade this aggression by US led NATO forces is going on in more

and more brutal forms. In spite of serving this butchering of a neighbouring people, as a paid servant, Pakistan is humiliated in all forms. In the names of attacking Afghan terrorists and al-Qaeda forces drone attacks are killing thousands of civilians. Pakistan rulers have no shame to allow this situation to continue. So the image they will see in the mirror of history will be just horrible. It is US imperialism which has turned this country into a base for recruiting and training terrorist outfits. Even thousands of madrazas were financed to recruit jihadis. Gilani is not ready to denounce this whole truth. He will never dare to do as it will lead to his elimination within days. He has to continue as an agent of the very same forces who stamp and spit over him and the people of his country, like the imperialist lackeys everywhere. If the ruling elite in Pakistan including its army and ISI think that they can save themselves by making closer relations with China they are in fool's paradise. The present Chinese ruling clique is no better than *modern Shylocks* with only trade and finance interests. They will ditch any one so long as they are having good trade relations with the US.

The present developments reveal the predicament of the Pak ruling elite and the crisis faced by the people there. This is a situation in which the government of India, if it has an iota of patriotism and hatred towards the rabid US imperialists who are the source of terrorism around the world including this country, has to make a rethinking and come above the narrow, dogmatic approach it was/is pursuing so far. It is the time to recognize that what is happening to Pakistan can happen to India tomorrow. Under any pretext Yankees can interfere in this country also nakedly. If the government of India shows more

empathy to the people of Pakistan and go for an open dialogue to settle all problems including a political solution to the Jammu and Kashmir problem it will be a turning point. It will be a historic step forward.

But the statement came out from the army chief of this country immediately after Osama was hunted down by his own creators was out rightly provocative and arrogant. Who authorized him to make such a statement? The people of this country deserve an answer. The RSS parivar and the corporate media are competing to come out with provocative statements against Pakistan and slavish approach towards Obama and his bastards' club. Like the Pakistan rulers, if the Indian rulers also dare to look in the mirror of history their image they will see will not be better in any way.

The US imperialists and their allies are the number one enemies of the world people today. They treat the people of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America as dirt. Even their leaders who are ready to do anything, however mean it may be, to appease them, are treated no better if they change their stand a little, as we are seeing in the case of their own lackeys and running dogs. We could see THIS in the case of Saddam Hussain, Osama and many others. The same may happen to Pak rulers also. This is not the time to rejoice when Obama who has drenched himself in the blood of the people of oppressed countries intensify aggressions against world people. This is the time to teach a lesson to the Yankees. For that people of India and Pakistan should join hands. If their leaders are not ready for it, hell with them. Pushing them away the people should come forward. ●

No To UN INVOLVEMENT IN TUNISIA

THIS EVENING of 17 May 2011, we have just learned that the Tunisian provisional government, whose leader is currently visiting Paris, plans to call in the United Nations (UN) following shelling in the sector of Dehiba, at Tunisia's border with Libyan.

In this very sensitive matter, the provisional government must show restraint and courage within the strict framework of its mandate.

While firmly asking Libya to cease taking military action on Tunisian territory, the Tunisian provisional government must avoid becoming involved on the ground with internationalization of this affair.

Indeed any internationalization, even under the cover of UN, can only benefit the NATO forces which for some weeks past, and in particular since the declaration of the British defence minister Liam Fox to the [European?] Community, has sought an excuse to occupy the Tunisian-Libyan border.

The territorial integrity of Tunisia and its sovereignty must guide the action of all the national forces. ●

*Khaled Falah, Foreign Relations Officer,
Tunisian Patriotic and Democratic Labour Party*

MY REACTION TO OSAMA BIN LADEN'S DEATH

IT'S INCREASINGLY clear that the operation was a planned assassination, multiply violating elementary norms of international law. There appears to have been no attempt to apprehend the unarmed victim, as presumably could have been done by 80 commandos facing virtually no opposition – except, they claim, from his wife, who lunged towards them. In societies that profess some respect for law, suspects are apprehended and brought to fair trial. I stress “suspects.” In April 2002, the head of the FBI, Robert Mueller, informed the press that after the most intensive investigation in history, the FBI could say no more than that it “believed” that the plot was hatched in Afghanistan, though implemented in the UAE and Germany. What they only believed in April 2002, they obviously didn't know 8 months earlier, when Washington dismissed tentative offers by the Taliban (how serious, we do not know, because they were instantly dismissed) to extradite bin Laden if they were presented with evidence – which, as we soon learned, Washington didn't have. Thus Obama was simply lying when he said, in his White House statement, that “we quickly learned that the 9/11 attacks were carried out by al Qaeda.”

Nothing serious has been provided since. There is much talk of bin Laden's “confession,” but that is rather like my confession that I won the Boston Marathon. He boasted of what he regarded as a great achievement.

There is also much media discussion of Washington's anger that Pakistan didn't turn over bin Laden, though surely elements of the military and security forces were aware of his presence in Abbottabad. Less is said about Pakistani anger that the U.S. invaded their territory to carry out a political assassination. Anti-American fervor is already very high in Pakistan, and these events are likely to exacerbate it. The decision to dump the body at sea is already, predictably, provoking both anger and skepticism in much of the Muslim world.

Varga Porattam (Tamil Political Monthly)

House No. - 43/21, Ponmana Chemmal Street, MGR Nagar
Chennai - 600 078

Marxwadi-Leninwadi (kannada Monthly)

No. - 21, 1st Main, 2nd Cross, Hanumanathpuram,
Shrirampuram, Banglore, Karnataka - 560021

Red Star (Punjabi Bi- Monthly)

C/o - Com. Ramesh Gautam
House No. - 5452; Street No. - 13; Basant Nagar
New Shimala Puri; Ludhiana (Punjab)

Sakhav Organ of Kerala State Committee of CPI(ML)

Sakhav”, Hashmi Lane, Pachalam PO, Kochi - 12, Kerala

We might ask ourselves how we would be reacting if Iraqi commandos landed at George W. Bush's compound, assassinated him, and dumped his body in the Atlantic. Uncontroversially, his crimes vastly exceed bin Laden's, and he is not a “suspect” but uncontroversially the “decider” who gave the orders to commit the “supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole” (quoting the Nuremberg Tribunal) for which Nazi criminals were hanged: the hundreds of thousands of deaths, millions of refugees, destruction of much of the country, the bitter sectarian conflict that has now spread to the rest of the region.

There's more to say about [Cuban airline bomber Orlando] Bosch, who just died peacefully in Florida, including reference to the “Bush doctrine” that societies that harbor terrorists are as guilty as the terrorists themselves and should be treated accordingly. No one seemed to notice that Bush was calling for invasion and destruction of the US and murder of its criminal president.

Same with the name, Operation Geronimo. The imperial mentality is so profound, throughout western society, that no one can perceive that they are glorifying bin Laden by identifying him with courageous resistance against genocidal invaders. It's like naming our murder weapons after victims of our crimes: Apache, Tomahawk... It's as if the Luftwaffe were to call its fighter planes “Jew” and “Gypsy.”

There is much more to say, but even the most obvious and elementary facts should provide us with a good deal to think about. ●

Noam Chomsky
Source: *Guernica*

OBAMA, OSAMA AND POLITICS OF OIL HUNGER

Ram Puniyani

THE military operation (May 2nd 2011) which killed Osama bin Laden has raised many questions related to the deeper truths of the phenomenon of Al Qaeda, Terrorism and role of US in the region. What is obvious is that US in a neat military operation violated the air space of Pakistan; with the help of highly trained commandoes killed Osama bin Laden, the most dreaded name in the annals of terrorism, the chief of Al Qaeda. Barrack Husain Obama is in the seventh heaven for achieving a feat which US intelligence claims it was trying from many years and finally has succeeded. Obama has all the reasons to be happy as now after garnering the Noble Price for Peace he has shaped himself as the one who looks 'strong' and can annihilate the 'enemies'. It should surely improve his electoral ratings.

Pakistan authorities have been caught in a strange situation. They have been claiming that Osama is not living in Pakistan; there are no terrorists in Pakistan etc. In this backdrop, lo and behold, Osama is found at the walking distance of the famous military academy of Pakistan. Pakistan as a state has been humiliated by the mighty US. US violated Pakistan's sovereignty. US did not inform Pakistan about the military operation which it undertook on Pakistan's land. On the top of that US is refusing to apologize for this violation of Pakistan's air space, for using its military in another country. Now fears are rife that US may do similar things to wipe out Pakistan's nuclear arsenal. Due to Pakistan's lie about Osama's living in Pakistan, there are voices calling for declaring Pakistan as a terrorist state. Indian army Chief is telling loud and clear that Indian armed forces are also competent to undertake such an operation.

In the whole spectacle created

around the death of Osama bin Laden, some deeper truth is being further hidden from the public eye. The fact that truth is a multilayered phenomenon is being ignored and the whole game of United States in first helping the creation of Al Qaeda, supporting Osama bin Laden with money and armaments to join the anti Russian forces is practically being pushed under the carpet. While Pakistan has to take the blame for 'housing' Osama, the deeper fact is that Pakistan army and ISI had mostly been hands in glove with the US policies for control over the oil wealth of the region.

Just a few decades ago, during cold war, Communism was projected as the enemy No One by United States and its minions. US policies aimed at conquering the World economically, politically and also militarily where possible. Socialist block was a big obstacle for US ambition. Around this time Russian army occupies Afghanistan, and supports Afghan Communist regimes' efforts to bring in land reforms. Russian move brings in a reaction in the form of US promoting a radical version of Islam. That was incidentally also the time when the US army was demoralized due to its defeat at the hands of Vietnamese people struggling to establish their own nationalism. To counter the Soviet presence in the area, US played a clever political trick. It resorted to encouraging and supporting the militant version of Islam. US-CIA helped set up Madrassas in Pakistan through the ISI. These Madrassas distorted the Islamic words Jihad and Kafir. A syllabus was developed in Washington to brainwash the Asian Muslim youth on to the path of terrorism. Osama, a Saudi Arabian Civil engineer was supported to take the lead of Al Qaeda and rest is by now too well known.

While we know the doings of Al Qaeda, its terror acts in the region, Pakistan, India both, not much is thought of the fact that at a time it was US and its alliance with Pakistan army and ISI that the cancerous seeds of this terrorist organization were sowed. An arrangement was struck whereby weapons were brought in the ships, which were not to be checked at the ports, and straight given to the Al Qaeda, which was in the good books of US at that time. One recalls an interesting statement by the one of the previous US Presidents, Ronald Reagan. While introducing the elements from Al Qaeda, who were on a visit to the White house in 1985, Regan told the puzzled media persons that the strange looking persons; gentlemen "... are the moral equivalents of America's founding fathers." (Ronald Regan while introducing the Mujahedeen leaders to media on the White house lawns. (1985). It was a time when these characters were fighting the US war in Afghanistan, the US war for balance of power and for the hegemony in the oil rich area.

After the gulf war 1991, in which Iraq was cornered by US, and after many other Muslim countries were mauled by US, the Al Qaeda outfits turned against its own creator, the United States. They started calling it

“The Great Satan” and poured venom against the US. Meanwhile Pakistan was under the grip of military dictatorship of different Generals, who were thick as thieves with the Maulanas and were constantly being guided by US through its Ambassador based in Pakistan. Pakistan Military and ISI, for a price, played the role of an assistant cum errand boy for the US policies in the area. The situation starting changing after 9/11, when the World Trade Center was attacked and nearly 3000 people from different countries and belonging to many religions were killed. After this US media manufactured a new word in the dictionary of terrorism. US media linked Islam with terrorism and word Islamic-Terrorism was coined which became the buzz word picked by the media all over the World. With this came the theory of ‘Clash of Civilizations’, the guiding principle of US foreign policy.

This theory in nutshell stated that the ‘backward Islamic civilization’ is out to attack the advanced Western Civilization. Gorge W. Bush used the word Crusade as his cover for attacking Afghanistan and outlined this thesis of Clash of Civilization in simple words, “Americans are asking: why do they hate us? They hate our freedoms-our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.” (George W. Bush, in his speech in US Congress in the aftermath of 9/11, 2001)

This thesis demonized the Muslims of the World to no end. With the efforts for democratic revolutions in Tunisia, Egypt and other Arab countries, many a biases created deliberately against Islam and Muslims are collapsing. US now wants to change the slogan which can continue its project to hegemonize the World. ‘Exporting Democracy’ may be one such slogan, which will give the legitimacy to its global military domination. Pakistan military regime which served the US interests so

compliantly for so many years has been partly overtaken by civilian Government in Pakistan, which in turn is trying to bring semblance of democracy, trying to release the Pakistani society from the shackles of Military-Mullah complex. This is coinciding with the change in US policy. Now probably US no longer needs the services of Pakistan Military ISI, so an open criticism of Pakistan after promoting it for decades. Pakistan leadership needs to introspect about the future of the people, as to how to escape the vice like grip of US domination and develop the nation in alliance with regional forces. US-Pakistan relations should be a lesson to others also. How US is capable of using the regimes and then abandoning them after depleting them of their self respect, is abundantly clear in this story. Other nations trying to dine in White House need a relook at the suicidal path being adopted by them. ●

OPPOSE RISE IN PETROL PRICES

The massive, biggest-ever rise in petrol prices by the Central Government under the leadership of the Congress is a massive blow to the common people. The price of petrol being raised by Rs. 5 per litre is only the beginning. The Central Government has threatened to raise the price of diesel, kerosene and cooking gas also soon. The rise in fuel prices will unleash another wave of unbridled inflation. These price rises will reflect in the prices of all essential goods and commodities. At a time when the common man is being buffeted by massive food prices and unprecedented price rise on all fronts, this price rise is a body blow which is made all the more grievous due to the fact that it displays a belittling of the trust reposed in the government.

The price rise comes at a time when the global oil prices are, in fact, declining, from the high that they had reached at the beginning of May 2011. It is clear that the Government did not want to change the oil prices during the elections and therefore chose the very day after the declaration of results for announcing the price rise.

The argument that this price rise is not a making of the Government but is the independent policy of the oil PSUs

also does not hold water for this very reason. The oil companies did not have any reason to wait till the elections were over. The argument that the prices have to rise to become in tune with international prices is also fallacious. A rough analysis shows that the cost of petrol, including refining costs, at international prices is around Rs. 34 per litre. However, it is taxes and duties that are raising the prices to such high levels. In any case, we have never seen the government reduce the price of fuel when international oil prices fall.

In any case, such arguments miss the point that the basic flaw lies in allowing fuel prices to be dictated by the vagaries of the international market, especially when we are making no efforts to develop alternate sources of energy like solar and wind energy. Fuel, being a basic necessity for life in this country, it has to be protected from the spikes in international oil prices and for this, we have to return to a regime of regulated oil prices.

We call upon the people to rise up and take to the streets to protest against this price rise. ●

14th May 2011

CC, CPI (ML)

THE assassination of bin Laden has been celebrated as a great strategic victory by the White House, the European capitals and all the major mass media outlets throughout the world. The killing has served as a major propaganda tool to enhance the standing of the US military in the eyes of the domestic public and to serve as a warning to overseas adversaries.

Contrary to this immense propaganda campaign and despite whatever *symbolic* value the killing may have in the eyes of his executioners, there is no evidence that the death will have any impact on the deteriorating military and political position of the US in South Asia, the Middle East, North Africa or elsewhere.

Bin Laden and Al Qaeda

Even in terms of weakening, let alone defeating Al Qaeda, the killing will have minimal effect. Al Qaeda is a highly *decentralized* organization, a loose collection of groups distributed throughout the conflict zones, each with its own leaders, programs, tactics and strategies. Al Qaeda is not a centralized international organization dependent on a 'central command' directed by a single person: bin Laden was an ideological symbol more than an operative leader directing operations. His death will merely lead to a new leader and will have zero impact on the rest of the loosely associated global network of groups which call themselves Al Qaeda. Hence, whatever actions and activities taken in the past will continue into the future.

Bin Laden and the Afghan Resistance

The killing of bin Laden will have the most minimum impact in Afghanistan, for the obvious reason that the major forces

ASSASSINATION OF BIN LADEN: ITS USE AND ABUSE

James Petras

carrying out the armed resistance are the Taliban and various other independent nationalist movements. The Taliban is totally *independent* of Al Qaeda in its origins, structure, leadership, tactics, strategy and social composition. Moreover, the Taliban is a mass organization with roots and sympathizers throughout the country. It has tens of thousands of trained Afghans fighters; it has deeply penetrated the Afghani government and military and has recently announced (May 1, 2011) a major 'spring offensive'. The Taliban is overwhelmingly 'national' in its composition, leadership and ideology; while Al Qaeda is 'international' (Arab) in its membership and leadership. The Taliban may have tolerated or even in certain circumstances tactically collaborated with Al Qaeda, but at no point is there any evidence that they took orders from bin Laden. The overwhelming majority of US and NATO casualties in Afghanistan were inflicted by the Taliban. The major bases of operation and support in Pakistan are linked to the Taliban. In summary the killing of Osama bin Laden will have zero impact on the correlation of forces in Afghanistan; it will have zero impact on the capacity of the Taliban to carry-out its prolonged war against the US occupation and inflict dozens of casualties each week.

Bin Laden and the Mass Arab Revolts

From Tunisia to the Gulf States, mass popular revolts have either overthrown US collaborator regimes or are on the verge of doing so. Al Qaeda had played a *minor* role, except perhaps among the Libyan "rebels". In Egypt and Tunisia, the mass movements embracing a wide gamut of secular students, trade unions and civic groups and moderate Islamic movements have dominated the uprisings. Al Qaeda is a marginal factor and bin Laden is a very marginal figure, where he is not openly rejected. The killing of bin Laden will not have any impact on the rising anti-imperialist sentiments which inform these mass movements. Some commentators even suggest that the killing will weaken White House propaganda efforts to justify US military operations under the pretext of "anti-terrorist" activities.

Bin Laden and Iraq/Iran

The major opposition to the US in Iraq is the Shia majority, minority Sunnis and ex-Bathists. Al Qaeda's terrorist actions have played a minor role and do not resonate with the mass of Iraqis demanding a US withdrawal. The major religious based mass anti-occupation movements have their own leaders and militias and community bases; none accept Al Qaeda leadership or even collaboration. The US withdrawal is a response to mass pressure from below, it is not a result of civilian deaths from the occasional Al Qaeda "suicide bombers". Clearly the retreat of the US from Iraq will not be affected by the killing of bin Laden; nor will the transition be affected by his local followers.

Bin Laden and Iran

The Iranian Islamic regime was a mortal enemy of Al Qaeda, jailing suspects and early in the Afghan war (2001-2003) collaborating with the US in its pursuit of its followers. Both the political opposition, secular and religious, were hostile to Al Qaeda. As a result, bin Laden had very little organized influence, even as he may have had a mass appeal as a symbol of armed resistance to the US: "The enemy of our enemy is our friend". The killing of bin Laden will not have any impact on Iran which has its own icon "Khomeini"; its own brand of Islamic nationalism and is much more engaged in supporting Syria, Hezbollah and Hamas. The US will not gain the least advantage in its efforts to undermine or destroy its Iranian adversaries.

The Significance of the bin Laden Assassination

Clearly the killing of bin Laden has absolutely no strategic or tactical importance in the major theaters of war and political revolt in the Arab world.

The major significance of the killing is in the context of the strategic military and political defeats suffered by the US, especially most recently in Afghanistan. On April 27, 2011, nine senior US military officers were assassinated by a "trusted" Afghan fighter pilot in the high security Kabul airport. Four majors, two captains and two lieutenant colonials were killed in the single biggest killing of high US military officials in the 20th and 21st century wars. Several facts mark this out as a strategically important event. It took place in a high security installation, suggesting that *no place* in Afghanistan is safe from deadly armed attacks by the Taliban or the armed resistance. Secondly, all US military, no matter how high their rank, are vulnerable to deadly attack. Thirdly, no US trained Afghan military official or soldier can be considered "loyal" - even those most closely in collaboration can and will turn their guns on their "mentors".

If the US cannot protect its senior officers in its highest security compounds, how can it claim to have "secured" any of the territory outside - namely the cities, towns and villages? Two weeks earlier, with the collaboration of jail officials, almost 500 jailed Taliban fighters and leaders

escaped via a 300 meter tunnel to a dozen waiting trucks. Only two years earlier 900 prisoners also escaped. In its aftermath the US insisted on the appointment of "highly screened" loyalist collaborators as heads and directors of security and prisons, to no avail.

The overwhelming evidence shows that the US war effort is failing to create an effective puppet regime in Afghanistan. The Taliban is slowly but surely eroding US influence. In the face of major strategic losses, as evident in the astonishing assassination of top military officials, Obama had to mount a political spectacle - a "military success story" - the killing of unarmed bin Laden, to buoy the spirits of the American public, military and its NATO followers. Every popular uprising against US puppets in North Africa and the Middle East is a political *defeat*; the enduring regime in Iran is a defeat for the US - Israel bellicose efforts for regime change; even Gadhaffi's resistance is a defeat for the believers in instant victories. So Obama and his mass media acolytes have to mega magnify the killing of an isolated, political leader of a loose association of marginal terrorists as a world shattering, game turning event. When in fact, the losses and defeats accumulate every day before, during and after the assassination.

The Taliban didn't even blink - their 'spring offensive' marches on; US military officials are wary of any encounters with any 'loyal' Afghan collaborators. Egypt rejects US-Israeli politics toward the unity of Palestinians; the revolts in the Gulf continue. The only stalemate - not victory - that Washington can celebrate - including the killing of Gadhaffi's grandchildren - is in Libya where, allied with Al Qaeda, in Benghazi, the war continues. ●

The Marxist Leninist

[Theoretical Organ of CPIML]

Issue 8

April 2011

1. On the Development of the Productive Forces and the Class Relations in the Soviet Union
2. Some Facts about Class Relations in Soviet Union After Second World War and Role of Stalin
3. About Che Guevara's Article: 'Socialism and the New Man in Cuba'
4. Where Does the Crisis of Capitalism?

Single Copy : Rs 25

Yearly Subscription : Rs 100

Address: C-141, Sainik Nagar, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi - 110059

WE ARE presently witnessing an historical moment. On March 11th a catastrophic nuclear accident took place in Japan in connection with a severe earthquake and a tsunami. It is still not clear what effects this accident will have, whether a meltdown can be prevented and what consequences this will have for Japan which is so densely populated. However, one thing is already clear: nuclear energy has once again proven to be an uncontrollable technology at the cost of the environment and human beings. In our ICOR resolution we therefore immediately demanded an active international resistance front for the immediate shutdown of all nuclear power plants worldwide.

On March 19th NATO airplanes began their aggression against Libya. Shortly before by devious means they had obtained a UN mandate under the pretext of protecting the civilian population from Qaddafi's terror. In the meantime it is becoming clear that this is all about the redivision of spheres of influence in Libya. Strong protests of the Shanghai Group against the NATO show an intensification of the inter-imperialist contradictions and the general threat of war. The starting point of this development is an intensification of the general proneness to crisis of the imperialist world system through the world economic and financial crisis since 2008. For three months a democratic movement of uprisings is spreading like a wildfire through all the Arabian countries of Northern Africa and the Middle East.

The starting point of this revolutionary cross-border process of fermentation are undoubtedly the fierce mass struggles in Southern Europe in the second half of last year against the shifting of

ADVANCE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALIST WORLD SYSTEM AND ITS LACKEYS

[Extracts of the Inaugural Speech by Com. Stefen Engel
to the Asian Continental Conference of ICOR
Successfully Held on 2-3 April, 2011]

the burdens of the crisis, in which many working-class migrants from Northern Africa also participated and which led to the sparks of class struggle reaching the other side of the Mediterranean. In Greece the 11th general strike within one year took place a short while ago. General strikes also took place in Italy, Spain, Portugal and France. Struggles similar to uprisings also took place within the past weeks in Albania, Serbia and Croatia.

After the failure of international crisis management and the beginning of the euro-crisis, Southern Europe is marked by fierce class disputes against the shifting of the burdens of the crisis onto the backs of the masses.

In Northern Africa the struggle focuses on democratic rights and liberties. This beginning process of revolutionary ferment still has a mainly non-revolutionary character. However, a number of detested reactionary potentates already had to take their seats and leave the country. Everywhere governments are being reconstituted and exchanged, deep political crises and the breakdown of the old state power are characteristic.

Our unrestricted solidarity goes to the liberation struggle of the masses. Therefore we reject with determination any attempt of the imperialists to interfere in Libya through military intervention under the pretext of supposed humanitarian aid.

The ICC immediately called up for worldwide protest with a declaration. The masses are often dissatisfied with simple solutions in which only certain persons are being exchanged. They can only organize their liberation by relying on their own strength with the support of international solidarity.

Especially in Tunisia, an intensive struggle is developing for smashing the entire power structure existing up till now. The awareness for the necessity of a **democratic revolution** is growing. The material basis for these struggles also lies in the massive price increases, continuing mass unemployment, especially among young people, widespread corruption, as well as in undemocratic political and social policies.

The people's movements have developed spontaneously and do not yet arise from a developed class consciousness and the necessity of overthrowing a system controlled by imperialism. But the developed mass struggle also allows political consciousness to mature more quickly, especially with regard to the influence of Marxist-Leninist or revolutionary parties and organizations.

Especially in Northern Africa, the working class actually plays an important and, in part, a leading role, but it is not yet geared to its

revolutionary historical tasks. Because of division, disintegration and especially massive political suppression, the parties could only play their role among the broad masses to a limited extent.

The significance of the ICOR starts from this weakness of the mass struggles, this contradiction between the objective and the subjective factor. In the meantime we have succeeded in taking up contact to revolutionary parties and groups in Northern Africa, especially in Tunisia, Egypt and Morocco.

Africa, but also the entire Arabian world is in movement. Although the struggles do not yet have an immediate revolutionary character, this explosive eruption of class contradictions shows the **potential of a revolutionary world crisis** which has developed in connection with the world economic and financial crisis. It becomes clear that such developments cannot remain limited to the national level, but instead immediately take on a **cross-border character**.

This is the starting point for the tremendous significance of the ICOR, which must promote and organize the mutual process of coordination and revolutionization through the coordination and cooperation of revolutionary parties and organizations.

With the reorganization of international production since the 1990s, the general proneness to crisis has become the general characteristic of the means of existence of imperialism. The continuing world economic and financial crisis, the international crisis management of the G20 which has been terminated and has also failed, but also the unforeseeable nuclear catastrophe in Japan have dramatically intensified this general proneness to crisis and made it directly visible for everyone. With the reactor catastrophe in Fukushima a crisis of nuclear energy has developed with a worldwide character. The world economic and financial crisis triggered the euro-crisis and intensified the tendency to state bankruptcy, especially of the financially weak and highly indebted countries. The recovery of the world economy in some countries is accompanied by an international structural crisis in which the traditional old national industries, especially in the neo-colonially dependent countries, are accompanied by the new construction of international integrated production systems and economic zones.

The democratic movement of uprisings in North Africa calls the power structures in North Africa and in the Middle East into question and intensifies the struggle for the re-division of the world among the imperialists, especially between the power blocks of the NATO and the Shanghai Alliance. The unbridled accelerated transition to the environmental crisis is becoming most clear in the approaching climate catastrophe. Politically, changes of government and governmental crisis like in Portugal are increasing. The debt crisis has international character and does not only affect the neocolonial countries, but also limits the maneuvering ability of most imperialist countries. The imperialist world system has also entered an ideological crisis of identity in the meantime. Increasing dissatisfaction is a worldwide phenomenon. The binding power of the imperialist world system is declining. In this situation it is not only important that we fight for the shutdown of all nuclear power plants and the immediate stop of all military attacks, but that we combine all of this with comprehensive political education work about the incapability of the imperialist world system and the necessity of a socialist alternative. Societal crises always include calling the society into question.

When this questioning takes on a universal character, the revolutionary working class and the broad masses of people also have to take consequences.

This is closely linked to the social, economic and political issues and demands of the workers and their families. The extreme increase in the level of exploitation of the workers in the factories has its basis in the same driving forces that underlie the advancing destruction of the environment and the war for the regions in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya which are rich in oil and other raw materials. And that is the battle for domination of the world market to realize maximum profits at any cost and on the backs of the working people and the natural environment.

The announcement of the destruction of 1200 jobs and open mass layoffs at Opel (GM) in Bochum/Germany is an unbelievable provocation of the Opel workers, who had gained a job guarantee until 2016 in struggle. Apparently the international monopolies now think that the time has come to intensify the shifting of the burdens of the crisis onto the backs of the workers after they could somewhat dampen the contradictions during the world economic crisis.

The founding of the ICOR certainly has an important significance which will manifest itself in practice only step by step. After the dissolution of the Communist International and also the Cominform, there was no international form of organization which dealt with the coordination of practical cooperation of revolutionary organizations and parties.

With the disappearance of revolutionary centers, many parties lost their point of orientation, they

became isolated. This was an important factor for the marginalization, but also the division among the international revolutionary and working-class movement in many countries.

Starting from the catastrophe of the revisionist degeneration at the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU, a process of decline, division and decomposition of the international revolutionary and working-class movement had begun which, for almost more than half a century, had made it tremendously difficult to conduct our revolutionary tasks in struggle appropriately. The revisionist camp, the destructive effects of modern revisionism, but also the division by liquidationism also played their role in keeping the work of the revolutionary parties and organizations in the defensive.

The founding of the ICOR sets a signal for a change in this international development.

It aims at focusing on joining and mutually strengthening forces,

at building up a revolutionary perspective in the struggle against reformism, revisionism and anarchism and showing the masses the revolutionary perspective which it so urgently needs. It is the positive response to the pitiful collapse of the revisionist block of the Soviet Union.

The founding of ICOR is one of the most important occurrences of today's time. This will surely first become generally clear at a later time.

With India we have an investment center of international finance capital in the framework of the reorganization of international production in which international super-monopolies have already developed in connection with imperialist tendencies. Countries like the so-called "tiger states" Thailand, South Korea, Malaysia have a developed industrial proletariat. Then we have countries like Afghanistan or Pakistan where in the struggle against imperialist aggression the conditions for an independent societal development first have to be created. But also a country like Nepal that has taken a first step for an independent construction with the overthrow of the King.

However, Asia is also a continent with decades of revolutionary traditions, with great experience in the anti-imperialist liberation struggle and in the people's war, with many and diverse struggles of the masses of the working class and peasants and different forms of organized cooperation. ●

Struggle against the imperialist world system!

Onward to socialism!

Let us fulfill the spirit of the ICOR!

Long live ICOR!

Workers of all countries, unite!

Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!

THE AFGHANISTAN RESOLUTION PASSED IN THE CONTINENTAL CONFERENCES OF ASIA

THE AMERICAN and NATO states invaded and occupied Afghanistan militarily in October of 2001. To mask the imperialistic nature of their actions and objectives, they claimed that they came to rescue Afghanistan people from Taliban and Al-Qaida terrorism, rehabilitate Afghanistan, bring democracy, reach the Afghan women to their rights and safeguard human rights. This was a claim that was never put into practice. Instead, they have been busy killing civilians, making permanent military bases, constructing the roads between

their bases, activating tele-communication system in Afghanistan for their own transportation and intelligence purposes and reaching their geopolitical objectives.

Currently, the imperialist occupiers and Islamic fundamentalists (Taliban) are active in killing Afghan civilians on daily bases by bombardments and suicides attacks. Each side mentions the presence of the other side to justify their own action of killing civilians.

To stop this Aggression and export of terrorism to Afghanistan, we urge the withdrawal of US-NATO occupying forces to leave Afghanistan for ever and put an end to exporting terrorism to Afghanistan from out side. The ICOR member-organizations are obliged to fight for the withdrawal of the troupes of their countries occupying Afghanistan. ●

Long live free and independent Afghanistan!

Down with imperialist occupiers and their reactionary allies!

April 3rd, 2011

NEPAL : AN INTERVIEW WITH MEMBER OF CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

[Interview with Com. Sant Bahadur Nepali, Member of Constituent of Nepal, representing the Communist Party of Nepal (Mashal). Comrade Sant Bahadur is not one of the directly elected members of the Constituent Assembly. He is nominated by the Communist Party of Nepal (Mashal) which got three seats on the basis of proportional representation in respect of the overall votes cast in their favour. Comrade Sant Bahadur Nepali is from the Arghakhanchi District in the Lumbini State (Anchal) of Nepal. He is also a Politburo member of the Communist Party of Nepal (Mashal). The interview was conducted on 21st May 2011 in Kathmandu by a correspondent of Red Star]

RS : Com. Sant Bahadur, do you think that there is any possibility of the Constituent Assembly preparing the Constitution by 28th May 2011, when its term is set to expire?

SBN : No there is no possibility of this at all. Even the outline of the Constitution which was to have been made has not yet been made. The Constitution Drafting Committee which has been charged with making this outline has not met since about the last one month. In particular, there are 4 Assembly members who are on that committee who will not at all let the Committee function. Some of them belong to communal parties. These members insist that there should first be a declaration of an assurance that their demands will be fulfilled. This the Government is finding itself unable to do. The Government has signed 49 agreements with such communities and tribes. Among these is also the agreement made with representatives of the Madheshi people that there will be only two states under the new Constitution "One Madhesh and one Pradesh". All these agreements were made in an opportunist manner by the Government to stop the agitations at that time. However, the Government now finds itself unable to fulfill these agreements. For example, it had agreed to the slogan of "One Madhesh and one Pradesh". However, today, the general public opinion is opposed to this demand. How can the Government give this demand? The four Assembly members are thus obstructing the Drafting Committee and the whole Constituent Assembly. The question of the "restructuring of the State", the "state system" etc are other questions on which there is no consensus. Hence there is absolutely no chance that the Constitution can be prepared by the coming 28th May.

RS : When and in which year were these 49 agreement made to which you have referred?

SBN : The first such agreements were made with the Madheshi parties which were made in 2064 (Bikram Samwat = c.2007) in Chaitra (c.

April), when the elections were due. At that time parties from Madhesh launched an agitation calling for autonomy for Madhesh. After this agitation, Girijaprasad Koirala (Nepali Congress), Prachanda (Maoists) and Jhala Nath Khanal (CPN - UML, the current PM) sat with the agitators and agreed to the concept of one autonomous Madhesh and one Pradesh. Our party has opposed such opportunist agreements from the very beginning. They wanted the right to self-determination for Madhesh. Our party has been putting forward from the very beginning that the "right to self-determination" is not correct in the context of Nepal today. After the elections, many such community-based organisations like the Adivasi Janjati Mahasangh, the Newar Samuday, the Kirat Samuday, the Tharu Samuday, the Ray-limbu Samuday, started agitating. In Dalits there is a caste called Badi who are traditionally born into prostitution. They said that we don't want this tradition so they also put forward their demands. An agreement was made with them also. Thus many agreements were made with communal organisations. However, not a single of these agreements has as yet been fulfilled.

RS : Who are the four members of the CA who are obstructing its work and to which party do they belong?

SBN : The first is Vishwendra Paswan who belongs to the Dalit Janjati Party. They represent the OBCs. He is a representative and agent of the Dalai Lama. There is Shardul Mia Haq who comes from the Muslim community and who is an independent member. One is Rukmini Choudhary who is from the Tharu community and there is Mahananda from the Newar community who was elected as a

member of the Newar Rashtriya Ekta Party.

RS : *What are main questions facing the Constituent Assembly for preparing the Constitution in your opinion?*

SBN : There are many sub-committees formed by the Constituent Assembly. Ten had been formed earlier and one has been recently formed that is the Constitution Committee or the Drafting Committee. These ten sub-committees are supposed to get information on their particular subjects and prepare drafts on them to present to the Constituent Assembly. In these are the sub-committee on Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles, on Minorities and right to protection of language, on State restructuring, on Judiciary, etc. All of them are charged with preparing drafts.

These 10 sub-committees have pinpointed around 210 disputed questions and placed them before the Constituent Assembly. These 210 disputed questions were then sent to the Drafting Committee. The Drafting Committee has made a sub-committee called the Dispute Resolution Committee. This Dispute Resolution Committee has so far resolved about most of the disputed questions. Small disputes have been resolved.

However larger questions is going to be more difficult to solve since the sub-committee consists of people from different parties and each has its own policy. In any case, all these questions will have to come before the Constituent Assembly. About 90 such disputed questions, relating mainly to the question of restructuring of the state and the nature of state rule and about the system of elections are still outstanding. The most complicated disputes are over the question of restructuring of the state. The question is about how to

restructure the state. Some want a restructuring on a geographical basis. This will mean the creation of six or seven states, with only limited powers and with the main power lying with the centre. The Maoists and the communal parties are calling for a restructuring on the basis of communities. Linked to this, of course, is the question of the right to self-determination – including the right to secession. Whereas the Maoists had earlier demanded this in toto, they have now veered round to the view of accepting self-determination as defined in ILO resolution 169.

The other question relates to communal based “primary rights”. By “primary rights” what is demanded is that in any state of a particular community, the Chief Minister must belong to that community at least for two terms. Similarly for at least two terms, in all Constitutional posts, only persons from that community can be appointed. In our country, no community is a majority, all are minorities. In language, the Nepali language is spoken by a majority; in religion, Hindus are a majority but as communities, all are minorities. For instance the Newar community is around 6% of the total population. Even in the area they demand as the Newar state, they are only 34%. Hence the concept of “primary rights” would be undemocratic. The Limbus, for instance are 5%. Magars are around 7%. All these are not significant in the total population and even in their “own” states are only 28% or 30%. In no case do they come to more than 50%. This would therefore be like handing “primary rights” to a minority and will clearly discriminate against other communities. These 60% to 65% people will not accept “primary rights”.

We say that Nepal is a multi-lingual, multi-religious, multi-cultural nation. The Maoists are putting forward the thesis that Nepal is not a nation but is a multi-national country. They consider Tharus, Magars, Limbus, Newars, etc are nations. We feel that they have not reached the level of nations. At most they are ethnic groups. No doubt we have to make provisions for their progress like in education, employment, etc. Ethnic groups form at a particular stage of social development. We have to help them advance from that stage. To consider them as nations, and to give them state power as such is not a Marxist understanding. In some cases they are indigenous peoples, in some, ethnic groups. We have to give them social, economic and political rights to help their development.

On the other hand, the Madheshis say that Nepal has two nations – one is the Madhesh (the Terai or Himalayan foothills) and the other, the Mountainous (Pahadi) nation. Hence they demand that there should be only two states. They also demand autonomy for the Madhesh. These are the most complex questions regarding the restructuring of the state. It is very difficult to solve these problems. Connected to these is the question of division of natural resources – rivers, forests, tourist attractions, etc. Nepal has a lot of tourist attractions. All communities desire that they should get such tourist attractions. The sub-committee on restructuring has so far made 10 such community based states and four on the basis of history or even in the name of nature. There are many disputes over this division. Many communities are demanding their own states. Vishwendra Paswan is demanding a separate state for dalits – the “Sailes Rajya” – on the basis of a Dalit king who ruled at a certain period in history called “Sailes”. There is a community called “Helambu”. They are demanding that if communal states are made then they will not be included in the Tamang state but demand a separate state. Among the Kirats, there is a demand for a separate state for “Pollo-kirats”. In a small area there is community called the Kochila who have probably come from Bengal in the past. They

are demanding a separate state. The Lepchas want a separate state rather than be in the Limbu state. Some communities like the Keping who number only around 60000 are also demanding a separate state.

To avoid this problem, the Nepali Congress and the UML had demanded a "Restructuring Commission" to give a report to the sub-committee. This was even incorporated into the interim constitution. However, this Commission could never be appointed. The Congress is now reopening its demand for a Commission on this question. The basic question is that none of them want to enter into the question of state restructuring. Even among the Maoists there are many now who privately admit that the demand for communal states is not correct. However its too late now, the communisty based organisation have already organised and are not willing to give up their demands.

RS : *This is the main dispute in the Constituent Assembly. Then have the other questions - the real peoples questions like the question of education, the question of food, the question of medical treatment - been discussed and solved?*

SBN : There are no major disputes on these questions. This Constitution makes the right to education, to employment and to health as fundamental rights. Thus there are no major disputes on the demands of the common people. The rights to the local people to the natural resources - jal, jungle aur jamin - have been accepted in the Constitution. There are no disputes on this in the Constituent Assembly.

RS : *Let us take education - is there anything in the Constitution about private education? Or on health - how does the Constitution guarantee health to the citizens?*

SBN : When Education, Health and Employment are included in Fundamental Rights, then it is clear that it is the Government which will have to provide. There is no dispute on including this in the Constitution. However on the question of land, there are clearly two viewpoints. We and the Maoists say that land above the ceiling must be confiscated without compensation and redistributed to the landless and poor. However the Congress and UML say that the right to property is also a fundamental right and therefore landowners must be compensated at market rates for the excess land confiscated. This dispute is also yet to be resolved.

RS : *What about industry? Are any restrictions or regulations planned in respect of foreign capital? Has there been any discussion on this question in the Assembly?*

SBN : In respect of industry, the Constitution provides for a mixed economy. Even we accept a mixed economy. We can have a nationalised economy only when we reach socialism. In today's situation, we also favour a mixed economy and this has been provided for in the Constitution. However, I have to add that in practise, in the name of a mixed economy, the present Government is becoming too liberal and is allowing massive foreign investment. A bill has been tabled for the creation of Special Economic Zones. We are, of course, going to oppose it. This has not yet been debated. This Bill was tabled when Baburam Bhattarai of the Maoists was the Finance Minister. He tabled this Bill. However, after their Government fell, there have been no further steps on this Bill. Thus we can see that all three big parties, the Congress, the Maoists and the UML are in favour of a liberal economy. The present Finance Minister says that in this age of globalisation, there can be no stopping foreign capital and

investment. However, the Constitution provides for a mixed economy.

RS : *Has there been any discussion about which part of the economy will be in the private sector and which in the public sector?*

SBN : No there has not been much discussion on this question.

RS : *When the right to employment is being included in the fundametal rights does this not mean that the unemployed will be guaranteed with an unemployment living allowance?*

SBN : This is yet only a draft. This was a demand of the people which has been put in the Constitution. However, the real drafting is being elsewhere - like in the Nepal Law Society, which is an NGO. They have already drafted a Constitution and they are calling for the Assembly to adopt it. It can be that this demand for an unemployemet allowance will be accepted or may not. It may be that a particular right is accepted by the Assembly but becomes quite a different one after drafting. There is clearly foreign interference in the drafting. Many people believe that whatever we pass here, the final Constitution will come from Delhi. The Nepal Law Society used to type the drafts in English and then send them abroad and the finalised versions, after correction, would be sent back to them. Hence it is not at all clear whether even the Constitution which is desired by the Assembly will be the Constitution which is finally made.

RS : *You talked about the Nepal Law Society (Nepali Kanoon Samaj). Could you please elaborate?*

SBN : I have read in the magazine "Nepal Ek" (One Nepal) about this. The Nepal Law Society is an NGO of advocates. This NGO brought together lawyers of different parties. Here, in Nepal,

NGOs have spread even inside of parties. There were lawyers from the Maoists, from the Congress, from the UML, from the Madheshis, etc. They prepared a document called "Constitution of a Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal : 2067 (2010)." This document states that wherever they found disputes between different parties, they have tried to make a middle road by drafting. In the question of restructuring of the state, they have given their opinion but not drafted this part. Except for this they have drafted the whole constitution. The Government lawyers were also involved in this exercise. When they were not able to solve a dispute, they would send the question abroad and then, a corrected draft would be sent back to them. They have invited the Constituent Assembly to accept their Constitution. They say that this draft has been prepared to lighten the burden of the Assembly.

RS : According to you, what type of Constitution is being prepared?

SBN : The Maoists say they want a People's Democratic Constitution. Other parties opposed this. They say that the April movement of 2006 was a movement in which all parties took part. Hence the Constitution must also be a common document. It cannot accord with the line of any particular party. It is not possible to prepare a People's Democratic Constitution right now. The Nepali Congress and other parties are also part of the Assembly. We feel that the Constitution must be made on the basis of the minimum common understanding. Our party feels that after 240 years we have been able to overthrow and abolish the monarchy. If we keep fighting for a People's Democratic Constitution, then the monarchists can easily take advantage of the situation to reestablish the monarchy. Right now

we must finish monarchy and establish the Republic. Later, when monarchy is no longer a threat, then we can talk of a People's Democratic Constitution. This is a later struggle, maybe even an armed struggle. This dispute is also still to be solved. Of course, the Maoists have no clarity on their political line. On the one hand they talk of a People's Democratic Constitution and on the other of community based states and a mixed economy. They have become a part of the peace process and have even run the Government in this process. They are sitting on all committees. Still they keep giving threats to all other parties. There is a gap between their politics and their practise. If you want a People's Democratic Constitution, by all means, go ahead. There is no need to come into the peace process. For that you need to continue the armed struggle. They had come into the peace process only when they saw that there was no chance of winning power only by their earlier struggle. To come into the peace process and even to come into Government and then to speak of forming a People's Democratic Constitution is duplicity.

RS : What are the other disputes?

SBN : There is a question of whether Parliament will be unicameral or bicameral. This has been more or less resolved in respect of a bicameral legislature. Whether there should be a Presidential form of Government or a Westminster form of Government is also a dispute. Many UML members are insisting that the President should be directly elected. There is also a dispute between multi-party system or pluralistic system. The Nepali Congress and the UML talk of a pluralistic system, which they say is fitted to a democracy, whereas the Maoists talk of a multi-party system like that which existed in China. The question of language is still to be settled. Many of the parties of the Terai want Hindi to be made the mother tongue for the Terai. Others say that the real mother tongues are Maithili, Bhojpuri, Awadhi, etc. The Madheshis want Hindi to be the link language, whereas all others are for Nepali to be the link language. We have 93 languages in Nepal. This dispute has mostly been resolved but not all have still accepted it. There are also disputes with regard to citizenship – especially with regard to citizenship based on marriage. Our party, along with many others feels that we should not be liberal on the question of citizenship. There should be strict laws for granting citizenship, otherwise we will be inundated and will become minorities in our own land.

RS : Only two more question – one is whether there has been any discussion at all about the right to recall?

SBN : No. There is a provision for recall of the President by impeachment in Parliament with a 2/3 majority and there is a provision for the Prime Minister to be recalled by her / his own party but there is no provision for an MP to be recalled by her / his constituents or even by her / his party. This has not even been discussed in the Assembly.

RS : Since long communists have called for an end to the difference between the executive and the legislature – in the sense that even officials of the Government should be elected. Has this been at all discussed in the Constituent Assembly?

SBN : No there has been no such discussion in the Constituent Assembly at least till now.

RS : Thank you for your time and wish you the best of luck.

SBN : Thank you. ●

NEPAL : A REVOLUTION COMPROMISED

Sanjay Singhvi

THE SITUATION in Nepal today is heart rending. After almost fifty years, the only real revolution to have taken place in the world, after the Vietnamese defeated US imperialism, is being compromised.

After the massive April uprising of 2006, the elections to the Constituent Assembly were finally held in April 2008 and the Constituent Assembly thus elected, of 601 members, was charged with the preparation of a Constitution within two years, i.e. By 28th May 2010. The term of the Constituent Assembly has already been extended by one year but still even by 28th May 2011, it is certain that the Constitution will not be ready.

The Nepali Congress was threatening that it would not agree to a further extension of the Constituent Assembly and has finally agreed for a six months extension on the basis that the UCPN (Maoist) must complete the "peace process" in five days. This includes turning over their arms to the Nepal Army and reaching an agreement on the merging of the PLA into the Nepal Army.

In the period from 2006 till today, over five years since the monarchy has been overthrown, the Government in Nepal has changed many times. The whole atmosphere is of petty bickerings and of opportunist agreements. There were as many as 49 agreements (openly known about) that the main political parties (Maoists, Nepali Congress and United Marxist-Leninists) signed with many other smaller parties and formations for stopping agitations. Many of these agreements are mutually contradictory. Thus while one agreement that the restructuring of the state will be on the principle of "One Madhesh, one Pradesh" (ie only two states), many of the smaller communities have been promised states of their own. There is bickering about whether there should be a Presidential form of Government or not and what should be the criterion for citizenship.

When the Maoists entered the peace process with the 7 party alliance, they had agreed that they would give up their arms and integrate the PLA with the Nepali Army after the Nepali Congress and other parties agreed to the formation of a Republic. This still remains a bone of contention. At present the formula that has been worked out is that a separate directorate will be formed under the Nepali Army in which the PLA fighters will be recruited. At the same time, the number of such cadres to be recruited is still under dispute. The Congress is insisting on no more than 5000, whereas the Maoists are holding out for at least 10000. How much compensation is to be paid to those who are not recruited and disbanded is also still under dispute.

In the meanwhile, all the parties, including all the communist parties in the Constituent Assembly have agreed that the economy will be a mixed economy. Foreign investment is being allowed to pour into the country as if a dam has been breached. Today, Nepal's trade deficit is to the tune of Rs. 131 billion per year, which is more than the GDP of the country. On

the other hand the per capita GDP is around \$300 with over half the population living on less than \$1 per day. In short the economy and the life of the normal people is going to the dogs while the politicians, most of whom claim to be "communists" are fighting and bickering over so-called abstract "principles" like "self-determination" and "secession" in totally inapplicable contexts, while no real change is being debated whatsoever.

No doubt the situation in Nepal is unique. It has just got over 240 years of uninterrupted monarchy - probably one of the last countries in the world to overthrow a monarch with unlimited authority. It is in the process of forming a Constitution, a Republic and a Parliament. What should be the role of communists in such a situation?

The communists in Nepal seem to agree that the present situation, even into the foreseeable future is of a "bourgeois democratic republic". They do not want to build a real "People's Democratic Republic" though the Maoists have been fighting for giving it that name.

The Maoists have been talking in confused tongues. In the Constituent Assembly they insist that the type of Republic they desire is a "People's Democratic Republic" whereas in public, they have upheld the formation of a "Bourgeois Democratic Republic". The World Socialist Website in an article¹ has reported the following about the stand of the Maoists, gleaned from various newspaper reports of interviews given soon after the elections to the Constituent Assembly.

In an interview with the *Nepal Times*, Bhattarai explained: "When we say we want to end feudalism, we don't mean we want to end private

ownership. Our economic development is in our language [a] bourgeois democratic revolution, in other words, collectivisation, socialisation and nationalisation is not our current agenda... We would like to assure everyone that once the Maoists come [to power] the investment climate will be even more favourable. There shouldn't be any unnecessary misunderstanding about that."

Prachanda and Bhattarai met with the Federation of Nepal Chamber of Commerce and Industries for two hours to deliver a similar message. *"Within 10 years, let us work magic for economic revolution and mesmerise the whole world," Prachanda told business leaders. "We will allow private investment and also promote foreign investment. Don't lose confidence, we are not going to capture industries, but we need your cooperation to gain economic prosperity."*

The DNA India website reported: *"The interaction started as a tense affair, with businessmen complaining about Maoist atrocities, but ended with Prachanda delivering an unexpectedly 'capitalistic' speech that received repeated applause from the crowd... 'We are Maoists of the 21st century,' Prachanda declared, after several businessmen raised the grievances and concerns." Promising to crack down on corruption, he declared: "A strong hand is needed to build a strong nation."*

Prachanda and Bhattarai held up Malaysia and South Korea as examples of how they would encourage foreign investment. Asked about China, Bhattarai praised Mao's elimination of the "feudal system" that *"established a solid foundation for economic growth... Once we restructure the state and involve the private sector, it will be possible to achieve rapid economic growth."*

Undoubtedly, there is a mixed message being sent out here. But

this is nothing new. The Maoists have been floundering theoretically in this situation for the past few years. Red Star supported the decision of the Maoists to withdraw the people's war and to join the mass struggle on the basis of the demand for ending the unlimited monarchy and for formation of a Constituent Assembly. This was in keeping with the demand of the people at that time. At that time, Com. Azad of the CPI (Maoist) had criticised the Nepal Maoists for giving up the armed struggle. However, Red Star had said clearly that the people demand a Constituent Assembly and a Constitution. To continue the armed struggle at this time would be to go against the demands of the people. The CPN (Maoist) acted in a mature and correct manner in ending the armed struggle and in joining the popular process of formation of a Constituent Assembly and of drafting a Constitution. The people also recognised this maturity of the CPN (Maoist) and responded with a massive landslide victory for the Maoists in the elections to the Constituent Assembly.

The question however is, how should a Communist party react when such a Constituent Assembly is to be formed? Does one have to accept the *fait accompli* that a Constitution drafted along with such parties as the Nepali Congress and the UML is bound to be a "Bourgeois Democratic Constitution" ? Or should one, nevertheless raise all demands corresponding to a "People's Democratic Constitution"?

Having been permeated with the sectarian line of regarding "protracted people's war" as the only strategy applicable for revolution in Nepal, for many years, the CPN (Maoist) inevitably was used to think of the revolutionary struggle as being confined to the "armed struggle" of being confined to the battlefield. In this framework, the struggle within the Constituent Assembly becomes nothing more than a partial struggle for some petty manoeuvring. While the UML does not even see the need to have revolutionary change, even other revolutionary communist parties in Nepal are seeing the struggle in the Constituent Assembly in the same manner. They see the Constitution is a sort of "Geneva Convention" that has to be worked out by hostile parties to lay the rules for the future war, for People's Democracy and Socialism, which will only be fought after this "Geneva Convention" is first worked out. None of the parties think in terms of a fighting a revolutionary struggle even within Parliament or within the Constituent Assembly. In this "Geneva Convention" the Maoists are making compromise after compromise with the ruling class parties all in the name of destroying finally the monarchy. Even other revolutionary parties in Nepal are mute bystanders to such compromise and have even agreed to compromises on basic and fundamental questions like about whether to allow foreign investment, about how to work towards socialisation of industry, etc.

This question is not confronting the international communist movement for the first time. In July 1917, elections were declared for the Constituent Assembly in Russia. We must note that this was after the February revolution in Russia but before the October Revolution, during the time of the Kerensky Government. Certainly the Bolsheviks did not dream of capturing a majority in this election. They also knew that they would have to sit in Government along with the Mensheviks, Cadets and others. This election was also held immediately after ending centuries of Tsarist (monarchist) rule in Russia. There were hundreds of small groups representing different sections of the population springing up in this situation in Russia. In this situation, Stalin has written "The Constituent Assembly"². This was published 8 days after Lenin had put forward the

slogan "All Power to the Soviets!". In this article there is no ambiguity about the role of the revolutionary parties during such a Constituent Assembly. Stalin clearly states,

*"Developments themselves are working in this direction, step by step exposing the futility of the policy of compromise. The task of our Party workers is to intervene in the Constituent Assembly elections to the utmost for the purpose of disclosing the perniciousness of this policy, and thus help the poorer strata of the peasantry to rally around the urban proletariat"*³

Further, Stalin goes on to say,

We are opposed to agreement with the capitalists and landlords, because we know that the interests of the workers and peasants can only suffer from such agreement.

"But that does not mean that we are opposed to all agreements in general.

We are in favour of agreement with the non-party groups of propertyless peasants which life itself is impelling on to the path of revolutionary struggle against the landlords and capitalists.

*We are in favour of agreement with the non-party organizations of soldiers and sailors which are imbued with confidence, not in the rich but in the poor, not in the government of the bourgeoisie but in the people, and, above all, in the working class. To repel such groups and organizations because they cannot or do not want to merge with our Party would be unwise and harmful."*⁴

Finally he lays down the basic policy framework on which to make such agreements, which serves as the skeleton of the manifesto for the Constituent Assembly elections (and therefore the manifesto for the proposed Constitution to be formed) :

"The following is a model platform that might serve as a basis of agreement with such non-party organizations of peasants and soldiers:

1. *We are opposed to the landlords and capitalists and their "Party of Popular Freedom," because they, and they alone, are the chief enemies of the Russian people. No confidence in, and no support for, the rich and their government!*

2. *We give our confidence and support to the working class, the devoted champion of socialism; we are for alliance and agreement of the peasants, soldiers and sailors with the workers against the landlords and capitalists.*

3. *We are opposed to the war, for it is a war of conquest. Any talk about peace without annexations will remain empty prating so long as the war is waged on the basis of the secret treaties concluded by the tsar with the British and French capitalists.*

4. *We are in favour of the speediest ending of the war by means of a determined struggle of the peoples against their imperialist governments.*

5. *We are opposed to the anarchy in industry, which is being aggravated by the capitalists. We are in favour of workers' control over industry; we are in favour of industry being organized on democratic lines by the intervention of the workers themselves and of a government recognized by them.*

6. *We are in favour of well-organized exchange of products between town and country, so that the towns may be supplied with sufficient quantities of provisions and the rural districts with sugar, paraffin, footwear, textiles, hardware and other necessary goods.*

7. *We are in favour of all the land – appanage, state, crown, landlord,*

monastery and church – being transferred to the whole people without compensation.

8. *We are in favour of all unused land, arable and grazing, belonging to the landlords, being placed immediately at the disposal of democratically elected Peasant Committees.*

9. *We are in favour of all unused draft animals and farm implements now in the possession of landlords or in warehouses being placed immediately at the disposal of the Peasant Committees to be used for purposes of tillage, mowing, harvesting, etc.*

10. *We are in favour of all disabled soldiers, as well as widows and orphans, being paid allowances adequate to maintain a decent human existence.*

11. *We are in favour of a people's republic, without a standing army, bureaucracy, or police force.*

12. *In place of a standing army we demand a national guard with elected commanders.*

13. *In place of a non-accountable bureaucratic officialdom we demand that government servants be elected and subject to recall.*

14. *In place of a police exercising tutelage over the people we demand a militia chosen by election and subject to recall.*

15. *We are in favour of the annulment of the "orders" directed against the soldiers and sailors.*

16. *We are opposed to the disbanding of regiments and the incitement of soldier against soldier.*

17. *We are opposed to the persecution of the workers' and soldiers' press; we are opposed to restriction of free speech and assembly whether in the rear or at the front; we are opposed to arrests without trial; we are opposed to disarmament of the workers.*

18. We are opposed to the reintroduction of the death penalty.

19. We are in favour of all the nations of Russia being granted the right freely to arrange their lives in their own way, and of none of them being subjected to oppression.

20. Lastly, we are in favour of all power in the country being turned over to the revolutionary Soviets of Workers and Peasants, for only such power can lead the country out of the impasse into which it has been driven by the war, the economic disruption and the high cost of living, and by the capitalists and landlords, who are battenning on the people's need.

Such, in general, is the platform that might serve as a basis of agreement between our Party organizations and the non-party revolutionary groups of peasants and soldiers."

It can be seen that the Bolshevik certainly did not see the Constituent Assembly or the Constitution as a mere "Geneva Convention". They saw the Constituent Assembly as another arena in which to put forward the basic slogans of the revolution for "Bread, Land and Peace".

No doubt the situation in Nepal today is quite different, in many respects, from the situation in Russia in 1917. There can be no doubt that the answer will not be to lift the demands from Stalin's article and insinuate these demands word for word in Nepal of today. The point is that the Bolsheviks did not treat the Constituent Assembly or the Constitution as a "Geneva Convention". They put forward their basic demands for a "Workers Democratic Constitution" and were not willing to compromise on a "Bourgeois Democratic Constitution". The Bolsheviks were not guided by the need to reach a sufficient compromise so as to form a workable constitution. In fact, when, in response to their

slogan of "All Power to the Soviets", Soviet power was sufficiently well established and wide-spread, they called (successfully) for the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly.

The basic changes for the restructuring of the state that are put forward here are based upon the analysis of the Paris Commune as made by Marx and then by Lenin. They include formation of a state which is a state of the workers and poor peasants and landless labourers. They include the formation of committees of workers and peasants at local levels and transferring power to such committees (or soviets in Russia). They include laying the basis for an army that is not detached and separate from the working class but one which is in the control of the working class. They include doing away with the division between the executive and the legislative wings of the Government – this means that officials and bureaucrats, including judges, police and military commanders. They include fighting for the right to recall, including recall of all elected officials.

What is striking is that none of these basic principles is being even debated in the Constituent Assembly in Nepal where over two thirds of the members belong to Communist parties. It is not as if there is no awareness of these principles. In his article published in the organ of the then CPN (Maoist), "The Worker" in 2004, entitled "The Question of Building a New Type of State" Baburam Bhattarai has shown the deep understanding of the questions of "Dictatorship of the Proletariat", of "proletarian democracy" and of the type of state to be built, which was then prevalent in the CPN (Maoist). However, inspite of such a clear understanding, being the largest single party in the Constituent Assembly, the UCPN (Maoist) has not been able to bring the questions mentioned in this article to the fore in the debate in the CA. In fact, these questions are not being debated in the CA at all. There has been no debate on the right to recall, no debate on election of officials, police and army commanders. All parties within the Constituent Assembly have accepted the premiss of a "mixed economy" and all are eager to invite "foreign investment". Even the other revolutionary parties in Nepal have not been able to bring these questions to the fore.

There may be several explanations why the most important revolution since Vietnam has now reached such a sorry pass. However, it is not the task of this article to explore such explanations. What is necessary to be stated however, is that communists have to see the struggle inside the Constituent Assembly also as a part of class struggle. The task of communists in the Constituent Assembly must be, like the task of communists in any bourgeois parliament, to continue the class struggle there, by putting forward the principles of the new state and new society and by fighting for such principles. It does not matter if the communists cannot get majority support in Parliament or in such a Constituent Assembly. The revolution will come, not from within the Constituent Assembly but from outside it. It is only by fighting for such principles in the Constituent Assembly and by continuing this struggle even outside the Constituent Assembly that the cause of the revolution can be advanced. ●

(Footnotes)

- 1 <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2008/apr2008/nepa-a18.shtml> accessed on 25th May 2011
- 2 Stalin, *Collected Works*, Moscow 1953, Vol 3 pp.158-165
- 3 *Ibid* pg. 159
- 4 *Ibid* pg. 160

POST-ELECTION KERALA SITUATION : URGENT NEED OF REVOLUTIONARY ALTERNATIVE

PJ James

THE RECENT Assembly election results call for immediate ideological and political intervention on the part of revolutionary left, progressive and democratic forces. Except in Assam where the ruling Gogoi government itself has managed to return to power in the absence of even a bourgeois opposition there, in all other states, the ruling coalitions who were resolutely engaged in implementing the neoliberal policies were decisively defeated. Generally speaking, the election results reflect people's fury against the anti-people, imperialist globalization policies practiced by the respective ruling fronts in different states.

It was a widely accepted fact even much before the Assembly elections that the people would kick out the CPI(M) led Left Front Government in West Bengal which was in power for almost three-and-a-half decades. The pro-corporate policies including Singur and Nandigram arrogantly imposed in the name of development and industrialisation by the Budhadeb government on the people, by forcibly displacing the tillers of the soil and the open repudiation of socialist ideas by West Bengal CPI(M) leaders even while using the Communist Party's name and holding the Red Flag and their embrace of neoliberal globalization are obvious reasons for the rout they have experienced in the election. It was in the absence of a revolutionary people's alternative, that Mamta, who belongs to the grand Congress family, through her populist gimmicks, and of course with the backing of all anti-communist forces, could mobilise people's negative votes and assume power in the state. The situation in Tamil Nadu is also not basically different. There also the people were waiting for an early opportunity to remove the Karunanidhi government which was one among the most corrupt regimes in India. Here also, it was the absence of a people's alternative to corruption and neoliberal policies that enabled Jayalalitha's AIADMK, whose policies and program are not in any way different from that of DMK, to gather as much negative votes as possible and come to power in the state. The few seats won by Congress and CPI(M) respectively in West Bengal and Tamil Nadu by clinging to the apron strings of Mamta and Jayalalitha are not on account of former's credit but clearly go to the accounts of Trinamool and AIADMK.

More or less similar trends are visible in Kerala too, though the pattern is a bit different. As in the case of Bengal, it is the people's hatred against the CPI(M) led LDF that is reflected in the election results. Obviously, it is not a defeat or rejection of the Left or Marxist ideas by the people, but a defeat of the social democratic policies pursued by the pseudo Left in the garb of progressivism. As a result, the LDF's tally of seats in the Assembly declined from almost hundred in 2006 Assembly election with more than two-thirds majority to 68 in 2011, a clear rejection of mandate by the people. But the election results also pinpoint to the relative unwillingness

on the part of people to put the Congress led UDF in the place vacated by the LDF as the former could gather only 72 seats with a thin majority of just 2 seats in an Assembly of 140 members. This only shows the extreme rottenness to which the Congress has degenerated on account of its neoliberal, corrupt, pro-corporate policies such that unlike in the past, it has become basically incapable of even cornering the negative votes of the people in spite of the backing of all reactionary, communal and casteist forces. It also pinpoints to the crisis confronting the ruling system under neoliberalism on the one hand, and the urgent necessity of building up a revolutionary left political alternative to the Congress led UDF, CPI(M) led LDF and BJP which is struggling to open its account in the Legislative Assembly, at this crucial juncture in which the line of demarcation between these ruling sections is being eroded.

This was evident during the election campaign itself. The CPI(M) led LDF government after coming to power in 2006 effectively utilizing people's wrath against the UDF which had been ruling since 2001, was continuing all the neoliberal policies of the latter. People responded to this by defeating the CPI(M) and its allies during the parliament and local body elections. In the meanwhile, the Manmohan government has become more rotten through a whole set of corruption scandals including the bribing of MPs to enact the traitorous, American sponsored Nuclear Bill in parliament. However, the LDF on account of its own adherence to neoliberal policies, refrained from carrying out a political campaign in the Assembly election exposing the corporate loot and corruption engineered by UPA government at the behest of speculative financiers. Even regarding the crucial issue of

banning Endosulfan, the LDF was reluctant to expose the anti-national, pro-agribusiness policy of the Manmohan government and only after the elections on April 13 that the Achuthanadan government took up this as a campaign issue. The LDF's apolitical election campaign, in spite of the fast deteriorating credibility of the UPA government and Congress in particular, was one factor that enabled the degenerated UDF to gather the minimum seats required for government formation.

As far as the revolutionary left, progressive and democratic forces are concerned, their ideological political tasks are all the more significant in the post-election scenario. More importantly, the ignominious rout of the CPI(M) led LF after a span of 34 years and the ascendancy of reactionary Mamta in West Bengal, and the defeat of CPI(M) led LDF in Kerala have yielded all hues of anti-communist forces an opportunity to attack the Left. Here the task of genuine left and revolutionary forces is to vigorously continue with the ideological offensive against reactionary and neoliberal forces even while exposing the pseudo left, including both the opportunists and anarchists. At the same time, they should take initiative for building up the broadest possible unity of working people against the new wave of neoliberal policies emanating from both the central and state governments. For, immediately after the elections results, the Manmohan government at the behest of private oil monopolies has raised petrol prices for the twelfth consecutive time since mid-2010 declaration of abolition of administered price mechanism in petroleum pricing and entrusting the same to market forces. Along with this, the Manmohan government has taken up policy

decisions for laying red carpet for corporatisation of agriculture led by agri-business, entry of foreign speculators in the financial sector including banking, insurance, pension and mutual funds, real estate development, corporate plunder of mining and natural resources through massive displacement of adivasis and peasantry and above all dumping obsolete nuclear plants selected centres all over the country.

In Kerala, immediately after election results, the chief minister designate and the Pradesh Congress president have unequivocally declared that they will go for an all out offensive to attract foreign and private capital to all sectors of Kerala where there are scope for plunder. It is declared that all infrastructure projects including, roads, metros, etc. will be undertaken on public-private-participation (a euphemism for privatization under neoliberalism) basis and the entire BOT and real estate lobbies are very much enthused. Land mafia, forest mafia, contractor mafia, road mafia, education mafia, and so on are in frenzied mood. On the very same day of oath-taking by the new chief minister Oommen Chandy, the education mafia including communal and casteist forces who control almost 80 percent of higher and professional education in Kerala has openly declared their unhindered freedom in respect of self-financing colleges. The UDF and reactionary forces in connivance with them are making this neoliberal offensive fully knowing that the CPI(M) led LDF will remain as mute spectators and will not obstruct in fulfilling the unfinished tasks left by the latter.

The CPI (ML) Kerala State Committee in its election manifesto has clearly stated that in the given situation, unless a revolutionary alternative is emerged, the post-election situation will be one of unhindered neocolonization, as within the system no other alternative is there. Over the years, due to the neocolonial policies consistently pursued by both the Congress led UDF and the CPI(M) led LDF, who have been ruling the State for almost five decades in alternate terms, Kerala has already become a 'show case' of neocolonialism. Unless challenged and resisted by revolutionary left and democratic forces, the state will move towards hitherto unknown levels of decay and degeneration whose characteristics are stagnation in productive sectors including agriculture and industry, massive unemployment and underemployment, ballooning of speculative and money-spinning sectors, devastation of the oppressed including adivasis, dalits and women and an unprecedented cultural degeneration. Therefore, it is high time on the part of genuine left, progressive and democratic forces to put forward a revolutionary people's alternative and organizing the broad sections of the people on the basis of an ideological political line capable of challenging the forces aligned to maintain the system. ●

From First to Ninth Congress *Nine Decades of the Communist Movement In India*

(In English and Hindi)

K.N. Ramachandran

Contribution : Rs. 25

**C-141, Sainik Nagar
New Delhi - 110059**

ON ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS IN WEST BENGAL

Alik Chakraborty

THE BOURGEOIS MEDIA are jubilantly celebrating the 'death of Marxism' in West Bengal. They are trying to portray the debacle of the CPIM-led Left Front in the Assembly elections as the death of Communism, Marxism-Leninism, etc. Francis Fukuyama wrote 'The End of History' after the collapse of Soviet social imperialism, hailing it as the collapse of the rule of the proletariat, socialism and communism. This same process is being repeated vis-à-vis the last Assembly elections in West Bengal.

But the people of West Bengal are well aware that this is a debacle not of communist ideology and politics, but the resounding defeat of the anti-people and reactionary role of the erstwhile Left Front government as was especially exposed from Singur down to Nandigram and finally Lalgarh. After Singur and Nandigram, people's support for the Left Front had been registering a sharp decline. The election results merely marked the culmination of this trend.

To be precise, the Trinamool-Congress alliance did not win the election – the CPI(M)-led Left Front lost it. In the 2006 assembly polls, the Left Front had got 49.7 per cent of the votes, while the TMC and Congress together got 41.2 per cent (though in the first-past-the-post system the Left Front ended up with 235 of the 294). In this year's election the Left Front got 41% and TMC-Congress alliance got 48% of the votes. In the period between 2006 and 2011, there was no reactionary wave unleashed by the Trinamool in Bengal but there was a series of brutal state repression set loose by the Left Front government. The swing in votes – from the Left Front to the TMC – was a direct fallout of this feature.

Gigantic scams, unprecedented price hike and all other anti-people steps of the Congress-led Central government could not swing the support of the people from the TMC to the Left Front, because the people first wanted a change at the state level. At the same time, the people also realized that the CPI(M)-led Left Front was just putting on a show of opposition against the scams and price hike etc. It was evident that the CPI(M) had no intention of initiating a mass movement against the disastrous policies of the Centre, rather it was busy trying to curry favour with the Congress so that Sonia Gandhi did not end up teaming up with Mamata Banerjee. But that initiative of the CPI(M) also resulted in failure as the Congress allied with the Trinamool on most unequal terms for the sake of ousting the so-called Lefts not just from Bengal but also from Indian polity.

For the vast masses of Bengal, a change in the state government looked likely to expand the scope of free speech and agitation. Over the last 34 years, the CPI(M) had earned for itself the notoriety of summarily silencing people's voices if it ran counter to the interest of the ruling class and the state. On many occasions, the Left Front government had cracked down on people's protests against Central government policies. To give a tiny example, the Left Front government consistently throttled the movement

of jute workers against the forced voluntary retirement scheme imposed by the Central government in the nationalized jute mills of Bengal. Finally, the movement lost due to overt and covert state repression. So, rightly or wrongly, the majority of the people felt that if they had to so much as protest effectively against government policies then they had to dislodge the Left Front from power. That type of people's intention is reflected in this election result. In this context, TMC got 181 seats, Congress 42 and CPI(M)-led Left Front only 62 seats.

To crush the Left Front the TMC under Mamata Banerjee resorted to some clever tactics. In the wake of the Singur movement, she succeeded in garnering the support of some leftist intellectuals. By speaking up for the rights of farmers and workers, by speaking of 'democracy', she succeeded in creating a pro-left, pro-people image and organized the vocal support of a large section of left and democratic-minded intellectuals.

On the other hand, she also gathered the reactionary sections around her, thus winning the confidence of both the people as well as the ruling class. This policy was, to some extent, the chief reason of her success. Secondly, Bengal had no political alternative to the Left Front other than the TMC, so naturally the people's wrath against Left Front went in favour of Ms Banerjee. The TMC was thus able to utilise the situation very

UTTARAN

[Bengali Political Monthly]

Sankar Das
257, Nandan Kanan South
Rahara
Kolkata
West Bengal - 700 118

cleverly. Both the propertied class as well as the toiling masses united against the Left Front government under the TMC's banner.

As Marx put it, "To decide once every few years which members of the ruling class is to repress and crush the people through parliament – this is the real essence of bourgeois parliamentarism, not only in parliamentary- constitutional monarchies, but also in the most democratic republics." Mamata Banerjee proved that she is a reliable representative of monopoly capital by joining the Central government and at the same time winning public sentiment. The CPI(M) too was trying its best to serve the ruling class but failed to retain the people's support. So Ms Banerjee was the automatic choice to rule this state. The ruling class and almost all the entire corporate media favoured her deliberately and extravagantly. Naturally, the ruling class favoured the direct rule of their representative (the rightwing TMC) instead of a camouflaged, middle-line, fragile representative like the CPI(M) and Left Front.

The most miserable aspect of this situation is that the revolutionary and left forces desperately failed to make a political consolidation in this election. Even a sizable political section was not consolidated under the banner of the revolutionary and struggling left forces. All of these forces together managed to get only 0.2% of the polled votes. This proves that they cannot make even a struggling consolidation of a small section of people. After 34 years, the Left Front departed but the revolutionary and left forces failed to make a significant appearance. Every struggling left and revolutionary force has to carry out serious introspection in order to find a way out of this politically marginal existence. ●

THE WRITER IN A NEO-COLONIAL STATE

Ngugi Wa Thiong

[Ngugi's essay "The Writer in a Neo-colonial State", first published in 1986 in a publication called "The Black Scholar", and subsequently as part of the 1993 book "Moving the Centre". Ngugi taught at Nairobi University and later in the USA. As much as he was a novelist, he was also an academic. In this essay Ngugi takes a long look back over the period from the end of the Second World War, and divides it roughly into three - the fifties, the sixties, and the seventies; liberation struggle; victory and independence; and neo-colonialist reaction. He considers the way that the literature affected these passages of history, and was affected by them – *Red Star*]

THE AFRICAN writer who emerged after the Second World War has gone through three decisive decades which also mark three nodal stages in his growth. He has gone, as it were, through three ages within only the last thirty years or so: the age of the anti-colonial struggle; the age of independence; and the age of neo-colonialism.

First was the fifties, the decade of the high noon of the African people's anti-colonial struggles for full independence. The decade was heralded, internationally, by the triumph of the Chinese Revolution in 1949 and by the independence of India in 1947. It was the decade of the Korean revolution, the Vietnamese defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu, the Cuban people's ouster of Batista, the stirrings of heroic independence and liberation movements in Asia, the Caribbean and Latin America. In Africa the decade saw the Nasserite national assertion in Egypt culminating in the triumphant nationalisation of the Suez canal, armed struggles by the Kenya Land and Freedom Army, Mau Mau, against British colonialism and by FLN against French colonialism in Algeria, as well as intensified resistance against the South African Apartheid regime, a resistance it responded to with the Sharpeville massacre. What marks the decade in the popular imagination, however, was the independence of Ghana in 1957 and of Nigeria in 1960 with the promise of more to follow. In Europe, the immediate post-war decades, particularly the fifties, saw consolidation of socialist gains in Eastern Europe and important social-democratic gains in the West. In the USA, the fifties saw an upsurge of civil rights struggles spearheaded by Afro-American people.

It was, in other words, the decade of tremendous anti-imperialist and anti-colonial revolutionary upheavals occasioned by the forcible intervention of the masses in history. It was a decade of hope, the people looking forward to a bright tomorrow in a new Africa finally freed from colonialism. Kwame Nkrumah was the single most important theoretician and spokesman of this decade. *Towards Colonial Freedom*: that was in fact the title of the book Kwame Nkrumah had published at the beginning of the fifties. How sweet it must have sounded in the ears of all those who dreamt about a new tomorrow! His Ghana became a revolutionary Mecca of the entire anti-colonial movement in Africa. Hutchinson, a South African

nationalist, captured Ghana's centrality to the era when he called his book – itself an account of his own life and escape from South Africa – simply, *Road to Ghana*. All the continent's nationalist roads of the fifties led to Kwame Nkrumah's Ghana. Everywhere on the continent, the former colonial slave was breaking his chains, and singing songs of hope for a more egalitarian society in its economic, political and cultural life and Nkrumah's Ghana seemed to hold the torch to that life!

The African writer we are talking about was born on the crest of the anti-colonial upheaval and worldwide revolutionary ferment. The anti-Imperialist energy and optimism of the masses found its way into the writing of the period. The very fact of his birth was itself evidence of the new assertive Africa. The writing itself, whether in poetry, drama or fiction, even where it was explanatory in intention, was assertive in tone. It was Africa explaining itself, speaking for itself and interpreting its past. It was an Africa rejecting the images of its past as drawn by the artists of imperialism. The writer even flaunted his right to use the language of the former colonial master any way he liked. No apologies. No begging. The Caliban of the colonial world had been given European languages and he was going to use them even to subvert the master.

There is a kind of self-assuredness, a confidence, if you like, in the scope and mastery of material in some of the best and most representative products of the period: Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*, Wole Soyinka's *A Dance of the Forests*, Camara Laye's *The African Child*, and Sembene Ousmane's *God's Bits of Wood*. The decade, in politics and in literature, was however best summed up in the very title of Peter Abraham's autobiography, *Tell Freedom*, while the optimism is all there in David Diop's poem 'Africa'. After evoking an Africa of freedom lost as well as the Africa of the current colonialism, he looks to the future with unqualified, total confidence:

Africa tell me Africa
Is this you this back that is bent
This back that breaks under the weight of humiliation
This back trembling with red scars
And saying yes to the whip under the midday sun
But a grave voice answers me
Impetuous son that tree young and strong
That tree there
In splendid loneliness amidst white and fading flowers
That is Africa your Africa
That grows again patiently obstinately
And its fruit gradually acquires
The bitter taste of liberty

The writer and his work were products of the African revolution even as the writer and the literature tried to understand, reflect, and interpret that revolution. The promptings of his imagination sprang from the fountain of the African anti-imperialist, anti-colonial movement of the forties and fifties. From every tongue came the same tune: Tell Freedom.

But very often the writer who sang 'Tell Freedom' in tune and time with the deepest aspirations of his society did not always understand the true dimensions of those aspirations, or rather he did not always adequately evaluate the real enemy of these aspirations. Imperialism was far too easily seen in terms of the skin pigmentation of the coloniser. It is not surprising of course that such an equation should have been made since racism

and the tight caste system in colonialism had ensured that social rewards and punishments were carefully structured in the mystique of colour. *Labour* was not just *labour* but *black labour*: *capital* was not just *capital* but *white-owned* capital. Exploitation and its necessary consequence, oppression, were black. The vocabulary by which the conflict between colonial labour and imperialist capital was perceived and ideologically fought out consisted of white and black images, sometimes freely interchangeable with the terms 'European' and 'African'. The sentence or phrase was '... when the whiteman came to Africa...' and not '... when the imperialist, or the colonialist, came to Africa...' or '... one day these whites will go...' and not '... one day imperialism, or these imperialists, will go...!' Except in a few cases, what was being celebrated in the writing was the departure of the whiteman with the implied hope that the incoming Blackman by virtue of his blackness would right the wrongs and heal the wounds of centuries of slavery and colonialism. Were there classes in Africa? No! cried the nationalist politician, and the writer seemed to echo him. The writer could not see the class forces born but stunted in a racially demarcated Africa.

As a result of this reductionism to the polarities of colour and race, the struggle of African people against European colonialism was seen in terms of a conflict of values between the African and the European ways of perceiving and reacting to reality. But which African values? Which European values? Which Black values? Which White values? The values of the European imperialist bourgeoisie and of the collaborationist African petty bourgeoisie? The values of the African peasant and those of the European peasant? An

undifferentiated uniformity of European, or white, values was posited against an equally undifferentiated uniformity of African, or black, values.

This uniformity of African values was often captured in the realm of political parlance by the grandiloquent phrase, African socialism. The phrase was to be given even greater intellectual sophistication by Julius Nyerere (whose personal integrity has never been in any doubt) when in his famous paper 'Ujamaa: the basis of African socialism' he defined socialism as an attitude of mind. A millionaire (while remaining a millionaire I presume) could be a socialist, and a worker (while remaining a worker) could be a capitalist. Socialism (and therefore its opposite, imperialist capitalism) was reduced to a matter of beliefs, moral absolutes, and not that of a historically changing economic, political and cultural practice. Values without the economic, political and cultural practice that gives rise to them even as they in turn reflect that practice were seen as racially inherent in a people.

In short the writer and the literature he produced did not often take and hence treat imperialism and the class forces it generated as an integrated economic, political and cultural system whose negation and the class struggles this generated had also to be an integrated economic, political and cultural system of its opposite: national independence, democracy and socialism.

And so the writer, armed with an inadequate grasp of the extent, the nature and the power of the enemy and of all the class forces at work could only be shocked by the broken promises as his society entered the second decade.

The beginning of the sixties saw an acceleration of the

independence movements. Tanzania, Uganda, Zaire, Kenya, Zambia, Malawi, Congo (Brazzaville), Senegal, Ivory Coast, Mali: country after country won the right to fly a national flag and to sing a national anthem. At the end of the sixties only a few smudges on the map represented old colonies. The OAU was the symbol of the new age, or rather it was the promise of greater unity to come. But if the sixties was the decade of African independence, it was also the decade when old style imperialism tried to halt the momentum of the anti-colonial struggles and the successes of the fifties. Old style imperialism tried to make a last stand. Thus Portuguese colonialism clung tenaciously to Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique. In Zimbabwe, Ian Smith and his Rhodesian Front, with the active overt and covert encouragement of the big imperialist bourgeoisie, tried to create a second South Africa by means of an American-sounding Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI). Internationally – that is, outside of Africa – this last stand of old style imperialism was represented by the USA in South Vietnam. But US domination of South Vietnam also represented new style imperialism; that is US-led imperialism ruling through puppet regimes. Thus in Vietnam lay a clue as to what was happening to the Africa of the sixties, happening that is, to its independence from classic colonialism. New style imperialism was dependent on the 'maturing' of a class of natives, already conceived and born by colonialism, whose positions and aspirations as a group were not in any fundamental conflict with the money-juggling classes, the financial gnomes of the real centres of power like Zurich, the City of London and Wall Street. There is a Kikuyu word, *Nyabaara*, derived from Kiswahili *Mnyapala* which adequately describes these mediators between the imperialist bourgeoisie and the mass of workers and peasants in the former colonies. George Lamming in his novel, *In the Castle of my Skin*, had called it an overseer class. The Boer racist South African regime, not to be outdone, was to caricature the new process when they too went ahead to create their own Bantustans. Bantustanism! How innovative the Boers are! But in a sense, how true!

To the majority of African people in the new states, independence did not bring about fundamental changes. It was independence with the ruler holding a begging bowl and the ruled holding a shrinking belly. It was independence with a question mark. The age of independence had produced a new class and a new leadership that was not very different from the old one. Black skins, white masks? White skins, black masks? In each of the African languages there was an attempt to explain the new phenomenon in terms of the 'White' and 'Black' symbols by which colonialism had been seen and fought out. But really, this was a new company, a company of African profiteers firmly deriving their character, power and inspiration from their guardianship of imperialist interests.

It was Frantz Fanon in his book *Les Damnés de la Terre*, first published in French in 1961 and later (1965) in English under the title *The Wretched of the Earth*, who prophetically summed up the character of this emergent phenomenon. The class that took over power after independence was an underdeveloped middle class which was not interested in putting the national economy on a new footing, but in becoming an intermediary between Western interests and the people, a handsomely paid business agent of the Western bourgeoisie:

"Before independence, the leader generally embodies the aspirations of the people for independence, political liberty and national dignity. But as soon as independence is declared, far from embodying in concrete

form the needs of the people in what touches bread, land and the restoration of the country to the sacred hands of the people, the leader will reveal his inner purpose: to become the general president of that company of profiteers impatient for their returns which constitutes the national bourgeoisie.”

I have always argued that literature written by Africans, and particularly literature of this period, cannot really be understood without a proper reading of the chapter ‘Pitfalls of National Consciousness’ in Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth*. The literature of this period was really a series of imaginative footnotes to Frantz Fanon.

The new regimes in the independent states increasingly came under pressure from external and internal sources. The external pressure came from the West who wanted these states to maintain their independence and non-alignment firmly on the side of Western economic and political interests. Where a regime showed a consistent desire to break away from the Western orbit, destabilisation through economic sabotage and political intrigue was set in motion. The US role in bringing down Lumumba and installing the Mobutu military regime in Zaire at the very beginning of the decade was a sign of things to come.

The internal pressure came from the people who soon saw that independence had brought no alleviation to their poverty and certainly no end to political repression. People saw in most of the new regimes dependence on foreigners, grand mismanagement and well-maintained police boots. To quote Fanon: ‘scandals are numerous, ministers grow rich, their wives doll themselves up, the members of Parliament feather their nests and there is not a soul down to the simple policeman or the customs officer who does not join in the great procession of corruption.’

Some military intervened either at the prompting of the West or in response to what they genuinely saw and felt as the moral decay. But they too did not know what else to do with the state except to run the status quo with the gun held at the ready – not against imperialism – but against the very people the army had ostensibly stepped in to save.

Thus the sixties, the age of independence, became the era of *coups d’état* whether Western-backed or in patriotic response to internal pressures. Zaire in 1960 and 1965; Nigeria and Ghana in 1966; Sierra Leone, Sudan, Mali, Uganda: all these and more fell to the armies and by 1970 virtually every independent state had experienced a measure of military coups or threat of coups. The result was often intra-class fratricide as in the case of Zaire and Nigeria but one that dragged the masses into meaningless deaths, starvation and stagnation. Wars initiated by Nyabaaras! The era of *coups d’état* also threw up two hideous monstrosities: Bokassa and Idi Amin, two initial darlings of the West, who were to make a total mockery of the notion of independence, but who also, in these very actions, made a truthful expression of that kind of independence. Hideous as they were, they were only symbols of all the broken promises of independence.

What was wrong with Africa? What had gone wrong? The mood of disillusionment engulfed the writer and the literature of the period. It was Chinua Achebe in *A Man of the People* who correctly reflected the conditions that bred coups and rumours of coups.

The fictional narrator captures in the image of a house the deliberate murder of democracy by the new leadership:

“We had all been in the rain together until yesterday. Then a handful of us – the smart and the lucky and hardly ever the best – had scrambled for the shelter our former rulers left, and had taken it over and barricaded themselves in. And from within they sought to persuade the rest through numerous loudspeakers, that the first phase of the struggle had been won and that the next phase – the extension of our house – was even more important and called for new and original tactics; is required that all argument should cease and the whole people speak with one voice and that any more dissent and argument outside the door of the shelter would subvert and break down the whole house.”

A Man of the People, coming out at about the same time as the first Nigerian military coup, had shown that a writer could be a prophet. But other writings – particularly Ayi Kwei Armah’s *The Beautiful Ones are Not Yet Born*, and Okot p’ Bitek’s *Song of Lawino* – were equally incisive in their horror at the moral decay of the new states. The writer responded to the decay by appealing to the conscience of the new class. If only they would listen! If only they would see the error of their ways! He pleaded, lamented, threatened, painted the picture of the disaster ahead, talked of a fire next time. He tried the corrective antidote of contemptuous laughter, ridicule, direct abuse with images of shit and urine, every filth imaginable. The writer often fell back upon the kind of revenge Marx once saw the progressive feudal aristocracy taking against the new bourgeoisie that was becoming the dominant class in nineteenth-century Europe. They, the aristocracy, ‘took their revenge by singing lampoons on their new master, and whispering in his ears sinister prophecies of coming catastrophe’.

In this way arose feudal

socialism; half lampoon; half echo of the past, half menace of the future; at times, by its bitter, witty and incisive criticism, striking the bourgeoisie to the very heart's core but always ludicrous in its effect, through total incapacity to comprehend the march of history.

The Communist Manifesto

Thus the writer in this period was still limited by his inadequate grasp of the full dimensions of what was really happening in the sixties: the international and national realignments of class forces and class alliances. What the writer often reacted to was the visible lack of moral fibre of the new leadership and not necessarily the structural basis of that lack of moral fibre. Sometimes the writer blamed the people – the recipient of crimes – as well as the perpetrators of the crimes against the people. At times the moral horror was couched in terms perilously close to blaming it all on the biological character of the people. Thus although the literature produced was incisive in its description, it was nevertheless characterised by a sense of despair. The writer in this period often retreated into individualism, cynicism, or into empty moral appeals for a change of heart.

It was the third period, the seventies, that was to reveal what really had been happening in the sixties: the transition of imperialism from the colonial to the neo-colonial age. On the international level, the US-engineered overthrow of the Allende regime in Chile showed the face of victorious neo-colonialism. The decade saw the clear ascendancy of US-dominated transnational financial and industrial monopolies in most of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This ascendancy was to be symbolised by the dominance of the IMF and the World Bank in the determination of the economies

and hence the politics of the affected countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The era saw the USA surround Africa with military bases or with some kind of direct US military presence all the way from Morocco via Diego Garcia to Kenya, Egypt and of course the Mediterranean Sea. The aims of the Rapid Deployment Forces formed in the same decade were unashamedly stated as interventionist in Third World affairs, i.e. in affairs of the neo-colonies. Indeed, the decade saw an increasing readiness of former colonial powers to enter Africa militarily without even a trace of shame. The increasingly open, naked financial, industrial (e.g. Free Trade Zones etc), military and political interference of Western interests in the affairs of African countries with the active co-operation of the ruling regimes in the same countries, showed quite clearly that the so-called independence had only opened each of the African countries to wider imperialist interests. Dependence abroad, repression at home, became the national motto.

But if the seventies revealed more clearly the neo-colonial character of the African countries, the seventies also saw very important and eye-opening gains by the anti-imperialist struggles. Internationally (outside Africa), the single most important event was the defeat of the USA in Vietnam. But there were other shattering blows against neo-colonialism: Nicaragua and Iran, for instance.

In Africa, the seventies saw a victorious resurgence of anti-imperialism. The armed struggles in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Zimbabwe had clearly gained from errors of the earlier anti-colonial movements in the fifties. They could see the enemy much more clearly and they could clearly analyse their struggles in terms that went beyond just the question of colour and race. Their enemy was imperialism and the classes that allied with imperialism. Within the independent African countries, *coups d'état* began to take on a more anti-imperialist and anti-neo-colonial character.

Although occurring in 1981 and 1983 respectively, Rawlings' coup in Ghana and Sankara's in Burkina Faso (previously Upper Volta) are the better examples of this tendency. But a more telling symbol was the emergence in the seventies of a people-based guerrilla movement fighting for a second independence. The armed liberation guerrilla movements in places like Uganda and Zaire may well come to stand to neo-colonialism what Kenya Land and Freedom Army and FLN in Algeria stood to colonialism in the fifties. The phenomenon of university-educated youth and secondary school graduates opting to join workers and peasants in the bush to fight on a clear programme of a national democratic revolution as a first and necessary stage for a socialist transformation is something new in the Africa of the seventies. Whatever their ultimate destiny, these post-colonial guerrilla movements certainly symbolise the convergence of the worker's hammer and the peasant's machete or jembe with the pen and the gun.

The awakening to the realities of imperialism was reflected in some very important theoretical political breakthroughs in the works of Amilcar Cabral, Walter Rodney, Samir Amin, Dan Nabudere, Bala Mohamed, Nzongola-Ntalaja and in many papers emanating from university centres in many parts of the continent. Imperialism was becoming a subject of serious and even passionate academic debate and scholarly dissertations. The Dar es Salaam debate, now published as *Debate on Class, State and Imperialism*, stands out. But other places like Ahmadu Bello University and Ife University in Nigeria, Nairobi University in Kenya, and the

Universities of Cape Coast and Ghana were emerging as centres of progressive thought; but even outside the university campuses, progressive debate was raging and it is not an accident that the *Journal of African Marxists* should emerge in the seventies.

Once again this new anti-imperialist resurgence was reflected in literature. For the writer from Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau his content and imagery were clearly derived from the active struggles of the people. Even in the countries that became independent in the fifties and the sixties, the writer started taking a more and more critical stand against the anti-national, anti-democratic, neo-colonial character of the ruling regimes. He began to connect these ills not just to the moral failings or otherwise of this or that ruler, but to the perpetuation of imperialist domination through the comprador ruling class in Africa.

The writer in the seventies gradually began to take imperialism seriously. He was also against the internal classes, those new companies of profiteers that allied with imperialism. But the writer tried to go beyond just explanation and condemnation. One can sense in some of the writing of this period an edging towards the people and a search for new directions. The writer in the seventies was coming face to face with neo-colonialism. He was really a writer in a neo-colonial state. Further he was beginning to take sides with the people in the class struggle in Africa.

The writer who edged towards the people was caught in various contradictions. Where, for instance, did he stand in relation to the neo-colonial state in which he was a citizen, and within which he was trying to function?

A neo-colonial regime is, by its very character, a repressive machine. Its very being, in its refusal to break with the international and national structures of exploitation, inequality and oppression, gradually isolates it from the people. Its real power base resides not in the people but in imperialism and in the police and the army. To maintain itself it shuts all venues of democratic expression. It, for instance, resorts to one-party rule, and since in effect the party is just a bureaucratic shell, this means resorting to one man rule, despotism à la Marquez's novel, *The Autumn of the Patriarch!* All democratic organisations are outlawed or else brought under the ruler, in which case they are emptied of any democratic life. Why then should the regime allow any democracy in the area of culture? Any democratic expression in the area of culture becomes a threat to such a regime's very peculiar brand of culture: the culture of silence and fear run and directed from police cells and torture chambers.

The Kenya that emerged from the seventies is a good illustration of the workings of a neo-colonial state. At the beginning of the decade Kenya was a fairly 'open society' in the sense that the Kenyans could still debate issues without fear of prison. But as the ruling party under Kenyatta, and later under Moi, continued cementing the neo-colonial links to the West, the Kenyan regime became more and more intolerant of any views that questioned neo-colonialism. In the fifties, Kenyans had fought to get rid of *all* foreign military presence from her soil. In 1980 the Kenyan authorities had given military base facilities to the USA. The matter was not even debated in Parliament. Kenyans learnt about it through debates in the US Congress. Now within the same decade which saw the Kenyan coast turned over for use by the US military machine, the Kenya regime had banned all centres of democratic debate. Even the university was not spared. University lecturers were imprisoned or detained without trial;

among them were writers like Al Amin Mazrui and Edward Oyugi.

Another lecturer, also a writer and Kenya's foremost national historian, Maina wa Kinyatti, has served a prison sentence in a maximum security prison for doing intensive work on Mau Mau. Maina wa Kinyatti was educated in Kenya and the United States of America. On returning to Kenya at the beginning of the seventies, he joined the History Department at Kenyatta University College. He became very concerned that ten years after the Kenya Land and Freedom Army had forced colonialism to retreat and allow Kenya a measure of self-rule and independence, no work had been done by Kenyans scholars on the actual history and literature of these who died that Kenya might be free. He set about collecting the songs and poems of the Mau Mau era, some of which he later edited into a book: *Thunder From the Mountain: Mau Mau Patriotic Songs*. He also started work on the whole anti-colonial resistance within the context of the Kenyan history of struggle from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries. The result? He languished in jail, going blind, for 6½ years until October 1989.

Over the same decade, the regime became very intolerant of theatre and any cultural expression that sided with the people. Kamiriithu Community Education and Cultural Centre's Open Air Theatre was razed to the ground. A number of plays were stopped. Kenyan writers like Micere Mugo, Ngugi wa Mirii, Kimani Gegeu, were forced into exile. In February 1985, the regime climaxed its decade of intolerance by bludgeoning 12 students to death, and 150 others into hospital; 14 went to jail for 6 months joining another 10 serving long jail terms of up to 10 years. Five others were tortured and subsequently sentenced from 6 to 12 months in

jail for holding an interdenominational prayer meeting in day time on an open university sports ground.

How does a writer function in such a society? He can of course adopt silence or self-censorship, in which case he ceases to be an effective writer. Or he can become a state functionary, an option some Kenyan writers have now embraced, and once again cease to be an effective writer of the people. Or he may risk jail or exile, in which case he is driven from the very sources of his inspiration. Write and risk damnation. Avoid damnation and cease to be a writer. That is the lot of the writer in the neo-colonial state.

There are other contradictions of a writer in a neo-colonial state. For whom does he write? For the people? But then what language does he use? It is a fact that the African Writers who emerged after the Second World War opted for European languages. All the major African writers wrote in English, French or Portuguese. But by and large, all the peasants and a majority of the workers – the masses – have their own languages.

Isn't the writer perpetuating, at the level of cultural practice, the very neo-colonialism he is condemning at the level of economic and political practice? For who a writer *writes* is a question which has not been satisfactorily resolved by the writers in a neo-colonial state. For the African writer, the language he has chosen already has chosen his audience.

Whatever the language the writer has opted for, what is his relationship with the content? Does he see reality in its unchangeingness or in its changeingness? To see reality in stagnation or in circles of the same movements is to succumb to

despair. And yet for him to depict reality in its revolutionary transformation from the standpoint of the people – the agents of change – is once again to risk damnation by the state. For a writer who is depicting reality in its revolutionary transformation is, in effect, telling the upholders of the status quo: even this too shall pass away.

I think I have said enough about the writer in the third period – the seventies – to show that his lot, particularly when he may want to edge towards the people, is not easy.

In the world, the struggle between democratic and socialist forces for life and human progress on the one hand, and the imperialist forces for reaction and death on the other is still going on and it is bound to become more fierce. Imperialism is still the enemy of human kind and any blow against imperialism whether in the Philippines, El Salvador, Chile, South Korea is clearly a blow for democracy and change. In Africa, the struggle of the Namibian people and of South African/Azanian people has intensified. And as the Zimbabwean, Angolan, and Mozambican struggles took the African revolution a stage further than where it had been left by the FLN and the Kenyan Land a Freedom Army in the fifties, in the same way the successful outcome of the Namibian and South African peoples' struggle will push the entire continent on to a new stage. In a special way, the liberation of South Africa is the key to the liberation of the entire continent from neo-colonialism.

Within the neo-colonial states, the anti-imperialist alliance of democratic forces will intensify the struggle against the rule of the alliance of the comprador class and imperialism. There will be more and more anti-imperialist coups of the Sankara type. There will be an increase in the Uganda type anti-neocolonial guerrilla movements. There will be greater and greater call and demand for a Pan-Africanism of the proletariat and the peasantry through their progressive democratic organisation. Each new stage in the struggle for real independence, democracy and socialism will have learnt from the errors of the previous attempts, successes and even failures. We shall see a further heightening of the war against neo-colonialism. For as in the days of colonialism, so now in the days of neo-colonialism, the African people are still struggling for a world in which they can control that which their collective sweat produces, a world in which they will control the economy, politics and culture to make their lives accord with where they want to go and who they want to be.

But as the struggle continues and intensifies, the lot of the writer in a neo-colonial state will become harder and not easier. His choice? It seems to me that the African writer now, the one who opts for becoming an integral part of the African revolution, has no choice but that of aligning himself with the people: their economic, political and cultural struggle for survival. In that situation, he will have to confront the languages spoken by the people in whose service he has put his pen. Such a writer will have to rediscover the real languages of struggle in the actions and speech of his people, learn from their great heritage of orature, and above all, learn from their great optimism and faith in the capacity of human beings to remake their world and renew themselves. He must be part of the song the people sing as once again they take up arms to smash the neo-colonial state to complete the anti-imperialist national democratic revolution they had started in the fifties, and even earlier. A people united can never be defeated and the writer must be part and parcel of that revolutionary unity for democracy, socialism and the liberation of the human spirit to become even more human. ●

KARNATAKA: STRUGGLE AGAINST IRON ORE MAFIA OF BELLARY-HOSPET

WITH the introduction of neo liberal policies under imperialist globalization at a frenzied pace from beginning of 1990s, one of the areas which attracted the mafias who wanted to get rich quick was the looting of the rich natural resources of the country for export. While old corporate houses like Tatas started turning in to this field using their access to a large number of mines in Jharkhand, new corporate houses like Ambanis, Essar, Jindal, Mithal etc also entered this field opening up new mining areas throwing out people inhabiting there and destroying the environment for earning fabulous wealth within short time. Besides these, local mafia gangs also entered this field and earned fabulous wealth in a short time using their wealth to buy those in power or themselves entering the political field. The Reddy group in Karnataka belongs to the last mentioned section.

Starting as local goons, their attention turning in to looting of the rich iron ore deposits in Bellary-Hospet area for export is only as old as the neo liberal regime in the country. This region has one of the richest iron ore, that is, iron ore with the richest iron content. Another advantage is that as all the hillocks are of iron ore it can be mined with the least expense. Besides, being a backward area, cheap labour is available aplenty. Reddy Brothers soon established their hegemony in iron ore mining from this area using the help of administration and police through heavy bribing and entered in to contracts with agents of Japanese and South Korean companies for exporting it from Kakinada and other ports in Eastern coast. As they started building their iron ore empire, they also indulged in state politics, first becoming a prop of Congress and then changing sides to BJP. It was not the Hindutua politics, but the economic clout of Reddy Brothers which assisted BJP in the last two assembly and Lok Sbha elections. With the formation of the BJP ministry in the state both Reddys became ministers with the mining and connected departments under them. It is a typical story of the rise of neo-rich under neo-liberal regime.

***No to Reformism, No To Anarchism,
March to Revolution***

**Documents Adopted by the All India Special
Conference of the CPI(ML) in 2009**

In Hindi and English

Contribution: Rs. 25

**C- 141, Saink Nagar
New Delhi - 110059**

Under the iron ore mafia raj of Reddy Brothers, as they were going up the ladder in all fields, one of the richest iron ore deposits was being looted at ever faster pace, depriving the people of the state and the country of a precious national wealth. While the leading parties in the state, BJP, Congress and Janatha Dal (Secular), as well as the corporate media, all of whom are benefitted from the contributions of this mafia, are maintaining silence on this question, the popular demands raised by forces like CPI(ML) were often sidelined. Even when Karnataka also was rocking with reports of major scams, Reddy Brothers could escape without any trouble.

At the same time, during the last two decades the national wealth was being looted at an ever faster pace. Even while the rich iron ore was being taken away from the area it did not improve the living condition of the people in the area which continued to remain one of the poorest. Meanwhile ecological devastation was taking place, turning the while area covered with a thick cloud of red dust 24 hours a day. The air and water pollution has reached alarming rates. Though this question was also raised continuously the consecutive governments refused to take any action.

It is in this situation, the Revolutionary Youth Federation of India (RYFI) state committee started a campaign with the demands: *Ban on export of iron ore, and Nationalisation of the iron ore mines of the region* from 15th April covering Bellary- Hospet and nearby districts. There was very good response from the people from all walks of life except, of course, from the mafia and its lackeys. Direct action of picketing the trains and trucks carrying the iron ore was started from 6th May by blocking the train carrying the iron ore At Raichur railway station. CPI(ML) state committee and different class and mass organizations have extended full support. It is expected that mass participation is bound to increase in coming days. The CPI(ML) state committee and RYFI have declared their resolve to advance the struggle till the iron ore mafia is thrown out and the mines are nationalised. ●

KERALA: ENDOSULFAN PRODUCTION STOPPED : A VICTORY OF PEOPLE'S STRUGGLES

AFTER prolonged people's struggles, the central government has issued orders to stop the production of 1600 tonnes of Endosulfan in the Aluva unit of Hindustan Insecticides Limited going on for more than two decades. After serious health problems including genetical deformities were observed among people, especially among

on new born children in Kasargode district where it was extensively used in the cashew nut plantations, for a decade or more people are struggling against its production and use. Along with various people's movements, CPI(ML) also had organized a number of campaigns and agitations for this purpose. As a result though its use in Kerala was banned by the state government about five years back, its production in the Aluva unit of HIL was continuing in spite of continuing demands from the people. It was in this situation, the RYFI after a statewide campaign organized a sit-in struggle in front of the HIL unit at Eloor, Aluva for 45 days to focus attention on this question. After the April 13 elections the LDF also raised this demand and under its initiative a successful statewide hartal was organized on 29th April. It is as a result of all these agitations now the central government was compelled to stop Endosulfan production at its Aluva unit. This is a victory of people's struggles against a government which refuses to open its eyes even when the consequences of its unscientific and anti-people actions affect millions of people including the new born babies.

But this struggle has to continue at all India level as still 4500 tonnes more are produced in other HIL units and used in plantations in a number of states. Though the people of those areas will be definitely suffering due to this no significant struggles are reported from these areas. In this situation a countrywide movement is required to stop its production totally and to ban its use everywhere. ●



Around 1000 workers from Vapi, Silvass (Dadra & Nagar Haveli) and Daman gathered at the May Day meeting organised in Bhilad (Gujarat) by the TUCI. After a rally, a massive public meeting was held where Com. Sanjay Singhvi, GS, TUCI, Com. Ramkaran Yadav, GS, Com. R. D. Jadhav, Secretary, and Com. Govinda Poojary KKU addressed the meeting. ●

ON THE DEATH OF COMRADE SHOBA NE MPEAKE, GENERAL SECRETARY, CPSA(ML)

ON 18 MAY Comrade Shobane Mpeake died at the age of 61 in a hospital after having suffered from severe illness. Our deep sympathy goes to the comrades of the Communist Party of South Africa (Marxist-Leninist) and to the family and friends of Shobane. The death of Comrade Shobane, General Secretary of the CPSA-ML is a great loss, not only for the oppressed masses, the workers and peasants, the women and youth of South Africa, but also for the entire international revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist and working-class movement. On 28 May a memorial ceremony will be taking place.

Shobane Mpeake stood at the lead of those comrades who built up their organization and founded the party in 1988 under the most difficult conditions of the Apartheid-Regime and in the struggle against the neocolonial oppression of imperialism. The CPSA-ML works among the miners in the gold and diamond mines and in the international industrial proletariat in the auto plants of Daimler (East London), VW (Uitinhagen) and Toyota (Durban).

In a declaration from the year 2004, Comrade Shobane expressed his conviction „that today proletarian internationalism urgently needs to be put in more concrete terms because imperialism internationalizes its production with lean production and structural adjustments (IMF, World Bank und WTO).“ As a founding member of the ICOR, the CPSA-ML put this into revolutionary practice in October 2010.

As a Marxist-Leninist Comrade Shobane kept to the „system of values of a genuine revolutionary“ as he said in his own words: „Abide by principles and do not give in one millimeter to the reactionaries, neither in the battle and nor even under the conditions of torture and prison. Remain steadfast in revolutionary work, in „times of peace“ as well as in times of the upswing of the revolutionary movement.“

Let us honor him in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. ●

25th May 2011

ICOR

PEASANT STRUGGLE IN WESTERN UP

THE Mayavati government has declared a war against the farmers who are opposing forcible acquisition of their land and demanding appropriate compensation for the land already taken over. After the incidents in Bhatta village in which two farmers died in police firing and hundreds injured while two policemen died and few others injured in the clashes, practically a reign of terror is let loose against the villagers. There are reports of police forces attacking many villages and burning down farmers houses. Rs. 50,000 is announced awards for helping the arrests of leaders of the farmers as if they are dacoits or terrorists. It is wanton state terror which is unleashed a few kilometers away from the capital of the country. Meanwhile there are reports that the farmers' struggle has spread to hundreds of villages in the districts of western UP, while the center of the struggle continues as Noida, Greater Noida and nearby areas of Gautam Budha Nagar district.

Thousands of acres of land were taken by force paying paltry amount to the farmers to help the corporate houses and land mafias. For years this practice was going on with the administration and police openly supporting the land grabbing. Now tens of thousands of acres of land are notified for the YAMUNA Expressway. Meanwhile, though the price of land has gone up considerably, the compensation is paid at very low rates and the payments are not done in time. In every manner the farmers are harassed who depend entirely on their land. As the state government is working as a terrorist force to snatch the land groups of farmers are going to each house and asking the farmers not to give any land to the various agencies.

Comrade Satpal Singh, president, and com. Manasayya, general secretary of AIKKS have issued a statement condemning the police atrocities on peasants. They have said that "peasants of Noida, Greater Noida and those affected by the Yamuna Expressway are struggling against the land acquisition policy of the state government and for proper compensation for the land already acquired. From Bhatta Prasad village near Noida they are agitating from 17th January. But the UP government was refusing to attend to their grievances. It was sending officers and police force who are working hand in glove with the real estate mafia which is indulging in confiscating large tracts of land displacing thousands of families and refusing to pay appropriate compensation at market rate. What is going on is open looting of the precious land by the government agencies and real estate mafia."

The All India Krantikari Kisan Sabha (AIKKS) calls on the peasantry all over the country to protest against the killing of peasants in Noida and demand settling of the compensation cases and stop forcible land

acquisition.demanding that the police forces should be withdrawn from the villages and the land acquisition should be stopped till the whole matter is discussed with the representatives of the farmers organizations. They have asked compensation to the families of the farmers killed in police firing and to all injured. Compensation should be paid for the damages caused to houses. The corrupt officers and policemen responsible for the sufferings of the farmers should be punished.

Though the leaders of various political parties have visited the areas the tension has not eased as the police is still indulging in attacks against the farmers. In this situation the struggle is bound to spread to more areas even if more police forces are deployed. The farmers are angry and they are not satisfied with the statements of the administration and the leaders of the ruling class parties. ●

CPI (ML) DHARNA AGAINST THE OPPRESSION OF FARMERS OF BHATTA- PARSAUL HELD IN KANPUR

THE CPI (ML), on 23rd May, organised a massive dharna in Kanpur, against the policy of the UP Government in connection with the forcible land-grab by the Mayawati Government and to condemn the police firing on the farmers. The dharna was attended by hundreds of farmers from over 10 districts in the state. It was also supported by the state units of AIKKS, TUCI, Krishi Bhumi Bachao Morcha, SEZ Virodhi Sangharsh Samiti and the Gharela Mahila Kamgar Union. The meeting was addressed by Com. Mona Sur, State Secretary, CPI (ML), Com. Satyapal Singh, President, AIKKS, Com. Vijay Shankar, District Secretary, CPI (ML), Com. Ashok Katiyar, State President, AIKKS, Com. Mohammed Shammi, State Secretary, TUCI, Com. Shambhu Dayal Verma, SEZ Virodhi Committee, Com. Meenu Sur, President, Gharelu Mahila Kamgar Union and Com. Ramashray Yadav, Secretary, Krishi Bhumi Bachao Committee.

Com. Vijay Shankar, speaking on the occasion, warned the Mayavati that the peasantry in UP had decided not to give up their lands easily and would fight to the bitter end against such policies.

A memorandum was also handed over to the Collector on that day. ●

If Undelivered Return to
Red Star
C - 141, Sainik Nagar
New Delhi - 110059
Phone: 011-25332343

Postal Reg. No. DL(S)-18/3162/2009-11
RNI Registration No. - DELENG/2000/615

Rally on the Occasion of 125th May
Day by TUCI Koppal District
Committee, Karnataka



May Day Rally, Chikmangalur, Karnataka

