

# frontier

Vol. 3: No. 4

MAY 2, 1970

PRICE: 35 PAISE

## On Other Pages

COMMENTS	..	2
<i>View From Delhi</i>		
LENIN AMONG THE CHARLATANS		
FROM A POLITICAL CORRESPONDENT	..	5
"DIVIDED AITUC"		
KALYAN CHAUDHURI	..	6
ON LENIN—I		
MONITOR	..	7
CALCUTTA DIARY		
GYAN KAPUR	..	11
FRANKLY SPEAKING		
SANJOY	..	12
INTERNAL MIGRATION—II		
ASOK MITRA	..	14
REVOLT OF THE ADOLESCENTS		
MRINAL SEN	..	17
LETTERS	..	18

Editor : Samar Sen

PRINTED AT MODERN INDIA PRESS,  
7, RAJA SUBODH MULLICK SQUARE,  
CALCUTTA-13 AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY  
FOR GERMINAL PUBLICATIONS (P) LTD.  
BY SAMAR SEN FROM 61, MOTT LANE,  
CALCUTTA-13

TELEPHONE: 243202

## ARMS AND ENEMIES

IT has been a persistent complaint in New Delhi that Pakistan regards India as her only enemy. And the complaint is made to show Pakistan's singular lack of virtue. That we have at least two enemies—Pakistan and China—is perhaps an indication of our moral superiority. In any case, New Delhi seems to take special pride in repeating this fact. Mr Swaran Singh has again been telling MPs that India must be prepared for attacks by both Peking and Islamabad and the Deputy Minister for External Affairs told the Lok Sabha last week that, on Pakistan's own admission, she had no enemy except India. There seemed to be a touch of envy in MPs' questions on how Pakistan was in the happy position of getting arms from all quarters. There was perhaps also a trace of bitterness in the Deputy Minister's reply that that this was "because of a world situation that favoured Pakistan". Nobody apparently asked whether India had contributed to creating a situation that not only favoured Pakistan but also made it necessary for India—at least in New Delhi's judgment—to spend more and more on arms. One member was afraid that China might supply Pakistan with atomic bombs for use against India and wanted the Government to secure a guarantee from the USA and Russia that they would "retaliate" on India's behalf in such an event. But the Deputy Minister was brave. He wanted India's own defence capacity to be raised to "such a pitch" that no country in the world "can cast evil eyes on our territory".

The Government has already yielded to pressure by some Jana Sangh MPs, ably assisted by the socialist Samar Guha, to have a study made of the cost of an Indian nuclear weapons programme. What is the point of such an estimate if New Delhi is serious in its determination not to make the bomb? Is the Government willingly allowing the chauvinistic pressure to grow? One can no longer be sure that it is not. The bomb lobby has lately become particularly active and increasingly frequent references are being made to the Chinese programme and Indian inaction. After China's spectacular launching of an earth satellite there will be further hysteria in this country over the fast-growing Chinese missile strength. It will also make the Americans and the Russians to sit up and rethink. But our MPs are surely not so simple-minded as to believe that the Chinese have built up a nuclear capability in order to attack

India; even our Ministers would not seriously suggest that a Chinese plan to attack India has been inhibited by an insufficiency of arms which is now being made good by atomic weapons. A nation which has to take into account the possibility of a war with Russia and/or America is unlikely to be particularly concerned over the means of fighting a war with India unless India is also involved in this war politics.

The game being played in New Delhi seems much more devious. Pressure groups have been formed to keep alive the fears of a twin threat from China and Pakistan, to harp on the military build-up in China and the arms supplies received by Pakistan, and to generate a climate of public opinion in which a continuing increase in defence—and police—spending becomes inescapable. The spokesmen these groups have found among the politicians are identifiable even if the underlying interests are still a little obscure. One reported demand, however, throws some light on the subterranean forces at work. It is now being suggested that military production should no longer remain an exclusively Government undertaking and big private firms should be allowed to manufacture defence equipment on Government contracts. This will be the beginning of that sinister phenomenon known as a military-industrial complex which is in no small measure responsible for the American military adventures abroad. Some of the contractors may even be subsidiaries of American companies which have so specialized in filling the arsenals of varied horror. Should this happen, even the U.S. Government may shed whatever reservations it may now have about an unrestricted arms build-up in India. It may even decide that, after all, India needs atomic weapons too. More and more will be heard about enemies, both external and internal; even the noises which are now periodically made about India wanting to be friendly with all will then cease. This will be the apotheosis of our non-alignment.

## The Long March

Twenty years after the birth of the People's Republic of China and six years after the explosion of her first atomic device a Chinese satellite is now orbiting a surprised world. After devoting so much space to the apocalyptic vision of a Chinese collapse as a result of the 'chaos of the Cultural Revolution' newspapers here should also have been surprised (but judging from the display of the news which was virtually lost in the grey letters describing some non-events they were obviously not.) Well, China is the fifth member of the space club and in Asia the second. The Chinese satellite weighing double the first Russian and twelve times the first American satellite is a testimony to Peking's great technological skill but the novelty has been to a great extent pre-empted by the moon adventure (misadventure as well). Isn't all this reason enough to play down the news?

But more than the weight of the satellite or the capacity of its transmitter the question that is important is what went into the launching of this satellite and to what purpose. People busy calculating China's rank in the space club might just be oblivious of the fact that only twenty years ago the Chinese people had thrown off their yoke and started building a nation from scratch. The obstacles have been stupendous but the will to surmount them has also been matching. In 1958 a brotherly Khrushchev wanted to take over the control of the Chinese army and place Russian troops within China as the "price" for nuclear know-how. Rejected, Khrushchev ordered in 1960 all the 1,390 scientists and technicians out of China. The blow was crippling but within 4 years and ironically the day after Khrushchev's fall the Chinese exploded their own nuclear device. The cost involved has been enormous but the Chinese, Khrushchev's malicious joke about the 'pantless Chinese' notwithstanding, have developed an economy strong enough to bear it. China ever since

has struggled singlehanded to catch up with the West. More than anything else the satellite that is defiantly beaming the tune of "The East is Red" over the skies of Washington and Moscow is a symbol of the indomitable spirit—the spirit that braved a Long March of 10,000 li.

The launching of an earth satellite is not just yet another status symbol of a great power. As the NCNA communiqué has emphasized, it is a measure in line with China's effort to achieve "greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism...and preparedness against war with concrete action." Apart from supplying extremely valuable meteorological data the satellite would help Peking in collecting vital intelligence about the enemies of the Chinese people. It may now be even possible to pass on intelligence about the disposition of the American forces to the guerillas in the hills and jungles of Asia. This will not surely decide the war but can definitely put the enemy into difficulty by depriving him of his technological superiority. However, what is of even more immediate relevance is the Chinese success in rocketry which has made a vertical breakthrough against encirclement. The rocket that launched the satellite into orbit can well deliver the bomb to the enemy's home. This has come as a severe blow to the bipolar hegemony and its exploitation of fear to induce submission. No wonder the Russian and American negotiators preparing for a private arms deal in Vienna were shaken. Now that an end has been put to their nuclear blackmail Moscow and Washington would now shore up their nuclear arsenal (perhaps jointly) to resist the Chinese "threat". But oppressed and exploited people the world over would draw from the Chinese success a new inspiration, and courage to stand up to the enemy. A new "balance of terror" would now help the people to wage, free of nuclear blackmail, the struggle for national liberation and socialism. The Chinese satellite is in that sense a further guarantee that the east will be red.

## May Day

Once more, a May Day. The rituals are gone through, tanks and planes are brought out in Moscow, the people march in Peking, proud of the singing satellite. Nearer home, the umpteen red flag parties, hauteur and mutual hatred in their heart, keep talking of working class solidarity even as some of them at least sell out to the enemy. Everything has a price, including allegiance to the cause.

Over large parts of the world, therefore, celebrating May Day is thus a vacant gesture, like the guzzling of good food and downing of rare wine following sundown December 24. And even where verbal militancy is matched by real militancy often the May Day manoeuvres do not add up to much beyond a sustained struggle for a wage hike. Class battles tend to get reduced to battles for the polyester fibre, the symbol of a cushier living for the workers. Somehow, the vision has been dispelled: only an insane few on the fringe talk of the brotherhood of the international proletariat. The manner in which the brother-bureaucrats of the Kremlin have used that particular alibi to promote, consistently, the jingo interests of the Soviet Union has been scarcely a help. May Day thus evokes only a snigger. The guerillas will fight on, the peasantry in the hungry, under-developed lands, on their own and through much suffering, will discover that steel of will and that extra measure of strength which sustain revolutionary movements all through history; the dialectical process will win out in Latin America as much as in Asia and Africa; the North American Negro will, again on his own, discover the right mix of strategy and valour for crushing the white oppression. But the old social phalanx of trans-country, trans-continental camaraderie is much impaired. Never mind it being May Day, many of the oppressed and exploited segments of the human population are severally on their own, severely alone.

Maybe the international solidarity

of the proletariat has always been folklore rather than fact. Yet, whatever the operational significance, till very recently, the idea at least was a living reality. There was a certain magnificence in the proposition that, leave aside the pigmentation of the skin and the rest of the environmental conditions, the Ashanti tribal and the American teamster, the Hongkong rickshaw-puller and the East Pakistani landless cultivator, the British dock worker and the Indian textile hand, the Brazilian slum-dweller and the Czech press worker, and others similarly placed, all belong together, and have a common allegiance to the Red Flag. This will not wash any more unless there is a sudden welcome resumption of the objective trends in the world's economic process which reveal class alignments in the nakedest light. For the present, the Russian factory worker would offer a comradely hand to the dull, money-laden, white-supremacist boor from the American Mid-West and spurn the overtures of the struggling student from Ghana; the Yugoslav peasant girl would rather sleep with the visiting West German tycoon in quest of a dalliance and not bother even to exchange a greeting with the uncouth Bulgar artisan; the American teamster would have murder in his eye when he meets an indigent black labourer on the street; an Indian communist MP would rather spend the evening downing imported whisky with a Swatantra colleague and would not have any time to spare to the tale of woe of a petty bank clerk who has been thrown out of his job.

May Day is dead in many parts of the world.

## Back And White

The black rebels of America had been led to a blind alley for centuries. They suffered a lot but gained very little. The problem was one of leadership. Most of the black leaders had not only a shrewd appetite for power but were resigned to a position of indefinite racial subjec-

tion. The break came with the Harlem uprising of 1964. Since then blacks have taken up arms to offer resistance to capitalist and racist oppression. This reduced the credibility of the civil rights leaders who upheld the prospect of integration. In fact, the two worlds of America—white and coloured—have been drifting apart in a self-perpetuating process. Racialism has been ingrained in white American minds to a degree that any suggestion for integration automatically invokes fear which, as Ronald Segal says, is hideous with individual imaginings—fear of losing status, fear of rivalry and fear of violence and retribution. The feudal lords knew it well that, as both Negro slaves and white subsistence farmers and share-croppers were victims of the same system, they could combine into a formidable force. Only by creating a division on the colour basis, the feudal lords could reign supreme. For poor whites, colour became a distraction from failure and impoverishment. The suffering of poor whites and blacks could not produce a common front against feudalism in face of the former's zealous upholding of the newly acquired "unique right". This white attitude of mind has survived side by side with the middle-class black leaders' appeal to the American "conscience" for improvement of the condition of the coloured people. If blacks could not decide between a separate development connected with the liberation and progress of the coloured world and political, economic and social integration with the whites, it was largely due to their innocence blended with caution. But their leaders' sycophantic begging for a place in the white sun has done immense harm to the black movement. What use to the black is equality of opportunity when he is so heavily handicapped by centuries of oppression, psychological distortion and neglect?

Today blacks know their enemy which is at three levels of oppression: the big business, the demagogic politicians and the fascist cops and army. Moreover, there is a definite

programme to underline the necessity of a relentless revolutionary struggle. Although the conditions of living of the entire working class have deteriorated in recent years, the black people have mainly to bear the brunt of the contradictions of U.S. imperialism. As America suffers reverses in Asia, Latin America and Africa, she has to increase the degree of exploitation of her workers, particularly the black. (The per capita income of 22 million blacks constituting 11 per cent of the American population is \$1,000 less than that of whites.) If there is a cut in black wages, the wage structure for the whites automatically depresses. Thus U.S. imperialism exists to the degree of its racist exploitation. The authorities could no longer have the illusion that by buying off moderate leaders under the cover of promoting black entrepreneurship or the war-

on-poverty campaign the black movement could be made harmless. This is because of the emergence of the working class leadership and rejection of a nationalist ideology (inspired by the authorities). There is nothing wrong in the blacks' proud assertion of their blackness, but the working class content of the struggle must become the conscious basis for action. The essence of black liberation has to be working class liberation.

## Eyeless In Manila

*A correspondent writes from New Delhi :*

The pedigree of the Manila-based outfit that calls itself the Press Foundation of Asia is rather obscure but could perhaps be traced to the discredited Asia Foundation which was a conduit for the CIA funds.

The Press Foundation of Asia staged a show of sorts early this month and the theme for the flamboyant seminar was "One Asia" but it turned out that the "One Asia" of the foundation's conception excluded China. The scrappy reports in our newspapers said something about Han Suyin being barred entry to the Philippines by the Government but had nothing to say about the massive leftist student demonstrations protesting against this.

To the dummy editors and free-wheeling proprietors of the Indian press, it was yet another junket, heavily subsidised. But how the Government of India and the Indian Federation of Working Journalists came to be roped into the elaborate racket is a matter for investigation. The public relationing for the seminar, at the New Delhi end, was the charge of the Press Institute of India and more particularly its tireless seminarist-director. And the publicity material put out on behalf of the Asia Foundation misled everyone into believing that the Prime Minister of India was a likely participant. But inquiries with the Prime Minister's Secretariat revealed that she had

no such plans and in any case no visit abroad was contemplated when Parliament was in session. Later on, the publicity material suggested that Mr Dinesh Singh, External Affairs Minister, might participate. In the end, it was the Principal Information Officer of the Government of India who represented the Government at the seminar. Nevertheless, the Government's sole interest in this obvious CIA drill was its anti-China motivation. This incidentally explains the presence at the seminar of the President of the Indian Federation of Working Journalists, believed to be a "leftist" organisation. The IFWJ has played its own little role as the Government's drummer boy in the anti-China chorus. About seven years ago, at the Afro-Asian journalists' conference in Djakarta an IFWJ delegation managed to be present, its expenses generously underwritten by the Government of India all because it was going to be an occasion for a Sino-Soviet confrontation and India had to tout the Soviet case at any international body. The IFWJ has to date given no satisfactory explanation of the source of funds that enabled the participation of its king-sized delegation at the meet.

The IFWJ owes its membership a credible explanation about the presence of its president at the seminar. Even if he was there in his personal capacity, the sponsors of the seminar have made much of the fact that the person in question happens to head the only organisation of working journalists and he was in fact described as such in all the documents. The Government owes the country an explanation about the criteria that made the allocation of foreign exchange to the editors and proprietors who went on a shopping spree in the free ports east of Suez under the guise of the Manila seminar. And lastly, one should be pardoned if one draws the conclusion that the Asia Foundation and the CIA now operate through the Press Foundation of Asia and the Press Institute of India unless the Press Institute of India makes a clean breast of everything, particularly its mix-up with the seminar.

## EPIC THEATRE

### LENIN NUMBER

Has come out on April 22

It contains

#### LENIN'S POEM—

as translated by  
Arun Mitra

#### GORKY'S ARTICLE

on PERSONALITY

#### STALIN'S LETTER—

Bill-Beloratsky

Boris Gorbunov's

article on the  
class character of culture

Satya Banerjee's

article on  
Culture & Trotskyism

Utpal Dutt's

Play  
"Leniner Dak"

Editor

Utpal Dutt

Manager  
Asit Basu

Secretary  
Sova Sen

## Lenin Among The Charlatans

FROM A POLITICAL CORRESPONDENT

AS was to be expected, the Establishment hijacked Lenin. It was the same bureaucrat-charlatan combine in charge of the laboured official ritual. Lenin's contemporary relevance to India appeared to be the function of the Indo-Soviet rupee trade (with all those sponsored supplements by the Ludhiana hosiery exporters), of the ISCUS junkets, and beneficiaries of the Lumumba Friendship University (through scholarships for their dud children). The Education Ministry has spent, according to a rough estimate, over Rs 30 lakhs to celebrate the event. And everything was rounded off with a vulgarly glittering Soviet Embassy reception with rivulets of vodka. May Lenin rest in peace until the next centenary.

The Government that issued a postage stamp in honour of Lenin (quid pro quo for the Gandhi stamp, of course) was busy drawing up plans for a Naxalite hunt and the CPI (M), in its total confusion, was trying to invoke Lenin in justification of its opportunism.

Mr Y. B. Chavan had always taken the position that the Government did not believe in banning political parties. But then, Mr Chavan is not the Home Ministry any more. The Prime Minister spoke like an oracle at a Congress Parliamentary Party that a ban on Naxalite activities was coming. The Lenin Centenary Year was an exercise, an inter-ministerial one, on banning the Naxalites selectively (taking care to see the legislation does not touch the extreme right, the communal forces and the senas that represent incipient fascism). Even Mr Harekrishna Konar did his bit here to provide the political alibi for the crackdown, insinuating that the present West Bengal Government was not arresting the Naxalites!

Neither Mrs Gandhi nor Mr Chavan would bother about an all-party consensus any more. The CPI and the CPI(M) might voice formal opposition to the proposed legislation, which might take the form of an amendment to the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act. There is already enough pressure from the right parties for such legislation and the Government can see it through during the budget session if it wants.

The CPI(M) appears to be the most confused party in an already confused situation. Contrary to the distorted Right Communist explanation, the two by-elections in Kerala have proved that the CPI(M) strength has increased both in Kottarakara and Nilambur. In Kottarakara, to go by the 1967 figures, Mr Achutha Menon should have polled 57,000 votes but he got much less. The Marxist-backed candidate put up an impressive show and on the basis of conservative estimates, he must have secured 10,000 of the CPI votes. In Nilambur, the Marxist candidate had polled 25,000-odd votes with the Muslim League and CPI support in 1967. He polled roughly the same number this time, without the backing of any other party.

In Kerala, the familiar pattern is repeating itself in a new situation. Always, the polarisation has been against the single largest party (1960, 1965 and 1967). Now the Marxists happen to be the single largest party and a new polarisation, against the CPI(M) is in the offing. If the CPI(M) is isolated at the next general election in Kerala, it will poll anything between 40 and 45 per cent vote and yet fare badly in terms of seats.

The Centre seems to be going on the assumption that the isolation of the Marxists would be inevitable in Kerala and possible in West Bengal.

The CPI(M) itself would be divided between the hard-liners and those who place a premium on united fronts and parliamentary methods. But hardliners would be more credible to the rank and file when it is found that despite a massive vote (40 to 45 per cent) the party gets, it would be swindled of seats because of the polarisation against it. The CPI(M) might face a split, one section demanding goodbye to parliamentary methods.

The Centre's immediate worry is to curb Naxalite activities but it is seized of the long-term Naxalite threat after the 1972 polls when a large chunk of the CPI(M) would show extremist tendencies. The CPI(M) has given the impression that it would welcome an offensive against the extremists right now, in West Bengal and elsewhere. A top intelligence officer from West Bengal was here on a mysterious mission and had meetings with some West Bengal CPI(M) Members of Parliament. The CPI(M)'s tacit consent to any Central offensive is now taken for granted.

### Attitude to Congress

The CPI(M)'s public stance vis-a-vis the ruling Congress does not square up with the private view of its leaders. For instance, the SSP leadership is now in possession of documents to prove that both the Swatantra Party and the CPI(M) think alike when it comes to toppling the Government at the Centre. When the SSP recently addressed a letter to all the Opposition parties on an alternative government at the Centre, the CPI(M) replied, expressing the view that an alternative should be worked out first before toppling the Government because there was the danger of the right reaction taking the Centre over. In private, a Politbureau member is known to have been saying that if Mrs Gandhi goes, 170 out of her 220 MPs in the Lok Sabha will go over to the rightist parties and she would be left with a mere 50 MPs. The Swatantra Party, approaching the problem from the opposite end,

has arrived at a similar conclusion. If Mrs Gandhi's Government goes, the communists would take over and therefore it would be unwise to attempt a toppling operation.

All the same, the Government at the Centre will survive the budget session, whatever the public stance of the various political parties. Mr Basavapunniah might write an endless series proclaiming a position of equidistance between the Syndicate and the Ruling Congress. But then

a pamphlet brought out by the RSP (obviously inspired by Mr Promode Das Gupta) is peddling the same line. In fact, there is mounting pressure on the CPI(M) leadership from the West Bengal unit for an anti-Indira Gandhi orientation to the party line but the A. K. Gopalans and the Namboodiripads will hold the balance and proffer perverse interpretations of Mr Basavapunniah's learned expositions.

April 26, 1970

## “Divided AITUC”

KALYAN CHAUDHURI

**A**MIDST a cacophony of allegations and counter-allegations the All India Trade Union Congress, formed 50 years ago, faces a split. Preparations for a CPM-controlled parallel “All India Trade Union Centre” are complete.

An all-India trade union convention of the “break-away” general council members of the AITUC met at Vasco Da Gama in Goa on April 9 and 10. The West Bengal Committee of the All India Trade Union Congress (BPTUC) has now convened a 4-day all-India trade union convention in Calcutta from May 28 to give shape to the Goa convention decision to set up a new organisation.

The CPM-dominated working committee of the BPTUC which met on April 24 in Calcutta was boycotted by all the 23 CPI members including its President, Mr Ranen Sen. The General Secretary, Mr Monoranjan Roy, claimed that out of 61 working committee members, 36 were present. The President, Mr Sen, and his “associates”, he said, had made it their practice for the last few months not to attend meetings of the BPTUC. Except 23 CPI and two RCPI (Anadi Das group) members, all other working committee members representing the Workers' Party, the Marxist Forward Bloc and the RCPI (Sudhin Kumar group) attended the last

meeting which endorsed the decision of the Goa convention and agreed to ask the BPTUC to act as a host organisation of the coming Calcutta convention.

The AITUC which organised a series of militant working class actions in the sixties, particularly during the whole of 1964 marked by successful observance of bandhs in Kerala on July 31, Gujarat on August 5, Maharashtra on August 12, Uttar Pradesh on August 18, Goa on August 20 and West Bengal on September 24, has been suffering from inner squabbles and ideological clashes between the CPI and CPM factions since the open split of the Communist Party. The major allegation against the Dangeite central AITUC, leaders, made repeatedly, by the CPM trade unionist, Mr Ramamurti, member of the working committee of the AITUC, is that “these revisionists are getting closer to the INTUC and HMS leadership and their class collaborationist policies are marked out as the official line of the AITUC in the notorious two-pillar policy.”

The CPI group in the AITUC on the other hand alleges that the CPM trade union leaders are trying to impose their party's politbureau decisions on trade unions under their control and using

the AITUC for narrow factional purposes. “Such a flagrant violation of trade union democracy, sheer political racketeering”, said Mr S. A. Dange in his Presidential address at the AITUC's recent Guntur convention, “is unknown since the immediate post-independence days when the Congress party leadership similarly broke away from the AITUC on so-called ideological grounds and set up the INTUC. Today, after 23 years, the Marxists are following in the discredited footsteps of Sardar Patel and Gulzarilal Nanda. In both cases, the only beneficiaries are the capitalists.”

After the Goa convention which was reportedly attended by 140 CPM trade unionist delegates including members of State committees and the general council and eight members of the AITUC working committee who had walked out of the last working committee meeting held in December last, the “break-away” members became more vocal against the dominant Dangeite leadership of the AITUC. Pinpointing their attacks on these “revisionists and class collaborators” they accuse them of an anti-worker conspiracy in collusion with the Congress.

They allege that the Dangeite leadership has inflated the membership of their unions, refused to give affiliation to unions not under their control and set up hundreds of paper unions and recognised them as members of the AITUC. All these they have done with a view to keeping absolute control over the organisation.

CPI leaders, including Mr Ranen Sen, defending the non-partisan role of the AITUC's central leadership, refer to the General Secretary's report which stated that out of the 952 new unions which had sought affiliation prior to the recent Guntur session, only about 50 have been disallowed. These include both CPM-led and CPI-led unions. The Credentials Committee representing members of all constituent parties of the AITUC found them to be “rival

or "parallel" to the already existing AITUC affiliates.

The CPI group of the AITUC is, however, silent over the charges of encouraging disruption on the trade union front and carrying on anti-worker conspiracy in collusion with the Congress. Their rivals cite a number of cases where the dominant Dangeite group allegedly act as the "agents" of managements. Questions raised about the central leadership's partisan role in appointing nominees to governmental bodies such as tripartite committees, wage boards, study groups of the National Labour Commission and Bonus commissions seem to be serious ones.

The allegations of the "break-away" AITUC leaders against the role of CPI trade unionists, particularly in West Bengal and Kerala during the United Front rule, remain unchallenged at the AITUC level. For instance, it is said that, while casual roll labourers of the Kerala State Electricity Board went on strike on April 21 demanding absorption into the nominal muster roll, the CPI man, Mr Balachandra Menon, General Secretary of the KTUC, came out with a statement condemning the strikers. In the Parur Taluk Chethu Thozhilal Union more than 2000 workers participated in the annual conference held in April, 1968. The CPM trade unionists of Kerala reportedly sought the AITUC's honest help in stopping CPI members of the union from setting up a parallel union with a strength of only 80 members. To their utter surprise, the AITUC gave affiliation to the splinter organisation. Similarly, in the Metal Labour Union, Shoranpur, the CPI member, Mr E. P. Gopalan, contested the post of president. Defeated by his rival member he formed a parallel union which was recognised by the AITUC.

In West Bengal a powerful AITUC union existed in the Alloy Steel Plant, Durgapur, where the CPM had overwhelming majority. Suddenly a rival union sprang up in the plant under the leadership of the CPI trade unionists Mr Nihar Mukherjee and Mr Mitish Seth. The leaders allege

that during the works committee elections in the plant the CPI joined hands with the INTUC and other elements to defeat the CPM candidate.

In the Braithwaite Workers' Union the General Secretary who was a CPI leader has not convened the annual conference for the last 8 years.

The CPM group of the AITUC has cited as many as 67 such cases in five States—Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan—where, they allege, the local CPI trade unionists with the active support of the central leadership of the AITUC have violated even the basic principles of the trade union movement.

## On Lenin—I

MONITOR

*"Bourgeois revolutions... storm swiftly from success to success; their dramatic effects outdo each other; men and things seem set in sparkling brilliants, ecstasy is the everyday spirit; but they are shortlived; soon they have attained their zenith, and long crapulent depression lays hold of society before it learns soberly to assimilate results of its storm-and-stress period. On the other hand, proletarian revolutions... criticize themselves constantly, interrupt themselves continually in their own course, come back to the apparently accomplished in order to begin it afresh, deride with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltriness of their first attempts, seem to throw down their adversary only in order that he may draw new strength from the earth and rise again, more gigantic, before them, recoil ever and anon from the indefinite prodigiousness of their aims, until a situation has been created which makes all turning back impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out:*

*Here is the rose, dance here!"*

*Marx—The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (1851-1852)*

**I**N observing the Lenin centenary the Left Establishment of India has shown a remarkable range of activities—from organising boxing competitions to the naming of streets. The Government of India is also not lagging behind. It has organised a

Centenary Committee, thereby proving, among other things, the non-capitalist character of our national bourgeoisie. In the midst of such 'revolutionary' activities our task is to give, as far as possible within the given space, an integral picture of Lenin's work and to show that Lenin was no Russian Gandhi.

I

The best way, we believe, to offer an exposition on Lenin is to follow the method that he himself adopted while writing his well-known essay on Marx.<sup>1</sup> Thus our method consists in showing, first, Lenin's theoretical contributions and secondly, his contributions in the realm of practice. The immensity of the work of Lenin as the successor and continuator of Marx and Engels cannot, however, be fully appreciated unless we have some idea of the state of Marxism at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth—that is, in the last years of Engels's life and those following his death.

By the time Engels died he was able to witness the extraordinary growth, including enormous electoral successes, of the Social Democratic parties (the then Marxist parties) of Western Europe, but at the same time he could already detect the first symptoms of degeneration in them.

<sup>1</sup>See Lenin—*Karl Marx* (1914). The recently published edition from Peking (1967) contains Lenin's own extensive bibliography on Marx and Marxism.

As early as 1887, eight years before his death, Engels spoke of the bourgeoisification of the French Party. The opportunist leadership of the German Party, in its turn, opposed the publication by Engels, in 1891, of Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (written in 1875). Again, the same leadership published, in a distorted way, some excerpts from Engels's introduction (1895) to Marx's *Class Struggle in France* (1850) in order to make Engels appear as the "defender of the tactics of peace at all costs and abhorrence of force" as Engels himself complained bitterly.<sup>2</sup> All the different deviations from Marxism found their most consistent expression, above all, in Germany whose working class movement was considered a model for similar movements in other countries. At the cost of some oversimplification, inevitable in such cases, one can say that there were three basic tendencies in the German working class movement: right or revisionist, centrist or so-called "orthodox", and "left."<sup>3</sup>

As regards the first, its leaders were G Vollmar and E Bernstein. Particularly the latter, in a series of articles in the Party journal *Die Neue Zeit* and later in his book *Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus* (Premises of Socialism, 1899) questioned the very foundations of Marxism. He denied dialectics, proposed to replace materialism by scepticism, agnosticism and the philosophy of Kant as the foundation of the working class movement, reduced Marxism to some kind of ethics and asserted that revolution was outdated and that the sole aim of the working class party was to obtain a majority in bourgeois parliament, thereby achieving "socialism" without tears.

As regards the second, its most important representatives were Karl Kautsky and Franz Mehring. Both

<sup>2</sup>Letter to Lafargue, April 3, 1895 in *Marx-Engels-Werke* (Berlin), Bd. 39 S. 454.

<sup>3</sup>For an admirable account of these tendencies see H. Lefebvre—*La Pensee de Lenine* (1957), ch. I.

of them made valuable contributions to Marxist theory. They, however, saw Marxism rather as an economic or historical science and neglected it as a philosophy, as an integral world-outlook. Mechanically interpreting certain formulations of Marx and Engels about the end of (speculative) philosophy, they asserted that philosophy itself had ceased to exist, and that Marxism and the rising working class had rendered unnecessary the classical philosophy and thereby all philosophy. These "orthodox" Marxists almost completely neglected the natural sciences at the very moment when these sciences were making extraordinary progress. They—specially Mehring—reduced dialectics to a philosophy of history, isolated dialectics from materialism, rejected dialectics of nature and separated Engels from Marx. Dogmatically interpreting Marx's famous proposition of the primacy of the forces of production over the relations of production and neglecting their dialectical inter-relationship they ended with the "logical" necessity of first developing the forces of production within the framework of capitalism before discussing and working on any revolutionary perspective. Once the forces of production had developed sufficiently, revolution would come by itself, they asserted, denying, by the same "logic", any socialist perspective in a backward country.

### Third Trend

As regards the third trend, its leaders were Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the latter being the most illustrious. Undoubtedly they were great revolutionaries and fought valiantly against rightwing opportunism in the Party. Rosa Luxemburg, particularly, made important contributions to economic theory. But this did not prevent her from committing grave errors on a number of important questions such as those touching on imperialism and the national and colonial question. Her outlook was based on a catastrophic vision of history, on the idea of a sudden breakdown of capitalism, once its external market

was exhausted, and the ushering in of socialism on the basis of a spontaneous revolutionary uprising of the exploited masses. Such an outlook, however revolutionary, in fact revealed an essentially undialectical attitude—no reciprocal relation between the subjective and the objective, knowledge and spontaneity, the masses and the party. This same attitude implied that there was no colonial, national or peasant question that would be of direct interest to the revolutionary movement, since the revolution itself, which would be a world revolution at a given moment of history, would take care of them all. It is against such attitudes that Lenin made his famous statement that it is impossible to understand Marx's *Capital* without having read and understood Hegel, without digesting Hegel's dialectical method.

These, then, were the dominant trends in the Social Democratic movement at the turn of the century and Lenin had to fight them all in order to restore the purity of Marxism and, simultaneously, to enrich it in new situation.

## II

One important reason why Marxism after the death of Engels was in a state of confusion was that, for various reasons Marx and Engels could not leave behind them "complete" accounts of their world-outlook. In a letter in the late fifties Marx, referring to Hegel's *Logic* had expressed his desire to come out with a small treatise on dialectics that could be accessible to the ordinary readers.<sup>4</sup> To the great loss of the working class movement the desire was never fulfilled. Engels, of course, had written extremely important works on philosophy.<sup>5</sup> How-

<sup>4</sup>Letter to Engels, dated January 14, 1858 in *Marx-Engels-Werke* (Berlin) Bd. 29, S. 259-61 where the date is corrected to January 16, 1858.

<sup>5</sup>E.g. Ludwig Feuerbach, *Anti-Duhring*, *Dialectics of Nature*. Lenin was not aware of the latter. About the first two, Lenin said: they were "handbooks for every class conscious

ever, some of the difficult but fundamental questions like, for example, the relation between logic and dialectics, were not treated by him in any systematic way. Lenin noted the absence of a completely satisfactory exposition of the dialectical method and justly accused Plekhanov, one of the founders of Marxism in Russia and author of important works on Marxist theory, of not writing anything on Hegel's Logic anywhere in his voluminous works on philosophy, adding, however, the following significant passage: "If Marx has not left a Logic (with a capital 'L') he has left us the logic of *Capital*. In *Capital* it is to one single science that Marx applies logic, dialectics and the materialist theory of knowledge (needless to use these words; they mean one and the same thing) taking from Hegel and developing all that is valuable."<sup>6</sup> In a sense neither Marx nor Engels could, by the nature of things, have left a "complete" treatise on philosophical materialism. It was for their successors to enrich materialism in the light of the important developments in science that were taking place before their eyes. Faced with the new situation the revisionists denied the very basis of materialism and the so-called "orthodox"—like Mehring and Kautsky—in trying to "defend" Marxist philosophy clung to some formulations of Marx and Engels dogmatically, assuming that Marxist philosophy was a "finished" body of doctrines given once and for all. Lenin had to combat both revisionism and the attitude of the "orthodox" immobilism in his celebrated *Materialism and Empirio-criticism* (1908).

In one of his very first writings—*What the 'Friends of the People' are and how they fight the Social Democrats* (1894)—Lenin established the methodology of all sciences. Every science must lay down a criterion for distinguishing the essence from the appearance, the law from the accidental. In a society it is not possible to

worker." For how many leaders in India is this true?

<sup>6</sup>*Philosophical Notebooks. Plan of Hegel's Dialectics (Logic). 1914.*

arrive at science from consciousness. There is a certain contradiction between consciousness and the objective social reality. Men adapt themselves unconsciously to the totality of social relations. Thus, for example, the relation of exchange, through which men have been living for centuries, could be given a conscious formulation only in recent times. Only materialism has removed this contradiction by carrying the analysis to the very origin of these social ideas and concluding that "the course of ideas depends on the course of things". Marx's materialist method of analysing society does not differ essentially from the method of natural sciences. Contrary to the contention of the "sociologists", the theory of Marx and Engels does not consist of "economic materialism"; it is, on the contrary, a materialist analysis of the totality of society. Marx's method does not deny consciousness or superstructure. On the contrary it studies them as phenomena through the analysis of which law is discovered. The natural scientists had discovered this method, in spite of their particular ideology, through their own researches. Marx alone extended this method to the science of society. Analysing the capitalist society Marx discovered its objective essence and its laws which showed, for example, that this society was not just an accidental agglomeration of individuals, but was one whole in the process of becoming and transformation.<sup>7</sup>

Lenin was to apply the same method later. In his works on imperialism, on war, on the State, he always searched for law beneath the chaos of phenomena, essence beneath appearance, real contradictions beneath superficial conflicts. Lenin always fought against all types of unilateral, sectarian conceptions of the world masquerading under Marxism and all types of distortions that Marxism underwent in the hands of the Second International 'theoreticians' under different forms—historicism,

<sup>7</sup>*What the 'Friends of the People' Are* (1894)—Part I, *passim*.

economism, sociology, etc. "The history of philosophy and the history of social science", wrote Lenin, "show with perfect clarity that there is nothing resembling 'sectarianism' in the sense of its being a hidebound, petrified doctrine, a doctrine which arose away from the high road of development of world civilisation. His (Marx's) doctrine emerged as the direct and immediate continuation of the teachings of the greatest representatives of philosophy, political economy and socialism."<sup>8</sup>

#### Internal Crisis

Lenin's most celebrated attack on revisionism and opportunism in philosophy was his *Materialism and Empirio-criticism* (1908). This work was the result of his realization, as he explained three years later, of "the necessity of combating a very serious internal crisis of Marxism for the purpose of defending the theoretical foundations of Marxism and its basic propositions, which are being distorted from diametrically opposite sides by the spread of the bourgeois influence to the various 'fellow travellers of Marxism'".<sup>9</sup> At the turn of the century physics profoundly disturbed the old notion of matter by its explorations in the realm of the "infinitely small." The notion of matter as a tangible substance was shaken to its very foundations when the atom was no longer considered indestructible, and as Bertrand Russell later put it, reflecting the prevalent bourgeois ideology, "the last vestiges of the old solid atom, have melted away and the matter has become ghostly." On the basis of these explorations philosophers like Ernst Mach—also a physicist—denied matter itself and revisionists of all hues, succumbing to bourgeois ideology, followed suit. Lenin took upon himself a critical analysis of this "crisis in physics."

Referring to the slogan "matter has

<sup>8</sup>*Three sources and three component Parts of Marxism* (1913).

<sup>9</sup>*Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism* (1911) Lenin's emphasis.

disappeared" Lenin pointed out that this "means that the limit within which we have hitherto known matter is vanishing and that our knowledge is penetrating deeper; properties of matter are disappearing which formerly seemed absolute, immutable and primary (impenetrability, inertia, mass, etc.) and which are now revealed to the relative.<sup>10</sup> In other words the so-called "crisis" is nothing but the crisis of *mechanical* (non-dialectical) materialism and of bourgeois ideology. The 'essence' of 'substance' is also relative; it expresses only the degree of profundity of man's knowledge of objects; and while yesterday the profundity of this knowledge did not go beyond the atom, and today does not go beyond the electron or ether, dialectical materialism insists on the temporary, relative approximate character of all these milestones in the knowledge of nature gained by the progressing science of man... nature is infinite, but it infinitely exists. And it is this sole unconditional recognition of nature's existence outside the mind and perceptions of man... that distinguishes dialectical materialism from relativist agnosticism and idealism.<sup>11</sup>

Lenin made a fundamental distinction between the notion of matter as philosophical category in which case it is *general*—and the notion of matter as belonging to this or that science like physics—in which case it is *specific*. From the point of view of philosophy the sole property of matter is that it is the objective reality of the physical world existing outside of our consciousness. This philosophical category has a universal, absolute character. This *universal* category, however, must be distinguished from the *particular* category of matter the knowledge of which, acquired from the different sciences, is always relative, provisional, approximate, depending on the progress of this or that science. From the philosophical point of view—which is the most vital for dialectical materialists—the

<sup>10</sup>*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (1908), Moscow (1947). P. 267.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid*—P. 269. Lenin's emphasis.

revolution in physics has done nothing to invalidate materialism. The so-called "disappearance of matter" "has no relation to the epistemological distinction between materialism and idealism".<sup>12</sup> Referring to Engels's earlier criticism of mechanical materialism in relation to the discovery of alizarin in coal tar Lenin pointed out: "In order to present the question in the only correct way... we must ask: do electrons, ether and so on exist as objective realities outside the human mind or not? The scientists invariably answer it in the affirmative just as they unhesitatingly recognise that nature existed prior to man and prior to organic matter. Thus the question is decided in favour of materialism".<sup>13</sup>

Lenin carried forward his enrichment of dialectics in his later studies that were left as fragments at his death and published posthumously as *Philosophical Notebooks*.<sup>14</sup> It is impossible to convey, within the space at our disposal, the richness of these notebooks. We shall be content with only the briefest indications pertaining to dialectics.

#### The Greeks

In philosophy Lenin went back to the very sources of Marx himself. Lenin noted the dialectics in the ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus—"everything is becoming; this becoming is the principle; this is implied in the expression: being is no more than non-being..." and quoted Hegel to the effect that there is not a single proposition of Heraclitus that Hegel had not taken in his logic.<sup>15</sup> Passing on to Aristotle, Lenin remarked that even though Aristotle had fought Heraclitean dialectics tooth and nail there was something fresh and living in Aristotle;

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid*. P. 265.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid*, Ch. V, Sec. 2. Lenin's emphasis.

<sup>14</sup>These *Notebooks* are the result of Lenin's work for many years. But the most intensive period of work in this connection was 1914-1916.

<sup>15</sup>*Philosophical Notebooks*: On Heraclitus.

but "clerical obscurantism had killed in Aristotle what was living, immortalized what was dead".<sup>16</sup> In Aristotle the general (the concept, the idea) is something isolated. The act of knowledge is, however extremely complex. One must distinguish the house in general from the houses. The house in general means nothing, taken in isolation; nonetheless it signifies the essence of particular houses. When (human) intelligence approaches the particular thing and draws an image (a concept) this is not an act that is simple, immediate, dead; this is not a reflection in a mirror, but an act with a double face, complex, zig-zagging—"an act that includes the possibility of imaginative flight outside of life. In the most simple generalisation, in the most elementary general idea ('the table' in general) there is a certain part of *imagination*".<sup>17</sup> This leads straight to the relation between formal logic and dialectics. Dialectics goes beyond formal logic in showing the relation between concepts that formal logic tends to isolate. If we take the simplest and the most commonplace propositions like: the leaves of this tree are green; Medor is a dog etc., "dialectics, as Hegel remarks, is already there: that which is particular is general... that which is occasional and that which is necessary, the phenomenon and the essence are already there. Thus in every proposition one can (and one should) discern, as in a chemical 'cell' the germs of all the elements of dialectics, demonstrating, in this way, that it applies to all human knowledge in general."<sup>18</sup> Lenin took up two aspects of dialectics, proposed by Hegel in relation to the ancient Eleatic School. First, the pure movement of thought in the concepts and secondly, contradiction in the essence of objects. That is, the first aspect shows that the concepts are not immobile but in perpe-

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid*: On Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid*: Lenin's emphasis.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid*: On *Dialectics*. Lenin's emphasis.

# Calcutta Diary

GYAN KAPUR

tual movement, passing from one to the other, without which, added Lenin, they would not be reflecting life. The second aspect shows, Lenin emphasized, that dialectics is the study of opposition between what is "itself" and what is "for another", between essence and phenomenon. "In the true sense dialectics is the study of contradiction in the essence itself of things: transitoriness, movement, fluidity are not in the phenomena alone but all that is equally true for the essence of things."<sup>19</sup> The division of a unit and the knowledge of its contradictory parts—this is the fundamental aspect of dialectics according to Lenin. The justness of this aspect of the content of dialectics must be verified by history and science. Earlier Marxists—Plekhanov included—had not paid much attention to this basic characteristic of dialectics: *unity or identity of opposites*. They as it were, dispensed with it with a couple of examples and had never treated it as the *law of knowledge and the law of the objective world*. "The unity of opposites is the recognition of tendencies that are opposite, contradictory, mutually excluding each other, in all the phenomena and processes of nature."<sup>20</sup> There are two fundamental conceptions of development: development as diminution or augmentation, as repetition, and development as the unity of opposites—separation of one into contradictory parts, mutually excluding each other, and their reciprocal relationship. "The first conception is dead, poor, dry. The second is living. Only the second offers the key to 'autodynamics' of everything that exists; it alone offers the key to 'leaps' 'rupture in the process', 'transformation in the opposite'; the abolition of the old and the birth of the new. The unity of opposites is conditioned, temporary, provisional, relative. The struggle of opposites, mutually excluding each other, is absolute."<sup>21</sup>

(To be concluded)

<sup>19</sup>Ibid: On Eleatic School. Lenin's emphasis.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid: On Dialectics. Lenin's emphasis.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid. Our emphasis.

NOTHING like the present Governor of West Bengal has hit the scene for a long, long time. To be sure Shri Shanti Swarup Dhavan's personality is a many-splendoured thing, to misquote Han Suyin. He can deal anything from Burdwan to Lenin with an aplomb that others might envy. That his talents have started flowering over here only after the United Front went to pieces should surely not be held against him. After all nature abhors a vacuum, a political one. That some of the utterances appear slightly melodramatic is also a matter of no consequence in this land of the jatra, with its florid language and gestures.

Shri Dhavan, according to some of his detractors, is on the side of the communists. But then he is also a man steeped in Indian traditions and determined to maintain them. Recollect, therefore, his famous statement that like Bharat in the Ramayana he will be ruling the State of West Bengal ever with the symbolic sandals of the people in his mind. He may be the saviour whom those communists of different views who are also deeply religious may have been looking forward to.

V. I. Lenin, one would have thought, would be beyond even Shri Dhavan's capacity to convert into a sort of religious figure. But Shri Dhavan has done the impossible. He has compared Lenin to Arjuna of the Mahabharata with the air of bestowing a compliment. Without batting an eyelid he could compare the friend of the oppressed people, Lenin, to Arjuna who was fighting for his petty kingdom and thought nothing of letting thousands die for it. Kind words, indeed, can kill.

Thanks to Shri Dhavan we can explore a whole new train of thoughts with much pleasure and may be some profit. To take the Pandava brothers as models, who else can be compared to them? Stalin's counterpart could

be Bhim, the strongman, for Marx the obvious choice would be Yudhishtir, the eldest Pandava brother who took poverty and banishment philosophically. As for Mao Tse-tung, Shri Dhavan no doubt would unhesitatingly compare him with the greatest warrior of the Mahabharata, Karna, whose kinship his brothers refused to accept in spite of all his valour. As for Engels, Shri Dhavan would perhaps be reminded of Krishna.

One could multiply the list of analogies endlessly, should one wish to do so. But even such a good thing must have an end. Those communists who are also devout Hindus, of whom quite a lot are about, however, should remember that well-meaning character of Hindu mythology who had easy access in all camps and was well versed in all the scriptures but caused no end of trouble whenever he wanted. With his penchant for quotations from Hindu mythology, Shri Dhavan will certainly excuse anyone who might think he comes perilously close to the venerated but feared Narada Muni.

\* \* \*

The spate of incidents involving educational institutions and sporadic bus burning attempts is much in the news. That the Naxalite students are not a negligible minority was shown by the procession, or rather series of processions brought out by them on the occasion of Lenin's Birth Centenary or the first anniversary of their party.

The Centre, of course, has got extremely alarmed as it does at anything which disturbs its beauty sleep. It would like nothing better than to discuss problems of this as of other States endlessly, going round and round like the O rail that never was. So they can hope to get the Preventive Detention Act again through the generosity of a Presidential Act of

Mr Giri whom, incidentally, both the communist parties helped to get elected.

To return to the so-called attacks of the young Naxalites in Calcutta. To this writer they appear to be a very tame affair indeed. A few fan blades twisted, and telephones damaged, some pictures torn and papers strewn about and some books burnt—there may be revolutionary elements in this but we have been here before. All this has been done by others. The only difference being that what is done by one set of students in excitement over stiffness of question papers or what have you, is being done by others in a planned manner.

All this, of course, is a god-send to New Delhi who can cry 'law and order' and provide big headlines to the 'National' Press. But for the uninitiated it is difficult to understand where Mao comes in if one leaves out the stencilled figure of a youthful Chairman. Whatever it might stand for and mean, Gandhism is dead and forgotten, particularly in this State. If books and papers are to be destroyed, stocks can be found in Writers' Building in Calcutta and numerous government offices in the State as well as big business, disappearance of which would make thousands of common people heave a sigh of relief. As for tram and bus burning, there are too few of these anyway for far too many people, while a handful of people go about in comfort, owning not even one but several cars. Few tears, perhaps, would be shed if such people were to have their choice limited.

---

For FRONTIER readers in

West India can contact

S. D. CHANDAVARKAR

10, Kanara House

Mogal Lane, Mahim

Bombay-16

## Frankly Speaking

SANJOY

WHEN one got a job at last in Calcutta towards the end of 1949, one was glad and expectant—glad to leave Sardar Patel's Delhi and expectant that something big was going to happen in this city. Reports had been reaching Delhi that the public temper in West Bengal was explosive, things were breaking down, in short, revolution was round the corner. How thrilling it would be to see at first hand a momentous event! One had 'missed' three traumas, as they call it: the 1942 movement, the 1943 famine and the 1946 great killing. Presence even at the scene of great calamities—the reference is to the last two phenomena—is a valuable experience if one does not become a victim—what would you see if you are beheaded?

The 1949 expectation was, however, subdued by some recollections. In Calcutta, July 29, 1946 was a big day. The Congress and the Muslim League had been swearing at one another and the politicians had forgotten the people in their righteous wrath. The mass fury of the INA demonstrations, the RIN mutiny and similar events had so frightened them that they were looking for diversions. The air was thick with communal propaganda. In this poisonous atmosphere the united, solid general strike of July 29 came as a great gust of clean wind. But perhaps it was too much for the ruling power and the would-be rulers. Seventeen days later came the great killing which shattered many dreams and paved the way for partition. The communists who were supporting the Muslim right of self-determination were left high and dry. An awful stench smothered the 'second city' and the pitiful intelligentsia. That such frenzy could overtake the people seventeen days after a magnificent general strike was a revelation.

So, back in Calcutta, in the middle of November, 1949 one waited to

see the revolution turn the corner, with a certain amount of scepticism. Would there again be some calamitous diversion?

What was happening was different. Acid bulbs and bombs were thrown at buses and trams. Detenus, emaciated by hunger-strike, tried to battle with the police. But there was no breakthrough. In the sphere of revaluation of tradition Rabindranath, who had died about eight years ago, had a second funeral. It was proposed to throw him into the dustbin of history.

As they say, 1970 is not 1949. But even after 20 years, the 'revolutionaries' are dragging their feet in this country where something always seems to go wrong. It has not had the correct leadership, national or communist. Whenever the revolutionary energy of the masses reached a bursting point from the 1919s on, the old man whom the world called a saint and whom the Birlas befriended heard an inner voice against violence and put a brake on mass energies. Energies do not disappear. In this case they found an outlet in communalism, eruptions of which began to pockmark the nation—or two nations. The old man, no doubt, could influence the masses. But how much? It is a fact that after 1930-31, he gave up mass contact and did not embark on another mass movement on a big scale. The way he died lent him the aura of a martyr. And let us not be uncharitable—despite his reactionary ideology and practice, he was not a little man. Attack his ideology but not belittle whatever he had done. He was the man who nurtured the communal poison tree planted by Bankimchandra but he paid the penalty with his life.

How to fight Gandhian ideas? To be frank, all the talk about the virtues of open debate in a bourgeois society is rather unreal. You retain your convictions, your views,

your habits and idiosyncracies if you are somewhat committed even after some great debater or brilliant article has proved to the hilt that they are all untenable. A Gandhian would remain a Gandhian even if someone points out that Gandhism is a bundle of reactionary contradictions. Debate in the abstract does not convert. Conversion is a matter of learning through action and experience, a process in which most petty bourgeois do not share.

Is this impatience with futile debate the reason why Naxalite students in Calcutta are burning Gandhiana? They made Jadavpur University their prime target because the Gandhi Centre and the unsavoury World University Service pointed to a link between Indian reaction and the CIA. The targets then became wider—books on or by Gandhi, American or Russian publications, one or two bookshops and printing presses connected with these publications and, the most constant target of minor attacks—rooms of principals or headmasters. The Maoists think that, as bourgeois institutions, schools and colleges have no sanctity and should be bombarded, no matter what the immediate reaction of the public is. Didn't the Cultural Revolution start in Peking University? Didn't Mao Tsetung rely on young students, who are not hidebound but are full of energy and daring, to fire the first salvoes of the Cultural Revolution?

What should be done in cities has been a dilemma for the CP(ML). Students have been urged to leave school and college and go to the countryside (Gandhi also made a similar appeal, from other motives of course, and, by the way, foreign stuff was burnt under his command—to help the native cloth manufacturers) but the response has not been and cannot be overwhelming. Students have to do something to feel that they are a part of the 'armed struggle that is sweeping the countryside'. Living in cities it is difficult to feel the heat of what is called the prairie fire. One has got to do something. There must be action. So

the Naxalite students have been asked to carry on a struggle against old habits, old customs, old ideas and U.S. and Russian infiltrations. A protracted, ideological struggle is out of the question. Before you call them narodniks, socialist revolutionaries, nihilists and sneer at their tactics, consider the all-India scare that has been created (is it being simulated to build up a case for preventive detention?), the uneasy concentration of the CRP and the police, the loud talk at the Centre and in the States, the envy and anger that has overtaken the 'radical' left parties sickly vegetating and whining under President's rule. Think of the dispersal of the State machinery of repression. If scattered incidents staged by squads of students can create so much panic among the ruling class and their henchmen, the objective situation, as the Naxalites say, must be excellent. Besides, the students are practising and perfecting guerilla tactics based on speed, secrecy and initiative—things which thrill the young. By their shock tactics they have roused the curiosity of the uncommitted in Calcutta. Despite the uneasy feeling that their actions are irresponsible, large masses of people lined the streets to watch the 15,000 or so Naxalites on April 22. It is rumoured that, as the techniques are perfected and the repressive organs of the State dispersed, the stage is being set for bigger things while the united fogies keep fighting among themselves. Something is round the corner?

The older generation who had diligently studied Lenin and Mao are worried, upset and angry. According to them the 'adventurist' impatience of the Naxalites is a petty-bourgeois, anarchic characteristic. Students who rely on notebooks to get through their exams want everything—even Maoism—to be Made Easy for them. And the leadership, a breakaway part of the CPM that was once a part of the CPI, is petty bourgeois in essence and so relying on terroristic tactics. Can any leadership be purified of petty bourgeois characteristics within a year? Ask Peking.

But the younger generation feels

that the vintage communist leaders have betrayed the ideals and the partisans over the years. To hell with their phoney, bookish Marxism! New times call for new tactics even if they look like juvenile pranks to establishmentwallas. The revolution in the countryside has to be telescoped with a cultural revolution in the cities. The sooner and the faster, the better.

But can one be cocksure that the urban tactics seen so far will ever transform the social and political order? That the revolution they talk about will not again be aborted as in 1949? It is not that easy to overthrow a system. Where is the working class in all these activities? However, to the Naxalites all doubters are at best fools and at worst traitors and agents. Let them meditate on the frustrations of 1949—1970 is not 1949. The youths will urinate and defecate on them, not debate with them.

Perhaps they have a right to think so. Do not think that they are having an easy time overground despite their devotion to militancy. Hundreds are being arrested, and the treatment many of them are being subjected to during 'interrogation' is inhuman, obnoxious. The police are out to break their morale; the age of the arrested is no consideration. Boys of fourteen and above are being 'taught a lesson' which, the police think, will stop them from all activities when they are released. The duration of detention is anybody's guess. Summonses from Bihar and Orissa are being engineered to keep the hard-core under prolonged police custody. There is, one should remember, a high degree of co-ordination between the intelligence officers of several State governments in Eastern India, achieved during the UF regime. The drawback the Naxalites suffer from is that their leaders cannot write frequent letters to the Governor before deciding the course of resistance.

#### Lenin

It was all Lenin last week. At the CPI-Dhavan function some one was overheard as saying that Lenin, in his statue, should have been clothed in

spotless dhoti and punjabi with a red scarf round his neck, plus a crumpled dhoti and punjabi, would have been all right for the CPM rally. He should have been armed with crackers or bombs and the Red Book in the impressive CP(ML) procession.

It is difficult for most students to emulate Lenin in personal life. His childhood was happy—he was a top-heavy, boisterous, bouncing boy—which explains the tremendous inner reserve and discipline that later marked all his life. A brilliant student at the Simbirsk seminary, he was taken up with the writings of great poets and novelists, the masters of Greek and Latin prose and, to some extent, history, but not political science. Some of his class-mates remarked on his tremendous capacity to control his emotions: on May 8, 1887, the day his elder brother went to the gallows, he answered his mathematics paper calmly and unhurriedly. Another curious fact: in all his correspondence and public speeches (published so far), he never mentioned his brother, except twice, and that too for routine information. All this restraint is the more remarkable because the execution of his brother must have been the climactic event which turned him into a revolutionary.

It is also interesting to recall that the principal of the seminary who was criticised after the arrest of his old student Alexander but who nevertheless allowed Vladimir to sit for his examination, was the father of Kerensky.

---

## NOTICE

Articles cannot be returned unless accompanied by return postage.

Business Manager  
Frontier

---

For FRONTIER contact  
SANYAL BROS.

26, Main Road Jamshedpur-1

## Internal Migration—II

ASOK MITRA

**I**N a paper on 'World Urbanization Trends, 1920-1960' based on a study prepared by the Population Division of the United Nations, it has been shown how, of the world's total population, the percentage in urban localities rose from 14 in 1920 to 16 in 1930, 19 in 1940, 21 in 1950 and 25 in 1960.

Another illustration of the large environmental change is found in the ratio of rural and small-town population to urban population: 6.4 to one in 1920, 5.3 in 1930, 4.4 in 1940, 3.7 in 1950 and 3.0 to one in 1960. It was observed that "increasing numbers of previously smaller towns and cities which grew into the size-classification of larger localities were in part responsible for the higher rates of growth of the latter. Although a large number of small towns must also have crossed above the lower size limit of 20,000 during the same periods, the accrued population has not been sufficient to permit rates of increase of the magnitude of those in the larger localities. In fact, an increase in 'top-heaviness' has been under way in the urban population, for the urban population tripled in forty years while the big-city population quadrupled". It has been observed that this too is subject to significant variations. Between 1920 and 1960, big-city population (500,000 and over as percentage of urban population with cut off point at 20,000 and over in major areas of the world) increased more rapidly in East Asia, South Asia, Africa and the Soviet Union, much faster than in Europe, Northern America, Latin America and Oceania. The Population Division of the United Nations divided urban regions of the world into three groups: (1) early urbanised; (2) recently urbanised; and (3) least urbanised. The phenomenon just mentioned was reclassified by these three groups. In this reclassification, it was found that urban and rural population pro-

ceeded unequally among the three groups of regions. Between 1920 and 1960, total population increased 52 per cent in Group I, 61 per cent in Group II and 63 per cent in Group III, but during the same time, urban population doubled in Group I, multiplied by 35 in group II and 4.5 in group III. Rural population grew by 17 per cent in Group I, 28 per cent in Group II and 48 per cent in Group III. In short, similar rates of total population growth have produced varied rates of urban and rural growth according to the levels of urbanisation: where the level of urbanisation was already high, only moderate rates of growth in both the urban and the rural population occurred, but where the level of urbanisation was low, both the urban and the rural populations grew with the greatest rapidity. Further, there is a marked similarity between the percentage of total population in urban places at a given date and the percentage of total population increase (during the preceding twenty-year period) which accrues to big cities. The reasons for this are complex and cannot be explained merely by the level of investment in big cities, in terms of external economies and economies of scale. Explanation has also to be found in the poverty induced tertiary service sector that all big cities tend to generate together with opportunities of better self-equipment by way of educational, health and other services that the growth of population demands.

In numerous developing countries the annual percentage rate of increase of population residing in cities with populations of 100,000 and over, has been several times the rate of growth of total population. This rate of growth is in marked contrast to the record of developed countries.

Some explanation of this is certainly to be found in the steady rate of increase in the level of population employed in manufacturing industry in these cities which demonstrated that industrial development acts as a big pull for growth by migration. This pull is noticeable, for example,

in India, but to a lesser extent also in other countries.

What is, however, more significant is the high rate of growth in towns of smaller population size in the developing countries where the rate of migration between 1920 and 1960 is much faster than among developed countries. This is noticeable wherever statistics over a period of time are available as in India and Pakistan. In India, the rate of decennial growth in the size group of 50,000 to 100,000 has often been higher than in the size group of 100,000 plus, while the rate of growth in towns of 20,000 to 50,000 and 10,000 to 20,000 though lower than the rate of growth in the 50,000 to 100,000 size group, is still higher than in the 100,000 plus size group. But, the degree of urbanisation, however, has varied widely among the less developed continents and within them and care must be taken before any generalised statement is made.\*

\*In developing countries, urbanisation is not always accompanied by industrialisation and does not necessarily result in development infrastructure. It, therefore, may be more profitable to classify towns and cities in terms of industrial characteristics of their working forces. This may yield interesting results. Following the 1961 Census in India, all Indian cities and towns were classified into services, mining and plantation, artisan, manufacturing, construction, trade and commerce, and transport towns and towns with high agricultural ratio according to the numerically predominant characteristics of their working population. The classification was related to rates of growth and migration which indisputably demonstrated very high positive association between population increase and industrial growth in manufacturing cities where such association exceeded that in cities of other functions. The rate of population growth in Service, Manufacturing and Transport cities was much faster and higher than that of cities and towns with other functions. Agricultural and plantation towns had about the lowest rate of population growth. The proportions of durations of more than three years stay were generally several times higher than those under three years for both rural and urban migrants in manu-

### Intermediate Towns

One of the reasons why towns of intermediate size classes in many developing countries have failed to attract rural migrants in greater numbers than the large cities, has been severe agricultural shortages and slow improvement in productivity. Intermediate towns, both by their geographical location and size class, serve as very active servicing and processing centres for agricultural regions and fall in agricultural productivity works in both ways against the growth of such cities and towns. Fall in agricultural output tends to drain from the countryside the most able-bodied and competent young men where per capita production appears to have declined in recent years, traditional production has suffered, as well as possibilities of innovation. These bring in other consequences in their train such as decline in construction and repair of rural houses, community buildings, roads, all leading to a general depression in the infrastructure. At the same time, agricultural resurgence in many developed countries, through the improvement of techniques and better application of water, improved seeds, fertilisers, and pesticides, is slowly transforming the rural areas of many countries from a vast reservoir of poverty to areas capable of absorbing investment. One tends to overlook that rural development and the new sense of power and destiny that the villager has gained in India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Thailand, Malaysia, to name only a few, together with the rise in grain prices and the increasing profitability of agriculture, which have resulted in the slowing down of flow of migration to the big city, but in increase in the flow to the smaller towns close to the agricultural regions. Another phenomenon which is overlooked is the extent to which the savings of workers in metropolitan, urban and industrial areas are

facturing towns. In the case of both rural and urban migrants, the sex ratio showed improvement in favour of females with longer durations, indicating a growing stability of migrants of longer durations.

systematically ploughed into rural areas even as savings from rural areas are kept by entrepreneurs and big farmers for setting up industries in small urban areas. In 1960-61, for example, the Calcutta industrial region sent out Rs 276 million by postal money orders alone to rural areas of India; Bombay sent Rs. 231 million; Delhi Rs. 77 million, Madras Rs. 69 million, and Bangalore, Ahmedabad and Kanpur Rs. 27 million each. These figures afford some idea of further savings which the worker carries with him on his annual holiday which must be twice these sums. This, together with the opportunities that agricultural processing and services and repairs to agriculture that the small town offers today lends plausible explanation to the growth of small towns and large rural-urban settlements and also an increase in the number of rural townsmen, and leads to the possibility that some part of the urban growth in the developing countries in the future will depend upon redefinition of settlements and on the greater availability of educational, social and municipal amenities in the prospering villages and small towns. The pattern of urban growth in developing countries may well differ from that which has been obtained in the developed countries in the past.

This is borne out by an analysis of internal migration and urbanisation in India based on the 1961 census data. In this analysis all the districts of India were divided into four levels of development with the help of 35 statistical indicators. This grading showed that the density of cultivators and agricultural labourers per 100 acres of net sown area was much less in the two top levels than in the two bottom ones. Secondly, the inter-State rural in-migration of cultivators and agricultural labourers was about the highest in districts of second and third levels (from the bottom) of development. Thirdly, districts in the lower levels of development, although they suffered from a high agricultural density already, were still relatively more jostled by cultivators and agricultural labourers

from outside the State. Overcrowding at intermediate levels of development with relatively low investments seems to attract more overcrowding. Fourthly, a very positive association was observed between the level of development of a district and its intra-State and inter-State migration pictures. As the level of development goes up, the districts in the two top levels of development attract more of rural and urban migrants, not only from within the State, but sometimes even more from outside. The level of urban to urban turn-round and step migration, in most cases, are high as well as the urban pulls. These forces operate on very low and even negligible levels in the districts of two bottom levels of development. In fact, they do not seem to exert much pull at all. Social, linguistic and cultural aspects work as limiting factors.

The upsurge in the agrarian base and near explosion in agricultural production through activation of peasant proprietorship have been greatly assisted by a combination of irrigation, electricity and communication. This, in turn, has led to the rapid intensification of physio-economic regionalisation to which private entrepreneurial skill in addition to public State investment has contributed a large measure of special purpose regionalisation.

#### Low Cost Areas

This regionalisation has been accelerated by preference on the part of entrepreneurial activity to gravitate towards low labour cost areas, that is, precisely those areas which are freshly coming up in agricultural production and by the tendency on the part of labour to migrate to more and more high-wage areas. This twin process has given rise to an interesting feature in recent times where migration has been selective in its preference more for those areas exhibiting a higher potential or possibility of absorption of labour than for areas which have already attained a high level of absorption. The rate of migration to the former is appreciably higher than to the latter.

The trend of migration in several developing countries therefore is definitely in favour of areas of higher expectancy and potential and these areas are precisely those which are "a combination of accelerated agricultural production, consolidation of peasant proprietorship, extension of electricity and irrigation with their consequent cycles of processing and agricultural industries and nodes of irrigated agriculture."

In an analysis of internal migration and urbanisation in India based on the Census data of 1961, it has been brought out how the rate of migration has accelerated and how urbanisation is burgeoning along electricity networks to the preference of metropolitan areas of high achievement. It can be cogently argued that the rate of urbanisation will be faster, and, ecologically different from the past, along electricity grids in the areas of spread effect, particularly in towns of less than 100,000 population than in the highly developed industrial economic regions. This has been borne out in an analysis of 533 factory locations owned by the top 32 industrial concerns and management houses in India. In some ways, the future seems to lie with small towns even below 20,000 where the greater availability of educational facilities in schools, vocational and technical institutions, and for on-the-job training along with expansion of processing, credit, repair, and services, marketing and other facilities, will exercise greater pull.

The process of urban growth therefore is facilitated where the country is large and already has a large number of middle sized settlements offering better opportunities for industrial dispersion. Indeed, in many developing countries, particularly those with small areas and small populations, the primate city seems to discourage intermediate urban growth and appropriate, instead, the bulk of rural-urban and urban-urban migrations. In Africa, for instance, the primate city drains the material and human resources from a network of settlements usually consisting of hamlets and villages. The resulting

demographic social and economic imbalances between town and country threaten effective overall development. It has been held that the modern African town did not grow out of the needs of, or in service to, its own hinterland. In many cases it has grown beyond the capacity of its hinterland to support it without radical reform. A strategy of strengthening the intermediate communities in the African regions may need more attention. A significant element in European, North American and Japanese agricultural development, and in recent years in countries like India, Pakistan, Egypt, Ghana, Thailand, Chile and Malaysia, is the small and medium sized towns which serve agriculture and the farming community. These settlements lack adequate means of communication with the main metropolitan centres. But in Africa also these intermediate communities may well grow into important strategic points in the process of modernising the rural areas and regulating or reducing the flow of migrants to primary cities. The strategy of expanding the holding capacity of the rural sector by appropriate measures of this kind are in the plans for such major regional development schemes as Volta and Aswan, the major aim being to place services and industries in such a way as to bring development closer to the farmer.

This scheme may find considerable support from the progress of service centres of rural-urban townships in Asian countries serving a group of villages. Such service centres, consisting of large service and medium-sized towns, have been increasingly functioning as viable units and as an optimum settlement pattern for achieving over-all rural and urban, agricultural and industrial development in Asia. In practice, a group of villages turns out to be serviced by its own industrial and middle-sized urban centres. These service/market centres would include processing industries and various social, cultural, economic, recreational and administrative services (such as secondary schools, hospitals, which would not be practicable in each

small village. The rural-urban towns tend to emerge from among the natural trade and communication centres and be connected in turn to larger urban centres within the framework of an overall network. Thus, these centres are used as a nucleus of the traditional market towns, established centres of trade, capital and enterprise, and become focal points of rural and agricultural development and serve as the centralizing point for agricultural marketing, cooperatives, services, and village industries. Such a settlement pattern, involving a group of villages, is bolstered by the long tradition in many Asian countries of inter-village contacts, involving, marriage, religion, trade, etc. The Chinese commune works out to be a thematic variation of his phenomenon in several Asian countries and confirms that smaller middle-sized settlements containing decentralised industries are not only desirable but feasible. The dispersion of industries to small towns and villages seems essential in creating the market atmosphere in rural areas so necessary to set in motion a series of economic and social changes, and also for utilising village-based idle labour for construction and other undertakings nor requiring a very high degree of skill. This is now being facilitated by electricity grids and expansion of transport networks. Large countries with diversified resources, like India, mainland China, Pakistan and Indonesia, are more likely to have more dispersed industrial resources, thereby facilitating industrial dispersions in small sized settlements serving a variety of both resources based and foot-loose or consumption industrial dispersions in small sized settlements serving a variety of both resources based and foot-loose or consumption industries. A major argument for decentralised industry in some rural small towns is that villagers can work in factories located in such settlements while continuing to reside in their villages (commuting by bicycle is fairly common). Railside and roadside industrial locations, have often proved in Asian countries to be more profitable than the crowded central city. (To be continued)

MAY 2, 1970

## Revolt Of The Adolescents

MRINAL SEN

**ENOUGH!** Enough of bad words, all too bad, about films that have been filling the columns of *Frontier*. For a change, now let us find a good film to talk about.

*IF* is the film of my choice, one that I saw for the second time in Delhi during the Festival last December. My first viewing was at Venice where, unconnected with the festival programme, a very private show was suddenly organised in an exclusively private theatre.

At Venice it was an after-dinner show. The fashionables, among others, visiting the festival and holidaying at the riviera hustled together, all strictly formal in dress and how-do-you-do's. As a contrast appeared the director of the film on the scene, violently informal in outfit, pacing up and down, squatting on the floor for brief moments, stretching his legs when he must, yawning without offering any apology and by doing so, outraging the fashionables' susceptibilities at every moment. A vicarious thrill, indeed!

Lindsay Anderson is the name of the director, born and made in England: angry, intolerable, intense and yet endowed with an inimitable sense of humour.

In Delhi, three months later, the film was presented at the festival outside the competition and as a condition for all festival showings it was untouched by the Censor Board.

In May 1968, the students at Sorbonne made a big noise and soon grew to be a major national event, a kind of mini-revolution, drawing world attention. In May 1969, *IF* got the Grand Prix at the Cannes festival where, exactly a year ago, Godard and his colleagues had rushed to the big screen of the festival theatre and created a militant scene chanting "Mao" and succeeded in paralyzing the traditional functioning. I can see a connection between the two: the ferment in 1968 and the verdict of the International

Jury of the 1969 festival at Cannes.

The script, I am told, was written before the May event in France. But changes were made, changes that made the connection more obvious. The story of the film, if it is to be called a story at all, is all about a "juvenile" attack on the Establishment.

From beginning to end, *IF* is an outrageously protest film, absurdly funny on the surface and bitter to the core. In its overall structure, in its thematic exploration, in the use of tools and in the minutest details of its anatomy, *IF* defies all conventions. It aims, at times, at the ludicrous, sometimes at the grotesque, but is always dangerously rebellious. And nowhere in the film has anger said goodbye to humour, which, to my mind, has given Lindsay Anderson's film a fascinating dimension.

If all these had happened in a public school: the silent protest of the students, the fermentation, the defiance, even the fun and violence of the inevitable sex-act among the adolescents the way it happens on the screen, and ultimately the resistance and the crusade: all this is the story of *IF*. A kind of wish fulfilment: queer, youthful and vibrant, all dreamlike in form and pure in content. The students of the public school dream a lovely dream, that of putting an end to the hateful business of "licking the frigid fingers" of the caretakers of the Establishment "for the rest of its frigid life." While, in essence, the message of the film goes much beyond the frontiers of the school premises, it is interesting to note that the director in order to find a "model" school, did not have to cross the English Channel. The area of operation is a typical British public school.

A duty-bound, discipline-ridden inspector of the school lodging walks into a room. The inspector smells alcohol. The students feign innocence. Silence awkward and amusing. Fuming within, the inspector walks out. Quietly do the boys pull out their bottles from under the pillows and cushions.

"In Calcutta", says one—an expert among the students—"there is one death out of starvation every few minutes." "The war", declares an inmate, gulping beer, "is the last creative act."

And you see a queer assembly of pictures and posters hung up on the walls: Che and Mao and also the Black Power which, according to a lodger, is "fascinating", not to speak of the guerillas and nudes and, of course, a familiar portrait of a Bengali girl who now is Aparna Sen.

In the gymnasium two boys play-act sword-fight, all so infantile. Suddenly they see blood. So do you. Follows an instant silence; silence that is intense, profound and electrifying. Offering blood the "warring" boys perform a ritual, pledging revolution. And thus "through wisdom" the students "get understanding".

Chargesheets are framed against a few boys for breaking the morale of "the house". They are punished which remind you of the horrors of the concentration camp. While you see the law-breaking juveniles being caned mercilessly and in the process getting steeled, surreptitiously does the camera capture another boy in another room quietly looking through microscope. The bacteria spread. So spread anger and violence.

The Establishment continues to function with apparent efficiency and considerable tact. There is no end to the big talk about the loyalty-bound public school and the tall promises about producing super-market managers. But the boys refuse to be beguiled any more. In utter desperation, they rise in revolt. They take a pledge: Death to the oppressor. Resistance, they say. Liberty, they promise.

Everything now is on a war footing. They call it a "crusade", the visuals and aural largely resembling modern warfare. And then in the midst of sound and fury the film ends abruptly, not with the customary "THE END" but with a big "IF".

IF is a funny, satirical, bitter allegory of an unusual kind where the implications told through words and

visuals are as familiar and communicative to a Calcuttan as they are to a Parisian or a Britisher or New Yorker or, for that matter, to any one who lives and grows in the contemporary climate.

## Letters

### 'The Real Revolutionaries'

There are certain people who are willing to go up to the brink, but not beyond. They would like, like circus spectators, to applaud the dare-devil sections of the revolutionaries, but the moment they see the dripping of the blood of the class enemy they get frightened. They say in wild horror—what nonsense, this is not Revolution. This is adventurism! If annihilating the class enemy and grabbing State power is not Revolution, then what is Revolution? Well, all these gentlemen who pretend to be on the side of the Revolution are really on the side of the counter-revolutionaries like the CPM and CPI. That is why they are still reluctant to call the CPM a class enemy. That is why they are reluctant to call Soviet Russia a social-imperialist country. They are in fact cunning agents of the CPM and the CPI in the garb of supporters of Revolution. These cowards accuse the CP(ML) for not taking into consideration the rank and file of the CPM as potential revolutionaries. What do these jackals really want? Do they want Charu Majumdar to address the rank and file of the CPM, and win them over by promising more economic benefits to them? What these self-patting intellectual flunkies forget is that in Bihar even the CPI rank and file came to the CP(ML) when the most-hated class enemies were killed in their area. So it is the action of annihilating the class-enemy that alone can bring the CPM and CPI rank and file to the side of the CP(ML). Fortunately the CP(ML) never cares to give any attention to what these impotent fence-sitting intellectuals pontificate. It is better

for these fence-sitters either to shut up, or call a spade a spade. Their game of hugging revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries, as it suits them, is not going to fool anybody except themselves.

M. N. D. NAIR  
Thycod, Trivandrum

In a recent article in the CPI-(ML) monthly, Mr Charu Majumdar has given instructions to his comrades explaining how to kill. I am a student of Marxism but I can't remember Lenin taking pains to tell how to kill. I fail to understand how a typical anarchist like Mr Charu Majumdar can pass for a 'revolutionary communist'. Violence is a necessary pre-condition for the liberation of the people, but it does never mean deliberate killing.

JAYANTA K. CHAUDHURI  
Englishbazar, Malda

### Megh O Raudra

A hidebound bourgeois, Mr Debal Chakravarty, in his letter (April 11) has accused the dapper critic Mr Mriganka Sekhar Ray of "highbrowism" and "modern nihilistic attitude." If phrases like "insipid yarn" or "sop" or mediocre or any other critical adjective is considered to be an aspect of "nihilistic attitude", then perhaps all critics are born like that.

What should be said about a film like Megh O Raudra is that it is only good in parts and to some extent more tolerable than an average mediocre Bengali film. But for that matter any attempt to paint it pink would amount to deifying one who does not deserve it at all.

PRADIP BISWAS  
Calcutta

---

FRONTIER is available from  
CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY  
23/90 Connaught Place  
New Delhi-1

MAY 2, 1970

PLACE A REGULAR ORDER FOR YOUR

# FRONTIER

## Subscription Rates

### INLAND

One year : Rs 16.50 Six Months : Rs 8.25

Five Years : Rs 75.00 Seven Years : Rs 100.00

### Foreign AIR MAIL Rates (One Year)

Europe : Rs 120 or 15 dollars

Asia : Rs 88 or 11 dollars

America : Rs 168 or 21 dollars

### By Surface Mail

All countries : Rs 40 or 5 dollars



# FRONTIER

61, MOTT LANE, CALCUTTA-13

Please supply the FRONTIER for  
Six Months/One year/Five Years/Seven Years

I am sending Rs.....

by cheque/money order\*

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Signature

\* Cheques should be drawn in favour of Frontier.

**WE ARE SOLE DISTRIBUTORS  
FOR EASTERN INDIA OF :**

DEPEND  
ON  
US...  
YOUR  
**SOUND**  
COMPANION

**MURPHY**

Radio and Transistor

**AHUJA**

P.A. Equipment, Hi-Fi  
Stereogram, Tape Recorder

**PYE**

Car Radio

**ARCEY**

Car Aerial, Suppressor,  
Condenser

**MECOM**

Intercommunication

**KEL**

Potentiometer, Rotary  
Switch



***murphy radio***

*Delights the home!*

**DEBSONS PVT. LIMITED**

CALCUTTA • GAUHATI • PATNA

CUTTACK • JABALPUR