

Proletarian Era

Volume 39 No. 4
October 1, 2005

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

Price : Rs. 2.00

MOVE TOWARDS UNITED EUROPEAN STATE

Effort to forge another imperialist combination

Some recent developments in different countries of Europe, centring round the activities of European Union (EU) and particularly the referendum there on the issue of adopting a common European Constitution, have attracted fresh attention of politically keen sections of people all over the world. These have also given rise to confusions in people's mind as to the role the EU may play in international politics and people's life. At the outset, it should be clearly stated that the EU is a Union of the ruling classes of the different European countries, floated, given shape to and trumpeted for, by the ruling bourgeois parties of those countries. Conflicts and combinations, contradictions and unity involved in these developments can only be viewed as frantic attempts of those capitalist countries of Europe, from big imperialists to weaker, relatively backward capitalists, to tide over their acute economic crisis, manifested in almost every one of them through rising unemployment, sickening industries trying to survive through merger, downsizing and the sorts, mounting political and social unrest and such others. In their turn, these contradictions and combinations develop on the background of the third intense general crisis of world imperialism, that developed since the second world war. As comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the founder General Secretary of our party, SUCI, and an eminent Marxist thinker of the post-Lenin days pointed out on different occasions as far back as in the fifties or sixties of the century ' emergence and existence of a parallel world socialist market, loss of the traditional markets of the former colonies, emergence of the bourgeoisie of the former colonies as competitors in the world market ' all this taken together did contract the market for the powerful imperialist countries, or for that matter, for the world imperialism-capitalism. The intense market crisis and concomitant acute recession compelled the imperialist-capitalist countries of the world to try one measure after another to get over them, albeit without success and in fact, forcing them to pass from one crisis to another

in the process. The course of events centring round the European Union need be judged in this background. In any case, an array of opinions and counter-opinions are being discussed. People of that part of the globe under the EU, as well as of the rest of the world should make a dispassionate study of the events and discussions to decide how this combination of European countries should be viewed and judged. We present this brief study on a Marxist approach to throw some light to that end. Before coming to the main issue, we would try to trace a brief history of the institution.

The beginning : the EEC

European Union is an organisation formed with the avowed goal of uniting European countries for their peaceful development. Such attempts were not entirely new for the continent. Barring the few attempts at unifying war-affected Europe in remote or recent past in the history of the continent, such as the Frankish empire of Charlemagne, the Holy Roman Empire, or more recent transient union under the French Emperor Napoleon or the German Kaiser, the first full-fledged union that emerged, was originally known as the European Economic Community (EEC: informally known also as the European Common Market particularly in the UK and our country India). It was established by the Treaty of Rome on 25 March, 1957 and implemented on 1 January 1958 with Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany as its members. Prior to the formation of the EEC, in 1952 the six countries had adopted some joint policies to pool their coal and steel resources in a common market controlled by an independent authority and based on them, had founded a joint commission on industries, to start with by forming an European Coal and Steel Community. In 1957, in addition to the EEC, there was formed an European Atomic Energy Community as well.

The EEC was meant to provide a common market for the constituent European countries who had lost in the second world war, a big

SUCI strongly condemns India Government's support to IAEA resolution against Iran

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, SUCI, in a statement issued on 26 September 2005 severely condemned the Congress-led CPI(M)-CPI backed UPA government for nakedly supporting the US and European Union sponsored resolution of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) requiring sovereign democratic Iran to succumb to their pressure and undertake its nuclear programme as per their dictates, thereby walking another mile for the brigand imperialist consolidation headed by the US imperialists. This once again proves that the Government of India with a view to subserving the aggregate interest of the ruling capitalist class is totally capitulated to world imperialism to curry favour for securing a berth in the G7 block, a permanent seat in the UN Security Council and pursuing the hegemonistic aspiration of the Indian monopolists.

The Congress-led government, said Comrade Mukherjee, is not at all perturbed by the so-called criticism of the CPI(M)-CPI who, it knows, are under compulsion of vote-politics to occasionally parade in such mock opposition for public consumption remaining firm in their commitment towards supporting it for full 5-year term.

Comrade Mukherjee called upon the people of the country to rise in protest and build up strong anti-imperialist movement to force the government change its pro-imperialist stand.

chunk at least, if not the whole of the market in their respective colonies they reigned over before the war. Led by France and Germany, and whatever be the explicit aim, it basically had a bent latent in it, directed against the increasing domination of the US imperialism. Expressedly, it worked for free movement of labour and capital, the development of joint and reciprocal policies on labour, social welfare, agriculture, transport, and foreign trade and, over and above, introduction of a common tariff in lieu of national tariffs by a period of twelve years. It established

Contd. on page 2

Move for united Europe began as aftermath of the second world war

Contd. from page 1

common price levels for agricultural products in 1962. In 1968, internal tariffs (tariffs on trade between member nations) were scrapped on certain products. An European Monetary System (EMS) became operative in 1979. Finally a common currency of the Euro (excluding the UK and Denmark, which have derogations and Sweden voluntarily excluding itself from the monetary union; the twelve countries accepting the Euro are Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Luxembourg, Greece, Spain, Ireland, Austria, Portugal and Finland) was also introduced. It was thus an organization with the aim of eventual economic union of its member nations to begin with.

But the course of events did not match straightaway with the aim. In 1958 only, Britain proposed that the Common Market be expanded into a transatlantic free-trade area. During those post-second world war days, the US capital was so strongly invested in the UK, that the rest of Europe, particularly France and Germany, saw this proposal of Britain as an attempt to push the USA into the ECM. Britain allegedly working for the latter. After the proposal was vetoed by France, Britain engineered the formation of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) in 1960 and was joined by other European nations that did not belong to the Common Market. Then again, beginning in 1973, with British, Irish, and Danish accession to the EEC, the EFTA and the EEC came closer in many areas of economic policy, and by 1995, all but four EFTA members had joined together.

European Union comes into being

In 1992 by the Treaty on European Union (commonly known as the Maastricht Treaty), the word 'Economic' was removed from the name European Economic Community and the European Union or EU was founded. The organization, however, bore differences right from the start in approach in running it. There were countries like United Kingdom and a few others which wished decision-making to be unanimous with member-states having the power. Others, like France, Germany and certain others tended to prefer decisions be made by majority votes with power to rest

with independently appointed officials or by representatives elected by the legislatures or people of the member states.

The European Union currently has 25 member states joining the EEC or the EU at different times. Thus there were the original six countries of the EEC, namely Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and The Netherlands as the founding members. United Kingdom, Denmark, Ireland joined it in 1973; Greece in 1981; Portugal and Spain in 1986; East Germany reuniting with West Germany joined in 1990; Austria, Finland and Sweden entered in 1995 and finally in 2004 there were Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia that joined the EU. Greenland which was granted home rule by Denmark in 1979, left the EEC in 1985, following a referendum. In addition, Croatia is a candidate to join the Union; Romania and Bulgaria are scheduled to become members on 1 January 2007; Iceland, Norway and Switzerland are not member states but do have special agreements with the Union. Russia, which is not yet a member of the EU, had a recent summit talk in Moscow with the EU leaders that ended on 29 May with a joint declaration in which the two sides acknowledged that they had failed to find accord agreeing only to further talks.

However, particularly in some western European member states like France or The Netherlands, reportedly there is an increasing disapproval of including eastern European, formerly socialist states into the EU. It is feared there that their inclusion will jam the labour market of the latter by the labour force of those countries, available at lower wages. This will only add to the already mounting unemployment in the western states. The remaining smaller or economically weaker countries are not viewed currently suitable for membership. A further point of contention for EU members is the Turkey question. France, Germany, the Netherlands, and other long-time members of the EU are fearful of Turkey joining the EU.

In summary, the European Union came up as an economic union of a few European countries as they desired and decided upon to move ahead with joint and common policies, common tariff and common

currency. From here the EU tended to grow up, with more members and to that extent with greater strength, into a more and more centralized political entity. In this process it developed a legislative process involving the European Commission, European Parliament and Council of the European Union, with whose working European Union Law increasingly made its presence felt in the systems of the member states. The Union has several other institutions like the European Court of Justice, the European Court of Auditors etc. and several financial bodies like European Central Bank (which alongside the national Central Banks, composes the European System of Central Banks), European Investment Bank (including the European Investment Fund), a number of agencies and lastly, the European Ombudsman, watching for abuses of power by EU institutions. With all this structural and institutional framework, the EU attempted at adopting a common constitution and legality reflecting its ultimate striving to assume some sort of state-like character, at the same time being not exactly a state, as commonly conceived. So much so about the facts and figures on the EU, through the years before and after it was born and passed through its teething periods.

The EU tries for European Constitution, receives a jolt

On October 29, 2004, heads of member-governments of the European Union signed a Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, to be ratified by all 25 member states of the EU. Hitherto the European Community acted as an actual body, including the European institutions (European Parliament, Council of the European Union, European Commission), whilst the European Union was a less tangible grouping of institutions and agreements. If ratified, the proposed new Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, to enter into force on November 1, 2006, would abolish this dual structure between the EU and the EC (former EEC), bringing all the European Community's activities under the auspices of the European Union and transferring the Community's legal personality to the Union. However, this process faltered on May 29, 2005 when the people of France (about 55% of the massive 70%

turnout) voted "non" in a referendum on the Constitution, referred earlier in this article. This forced a change of Prime Minister in France. Their 'non' was followed three days later by a Dutch 'nee' on June 1, 2005 when people of the Netherlands voted against it as well.

The aftermath did not prove healthy for the EU. The EU summit in Brussels on June 16 and 17, reportedly effervescent, ultimately agreed on a 'pause for reflection', and decided to go slow in the process of recruiting more members to the EU, as also to scrap the November 2006 date for the EU treaty on the Constitution to be ratified. This marked a retreat from earlier opinions of Germany, France and Luxembourg, that had called for the ratification process to continue, despite rejections in France and the Netherlands. It also marked a sort of victory for Britain, which assumed the EU presidency on July 1 and never was enthusiast on the constitution. The last-named country did not buy time to hold back its proposed own referendum on the constitution in a year's time, and virtually concluded the constitution treaty dead. Recent strifes within the EU cropped up in other issues like the EU budget, or a change in the 'current heavy focus on farming subsidies' etc. too.

Peaceful alliances of imperialists grow out of wars and prepare ground for wars in turn

To comprehend the significance of such an event-generating organisation as the EEC, now developed into the EU, in the world politics, we should get at certain important features of the history of the continent of Europe itself. But before that we would like to bring in a few words of Lenin, the great Proletarian leader. As far back as in 1915, in the post-first world war situation, when world capitalism-imperialism was facing a mounting economic-political crisis and was groping for a way out, Lenin wrote in *Sotsial-Demokrat* (Collected Works, Prog. Pubs., Moscow, Vol. 21, 1965, pp. 339-43) on the Slogan for a United States of Europe: "A United States of Europe under capitalism is tantamount to an agreement on the partition of colonies. Under capitalism, however, no other basis and no other principle of division are possible

Contd. on page 4

COMBAT LIBERALISM

Mao Zedong

We stand for active ideological struggle because it is the weapon for ensuring unity within the Party and the revolutionary organizations in the interest of our fight. Every Communist and revolutionary should take up this weapon.

But liberalism rejects ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace, thus giving rise to a decadent, Philistine attitude and bringing about political degeneration in certain units and individuals in the Party and the revolutionary organizations.

Liberalism manifests itself in various ways.

To let things slide for the sake of peace and friendship when a person has clearly gone wrong, and refrain from principled argument because he is an old acquaintance, a fellow townsman, a schoolmate, a close friend, a loved one, an old colleague or old subordinate. Or to touch on the matter lightly instead of going into it thoroughly, so as to keep on good terms. The result is that both the organization and the individual are harmed. This is one type of liberalism.

To indulge in irresponsible criticism in private instead of actively putting forward one's suggestions to the organization. To say nothing to people to their faces but to gossip behind their backs, or to say nothing at a meeting but to gossip afterwards. To show no regard at all for the principles of collective life but to follow one's own inclination. This is a second type.

To let things drift if they do not affect one personally; to say as little as possible while knowing perfectly well what is wrong, to be worldly wise and play safe and seek only to avoid blame. This is a third type.

Not to obey orders but to give pride of place to one's own opinions. To demand special consideration from the organization but to reject its discipline. This is a fourth type.

To indulge in personal attacks, pick quarrels, vent personal spite or seek revenge instead of entering into an argument and struggling against incorrect views for the sake of unity or progress or getting the work done properly. This is a fifth type.

To hear incorrect views without rebutting them and even to hear counter-revolutionary remarks without reporting them, but instead

to take them calmly as if nothing had happened. This is a sixth type.

To be among the masses and fail to conduct propaganda and agitation or speak at meetings or conduct investigations and inquiries among them, and instead to be indifferent to them and show no concern for their well-being, forgetting that one is a Communist and behaving as if one were an ordinary non-Communist. This is a seventh type.

To see someone harming the interests of the masses and yet not feel indignant, or dissuade or stop him or reason with him, but to allow him to continue. This is an eighth type.

To work half-heartedly without a definite plan or direction; to work perfunctorily and muddle along—"So long as one remains a monk, one goes on tolling the bell." This is a ninth type.

To regard oneself as having rendered great service to the revolution, to pride oneself on being a veteran, to disdain minor assignments while being quite unequal to major tasks, to be slipshod in work and slack in study. This is a tenth type.

To be aware of one's own mistakes and yet make no attempt to correct them, taking a liberal attitude towards oneself. This is an eleventh type.

We could name more. But these eleven are the principal types.

They are all manifestations of liberalism.

Liberalism is extremely harmful in a revolutionary collective. It is a corrosive which eats away unity, undermines cohesion, causes apathy and creates dissension. It robs the revolutionary ranks of compact organization and strict discipline, prevents policies from being carried through and alienates the Party organizations from the masses which the Party leads. It is an extremely bad tendency.

Liberalism stems from petty-bourgeois selfishness, it places personal interests first and the interests of the revolution second, and this gives rise to ideological, political and organizational liberalism.

People who are liberals look upon the principles of Marxism as abstract dogma. They approve of Marxism, but are not prepared to practice it or to practice it in full;

they are not prepared to replace their liberalism by Marxism. These people have their Marxism, but they have their liberalism as well—they talk Marxism but practice liberalism; they apply Marxism to others but liberalism to themselves. They keep both kinds of goods in stock and find a use for each. This is how the minds of certain people work.

Liberalism is a manifestation of opportunism and conflicts fundamentally with Marxism. It is negative and objectively has the effect of helping the enemy; that is why the enemy welcomes its preservation in our midst. Such being its nature, there should be no place for it in the ranks of the revolution.

We must use Marxism, which is positive in spirit, to overcome liberalism, which is negative. A Communist should have largeness of mind and he should be staunch and active, looking upon the interests of the revolution as his very life and subordinating his personal interests to those of the revolution; always and everywhere he should adhere to principle and wage a tireless struggle against all



26 December 1893 – 9 September 1976

incorrect ideas and actions, so as to consolidate the collective life of the Party and strengthen the ties between the Party and the masses; he should be more concerned about the Party and the masses than about any private person, and more concerned about others than about himself. Only thus can he be considered a Communist.

All loyal, honest, active and upright Communists must unite to oppose the liberal tendencies shown by certain people among us, and set them on the right path. This is one of the tasks on our ideological front.

September 7, 1937

[We regret our mistake with the date of birth of Mao Zedong in Proletarian Era issue dated September 1, 2005]

State level students' convention at Bhubaneswar

A state level students' representative convention organized by AIDS, Orissa State Council was held on 21st August 2005 at Bhubaneswar to chalk out a programme of state level students' movement against anti-students and anti-education curtailment scheme of the state government. The convention demanded abolition of some basic subjects like Economics, Political Science, Mathematics, Philosophy etc. from +3 Arts Syllabus and rampant fee hike. The convention was presided over by a Presidium with Comrade Rajendra Burma and Nirakar Pandav, President and the Vice-President of the State Committee respectively. Comrade Ashok Mishra, Secretary of the State Committee gave the

introductory speech. Some eminent educationists like Professor Srinibas Rath, Dr. Birendra Nayak and Dr. Benudhar Padhy along with SUCI Orissa State Committee member Comrade Chhabi Mohanty addressed the convention and called upon the student community to rise up to the occasion to resist the attack of commercialization on education and to protect the right of education which is being curtailed by the ruling class. Students' representatives from more than 100 colleges attended the convention. The convention decided to hold a massive students demonstration on 16th September 2005 before Orissa Secretariat to pressurize the government to withdraw their anti-education policies.

The war brought forth more of cosmopolitanism and a change in balance of power

Contd. from page 2

except force.....Of course, temporary agreements are possible between capitalists and between states. In this sense a United States of Europe is possible as an agreement between the European capitalists... but to what end? Only for the purpose of jointly suppressing socialism in Europe, of jointly protecting colonial booty against Japan and America....A United States of the World (not of Europe alone) is the state form of the unification and freedom of nations which we associate with socialism — until the time when the complete victory of communism brings about the total disappearance of the state, including the democratic." Lenin also placed clearly that "...a general alliance embracing all the imperialist powers, is inevitably nothing more than a "truce" in periods between wars. Peaceful alliances prepare the ground for wars, and in their turn grow out of wars; the one conditions the other, producing alternating forms of peaceful and non-peaceful struggle on one and the same basis of imperialist connections and relations within world economics and world politics." (Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism).

It was on such invaluable Marxist-Leninist understandings and teachings that reached far beyond the time of their composition, that our party, SUCI, led by the eminent Marxist thinker of the era and our founder General Secretary, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, presented an elaborate analysis of the reasons of emergence of and the role to be played by the EEC or the European Common Market, as it was known more popularly here in India. More than four decades back from now, not too long after the end of the second world war, we made this study in our Bengali party organ, Ganadabi, August 31, 1961 issue. Armed with Leninist teachings, we concluded then that the EEC appeared to be an organization that could be termed as the twentieth century instance of the series of attempts at peace that interspersed with periods of devastating wars sweeping across that continent.

During the post-industrial revolution days, the western countries soon grew up to monopoly and then to capitalist-imperialist powers to rule over the world

market. However, in the same course they were also entangled in a sequence of events. In the initial phase of development of their bourgeois democracy and capitalist economy, the bourgeoisie, the capitalists pleaded for sovereignty of their country and economy. Obviously that was required for a smooth and speedy growth of their economy and politics, free from clutches of any external interference. But as their exploitative capitalist economy gave rise to crisis in the internal market of their respective national soil, laissez-faire economy of free competition gave way to concentration, i.e., monopoly. The bourgeoisie, who were once-champion of freedom, democracy and sovereignty became proponents of cosmopolitanism in economy seeking for external market. In politics they took to imperialism-colonialism. Thereby they transgressed upon sovereignty of other countries, subjugating them to their colonial-imperialist rule. In this process, at times the imperialist countries were at war with each other with a view to extending and consolidating their respective spheres of influence and market. At others, they carried the banner of peace, with, however, the same motive of keeping hold on the world market, this time mutually sharing the available market without any further loss of their own strength.

Once again, we recall here the brilliant analysis of Lenin in his famous book "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism". In course of his discussion, drawing out examples from Britain, he said, "In the most flourishing period of free competition in Great Britain, i.e., between 1840 and 1860, the leading British bourgeois politicians were opposed to colonial policy and were of the opinion that the liberation of the colonies, their complete separation from Britain, was inevitable and desirable...But at the end of the nineteenth century the British heroes of the hour openly advocated imperialism and applied the imperialist policy in the most cynical manner!" While elaborating the characteristics of the finance capital of the age of imperialism, he added "Finance capital is such a great, such a decisive... force in all economic and in all international relations, that it

is capable of subjecting, and actually does subject, to itself even states enjoying the fullest political independence;... Of course, finance capital finds most "convenient", and derives the greatest profit from a form of subjection which involves the loss of the political independence of the subjected countries and peoples." Thus "Monopolies, oligarchy (meaning the financial oligarchy — Editor, Proletarian Era), the striving for domination and not for freedom, the exploitation of an increasing number of small or weak nations by a handful of the richest or most powerful nations — all these have given birth to those distinctive characteristics of imperialism which compel us to define it as parasitic or decaying capitalism." Consequences of such development, Lenin explained it too, with the words: "The epoch of the latest stage of capitalism shows us that certain relations between capitalist associations grow up, based on the economic division of the world; while parallel to and in connection with it, certain relations grow up between political alliances, between states, on the basis of the territorial division of the world, of the struggle for colonies, of the "struggle for spheres of influence"...It is beyond doubt, therefore, that capitalism's transition to the stage of monopoly capitalism, to finance capital, is connected with the intensification of the struggle for the partitioning of the world."

Thus the acute market crisis, inevitable with the exploitative capitalist system growing into imperialism led to the first world war. It involved all the major imperialist countries of Europe, being pitted in two warring camps and trying to establish their own respective domination over the world market. However, the war could not reduce the crisis. Rather, Russia, a Tsarist imperialist country had to give way to the first socialist state, the Soviet Union, born under the leadership of the great proletarian leader Comrade Lenin. In Europe, there was a transient peace attempt. The crisis, however, haunted the capitalist-imperialist camp in ever-deepening form. Nazism in Germany, and fascism in Italy were established as the panacea to overcome the crisis. But the crisis simply drove these and

other imperialist powers like Britain, France, America and their allies to the devastating second world war. End of that war forced the market-hunting imperialists to peace, but with their market crisis aggravated manifold. Socialism emerged as a strong force that led the world to save humanity from the menace of fascism. One-third of the world became socialist states, forming the socialist camp. Numbers of colonies and semi-colonies of the imperialist powers in Asia, Africa and Latin America emerged as newly independent sovereign states, that chose to take up capitalist path and thereby emerged also as new competitors in occupying shares of the world market, hitherto held solely by the major imperialist powers. With the market thus squeezed sizeably, yet productive capacity increased still further, the recession, the crisis surpassed all earlier limits. A series of changes, however, followed in the fields of economy and politics.

Second world war drove imperialists more to cosmopolitanism and brought change in balance of power

Different bourgeois national states with their respective national character and national aspirations as the main basic facets and, at the same time, with monopoly capitalism developed in them, tried to build up cosmopolitan monopoly capital through their different kinds of combination, even amalgamation with each other with a view to strengthening capital to combat the crisis. If and wherever they failed, they tried to adopt joint policies in case of specific industries without actual amalgamation of capitals. This, however, always left a possibility of contradiction between the existing, inherent national interests and the emerging cosmopolitan interests of the monopoly capital of different countries striving for amalgamation.

This was accompanied by the new balance of power within the imperialist-capitalist camp, that developed after the second world war. Britain and France, along with the Dutch, Belgian and other powers, were war ravaged themselves and had largely lost their traditional market in the colonies and semicolonies in Asia and

Contd. on page 5

Crisis of capitalism, globalization and consolidation of the EU go hand-in-hand to make people the worst sufferer

Contd. from page 4

Africa, Germany, Italy and Japan were simply devastated and humiliated. The USA, on the other hand, least affected by the war and, on the contrary, reaping good fortune through liberal sale of arms to the warring European countries, shoved back Britain and France and tried to assume the status of the major imperialist power in the post second world war scenario. They jumped upon the opportunity to establish their neo-colonial domination over the economically weaker countries of Asia-Africa-Latin America, often with military might and intervention-subversions. At the same time, they pushed ahead with liberal export of their finance capital, often in the name of aids and loans to the war-ravaged European countries avowedly for peaceful reconstruction of their economies and protection from further advent of socialism-communism. Thus there came up the alliances like the NATO in Europe cordoning the Soviet Union and East European countries of the socialist camp.

Europe needed to combat US imperialism and regain market to surmount crisis

Soon the European countries, thus faced basically two-fold problems: one of freeing themselves from the economic and political domination of the upcoming US imperialists and the other of regaining, at the same time, their own spheres of influence with a view to ensuring enough market to overcome the deepening crisis. Emergence of the EEC in the post second world war Europe manifested these conflicts-contradictions-aspirations and attempts. The common market, the joint policies, the tariff-free trade were all attempts to bring the concerned imperialist powers together, with a view to consolidating and strengthening their state and private monopoly capital. With that they could look ahead to combat the US domination and could also explore and extend their own spheres of influence, all with the sole motive to fight out the irreconcilable market crisis. All these were thus manifestation of contradictions within the post-war imperialist camp, between the US imperialists

on one hand and the lost-glory, yet aspirant European imperialists on the other. They also manifested contradictions among the European imperialists themselves which tried to resolve their contradictions, at least temporarily through non-antagonistic, peaceful means, banking on cosmopolitanism, yet retaining their respective national interests. This situation that started shortly after the end of the second world war and led to the formation of the EEC, persists in essence till today when the EEC has given way to the broader and stronger EU.

But the 'search for peace' or 'resolving differences' peacefully could never prevent contradictions from playing their inevitable role. From their class position and being basically united in their class interest against the working class and proletarian revolution, the US imperialism could compel and drag the European capitalists-imperialists to join NATO with a view to containing the Soviet Union and communism. Yet the European capitalists-imperialists strove to free themselves from the US domination. Even in their so-called 'unipolar' world, the contradiction between the US imperialists on one hand, and the European powers on the other was apparent in different global issues, like that of the naked aggression on Iraq by the US-UK imperialist combine being opposed by the French or German imperialists. Attempts to consolidate the EU further, with adoption of a constitution and giving it a shape of state, are also indicative of the hectic move of European powers to consolidate their strength obviously against the domination of the US imperialists in the present world of globalised economy.

Major contradictions of post-war world manifest vividly through the EU

In addition, there were and there are contradictions among the European powers themselves, now coming down, then buoying up. The six-nation EEC and the UK-led EFTA were involved in such a contradiction. The EFTA countries have joined the EU; but the contradictions particularly between the British imperialists and the French, German and other imperialists, remain, amply demonstrated even of late on

questions of the Constitution or the EU budget or 'subsidies to farmers' issue. There are also contradictions between Germany and other major European countries, particularly like that of France, who are always apprehensive of the German domination, reminiscent of the world war days.

The complexities of relations among different capitalist-imperialist countries with which the EEC and later the EU grew up in the post-world war scenario or the complexities which they bore all these years, are thus to be viewed on the background of these. From their basic class instinct and interest, all these capitalist-imperialist powers, the US, or the European are united in their opposition to socialism. Yet contradictions within contradictions drove the European imperialists to seek for unity among themselves against the US imperialist domination and in their common interest of regaining market. Similarly, among the European forces, the British imperialism could not ignore the European move; it was in the same boat with them having lost the empire in which the sun supposedly never 'set'. So it had one step forward to join the EEC. Yet historically alienated from the 'continent', right from the start of its post-war rejuvenation, it preferred playing a sort of second fiddle to the upcoming US imperialism. Hence its proposal to make the common market 'transatlantic' in the fifties of the last century and hence its enthusiasm to remain in tow with the war-monger US imperialism in their 'anti-terror' campaign even at the turn of the century. Again, contradictions among the other European imperialists themselves were also within the fold of contradictions within the world-imperialist system itself. Which of these contradictions will assume determining role at a particular historical moment in the international politics will depend on an ever-varying complex set of factors. Thus Europe may come closer at a moment against the USA; at another it may show clearer signs of mutual strife. At one moment, one imperialist power may succumb to the pressure of a mightier another; but that does never mean that it won't come up

as a viable contender for prominence or hegemony at another suitable moment. These contradictions as yet peaceful, are however basically antagonistic in nature, as they generate from the frantic efforts of imperialists to grab market to save their respective crisis-ridden economies. These are the very same contradictions that generated the two world wars and led Comrade Lenin to propound his invaluable thesis that 'imperialism inevitably generates war'. It remains true, even if they may take place in a so-called 'unipolar world'.

Besides there are the contradictions between the major imperialist powers of Europe and the economically weaker or relatively less developed capitalist countries of the world that assumed independent sovereign status after the second world war. Some of them like India have already assumed the character of imperialism by exporting finance capital and exploiting the cheap labour, raw materials and market of weaker countries of Asia, Africa and even Europe. In fact, British Prime Minister's remarks, made immediately after the failed summit of the EU in Mid-June, were meant to make the European powers aware of the growing economies of India and China in particular, as also of other Asian countries. In their hours of crisis, they will take these latter countries as potential threats to Europe; at other moments they will make amends with economic deals and concessions to share the available part of global market. Verbosity in talks between the British Prime Minister and his Indian counterpart are the latest examples of the latter. Obviously this contradiction, sometimes antagonistic at others not, stands out as a glaring example of the contradiction between the traditional powerful imperialist countries and the newly developing capitalist-imperialist countries, which under certain conditions may assume important role to play.

EU strongly manifests contradiction between the ruling capitalists and the people of each constituent country

Finally, the developments and conflicts within the European Union

Contd. on page 6

EU injures nationalism and poses danger to play upon it as well

Contd. from page 5

also highlights another major contradiction of the world today. Since capitalism assumed power and particularly since capitalism entered its highest, yet moribund stage of imperialism, the contradiction between the ruling capitalist class and the vast masses of the exploited, toiling people has assumed a major role to determine the course of events. The present irreconcilable and unassailable crisis of world capitalism has prompted the ruling capitalist class of European countries to seek redressals in the EU. They take to globalization, to cosmopolitanism to fight out the crisis, but the more there is globalization or cosmopolitanism, the more acute the crisis has become. It has given birth to increasing plight in the life of people there. This is manifested in their economic stagnation and particularly in the acute unemployment. Obviously the wrath and indignation of people burst out in series of movements, massive demonstrations, road blockades, even regional or countrywide strikes by workers and peasants and middle class toiling people in different countries of Europe. Finally they found a shape in the French and Dutch people's refusal of the proposal of the European constitution floated by their ruling capitalists-imperialists. Thus, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Workers of France (PCOF) (vide its statement on May 29, 2005, the very day on which the French refused the European constitution and published in online edition of the Revolutionary Democracy) or the Pole of the Communist Renaissance in France (PRCF), representing a section of the French communists that are fighting against their revisionist leadership within the party, independently or jointly with forces like the Marxist-Leninist Party of Denmark, the Communist Party in Denmark, and the Communist Party of the Spanish people pronounce in unambiguous words (see the Communist Initiative December 2004) that the proposed new EU Constitution is a totalitarian project that follows introduction of a common currency, raising of European army and a series of reactionary treaties, as an attempt by the forces of big capital to take a new step towards building up sort of an European state of

several nations with the help of an European Constitution. This is happening at a moment when on one hand the US imperialism is carrying on offensives in this or that part of the globe, as well as when the ruling capitalists of different European countries themselves are unleashing 'neo-liberal' aggression on their people with privatization of public services, deregulation of the right to work, liquidation of social security, so-called 'flexibilization' of labour thereby destroying industry, agriculture, public sector, research, culture and even language in the name of European integration. Leaders of the right and of the social-liberals, the compromising bourgeois-petit-bourgeois leadership within the left movement in different States of the European Union all join the chorus of implementing these policies. The policies also involve militarization of the Union under the pretext of the "fight against terrorism," a priority in the proposed constitution.

European people identify European Constitution as a 'neo-liberal' globalization menace

It all means that people of Europe identify the Constitution as a mark of 'neo-liberal' globalization designed to reap maximum possible benefit for monopoly capitals of imperialist powers from a consolidated, rather globalized economy and politics. They have begun to believe firmly that the Constitution, as the latest contrivance associated with the EU, is being implemented to help monopolists pass on the entire burden of the recession and market crisis of capitalism on to the toiling masses at the cost of any measure conducive to the interest of the common people. In the process, as they hold, it destroys social acquisitions and public services. It facilitates industrial break up, though at the same time help imperialist powers consolidate themselves. It completely shatters hard-earned democratic rights and liberties of toiling people, and any and every welfare measure for people, the bourgeois society was once compelled to offer to people. The European Constitution is also designed to curb liberties of people and any possibility of their resentment and resistance, and thereby even to transgress upon national sovereignty of the

European peoples. It is also destined to neocolonize the former socialist countries by transforming them into reserves of raw materials and cheap labour, all the while encouraging the repressive anti-communist government. Far from constituting a point of support for the forces of peace, the European communists point out that, this block cannot but comport itself as a new pole of domination, 'sometimes vassal of the USA, sometimes rival of the latter for the world domination'.

They also bring out, in concrete terms, the real face of the European Union or the proposed Constitution. They add that as it is revealed from every statement of accounts of the MNCs, consolidation of monopoly capital of different countries have simply helped their profits to soar high with parallel rise in people's unemployment, poverty and plight. In this respect, the following figures from France are further revealing. This European Constitution proposal was heavily promoted by the transnational monopolies; it was the latter who persuaded people to vote "yes for a prosperous Europe." For instance, in France these included the petroleum concern Total, which reported \$10.9 billion profits in 2004, the highest ever recorded by a French firm, and which is laying off workers on French territory; the cosmetics firm L'Oréal, whose CEO is the highest paid in the country at \$7.9 million per year and whose owner is "the richest woman in France" with a fortune of \$13.7 billion, the machine tools company Schneider, whose shareholders enjoyed the biggest increase in dividends last year—63.6 percent and the armaments firm Dassault, which has just bought part of the media. The last-mentioned bombarded the public with "yes" slogans. On the contrary, one of every six French workers is paid only the minimum wage and 7 million people in France live in poverty.

This is how the European people feel about the EU and its proposed Constitution. Recent rejection of the Constitution in France and elsewhere, was defeat of plans and aspirations of the ruling capitalists there, by the people. "This victory is not only an act of resistance; it is a statement of joint struggle against neo-liberalism, the policy at the exclusive service of the monopolies", so was concluded by the CC(PCOF) and others, with

a call for constructing a large front of workers and progressives in each country, linked with popular struggles against unified Europe of big capital and against the project of their European Constitution they wanted to impose on people.

We sincerely hope people of Europe, not just of France and any other country in singular, will come to realize this exposed skeleton of the EU.

Move for consolidating EU injures people's nationalist feelings and thus evokes opposition

It is clear from the above discussion that centring round the European Union there has developed a peculiar situation in the world politics, particularly in its European scenario. A large section of the ruling monopolists of different major European countries are trying to set up a new type of state, rather a sort of a united states of Europe comprising at least majority of European countries. They started with an economic union with the help of which they might enjoy mutual advantages or concessions. And now they are trying for a more consolidated political union, the said sort of a united states of Europe with a constitution, a parliament and so on and so forth. But their aspirations suffered a setback particularly on the question of the Constitution and other issues. Whatever the ruling monopolists might have wanted, people of their countries do not seem to fall in line. However hectic the rulers might be in their moves, there is no sign of people being enthusiast in participating in their moves. The monopoly-controlled media is keen to generate a hype in favour of the European Union and its proposed, yet failed, Constitution. Their campaign, well lubricated with monopoly sponsorship, may have confused a section of people within Europe and without. Yet the opposition is of late indicated, for example in the French or Dutch referendum. These events have once again made it apparent that people of the constituent countries of the EU have nationalist feelings, centring round their own respective country, strongly working within them. Increasing disapproval of including eastern European, formerly socialist states into the EU, that is to be

Contd. on page 7

People's revolutionary movement stands at stake with the EU

Contd. from page 6

found in the two countries mentioned, that is, France and the Netherlands or in others where there has not been apparently any opposition to the Constitution also really marks contradiction in terms of the nationalist sentiments of the respective people ; though it may be outwardly based on apprehension that inclusion of these east European countries will jam the labour market of the western European countries by the labour force of those countries, available at lower wages. It is this nationalist feeling, because of which people have refused to give in to the monopolist move. It is this nationalist feeling, on the strength of which people refuse to forego their sovereignty to make room for the combination working obviously in favour of the monopolists.

History of appearance and course of disappearance of nationalism and national states and their bearing on the EU

In this connection, it may be mentioned that nationalism as an ideological creed appeared at a particular juncture of human history. It developed within the confines of particular geographical territories, during and through their respective people's struggle against the then ruling feudal authority or monarchy or later in the days of colonialism-imperialism, against the ruling imperialist-colonial power. Such struggle against feudalism or colonialism-imperialism, termed also the democratic revolution, created a common bondage, a common feeling among the fighting people irrespective of caste, language or religion etc., that provided the foundation of nationalism to grow. We have however crossed over to the present age, which is generally and characteristically the age of proletarian revolution, though there may crop up nationalist struggle in one soil or other, under typical circumstances.

When at this stage of history of human society Karl Marx presented his theory of communism to the working class of the world, he raised the slogan "Workers of the World Unite"! At the same time he also emphasized that the working class movement must build up on the basis of the fundamental content of proletarian internationalism, and not on nationalism. How should we

grasp the significance of these slogans? Working class of different countries, their oppressed people raise these in course of their struggle against their respective ruling class. By this they mean, they aspire for, they seek for the fighting fraternity and solidarity of workers and toiling masses of different countries in their fight for the common goal to end with exploitation and oppression. Unity signifies this; unity strives for this. Marx knew it well that workers cannot be freed from their bourgeois nationalist feelings and be united on the ideals of proletarian internationalism overnight by one stroke. It can only materialize through long arduous struggles under the leadership of the respective working class of different countries. Such struggles though developed within the confines of nation states, will not be based on nationalism. They will seek inspiration and strength from the ideology of Marxism and the feelings and sentiment of proletarian internationalism and will gradually steel the fighting oppressed people with their cherished ideology and feelings. It is only in this way through successfully accomplishing revolution by overthrowing capitalism in one country after another, the working class will establish the socialist state, the proletarian dictatorship respectively in one and all of them as a transitional phase. To quote Marx : "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." (Marx quoted in State and Revolution: Lenin) Socialism, thus founded and guided by the Marxist ideology and outlook, will seriously and all pervasively cult proletarian internationalism and will thus pave the way to reach the threshold of establishing the world communist society, in other words, establishing the classless human society. Abolition of class will naturally make the state, the coercive instrument of class rule, useless. Thus states hitherto operating within the national confines will lose their role and disappear from the history of mankind. The state, to quote the words of Engels, "is not 'abolished'. It withers away". (Engels quoted in

State and Revolution : Lenin) They will make room for the higher form of human society, the world communist society. This remains the infallible guideline and teaching in regard to the disappearance of nationalism and national states. No hotchpotch or hasty combination of national states can emerge, leave aside sustain, circumventing or avoiding this historical course of their development. Some attempts were made at times, invariably without success. Going against this correct Marxist teaching, once, towards the middle of the last century, there were efforts to unite Egypt and Syria, that was very soon frustrated. Now frantic efforts to forge unity of different bourgeois states in the name of forming an European state, the EU, are finding newer and newer obstacles. Such is bound to be the course and fate of these combinations.

Obviously, nationalism played an indispensable role in formation of nation states under the rule of respective capitalist class. Any attempt, as is being made by the capitalists-imperialists of European countries, towards a new form of state as the EU, cannot avoid this course of struggle, through which nation states were formed. Evidently, there is no common goal, common aim for these constituent countries to result in a common struggle directed towards forming the new type of state. There is no evidence either of emergence of any European nationalism. Thus there remains no chance of a united Europe to emerge as a new full fledged national state. It is true that European countries harbour some feelings against the US imperialism. But on the part of the ruling capitalists-imperialists of these European countries against US imperialism, this is a contradiction on extending and maintaining control of over world market in the face of their acute economic crisis. On the part of people, on the other hand, it is a contradiction stemming from European people's feelings against US domination. But all these work in reality at national levels, not as any contradictions of Europe as a whole. Had there been a unified and direct political rule of the US imperialism over Europe and a common unified struggle for emancipation from that domination, there would have emerged a uniform European nationalism. But the prevailing situation, by no

means, comes near that. Hence the prevalent nationalist feelings in different countries have prompted their people to discard or stand against the move for union into this new type of state of different nations. They raise their opposition standing firm within their national confines itself. They refuse the union very much from their nationalist feelings, eager to defend their national sovereignty. The crux of the situation turns out to be this.

While examining the prospect of emergence of united Europe, the case of emergence of the erstwhile Soviet Union may come to the mind of some people. In regard to that it must be understood that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the USSR or the Soviet Union, was formed of several countries emerging with a revolutionary goal and in the interest of revolution. They were the states where there was sustained working class revolutionary movement on proletarian internationalist outlook aimed at the abolition of the Tsarist or any other monarchical regime and establishment of socialism prior to their merging voluntarily and ultimately into this first socialist state to mark the beginning of the world socialist system. In fact, it was the outcome of an aspiration, a keenness, resulting in a combined effort, to build socialism together after they had overthrown capitalism from their soil and when they vowed to build up a human society that would pave way for the mankind to end with exploitation. Subsequently, modern revisionism polluted it, corroded it and finally destroyed it. But that cannot rob its superiority and nobility. Nor can this Soviet Union in any way be expected to compare with the latest move of the European imperialists for a united states of Europe. The two are built on totally different propositions. The USSR had the goal of ending with exploitation, freeing people from under it. Bourgeois combination of national states, such as the EU is, aims at consolidating the monopoly capital only to increase its power to exploit, particularly in hours of crisis, when capital faces irreconcilable recession tending to rob it of all vitality. They thereby pass the entire burden of the crisis of their system on to the workers and toiling masses. We have already indicated that the opinions of

Contd. on page 8

EU has nothing to offer to people but exploitation

Contd. from page 7

European communists on the emergence and character of the EU and its Constitution also contain examples of how the rulers of different European countries are trying to shift the burden of their crisis on to the common toiling people. Before concluding we would like to discuss a few extremely harmful aspects of this issue.

Problem of national oppression will become more acute in the EU

Monopolists of different European countries are contemplating and frantically running after this move for a united states of Europe with a dream that this will improve their competitiveness vis-à-vis US imperialists. As a result, they think, they will be in a stronger position to compete with the US imperialists on the strength of their consolidated capital. They must also be contemplating that they will be able to check the growth of revolutionary working class movement in those countries by playing upon people's divisions on nationalist feelings. What they may not be taking into account is that they cannot tide over their insurmountable intense recession and market crisis simply by dint of this union, getting over the inexorable laws of social contradictions and changes. In effect, this move of theirs will only intensify exploitation in every

constituent country. It will turn out to be a union of monopolists of a number of countries to fleece people more severely.

For people, this kind of union of different national states which has been formed through manipulations and manoeuvres of the ruling capitalists of different countries is fraught with several dangers. In the first count, with nationalist feelings still prevailing and working in people of the constituent countries, the rulers, the capitalists-imperialists of the proposed united state will find ample scope to play on them. In their bid to exploit people more and more they will take to inciting one section of people against another, people of one constituent country against those of another. In other words, problems of national oppression which is very much present in these constituent capitalist countries, will assume dangerous dimensions. It may be added that nationality oppression is a part of the capitalist exploitation itself. It is true in a multi-nationality bourgeois national state as also in combination of bourgeois national states like the European Union. In either of the cases the ruling capitalists use this nationality oppression to bring about disunity among people, the powerful and dominating nationality inciting its people with nationality jingoism. People of the oppressed nationalities, if they fail to realize the class character and class design

behind the nationality oppression, may direct their wrath even against people of the dominating nationality, forgetting that it is not them, but the handful capitalists-monopolists and the rulers who are the perpetrators of the whole oppression.

As a result, in the proposed united states of Europe, people's unity will be at jeopardy. Leave aside the question of their revolutionary movement against the newly emerged rulers, it will become difficult even to launch united democratic movement of the toiling masses. Under such circumstances, genuine Marxists-Leninists can never welcome the move. A Marxist-Leninist, a revolutionary, who strives for revolution with emancipation of man from exploitation as his ultimate goal, finally judges issues as good or bad, only on the anvil of whether it is conducive to the revolutionary cause or not.

EU has nothing to offer to people barring more exploitation and coercion

Such combinations like the EU has nothing to offer to people. Truly, it has little chance of survival. Even if it survives, it will simply pose a serious danger to people from the standpoint of growth and development of working class revolutionary movement. Rulers of the constituent countries will try to build up a more consolidated power, political and military, being united among themselves on the common interest of thwarting working class revolution, if and when it breaks

out. It will act in the same way and with the same object as those in and with which NATO was formed, its primary object being suppression of revolutionary movement in the constituent countries. Thus, with the NATO dominated by the US imperialism, in case of a revolutionary movement in any of its member European country, the latter may call in US troops for support and survival.

Such being the reality, the scenario, we will expect that toiling people of the world and particularly of Europe will realize the danger of the capitalist combination like the EU. They will realize, we are sure, that this move for a more consolidated EU must be frustrated and foiled. To that end, people of the constituent countries must develop stronger and broader democratic struggles under correct leadership in each and every country against the ruthless capitalist-imperialist exploitation and oppression. They must also look ahead to forge fraternal fighting unity among the toiling masses, not just within their respective national confines, but of other countries of the EU. Only this way can they resist and defeat the heinous conspiracy of the European imperialists to give birth to another highly imperialist state of the EU inimical to the growth and development of world revolutionary movement. This is sure to add to the existing burden of exploitation, uncertainty, insecurity, deprivation, moral and cultural degradation, even danger to their national sovereignty, people bear or face now.

First Gaya District AIDS Conference

The first Gaya District Conference of AIDS was held at Gaya College on September 15, 2005. Student delegates coming from different colleges and schools of Gaya district attended the conference which was presided over by Comrade Om Prakash. Addressing the conference Comrade Raj Kumar Chaudhary, AIDS state committee member, Bihar, said how all the central and state governments while serving the interest of ruining capitalist class, curtailed the scope of education. Governments are shirking the responsibility of providing education to poor students as a result of which education at all stages is suffering from miserable. On the other hand, fee hike at all levels and other measures of privatization-commercialization

are depriving the common students from getting education. Comrade Jyoti Kumar, AIDS state committee member, Bihar, said that the dreams of Kshudiram Bose, Bhagat Singh, Chandra Sekhar Azad, Baikunth Shukla, Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose and other revolutionaries and freedom fighters in which all students would get the education and after completing it get suitable jobs, could not be realised. Underscoring the responsibility and commitment of students towards society he urged the students to build up mighty student movement. An 11-member Gaya District Committee was formed with Comrade Brijnanda Singh Bharat as President and Comrade Om Prakash as Secretary.

Read Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's Works

Selected Works, Vol. I
Selected Works, Vol. II
Why SUCI is the Only Genuine Communist Party in India
An Evaluation of Saratchandra
Lessons of November Revolution and Revolutionary Movement in India
On Steps taken by the CPSU against Stalin
Cultural Movement in India and our Tasks
Labour Policy of First United Front Government—Its Real Significance
Self-Criticism of the Communist Camp
A Scientific Approach to Our Educational Cultural Problems
The Ninth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party
The Tenth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party
Soviet Military Intervention in Czechoslovakia and Revisionism
War and Peace, Peaceful Co-existence and Peaceful Transition to Socialism
An Appeal to the Leaders of the International Communist Movement
Cultural Revolution of China

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : NIHAR MUKHERJEE

Edited & Published by Sukomal Dasgupta from 48 Lenin Sarani, Kolkata 700 013 and printed by him at Ganadabi Printers and Publishers Private Limited, 52B, Indian Mirror Street, Kolkata 700013 Phone : 2244-1828, 2244-2234 E-mail : suci_cc@vsnl.net Website : www.suci.in