

Programme

Part 2

**Socio-Economic System of Bangladesh,
It's development and
the situation of the country and the people**

Programme: Part 2
Socio-Economic system of Bangladesh

Publisher: CC, PBSP

First Edition as a part of the total doc : September 2023

Revised second edition: August 2025

Price: 80 Taka

Preface to the Second Edition

Chapters 3 and 4 of the main document on the program of our party are printed here separately.

The first edition of the entire document on the "Program" was published in September 2023. The 5th National Congress of the Party held at the end of 2024 approved the basic positions of the document. Various amendments and additions have been made to the entire document based on the opinions and suggestions put forward on the document by various comrades before and during the Congress.

The entire "Program" document is being republished separately. In addition, some parts of the program are being published in parts. This part is one of them. This has been done to facilitate study, education and propagate at different levels of the party and outside the party as needed.

The title of this part has been slightly changed for editorial purposes.

- Office, CC.

Table of Contents

1. A Glimpse at the Historical Development
of the Society of East Bengal / 5
 - *British Colonial India* / 5
 - *Semi-Colonial Semi-Feudal Pakistan* / 12
2. A Glimpse at the Bangladesh State's 50 years
from the Beginning to the Present / 20
3. New/Semi-Colonial Bangladesh / 22
4. Imperialist-Dependent or
neo-colonial Economy and 'Development' / 25
5. Semi-Feudal Agriculture / 31
6. The Extent of Semi-Feudal Relations
in Other Spheres of Society / 42
7. What Has the Existing System Brought
to the Country and the Lives of the People? / 47

A Brief Overview of the Historical Development of the Society of East Bengal

The socio-economic system of a country does not fall suddenly from the sky. It develops historically.

Only by discussing it historically can the present situation be correctly known and understood. In the case of our country, we shall make a very brief attempt at this below.

British Colonial India

A thorough discussion of the history of social development of pre-British or ancient India is a task of deep research. Here, we shall not enter into analytical or explanatory discussions about the specifically feudal society of medieval India, or the particular forms of slave society that existed in the distant past. These are not very relevant for formulating the present revolutionary programme of East Bengal (Purbo Bangla). Whatever the distant past history and trajectory of any country or nation may be, it was Western colonialists—and later imperialists—who reshaped today's world and transformed it into a real world system. In this region, that process was initiated by British colonialists in the eighteenth century, through the defeat of Siraj-ud-Daulah (1757) and the beginning of their seizure of state power here.

During the Mughal period before British rule, the development of capital had begun in many parts of feudal India. It is said that Bengal and the Mysore regions were comparatively advanced in this respect. Nevertheless, the feudal classes remained the owners of state power. After the British conquest, they introduced significant changes in land

ownership through the so-called Permanent Settlement (1793), by creating a Western-style landlord/zamindar class.

These landlords/zamindars were the first loyal lackey class of the British. They brutally exploited the peasants and handed over a large share of the extracted surplus to the British. For the first time in the history of India, the wealth and resources extracted from the country's main population began to be systematically siphoned abroad.

At this time, in order to protect the market for cheap mill-made cloth in Britain, they destroyed the rich and developing textile production of this region. They crushed the potential for capitalist industry and initially allowed their loyal collaborators to become wealthy through trade. At a later stage, for their own needs, they allowed limited industrial development. In this way, a comprador bourgeoisie class developed here, which, like the neo-zamindar groups, was an equally devoted lackey of the British. As a result, unlike Europe, no strong revolutionary bourgeois class could develop in India, and no genuine "Renaissance" occurred. What did occur was a distorted bourgeois reform carried out through British colonialism and its loyal bourgeois-zamindar collaborators, which glorified British rule.

Relying on these two classes, the British colonialists secured their rule here. They destroyed the previously prosperous economy of India, especially of the Bengal region. As a consequence, the most horrific famine in remembered history occurred, leading to the tragic deaths of millions of peasants and people. The region's promising industries and agriculture were destroyed. A distorted economy subordinate to and dependent upon colonial-imperialist interests was created.

Revolutionary Uprisings and Struggles of the People against British Colonialism

British colonial exploitation and oppression were so intense, cruel, and barbaric that during the two hundred years of British rule countless peasant uprisings erupted across

India. Among these, the most significant was the uprising known as the Sepoy Mutiny (the first nationwide independence movement in 1857), involving the rebellion of common peasant-soldier sepoys and the masses, with the support or participation of former patriotic kings and feudal lords. In addition, many peasant uprisings emerged in this region, including the struggles of Titumir, the Santhal, Munda, and Sannyasi uprisings, the Indigo Revolt, and many others that continued persistently over decades. These are often erased from conventional history, or presented in distorted and/or merely token forms. The neo-zamindar and comprador classes of this country, along with the intellectuals who represented them, opposed these uprisings and shamelessly acted as collaborators of the British. Yet even today they are glorified in history. Despite these numerous peasant uprisings, due to the limitations of peasant leadership, they could not achieve final success. All peasant uprisings were suppressed by the British rulers through countless massacres and extremely brutal methods.

The British colonialists destroyed the existing education system and, through education tailored to their own interests, fostered the development of a middle class. Through this process, a section of the population became acquainted with Western knowledge and science. Thus, among a section of them, a consciousness of independence developed. By the twentieth century, a section of middle-class youth organized armed struggles for independence. Famous revolutionaries such as Khudiram, Bagha Jatin, Bhagat Singh, and Surya Sen, Pritilata were activists and leaders of this armed independence movement.

However, due to their middle-class outlook, they were detached from the main force of the people—the peasantry—and naturally their struggle assumed a terrorist form, which the British were able to suppress with relative ease. The aforementioned intellectuals also opposed these middle-class armed revolutionary independence movements.

The Independence Movement of India under Comprador Leadership and the Creation of India and Pakistan

To share a portion of power with the emerging educated comprador-landlord class while keeping them under its subordination, the British had built bourgeois politics here. Exhausted and weakened by two inter-imperialist wars, all of them were involved in the conspiracy to derail the revolutionary struggle of the peasants, workers, and oppressed people of India. At one stage, they brought forward the agenda of establishing the so-called independent India by transferring state power into the hands of the educated and comprador class trained by them.

Initially, under British patronage, only the Congress Party was formed to represent this class. However, the relatively backward Muslim feudal-comprador classes sought to secure their own share of power by asserting a separate identity and initiating negotiations with the British rulers. In British India, Muslims lagged behind in bourgeois education. Behind this were not only the conspiracies of British colonialists, but also the religious conservatism and backwardness of Muslim society, particularly among its wealthy classes.

At a later stage, for their own development, Muslim feudal-comprador elements formed the Muslim League as their communal political party. They undertook initiatives to divide the people along communal lines. The British rulers seized upon this division among the reactionary comprador classes and actively encouraged it. Initially, they used it as part of their “divide and rule” strategy to secure and prolong their colonial domination. Specially, this reactionary class and the British rulers were able to divide even the educated middle class and the common people to a large extent on the basis of religion.

Eventually, demands were raised to divide India on the basis of religion. Pre-existing non-antagonistic religious differences among the people were deliberately exploited for

this purpose. As a result, on the one hand, the people became deeply divided, and on the other hand, their struggle against the real enemies was diverted. In this manner, the significant and developing nationality question of the multinational Indian subcontinent was also effectively suppressed.

For centuries in undivided India, Hindu and Muslim communities had lived side by side. Despite religious differences, under British rule the common fundamental enemies of both Hindu and Muslim peasants and ordinary people was British colonialism and the zamindar–comprador classes, irrespective of religion. Throughout the long period of colonial rule, people from both communities jointly organized numerous revolutionary and democratic struggles against these enemies. Even in the uprising known as the “Sepoy Mutiny (Indian Rebellion of 1857),” regarded as India’s first war of independence, Hindu and Muslim soldiers, peasants, masses, and patriotic feudal elements fought together.

The fundamental reason for this unity was that religious differences and conflicts between Hindu and Muslim people were not class contradictions or basic contradictions in social development. However, through the conspiracies of British colonialists and their Hindu–Muslim feudal–comprador collaborators, the relative backwardness of the Muslim population was exploited to advance proposals for a separate religious state. Communal antagonism was brutally incited.

This incitement was carried out with such cruelty that, at one stage, vast regions of India were engulfed in severe communal violence. In particular, Bengal and Punjab were flooded with the blood of ordinary Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh people.

For the first time in the history of so-called “modern civilization,” under the complicity, patronage, and approval of British imperialists and their comprador bourgeois politicians—Gandhi, Nehru, Patel, Jinnah, Shyama Prasad, and others—this most barbaric communal carnage claimed the lives of nearly one million people. More than fifteen

million were displaced and forced to abandon their homes. Countless women were violated and oppressed. Vast amounts of property were destroyed, and barbaric looting was carried out.

Through this crime of barbaric devastation, the British rulers brought their colonial chapter in India to an end and divided the subcontinent into two religion-based states, a division endorsed by the bourgeois-feudal parties, the Congress and the Muslim League. After rivers of blood, the violation of countless women, the displacement of millions, the destruction of enormous wealth, and indescribable suffering, this religion-based partition and the empowerment of comprador enemies of the people under a new imperialist neo-colonial arrangement were labelled “independence.” From colonial and feudal–semi-feudal India emerged two semi-/neo-colonial, semi-feudal states—India and Pakistan.

Direct British colonial rule in India came to an end. As a Muslim-majority region, East Bengal was incorporated into Pakistan under British planning and at the behest of West Pakistani Muslim feudal–bourgeois leadership.

The Incorporation of East Bengal (Purbo Bangla) into Pakistan

During the British period, East Bengal was a part of the larger province of Bengal. However, as mentioned earlier, Muslim zamindar–comprador elements formed the Muslim League in pursuit of their own development and as part of the British “divide and rule” strategy. For administrative convenience and as part of a reactionary policy to divide zamindars, compradors, and the people along religious lines, the British decided to partition Bengal in 1905. Since then, the names “Purbo Bangla” or “Purbo Bongo” came into use, and Dhaka was designated as its centre.

However, primarily Hindu zamindar–comprador classes based in Calcutta perceived this as an obstacle to their monopolistic development and launched a fierce movement against it. Outwardly, this movement generated a spirit of

Swadeshi nationalism, and against their own intentions, a significant portion of it—through educated middle-class youth—transformed into an armed anti-British independence struggle. As a result, and in order to side with the Hindu zamindar–comprador classes, the British colonialists hastily annulled the partition of Bengal in 1911.

At the same time, to retain the loyalty of Muslim zamindar–compradors, and despite objections from Calcutta-based Hindu elites, the British promised to establish a university in Dhaka, the promise later fulfilled in 1921. This decision subsequently played a crucial role in the development of the educated Muslim middle class in East Bengal. It significantly contributed to the growth of Muslim Bengali nationalism and propelled their major participation in the Pakistan movement.

In this way, the Muslim League emerged in East Bengal as the largest bourgeois-feudal political party with mass support. In 1940, at the Lahore Conference of the Muslim League, within the ongoing politics of partition, a demand was raised for the Muslim-majority province of Bengal to become an independent Muslim-majority state. However, the Hindu zamindar–comprador classes centred in Calcutta refused to be part of a Muslim-majority Bengali state and instead demanded the partition of Bengal itself. The Congress, under the leadership of Gandhi and Nehru, supported this demand. Thus, those very Hindu zamindar–compradors who had once opposed the partition of Bengal in the name of patriotism and Bengali identity now demanded the division of Bengal along religious lines and its incorporation into two separate states. The central leadership of the Muslim League Jinnah and others prioritised West Pakistani interests and accepted the demand for the partition of Bengal. Due to their weakness, Bengali Muslim leaders failed to resist this decision. Although leaders such as Abul Hashim and Sarat Bose attempted to establish an undivided, secular, independent Bengal, their efforts were thwarted by the conspiracies of all-India Congress–League leaders and

the British. As a result, East Bengal was incorporated into Pakistan as part of the Pakistani state.

Semi-Colonial, Semi-Feudal Pakistan

Peasant–Worker–People’s Movements in Pakistan

Pakistan, created through British imperialist and Congress–League conspiracies by exploiting religious communal consciousness, emerged from the very beginning as a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country under neo-colonial imperialist domination. As a result, the vast peasantry, the emerging middle class, and the working class of the country failed to achieve any real liberation. Instead of British rule, they were subjected to a new form of exploitation and oppression. Very soon, the people began to organize various forms of resistance and movements against this system.

Immediately after the creation of Pakistan, the famous "Tebhaga" movement (a peasant movement for increase of their share of crops) erupted across large areas of East Bengal. The 1950s and 1960s were marked throughout Pakistan by massive peasant awakenings, large-scale workers' movements, the historic Language Movement in East Bengal, and diverse struggles led by students and youth across the country. Most notably, the 1969 Mass Uprising across Pakistan was an unparalleled anti-imperialist, anti-dictatorial, and anti-national-oppression mass movement in the modern history of the subcontinent. It transformed into a full-scale uprising and compelled the military dictatorship of Pakistan to retreat.

However, due to the leading and influential role of democratic forces, particularly the Communist Party—in these movements, the state sought to protect its interests by taking shelter under Muslim religious communalism. At one stage, under pressure and influence from their imperialist patrons, the rulers also attempted to derail the mass movements from within through bourgeois parliamentary

parties such as the Awami League and the PPP (Pakistan People's Party led by Bhutto). Meanwhile, the seizure of state power by capitalist roaders in the Soviet Union led to deep splits within the communist movement in Pakistan. Taking advantage of these splits and various weaknesses in revolutionary politics, the ruling classes largely succeeded. Consequently, people's democratic movements in Pakistan were diverted from their revolutionary path, and the foundations of military authoritarianism remained intact. It was this very ruling clique that later carried out a genocidal campaign of extreme national hatred against the nation and people of East Bengal in 1971, which played a decisive role in the eventual disintegration of Pakistan.

The Nationality Question in Pakistan

British-ruled India was a multinational country inhabited by numerous nationalities. Even after the partition of India and the creation of Pakistan and India as two separate states, both remained multinational in character.

The eastern wing of Pakistan, known as East Bengal, was overwhelmingly populated by Bengali-speaking people, with only a few minority nationalities. In contrast, the western wing was inhabited by several nationalities, the four major ones being Punjabi, Sindhi, Baloch, and Pashtun, alongside smaller national groups. Thus, Pakistan was a multinational state primarily composed of five major nationalities. From the very inception of Pakistan, however, the ruling class denied this multinational reality. Their objective was to suppress national development in order to secure unchallenged exploitation and rule under the banner of religion. In particular, since the Bengali nation of East Bengal constituted an absolute numerical majority within Pakistan, the West Pakistan-centric ruling elite feared losing their monopolized power through parliamentary democracy and a genuinely multinational state structure.

As a result, even before a decade had passed since Pakistan's creation, the ruling class—backed by U.S.

imperialism imposed military rule and seized state power. Subsequently, they introduced the notorious “One Unit Scheme”, aimed at preventing the emerging bourgeoisie of East Bengal from gaining power by utilizing their demographic majority. They also ignored the earlier proposal (in 1940) that Pakistan should be formed as a confederation, with East Bengal constituting a separate state. Thus, several new political problems emerged in Pakistan:

1. Military dictatorship imposed through martial law, which forced not only the masses but even bourgeois parliamentary parties to launch movements against it. This struggle culminated in the victorious 1969 Mass Uprising, compelling the military regime to retreat.

2. The nationality question within Pakistan remained unresolved. Instead, demands for regional autonomy arose among various nationalities. Particularly significant were the demands for autonomy and the abolition of the infamous One Unit Scheme, led by Maulana Bhashani and other progressive forces which was the key components of the 1969 uprising.

3. In East Bengal, under imperialist patronage, the emerging bourgeois leadership organized a bourgeois nationalist movement around the Six-Point Program through the Awami League, focusing exclusively on the Bengali nationality question. At its core, this movement aimed to divert the progressive struggles of the peasants, workers, students, and youths led by the communists, as well as the broader left-led autonomy movement, through a long-term conspiracy.

Thus, the nationality question of Pakistan became increasingly centered on the national movement of East Bengal.

Role of Different Classes and Forces in the East Bengal Nationality Question

British imperialism handed over state power of Pakistan to the non-Bengali landlord-comprador class. Through them,

imperialist domination and exploitation continued in both India and Pakistan. However, as British imperialism was severely weakened during World War II and gradually lost its global dominance to U.S.A imperialism, American imperialism emerged as the principal external exploiter in Pakistan. Consequently, imperialist exploitation continued in East Bengal as part of Pakistan, primarily under U.S.A dominance.

But after Pakistan's creation, two major developments significantly influenced its socio-economic structure. Prior to partition, the dominant section of Bengal's landlord-comprador class was Kolkata-based and/or Hindu-dominated, and this dominance extended to East Bengal as well. Pakistan's emergence as a Muslim religious state, the outbreak of massive communal violence, and the large-scale migration of Hindu populations particularly the affluent sections greatly weakened Hindu landlordism. Taking advantage of this situation, the Pakistani state soon announced the abolition of the zamindari system (1951), accelerating Hindu landlord migration and initiating major changes in feudal land ownership. This constituted the first major development.

However, this was not a revolutionary land reform. Its purpose was merely to weaken Hindu landlord-comprador dominance through religion and transfer feudal control to Muslim elites. The land ceiling of 100 bighas/33.1 acres per family was largely symbolic and soon increased to 375 bighas/124 acres. Large landholdings continued through the jotedari system, feudal exploitation persisted in various forms, agriculture remained the dominant sector, and feudal relations continued to prevail.

The second major development was the systematic national oppression of East Bengal by the West Pakistan-centric, non-Bengali ruling class. From the outset, they attacked the Bengali language to obstruct national development—an attack decisively defeated by the famous Language Movement of 1952. The capital was established in

West Pakistan, despite East Bengal's decisive role in Pakistan's creation and its status as the majority nationality (54% of the total population). Bengalis were severely discriminated against in the bureaucracy and military. Revenue from East Bengal's primary export crop, jute, was largely siphoned off to West Pakistan. The One Unit Scheme was also imposed to obstruct the development of the Bengali bourgeoisie.

Thus, the national question of East Bengal increasingly emerged as a major political issue. Progressive forces from the beginning emphasized the demand for autonomy, with Maulana Bhashani, supported by communists, emerging as its principal representative. In contrast, the Awami League and the Suhrawardy–Mujib leadership—representing the emerging Bengali bourgeoisie, initially downplayed and effectively opposed this nationality question.

Meanwhile, under both private ownership and state initiatives, a number of jute mills, textile mills, and other industrial enterprises were established in East Bengal, although a significant portion of these industries remained under West Pakistani ownership. As a result, the industrial working class began to grow. Despite its weaknesses and deviations, the communist movement expanded rapidly during this period.

By 1958, with the backing of U.S.A imperialism, the military–bureaucratic bourgeois forces destroyed the emerging prospects of parliamentary politics in Pakistan and seized state power across the entire country. However, in order to sustain themselves in rivalry with India, they also developed relations of friendship with socialist China, which at that time was India's principal adversary.

On the one hand, to divert the growth of the communist movement and the strengthening of workers', peasants', students', and youth movements along progressive lines. On the other hand, as part of a U.S.A imperialist strategy to exert pressure on Pakistan's central rulers, the emerging Bengali bourgeoisie, under Mujib's leadership, put forward

the Six-Point Bengali nationalist program in 1966. This program served a dual purpose: first, to divert workers, peasants, and progressive students, youth, and intellectuals away from anti-imperialist socialist and revolutionary movements and contaminate them with bourgeois nationalism; second, to counter the influence of socialist China.

Nevertheless, the people of both wings of Pakistan jointly organized a great mass uprising in 1969 against the military-autocratic bourgeois regime, as mentioned earlier. Under the leadership of socialist-oriented left forces, this uprising raised demands for opposition to imperialism, just demands of workers and peasants, and autonomy for all nationalities of Pakistan. However, the emerging bourgeoisie of East Bengal, under the leadership of Mujib and the Awami League, limited themselves solely to demands for autonomy for Bengalis alone, while avoiding and in practice opposing—anti-imperialist politics and workers’ and peasants’ demands, as reflected in the Six-Point program.

At that time, the correct revolutionary program was to conduct the revolutionary struggle on the basis of a New Democratic Revolution throughout Pakistan, integrating the nationality question into this framework—of which the East Bengal national question would have been an integral part. This was possible only under Maoist revolutionary communist leadership, and it is important to note that they did make efforts in this direction. However, by then the Maoist movement had become fragmented and weakened for various reasons. Numerous weaknesses and deviations had emerged within Maoists, particularly regarding how to integrate the nationality question of the entire Pakistan into a all-Pakistan New Democratic Revolutionary program. Instead of finding a correct solution, Maoists deviated toward Bengali nationalist errors. Some advanced positions such as “Pakistan’s colony,” others emphasized “geographical distance” of the two wings of Pakistan, and on such grounds presented East Bengal-centric programs.

Neglecting the internationalist duty of building a Pakistan-wide working-class party, they deviated toward forming East Bengal-based parties.

As a result, on the one hand, the Pakistan-wide revolutionary democratic movement weakened; on the other, the East Bengal national movement, instead of being placed within the framework of Pakistan's overall national question, increasingly strengthened the bourgeois nationalist trend due to its East Bengal-centric orientation. In particular, as part of an imperialist plan to derail the victory of the great 1969 mass uprising, the bait of the 1970 elections was offered. By participating in this process under Mujib's leadership, East Bengal's bourgeois nationalists achieved temporary success in a reactionary conspiracy to pacify the mass movement.

1971—

**The People's Great Liberation War,
Inter-Imperialist Contradictions, and
the Emergence of the "Bangladesh" State
through Indian Conspiracy**

However, Pakistan's rulers were not prepared to accept even the demand for autonomy in East Bengal under the leadership of the imperialists' comprador emerging bourgeoisie. The people's struggle and aspirations had reached such a stage that even Mujib and the Awami League could no longer compromise on this issue to secure a share of power. In this situation, with U.S. backing, Pakistan's military rulers imposed a brutal genocide against the nation and people of East Bengal beginning on 25 March 1971 and continuing throughout the year. In response, the Awami League and Mujib failed even to lead the people on the question of autonomy alone—owing to their comprador bourgeois character. In the face of genocide, Mujib shamelessly surrendered to Pakistani military fascism. Acting on his instructions and/or to save their own lives, other leaders hastily fled to India, abandoning the people to the face of Pakistani cannons. The failure and bankruptcy of

Awami League bourgeois nationalism thus reached its full culmination, and whatever limited progressive character it once possessed came to an end.

Using the people's great liberation struggle of East Bengal, India along with the Awami League leaders who had taken refuge there—seized the opportune moment to dismantle its enemy state, Pakistan. U.S.A imperialism sided with Pakistan in the hope of gaining time to formulate a new plan involving Mujib. Meanwhile, Indian expansionism, under the patronage of its imperialist rival Soviet social-imperialism engineered the conditions for a Pakistan–India war. A full-scale war ensued, India occupied East Bengal, and the Awami League was installed in power.

Thus, in 1971, East Bengal emerged as a separate state. Bound within the neo-colonial chains of imperialism, this new state was named “Bangladesh.” With Bangladesh emerging as a new state under imperialist subordination, imperialist exploitation and oppression continued unabated, and Indian expansionism replaced Pakistan as an even greater national enemy. In this manner, the people's aspirations for genuine independence were brutally betrayed, and the Awami League emerged as a treacherous national betrayer in its quest for state power. The pre-existing semi-feudal system also remained intact. Consequently, there was no positive change in the condition of peasants and workers. Rather, in pursuit of its own class interests, the new ruling class unleashed a steamroller of plunder, foreign compradorship, land grabbing, terror, corruption, authoritarianism, and exploitation. As a result, within a short time, this newly “independent Bangladesh” witnessed a famine in which 300,000 people (according to some estimates, 1.5 million) died in 1974—a tragedy that had not occurred even during 23 years of severe Pakistani exploitation. Between 1972 and 1975, during the Mujib regime, 30,000–40,000 political activists—mostly Maoist revolutionaries and leftists were killed by the state apparatus and party-sponsored armed gangs. Political repression and

mass persecution on this scale had never occurred even under Pakistani rule (excluding the wartime period of 1971). In this manner, the new state revealed its true character and future.

The Socio-Economic System of “Independent Bangladesh” and Its Development

An Overview from the Beginning of the Bangladeshi State to the Present

From the foregoing discussion it becomes clear that the major class contradictions responsible for the development of East Bengali society continued into the period of Bangladesh with the sole exception of the earlier Pakistani national oppression. These contradictions include: the national contradiction between the people and imperialism and expansionism; the class contradiction between the peasantry and the broad masses on the one hand and the feudal and semi-feudal system on the other; and, added to these, the emerging contradiction between the masses and the rising comprador-bureaucratic bourgeoisie that came to power as the new ruling class.

Initially, under the leadership of the Awami League, the rising Bengali bourgeoisie prioritized plunder, occupation, theft, and corruption in pursuit of its own development. But soon this newly wealthy class also began to search for a more “systematic” path to further expansion. As a result, they were compelled to partially restructure the policy of exclusive plunder of the state-owned economy that had been implemented in the name of Mujib’s so-called socialism. At the same time, due to Bangladesh’s position in the Soviet bloc amid the US-Soviet rivalry, USA imperialism and pro-Western forces began to promote the ideology of the “free economy.” The extreme authoritarianism, terror, corruption, plunder, man-made famine, mass killings by the Rakkhi

Bahini, open subservience to India, and finally the one-party BAKSAL (Bangladesh Krishak Sramik Awami League) rule of the Mujib government provoked widespread anger, resistance, struggle, and rebellion among the people. Taking advantage of this situation, a disgruntled section of the ruling class, backed by the United States, carried out a coup and ended Mujib's rule. They quickly reorganized the economy along Western imperialist lines, a process led mainly by General Zia and later General Ershad. After the collapse of Soviet social-imperialism and riding on the boat of Western "globalization," the post-1990 governments continued this program even more aggressively.

Through these processes, several significant transformations have taken place in the country's socio-economic structure over the past five decades. The main features are:

First, the development of imperialism-dependent capitalism led to the emergence of the bureaucratic-comprador class as an enormously powerful force, extending its dominance, exploitation, and plunder over the economy, politics, and all other spheres. Thus consolidating itself as a single dominant ruling class.

Second, through this class, imperialism and Indian expansionism have established massive economic (and political) influence and control, leading to deep economic penetration by these forces.

Third, relying on pre-existing semi-feudal relations in agriculture and other sectors, bureaucratic-comprador capitalism has penetrated society, producing significant changes within the old feudal relations of both rural and urban areas under the combined influence of imperialism and comprador capital.

On this basis, the ruling class has constructed a powerful authoritarian system to brutally exploit peasants, workers, the poor, and the working masses; to carry out limitless plunder of national resources; to ensure its own internal distribution of loot in alliance with imperialism and

expansionism; and to suppress popular resistances. To maintain such a system, the rulers occasionally invoke the rhetoric of democracy (in the bourgeois sense), but in general, over the past 54 years, Bangladesh has experienced alternately: overt one-party ultra-nationalist rule, overt or disguised military rule or so-called “non-political” third-force rule, and disguised one-party dominance as the principal political forms. Although universal/general elections have sometimes been introduced under popular pressure as a pillar of bourgeois democracy, the authoritarian character of the system has forced the rulers to repeatedly suspend or manipulate them as mere showcases. Thus, even after 54 years, the ruling class and its various parties, bureaucrats, and civil intellectuals continue to invoke slogans of “democracy” or, alternatively, “development” or “reform.” They have neither succeeded in establishing a truly independent and self-reliant country free from foreign intervention, exploitation, and control, nor even in constructing a genuinely democratic (even in the bourgeois sense) state.

These issues will be discussed further below.

Neo/Semi-Colonial Bangladesh

As discussed earlier, after World War II imperialism adopted neo-colonial policies as the main mechanism to exploit and control former colonies. East Bengal first became “independent” as part of Pakistan after the end of British colonial rule, and then again in 1971 through secession from Pakistan and the establishment of Bangladesh as a separate state. (Additionally, the political changes of 1975, 1990, and 2024 have also been portrayed by different ruling factions as new “independence” or “revolutions.”)

What is the essence of these repeated “independences” and “revolutions”? Nothing more than the creation of different states under different names within the imperialist world system — states that are not truly independent. Such

countries are called neo-colonial states; and because they are not directly ruled by a single foreign power but are instead controlled indirectly through a domestic comprador ruling class serving multiple imperialist (and expansionist) powers, they are often termed semi-colonial.

With the creation of Pakistan out of British India, East Bengal became a semi-colonial as a part of Pakistan, though it was also subjected to distinct West Pakistani national oppression, culminating in the genocidal repression of 1971. This led the Bengali nation and people to justly wage a liberation war for separation. However, due to the conspiracies of Russia and India, the betrayal and failures of the Awami League and the rising bourgeoisie, and their transformation into comprador forces, that struggle was diverted — as discussed earlier.

The new state called “Bangladesh” that emerged through India’s instigation of war against Pakistan and Pakistan’s defeat in East Bengal is also propagated by the same imperialist and comprador narrative of independence. Yet it is no secret that economically, politically, and culturally this state remains subordinate to imperialism and Indian expansionism — something made especially clear during elections. Therefore, no faction of the ruling bourgeoisie has any legitimate claim to “independence,” since the state itself was born through foreign intervention by forces hostile to oppressed nations and peoples. India, which suppresses national liberation movements within its own borders, was elevated as a “liberator” of East Bengal through Awami League betrayal — a role that has persisted. Alongside this, Bangladesh has remained an open field for imperialist exploitation and plunder.

In today’s world, some of the principal means through which imperialist powers exploit and control countries like ours in a neo-colonial manner are as follows:

First, they install and maintain their local agents in power in all spheres — economic, political, and otherwise.

These agent classes consist primarily of the bureaucratic-comprador bourgeoisie and the feudal and semi-feudal classes. These classes function as the social base of imperialist and expansionist domination and exploitation.

Second, through these reactionary classes they block the development of independent capitalism and bourgeois democracy, and instead perpetuate various forms of authoritarian rule. For this purpose they support and/or construct military regimes, one-party rule, so-called “non-political” governments, various forms of fascism, and even monarchies. In this way they nurture backward classes and social relations — such as feudalism, religious fundamentalism, patriarchy, and internal national oppression.

Third, they entrap countries in networks of usurious exploitation through various loan agreements, while simultaneously imposing numerous political and economic conditions through these loans in order to control them.

Fourth, they invest capital in various unnecessary large-scale projects in these countries and use them as channels for the extraction of cheap labor and natural resources.

Fifth, they plunder rich natural resources such as minerals, gas, and water; the local comprador ruling classes receive commissions for facilitating this plunder, transfer the money to the imperialist countries, and function as their servants.

Sixth, they provide both policy support and practical assistance for building large anti-people military and paramilitary forces, which are used to control the political order, sustain the arms trade, generate massive profits, and support imperialist global war strategies under various pretexts.

Seventh, when necessary, imperialist powers — or other powerful states acting with their approval — organize military coups or even launch direct military interventions under various excuses.

Through these and many other mechanisms imperialism exploits and controls neo-colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Bangladesh state too has functioned as such a neo-colonial/semi-colonial country under the banner of so-called independence since its birth in 1971. We shall examine the economic expressions of this reality below.

It is also worth noting that after the creation of Bangladesh the Maoist movement in the country, continuing earlier nationalist deviations, failed to adhere to class revolution and agrarian revolution, and instead advanced a program of national revolution. Political lines such as “an Indian colony” or “a Russo-Indian colony” led to further deviation. Although one section echoed the language of class revolution following the Indian Maoists, it lacked a concrete analysis of Bangladesh’s specific social realities, particularly the special conditions of 1971, the rise of the bureaucratic-comprador bourgeoisie to state power, and the profound transformations in society and the economy that followed.

Imperialist-Dependent (or Neo-Colonial) Economy and ‘Development’

The essence of Bangladesh's widely propagated economic development and progress lies in the massive infiltration of imperialism and expansionism into its economy, and the price paid by the country and its people for it.

The ruling class proudly refers to this economic infiltration as “investment” and competes among themselves over which group is leading in this regard.

All the major so-called mega-projects — large power plants, bridges, highways, railways, metro systems — along with EPZs and newly established SEZs, are tied to foreign investment. These projects involve hundreds of billions of taka in foreign capital at high interest rates and at costs often two or three times higher than international norms. The eight ongoing mega-projects alone involve more than six trillion

taka in foreign investment, obliging Bangladesh to pay tens of thousands of crores annually in interest.

Why is the ruling class and the state so eager for such projects?

First, they serve imperialist and expansionist interests, and in return the foreign powers guarantee the ruling class's hold on state power. The local ruling elites receive a share of the plunder — through contracts, consultancy appointments, import of technology and equipment, and other channels. Project costs routinely double or triple during implementation. For example, the Padma Bridge (road section only) began with a budget slightly over 10,000 crore taka and ended up costing more than 30,000 crore. These projects are presented as monuments of development, while their unnecessary or even harmful nature is concealed — along with the massive profits they generate for imperialists' and Indian interests.

All such investments must be repaid with interest, which the ruling class extracts brutally from the people. Through the World Bank, IMF, ADB, JICA, G-to-G deals, and PPPs, enormous sums are siphoned off every year. Bangladesh's foreign debt now approaches ten trillion taka; in 2023 alone interest payments amounted to about twelve thousand crore. These loans come with many conditions — withdrawal of agricultural subsidies, increases in electricity and fuel prices, mandatory purchase of overpriced foreign equipment, appointment of highly paid foreign “experts,” and even employment of foreign labor — along with explicit or implicit political conditions.

Imperialists and Indian expansionists also capture markets for their low-quality consumer goods, undermining local industry. Large numbers of Indian workers and professionals are illegally employed in Bangladesh, leading to substantial remittance outflows, while millions of Bangladeshis remain unemployed.

The Three Pillars of So-Called Development

Imperialist “development” rests on three main pillars. We will briefly discuss them below.

* The garment sector — along with EPZs and the plan to establish 100 SEZs — has resulted in land dispossession of peasants, destruction of water resources, depletion of gas reserves, severe air pollution, environmental devastation, and the opening of the country to foreign exploitation of cheap labor.

In exchange, the big sharks of the ruling class and their foreign patrons grow fabulously rich. Garment workers receive among the lowest wages in the world, and working conditions are so unsafe that thousands have been killed or injured in factory accidents and fires. The 2013 Rana Plaza collapse alone killed around 1,200 workers and injured or crippled thousands more — a tragedy almost unprecedented in the modern world.

Through the garments industry several thousand people have become major stakeholders of the neo-bourgeois ruling class. It is said that this is an excellent path for solving unemployment and earning foreign exchange. By saying this they have proven that they have neither the capacity nor the will to solve unemployment through any self-reliant industrial revolution. This cannot be a path of development for any truly independent nation and state.

* The same applies to migrant income, which is another main pillar of the country’s so-called “development.” At present, approximately four+ hundred thousand crore taka comes into the country every year through about ten million expatriates, most of whom are workers, and a portion of whom are women workers as well.

Without employing the country’s human resources for its own real development, and without creating proper employment for them, the business of “human trafficking” cannot exist in any self-respecting country or any patriotic ruling class opposed to the decaying world system.

Migrant income directly makes the country dependent on imperialism, and instead of engaging the intelligence, labor, suffering, and sacrifice of the country's huge manpower for national development, it uses them within the imperialist world system's planned global division of labor — a program that sells out the country.

About ten million people are employed abroad. It is said that through them huge amounts of dollars are coming into the country. Huge employment opportunities have been created.

The question again is: why could this system, even over a long period, not create employment for this huge population within the country? From their own statements it becomes clear that their system has created a huge unemployed people inside the country. Despite exporting such a vast amount of labor power abroad, large numbers of young people and others still remain unemployed inside the country. (Government propaganda about unemployment is very striking. They said that in 2023 only 2.6 million people were unemployed. But private institutions have said that at least forty million people are unemployed or under-employed. This manipulation in government statistics comes from using a foreign standard, according to which even if someone works one hour a week, they will not be counted as unemployed!)

On the other hand, although migrant money creates a kind of cosmetic affluence, it plays very little role in developing the fundamental economy of the country. A peasant sends his child abroad by selling his land. Later he buys that land again at a much higher price with the money sent by his child.

Generally migrant income is spent on buying land, building expensive houses and shops in cities for rent, consumption and luxury, or at best investing in small businesses — which are themselves unreliable — in such low-priority or unnecessary sectors.

The main reason is that opportunities to build national industry, which is the main driving force of economic development, are very limited, and the possibility of surviving and making profit there is very low; therefore migrant income fails to play any significant role in the country's fundamental progress.

On the contrary, it plays a major role in destroying traditional agriculture in the country, especially in rural areas. Migrant income has created a huge idle group inside the country whose sole aim and obsession is to go abroad; or whose activity is to show off at home with the money sent by relatives working abroad. This has also produced a distorted cultural development, which on the one hand imports imperialist-expansionist anti-people culture, and on the other hand continues to be based on feudal-religious values and develops them in a distorted manner.

* Another major sector of the current economy is agriculture. We will discuss the agrarian question separately. But what needs to be mentioned here is that in agriculture too a major grip of imperialism-expansionism is destroying agriculture, which is hidden behind propaganda about increasing agricultural production. We have already mentioned that peasants are losing vast amounts of land on the altar of so-called development. But the more important issue is that the two main elements of this country's rich agriculture — its fertile soil and its valuable water resources — have both been placed under severe threat. The factor that has played the biggest role in increasing agricultural production is the cultivation of rice in the IRRI-Boro season. Compared to the earlier main Aman season, more crops are now produced in the Boro season through irrigation, almost all of which is done by lifting underground water. A country that was once a land of rivers, canals, wetlands, and water now cannot even grow Aman crops without underground water. As a result the groundwater level is rapidly going down.

Therefore there is increasing dependence on installing deeper deep tube-wells. But why has underground water extraction been promoted? It has been promoted in order to make peasants dependent on mechanized cultivation and thereby make them dependent on foreign sources for irrigation and cultivation. Because for irrigation pumps, deep tube-wells, tractors, seedling planters, fertilizer spreaders, harvesting machines, threshing machines — one by one everything has to be depended on foreign sources. The ruling class that shouts about industrial development has in fact not built any industry to produce the machinery essential for mechanized agriculture in this agriculture-based country.

Mechanization is not a crime. Rather it must be undertaken to develop agriculture beyond the medieval level. But first, it must be peasant- and people-friendly; second, it must be based on domestic production, that is, self-reliant; third, it must be environmentally friendly. Instead, it is being done by relying on imperialism-expansionism.

This type of mechanized cultivation on the one hand creates foreign dependence, and on the other hand creates a new rental business of machinery instead of developing capitalism in agriculture, which is not at all farmer-friendly. In reality, within the atmosphere of an import-export dependent economy, a section of the ruling class is doing booming business, and they have quickly become extremely wealthy, and they in no way want such industries to be built in the country.

Above all, mechanized cultivation is entirely dependent on electricity and fuel, which are almost completely imperialism-dependent. At present the country has also been made dependent on India for electricity. Not only machinery and fuel, but fertilizers, pesticides, and seeds are also heavily foreign-dependent.

Therefore, the main hidden truth behind increased agricultural production is handing over agriculture and the produce of peasants' hard labor to the hands of imperialism-

expansionism, and through this swelling the pockets of the ruling class and their local agents.

* In this way all three main sectors of the economy have been built or handed over under the shelter of imperialism, under its global planning, and in deepening subordination to it. The impact of this has fallen on all areas of society, economy, politics, and culture. From these facts the semi-colonial character and features of Bangladesh in the economic sphere become clearly understandable.

Semi-feudal agriculture

There are various kinds of debates in the country regarding the character of agriculture. Even among the leftists. While presenting the character of agriculture, we will also discuss those debates to some extent below.

During the British period, not only the territory of present-day Bangladesh but the entire Indian subcontinent was dependent on agriculture. Therefore, the main source of exploitation for the ruling class was agriculture. The British created a new landlord class here in the name of the Permanent Settlement. A large portion of the feudal rent collected by them was appropriated by the British themselves. Along with plundering various resources of the country, they destroyed the emerging local capitalism for trade and eventually built up their own comprador class. The peasants, the principal class of this country, were bound under the yoke of three exploiters: the foreign British, and domestically the landlords and the compradors.

We have seen earlier that immediately after the creation of Pakistan the zamindari/landlord system was abolished. But the jotdari (tenant) system remained, and the large landowners also continued to exist in full strength. Although initially the land ceiling was fixed at 100 bighas/33.1 acres, during the Ayub period (1958–1968) it was increased to 375 bighas/124 acres. Through various means such as

sharecropping, leasing, and Dadon, the yoke of exploitation by these large landowners was imposed on the peasants. Along with this was the usurious exploitation in various forms by the old moneylender class.

After the creation of the Bangladeshi state, the new ruling class did not bring about any transformation in the land question. During the Mujib period, the nominal fixation of the maximum land ceiling at 100 bighas/33.1 acres was a deception of the peasants in two ways. First, in a densely populated and fertile land like East Bengal, 100 bighas/33.1 acres constitutes a very large holding. This did not create any real possibility of distributing land to the peasants.

Second, this declaration was deceptive, just like the Mujib–Awami League’s claim of establishing socialism. In many cases, large landowners were able to retain hundreds of bighas of land by dividing ownership among their children and family/relatives. The Mujib government neither had the ability nor the will to resist them.

After Mujib (after 1975), when the slogan of socialism disappeared, even this formality no longer remained.

Nevertheless, due to excessive population pressure on agriculture and population growth, the size of holdings began to decrease. This was accompanied by the fact that greater income opportunities for the rich in non-land sectors prevented significant development of land-based investment. As a result, the number of large landowners declined. On the other hand, a bourgeois class in agriculture also failed to develop.

Meanwhile, as a result of the development of comprador–bureaucratic capitalism and its imperialist-dependent economy, agriculture’s share in total GDP has now fallen to around 13 percent. From this, many want to reject the strategy of an agriculture- and peasant-based revolution.

But more important than agriculture’s share in GDP is how far agriculture contributes, or can contribute, to the country’s real self-reliance, that is, to an anti-imperialist

position. Connected to this is how large a portion of the country's total labor force is engaged in or dependent on agriculture.

An important consideration is the character of the industry that has developed (around 32 percent of GDP) and what the program should be for it. Another issue is who are involved in the service sector (more than half), what kinds of relations operate there, and what kind of program must be adopted there.

Even though agriculture's share in GDP has declined sharply under the pressure of so-called development, agriculture still employs the largest portion of the country's labor force. The latest survey shows that more than 50 percent of the country's total labor force is engaged in agriculture. Not only that, the rural population constitutes more than about 62 percent of the country's total population. They are connected with the agricultural economy in various ways.

On the other hand, the overwhelmingly dominant part of industry is garments, which is almost entirely imperialist-dependent and is the hidden formula of the so-called "prosperity" of the present economy. Besides this, the service sector contributes more to total GDP than both industry and agriculture, and it is heavily dependent on migrant remittances. This too is completely imperialist / foreign dependent. Unless the country is freed from absolute dependence on such imperialist-dependent industry and the service sector, no revolutionary future can be built for the country. That means that no fundamental construction of the national economy is possible.

In reality, agriculture has kept the vast masses of the country alive, and it is on the basis of this agriculture that all the brokerage and ostentation of the ruling class continues.

Now the question is: what is the character of this agriculture?

There are also some who speak of Marxism and propagate that a democratic revolution was completed in

Bangladesh in 1971. They erase the fundamental theoretical position that the formation of a separate state under today's imperialist world system is not, in the Marxist sense, any definition of independence, and that a democratic revolution cannot be completed without the completion of an agrarian revolution.

But besides them, there is also a large section who argue that since the ruling class is a big bourgeois class and large feudal landlords are not very visible or dominant, therefore capitalism is the main problem here, not feudalism.

In this view two major mistakes are made. First, although the ruling class of this country is a big bourgeois class, they are agents of imperialism. They are what are called the bureaucratic-comprador bourgeois class. Therefore, they are not the bearers of national industrial development, but rather its obstacles. The economic reason why they constantly act as agents of imperialism-expansionism lies here. Or, because they are economically fully tied in a knot with imperialism, they want and are compelled to invite imperialism into all spheres of the country, including politics and culture.

What kind of economy has this ruling class established in agriculture? There is extensive penetration of imperialism in agriculture, as has been discussed earlier. But what is the fundamental character of production?

To judge that, the question of ownership of land, the most basic means of production in agriculture, must necessarily come into discussion.

The second confusion is to conflate feudal and semi-feudal relations. The original feudal large landlord is now seen less. But that does not mean that feudal relations have ended. In reality, here capitalism has developed on a feudal foundation, not by destroying it, which is called semi-feudal. Today this relation is maintained mainly not by the big feudal landlords, but by the bureaucratic-comprador capitalists. They preserve many diverse feudal relations and,

standing on them, develop their capital. Therefore the basis of production remains semi-feudal. We will discuss the character of our agriculture in this light.

In present-day Bangladesh there is no doubt that commodity production in agriculture, that is, production for the market, is widespread. But only from this aspect, one cannot draw the conclusion that the mode of production is capitalist. The most important characteristic of capitalism is the transformation of labour-power into a commodity, and the exploitation of the surplus value produced by the worker through its purchase and use, which creates the capitalist's profit.

In capitalism the capitalist does not produce for his own need; he produces for profit. If there is profit, he produces; otherwise he looks for another sector. For profit he sets in motion large-scale production, where he exploits the worker's surplus value and produces commodities for sale in the market. For this he may rent land from a landlord, he may take loans from banks. But he repays all this from the profits of worker exploitation and also counts his own share. Otherwise he would not produce.

Apart from a few agricultural bourgeois in East Bengal, are there peasants who produce on a large scale, whose main aim is to exploit labour, who produce not for their own needs but purely for profit?

Some bourgeois economists want to place owners of up to half an acre of land in the landless category and present them as wage labourers or proletarians. From this they want to conclude that since such a large number of rural people are agricultural labourers, the character of agriculture is capitalist.

But in terms of our country's present level of productivity, half an acre of land is not negligible. And if it is three-cropped, a peasant family can survive quite substantially on it. These arguments do not hold when we see that even though the proportion of landless and poor peasants

has increased greatly, agriculture in general is not large-scale, and landowners do not run profit-based, wage-labour-dependent capitalist agriculture. The landless and poor peasants are overwhelmingly engaged in petty agricultural production. At the same time, these landless peasants are also very little able to be employed in industrial labour in towns and cities. Most of them survive as informal workers in villages and towns, often as temporary labourers or workers, or by petty trade.

The fundamental character of agriculture in East Bengal is petty ownership and petty production.

From big portion of rich peasants down to poor peasants, most are petty owners. Although the number of the truly landless is also large, a substantial part of them too engage in petty production through sharecropping, leasing, and similar arrangements, and they produce in order to survive. Or, on their own extremely small plots they combine independent production, some sharecropping, some agricultural wage labour, some other kinds of work, and some migration to towns — in other words, they are involved in a variety of occupations. These are not characteristics of industrial capitalism or of an industrial proletariat.

Large landowners, however, still exist in some places in the old manner — for example in the haor regions, in some beel areas, in char areas, and in the coastal regions. Some of them do practice commercial cultivation by mechanical means, that is true. But the majority of them lease out their land under sharecropping arrangements, which are cultivated by middle peasants, poor peasants, and in some cases even rich peasants. Instead of sharecropping, some arrange cultivation through leases or similar contracts. This too is another form of petty production.

Therefore the dream of the peasant here is to become a petty landowner. Whoever owns some land wants to own more. But this dream is fulfilled only rarely. Nevertheless,

hunger for land is the fundamental characteristic of the peasantry. They — especially the poor and the landless — want to become landowners. But through sharecropping, debt, and various forms of exploitation, they usually cannot. The hunger for land remains.

It is true that peasants now produce commodities on a wide scale. But they also produce extensively for their own needs. Moreover, with the money obtained from selling part of their produce as commodities, they repay debts, meet urgent needs, and then buy the same products again from the market for their own consumption, or buy other goods for their own consumption. In short, peasants produce primarily for their own use, in order to survive.

This is not capitalist agriculture. Rather it is pre-capitalist agriculture, which fails to develop into capitalism for various reasons, one of the main ones being semi-feudal land ownership. Because capitalist agriculture and national industry do not develop in a real way, the petty peasant remains trapped in a circle. Land keeps them alive on the margins; at the same time land also traps them, becoming an obstacle to moving toward higher forms of production.

— The problem of khas (state-owned) land is another major aspect of the land question. Legally, this land belongs to the landless and poor peasants. But due to the dominance of those close to state power, the peasants of this basic class have benefited very little from it, or are benefiting very little.

Therefore, it appears that only by distributing the land of feudal landlords, khas land, and some surplus land of rich peasants among the landless peasants and guiding them toward collective ownership — and by including middle peasants in this process — can real agricultural development be achieved. Whether agriculture develops along a capitalist path or a socialist path will depend on how the peasants are organised after this revolutionary land redistribution, and on which class leads the peasantry.

— Alongside old feudal land ownership and the problem of khas land, another problem has now been added to the

land question: the new problem of peasants being dispossessed of land in the name of imperialist–comprador “development”.

The ruling bureaucratic–comprador class and their state are massively acquiring peasant land for themselves and for imperialist / foreign interests. Thousands of acres have been and are being acquired for SEZs and EPZs. Through various large imperialist, state, and ruling-class projects — government administrative projects, road construction, large “development” projects, cantonments, bourgeois and upper-middle-class housing — peasant land is being seized. The peasants’ movements for land against this seizure (from Phulbari to Arial Beel, from Mirersarai to the Mymensingh divisional headquarters project — everywhere) show how strongly the hunger for land drives them.

Thus, there is no old zamindari system, yet the peasantry itself is becoming landless. They are crowding into the cities. They are joining various formal and mostly informal occupations. But their minds remain in the villages. Therefore everything cannot be judged merely by looking at urban population figures. A very large part of the urban working people, and even of the ordinary middle classes, though occupationally separated from agriculture, remain connected to village and agricultural life in many ways — a small expression of which is seen in the flood of people moving toward villages during Eid and other festivals.

A major aspect of semi-feudal agriculture and rural areas is debt.

Many present the erosion of old moneylender debt as a symbol of capitalist development. But the main holders of the space that debt occupied are the NGOs, which have invested tens of billions of taka in microcredit projects and are earning thousands of crores in profit. Alongside this, the old-style moneylender debt continues. The burden of this debt has become so great that almost every poor family (in villages and cities) can be heard discussing installments.

Such reports exist that some people, unable to repay their installments properly, have fled, abandoned their homes, had their homes demolished, or even committed suicide. The significance of microcredit and entrepreneurship is widely promoted and glorified. Apart from some exceptions, the very term “microcredit” suggests that it preserves petty ownership and supports petty production — although a large portion of it is not invested in any productive activity, but rather spent on subsistence or other needs, which is also important. We will come back to this later. First, it is necessary to examine the extent of exploitation in this sector and whether the character of the interest is capitalist.

Excluding the old moneylender interest business, NGOs alone provide microcredit from which they earn several thousand crore taka in annual profit. Added to this are agricultural loans or similar loans provided by government/private banks, which peasants take or try to take. To obtain such loans, peasants must give large bribes. Even then, due to poverty, many peasants fail to repay the loans on time and face lawsuits. For a default of just a few thousand taka, peasants are tied up and taken to the police station — such incidents have been widely discussed across the country. NGO loans are given to those they generally target: women, the poor, or petty entrepreneurs. Loans taken in women’s names are often not invested in productive work; instead, their husbands or male family members spend the money on other things, sometimes in significant amounts. These expenditures are often purely for consumption or daily urgent needs — for example, medical care, children’s education, funding a family member to go abroad, legal expenses, bribes for jobs, dowries for daughters’ marriages, house construction, and various other purposes. Part of it is used to repay other loans or for business purposes. Those who use loans for productive purposes generally purchase one or two cows or goats, cultivate vegetables, farm fish, rear chickens, or run small businesses, in which they themselves provide labor. Many ultimately cannot survive in

these ventures. Some manage to survive, and very few become wealthy entrepreneurs. It is seen that while microcredit is promoted as a “virtuous” measure to help the poor avoid destitution in cities and sustain some form of livelihood in the villages, the profits from the interest system are enormous. That is why Dr. Yunus has been rewarded by imperialists for this “achievement,” so that the protests and rebellions of the hungry are suppressed and they are kept trapped in a system of hard labor for individualistic, imperialist purposes, while generating profit from it.

Therefore, it is clear that this interest business is semi-feudal, in which the borrowers themselves are taking the loans. It is not the case that, with a few exceptions, borrowers form capitalist enterprises and earn profits by exploiting labor.

— Furthermore, as stated earlier, old-style moneylender exploitation exists extensively throughout the country — in villages and cities. Peasants and ordinary people, in urgent need, are compelled to take such loans rather than approach banks or even bother with NGOs. In coastal areas, fishing communities are widely trapped in such loan systems. In haor and char areas, loans and interest businesses of various kinds and names are widely active.

— The state has not only kept both types of moneylender interest business alive, but especially through NGOs has actively encouraged and supported this business of the big bourgeoisie. This remains a major means of expropriating the fruits of the people’s labor and is appearing in various new forms.

Another form of semi-feudal exploitation on rural and peasant populations is leasehold exploitation.

All important haats, ghat, bazaars, and fishing grounds are leased out by the state. In this way, the state plays the role of the largest initial lessor. But the local authorities who take leases from the state earn enormous profits from them,

the entire burden of which falls on the shoulders of the peasant population.

* In the coastal regions and char/bill areas of the country, a large population belongs to the fishing community, who are closely connected with agriculture and peasants. A significant portion of them belong to the Dalit community. On these Dalit-class fishers in particular, and on all fishers in general, semi-feudal exploitation is extremely intense.

In haor, char, and bill areas, under the support of the state and the dominance of the ruling class's leaseholders, fishers' unrestricted rights to catch fish in open water bodies have been taken away. In coastal areas and elsewhere, fishers must pay high shares (dadan) for nets, boats, and other equipment.

* In the country's weaving community, while many have become laborers in loom factories, like other marginalized groups (e.g., potters, blacksmiths, sanitation workers, etc.), a large portion are spending their days enduring the unbearable pain of gradual disappearance. They also live helpless lives under semi-feudal exploitation in the form of interest and debt.

* On the basis of this semi-feudal foundation, imperialist and bureaucratic-capitalist penetration and exploitation have added new elements to agriculture, known as modern agriculture, commercial agriculture, or mechanization in agriculture. This is often referred to as a "revolution in agriculture" by the ruling class. But these "revolutions" — in many places also called the "Green Revolution" — and the so-called "development" and "success" in agriculture have not succeeded in creating capitalist farms, although a few capitalist farms have emerged here and there.

Through mechanization, imperialist and bureaucratic-capitalist interventions in agriculture — via machinery,

technology, irrigation, fertilizer, seeds, pesticides, and almost every field involving thousands of crores of taka in business — have made agriculture dependent on imperialism, expansionism, as discussed above. In some cases, imperialist or state-led development projects have also dispossessed peasants of their land. This has created a huge displaced and unemployed/semi-employed population, which cannot be absorbed into even moderately developed industrial sectors. The result is massive out-migration for foreign labor and a large informal or service-sector workforce.

In this way, the underdevelopment of capitalism in agriculture and the blockade of national industrial development have entrenched the semi-feudal system permanently.

In other areas of society

The prevalence of semi-feudal relations

The semi-feudal system, which is the main foundation of our society in agriculture, has now spread into many other sectors.

We can observe semi-feudal relations extensively in small factories, many areas of the service sector, and in trade and commerce. On one side are the state and leaders/cadres of the ruling class or parties, and on the other side are large numbers of laborers and consumer populations. Even in major capitalist industries, such as garments, various forms and degrees of semi-feudal relations can be found.

Among these are transportation, petty business, domestic work, rural judicial systems, police bribery, land grabbing, and so on.

* The country's transportation sector is the largest informal sector, employing a huge number of transport workers. Except for a few large companies, most of it operates under lease systems or small ownership, managed by "self-employed laborers." Instead of capitalist methods, most bus owners allow contract-based workers to drive the

vehicles. Due to widespread unemployment, there is intense competition among transport workers. Owners exploit this competition to extract more money from them. In many cases, they are employed on a daily wage basis.

As a result, the transportation sector suffers from widespread chaos: frequent accidents, untrained drivers, overcharging passengers, and labor-passenger conflicts. The sector is a major example of where **capitalism has not developed**. A huge number of autos, tempos, baby taxis, and bikes operate on the streets, owned mostly by small proprietors, while the workers are informal. They are laborers in practice but not institutional employees under capitalist enterprises. Consequently, they lack labor rights, job security, or stability. Including rickshaw workers, the total number of transport workers in both rural and urban areas is nearly in the tens of millions, making it the second-largest sector after agriculture. Landless and poor rural peasants, having lost their land or failing to subsist on small plots, are increasingly employed in the transport sector. Not only do they face massive uncertainty in their work, but they also endure widespread extortion by the police (often in collusion with bourgeois political cadres). Through various legal manipulations, the police extract thousands of crores from the transport sector purely through state power. Earlier, under the false license system at BRTA, they had to pay huge amounts. Hence, the main problem for these workers is not the small transport owners, but the state — transport bureaucrats, police, and extortionists operating under the protection of major parties — whose exploitation revenues flow to the highest levels of the ruling class.

* Due to widespread unemployment and displacement from agriculture and rural areas, another major livelihood sector for peasants and poor populations is hawking and petty trade.

In urban areas, footpaths, small shops, or street vendors cannot operate without paying so-called “chanda” (extortion).

In every city, a significant source of income for the police and ruling-class godfathers/cadres comes from daily, weekly, monthly, and annual extortion from these shops and small businesses. As a result, footpaths and open spaces turn into markets, causing serious problems in urban life. Yet the poor hawkers and petty traders are blamed. Under this pretext, they are occasionally evicted, only to be reinstalled after paying increased extortion. This extortion is carried out using state power and government land. Even after paying extortion, petty traders cannot easily run their businesses. With changes in local police administration and government, new rates of extortion are imposed. Conflicts between government enforcers over territorial dominance often force the public to bear the brunt of armed confrontations. Under pressure from large markets and promotion by the upper-middle class and media, they are sometimes temporarily evicted.

* Although the system of year-long bonded agricultural labor once prevalent in the peasant life of Bangladesh has declined, in urban life domestic work as bonded labor has become a major field of employment, especially for women. A large part of these workers are adolescent girls and young women. Those who work on a contract basis enjoy some degree of independence, but permanent domestic workers are subjected to feudal-type exploitation and oppression. Many rural women are forced into permanent domestic service due to divorce, their husbands' second, third or multiple marriages, the death of their husbands, and rural unemployment. It would not be wrong to describe such domestic workers as the urban version of the old feudal serfs.

* Because the country's cities have not developed as capitalist cities, the housing problem has largely been kept under a semi-feudal system. The housing of working people on the outskirts of major cities has developed under the ownership of local landholders. These settlements are usually based on petty ownership, have grown without any overall planning, and remain governed by feudal values and relations. In such housing areas, the landlord-tenant relationship is essentially a continuation of the old landlord-peasant relationship.

There are virtually no enforceable rules regarding rent, tenant rights, or protections. These "new landlords" — often former small landowners who have turned into house owners — form the local social base of bourgeois parties. The older among them are accustomed to oppressing tenants: frequently raising rents, controlling tenants' use of lights, fans, and water, monitoring their religious practices, imposing arbitrary rules, abusing and insulting them, and even physically assaulting them for late payment of rent. At the same time, they sit on mosque committees, take the lead in building neighborhood madrasas, and act as brokers for powerful local commissioners, members, and chairmen. Their children become the thugs of bourgeois parties — drug users and dealers, perpetrators of sexual violence against garment and other women workers, extortionists in local markets, and organizers of extortion and terror in the name of party activities.

Thus, on the basis of housing, a vast semi-feudal social world has been constructed within urban life.

* There are many other fields of semi-feudal exploitation and oppression in society. Among them, the rural arbitration system (salish) is particularly significant. Except in rare cases, it is run by corrupt and bribed rural strongmen, in close connection with the police administration. They take bribes, deliver biased judgments,

protect powerful criminals, openly oppress and abuse women, use violence, misuse religion for their own ends, stir up conflicts among the people, benefit from those conflicts, entangle people in legal cases, and so on. All of this reflects the absence of democratic rights for the people and the failure of capitalist development. A section of this class also operates as organizers and protectors of robbery and banditry, from which the police receive their regular share. They are the main agents behind various forms of repression against religious minorities, including the forcible or fraudulent eviction of minorities from their homesteads and land — often in alliance with major bourgeois parties and religious groups.

In these many ways, feudal relations are preserved in our society. How deep, extensive, and powerful these relations are can be seen in the country's dominant cultural consciousness and values: religious fundamentalism and patriarchy, alongside the flood of imperialist-comprador cultural decay — from films and music to religious sermons and madrasa-based education, from Facebook and TikTok to the constitution and the judicial system, from authoritarian state and politics to everyday lifestyles and worldviews. All of this benefits everyone from local strongmen and political thugs to those at the very top of state power — political leaders, bureaucrats, and police — who together form, at the lower level, a new semi-feudal class and, at the upper level, the ruling bureaucratic-comprador bourgeoisie and their foreign imperialist patrons.

This semi-feudal and neo-colonial system is the foundation of authoritarian state power in this country. It is not the problem of any single individual or party. Any political force that seeks to govern on this foundation is compelled to operate within an authoritarian framework. Therefore, unless this semi-feudal base is uprooted, any

attempt to establish a democratic system in any real sense will remain either a fantasy or a deception.

What Has the Existing System Brought to the Country and People?

In the five decades since the establishment of Bangladesh, the so-called “development” promoted in the country has focused on key points—massive GDP growth, expansion of overall economic growth, increase in reserves, rise in per capita income, and substantial growth in the government’s annual budget, among others.

In addition, there has been expansion in urbanization, growth of industries, factories, commercial agriculture, and agricultural production. Some even boast that the country has become “self-sufficient” in food.

The visible results of all this are portrayed as major improvements in transport infrastructure, such as large bridges, roads, metro rails, and village-level roads. There is also an emphasis on “digital” operations.

Those with some humanitarian concern highlight the expansion of education (numerous colleges, universities, schools, and their student populations), improvement in female education, women’s participation in the workforce, reductions in maternal and child mortality, and increases in average life expectancy.

Let us examine what these proclaimed developments over more than fifty years have actually brought to the lives of the people. Truly, it is astonishing and striking!

We have already seen that, largely due to the garment industry dependent on imperialist capital and remittances, Bangladesh’s GDP has grown, and consequently, per capita income has multiplied. But let us look deeper into the average income. According to official figures, the annual per capita income exceeds 400,000 taka, which would be about 2 million taka for a family of five. Yet we know that even if a

garment worker earns about 12,500 taka per month, their family's annual income is only around 250,000 taka. So where has the rest of this enormous wealth gone?

Here lies the gap in "development." A worker's family, with both husband and wife working, barely makes ends meet. They often live in a single room with their children, and sometimes with parents as well. Housing is generally in slums or slum-like areas. In colonies on the outskirts of industrial areas or cities, many families live together. They must share a single toilet with multiple families. A tiny kitchen and limited stoves are shared among several families. These homes lack proper light and ventilation. The rooms are cramped, and in extreme heat, living conditions are unbearable. Landlord oversight governs water, electricity, and fan usage; extra fees are charged for refrigerators. Furthermore, prices of goods continuously rise. While urban workers may enjoy some minor conveniences, rural farming families experience none of this unless they have sufficient land or family members earning money abroad or in cities.

On the other hand, where is the garment money going? Most of it goes into the pockets of imperialists, who are the actual entrepreneurs and owners of the garment industry. They are both the sellers and buyers. Only a small portion of the profits reaches Bangladesh's garment owners, who still become billionaires. This indicates the massive exploitation of workers in this sector.

A picture of development emerges clearly when examining poverty in the country. Even according to official recognition, after all this development, around 22% of the population lived below the poverty line, which rose to over 40% following COVID-19. Considering the population as 200 million (officially about 180 million, with many gaps), this means roughly 80 million people live below the poverty line. Do these figures not mock the rhetoric of GDP, reserves, and per capita income? What is the purpose of this wealth? Is it not meant for improving living standards and real national development? Does poverty data validate these

claims? Certainly, the massive gains have benefited only a few thousand or a few million people, whose wealth is so high that they no longer feel safe or comfortable living in the country. They transfer their wealth to developed countries. After the fall of the Hasina government, reports revealed that approximately 28 lakh crore taka were siphoned out of the country during her sixteen-year tenure. (By comparison, the amount looted during the Pakistan era was insignificant!) And this did not happen only during Hasina's tenure; it has happened before, continues now, and will continue in the future—some more, some less. This is the inherent nature and character of the bureaucratic-bourgeois class.

During the COVID-19 disaster, when the majority of the country's people were forced to reduce their consumption of essential food and other goods, several thousand new millionaires emerged in Bangladesh. Astonishingly, during this period, the rate of increase in millionaires in Bangladesh was the highest in the world!

Of course, this economy has also created a substantial middle class, part of which lives happily pursuing a dream of a job, a family, a comfortable life, and, if possible, a small piece of land or their own house. Among them are a large number of intellectuals—teachers, journalists, professionals, doctors, engineers, agricultural scientists, salaried employees, and medium-scale businessmen—who form a significant layer of this so-called development. A considerable portion of their upper strata, however, dreams of leaving the country.

For the broad mass of peasants, workers, and the middle class alike, common problems persist—rising prices of goods, unemployment, uncertainty and high costs in education and healthcare.

Urban populations face housing shortages and related problems.

As a result of constructing large roads and bridges, the country has turned into a continuous scene of road accident fatalities. Every year, about 5,000–10,000 people die, and

several times that number are injured or disabled—a grim normality. Even with modern transport systems, unbearable traffic congestion wastes countless hours of millions of people every day.

Peasants are losing land under the onslaught of development. Air, water, and noise pollution have reached alarming levels. Rivers are disappearing. In cities, there are no canals or ponds—they have either been occupied or converted into drains under the pressure of development.

Many such examples can be cited to show that bureaucratic-capitalist “development,” aided by imperialist support, has brought no fundamental benefit to the people. The three basic resources of our country—people, water, and land (Jon, Jol, Jomin), which we call the three “J’s”—have been destroyed in the interest of imperialism, replacing them with garment factories, manpower export, and road-bridge construction.

Their so-called self-reliant economy is an import-export dependent economy; it is a tailoring economy, retail economy, and labor-export economy instead of a basic industrial economy, and even runs contrary to capitalism in some aspects.

Many of the type of developments that has occurred, and is accelerating, also took place during the British or Pakistan eras. Why, then, did we drive out the British or Pakistan? Because even though they showed some external development—what could be called cosmetic development—the real gains went to the rich elite and their foreign masters, and there was no substantial change in the lives of the people. That is still happening today. What is called “development” has been done and is being done for a few powerful wealthy individuals and their foreign masters. They are incapable of achieving this kind of development without foreign imperialist or expansionist aid. They require this foreign support, especially to preserve their power and secure their positions against popular uprisings and revolutions. For this reason, the ruling class is tightly bound

with these foreign powers. They will not, and cannot, undertake development in the interest of the people.

* It is said that massive industrialization has occurred in the country. Cities have expanded significantly. Workplaces and the working class have grown considerably. These are held up as symbols of the prosperity of this system.

The main area of industrialization is the garment sector, where the majority of the workforce is women. This did not happen out of any progressive attitude toward women. Rather, it happened because, amid widespread unemployment, women's labor could be purchased at very low cost, and women workers posed less risk of protest or resistance. As noted earlier, garment workers in Bangladesh earn some of the lowest wages in the world.

Besides the garment sector, in construction, transport, tea industries, hotels, and other small-scale industries or agriculture, the conditions of workers are dire. They have no structured wages, and if they do, these are inhumane. There is no job or work security, and housing is unavailable. In many cases, workers are engaged in hazardous tasks without any safety measures. Thousands of construction workers die each year, and their families receive little or no compensation. Many child laborers are employed, often receiving only minimal wages or just food, and are forced into inhumane labor. The conditions of tea workers, partially revealed during the 2023 tea workers' movement, are equally appalling. They live almost as land serfs, with their female and indigenous labor exploited at extremely low wages.

In villages and rural areas, numerous rice-processing centers (chatal) have emerged alongside agriculture. In these rice-processing centers, owners prefer easily available female labor at low wages. Workers in these centers are employed at extremely low pay.

* The semi-feudal relations of production in agriculture, and the imperialist/bureaucrat-capitalist intrusion based on

them, have brought clear hardships to agriculture and the lives of peasants.

First, peasants themselves are continuously being evicted from their land, and most of these displaced people are forced into an uncertain, destitute life. Even if some choose to work as sharecroppers in the villages, job opportunities in rural areas are declining compared to unemployment, pushing them toward urban centers. Some temporarily work as rural agricultural laborers, but there is no year-round work available in agriculture. They then work in cities or villages in various informal sectors—daily labor, small shops, street vending, transport-auto-rickshaw, or construction labor. While a portion works primarily in the garment sector, most men work irregularly in the aforementioned informal sectors. They have no labor rights, no wage scale, and their housing in slum-like areas on the outskirts of cities is extremely poor. Their women work in garments, or as construction laborers, domestic workers, or in small trade/business, and even though they earn some cash, it is entirely spent on subsistence.

The excessive demands of landlords (housing) and rising prices continually pressure them. After returning to the village, the dreams of buying a small plot if they have no land for housing, or constructing or repairing their house, or buy or lease a piece of land for cultivation, and side by side launch a small trade or shop, remain mostly unfulfilled. Educational opportunities for their children are minimal. The extensive state-promoted education offers them no security because they lack access to higher education and see little value in primary education. Many are forced into rapidly growing madrassas for education—drawn by religious belief and the accessibility of madrasa schooling. For medical care, despite the development of advanced technologies in public hospitals, many still rely on traditional healers, quacks, or faith-based remedies due to excessive costs and long procedures.

Those engaged in street vending or various transport work face extortion from police and enforcers of the bourgeois parties, along with legal harassment. They constantly suffer from job and occupational insecurity.

Due to imperialist/bureaucrat-capitalist intrusion in agriculture, and the mechanization and large-scale cultivation, the costs of farming, irrigation, seeds, pesticides, fertilizers, fuel, and electricity have increased drastically, making agriculture extremely difficult. Additionally, because the ruling class, the state, and their agents (middlemen, hoarders) monopolize the market, peasants cannot get fair prices for their crops. Many are losing interest in cultivation, and traditional agricultural practices are disappearing. Poor peasants are forced to sell their crops at low prices during the season, only to buy the same crops at much higher prices later for their own consumption.

It is true that, due to technological applications, the introduction of improved seeds, and the use of fertilizers and pesticides—especially the extraction of underground water for irrigation during the Boro season—rice production has significantly increased. Urban markets, fueled by cash income among a vast population, have driven increased production of vegetables, fish, poultry, eggs, cattle, goats, and fruits. As a result, food security for the general population has somewhat improved. However, in exchange, many diverse rice varieties have disappeared, numerous rich fish species have been lost or are on the verge of extinction, and the quality of water and fertile soil—the country's greatest resources—has deteriorated. Cities and even rural areas now suffer from abnormal air pollution. Canals, ponds, rivers, and water bodies are drying up or have already disappeared.

Although the assurance of rice for many people has improved somewhat compared to the past, for a large portion of the population, food security—especially nutritional security—remains inadequate. A significant part of the population still regularly or occasionally subsists on half

meals, particularly slum dwellers and street children, mocking the many propagated slogans of development and self-reliance.

Milk is generally beyond the reach of the vast majority of people, including most peasants. The same applies to nutritious fruits. Particularly, much of the country's diverse food heritage has also been lost. It is important to expose the falsehood and serious issues behind the government's—especially the pre-'24 ruling Awami League's—propaganda claiming the country is “self-sufficient” in food. In reality, the country is far from self-sufficient in food production. Key food items such as wheat, edible oils, and sugar remain largely import-dependent. Even the staple food, rice, is regularly imported in several million tons each year. It is also important to note that a significant portion of the inputs required for food production is imported. Many of these are almost entirely or largely foreign-dependent, such as tractors, irrigation pumps, harvesting machines, fuel, pesticides, hybrid seeds, fertilizers, and more. Therefore, the so-called self-sufficiency propaganda is misleading; in fact, they have made food production highly dependent on foreign inputs, whereas a few decades ago it was self-reliant.

Additionally, they have severely damaged other necessary agricultural products such as jute and cotton.

The environmental, agricultural, and arboreal damage in many southern areas caused by commercial shrimp farming is irreparable. On one hand, semi-feudal ownership, and on the other, imperialist-bureaucratic anti-people development projects, have caused permanent or temporary waterlogging in many agricultural areas, leading to severe hardships for farmers and agriculture. The state, under the pretext of conserving Hilsa fish, has imposed fishing bans for several months each year, putting additional police oppression on fishers. Simultaneously, through nominal payments or aid in a corrupt system, fishers are kept on half-rations during these periods. Like transport workers' unions, fishers'

cooperatives and these organizations are managed under the leadership of owners and big capitalists.

As part of “development,” unplanned projects against the interests of the nation and its people—especially large bridges such as the Padma Bridge—have caused unwanted erosion of rivers. Many traditional markets, towns, and agricultural lands are being swallowed by rivers or are at severe risk. Those responsible evade accountability by blaming nature, and no arrangements are being made to rehabilitate affected peasants and communities.

* The current system has inevitably created massive unemployment, which the state and ruling class attempt to mask partially through human trafficking systems. In reality, a large portion of the workforce is semi-unemployed. They constantly shift from one occupation to another, forced to live in uncertainty.

* The entire system has made access to proper healthcare and affordable treatment impossible not only for the poor but also for the broad middle class.

Health and medical care have been privatized and commercialized. Even the available public healthcare rarely provides quality services. Widespread corruption and bribery have engulfed these public sectors. Patients must chase doctors for the most basic care. In government medical facilities, even routine treatment requires visiting multiple places over several days. Securing an operation date or a hospital bed is extremely difficult. Many diagnostic tests must be done privately.

The government allocates far less than required for healthcare in the annual budget. A significant portion of what is allocated is spent on infrastructure construction, corrupt procurement, and outright theft. Healthcare, like all other services, is concentrated in the capital and urban centers, depriving rural populations or forcing them to bear

substantial costs and hardships for travel and accommodation.

Government hospitals' expensive equipment, worth millions, is often left unused, forcing patients to seek private diagnostic centers or hospitals. In many cases, unnecessary tests are prescribed, for which senior doctors receive commissions from diagnostic centers. The same applies to medicine. Pharmaceutical companies spend millions to promote their drugs to doctors, hospitals, and other stakeholders, offering lavish gifts, foreign trips, and degrees to secure their influence. All these costs are ultimately borne by ordinary people.

Despite the presence of a large number of qualified specialist doctors, the overall condition of the healthcare system is extremely poor. As a result, not only the wealthy but also a significant portion of the upper-middle and middle classes go abroad — especially to India — for medical treatment. Consequently, hundreds of crores of taka are transferred out of the country every year.

* The condition of education is no better than that of healthcare. Education is in a state of deep crisis under the combined assault of privatization, commercialization, religiousization, and structural inequality. Even bourgeois experts admit that alongside the rapid expansion of educational institutions and the dramatic rise in GPA-5 results, the quality of education has sharply declined and continues to deteriorate. Not a single public university from the country appears on the list of the world's top one thousand universities.

The present education system is producing millions of semi-educated youths and madrasa-educated young people shaped by medieval values, along with millions of educated unemployed. At the same time, it is creating a labor-averse, foreign-oriented, extremely corrupt, socially detached elite class and bureaucracy. This education system functions as a

powerful weapon in favor of the rule and exploitation carried out by the enemies of the people.

In the interests of imperialist and foreign exploiters, the burden of English and Arabic has been imposed upon students, while the path to genuine knowledge for the masses has been obstructed through complex curricula and examination systems. Conversely, for the enemy classes of the people, special educational arrangements such as cadet colleges, residential model schools, elite private institutions, and O- and A-Level systems have been created to educate a select few and consolidate their capacity for exploitation.

This education system forcefully injects the poison of communal ideology into the public mind.

For the past fifty years, bureaucrats and anti-people intellectuals have continuously experimented on primary and secondary education, and the price of these experiments is being paid by children and adolescents — and even by the broader community of teachers.

Under the pretext of providing free textbooks in public schools, the government has become involved in a trade worth thousands of crores of taka, a large share of which goes to India. Alongside these so-called free books, an even larger guidebook/notebook business is flourishing. The decline of school education and the pressure of “dog eat dog system” have fueled the massive growth of the coaching business. Thus, while the state claims to make education accessible, the opposite is occurring — education has become increasingly expensive. Since the vast poor population cannot bear this cost, official claims about literacy have turned into a farce. Even after five decades, government statistics show that around 30 percent of the population remains illiterate. Moreover, a large portion of those labeled “educated” can barely sign their names and remain far from genuinely educated.

Large numbers of poor families are sending their children to madrasas, many of which do not even properly teach the Bengali language, let alone science or history. This

is the result of the state's policy of appeasing religious ideology and refusing to separate religion from public and state life. It divides the people and transforms them into a reserve force for religious politics against modern and scientific education.

Simultaneously, the state apparatus maintains multiple streams of education, including English-medium institutions that function as factories for producing servants of imperialism and the ruling class for the benefit of the elite and affluent middle class.

Even at the school level, scientific education is being steadily reduced, while continuous concessions are being made to religious forces.

Due to the absence of clear goals and direction in higher education, many young people crowd into universities in pursuit of advanced degrees. Yet it often takes ten years to complete a five-year program, wasting a significant part of their youth. The lack of adequate employment opportunities for the educated population increases the number of educated unemployed, fueling frustration, drug addiction, and outward migration. At the same time, despite the country's urgent need for technically skilled professionals, technical education is given far too little importance.

Alongside the numerical expansion of higher education institutions, the quality of education has collapsed. Instead of genuine scholars, committed scientists, researchers, and teachers, institutions are filled with factional and opportunistic so-called academics. At the same time, under the banner of student politics, thuggish elements linked to bourgeois party fascism, religious extremism, and authoritarian anti-people politics dominate campuses.

As a result, a large number of students are going abroad for higher education. Along with them, a huge amount of the country's foreign currency is also flowing out. Some of them, after completing their higher education, do not return to the country — a situation that is also occurring with teachers.

This crisis is being “addressed” through the reactionary policy of depoliticization — banning student politics — particularly in private universities serving the elite and affluent. After the fall of Hasina, this disguised fascism, supported by advocates of so-called depoliticization in power, has begun to contaminate public universities and colleges as well.

* The right to housing is a fundamental right of the people.

In rural areas, many landless peasants and poor laborers have little or no homestead of their own, often living on others’ land. Even those who possess land lack the means to build livable houses. Their dwellings serve merely as nighttime shelters, without sanitary toilets, safe drinking water, or adequate fuel. Storms, rain, and floods further worsen their conditions.

In urban areas, the housing crisis of poor, casual, and even many permanent workers is equally severe. On one side stand luxurious high-rise buildings in elite neighborhoods; on the other, vast slums. In these slums, power cuts, low gas pressure forcing women to cook through the night, lack of clean water leading to diseases such as jaundice and typhoid, and the relentless torment of mosquitoes all reflect the inhuman housing conditions.

Only a small minority of urban residents have their own homes or secure housing. The number of homeless people in major cities is enormous.

For those living in rented housing, a large portion of their income — often nearly 50 percent — is spent solely on rent.

To conceal this helplessness of the poor and lower middle-class population and to serve the narrow interests of bourgeois party politics, successive bourgeois governments have at various times undertaken programs under different names such as “Ashrayan,” “cluster villages,” and similar schemes. These announcements and limited initiatives

themselves prove how, even more than fifty years after so-called independence, an enormous number of families still do not have a roof over their heads.

Moreover, these projects are driven by base political motives: distributing contracts to local power-holders and enabling embezzlement through corruption, allocating houses in exchange for money, creating vote banks, and even depriving the genuinely homeless in order to allocate houses to relatives and political allies of those in power.

Such programs cannot offer any fundamental solution to the housing crisis of the rural homeless or the vast urban homeless population.

But housing is not merely a place to shelter one's head. Children and adolescents need playgrounds, spaces for cultural activities, organizations, and facilities for learning and practicing swimming — and more. Even boys lack such opportunities; the situation of girls is therefore easily imaginable. Housewives are effectively confined to a few rooms, living a life of enclosure.

The children of the poor grow up more on the streets than in their single overcrowded rooms; they play on the streets, and they also learn street violence there.

The most destitute sections of the population live mainly in urban slums. In Dhaka city (the capital) alone there are several thousand slums and several million slum-dwellers. This vast population is forced to pay regular "fees" to obtain water, gas, and electricity — a system exploited by bourgeois political godfathers and local strongmen in collusion with the police and bureaucracy.

In urban areas, waterlogging, the complete breakdown of the sewage and drainage system, and the severe mosquito menace have become an unbearable problem. Even with light rainfall, the roads of major cities turn into dangerous canals, which then overflow with the filth and sewage from the drains — a "memorial" to all this so-called development in these cities. Moreover, due to so-called development, the natural water outlets in alleys and neighborhoods have been

blocked, and the drains and canals have been encroached upon and occupied. As a result, these areas suffer from almost permanent waterlogging — a black, foul liquid mixed with human waste and urine. The drains themselves are frequently non-functional due to extreme corruption, mismanagement, and chaos, turning them into breeding grounds for mosquitoes and flies.

Housing and its surrounding areas also require public security. Alongside theft and hijacking, the reign of local thugs operating under bourgeoisie political protection makes daily life insecure and unsafe for the people, especially for women.

In urban areas, industrial zones, markets, and commercial areas are being built intermingled with residential neighborhoods. This prevents even the wealthy from enjoying peaceful residential life. Although some housing projects are created for the affluent, they soon turn into open, mixed-use areas.

* The transport situation has already been discussed to some extent. The most visible form of “development” under the existing system — and the one most proudly showcased by the state and ruling class — is the so-called “revolutionary” transformation of transport: roads, bridges and culverts, mega-bridges, flyovers, expressways, metro rail, tunnels, and now even underground rail projects.

Alongside this, however, there is unbearable traffic congestion, an ever-increasing toll of horrific road accidents, irreparable environmental destruction, and above all the conscious and systematic destruction of this small country’s traditional river- and canal-based water transport system, turning the entire transport sector into one dependent on imperialist and foreign powers.

It is not that roads, bridges, and fast transport are unnecessary. But they are built in reality for the interests of the ruling class and their foreign masters, while the people are lured with the promise of speed and convenience. In

chasing this mirage, the country and its people are made to pay an enormous price.

The real causes of road accidents and deaths are the leasing system, police extortion, corruption and mismanagement in traffic administration, corruption in BRT projects, drug and mobile-phone addiction fostered under state and ruling-class patronage, and unfit, expired vehicles. To conceal these real causes, the poor transport workers are blamed unilaterally and even subjected to laws imposing the death penalty.

The state and ruling class import various vehicles in their own and imperialist interests, then soon ban them in the name of pollution or accidents. As a result, transport workers and small owners face constant police harassment, are forced to pay bribes under the threat of cases, and are pushed into livelihood insecurity.

* Under the existing semi-feudal and bureaucratic-comprador system and culture, which sustain an authoritarian order, the miserable condition of women is visible daily in the national newspapers. Religious ideology restricts or denies women's equal rights to land and property, and even where such rights formally exist, most women cannot realize them due to patriarchal domination. In society and in the family, women's status is openly subordinate.

The scale of rape cannot be understood from official statistics, largely because many perpetrators are protected as cadres or godfathers of the ruling bourgeois parties, local power-holders, or beneficiaries of bureaucratic patronage. Violence against women under the label of "eve-teasing" has increased to such an extent that news of suicides and murders of adolescent girls and young women appears frequently.

On the one hand prostitution is maintained within society; on the other, in the name of morality or religion, prostitutes are evicted from even their last shelters so that

their land can be seized. They have no legal rights, and even their children are denied the right to live with dignity.

The Hizras and transgender community is also marginalized and degraded in society. Denied equal access to education, housing, and employment, they are forced into begging or coercive means of survival. As with prostitutes, a large portion of their income is seized by thugs, political cadres, godfathers, and the police.

Although dowry is legally prohibited, its prevalence is steadily increasing, leading to domestic violence, divorce, and even murder. Although child marriage is legally banned, the government has capitulated to religious pressure. In practice, because women are devalued and poor communities suffer constant harassment by thugs, child marriage remains widespread. Taking advantage of legal loopholes, police and local power-holders legitimize child marriages through bribery and extortion.

As a result of child marriage and adolescent childbirth, countless women suffer severe health damage, marital breakdown, and endless misery.

Working women are, in most cases, denied equal pay for equal work. The labour of women in peasant households in the countryside or in domestic work in towns and villages has no recognized market value at all. The general lack of sufficient and hygienic toilets along travel routes and in offices, courts, and workplaces is particularly severe for women. As a result, women are not only frequently subjected to humiliating situations but also suffer from various bladder and urinary diseases. Even where toilets do exist, security for women around them is often highly risky.

* Like women, other vulnerable and minority groups — nationality, religious, and linguistic minorities — are also victims of fascist repression.

The country's minority nationalities are at the same time religious minorities; likewise, a section of linguistic minorities are also national minorities. In one way or

another, all of them are subjected to oppression in different forms and degrees.

The national minority peoples of the Chittagong Hill Tracts and of the plains have long been struggling for recognition of their distinct national identities. But the ruling class and its constitution and the state first demanded that they should become Bengali, and later, through political maneuvering, insulted and diminished their identities by labeling them “small ethnic groups.” Everywhere they are losing their homesteads and land to powerful interests under attacks by aggressive Bengali/Bangladeshi nationalism and religious extremism. They are being persecuted on religious grounds, and many are being forced into exile.

The indigenous peoples of the Chittagong Hill Tracts have long struggled for regional autonomy. When their just demands were harshly rejected, they naturally fought for the right to self-determination, including the right to form a separate state. The state not only brutally suppressed this struggle, but also forced a large portion of them to flee the country. Most gravely, their homelands have been placed under a regime of disguised military rule, and large numbers of poor settlers from the plains have been relocated there in order to turn the indigenous population into a minority on their own land. In this way, the ruling class provokes conflict between hilly peoples and Bengalis to secure its aggressive nationalist rule. Using legal pretexts, the state evicts indigenous people from hill lands and effectively hands them over on long-term leases to wealthy Bengali elites and bureaucrats.

At one time in East Bengal, alongside the Muslim population, there was a large Hindu population. When India and Bengal were partitioned under British conspiracy and with the collusion of their local agents, the Congress and the Muslim League, Hindus constituted about 25 percent of East Bengal's population (in 1947). By the end of the Pakistan period this had fallen to around 15 percent (in 1971). Although Bangladesh was formed in the name of so-called

secularism, oppression, discrimination, and humiliation of Hindus (and of the much smaller Buddhist minority as well) continued in accordance with the predatory character of the ruling class. As a result, their share has now declined to about 8 percent. Yet even now they number around fifteen million — more than the total population of many European countries. Nevertheless, this vast population lives in this country essentially as strangers. All major bourgeois parties bear responsibility for the seizure of Hindu land and property, a reality that the supposedly Hindu-friendly Awami League long concealed behind its habitual false propaganda. The oppressive character of the ruling class and the state, the massive expansion of religious fundamentalism with their patronage, and the Hindutva conspiracies of the Indian expansionist ruling class have also fostered India-oriented illusions among sections of this religious minority, especially among the middle class — illusions that divert them from the struggle to establish their rights in this country.

* As noted earlier, the so-called development programs of this system and other policies have caused, and continue to cause, massive environmental destruction. Rivers, canals, wetlands, and water bodies have been dried up. Then, in the name of “restoration,” new development projects are launched to enable the looting of hundreds and thousands of crores of taka. Fish have almost disappeared from most rivers, especially in those near cities, destroying the country’s traditional fisheries and fish production on a massive scale. Their place is being taken by fish-farming ponds that destroy agricultural land.

Countless old and valuable trees are sacrificed for road construction and development projects, while destructive, water-guzzling foreign species are imported and promoted. The few remaining forests of this small country are being destroyed by large projects and plunder. Hills are cut down and their soil sold; plains are created and occupied at will. In cities, former canals, rivers, and ponds have been filled in

and occupied, or turned into narrow, foul-smelling drains. Urban air is now among the most polluted in the world. In what was once one of the world's richest countries in water resources, safe drinking water has become scarce. The over-extraction of groundwater for high-yield crops has made even underground water increasingly unavailable.

Brick kilns not only devastate the environment but also destroy large areas of agricultural land and undermine farming in surrounding areas. As a result of monstrous urbanization, countless slums have emerged, where drinking water, electricity, sewage, and all basic services are in miserable condition, housing millions of poor people and causing massive environmental damage.

Waterlogging now affects not only cities but also agriculture in many regions; places like Bhabaadhaha exist in many parts of the country. After floods and coastal cyclones, waterlogging remains a persistent problem — as seen after Cyclone Sidr (2008), whose aftermath has still not been fully resolved.

Unexpected river erosion is wiping out many ancient settlements. Behind the propaganda around the Padma Bridge, the disappearance of important old settlements in Shariatpur district has been pushed into silence.

Despite the devastating role of plastic, its unchecked expansion continues to destroy the environment on a vast scale. Although funds and projects are occasionally announced to address the problem, these become new channels for corruption — like pouring water on leaves after cutting the roots of a tree. Even the “interim government,” (2024/25) together with loudly environmentalist NGOs, announced a program to ban polythene but failed to implement it. In this way every faction of the ruling class has displayed its failure and empty rhetoric.

As a result of their disastrous urbanization and industrial policies, fires have become a regular occurrence across the country, destroying thousands of crores worth of property and killing and injuring many people. There is virtually no

modern firefighting system, and even the traditional method of extinguishing fires with water has become impossible because water bodies have been mercilessly destroyed. In many slum fires, there is clear evidence of deliberate arson by powerful interests seeking to seize land. Yet the real perpetrators always escape punishment, because they belong to one or another faction of the ruling class.

* The entire system has brought about massive distortion and stagnation in the cultural sphere. On the one hand there is medieval religious obscurantism, hostility to science, and backward consciousness; on the other, the toxic grip of imperialist-capitalist commodity culture, including a huge burden of degenerate imported culture from India. Together these are pushing the masses — especially the youth — onto a disoriented and misguided path. Added to this is the so-called “digital culture” through which imperialist, bureaucratic, and comprador capital extracts profit via smartphones, Facebook, and laptop culture.

In the name of so-called “blasphemy,” attacks are periodically carried out against religious minorities and against various belief communities, and riots are incited. In this, religious fundamentalism, the state, and bourgeois parties play a major role through their incitement, patronage, and support, and through the communal, reactionary, fascist consciousness they cultivate among the backward sections of the people.

The people’s revolutionary and militant traditions have been erased; where they could not be erased, they have been distorted. Popular commemorative days have been reduced to empty rituals. The true heroes of history and the history of heroic popular struggles have been deleted and replaced with clowns, deceivers, puppets, traitors, collaborators, and capitulators. Real history and scientific knowledge are being removed from the education of children and adolescents. Youth are being trapped in a remittance-driven, outward-looking culture. Young people from the wealthy and well-off

classes aspire to permanent settlement abroad, while others are being pushed into various forms of drug addiction, from which the ruling class and the guardians of the state apparatus extract huge profits.

State-controlled mass media — television and radio — continuously promote a culture that serves the interests of the fascist and authoritarian regime, foreign exploitation, and feudal relations. Through the control of a large number of newspapers as well, propaganda is carried out in favor of the ruling class and fascism/authoritarianism, and against the people's revolutionary struggles.

Some influential newspapers openly campaign for imperialism and conduct slander and propaganda against Marxism and communism; others advocate Indian expansionism.

Imported foreign films, most domestic films, theatre, popular performances, music, YouTube content, and similar media relentlessly promote obscenity, criminality, violence, feudal values, extreme individualism, romantic individualism, and cults of personal heroism.

The country's once-rich theatrical tradition has been destroyed by the invasion of Indian family-intrigue serials and hero-centric cinema. Television drama has been turned either into training courses in romantic obsession or into vulgar caricature. Foreign serials are filling the vacuum. Even the film industry itself has been placed under threat by Indian cultural aggression. Not only has revolutionary and progressive art been wiped out, but even high-quality bourgeois cinema, which existed a few decades ago, has vanished. By liberalizing film imports from India, the Hasina regime effectively drove the final nail into the coffin of the national film industry — a policy that has not changed even under so-called anti-India governments. As a result of hostile state policy, the industry is in such dire condition that cinemas are dying out: apart from a handful of cineplexes, halls across the country are closing. Where there were over a

thousand cinema halls after independence, there are now barely over a hundred.

The weak current of mass songs that still survived until recently has been washed away. Under the banner of “fusion,” folk traditions are being destroyed; the bearers of genuine folk and spiritual-rational culture are either banned in accordance with fundamentalist demands or bureaucratized and converted into commodities for the rich.

As a result of imperialist “development” and reactionary urbanization, urban schools generally have no playgrounds, no ponds, no libraries in schools or neighborhoods, and no clubs for healthy cultural activity — all have been eliminated. Sports are promoted only as a star-making industry, not for the physical, mental, and cultural development of millions of children and youth. What once seemed unthinkable is now common: a large part of the young generation cannot even swim — in what was once a river-based country.

By promoting waves of overseas migration, the state opens wide the path for specialists, educated professionals, and technically skilled workers — trained at the people’s expense — to leave the country, while dangling the “Middle Eastern dream” to push working-class youth abroad and blunt their sense of social responsibility.

Through relentless advertising of foreign luxury goods, cosmetics, cars, bikes, and fashion items, people — especially young men and women — are shaped into consumers obsessed with foreign products, surface glamour, spectacle, shallow ambition, restless individualism, and alienation from national consciousness.

Communal poison is still being spread among the people in various ways by religious groups and fascist/authoritarian governments.

Under imperialist prompting, population is deceitfully portrayed as the main cause of poverty and suffering, shifting responsibility for social misery onto the people themselves.

Through the education system, state propaganda, and sections of the press and literature, people are told that “the people are corrupt and thieves,” “Bangladesh has no resources,” and “there is no alternative to foreign aid,” spreading false beliefs and crippling national dignity and self-respect, while the crimes of a small corrupt, parasitic, and anti-people elite are blamed on the population as a whole.

Foreign religious organizations, foreign-aid-funded NGOs, and so-called service and development agencies continuously work in the interests of foreign powers.

Under the name of religion, public opinion is constantly mobilized against women’s rights, promoting medieval feudal notions in the name of morality; at the same time, in the name of women’s “freedom,” imperialist and reactionary bourgeois forces commodify women. Anti-people culture has thus penetrated deeply into broad sections of society.

* In this state and society — built over more than fifty years by the ruling bourgeoisie and their foreign patrons — there is no real place for the elderly and the disabled. The old-age allowance program is largely symbolic: few receive it, the amount is tiny, and access depends on party connections; much of it is siphoned off by local power-holders. There is no proper healthcare system for the elderly; many go untreated, or sell their remaining assets before death to pay big doctors and private clinics. The elderly are treated as burdens; their experience and skills are not used for social benefit.

Nor does this society value youth and children.

Its message to young people is: become a garment worker or transport laborer, or go abroad; if you cannot, turn to drugs. Watch celebrities’ play sports, but do not play yourselves — instead, play games on your smartphones.

The message to children is: go to school with a burden of books on your neck, accompanied by your mother; after school go to coaching, then come home and remain absorbed

in a smartphone or laptop. Village children have not yet fully fallen into this trap, but if the implementation of the state projects “Village Will Become City” and “Smart Bangladesh” advances, the same will apply to them as well.

* In the existing autocratic system, the people do not even have bourgeois democratic rights. Although occasionally, the ruling class and their masters try to put on a show of democracy through somewhat democratic elections.

The inevitable expression of this system is the intervention and control of imperialism and expansionism in the affairs of governance. They almost always determine the ruling party and groups of the country. The fascist-like repression by the state machinery, unlimited corruption, brutal suppression of the people and even the opposition bourgeois camp, enforced disappearances, extrajudicial killings, physical torture, denial of the people’s and opposition voices’ right to freedom of expression, partisan control of the judiciary and shameless violation of the rule of law, countless black laws — these are the indispensable features of this system. Because of these, people of all strata have to suffer endless misery, repression, exploitation, and deception.

The practice of bourgeois politics within the existing autocratic system itself is a major source of oppression, deception, and lies for the people. This politics not only keeps the people divided, but is also the breeding ground of all existing and growing ignorance, corruption, hooliganism, terrorism, and false history.

This politics has made the broad masses indifferent to politics itself. This politics creates divisions, fights, clashes, killings, and plunder among the people. This system produces ultra-nationalism, religious fundamentalism and fascism, one-party or military rule. It has made even the bourgeois form of change of power through elections impossible, and has turned elections into a farce. This politics has created gangs and terrorists among students,

workers and youth; it has created ruthless extortionists — the consequences of which are borne by the broad masses of ordinary people. And lending support to this are certain so-called intellectuals—a self-serving, power-obsessed, and profit-driven group who have sold out their principles.

To escape from this anti-people politics and crisis of rule of the ruling class, and to deceive the people, one section of them pushes forward the politics of depoliticization. Its expression has again been seen after the fall of Hasina through the formation of an “interim government,” (2024/25) whose main force is the military-bureaucracy and the so-called “non-political” civil society.

All forms of politics of the ruling class and the so-called politics of depoliticization have turned the country into a hunting ground for imperialism and expansionism, that is, for foreign exploiters. They not only determine economic policy, but even control the country’s politics and elections, and determine the rulers, state power, and policies of the country. Yet shamelessly they shout about independence, the spirit of the Liberation War, democracy, and the aspiration of mass uprising.

All these have become a burden on the people; therefore they have turned away from bourgeois politics. Bourgeois politics is alienated not only from the broad masses but also from the large educated middle class and even the upper middle class.

But in bourgeois political voting or movements, electoral conflicts or strikes and street violence, it is the broad poor and ordinary people who suffer the most. They go hungry during strikes, get shot in movements, become victims of extortion, are evicted from their livelihoods, and go to jail. That is what happened in the recent mass uprising (2024) as well. And using this struggle and sacrifice of the people, some power-hungry/opportunist/unconscious student leaders and anti-people bureaucrats (military and non-military), NGOs, civil society actors, intellectuals, and

opportunistic and deprived bourgeois politicians and businessmen have arranged their own gains.

* In the existing system, among the important ways and spheres through which the working people and the broad masses are exploited, plundered, and oppressed, are the judicial system, the police and administrative system, bribery-corruption-plunder, which are products of the autocratic semi-feudal and bureaucratic-comprador dependent distorted capitalist system here.

The rulers often continue to justify these by saying, “corruption exists in every country,” “there is no completely corruption-free society in the world,” and similar statements. Again, some declare so-called jihad against corruption. On the one hand they chant about the rule of law and democracy; on the other hand they practice neither for the people nor even for dissenters within their own class or parties. They raise slogans in the name of independence, the Liberation War, and/or mass uprising, while in practice they act as agents of imperialism and Indian expansionism. They speak of secularism, yet in practice nurture religious fundamentalism under a multi-religious cloak, primarily patronizing Muslim fundamentalism. Some other sections openly seek to establish religious fundamentalism.

The so-called reforms of this social system promoted by so-called civil society and NGOs — which they and all bourgeois parties and their tail-end small parties (including so-called leftists) have done after the 2024 mass uprising — are purely false.

They try to present their own power and huge financial growth as the people’s development; this has no meaning other than crying in the wilderness or conscious deception.

This system cannot give any beautiful/secure future to the country and the people. There is no meaning in reforming it, nor is there any way to do so. Destroying it and building a new society on its grave can be the only program for the liberation of the people. And for that, one must go deeper

into the social system, understand its governing contradictions, recognize the different classes, and understand who are for this revolutionary transformation and who are against it. Only by uniting the true friends against the real enemies can a positive revolutionary program be built.

The End.