

Programme

Part 3

**Basic Contradictions,
Class Analysis and Political Currents of the
Society of East Bengal**

Programme: Part 3
Basic Contradictions, Class Analysis,
and Political Currents of the Society of East Bengal

Publisher: CC, PBSP

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

Revised second edition: August 2025

Price: 50 Taka

Preface to the Second Edition

The fifth chapter of the document regarding the “Program” of our party is printed separately here.

The first edition of the entire document regarding the “Program” was first 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 by various comrades on the document before and during the Congress.

The entire “Program” document is being republished separately. In addition, the program doc. is being published in 4 parts also. This part is the 3rd of them. This has been done to facilitate study, education and propagate at various levels of the party and outside the party as needed.

-- CC
August 2025

Table of Contents

1. The Character and Basic Contradictions
of the society of Purbo Bangla (East Bangal) / 5
2. Class Analysis of the Society of Purbo Bangla / 8
 - Enemy Classes of the Revolution / 8
 - Classes in favour of Revolution / 15
3. Main Political Currents and Parties, and
our outlook and policy towards them / 28

The character and basic contradictions of the Society of Purbo Bangla (East Bengal)

Just as the basic character of East Bengal's society should be understood as part of the world system, in the same way the program of revolution here must be constructed under it as part of the world communist revolution. That is why we say that the revolution in this country is part of the world revolution.

The world revolution has two currents — for two types of countries in the world. One, the New Democratic Revolution in countries oppressed by imperialism, which constitutes the first stage of the revolution. After completing this, the tasks of the second stage of the socialist revolution must be taken up. And two, the socialist revolution in imperialist-capitalist countries.

Both types of revolution first take place in one or more specific countries, as happened first in Russia and later in China in the last century. But the establishment of socialism is not the end of the revolution. Because the final program of the communist revolution is the establishment of a communist world free from all forms of exploitation, oppression, and inequality — an exploitation-free, classless, and stateless world. The establishment of socialism in one or a few countries is only an interim phase on the way to that final goal.

Countries like ours are currently at the first stage of the revolution — the stage of the New Democratic Revolution. The first objective of this revolution is to free the country from imperialist exploitation, plunder, and oppression. In today's world, imperialism builds up in these countries its comprador-bureaucrat bourgeois class to work on its behalf, which is different in form from old colonialism but identical

in essence. They grant these countries a superficial independence and control their economy and politics through the domestic comprador-bureaucrat class. This is called the policy of neo-colonialism. Bangladesh is therefore a neo-colonial country, whose independence is a fake independence. That is why we see that even after so-called independence twice — once after the British left and once after Pakistan left — imperialist and expansionist exploitation, oppression, and control over the country continue. The elimination of imperialism is inseparably linked with the elimination of the domestic comprador-bureaucratic class. Inseparably linked with these two enemies of the New Democratic Revolution is the country's semi-feudal system. After the development of imperialism and the Russian Revolution, it is no longer possible for the bourgeoisie of these countries to complete a democratic revolution by overthrowing feudalism in a revolutionary way. Rather, the main bourgeois force in these countries, the comprador-bureaucratic bourgeois class, becomes an enemy even of the bourgeois democratic revolution. Therefore, the responsibility of completing the democratic revolution falls upon the proletariat.

From all these we obtain the strategy of the New Democratic Revolution, which, through the elimination of imperialism and its agents and under proletarian leadership, becomes part of the world proletarian revolution. On the other hand, it is not itself the socialist revolution, but rather its preparatory stage. It is a new type of democratic revolution, led by the proletariat, which also eliminates the main section of the bourgeoisie (i.e. comprador-bureaucratic bourgeoisie - another lackey of imperialism) as an enemy of the new democratic revolution, and after completing this revolution proceeds without pause toward the socialist revolution.

From the above discussion we find that the basic/important contradictions responsible for the development of our country and society are as follows —

1. **The national contradiction between the nation and people of East Bengal and all imperialisms including the US-EU-Russia-China and Indian expansionism.**
2. **The contradiction between the ruling comprador-bureaucratic bourgeois class holding central state power and the broad masses including workers, peasants, the poor, the working people, and the general middle class.**
3. **The contradiction between the semi-feudal system/class and the broad masses, especially the peasants.**
4. **The contradiction between the bourgeois class of East Bengal and the working class. And,**
5. **The contradiction among the imperialist-expansionist forces and their domestic agents themselves.**

Among the above contradictions, the comprador-bureaucratic bourgeois class, as the main ruling class, is the principal class operating state power, and its contradiction with the broad masses of the people is the principal contradiction. This class currently plays the leading role in maintaining and defending the existing neo-colonial semi-feudal system.

However, at the present stage of the revolution, on the one hand imperialism-expansionism, the comprador-bureaucratic bourgeois class, and the feudal and semi-feudal classes together form the axis of the enemy camp of the people, who are the enemies of the revolution. On the other hand, workers, peasants, the broad poor and working people, the general middle class, and even a section of the upper middle class and medium bourgeoisie opposed to foreign exploitation and oppression together form the vast sea of nearly 90 percent of the country's people, who are the forces in favor of the revolution. The contradiction between these two camps constitutes the fundamental contradiction of the society, and the success of the revolution depends on its resolution.

Class analysis of East Bengal's society

Mao said: who are our enemies and who are our friends — this is the first important question of the revolution. Because revolution is the forcible overthrow of the ruling reactionary class and the establishment of state power of the oppressed class / people / nation. Therefore, on which class plays what role in the revolution depends how we organize the people and how much we rely on whom.

Enemy classes of the revolution

As the ruling class of Bangladesh there is directly the comprador-bureaucratic bourgeois class, and as their allies there is the semi-feudal class. Behind them stand imperialism and Indian expansionism. A brief discussion of the identity of these enemy classes of the revolution is given below.

Imperialism

From the very beginning of the imperialist era, the imperialist powers have completed the division of the world among themselves and have been engaged in fierce struggles among themselves for its re-division. As a result of this, two world wars occurred in the last century. After the Second World War, U.S. imperialism emerged as the principal leader of the world system.

However, after the defeat of socialism in Soviet Russia and the establishment of capitalism there (1956), and through its process of development, it turned into social-imperialism by the end of the 1960s. Immediately thereafter it became involved in intense conflict with the U.S. for world hegemony. Thus, from the beginning of the 1970s world imperialism once again split into two rival blocs.

In the early 1990s, as a result of the collapse of Soviet social-imperialism, U.S. imperialism once again established itself as the sole superpower exercising global control.

But within the following two decades, on the one hand Russian imperialism reorganized itself and began attempting to restore its former empire. On the other hand, once-socialist China followed the former Soviet path and developed from capitalism into social-imperialism. As a result, China began to advance to claim a share of global dominance from the U.S. After passing through a trade war with the U.S., China openly began promoting a multipolar world in order to claim a share in world hegemony, a call that Russian imperialism also echoes. Through the Ukraine war and subsequently through continuing wars in the Middle East, inter-imperialist contradictions have once again developed into sharp hostility, and cracks have appeared in the U.S.-dominated unipolar world.

Therefore, when we speak of imperialist exploitation and oppression in our country, we must understand it to mean all imperialisms — including the U.S., the EU, Russia, and China. Under no circumstances can one imperialism be supported against another, because that would work against the country and the people. Although the ruling class of Bangladesh maintains relations with all imperialist camps and speaks of a so-called “balanced” diplomacy, they are again becoming embroiled in intense struggles as influenced by the divisions among their international masters. One section follows in practice the footsteps of Indian expansionism in the name of the “spirit of 1971” and advances accordingly in international relations. The fallen Hasina–Awami government also followed this path. Although India’s large ruling class can bargain with imperialism to a considerable extent, Bangladesh’s ruling class cannot do so to the same degree — which was one major reason for the crisis and fall of the Hasina–Awami government.

Here, on the one hand the U.S., and on the other China and Russia, are making their respective moves and are actively creating their own client forces. Even so, all factions of the ruling class are compelled to maintain special relations

with Indian expansionism, although the degree differs among them. The Awami faction gave the highest priority to Indian interests, because acting as India's agent was the main guarantee of their acquisition and preservation of power. On the other hand, the BNP and similar or so-called "third force" India-opposing sub-groups attempt to oppose India by aligning directly with different imperialist camps. But since India remains extremely important to U.S. imperialism in South Asia, no ruling faction has yet been able to take a fundamentally anti-Indian position. However, as the China–U.S. contradiction intensifies, the future degree of anti-Indian positioning will be significantly influenced by how the ruling classes and states of East Bengal and India align with the world super-powers.

Indian Expansionism

Indian expansionism, with the backing of the then Soviet social-imperialism, played a direct and principal role in the creation of the Bangladeshi state, using the heroic liberation struggle of the people through the nationally treacherous leadership of the Awami League to serve its own expansionist interests.

Thus, from the very emergence of the rising bourgeoisie of this country as the ruling class, Indian expansionist domination and tutelage became attached to it — something the Awami faction shamelessly promoted as a "blood relationship" or a "husband-wife relationship." Other factions may utter some words against India, but none can put forward any fundamentally anti-Indian program.

From the outset Indian expansionism has functioned as one of the principal national enemies of the genuine independence, liberation, and revolution of this country's people. Its special geographical advantages, its success in diverting the people's liberation aspirations in 1971, through these its ability to build a powerful comprador group and intellectual/media/cultural apparatus here, and the economic-

military strength of a huge comprador-bureaucratic class of a vast, densely populated country — all enable this role.

India itself is oppressed by imperialism and is a country that binds a vast population in medieval semi-feudal and feudal chains of exploitation and oppression. Yet by using the above advantages and relying on imperialists and their contradictions, it remains constantly active in building its own sphere of influence in South Asia. Thus it is not only an enemy of its own people, but acts as a national enemy of all the peoples of South Asia.

In recent years, to manage its own crises and to mislead and confuse the people's revolutionary struggles, it has advanced Hindutva fascism. This has had a seriously negative impact on democratic development in our country and has also greatly contributed to the growth of Islamic fundamentalism. In this way it directly and indirectly contributes to the development and preservation of both aggressive Bengali nationalist fascism and religious fascism in our country.

Therefore, Indian expansionism is a permanent enemy of the nation and people of this country.

The Comprador-Bureaucrat Bourgeois Class

As already shown, after the creation of the Bangladeshi state the main domestic class that came to occupy central state power was the rising Bengali bourgeoisie. In character they were comprador — agents of imperialism and expansionism. Using state power, they rapidly transformed into a big bourgeois class.

This class currently includes —

1. Former and current high-ranking bureaucrats — military and civilian — who have become owners of vast wealth, property, and power through “legal” and illegal means, and many of whom later became linked with various businesses and comprador-type industries, accumulating even greater wealth.

2. Leaders, ministers, MPs, upazila (sub-district) chairmen, and a section of union parishad chairmen of various bourgeois political parties — who, like the above, use state power for bribery, corruption, extortion shares, plunder, land-grabbing, and involvement in various businesses and industries.
3. Big businessmen and industrialists — who are often linked to or benefit from state power; a large part of the businessmen are involved in import-export with foreigners; most industrialists are now garment owners and real-estate project magnates; large transport owners and media proprietors also belong here.
4. Owners or senior officials of large NGOs; wealthy journalists, doctors, teachers, and professional leaders.
5. Big smugglers, drug traffickers, traffickers in women and migrant labor — and other large capitalists involved in “illegal” businesses, as well as bank looters, loan defaulters, stock-market plunderers.

This class possesses enormous wealth, they own cash and gold, markets, large housing projects, banks; they are the godfathers of plundering the banking and stock markets; owners of big hospitals and educational institutions; owners of vast tracts of land and plots in cities and industrial zones; owners of multistoried buildings; big importers and exporters; major contractors; and owners of large industries and factories. They are comprador bourgeois. All of them are connected to state power, and it is precisely the force of that power which creates and preserves their existence as a big bourgeois class.

Feudal / Semi-feudal class

At present, in the process of transformation of the large feudal landowning class, the real existence of the old-type feudal class has declined. Nevertheless, as we have already

seen, in many regions of the country — especially in the char areas, wetland basins, haor regions, and coastal zones — large feudal landlord classes still exist. They still often cultivate land through sharecropping or leasing systems.

The main section of this group is now, in various ways, connected with the aforementioned bureaucratic-comprador bourgeois class. At the same time, they are contractors, businessmen, bureaucrat-officers, lawyers and barristers, industrialists, smugglers, drug dealers, leaders of bourgeois political parties, land grabbers, river grabbers, wetland occupiers, and godfathers of terrorism, etc. Therefore, these landowners are deeply and organically linked with the bureaucratic-comprador bourgeois class.

But apart from these large landowners, throughout the countryside and even to a large extent in urban areas one can find a class that directly operates the semi-feudal system.

Among them are large rural jotedars (big land-owners, who do not bodily participate in agricultural work), sections of rich peasants, union chairmen, urban ward members, corrupt village elders — who, in collusion with the police, function as centers of judicial oppression and corruption against peasants — terrorist godfathers, major beneficiaries of extortion, land grabbers such as brick-kiln owners, patrons of bandits, market leaseholders, a large section of urban landlords (housing), and wealthy transport owners who operate their vehicles under leasing systems, etc. These constitute the rural or local base of the bourgeois parties.

Alongside the old feudal class in rural areas, the new semi-feudal class that has emerged is now almost entirely linked with the bureaucratic-comprador ruling class, their political forces, and the state apparatus. By virtue of this relationship, they carry out multiple forms of exploitation and oppression against peasants. They control and operate rural judicial systems in their own interests, and in this way they and the state power massively plunder and oppress peasants. They engage in enormous exploitation and

corruption through dealership and sales of agricultural inputs. On the other hand, by controlling agricultural markets and the transport chains that deliver products to actual consumers, they exploit peasants on a large scale. By force of power they impose various forms of oppression upon women and minority (national and religious) populations.

On the one hand, through sharecropping, usury, and leasing they exploit peasants, workers, and the general population. On the other hand, as the local base of state power, in cooperation and collusion with the police, they carry out oppression and corruption against the masses through multiple methods.

However, the sources of their power are, first, whatever the extent or degree, their ownership of land; and second, on that basis, their relationship with the state apparatus and bourgeois politics.

Standing on such a feudal foundation, in many cases they also carry out capitalist exploitation. In this way, this semi-feudal system has taken the place of the old feudal system, and it functions as a fundamental pillar of the existing system.

The above classes and groups are the protectors and/or beneficiaries of the existing system.

But at the local or lower level of this semi-feudal system, a section of the people can also be found to be involved. For example, sections of rich and middle peasants in sharecropping, usury, or in renting out two or four rickshaws, autos, vans, houses, or shops; even a section of the poor are involved. But this does not by itself make them enemies of the revolution. The grassroots characters of extortion and gangsterism also usually come from among the people — just as ordinary members of the police and other state forces also come from the people. The important issue here is which system they serve and which relations they defend.

In the revolutionary program, therefore, it is necessary to present a correct analysis of the class character of such

individuals, to separate the fact that they are used as functionaries of a system or that they derive some benefit from it, from their overall class character — and in their case to resolve contradictions in a non-antagonistic way.

Classes in favour of the revolution

Now we will discuss the class analysis of the vast masses of the people who stand opposed to the above enemies of the people.

Four main classes are counted in favor of the new democratic revolution: the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie (or middle class), and the national bourgeoisie. None of these classes is homogeneous. Each contains various strata. In any case, some more detailed and specific ideas about these classes and their internal strata will be presented below.

Firstly, the Working Class

1. The Industrial Working Class

Because classical capitalism did not develop properly in our country (first due to colonialism and later due to neo-colonial exploitation and oppression), industrial development has been very unplanned, chaotic, uneven, and distorted.

Due to neo-colonial exploitation and oppression, the main industrial sectors have developed in a comprador form and in close connection with the bureaucracy.

Therefore, industry here has developed under the framework of imperialism's world market and its global plans. The jute mills and sugar mills and textile industries that were built during the Pakistan period (1947-71) were brutally destroyed during the Bangladesh period under the new plans of imperialism and expansionism. Through this process, the garment industry has now become the main industrial sector of the country. It is fundamentally an import-export dependent industry. Although a huge working class has now emerged here, because of semi-feudal

agriculture and other systems, this class has in many cases not developed into a fully proletarian industrial working class that is completely freed from land. A large part of the workers employed in garments and all major industrial sectors are still tied to the villages in various degrees — not only psychologically or culturally, but economically as well.

Nevertheless, a section of these industrial workers are proletarians, who can be called the industrial proletariat. The remaining section is semi-proletarian, and some are even petty owners.

Besides the large comprador-bureaucratic capitalist industries, there are many small factories and workshops scattered throughout the country. In those too, a portion of the workers can be included in the proletarian or near-proletarian class. This class is the comparatively most revolutionary class in the country. Because they are connected to urban life and industrial production, they are at the same time freed from petty rural ownership, comparatively more capable of organizing, and comparatively more politically conscious. For them it is most convenient and easiest to adopt the ideals of socialism and communism. Therefore, they have a greater capacity to become members of the Communist Party and, according to the stage of the revolution in this country, to lead the semi-proletarian and poor peasants and working people in the countryside.

But at the same time, the industrial working class often occupies a comparatively more advantageous livelihood than other workers or working people in this country. Among them, on the one hand there exists an aristocratic-worker ideology, and on the other hand, compared to the extremely poor rural life and informal workers, they are currently more privileged — as a result of many years of Communist-led economic struggles. Although the issue of wages and the constant threat of retrenchment always haunt them, and they are compelled to work at extremely low wages compared to

any other country, still a certain sense of comfort and security operates among them due to the above reasons.

A section of them dreams of petty ownership in villages or cities, small businesses, or cultivation of land. Some achieve this to a certain extent. As a result, they also show political weakness. In this respect, serious constraints have been imposed by armed gangsterism inside factories, the hired forces of bourgeois politics, and fascist repression.

When Communists carried out political and movement work with importance in factories during the Pakistan period, it was seen how rapidly socialist politics spread and gained popularity among this class. But because the Communist movement of that time did not adopt the politics of New Democracy and the countryside-based, peasant-reliant protracted people's war, it failed to organize and lead this advanced section of the working class for revolution.

Nevertheless, this frightened the emerging bourgeoisie and later the ruling class. Therefore, in order to divert workers, they polluted them with nationalist Awami politics. During the Bangladesh period, bourgeois politics drew the privileged section of these workers into a culture of extortion. Through gangster domination it suppressed all forms of workers' movements. At the same time, whatever workers' movements existed were confined within crude and deceptive economism through NGOs. Alongside this, the state apparatus followed open and crude fascist policies against the workers' movement.

As a result, although the working class has expanded enormously, its advanced role is not visible today. In this regard, not only other so-called leftists but also our country's Maoists, as revolutionary communists, bear responsibility. In giving importance to countryside-based, peasant-reliant people's war, they have severely neglected work among the working class, urban work, various kinds of open and semi-open work and mass movements, and economic struggles.

We must overcome this error and bring forward the advanced role of the working class.

2. Informal Workers, Working People, and the Semi-Proletarian Class

Beyond the above industrial proletariat, there exists a vast mass of proletarian and semi-proletarian working people, including construction workers, transport workers, hotel workers, rickshaw and van pullers, etc. Alongside them are domestic workers, day laborers, and many others who live by selling their labor.

A part of these workers are proletarian, another part semi-proletarian, and quite a few are connected with various petty businesses, petty ownership, or some agricultural work. Many of them often work as temporary workers. They are frequently forced to change occupations. Some of them return to the villages from time to time. Although this section is often economically worse off than the industrial proletarian or semi-proletarian class, their weakness is that they are not connected to large-scale production processes, often work under small owners, perform temporary work, and cannot organize widely at their workplaces. As a result, socialist political consciousness and workers' solidarity are weak among them.

The state apparatus does not recognize them as workers, they have no wage structure, and they are almost cut off from labor rights. Because of their partial unemployment, livelihood insecurity, stronger direct links with the countryside, and in many cases greater oppression under the semi-feudal system, they have a greater opportunity and tendency to adopt New Democratic politics. They can be drawn into the revolution quickly and can be rapidly developed in socialist consciousness.

Therefore, like the industrial working class, these proletarian and semi-proletarian workers and working people must also be given the same importance.

3. Agricultural/Rural Laborers

A significant portion of rural laborers resemble the aforementioned informal workers. Some are entirely

proletarian or landless farmers, but the majority are semi-proletarian, simultaneously working as agricultural laborers. Instead of permanent agricultural labor, in most cases they work seasonally—during harvest, transplanting, or planting periods. In some capitalist farms—particularly those related to poultry, dairy, or fisheries—or on certain semi-feudal estates, permanent agricultural laborers can still be found, or some semi-feudal landlords employ bonded labor in the old manner, though such cases are negligible. These agricultural laborers engage in various other occupations during off-seasons—fishing, transport work in villages or towns, daily wage labor, petty trade, hawking, etc. Their advantageous aspect is their close connection to the villages, as they spend most of their time there. Consequently, they are directly influenced by the new democratic agrarian revolutionary programs and the people's war. Like the previously mentioned groups, they are part of the revolutionary leadership cadre.

Second: Peasants

Peasants are divided into several important categories, with differing class characteristics and attitudes toward revolution. Therefore, a class analysis of peasants is crucial.

4. Landless and Poor Peasants

Those who do not own land and cultivate the land of others are landless peasants.

Some possess a small homestead, others none, or what little land they have is trapped in debt.

Landless peasants cultivate others' land through sharecropping or tenancy arrangements. Not all landowners are wealthy landlords; many smallholders with little land live in towns, working in minor jobs or as permanent/temporary laborers, or running small businesses. They lease their agricultural land under sharecropping or tenancy.

Landless peasants also work as agricultural laborers, daily wage laborers, or in transport or construction—taking temporary jobs.

Very poor smallholders with minimal land (up to 3 bighas or 1 acre) closely resemble completely landless peasants. Both groups are staunch supporters of revolutionary land reform and agrarian revolution. They also support wage increases and play a firm role against various semi-feudal exploitation in the villages.

Though they have tendencies to become small proprietors, they readily embrace socialist politics.

This category, including agricultural laborers, constitutes the largest group in the villages—approximately 50%.

5. Middle Peasants

Medium peasants primarily cultivate their own land, usually owning between 1 and 2–3 acres, depending on soil fertility. Besides their own land, they may also cultivate leased or sharecropped land. Following landless poor peasants, this group forms the next major segment in villages—about 30–40%.

Although medium peasants farm a significant portion of their own land, they too suffer under the semi-feudal class, central bureaucratic-capitalist class, and state apparatus, experiencing various forms of exploitation and oppression. They desire change in the existing system.

They struggle to procure agricultural inputs and spend substantial cash due to mechanized farming. Consequently, they take loans at high interest from moneylenders or NGOs. While not as widespread as in India, stories of suicides under loan pressures occasionally appear, and the frequency is increasing.

Additionally, they cannot store their produce long; they are compelled to sell at low seasonal prices, often incurring substantial losses. For example, control over potato storage

by wealthy landlords frequently results in severe losses for peasants.

They also face uncertainty in children's education, healthcare, women's honor and dignity, thefts and robberies, legal expenses and harassment, and rising prices. Despite their hard labor, they generally fail to improve their situation.

Therefore, medium peasants also play an important role in spreading revolutionary politics in villages and can be considered reliable allies of the revolution.

However, they simultaneously aspire to secure jobs for their children, sometimes sending them abroad to improve family fortunes. Selling land to migrate overseas or securing a good job may alter some of their class character. Conversely, some face extortion, risk, or fall prey to criminal networks supported by the ruling class, leading to deaths in the Mediterranean or imprisonment abroad in Libya or elsewhere, losing vast sums of money.

6. Rich Peasants

Currently, rich peasants and landlords are entrenched in most regions of the country. However, the term "rich peasants" applies to those who are actively involved in agricultural labor themselves. They possess enough farmland to sustain themselves comfortably, with some even having surplus. In addition to their own labor, they employ wage laborers partially, exploiting them.

Yet, they cannot be called agrarian bourgeoisie because they do not operate large-scale production. They remain small-scale producers, do labor themselves and there are a few of them who are capitalists who rely solely on wage exploitation for cultivating land. Mao therefore classified them as semi-feudal. Many also engage in moneylending at high interest and may lease some land to tenants.

Typically, rich peasants own 3 to 5 acres of land. Depending on fertility, some plots may be surplus, which the revolutionary process could partially acquire through state compensation.

Rich peasants send their children abroad or place them in lucrative jobs, with some becoming high-ranking urban officials, businessmen, or successful entrepreneurs. They now run substantial village-level trade and commerce, operate shops in markets, and thus blend peasant character with middle-class or bourgeois traits.

Consequently, a segment of them becomes significantly privileged within the existing society. Some serve as local power bases and pillars of bourgeois politics, reinforcing their semi-feudal status.

Yet, like medium peasants, they remain vulnerable to rising input costs and low prices for agricultural produce. Particularly under semi-feudal oppression, theft, extortion by bourgeois politics, legal harassment, educational and healthcare challenges, and issues concerning women, when revolutionary influence grows, they can align with the revolution. Nevertheless, their rural privileges also prompt resistance to revolutionary change, and they often view the rise and empowerment of poor villagers with suspicion or disfavor.

We cannot categorically classify wealthy peasants as enemies or allies. They must be kept neutral and gradually drawn toward the revolution. They are unreliable but should be considered allies in class terms. Relations with them should remain cautious and never reliant.

Third: Petty-bourgeoisie or Middle Class

7. Middle Class

The concept of “middle class” emerged long ago when feudal Europe consisted primarily of two classes: feudal lords and peasants. The bourgeoisie began to rise in such societies, initially called the middle class because real wealth and power remained with kings, feudal lords, and landlords.

Later, this situation changed. In Europe and many Third World countries, the era of kings and feudal lords ended. In industrially advanced Western countries, capitalists replaced

them. Once established as the dominant ruling class, capitalists eventually expanded into imperialism, and under neo-colonial policies, facilitated the rise of extensive bureaucratic-capitalist classes in oppressed countries, though old feudal elites often retained authority in many regions.

Capitalist development—whether in advanced or oppressed countries—produces a large new middle class. They are neither feudal, capitalist, worker, nor peasant, thus forming a distinct social category. Alongside a highly educated middle class, numerous small traders, entrepreneurs, and small-scale producers occupy substantial social space. Depending on education or affluence, they dominate various professional sectors, media, and technology.

Education expansion has also produced a large teaching community. Similarly, offices, courts, business centers, and markets support a vast stratum of employees, technicians, professionals, lower-level officers, shopkeepers, small to medium entrepreneurs, and small property owners.

The middle class is further divided into lower, middle, and upper segments:

Lower Middle Class: Those who barely manage their households, often facing crises, borrowing, consuming and wearing little—such as small school or madrasa teachers, office or business employees, small shopkeepers, minor traders, technicians, etc.

They struggle to cope with rising prices and face serious issues like housing costs. They are discontent with the existing system and dislike bourgeois politics but aspire to prosperity, often failing.

Some maintain ties with the poor, though the educated tend to distinguish themselves. The lower middle class is a steadfast ally of the revolution.

Middle Middle class: New professionals—doctors, engineers, college teachers, agriculturists, schoolteachers,

journalists, cultural workers, minor officers, moderately affluent shopkeepers, small entrepreneurs—constitute the middle-middle class. Some see themselves as educated or genteel, influenced by imperialist culture. They aspire to make their children professionals or affluent employees and occasionally succeed. Many, however, are unable to overcome economic or social turbulence. They generally remain indifferent to worker or peasant movements but detest foreign exploitation and ruling-class plunder. When revolutionary politics advance, they tend to support it, especially in movements against fascism or autocracy. Enlightened elements among them may become supporters of leftist politics, science, or even revolutionary socialism.

Overall, they support the revolution, though not firmly.

Upper middle class: Most doctors, engineers, high-ranking officers, well-paid employees, affluent shopkeepers or businessmen fall into the upper middle class. A small fraction become bourgeois, legally or illegally, and are heavily influenced by bourgeois politics with imperialist leanings. They are not enemies of the revolution but cannot be considered reliable allies; they only lean toward the revolution when its tide rises.

* Students also constitute a significant segment of the middle class or petite bourgeoisie, though they do not form a separate class. They come from diverse backgrounds, which shapes their primary class character. Collectively, however, they largely represent the middle portion of the middle class.

Due to modern education and youth, they exhibit pronounced protest against injustice, humanism, bourgeois democracy, and progressive tendencies. They can play a crucial role in democratic and progressive educational movements as well as other anti-imperialist and democratic struggles. Likewise, some among them show empathy and sensitivity toward movements of various fundamental classes of the people.

Their progressive and revolutionary consciousness holds political significance. A portion of them adopts Marxism and can take a leading role in the revolution.

Currently, students in madrasa education and English-medium institutions present two issues that must be considered separately from general student concerns. The former often serve as a reservoir for religious-political forces, though most come from poor families. To prevent them from becoming obstacles to revolutionary politics, a sustained, patient, ideological, and political policy is necessary to win them over. Due to ideological cause, antagonism should be avoided wherever possible.

The latter group mostly comes from upper-middle or upper-class backgrounds, inclined toward wealth, indifferent to politics, and oriented abroad. Yet, anti-imperialist, anti-religious, and anti-fascist/ autocratic political-ideological work among them is crucial.

Overall, student issues must be treated as central to middle-class concerns. The vast student population is crucial in urban-centered mass movements. A large portion of rural students can be won over in support of the agrarian and New Democratic Revolution. In general, educating and mobilizing the militant and advanced segment of the student population in revolutionary politics, educate them in party's agrarian-revolutionary politics, and socialist ideology/doctrine and pull them into it holds immense potential and importance.

Fourth: National Bourgeoisie

8. National Bourgeoisie or Middle Bourgeoisie

In the process of capitalist development, the country's main industrial and commercial sectors came under the control of bureaucrat-capitalists (and imperialist/foreign agents), forming the big bourgeoisie. Concurrently, a considerable number of medium-sized industries and production units also emerged.

Among some leftists, there is confusion regarding the existence of the national bourgeoisie, which does not align with social reality.

Despite the dominance of bureaucrat-comprador capitalists, numerous small-scale industries and service sectors developed that are not part of the big bourgeoisie. These employ more than five but fewer than 10, 20, 30, or 50 workers—such as small workshops producing or repairing agricultural machinery, irrigation equipment, mechanical farming tools and parts, motor parts, buses, trucks, auto-rickshaw components, mechanized looms, bakeries, leather-related industries, small subcontracted garment factories, small/medium clinics or hospitals, domestic software/IT firms, small/medium contractors, and countless small hotels and restaurants. Small owners of 5–10 auto-rickshaws, minibuses, or small trawlers, and small factories producing mechanical parts or construction materials, are numerous.

Though agriculture remains predominantly semi-feudal, numerous labor-based producers have emerged around agriculture-related enterprises—poultry, dairy, fisheries, fruit and vegetable cultivation. Additionally, a rental market has developed for agricultural machinery like irrigation pumps, threshers, and harvesters.

While major capitalists have now entered these sectors, many medium-level owners have also established a somewhat national bourgeoisie class through commerce and production.

Some even classify bureaucrat-capitalists as national bourgeoisie, e.g., Khrushchevite revisionists CPB or BASOD affiliates, believing that domestic/Bengali people constitute the national bourgeoisie. This is a serious misconception rooted in an inability to grasp neo-colonialism and bureaucrat-capitalist theory. In reality, they fail to understand or even serve as agents of neo-colonialism.

Medium bourgeois, especially small producers, constantly face risks due to state and ruling-class dominance and semi-feudal structures. They often suffer losses from

foreign machinery imports, imperialist and Indian expansionist goods, rising production input costs, unfair competition with big bourgeois, electricity and gas price hikes and shortages, market and transport control by ruling classes, land/house rent, extortion, and attacks by thugs.

Although they exploit laborers, these factors generate anti-imperialist, anti-bureaucrat-capitalist, and anti-feudal sentiments. Consequently, their political character contains dual tendencies. There exists an opportunity to unite them in struggles against imperialism, Indian expansionism, bureaucrat-comprador capitalism, and feudalism. However, in weak revolutionary phases, they generally lean toward intermediary bourgeois politics or, at most, reformist tendencies.

9. Corrupt or Lumpen Elements

Outside the aforementioned classes, a significant segment of society consists of corrupt or lumpen elements. Severe unemployment, bureaucratic corruption, bourgeois political malpractices, and oppression by semi-feudal enemies drive some impoverished people into such professions, fostering corrupt character.

This includes thieves, robbers, prostitutes, sex traders, beggars, fraudsters, snatchers, accomplices of theft networks, religious functionaries, shrine workers, drug carriers and users, gamblers, quack doctors, vagrants, etc.

Some operate under the protection of big bourgeois or semi-feudal classes, serving their interests; others come from poor families and join these roles out of survival necessity, eventually adopting them as professions and habits.

Due to their corrupt nature, particularly certain social offenders, the ruling class and state apparatus organize and use them against the revolution—engaging in espionage, robbery, extortion, village arbitration, oppression, and rape under the guise of revolutionary parties, and even joining state auxiliary forces. Hence, caution is essential, and emphasis must be placed on neutralizing them.

Among these corrupt individuals, those who are poor and not seriously criminal should be reconstructed within the revolutionary process. Although many are efficient, courageous, and talented, their destructive and corrupt character is not easily reformed, requiring extended time. Therefore, it is preferable not to immediately involve them in revolutionary work, especially keeping them out of militant operations.

Main Political Currents and Parties, and Our Perspective and Policy Towards Them

During the British period in India, the main bourgeois parties were the Congress and the Muslim League. These two parties represented the zamindar-bureaucrat class and acted politically as agents of the British. Even when they raised the demand for India's independence, it was a reformist political program under British patronage, which ultimately pushed India toward a painful, reactionary partition.

Throughout British rule, various peasant and youth uprisings emerged, but the revolutionary political currents and organizations formed in these movements were suppressed and eradicated by British repression. Peasant uprisings were generally not organized by any formal political organization; they were led by local religious or community leaders. However, in the first three decades of the twentieth century, petit-bourgeois armed revolutionary organizations began to emerge. Notable among them were groups such as Anushilan and Jugantar, which carried out armed revolutionary activities.

Later, under the influence of the Russian Revolution, the Communist Party emerged in India as the political party of the working class, introducing the most modern and progressive ideas to the country. Through this party, socialism became popular, Marx, Lenin, and Stalin became influential figures, and for the first time, a socialist-oriented

labor movement, followed by a peasant movement, began to take shape in India.

However, due to various political deviations—most importantly the failure to fully embrace peasant revolution and prolonged people's war—the Communist Party, despite periods of significant growth, failed to form a cohesive and effective revolutionary struggle. Even in the great Telangana and Tebhaga peasant uprisings, where many party leaders and cadres displayed heroic roles, the party's revisionist leadership eventually committed overt betrayal.

During this period, some other parties emerged, like the Krishak-Praja Party (Fazlul Huq) and the Swaraj Party, but due to their petit-bourgeois reformist nature and essentially bourgeois subservience, they could not survive independently for long.

In the creation of Pakistan, the Muslim League played the leading role. Influenced by contemporary Muslim nationalism, many middle-class politicians also joined. However, as the ruling party immediately after Pakistan's creation, the Muslim League's communal and reactionary character became evident. The main leadership of the Muslim League became agents of Pakistani national oppression. Nevertheless, a large section of the middle class in East Bengal broke away to form the Awami League. Later, in 1957, opposition to the imperialist tendencies of Awami League leaders like Suhrawardy and Mujibur Rahman, led to the formation of the National Awami Party (NAP) with the leadership of Moulana Vashani, a progressive peasant-middle class leader. NAP functioned as a platform for leftists, including communists. In this way, during Pakistan's rule, two major popular parties emerged in East Bengal: the Awami League and NAP. The Communist Party maintained clandestine activities but carried out mass work largely through NAP.

However, during the Russo-Chinese ideological debates, NAP split in the 1960s: one faction pro-Khrushchev-Russian, the other pro-Mao-China. Awami League continued

separately. The NAP split reflected the divisions within the Communist Party. The pro-Khrushchev revisionist party was led by Moni Singh and Farhad, while the Maoist faction initially formed the EPCP (ML) under the leadership of Haq, Toaha, and Sukhendu. The international debates, particularly the Mao-led Cultural Revolution in China and the Naxalbari peasant uprising in India, caused further splits. Subsequently, Comrade Charu Majumdar's line also influenced this country. Amidst this, the 1971 war occurred.

As a result, the communist movement advanced through reconstruction. The revolutionary faction, following Maoist thought—including our party—developed significant armed revolutionary struggle in the 1970s. Later, after Mao's death and the rise of revisionism in China, and Albania's Hoxha attacked Mao, another split occurred in the global left-communist movement.

After the formation of Bangladesh, the Awami League emerged as the ruling party and became fascist. The Pakistan-aligned Jamaat, acting as an accomplice in the 1971 genocide, was widely rejected by the people. The pro-Russian party, following revisionist paths, collaborated with Awami League during the 1971 war. Subsequently, they became the main ally of the fascist Awami League and later joined the fascist BAKSAL. Only Maoist parties and groups maintained revolutionary and anti-imperialist politics. Due to weaknesses in revolutionary politics, theory and ideology, most of them later became collaborators with the post-Mujib ruling class faction, while another section opposed revolutionary currents as carriers of reformist politics.

In contrast, a small section remains in Maoist revolutionary politics and gradually redevelops. Our party is part of this section, sustaining revolutionary politics in the country for over five decades.

Currently, the main political currents active in the country are:

1. **The ruling-class bourgeois political current—enemy of revolution;**
2. **The religious political current—main part of this also enemy of revolution;**
3. **Various petit-bourgeois reformist and revisionist left forces claiming communism or socialism;**
4. **Maoist revolutionary current.**

Below, we briefly discuss these currents/parties.

The Bourgeois Political Current of the Ruling Class

Within the bourgeois political current of the ruling class, there exist numerous sub-factions that constantly fight like dogs over control of the main share of state power. They form different parties and oppose one another in an attempt to present themselves as the true friends of the people. But once they come to power, their real character becomes distinctly exposed. No matter how much they try to portray themselves as friends of the people, their political programmes themselves reveal their true role as protectors and managers of the ongoing anti-people system.

The parties of the ruling class represent the bureaucratic–comprador class of the country. Naturally, they have preserved the semi-feudal system within the country and act as agents of foreign imperialism. When inter-imperialist contradictions intensify, different sections of this class align with different blocs and engage in fierce internal infighting. Moreover, as part of imperialism’s regional strategy, all of them serve India’s interests as well, though with differences of degree. In the international arena, amid the intensification of Sino–US and Russo–US contradictions, the future India-related orientation of different factions of Bangladesh’s ruling class will largely depend on the positions of the Indian and East Bengal ruling classes and states.

* As stated earlier, after the establishment of Bangladesh, the **Awami League** emerged as the ruling party.

Even during the Pakistan period, it pursued politics in favour of imperialism, particularly US imperialism. However, in the latter half of the 1960s, due to its opposition to Pakistan's national oppression, a large section of the middle class and the masses also became associated with it on the basis of bourgeois nationalism.

After emerging as the ruling party, under Mujib's leadership it transformed into an ultra-nationalist fascist party—something that had already become evident during the 1971 Liberation War. At that time, within the framework of inter-imperialist contradictions, it aligned itself with the Soviet bloc against the US through India.

Since coming to power in 2009 with the blessings of both India and the United States, they have been working and ruling as India's primary local agent in this country for long 16 years. Prior to that, in the intervening period, under the pressure of the mass movements of the 1980s and the mass uprising of the 1990s, and with the approval of imperialism, they had displayed a comprador-bourgeois democratic appearance. However, from the second decade of this century onward, they once again openly revealed their character as a fascist party. In the arena of inter-imperialist contradictions, they have followed India. Therefore, in the name of "balance diplomacy," they attempted to maintain relations with the United States on one side and China-Russia on the other. This also invited crisis and danger for them. Due to the intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions, and particularly because of the China-India conflict, they found themselves in trouble regarding the determination of their master and in international diplomacy. They were also deprived of the unconditional blessings of the United States. Although, in order to retain power, they tried their best to compromise with the US, ultimately, on one hand due to the continuous movements of the people and on the other hand due to losing the support of various

factions within the ruling class, they fell in the mass uprising of 2024.

After being ousted from power, top leaders of this party have nakedly taken shelter in the lap of India and are continuing their anti-national and anti-people conspiratorial activities. Because they were removed from power for mass alienation and through serious violence, it may become difficult for them to survive as a ruling-class party. However, India may, in any way possible, reorganize and rehabilitate the Awami League as its agent, or create a new platform for them.

In this country, among the ruling class, someone or the other will create a seat as an India-aligned with the sign-board of '71 spirit' — whether a little earlier or later.

* In the face of the mass alienation and ouster of Mujib–Awami politics, the **BNP** (Bangladesh Nationalist Party) was formed in the latter half of the 1970s as a new ruling-class party.

The BNP gained popularity by outwardly opposing Awami fascism and India's naked servitude. It also put forward some alternative political currents for the ruling class to the Awami League. Initially, the party gained popularity by building friendly relations with the then socialist, and later on socialist-faced China. By introducing bourgeois multi-party politics in opposition to BAKSAL's one-party rule, it also gained the support of a large section of the bourgeoisie and the middle class. But as a representative of the ruling class, it too functioned as an agent of the same authoritarian system and served US interests. In the context of the ouster of Hasina–Awami in 2024, it temporarily emerged as the principal political party of the ruling class again.

However, in the context of the current inter-imperialist and regional contradictions, this party, like the Awami League, is also in danger. The problem for the BNP is that, at present it is not capable of coming to power or remaining in

power without US backing, which will place its original relationship with China in crisis. Therefore, amid the US–China tension, it will remain difficult for the BNP to govern power comfortably.

At the same time, the US considers it important to keep India by its side in its anti-China and anti-Russia international politics, although contradictions also exist in this regard. US imperialism also puts pressure on India to strengthen its anti-Russia stance. Yet, in the current situation, the BNP seeks to weaken the China lobby and cling to the US lobby in order to come to power and remain in power. But in doing so, its ‘popular’ anti-India politics will fall into crisis.

* In the situation of crisis and mass alienation of the above two principal bourgeois parties, sections of “civil society” and NGOs outside them also play an important bourgeois political role. In situations of the failure, crisis, and mass alienation of bourgeois politics on the one hand, and the weakness of progressive politics on the other, these groups of the ruling class enter the field with slogans of reforming the existing system and making it tolerable. A section of them is effectively engaged in conspiracies to sideline conventional bourgeois politics and themselves become the principal share-holders of state power.

However, another section of them—especially some NGOs—speaks on issues of mass interest such as the women’s question, indigenous peoples’ issues, environmental problems, human rights issues, and even workers’ wage issues, and attempts to build limited forms of mass movements. These activities have political objectives, and are often supported and patronised by Western imperialists.

The crisis and vacuum created in bourgeois politics due to the flight of the Hasina–Awami League and the repression against them has made this “**Third force**” of the ruling class desperate to seize that space. Because of the exposure of the

anti-people character of traditional bourgeois politics, depoliticisation and reformism constitute the core politics of this force. Included within it are “non-political” civil society, intellectuals, NGOs, former military and civil bureaucrats, a large section of businesspeople, and a section of power-aspiring military bureaucrats, etc. Some former student leaders who trampled upon the aspirations of the July ’24 uprising have also joined hands with them.

In fact, this very third force was the architect of the camouflaged military rule in 2007, and the mastermind of the conspiracy to establish its authority by sidelining Awami–BNP politics through the “minus two” formula. It was they who, with US and Indian backing, installed the Awami League in power in 2009 with the objective of sidelining the BNP. Having failed in that, they have now once again posed as anti–Awami fascists, hijacked the mass uprising of ’24 to come to power, and are again attempting to sideline the BNP or corner it in order to establish their own authority in power.

However, due to the risks and popular opposition associated with depoliticisation and direct military rule, they are engaged in conspiracies to set up new king’s parties and bring them to power or give them a large share (for example, the **NCP**). In this process, they are also rehabilitating religionist fascist Jamaat and other religionists, providing them with extreme reactionary patronage to grow stronger.

* **Jamaat**, which uses religion, is in effect also a bourgeois party. Its genocide-collaborator role in 1971, and its games of alliance and opposition with Awami/BNP politics, have exposed it. Lacking any concrete, specific programme aligned with the interests of the people, it does not possess a strong mass base. But the organisation has a powerful organisational network and significant backing from reactionary Middle Eastern states. It also has the advantage of exploiting the backward religious

consciousness of the masses. It maintains relations with imperialism and India at various levels.

Previously, it survived and attempted to strengthen itself under the shelter and patronage of the two major ruling-class parties. At present, it is engaged in conspiracy with the “third force” and is working to strengthen itself outside the Awami–BNP framework. Like the Awami League, it too is a fascist party. Its crisis has deepened due to competition with other religionist parties. Nevertheless, as an established, strong, and well-organised party that exploits religious sentiment, Jamaat remains important for the ruling class. Especially with the backing of the “third force” and by forming alliances with other religionist forces, it dreams of coming to power, which may be realised temporarily.

Like the Awami League, it is a highly dangerous and active fascist force against revolution.

* Apart from the above parties, there are several other bourgeois parties or petty-bourgeois tailist parties, among which is the Jatiyo Party (National Party - JaPa - established by military junta General Ershad during '80s). However, having been exposed as Awami collaborators during Hasina regime, they are facing an existential crisis.

* **The military** is an important political force in this country, although ostensibly the ruling class and the middle classes influenced by it seek to present the military bureaucracy as a “non-political force” and portray it as free from and above bourgeois political factionalism.

Taking advantage of factional conflicts among bourgeois political parties, or to save the existing system from the spearhead of popular struggles and protests, it had seized state power at various times. Generally, imperialists, or some section of them, support this, while simultaneously maintaining pressure and raising the slogan of 'democracy' or 'elected government' to secure their own interests. In the future as well, there remains the possibility of direct seizure

of power by them. Whether directly in power or not, the military bureaucracy has always been a major pillar of bourgeois politics, and it always influences and/or controls the ongoing bourgeois political process.

The Religious Political Current and Parties

Due to Jamaat's anti-people and heinous role in 1971, the ruling class is pushing forward several other parties and organisations as alternative religionist parties, which present more overtly fundamentalist programmes. These include "non-political" Hefazat, Tabligh, Talim, and numerous organisations large and small such as Atroshi and Charmonai. All of these receive one form or another of patronage from the bourgeois parties of the ruling class in strengthening religionism.

Through all this, religionism has grown enormously strong in the country. Because it offers an alternative amid the failure and mass alienation of bourgeois politics, and at the same time blocks democracy, progressivism, and revolution, it also enjoys the favourable attention of imperialists—although imperialists hypocritically raise slogans of democracy against religionism and "fundamentalism".

Their major parties are essentially religionist fascist parties and organisations. However, there also exist many middle-class religionist organisations of various tendencies in the country that are not directly anti-people.

The fascism of the Awami current and the fascism of the religionist current have reinforced each other toward a common objective—to oppose and crush the democratic and progressive upsurge and consciousness of the masses. This continues even after Hasina's ouster.

They are extremely dangerous as enemies of revolution.

However, a vast section of the children of rural and urban poor and middle-class people are connected to them as madrasa students or as disciples of pirs. Therefore, efforts

must be made to keep the broad masses of religionist poor people misled by them neutral, and where possible, to win them over.

A section of the religionist parties, inspired by international religious fundamentalist armed upsurges (ISIS, al-Qaeda, Taliban, Iran, etc.), is organised into clandestine armed groups. Some sections of their leadership maintain relations with segments of the domestic and foreign ruling classes and intelligence agencies. The objectives of imperialism—expansionism and the ruling class/state are to, through their activities, win over a section of militant youth, divert them from the revolutionary path, even use them as reserve forces to assassinate revolutionaries, and at the same time, on the issue of opposing their armed militancy, further build the state apparatus into a more authoritarian form.

* Outside the reactionary religionist parties, there exist in the country many kinds of religious groups, communities, and devout individuals who, in a peasant-origin middle-class manner, hold and propagate various forms of spiritualist consciousness. They must be clearly distinguished from the above reactionary religionist political currents. Relations with them must be determined on the basis of class analysis and political outlook.

Petty-Bourgeois Left Parties — The Reformist Current

The petty-bourgeois left parties can be divided into several currents:

- (a) the CPB (Communist Party of Bangladesh) current;**
- (b) the BASOD (Bangladesher Shomajtantrik Dol--
Socialist Party of Bangladesh) current;**
- (c) the reformist current of former Maoists.**

* The **CPB** is the original revisionist party in this country since mid-60s. They earned notoriety during the Mujib era as the B-team of the Awami League (early '70s). This happened due to their Khrushchevite revisionism and later their role as agents of Soviet social-imperialism. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, they have become weakened and declining due to the lack of an international patron. However, they still have the potential to emerge as the local base of Chinese social-imperialism, even though historically they have been aligned with anti-China forces in the international arena. Therefore, in the current changed world situation, they are in a state of crisis. Although they no longer possess the large worker and peasant base they once had, they still occasionally build some reformist movements. On the basis of these, issue-based unity with them may sometimes be possible. However, no fundamental political or programmatic unity can be forged with them, because they portray the former Soviet Union and the present-day Chinese social-imperialism as socialism and thereby act as their partisans.

Moreover, although they sometimes raise their voice against certain policies of the US-led imperialist bloc, they are not, in an overall sense, opposed to the imperialist system or the domestic system subordinate to it. They are the upholders of Awami League's '71-spirit and the reactionary constitution of 1972. Nevertheless, there remains scope for joint action with them in issue-based mass movements.

* The **BASOD** current originated from JASOD. It is now fragmented into multiple parts. It has not yet freed itself from the JASOD-type 1971-spirit. Consequently, it considers the bourgeois revolution have been done and independence has been achieved in 1971. This politics keeps them distant from genuine leftism. However, one section of them has rejected the legacy of JASOD's fascist politics. Some sections follow the Indian social-democratic leader Shibdas Ghosh. Accordingly, they oppose the Maoist movement.

Some of their sections seek to be active in various reformist movements at different times. With them, there exists the possibility of joint movements, and at times even issue-based alliances.

* Many groups have emerged from, and again disappeared out of Maoist revolutionary politics. One section has degenerated into Hoxhaite revisionism during late '70s and '80s of the last century. Some other sections, following Chinese Dengist revisionism, regard present social-imperialist China as a friend and are turning into its agents.

Another section is active in opposing imperialism—including China. They can broadly be described as anti-imperialist. With them, there exists the possibility of political unity in anti-imperialist movements.

However, there are various political confusions among them—for example, opposition to the revolutionary politics of protracted people's war in the name of urban-centred mass uprisings. They also oppose new-democratic politics based on the peasant question in the name of capitalist economics. Some of them uphold and propagate the “tactic” of participating in elections under the existing system.

Despite these confusions, unity can be built with them in political and economic movements on the basis of areas of political agreement.

The Maoist Revolutionary Current

Although the Maoist revolutionary current was very strong during the revolutionary upsurges of the 1960s and 1970s, later, under the influence of international revisionism and during the setbacks of the domestic revolutionary movement, reformist consciousness brought about severe splits and degeneration within it. In this process, only the revolutionary Maoist sections of our Party and Purbo

Banglar Communist Party (PBCP) continued revolutionary politics.

However, at the end of the last century and the beginning of this one, both of these Maoist parties again split into several parts. In this way, the revolutionary Maoist movement was severely weakened.

The MBRM (Maoist Bolshevik Revolutionary Movement), split from our Party, remains active in armed struggle in some rural areas in a declining condition. On the other hand, several groups of PBCP are known to be attempting reorganisation.

In addition, several intellectual-type groups are also active, seeking to uphold Maoism and to carry forward the country's past Maoist revolutionary legacy.

But almost all such groups, except our Party, promote a one-sided purist consciousness regarding the past. Such sub-currents of PBCP identify themselves as CM (Charu Mazumder)-oriented, while the sub-currents that claim the legacy of our Party identify themselves as SS(Siraj Sikder)-oriented.

For several years now, ideological debates and splits that have emerged in the international Maoist movement have produced the influence of the Gonzalo line, the Avakian line, and anti-RIM (Revolutionary International Movement) positions among these groups.

Although the intellectual groups verbally speak of Maoist agrarian/peasant revolution, they do not hold fast to work among peasants in rural areas. At the same time, they do not hold fast to the task of immediately initiating people's war. Nor do they firmly undertake the task of building a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist party; either they postpone it or effectively distance themselves from it. As a result, they turn into intellectual/theoretical groups, remaining confined to current issue-based political work and/or reformist activity basing themselves in cities.

We must continue our efforts to wage two-line struggle on these ideological-political questions and to develop

debates and struggles based on the synthesis of the experiences of the revolutionary struggles of the past five decades. In this light, we must also carry forward the call and effort to unite the Maoists on the basis of Maoism under a single centre.

However, alongside this, there remains scope for forming alliances and/or undertaking joint programmes and issue-based movements with these groups in various issues of the Maoist revolutionary movement and in anti-imperialist struggles.

The End.