

# A Few Questions On C P I (M)'s 13th Congress

To all with concern for the current developments and drifts in the international and national situations, the CPI(M)'s recent party congress holds significance both for its decisions and for non-decisions or failure to reach decision. Let alone the Marxist-Leninist parties, every political party has an objective necessity behind its holding conferences or congresses, except when the same are rituals. The question arises: what necessity did induce the CPI(M) leadership to hold the present party congress? And in what way do the decisions of this congress conform to the historical needs of the people in the present situation? In the background of the current manoeuvres of the CPI(M) leadership to thrust the party into electoral forefront on the national political arena these questions assume all the greater relevance.

## UNPRECEDENTED CRISIS OF WORLD CAPITALISM

The prime aspects of today's international situation cannot be lost sight of by any politically conscious man, let alone a cadre of a Leftist or a Marxist-Leninist party. The entire capitalist world is being rocked by a crisis of unprecedented dimension. The crushing burden of capitalist exploitation and oppression apart, revival of religious fundamentalism and fanning up of obscurantist ideas, assaults on values, morals and culture by the ruling capitalist class and its agents with dark fascist design are now the general features both in the advanced and in the relatively underdeveloped countries in the capitalist world. Yet there is no revolutionary upsurge forthcoming for radical transformation. If Lenin and Stalin had found in their time a 'profound revolutionary crisis' the world over, it is all the more true today; but such favourable situations for developing revolutionary struggles are getting lost. On the other, the present leadership of the CPSU headed by Mikhail Gorbachev has initiated a comprehensive scheme of restructuring the Soviet society's ideological-political thinking, economic system, cultural-social life and, above all, the hitherto existing political system. The scheme of total 'restructuring', *perestroika*, and 'democratization and openness', *glasnost*, has been accompanied by a fresh wave

of slanders against Stalin, the worthy defender, elaborator and continuator of the Leninist teachings under whose leadership the mighty Soviet socialist system was built up and the great victory over the fascist military might was achieved in Second World War.

## CRISIS OF INDIAN CAPITALISM

Second, capitalism in India, as an inseparable part of the world capitalist system, is deeply enmeshed today in intense crisis in the economic, social, political and cultural spheres and the ruling bourgeoisie is shifting the entire burden of the crisis on to the common people who are subject to savage exploitation, oppression and torture. In its bid to drive the country to all-out fascism to give the moribund capitalism a fresh lease of life, the ruling class, in the main through the Congress(I), its most trusted political agent, is disarming the people by robbing off all their hard earned democratic rights and by disrupting their unity by aiding and abetting, both overtly and covertly, the communal, parochial, casteist, divisive, separatist and secessionist forces. Despite all attempts by the bourgeoisie to project Rajiv Gandhi as the leader and saviour of the country, he and his party stand thoroughly discredited today in the eye of the people. Corruption on an unprecedented scale is pervading the country, right from the topmost echelon of the ruling hierarchy. To

carry the fascist blueprint to success the bourgeois offensive is revealing itself most nakedly and savagely in the field of education, culture, morals and values. The people, now pushed to the verge of extermination, are simmering in discontent against this perpetration of barbaric crimes, yet no country-wide massive surge of legitimate democratic mass movement is forthcoming. What is the chief malady in the international communist movement for which such revolutionary situations in different countries are getting lost? Why cannot a countrywide mass movement be unleashed throughout India despite the people's outbursts against the savage capitalist exploitation and the anti-people policies and measures of the Central Congress(I) Government headed by Rajiv Gandhi? Such are the basic questions against which the political analysis of the international and national situations by any party claiming to be

We cannot publish the news of Save Education Convention in Madras held on 13th and 14th February last. The next issue of P. Era will cover the same.

Marxist-Leninist has to be examined. Whether CPI(M)'s formulations at the 13th party congress give a definite political direction to the exploited masses have to be ascertained in the context of the basic features of the international and national situations outlined above and the basic questions involved therein.

In discussing the present state of capitalist economy internationally, the CPI(M) leadership has underlined in the Draft Political Resolution—the document on the subject available up to now, and the party's central organ, *People's Democracy*, does not re-

(Contd. on page 2)

# Proletarian Era

Organ of SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA  
(Fortnightly)

Founder Editor-in-Chief: COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

Vol. 22 No. 13 March 7, 1989 Price 60 P.  
Air Charge 5 P.

## Com. Nihar Mukherjee Flays Central Budgets

While vehemently condemning the increase in Railway freights, Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, S.U.C.I., has issued the following statement to the Press on March 1.

The Railway Budget has once more proved the anti-people and tricky nature of the Central Government. Viewing election the Government has not increased passenger fares; but the rise in Railway freights will add to the spiralling prices of all commodities. We urge upon all Left, democratic and Opposition parties to build up movement against this anti-people decision of the Central Government.

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, S.U.C.I., commenting upon the Budget proposal of the Congress(I)-led Central Government has said that with an overall deficit of Rs. 8240 crores and increase in both direct and indirect taxes and excise duties this budget would further aggravate the inflationary process, which is already in its height. In addition to the burden of pre-Budget administered price hike in sugar, coal, steel, cement etc., an 11 per cent hike in freight charges in the railway budget, the tax and excise duty proposals will virtually push up prices of all articles of daily use. Common men, from the poor to the middle income group, will find their daily life more burdensome, expenditure by far more than their income. Real wages of all sections of working people will be further eroded. This budget does not hold any hope for the vast unemployed and for those employed who are now made unemployed due to closure of factories and mills.

But considerable concessions are given to big business as well as to the multinationals through proposals of concession in customs duty on import of capital goods for technology under technology upgradation scheme to be extended to more industries.

The reduction in agricultural tax by 12 per cent will help only the rich peasants and this is nothing but a political design to woo the rich kisan lobby in the election year.

Decontrol of price and distribution of cement and aluminium is a big concession for the big monopolies owning such industries, whereas the consequential rise in prices of such essential items will hit hard the common men by making new housing and other requirements more costly. So the declared housing loan to the rural poor will virtually be of no use. The increase in excise duty on two-wheelers will make them costlier and hit the middle class.

The meagre five per cent tax relief to the middle-income employees earning up to Rs. 2000 per month will be of no avail due to all-out rise in prices. This is rather an attempt to hoodwink the employees in the election year.

(Contd. on page 8)

# CPI(M)'s 13th Congress

(Contd. from page 1)

port that questions in this regard were raised at the congress—that “The capitalist economy is still in the process of recovery.” (p. 1) Although facts and figures have been marshalled to show that ‘uncertainty continues’ in the capitalist economy, that the economic advance “has started slowing down after reaching the peak in 1984” (p. 2), that “the so-called upswing is accompanied by increased unemployment and high unemployment rate” (p. 3), and how “the world economy passes its burden on to the developing countries to ensure a minimal growth rate for the capitalist countries” (p. 3), the picture does not expose the true nature of the capitalist crises. Short of doing this, the picture is a description of capitalism in trouble, trying laboriously to ‘recover’ itself and, as one measure toward this end, ‘selfishly’ demanding “huge expenditure on military and destructive weapons”. What does the CPI(M) leadership purport to say with these words? Does it mean to say that capitalism as a historical force has not exhausted itself yet internationally? Has capitalism still a role to play in the service of people? Does it have a progressive role in the relatively underdeveloped third-world countries—in India, for instance? Or, is it a logical pre-requisite to paint the state of the capitalist economy internationally in this light in order to sustain the CPI(M)'s thesis of people's democratic revolution for India in which the national bourgeoisie, too, has been viewed to have a progressive role?

## RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN USSR AND CPI(M)'S STAND

This issue of gravest concern today, not only in the international communist movement but among politically conscious people the world over, is the scheme of

total reform in socialist economy and political system now being pursued by the present leadership of the CPSU. There cannot be two opinions that these reforms will have far-reaching consequences for the Soviet socialist system in particular—for the present as well as for the future—and, also for the international working class movement in general. The CPI(M) leadership's stand on this vital issue, as far as it has come to light in the party's central committee resolutions, the Draft Political Resolution at the congress, or speeches of Politburo and Central Committee members may now be examined. Initially, the Politburo member, B. T. Ranadive, had expressed a reaction in these words: “From the facts and figures furnished by the CPSU there is no doubting the urgency of restructuring the socialist economy. True, for lack of improvement of economic management, the capacity of socialist society rich with its technological revolution cannot be utilised in full, which means, in the Marxist understanding, non-correspondence between development of productive forces and the existing relations of production... By conferring responsibility on the workers' collectives through elected managements, it is true, participation of the common worker has been sought to run the means of production. But, clearly, this can lead to success only if, along with its vanguard, the entire working class be inspired to contribute the best it can to advance the common cause of socialism. Increasing the socialist consciousness is the real key. This is the key which alone can guarantee restoration of correspondence between the productive forces and the management. However, we do not find that the importance of this issue has been properly grasped. In regard to other reforms, it may not be wrong to say, not as much intention to de-

pend on increased socialist consciousness is evident as on individual interest or material incentives. This over emphasis on material incentives is perhaps the main cause behind stagnation in production. In this background one may naturally look askance at the decision to convert some State farms into cooperatives or family farms or convert the socialist organisations into a kind of cooperative in the market... It is one step backward, not a new contribution toward organising and building the socialist society.” (*Ganashakti*, CPI(M)'s Bengali daily, July 13, 1988; translation ours)

Then again, with regard to this attitude to the past, B. T. Ranadive had said: “The present CPSU leadership says in its document that in general Stalin's leadership was correct, but torture in some cases, cult of personality, and such other things were wrong. But in public criticism things are being said as if everything was wrong. It means negation of the achievements of socialism from the beginning of revolution. This is the direction of the present criticism... To say that the mistakes then were due to Stalin will be ahistorical... In the name of fighting the mistakes of Stalin, Stalin is being sought to be denigrated. In the long end, it means denial of all achievements of socialism.” (*Ganashakti*, 14.7.88; translation ours)

Thereafter, a month later, at its meeting of August 8-10, 1988, the Central Committee of the CPI(M) adopted a resolution *On Recent Developments in the Soviet Union* in appreciation of “the desire of the Party ranks and leaders to examine in detail the recent developments in the Soviet Union especially in connection with the discussions and resolutions of the 19th Conference of the CPSU”. Therein, without attempting any concrete critical analysis

of concrete issues like the outlook behind perestroika and glasnost and the specific plan of economic reform and reorganisation of the political system, the party leadership laid down “in a general way how we can approach these problems”. With reference to the criticism of Stalin by the CPSU, it said: “In relation to Stalin the CPI(M) had made its assessment. It is quite possible, however, that some comrades may be of the opinion that the assessment should be re-examined and they can raise the question during the course of discussion on these recent developments.” (*Ganashakti*, 14.7.88—translation ours)

## PALPABLE CONTRADICTIONS

Now what did the Draft Political Resolution placed at the 13th Congress say on all these? On the question of the economic reform introduced by the present CPSU leadership—which was sought to be explained by the 11th Congress (Vijayawada) of the CPI(M) to be “due to the fact that they are forced to divert a substantial part of their resources for defence purposes in view of the imperialist war preparedness and also perhaps due to the recessionary business conditions in countries with whom they have developed new trade relations”—the Draft said: “However, it seems that the malady was somewhat deeper than what was understood by us at that time. The CPSU leadership has frankly told the people that the difficulties are arising from inefficient management, bureaucratism and other distortions. These difficulties, it must be understood, are coming after huge achievements in the earlier period and they must be understood as shortcomings arising from lack of adjustments to new requirements.” Then it said: “The fact is that the difficulties which emerged from earlier distortions and lack of increase in managerial efficiency and consciousness towards production are

already being remedied though it is admitted that much remains to be done to meet the situation fully. Nonetheless, it should be quite clear that a socialist society faced by such difficulties is able to immediately overcome them and set the economy in the road to progress in the shortest possible time. This is because the means of production are controlled by society and difficulties arise only because of some distortions of the norms. There are no antagonistic contradictions in socialist society and it is always possible to plan out production to realise the full potentialities of the productive forces.” (p. 6) In a space of a few months, from B. T. Ranadive's emphatic observation that “this over-emphasis on material incentives is perhaps the main cause behind stagnation in production”, that “it is one step backward, not a new contribution towards organising and building the socialist society”, that “it is a wrong thinking (attributing the slackening in State farms to bureaucracy—Ed. *P. Era*) and, we hope, they would soon realise it”, the Draft Political Resolution toned down the CPI(M) leadership's ‘independent counter adverse trends judgement’ on “whether the measures taken to and developments fit in with our understanding of Marxism-Leninism or whether there is room for difference”. The Draft, as a matter of fact, left no room for difference, being tacitly eloquent on the CPI(M) leadership's acquiescence with the reasons adduced by the CPSU leadership for the economic stagnation and other maladies in the Soviet economy.

## SERIOUS THEORETICAL QUESTIONS HUSHED UP

And not a single reference has been made to the leadership of Stalin in the Draft or in Ranadive's introductory speech on the Draft at the Congress. The editorial comment in the *Peo-*

(Contd on page 3)

## CPI(M)'s Congress

Contd. from page 2)

*People's Democracy's* issue (January 22, 1989) on the Party Congress of the CPI(M) refers to a number of delegates speaking their mind on the recent developments inside the USSR, criticising "the nihilist attitude towards the great achievements of Soviet society under Stalin's leadership", and expressing "Open concern with some of the steps taken, like cooperatives, promotion of private production", and asking "whether all these squared with the Marxist-Leninist conception of building a socialist society." What did turn out as the final resolution on the issue at the congress? Winding up the deliberations, B. T. Ranadive said "Some comrades have felt that the statements made in the Political Resolution regarding these developments go beyond what is stated in the August Resolution of the Central Committee. They had suggested that a reference to the two Resolutions of the C.C. of May and August should be made in the text of the Political Resolution. This, they say, will keep our understanding of these developments within the framework of the August Resolution until the new C.C. comes to a final conclusion regarding the suggested reforms. Comrades, this is a suggestion we accept. For the rest the C.C. feels that there need not be any change in what is stated in the Resolution." (*People's Democracy*, 22.1.89). Such has been the fate at the CPI(M) party congress of so vital an issue like the total reform introduced by the present CPSU leadership in the Soviet society. And this in a manner after all that talks of the CPI(M) Central Committee in its resolution in August 8-10, 1988, asking the party members "to adopt the scientific approach to the problems raised and not to dispose of any new purposes in an off-hand manner", and to decide "whether

the measures proposed to meet the immediate situation stand the test of Marxism-Leninism. This will lead to a fruitful discussion and enable us to reach our independent judgement". The judgement at the 13th Congress has been to understand the issue in the same light as the CPSU leadership headed by Mikhail Gorbachev, is asking to. Has it been independent?

But the CPI(M) cadres with concern for progress of socialism ought to pause and reflect on the issue, truly adopting "the scientific approach to the problems raised". Listing a whole series of maladies 'alien to socialism' which are afflicting all spheres of life of the present-day Soviet society, the CPSU leadership headed by Gorbachev has initiated a total reform programme which it asserts to be "a general policy of a revolutionary reorganisation of all aspects of socialist society's life" aimed at "raising socialism to a qualitatively new level." Taking into account the measures of economic reorganisation together—namely, switch-over to cooperatives at the expense of collective farms, introduction of lease and contract system, proprietary right to the collective farm peasants, freedom to enterprises for self-funding and self-marketing, abolition of single wage standard and encouragement to the system of material incentives, and doing away with centralised planning—one is apt to ask whether or not all this will bring about more and more privatisation of the means of production as against socialisation? Will not this expanded sphere of commodity production be governed mostly by the capitalist market law of demand and supply? Will not it decentralise the socialist economy, leading to complete decentralisation both in economy and its administration, adversely

affecting balanced development of the national economy which is an important requirement of the socialist economy?

### ANTAGONISTIC CONTRADICTIONS STILL REMAIN IN SOCIALISM

Obviously, the necessity of administrative decentralisation under the programme of reorganisation of the political system arises from the need of economic decentralisation. In the background of the growing individualistic trends in the present Soviet society and the decision to make the farmers the sovereign master of their lands, and to accord right to enterprises, collective farms and co-operatives to have trades among themselves in the open market and also with the foreign countries, will not this withdrawal of central control of the administrative bodies over economic managements open up the possibility of restoration of capitalism if all the above measures are implemented? Again, is it not true, what Lenin had said, that "class struggle does not disappear under the dictatorship of the proletariat, it merely assumes different forms"? In other words, is it not true, as Comrade Shibdas Ghosh pointed out, that "even after classes be done away with in the economic sphere, when classes as economic categories would not exist, struggle centring round production and distribution would be reflected in the superstructure as an antagonistic contradiction between individual interest and social interest"? Is it, therefore, correct to say, as the CPI(M) leadership did in the Draft Political Resolution, that "there are no antagonistic contradictions in socialist society" and that "they (the difficulties — Ed. P. Era) must be understood as shortcomings arising from lack of adjustment to new requirements"? Clearly, in order to induce the cadres into accepting the reforms

programme of the present CPSU leadership, the Draft Political Resolution carefully evaded the task of probing into the programme critically. It is well known, the CPI(M) cadres will recall, too, that it was the Khrushchev leadership of the CPSU, after Stalin's death, which introduced all non-socialist economic policies like material incentives, extended the sphere of commodity production and circulation—and, in the name of democratisation, introduced popular bourgeois democratic concepts and vulgar materialist culture of earning more somehow and living happily instead of proletarian culture. Now, after long and constant pursuit of these revisionist reform programmes for three decades, the difficulties which the Khrushchev leadership had cited as being the reason for its introducing those reforms have aggravated into such terrible dimensions that the Gorbachev leadership, narrating these social ills, says: "...at some points the country began to lose momentum, difficulties and unresolved problems started to pile up, and there appeared elements of stagnation and other phenomena alien to socialism. All that had a most adverse effect on the economy and social, cultural and intellectual life." What is the solution decided by the present CPSU leadership for this steady aggravation? Is not the programme of reforms initiated by this leadership a more advanced comprehensive and thoroughly revisionist plan than that of Khrushchev? Can these programmes, therefore, solve the present-day ills of the Soviet society? Or, are not these reforms more likely to aggravate the ills many times more to shake the foundation of the Soviet socialist society?

### CPI(M)'S BLIND SUPPORT TO THE SOVIET PEACE DRIVE

The CPI(M) Central Committee's resolu-

tion of May 3-6, 1988, *On Certain Ideological Questions* had adopted a critical approach to the "estimates and formulations" of the present CPSU leadership regarding today's international situation. Therein, the CPI(M) leadership had concluded that this assessment of the international situation "goes against our understanding and is directly contradicting to it." At one place the resolution said "The report (Gorbachev's *Report on the 70th Anniversary of the October Revolution*—Ed. P. Era) gives due recognition to the developing peace movement as an integral part of the world revolutionary process, to the vital role played by the Soviet Union in defending peace and the rapid growth of the peace movement which continues to reach wider and wider sections often becoming a very powerful force in the advanced countries of the West." Only two pages later the resolution says: "But the struggle for peace is not considered (by the CPSU leadership—Ed. P. Era.) as an integral part of the world struggle for peace, democracy and socialism." Is it a palpable contradiction, or is it that the CPI(M) leadership differentiates between "the world revolutionary process" and "the world struggle for peace, democracy and socialism"? However, this is not the point of discussion here. More important is the point that, after examining the major contradictions in the present-day world—for instance, the question of peaceful co-existence, intensification of the contradiction between imperialism and socialism, the present CPSU leadership's theory of "the integrated world" and the supposed laws modifying the contradictions, the contradiction between imperialism and the third world countries and the decline of the national liberation movement—the resolution concluded: "The report therefore makes a world assessment at variance

(Contd. on page 6)



## SUMWU holds its Annual Conference

The Annual Conference of Sukinda Upatyaka Mines Workers' Union was held on 14-15 February 1989 at Saruabil. This conference was very significant because it was held at a time when the mines workers and the working people at large, undaunted by the conspiracy and combined attacks of mines owners, the Congress(I) Government and the brutalities of armed police have successfully carried on the united movement against machine-mining.

The open session was held on 14th February near Sukinda Chhak. Com. Tapas Dutta, President of the union and General Secretary, UTUC (Lenin Sarani) addressed it as the main speaker. Com. Sitesh Dasgupta, Secretary, UTUC (Lenin Sarani), also attended it. Com. Mayadhar Nayak, General Secretary of the union presided.

Com. Tapas Dutta in a brilliant and short speech said, the mines workers organised by Sukinda Upatyaka Mines Workers Union have fought against the mines owners and the Government on their legitimate demands and achieved glorious victories, making heroic sacrifices in course of their struggle in the last eleven years of the existence of the union. Emphasizing the significance of the united movements of workers and

peasants against machine-mining and demanding employment, he said, this movement had made a tremendous stir not only in Orissa, but also throughout the country and had raised hopes among the workers and employees to fight for their legitimate demands. He pointed out, the INTUC affiliated TISCO Union has backed total machine-mining and Janata backed Union at Kaliapani had followed it resulting in retrenchment of thousands of workers, but Sukinda Upatyaka Mines Workers' Union was carrying on a protracted and arduous struggle to stop machine-mining and give employment to retrenched workers and unemployed youths. He said, this movement would achieve its goal if the mines workers of Sukinda unitedly join forces with the unemployed youths and peasants and

retrenched workers. Com. Dutta criticised the Congress(I) Government for deceiving the people by their election-oriented assurances of industrialisation and employment which have never been materialised. He said, the promise of Nickel Plant and Second Steel Plant of Orissa in Sukinda had gone with the wind. The only way to compel them for it was through movements of workers and peasants taking lessons from their experience.

Com. Bishnu Dash, Asst. Secretary of UTUC (Lenin Sarani), Orissa State Committee, and Com. Debendra Sahoo, organisers of the union, also spoke.

The Delegate Session was held at Saruabil on 15th February. Com. Tapas Dutta and Com. Sitesh Dasgupta conducted it. A resolution condemning the anti-working class and undemocratic Orissa-ESMA Act and demanding its withdrawal was passed in this session.

Another resolution called upon TISCO, OMC and other mine-owners who have been carrying on machine mining to withdraw machines and employ retrenched miners and the unemployed people. It also called upon Misrilal and other mines owners to desist from machine mining and give employment to workers. It called upon the miners, the unemployed workers and the youth to organise broad-based united movement to force the mine-owners and the Government to relent from all anti-worker moves.

The conference unanimously elected the office bearers and Executive Committee of the union for the year 1989. Com. Tapas Dutta was elected the President. Comrades Sitesh Dasgupta, Bishnu Dash, Sambhunath Naik, MLA, Vice Presidents. Com. Mayadhar Nayak, General Secretary, Comrade Sibanskar Sethy and Com. Bilas Kumar Behu-

## Demonstration By Orissa Jute Mill Workers

At the call of the Dhanamandal Sramik Sangha affiliated to the UTUC(LS) the workers of Orissa Jute Mill stopped their work and participated in a massive demonstration before State Labour Commissioner on 8th February last. More than 2000 workers marched in a colourful procession from Bhubaneswar Railway Station and reached the Commissioner's office where they were stopped by the armed policemen.

Incidentally it may be pointed out that in the past the trade union wings of many other political parties including the Janata and the CPI formed unions but could not face the terrorism of the INTUC and left the workers helpless. In this background the UTUC(LS) started organising workers and within a very short period almost all the workers joined the Sramik Sangha excepting

a few INTUC hooligans. But the management started negotiation with INTUC Union for agreement. When all avenues of protests were exhausted, the Sramik Sangha moved the State High Court which ordered an interim stay on any type of agreement with the INTUC Union.

The Labour Commissioner took two years to complete the verification of the union membership and even after that the State government has now been pressuring to Commissioner to withhold the verdict. So this demonstration was organised to put pressure upon the Commissioner to declare the verdict soon. The Commissioner met a deputation consisting of Com. Mayadhar Nayak, (G.S.), Bijoy Kumar Sahoo (Vice President), Damodar Nayak and Jagannath Rout (Joint Secretaries) when he assured to declare the verdict soon.

## Meeting By Sonepur Spinning Mill Workers

The Sonepur Spinning Mill Workers' Union organised a public meeting at Sonepur Town Hall Maidan on 5th January last, to protest against the illegal activities of the management and the Congress(I) union with the help of police and district administration. The meeting was presided over by Comrade Gobindo Maharana, the Trade Union leader and District Secre-

tary of the SUCI, while Com. Balgopal Mishra, MLA, Seikh Quassim, Vice President, UTUC (LS) Orissa State Committee and Gorekhnath Sahu, journalist attended the meeting as Chief Guest, Guest of honour and the main speaker respectively.

The management of the Sonepur Spinning Mill Ltd. had illegally declared a lockout on 17 October '88 and under pressure of sustained movement by the SUCI-led workers' union the management was forced to open the Mill on 1st January 1989. But the management in connivance with the Congress (I) union did not allow the SUCI workers to work in the Mill. The SUCI-led workers' union has been organising movement against this illegal act of the management.

(Contd. on page 5)

Statement about ownership and other particulars about newspaper PROLETARIAN ERA to be published in the first issue after last day of February :

### FORM IV (See Rule 8)

Place of Publication	:	48, Lenin Sarani, Cal-13
Periodicity of Publication:	:	Fortnightly
Publisher's Name	:	SUKOMAL DASGUPTA
Nationality	:	INDIAN
Address	¶	48, Lenin Sarani, Cal-13
Printer's Name	¶	SUKOMAL DASGUPTA
Nationality	¶	INDIAN
Address	¶	48, Lenin Sarani, Cal-13
Editor's Name	:	SUKOMAL DASGUPTA
Nationality	¶	INDIAN
Address	¶	48, Lenin Sarani, Cal-13
Name and Address of individuals who own the newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one percent of the total capital	:	Central Committee Socialist Unity Centre of India.

I, Sukomal Dasgupta, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

1.3.89

Sd/- SUKOMAL DASGUPTA  
Signature of Publisher

### Students' Deputation against University Ordinance—1988

Kendrapara 24.2.89.

Students of Kendrapara College of Utkal University submitted memorandum to sub-Collector Kendrapara against Orissa University Ordinance—1988 on 24.2.89. Com. Sukansu Das, Com. Arjun Jana and other student leaders demanded immediate withdrawal of the black ordinance.

\* \* \*

Pattamundai, 25th February '89—Protesting black Orissa University Ordinance 1988 a students demonstration was held in front of Pattamundai Tahasil Office. About thousand students of Pattamundai College gathered in a rally shouting slogans against the black University Ordinance and reached at the Tahasil office after crossing Pattamundai town. They submitted a memorandum addressing to the Speaker of Orissa Legislative Assembly through Tahasildar, Pattamundai, there under the president-A meeting was held ship of Com. Ranjit Swain, President, Pattamundai College Students' Union, Com. Khageswar Sethi (A.I.D. S.O. Organiser), Com. Rajendra Burma (Secretary A.I.D.S.O. Kendrapara sub-division Committee) and many student leaders of Pattamundai College addressed the gathering and demanded immediate withdrawal of the un-democratic ordinance. At last one copy of the University Ordinance was burnt by the students.

### Fakirmohan Day Observed

On 22nd January last, the MSS, Jajpur Local Committee observed Fakirmohan Senapati Day at Jajpur Town Hall. Com. Binapani Das, MSS State President highlighted the fight of Fakirmohan for women education and social reforms through his writings. Other speakers included Com. Lily Das Orissa State Secretary, MSS, Shantilata Panda and Swarnaprava Nayak.



Speaker on the dais on 3rd February Sit-in demonstration at Esplanade East, Calcutta, against 'Left Front' Government's anti-people language and education policy. Dr. Pratul Gupta, Ex-V.C. Visva Bharati and Rabindra Bharati Universities. Sitting (From Left) Comrade Manik Mukherjee, Dr. Arabinda Nath Bose, former V.C. Jadavpur University, Sri Sailesh Dey, Writer, Prof. Subir Basu Ray, Prof. Tarun Majumder and Comrade Tapan Ray Chowdhury.

### Meeting By Sonepur Spinning Mill Workers

(Contd. from page 4)

In the protest meeting Comrade Balgopal Mishra, MLA severely criticised the wrong industrial policy of the state and Central government and condemned the management of the spinning Mill for allowing the workers to work after signing a bond. He demanded that the management must open the industry to all workers irrespective of their political affiliations.

Comrades S. K. Quassim and Gorekhnath Sahu also addressed the meeting.



Under the auspices of Siksha Sankochan Birodhi O Swadhikar Raksha Committee a mass deputation to the West Bengal Chief Minister was organised on 28th February last in Calcutta demanding re-introduction of English and system of pass and fail in examinations at the primary level of education and repeal of the unscientific and harmful English syllabus at the secondary stage, introduction of mother tongue as the medium of instruction at all levels of education, autonomy of educational institutions etc.

Students and the people at large participated in thousands from all the districts of West Bengal and assembled at the foot of the statue of Vidyasagar at College Square. Therefrom they marched in a huge and colourful procession parading through College Street, Nirmal Chunder Street and Lenin Sarani and converged at Esplanade East.

From there a 5-man deputation under the leadership of Com. Manik Mukherjee went to submit the memorandum to the Chief Minister. Above is a portion of the huge demonstration and below a part of the vast gathering at Esplanade East.





## CPI(M)'s 13th Congress

(Contd. from page 3)

with our understanding, virtually liquidating the contradictions of the period and acts as a damper on the world revolutionary movement. Our party cannot accept this analysis, argument and its conclusions." But what did the Draft Political Resolution at the 13th Congress say? Examining the "sharpened contradiction" between "the imperialist and socialist camp", the "contradictions between the capitalists and the working class" and the "intensification of the contradictions between imperialism and the third world countries" — in a reportage like fashion, it scrupulously avoided making any reference to its variance with the present CPSU leadership's point of view and role. Whereas the CPI(M) leadership had said in its May resolution, "It (Gorbachev's Report at the 70th anniversary of October Revolution — *Ed. P. Era*) is presented as if the imperialist system is entering upon a new period of stabilization and expansion and the revolutionary movement will have to be carried on in a low key. This understanding liquidates the understanding of the present epoch, its transitional character and prospects of the advance of the world movement", the Draft Political Resolution at the congress makes no such reference. Instead, it is overflowing with praise for the Soviet leadership's drive for peace. For instance, it said: "The struggle for peace waged by the Soviet Union has helped in a big way the advance of the forces of freedom, peace and socialism. Protected against nuclear war, the workers and people of all countries were able to concentrate their attention on their internal contradictions and struggles." It said further: "In recent years the Soviet Union's struggle for peace has played a vital role in curbing the aggressive activities of the imperialist camp against the socialist countries and the drive

for nuclear war." But what is the real character of the present CPSU leadership's policy on war, peace and peaceful coexistence? No doubt, the task of not allowing the imperialist warmongers to drain out their accumulated excess capital and capitalist surplus production by unleashing a fresh imperialist war and thereby finding a way out, even if temporary, from their present acute crises and the task of fighting for preservation of world peace and for defeating the war strategies of the capitalist-imperialists are of supreme importance. And, no doubt, the fight to preserve world peace may entail undertaking bilateral negotiations and agreements or treaties. But can bilateral negotiations, agreements and treaties alone ensure preservation of world peace by themselves? Is not the law of inevitability of war very much valid and operative since imperialism as a world system still exists?

### PEACE MOVES MUST BE BACKED BY MILITANT MASS MOVEMENTS

And is it not also true that so long as capitalism-imperialism exists with its exploitative system, surplus production and consequent attempts to have more and more market under its control, treaties and agreements are liable to be obeyed by the imperialist warmongers more in dishonour and disregard than in compliance? Therefore, the essential pre-requisite of preservation of world peace is that bilateral negotiations, accords and treaties will have to be backed up by and be part and parcel of a worldwide militant mass struggle for peace conducive to the growth and development of revolutionary struggles in the capitalist-imperialist countries and national liberation movements in colonies and semi-colonies. But is that the way the CPSU leadership is conducting its "struggle for peace"?

In its May resolution, the CPI(M) Central Committee criticised the present CPSU leadership's stand on imperialism, its assessment of the contradiction between imperialism and the Third World countries and the decline of the national liberation movement in colonies and semi-colonies. Without naming the CPSU leadership the Political Resolution said: "Discussion on contradictions in international documents generally avoids all references to the massive popular movements that are developing in Third World countries. These movements are challenging the reactionary rule of and exploiting classes as in India and fighting Governments which compromise with imperialism and endanger, the economic independence of the country". Then why is the CPI(M) leadership so eloquent over the peace drive of the CPSU leadership?

### CPI(M) NOW HAILS MORE REVISIONIST GORBACHEV BUT ONCE BRANDED KHRUSHCHEV REVISIONIST AND SPLIT FROM CPI

It is very significant that the CPI(M) leadership which criticised the present CPSU leadership's stand on the international situation in so many respects in its May Central Committee resolution evaded those issues in its Draft Political Resolution. But it has not given any reason for this shift in stand. It should be recalled that at the time of its split with the CPI, the CPI(M) leadership had branded the Khrushchev leadership of the CPSU as out and out revisionist. Today when this Gorbachev leadership calls Khrushchev's line a hallmark and is giving the Khrushchevite revisionism a comprehensive form, the CPI(M) leadership is lining up with it. Long back in 1969 when the CPI(M) leadership was very much anti-Soviet, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had pointed out: "But despite all their hue and cry against revisionism and despite their anti-Dange

slogans they are, as I have already told you, surreptitiously trying to develop friendship and intimacy with the Soviet Union". Today the CPI(M) leadership's approach to the CPSU leadership proves how correct was this analysis of Comrade Ghosh. Is it only a tragedy of turn of events? Or, is it not the worst form of revisionism?

At the party congress the leadership hung a portrait of Stalin. But not a single word has been uttered in the draft against the heinous slanders unleashed by the CPSU leadership against Stalin.

### DEMANDING OUSTER OF RAJIV WHILE SUPPORTING HIS FOREIGN AND HOST OF INTERNAL POLICIES

On the national situation, the first, foremost, central and sum total of conclusion of the CPI(M) leadership has been expressed in these words: "The developments in our country in the last three years (i.e., in the years since the last Party Congress of the CPI(M) — *Ed. P. Era*) have brought to the forefront the urgent task of ousting Rajiv Government from power to enable the country to have a Government of its choice...". So the immediate task has been set "to secure the ousting of the Rajiv Government in the coming elections while protecting unity and integrity of the country against the divisive designs of imperialism and the secessionist and communal forces".

What, however, cannot be lost sight of the fact that even as the CPI(M) leadership harps on "Outburst of spontaneous mass discontent" against the Rajiv Gandhi Government and its isolation from the people, the leadership is waxing eloquent on the foreign policy of this Government. In the words of the CPI(M) leadership: "The Government of India and Rajiv Gandhi continue to take a correct position on Afghanistan calling

for political settlement and implementation of the Geneva Accord. The Government continues to support the fighting people of Kampuchea and the role of Vietnamese troops in that country and refuses to conciliation with the allies of Pol Pot. It takes a forthright stand on the question of apartheid, offers aid to frontline states, demands effective sanctions and calls for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela. It continues its support to the cause of Palestinians, to Angola and Nicaragua. It took a correct position in the prolonged Iran-Iraq war and threw its weight in favour of an early end to war". Further: "Despite economic pressures of the World Bank and the effect of the economic policies pursued, India's policy of non-alignment and friendship with Socialist countries continues. It is because, side by side with the pressures, there is also a sharpened contradiction with imperialism due to its continuous arming of Pakistan, its support to the latter's plan for developing nuclear weapons. These, together with the interests of the ruling classes, in peace, development of foreign trade and economic activities abroad ensure continuation of the non-aligned policy".

### THAT INTERNAL POLICY REACTIONARY WHILE FOREIGN POLICY PROGRESSIVE IS NON-MARXIST

What is really the class character of this policy of Non-Alignment which for long has remained the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the Government of India including the present Rajiv Gandhi Government? One does not have to be a Marxist-Leninist to agree to the basic concept that the foreign policy of any government in any country is an extension of its home policy. Taking the case of India, we find that despite all attempts for all-round development and consolidation of the Indian capitalist economy

(Contd. on page 7)

## CPI(M)'s 13th Congress

(Contd. from page 6)

with the patronage, aid and protection of the State power, everdeepening and allout crisis has gripped the Indian capitalist economy in this third most acute phase of general crisis of the world capitalism. The crisis of economy in India is the crisis of monopoly capital. The Indian monopolists, it should not be overlooked, are exporting not only commodity but also capital. Apart from their wholly-owned ventures abroad and their joint ventures with the State or private capitals of comparatively underdeveloped countries, they are also participating in joint ventures with the monopolists of the traditional imperialist countries to exploit the cheap labour power, raw material and market of some other countries, particularly the underdeveloped countries whatever the backwardness of Indian capitalism in comparison to the advanced capitalist-imperialist countries, whatever the standard of living and the scale of poverty of the masses of the people, in the test of the law of development of capitalism the Indian capital, having been elevated to the stage of finance capital through merger of industrial capital and bank capital and consequent birth of, in the process, financial oligarchy, has lost, to that extent, its national character and acquired an imperialist character. True to the imperialist character of finance capital, the Indian monopolists, too, consider the home market a part of the world capitalist market and the aspirant character of the Indian monopolists can also be gauged from the nature of partnership of the Indian monopolists with foreign monopolists in the home market.

Consistent with this home policy in general, the foreign policy of the Government of India aims at fulfilling the tasks of, *first*, unhindered development of the In-

dian capitalist economy in a relatively peaceful international situation, seeking to utilise the present balance of world social forces to its own advantage, and, *second*, ensuring market for the growing capitalist economy in a truncated world capitalist market already ridden with the problem of surplus production and excess capital.

Therefore, the main thrust of the foreign policy of Non-Alignment of the Government of India—whether headed by Jawaharlal Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Indira Gandhi, Morarji Desai or Rajiv Gandhi—reflecting this typical contradiction of the aspirant resurgent bourgeois class of India simultaneously with both the imperialist and the socialist countries, is to strike a bargain to its maximum benefit from both the imperialist and the socialist countries by playing between them as to handle to its benefit the contradictions among the imperialist countries as well as those between the underdeveloped and the western capitalist-imperialist countries. This is the sole objective behind the initiative and encouragement for Non-Alignment Movement by the ruling class and the Government of India. They want to penetrate the markets of comparatively underdeveloped non-aligned countries by playing on the deep-rooted anti-western imperialist sentiments of these countries and to enhance bargaining power for securing concessions from both the imperialist and the socialist countries. So, no doubt there is people's demand for support to the cause of the frontline countries, to Angola and Nicaragua, and to the cause of the Palestinians, but the support extended by the Government of India to all these aims solely at fulfilling the needs of the ruling capitalist class. From the same objective the Government of India has entered into a treaty

with the Soviet Union, has decided its stand on Afghanistan and the Iran-Iraq war, and takes initiative in the SAARC to maintain its supremacy as a regional superpower. From the objective of playing between the USA and the USSR to reap its own benefit, the Government of India has also been carrying on negotiations from time to time with the US Government. But the CPI(M) leadership has failed to analyse from the class angularity this dual character of the Rajiv Gandhi Government. This is why the Draft Political Resolution said: "Under pressure of economic events Rajiv is forced to dispense with a forthright stand against US misdeeds and intervention."

In the case of Sri Lanka, too, all who have followed the bloody development there may have realised that the Government of India, in its expansionist design and with support from US Government, interfered in the internal affair of that country and forced an Accord between the two countries over the Tamil minority problem, even despatched troops under cover of a peace-keeping mission. The collusion between the India Government and the US Government over Sri Lanka was realised by the CPI(M) leadership, too, as will be evident from B. T. Ranadive's speech at the 13th congress when he placed the Draft Political Resolution: "The steps that the Government of India took in relation to Sri Lanka were later on supported by the USA. India's action in Maldives also had the previous sanction of the USA." But the CPI(M) leadership did not only endorse this intervention and the Accord, in the Draft Political Resolution it lent total support to Rajiv Government's intervention: "But for the direct help to Sri Lanka, the imperialists would have succeeded in their plan." How does the CPI(M) leadership reconcile its support to

Rajiv Gandhi Government's intervention in the internal affairs of Sri Lanka with its knowledge of US patronage behind this intervention?

Again, what the CPI(M) leadership emphasises as "The interests of the ruling class in peace" actually reflects, as pointed out earlier, the interest of the Indian capitalist class for a relatively peaceful international situation for unhindered development of the Indian capitalist economy. Recognition of this fact comes from the CPI(M) leadership, too, when it said that the Indian ruling class's interest for "development of foreign trade and economic activities abroad ensure continuation of the non-aligned policy". But the leadership will not explain to its cadres and the people the class character of these economic activities abroad and of this policy of non-alignment. Because, in that event, not only its castle of People's Democratic Revolution built in thin air will disappear but also the objective behind its support to the CPSU leadership and to the foreign policy of the Government of India as also its tricky manoeuvre to come to the electoral forefront on the national political arena will get exposed.

### CPI(M) TOEING SOVIET LINE IN REGARD TO RAJIV

Criticising the CPSU leadership's argument "for adjusting imperialist exploitation in the name of balancing the interests between the exploiters and the exploited" in the Third World countries, the CPI(M) leadership observed in the Central Committee's resolution of May 1, 1988: "It is the same outlook that is displayed when the CPSU argues that there is no alternative to the Rajiv Government in India and totally ignores the popular forces struggling against the present inequitable order. So how the vital force of social change is disposed of." (*The Marxist*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1988). At the party Congress, too, it had been said that "these movements are challeng-

ing the reactionary rule of the exploiting classes as in India and fighting Governments which compromise with imperialism and endanger the economic independence of the country." Strange indeed! Did not the CPI(M) Politburo leader Jyoti Basu himself comment several times that "There is no alternative to Rajiv Gandhi"? But the CPI(M) leadership accused the CPSU leadership for the same trend of thinking! More important, how does the CPI(M) leadership extend support to Rajiv Gandhi Government's foreign policy, knowing full well that it is a reactionary rule of the exploiting classes which compromises with imperialism and endangers economic independence of the country?

It has always been the practice of the CPI(M) leadership, and for that matter of the undivided CPI, to separate the foreign policy of the Government of India, calling it progressive, from home policy which it makes a target to attack whenever it feels necessary to promote its petty parliamentary interest. In the first place, the CPI(M) leadership is so eager to support this foreign policy, that in the Draft Resolution, it identified itself with the policy, saying: "It is part of our struggle against imperialism must be urgently pursued. Underestimation of the importance of our foreign policy plays into the hands of imperialism." (emphasis added) Secondly, on the national arena, too, the CPI(M) leadership supported the Rajiv Gandhi Government over many major issues on many occasions. For instance, on the Punjab and Assam issue in recent times. Also, in States where they are in power their education and language policy, the question of collaboration with multi-nationals, their anti-people fiscal policies, and attitude to legitimate democratic mass movements in crushing them with coercive force of the police etc. one can hardly find any difference

(Contd. on page 8)

## CPI(M)'s 13th Congress

(Contd from page 6)

with the policies of the Congress(I). Is it wrong to say that this opposition to the Central Congress(I) Government on some issues and extension of support to it on so many other issues are part of a parliamentary game as among the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties?

### CPI(M) ALIGNS NOT WITH LEFT FORCES BUT WITH COMMUNAL FORCES IN TN POOL

The main slogan at the 13th congress was: "Oust Rajiv Government." The party's General Secretary, E. M. S. Namboodiripad, declared in his opening speech at the Congress: "This Congress will naturally devote itself to the political and organisational problems connected with this important aspect of national politics". And, to this end, the Draft Political Resolution set down the task: "It is necessary therefore to mobilise all the bourgeois opposition secular forces and the left force for a common fight against this Government of national disintegration and authoritarian attacks."

What initiative did the CPI(M) leadership take to mobilise and combine all bourgeois Opposition secular forces and the Left forces? Before the ink had dried up of the 13th congress the Left forces were divided at the Tamil Nadu Assembly elections. The leadership had said at the congress: "The CPI(M) has to discharge its responsibility as a leading force of the left, its responsibility as a party of the working class." (Draft Political Resolution). In reality, immediately after the congress, the CPI(M) leadership took no initiative to discharge its responsibility to combine the Left and democratic forces, at

these elections, and, solely motivated by consideration of its own electoral gains, allied with the DMK, frustrating any prospect of Left democratic unity, while the CPI went with the ADMK Jayalalitha group. The task of isolating the communal forces was bid a goodbye. Along with combining with the DMK, the CPI(M) combined with the Muslim League (Lateef group), too! Can it be called anything other than politics of expediency and sheer opportunism?

This politics of the CPI(M) has no principle and no concern for the people's real needs at this hour. The CPI(M) leadership refuses to make any alliance with the BJP in any struggle against the Rajiv Gandhi Government. But at the last Haryana Assembly elections it had entered into alliance with Devilal where BJP was a partner!

Although the main objective of the 13th congress was to decide on the party's line for the forthcoming parliamentary elections, the CPI(M) leadership either could not reach any decision in this regard or kept doors open to make any combination that will give maximum parliamentary dividends. It did not say clearly whether or not it would enter into alliance with the National Front. It did not name the parties and forces it viewed as allies in the combination against the Congress(I) at the forthcoming elections. If the leadership were serious about the National Campaign Committee it would have taken initiative to develop it. But that is not the approach of the CPI(M) leadership. Clearly, it is using the Campaign Committee as a lever of bargain to put pressure on the National Front and handle the Front to its own advantage.

### MAIN PURPOSE BEHIND HOLDING THIS CONGRESS

So, the object of going through the 13th congress with such pomp and fanfare was clearly to thrust the party on the national political arena and enhance its bargaining power with an eye to the forthcoming parliamentary elections and also to gear up the party organisation towards this end. For a revolutionary party election cannot be an end in itself. If in course of organising and building a legitimate democratic mass movement against the anti-people policies and measures of the ruling party an election comes as a contingency it has to be fought as part and parcel of the democratic mass movement. Only in the background of such a movement a front or an electoral alliance shaped out and from the platform of movement can be safeguarded the interests of the people. At the 13th Congress there was no clear political direction given for building up such democratic mass movements. There was no genuine attempt to pave the way for building Left and democratic unity. The congress was not working out a political line in the people's interest but for electoral gains and opportunism. Is there any room for doubt after all this that ideology or principles do not really matter with the CPI(M) leadership? The 13th congress was claimed to be Congress of Unity, Congress for Advance. But in reality it turned out to be Congress of Disunity, Congress for Election or Congress Oriented to Election.

The historical need—the first, foremost and supreme need of the hour—is to unite all Left, democratic and Opposition parties and forces and launch a country-wide united democratic mass movement on a common agreed programme and code of conduct against the anti-people policies and the fascist

## CENTRAL BUDGETS

(Contd. from page 1)

Thus it is clearly evident that all such talks of "tax-relief" to the poor and imposition of tax on the rich is nothing but a big hoax, since the poor will be hit harder by the overall rise in prices and the rich will get more concession and benefits out of the same. This is nothing but a gimmick of the Congress(I) for the election year. It will be sheer naive to expect anything else from this capitalist Government when the system is neck-deep in acute crisis.

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee adds that this Budget once again justifies the need to build up and carry out relentless united mass struggle against this capitalist Government and its anti-people fiscal and other policies which our party has been voicing for a long time.

## Stir by Bihar MSS

Patna, January 24 :—

MSS led a massive demonstration to the Raj Bhavan at Patna on 24th January last to protest against the outrage on women and the government's utter failure to protect the rights of the women. The demonstrators demanded arrest of the policemen involved in Kolhua gang rape, Papri Bose Apaharan Kand of Bhagalpur and the Pararia Kand.

The demonstration was stopped by the police at the Railway crossing of R. Block and Comrades Rekha Sinha, President, Mahila Sanskritik Sangha, Bihar, Vibha Singh, Mithilesh Thakur, Usha Sinha, Lilavati Devi, Kumari Siddham and others addressed the gathering.

Later a deputation led by Comrade Rekha Sinha met the additional Secretary of the Rajyapal and handed him a memorandum.

drive of the Central Congress(I) Government headed by Rajiv Gandhi. This is the task before all Left, democratic and Opposition parties who talk of the people's cause.

No trickery, no other consideration must flinch us from this task. Opportunities to advance the people's cause have been wasted in the past for petty parliamentary gains. If this opportunity, too, is surrendered and recourse is taken to the same old course of reaping parliamentary gains through all unprincipled and opportunist means at the election, history will not forgive. Do not the cadres of the CPI(M) and its allies have their own positive role to play in this situation? We urge upon them to pause and ponder over it.

### ORISSA

## Netaji Day Observed

Netaji day was observed by the MSS on 23rd January last at Bhandari Pokhari of Balasore district. Com. Basanti Swain, local MSS Secretary, was the President. Com. Lily Das, in her speech, threw light on the exemplary uncompromising battle of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, Com. Tarulata Behera, a leading organiser, stressed how Netaji advocated for women freedom and for the equal rights of women and other backward community. Com. Shantilata Panda also spoke.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF—COMRADE NIHAR MUKHERJEE

Edited and Published by Sukomal Das Gupta from 48, Lenin Sarani, Calcutta 700 013 and printed by him at Ganadabi Printers and Publishers Private Limited 52B, Indian Mirror Street, Calcutta 700 013