



RED SALUTE COMRADE STALIN THE GREAT COMMUNIST LEADER

On the solemn occasion of the 38th death anniversary of Comrade J. V. Stalin, the giant communist leader, a worthy disciple of Great Lenin, defender and continuator of Leninism which is Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, an accredited leader after Lenin of the international communist movement, we on behalf of the revolutionary detachment of the Indian proletariat, the working people and all forward-looking and well-meaning sections of our country along with true revolutionaries of the world pay our respectful homage and sincere tribute to him.

We pay our tribute to Stalin at a time when all sorts of accusations are heaped upon him and he is painted in the horrid picture of a dictator, a demon. The renewed propaganda of the Gorbachev neo-revisionist-capitalist roaders' clique add grist to the mill of tirades of the bourgeois scribes all over the world. Naturally, in this war of propaganda truth is the first casualty. But we the communists stand for truth, the whole truth. For truth, the whole truth can alone be the real basis of a dispassionate evaluation of any-

thing, not to speak of a man of history like Stalin. We therefore propose to trace certain landmarks in the life and activities of Stalin, guided as he was entirely by Leninist thoughts, ideas and principles, along with the evaluation of our Party about Stalin at the end.

STALIN—A CLOSE COMRADE-IN-ARMS OF LENIN BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER THE REVOLUTION

Stalin was the product of the revolutionary

movement of the international working class. The fire of revolutionary movement steeled him. Historical records and documents not only of the Soviet government but also of non-communist scholars like E. H. Carr, the British author (his celebrated book: *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923*, Penguin) show that Stalin was an outstanding organiser, a defender and elaborator of the Marxist-Leninist teachings of first rank within the Party, editor of the banned party organ and journals and above all a resolute defender of Lenin against his many detractors before, during and after the revolution. Just on the eve of revolution when doubts and waverings were prevailing among a section of leaders within the party Stalin stood firmly in defence of revolution and Lenin. We quote one or two examples from the book of Carr for the veracity of this fact.

Just a few months before the revolution, when Lenin had to be in hiding and many important leaders were in prison, Stalin had to take up the responsibility of organising the 6th Party Congress at Petrograd. Stalin arrived at Petrograd in March, 1917 to take organisational responsibility of the Petrograd Soviet. Within a few months came this responsibility. In absence of Lenin depending only on his guidance Stalin organised this Congress of historic importance. For, it was the Congress for preparation of the final assault. Echoing the doubt of Rykov, Nogin questioned whether the country really made such a leap in two months that it was already prepared for revolution. Stalin's telling reply was: "It would be unworthy pedantry to ask that Russia should wait with her socialist transformation till Europe 'begins'" and that "the possibility is not excluded that Russia may be the country which points the way to socialism." (Carr, p. 102)

The battle was however still not finally won. Kamenev and Zinoviev circulated a letter protesting against

Bush and his Cohorts the War Criminals

—Comrade Nihar Mukherjee

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, SUCI, has on 25th February '91 issued the following statement on the current critical situation of Gulf War.

"In spite of a positive response from Iraq to the peace proposals, including its withdrawal from Kuwait, the US-led imperialist forces are not only continuing their savage attack on Iraq, killing thousands of civilians, but have also pounced on it with increased ferocity after the lapse of the unilateral US ultimate deadline. In the name of a ground war the imperialist butchers are now using unconventional mass-destructive war-heads like napalm bombs and air fuel bombs, whose destructive powers are comparable to the Atom Bombs.

"This brutal attack exposes the heinous design of Bush and allies that on the pretext of freeing Kuwait they are all after destroying and occupying Iraq to grab permanently the oil-rich West Asia and thereby dominate the whole world.

"We strongly condemn this criminal act and demand a trial of Bush and Co. for their war-crimes before an international tribunal.

"We appeal to the Soviet Union and China not to limit their acts only to the diplomatic plane but to fight for peace and take active and positive steps to put up a challenge to the imperialist war design.

"We urge the Government of India to stop its co-operation with the US, to take a firm anti-war stand and sever immediately all ties with the USA. We appeal to the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin and Central America to cut off all ties with the USA.

"We appeal again to all peace loving people of the world in general and communists in particular to forge a mighty militant peace movement and force peace upon the imperialist warmongers."

the decision of armed insurrection by the Bolsheviks. This not only spread doubt and uncertainty in the party circle but also alerted the enemy. The Provisional Government in Russia attempted to send certain regiments of the Petrograd garrison to the front. But the Petrograd garrison, won over to the side of revolution, declared its allegiance to the Petrograd Soviet and

refused to take the government order not counter-signed by the Soviet. Stalin and like-minded members of the Central Committee came in resolute support of Lenin. Stalin and like-minded two lines: one is headed for the victory of the revolution and leans on Europe: the other does not believe in the revolution and counts only
(Contd. on page 2)

Proletarian Era

Organ of SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
(Fortnightly)

Founder Editor in Chief: COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

Vol. 24 No. 12 2 March, 1991 Price: 80 P
Air Surcharge 5 P.

(Contd. from page 1)

on being an opposition. The Petrograd Soviet has already taken its stand on the road to insurrection by refusing to sanction the removal of the armies." (Ibid, p. 106)

Immediately after the revolution Lenin was challenged by the Trotskyites and 'Left Communists' within the Party over the question of conclusion of peace to bring an end to the war that was going on for 4 years. The country was worn out and the fatigue of the masses could not be ignored. Nor could be ignored the danger of being embroiled in an imperialist war. The Bolsheviks had just seized power which was being threatened by the bourgeois and imperialist forces. The burning question was peace at the earliest opportunity to defend the revolution. But the opposition was calling Lenin a revisionist—he was liquidating the gains of the socialist revolution etc.! At this decisive moment Stalin was in resolute defence of Lenin and his peace proposal. At a meeting of the Central Committee (March 1918), Stalin summed up the issue in one sentence: "Either a respite or the downfall of the revolution." The opposition was defeated and the Brest-Litovsk Treaty achieved, though under very harsh terms but surely not equal to the gains of revolution.

After the revolution came the danger of counter-revolution by the overthrown bourgeoisie directly aided and abetted by the imperialist powers like Britain, France and Germany who had large amounts of finance capital invested in Russia. It was a direct threat to the existence of the nascent socialist state. Stalin's very prominent role in this period has been testified to by Voroshilov.

"In the period from 1918 to 1920 Comrade Stalin was probably the only person whom the Central Committee shifted about from front to front, selecting the most vulne-

rable spots, the places where the threat to the revolution was most imminent. Stalin was never to be found where things were comparatively quiet and going smoothly, where success was attending our arms. But wherever, for various reasons, the Red Armies suffered reverses, wherever the counter-revolutionary forces pressing their successes, threatened the very existence of Soviet power, wherever alarms and panic might at any moment develop into helplessness and catastrophe—there Stalin was always sure to appear." (Voroshilov: Stalin and the Red Army)

STALIN'S CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONALITY PROBLEM

After revolution there was the paramount problem of how to unite the different nationalities of various ethnic origins from the ruins of the vast tsarist empire. On the successful solution of this problem depended the very existence of the Soviet power amidst the capitalist encirclement. It had to be consolidated on socialist principles based on Lenin's thesis on national question. There was the need to proceed along the internationalist objective of the communist movement. The need of the moment was to rally behind the Soviet power broader sections of the masses as also to fulfil the unfinished historical task of bringing the people of the oppressed nationalities in the mainstream of communist movement. On the success of all this rested setting the example before the oppressed nations of the world the superiority of communist movement over bourgeois nationalism that cannot solve the problem.

This historic task was vested in the People's Commissariat for the Affairs of the Nationalities, unique in its kind, and Stalin was chosen to take charge of it. Stalin had before him the guideline provided by Lenin that :

"The Proletarian party strives to create as large a state as possible for that is to the advantage of the toilers, it strives to bring about closer ties between nations and the further fusion of nations ; but it desires to achieve this aim not by force but exclusively by a free, fraternal union of the workers and the toiling masses of all nations."

(Selected Works
Vol. 2, pp. 37-38)

Enunciating the basis of solving the national problem Lenin further showed: "Complete freedom of secession, the broadest local (and national) autonomy and detailed guarantees of the rights of the national minorities" should be followed. Lenin upheld these rights not to encourage secessionism, nor to pander to local nationalism but to indicate the historical process of unification. Guarantee of the rights was the logical method to dispel all shades of doubts and apprehensions from the minds of the people of oppressed nationalities.

After revolution Lenin described the 'national and agrarian questions' as 'the root questions for the petty-bourgeois masses of the population of Russia at the present time.' Stalin afterwards referred to "peace, the agrarian revolution, and freedom for the nationalities" as "the three principal factors which rallied the peasants of more than twenty nationalities of vast Russia round the red flag of the Russian proletariat."

The People's Commissariat of Nationalities led by Stalin became the instrument of this new Leninist policy on nationality question. It became the centre of ideas of socialist work. It took the method of forming a section with the administration of each nationality whose tasks were : (a) carrying into effect all decisions of the People's Commissariat of Nationalities ; (b) Carrying into effect the principles of Soviet power in the milieu of the respec-

tive nations and in their own languages ; (c) taking all measures to raise the cultural level and class consciousness of the working masses of the nations and (d) lastly, relentless struggle against counter-revolution in its national manifestations (struggle with national bourgeois governments).

Thus through untiring political education, the method of persuasion and raising the standard of political and cultural consciousness the historic task of uniting the nations was accomplished in Soviet Russia. The first All Soviet Socialist Congress in December 1922 adopted on Stalin's report the historic resolution on forming the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—USSR. Later, in the Soviet Constitution, the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics was considered a federal state formed on the basis of voluntary association of the 16 Soviet Socialist Republics (Article 13) with every Republic reserving the right freely to secede (Article 17).

For the first time, therefore, in the history of Russia there came the constitutional guarantee (the Constitution goes by the name 'Stalin Constitution') for the rights of the non-Russian groups to be equal with those of the Russian. It encouraged their languages and culture and development of their educational system. In economic matters too came the integration of the common objective of socialist construction for progress and prosperity. As Carr has nicely expressed: "The ultimate expression of the Bolshevik doctrine of national self-determination is a union of equal nations in a socialist federation." (pp. 280-282)

So, it was not a cunning manipulation of theory to placate the nationalities for serving immediate purpose but was the logical historical process of unification of nationalities having a definite internationalist objective in view. To show the distinction of the uniting

socialist states Stalin showed: "The working class and its international party are the force that cement these new nations and lead them. An alliance between the working class and the working peasantry within the nation for the elimination of the relics of capitalism in order that socialism may be built triumphantly ; abolition of the relics of national oppression in order that the nations and national minorities may be equal and may develop freely ; elimination of the relics of nationalism in order that friendship may be knit between the people and internationalism firmly established ; a united front with all oppressed and unequal nations in the struggle against the policy of annexation and war of annexation in the struggle against imperialism—such is the spiritual, social and political complexion of these nations."

(The National Question and Leninism)

Today, this unity and solidarity of the nations that stood the test of fascist aggression during Stalin's time is in the process of disintegration. This process started from the period of the revisionist Khrushchevite clique which encouraged, among others, the policy of decentralisation helping thus not only to undermine the authority of Stalin but also to denigrate him. The leaders who came to power after Khrushchev continued this line further and adopted certain policies pertaining to the language policy in particular which helped generate a simmering discontent among the people of different ethnic origins. As a result, the national bourgeois feelings and sentiments prevail in the nations within the union of the republics, more so, when the dictatorship of the proletariat has been liquidated by the Gorbachev revisionist clique. The poisonous fruits of restoration of capita-

(Contd. on page 3)

(Contd. from page 2)

lism are bursting forth. Faced with the evil consequences of their own undoing the Gorbachev clique is hurling at random abuses and insinuations against Stalin who laboured most for the voluntary association of the nations in Russia. The Gorbachev clique may better recall the warning of Stalin that: "There are cases when the right of self-determination conflicts with another, a higher right—the right of the working class that has come to power to consolidate its power. In such cases—this must be said bluntly—the right of self-determination cannot and must not serve as an obstacle to the working class in exercising its right to dictatorship. The former must yield to the latter."

But will the Gorbachev clique draw any lesson from this historic warning? Those who have liquidated the working class state, the dictatorship of the proletariat and have restored capitalism to be in the fraternity of bourgeois nations under the leadership of American imperialism hardly have any commitment to communist ideology, its historic mission and internationalist goal and objective.

AS THE LEADER OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

One of the very remarkable achievements of Stalin was the socialist construction of Russia after revolution. Marx and Engels bequeathed to the communist movement only a rough outline of the changes the capitalist society would undergo after the proletariat would conquer power. In the Communist Manifesto they enumerated the possible measures the socialist proletariat would carry out in the event of its victory. But this programme of the communists had not been put into effect anywhere before the Russian working class conquered

power in 1917. There were very many obstacles. Poverty and devastation, want of funds for development, even the snapping of the trade relations by the British government, resistance of the kulaks, industrial bourgeoisie and a section of the bureaucrats, intrigues and subversion of the opposition groups, the encircling imperialist powers just on the lookout of pleas for their military interventions and last but not of least significance the rightist opposition within the party—such was the concrete situation at the time of launching the economic planning and socialist construction.

Socialist Russia's hope of survival depended on racing against the time—how quickly to cover up the big gap that lay in the economic and military capabilities with the imperialist powers. The bourgeois spokesman had to admit in other words that history had never known before industrial construction on such a gigantic scale with such a high pitch of enthusiasm and such tempo of activities. The masses of the working people accomplished the feat of reaching the targets of Five Year Plans before time. A new kind of movement, the Stakhanovite movement of the conscious working men and women in both fields and factories dedicated to the noble cause of socialism on higher proletarian culture was writing the saga of heroism of labour. It had a profoundly revolutionary significance. It was breaking down the old views of technique, shattering the old technical standards, old designed capacities, old productive plans and was demanding the new in all these.

Obviously reacting to this movement Stalin said: "The times have passed when leaders were regarded as the only makers of history, while the workers and peasants were not taken into account. The

destinies of nations and states are now determined, not only by leaders, but primarily and mainly by the vast masses of the working people...they are the real heroes and creators of new life." (From speech at the First All-Union Congress of Collective Farm Shock Brigade, February 19, 1933—Stalin Works: Vol. 13). Is it the voice of a dictator? Or the wisdom of a true Marxist having unbound faith in the creative potentiality of the politically and culturally conscious masses? As a giant Marxist Stalin was quite aware that the material incentive of the bourgeoisie and of the revisionists demeans man and insults him, he being the creator or builder of civilization. It is only the higher socialist values, the conscious recognition of man or woman's creative role that alone can translate today the ideology into material force of change in history. This unique creativity, this hatred against parasitism that was at the base of the transformation of Russian society during Stalin's time and that is why the Russian people did not know then what was stagnation.

Like the rapid industrialisation the countryside was undergoing a sea change in Russia through collectivisation and modernisation of agriculture. Regarding the political, economic and social importance of collectivisation, Stalin wrote: "The Party proceeded from the fact that without collectivisation it would be impossible to lead our country on to the high road of building the economic foundations of socialism, impossible to free the vast masses of the labouring peasantry from poverty and ignorance." (Problems of Leninism, P. 520).

Stalin has been accused of resorting to coercive methods in the collectivisation of agriculture by the bourgeois and revisionist spokesmen. They conceal the fact that worried by the 'Left' distorters of the party-

line, Stalin wrote his celebrated article "Dzzy with Success" to re-emphasize the party line. This article was a warning to all who had been so carried away by success of collectivisation as to commit gross mistakes and depart from the party line, to all who were trying to coerce the peasants to join the collective farms. It stressed the principles that the formation of collective farms must be voluntary.

Stalin suddenly became a hero to millions of peasants, their champion against local excesses. Stalin quickly warned against this hero worship by publishing "Answers to Collective Farmers", in which he stated: "Some people speak as if Stalin alone made that statement. The Central Committee does not...permit such actions by any individual. The statement was...by the Central Committee."

Moreover, in his "The Party's Policy in the Countryside" Stalin wrote:

"Proceeding from the fact that differentiation is going on in the countryside, some comrades draw the conclusion that the Party's main task is to foment class struggle there. That is wrong. That is idle talk. That is not our main task now. That is a rehash of the old Menshevik songs taken from the old Menshevik encyclopedia.

"To foment class struggle in the countryside is not by any means the main task at present. The main task at present is to rally the middle peasants around the proletariat, to win them over to our side again. The main task at present is to link up with the main masses of the peasantry, to raise their material and cultural level, and to move forward together with those main masses along the road to socialism. The main task is to build socialism together with the peasantry, without fail, under the leadership of the working class; for the leadership of the working class is the basic

guarantee that our work of construction will proceed along the path to socialism."

"That is now the Party's main task."

(On The Opposition, page-220)

It cannot therefore be construed that coercion and not persuasion was the approved method. It was on the other hand a conscious, voluntary movement that was initiated at a particular stage of class struggle, having the definite objective of elimination of the exploiting kulak class and thus change the face of peasant Russia.

We need to recall here the contribution of Stalin in charting out the path of economic development in order to proceed from Socialism to Communism in his last work of historic importance, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" (1953). Stalin showed:

"Of course, when, instead of the two basic production sectors, the state sector and the collective farm sector—there will be only one all embracing production sector, with the right to dispose of all the consumer goods produced in the country, commodity circulation with its 'money economy' will disappear as being an unnecessary element in the national economy." (ibid p. 18) Stalin showed that in order to pave the way for a real and not a 'declaratory' transition to communism, three main preliminary conditions need to be fulfilled. It is necessary, in the first place, to ensure not a mythical 'rational organisation' of the productive forces but a continuous expansion of all social production, with a relatively higher rate of expansion of production of means of production. This is necessary not only for supplying equipment both for its own plants and those of other branches of the national economy but also for the reason that reproduction on an extended scale is impossible without it.

Secondly, to the advantage of the collective

(Cont. on Page 4)

(Contd. from page 3)

farms and hence of all society gradual transition from collective farm property to public property (that is state property) and replacement of commodity circulation by a system of product-exchange under which the central government or some other socio-economic centre has to control the whole product of social production for its social consumption.

And thirdly, to ensure such a cultural advancement as will secure for all members of society the all-round development of their physical and mental abilities, so that the members of society may be in a position to receive an education sufficient to enable them to be active agents of social development, and in a position freely to choose their occupations and not to be tied all their lives, owing to the existing division of labour, to some one occupation. (ibid)

The revisionists since Khrushchev to Gorbachev deviating from this scientific path and applying more and more the bourgeois methods have not only enmeshed the Russian economy in various ills of bourgeois economy but have ultimately restored capitalism to undo the historic achievements of socialism for more than three decades with which is associated the name of Stalin as the leader.

AS DEFENDER OF LENINISM WITHIN THE PARTY

Stalin was elected the Secretary General of the CPSU on Lenin's motion at the Party plenum on April 13, 1922. Lenin was seriously ill and did not live long. In 1924, Great Lenin passed away. The mantle fell on Stalin to defend the Leninist theory and principles within the party and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat. Historical records show that Stalin discharged the responsibility with credit for nearly three decades steering clear the

Left sectarian opposition headed by Trotsky, later the right opportunistic opposition led by Bukharin and ultimately those two trends combined in one opposition bloc against the party and the state.

It is clear, therefore, the kind of foresight Lenin showed in selecting Stalin as the most trustworthy comrade and entrusting him with all sorts of difficult tasks and responsibility at an early stage when Stalin was practically unknown among the masses of the people, but not on those stalwarts who were then very prominent in the party. Stalin of course proved his unique grit and mettle of character to prove himself worthy disciple of Lenin. This was the reason why Lenin depended much on Stalin at every critical moment which proved Lenin's wisdom and power of judgement. And this very struggle helped elevate Stalin from the position of an ordinary worker to that of the supreme leader of the party and the state not being imposed from above.

However, during Lenin's lifetime both these above-mentioned trends tried to raise their ugly heads. Trotsky challenged Lenin's thesis about the possibility of socialism in a single country due to the operation of law of uneven development of capitalism. Not only that, Trotsky found no revolutionary potential even among the rural proletariat and working peasantry. From a mechanical understanding of Marxism he was opposed to unity between the working class and working peasantry and with the middle peasantry neutralised, common fight against the capitalist survivals within the economy. Behind this theoretical mask was discernible Trotsky's non-acceptance of Stalin as the leader of the party after Lenin. When the opposition became openly against the party and the state and converted it into intrigues and subversive activities, it was removed from the party at

the 15th Party Congress. In reply to scurrilous campaign and slander of this group Stalin replied with rare candour and equivoque thus: "I think the opposition does me honour by venting all its hatred against Stalin. That is as it should be. I think it would be strange and offensive if the opposition, which is trying to wreck the party, were to praise Stalin who is defending the fundamentals of the Leninist party principle." (The Trotskyite Opposition, Before and Now—Speech at the joint plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the Central Commission — October 23, 1927—Stalin Works: Vol. 10). This Opposition was joined by another opposition from the right direction led by Bukharin who was opposing the party's decision to launch all-out attack against the kulaks and for elimination of this exploiting class, against the survivals of capitalism and new bourgeoisie in the economy. It is to oppose, in other words the historic task of elimination of capitalism and laying the firm foundation of socialist economy. 'Capitalism will grow into socialism', capitalism has become 'rational', growth of private trade and commerce poses no danger to socialism were the familiar Bukharinite refrains. Rebuffed by the party this right opportunist capitalist roader group veered round the Trotskyite group on the common ground of opposition and even conspiring for splitting the party and against the state.

Notwithstanding slanders and lies heaped on Stalin personally by this combine, it stands to the credit of Stalin that he defended all through the Leninist line and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dictatorship of the Proletariat has been a red rag to the bourgeoisie and revisionists alike. They have either distorted it to mean 'dictatorship by the party or even of individual or have counterposed democracy in general which is bourgeois democracy when the former is qualitatively

different from the latter. It was Kautsky who raised the question first in a vigorous manner to which Lenin gave telling rebuff. Lenin showed that: "...the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is the organisation of the vanguard of the oppressed as the ruling class for the purpose of crushing oppressors, cannot result merely in an expansion of democracy. Simultaneously with an expansion of democracy, which for the first time becomes democracy for the poor, democracy for the people, and not democracy for the rich, the dictatorship of the proletariat imposes a series of restriction on the freedom of the oppressors, the exploiters, the capitalists. We must crush them in order to free humanity from wage slavery, their resistance must be broken by force..." (State and Revolution)

Elaborating the Leninist interpretation of the dictatorship of the proletariat Stalin showed that it cannot be construed as the dictatorship of the party. He showed that: "The party is the main guiding force in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Stalin Works: Vol. 3 page 32) Stalin further explained: "The party is the teacher, the guide, the leader of its class and now a power based on the use of force in relation to the majority of the working class. Otherwise, there would be no point in talking about the method of persuasion as the proletarian party's principal method of work in the ranks of the working class. Otherwise, the party would have to replace the method of persuasion by the method of ordering and threatening the proletariat, which is absurd and absolutely incompatible with Marxist conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Stalin Works: Vol. 9, p-84)

To deny the dictatorship of the proletariat which Marx - Engels - Lenin - Stalin defended so vigorously and unwaveringly is to deny the law of class-struggle even in socialist state. The neo-revisionist clique headed

by Khrushchev started enfeebling the dictatorship of the proletariat by the revisionist proposition of the 'State of the Whole People'. The Gorbachev renegade capitalist-roader clique have completely demolished the dictatorship of the proletariat to restore capitalism in Russia.

Stalin was well aware of the danger of revival of anti-Leninist thoughts and ideas in the event of slackening the intense ideological-political struggle within and outside the party. Of particular historical significance was his warning at the 17th Party Congress. At this Congress Stalin set before the party as immediate task: "to overcome the survivals of capitalism in economic life and in the minds of people" and warned: "It stands to reason that these survivals cannot but create favourable soil for the revival of the ideology of the defeated anti-Leninist groups in the minds of individual members of our party." And: "It goes without saying that if this confusion of mind and these non-Bolshevik sentiments obtained a hold over the majority of our party, the party would find itself demolished and disarmed." (Report to the 17th Congress)

At the last Party Congress he attended, only a few months before his demise (19th Congress, October 5, 1952) certain very important decisions were taken which Stalin did not live to guide and lead for implementation. The decisions were in regard to consolidation of ideological centralism by enlivening the process of democratic centralism through criticism and self-criticism from below, etc., we quote a few extracts to show the direction and line of thinking.

On the importance of criticism and self-criticism the Report said: "It is particularly important at the present time to stimulate self-criticism from below and ruthlessly to combat, as malignant enemies of the party, all who hamper the develop-

(Contd. on page 5)

(Contd. from page 4)

ment of criticism of our shortcomings, who stifle criticism, and answer it with persecution and victimization."

(Report to the 19th Party Congress, CPSU)

Further: "It would be a mistake to think that criticism from below can develop of itself, spontaneously. Criticism from below can grow and spread only if, every person who comes forward with sound criticism feels sure that he will have the support of our organisations and that the defects he points to will really be removed." (Ibid)

Regarding the importance of intensifying ideological struggle within Party the Report uttered the note of caution:

"Ideological work is a prime duty of the Party, and underestimation of its importance may do irreparable damage to the interests of party and state.

"We still have vestiges of the bourgeois ideology, relics of the private property mentality and morality. These relics do not die away of themselves; they are very tenacious and may strengthen their hold, and a determined struggle must be waged against them." (Ibid)

In fact, Stalin gave serious attention to the question of raising the ideological level of the leaders and rank and file members of the communist party. But it remains that despite all attempts this standard could not be raised to meet with the challenge of the situation. Therefore, ideological level could not be raised, mechanisation of thought process and blind sense of allegiance to the leadership could not be fought out. As a result, the process of functioning and operation of democratic centralism was affected so much so that the absence of a leader could bring about unthinkable disaster. This is what had happened after the demise of Stalin when revisionism crept in taking advantage of this situation.

Three years after his death came the deadly attack against the mighty edifice that Stalin built up with unmatched dedication and strenuous labour. The traitors who were lying low within the party ganged up and taking opportunity of the situation brought the heinous assault in the name of fighting the cult of individual which they themselves were guilty of building up. Here comes the historical role of individual as also the default of the party mechanism that was proved quite unprepared for the situation. As Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the founder General Secretary of our party and an eminent Marxist philosopher and thinker, has shown that the role of individual has not yet been exhausted in our society. "In society as well as in the party, individuals do play significant roles. It is incorrect to assume that in a communist party all the members are of equal standard and calibre. So long as the difference in the standard of members exists there is bound to remain the difference between the leader and the rest of the collective whole." (Selected Works, Vol. 1. p-68) Again, Comrade Ghosh elsewhere has shown that: "Attainment of... a minimum standard for making critical analysis of theories, requires as its precondition, the attainment of a higher ethical-cultural standard by the cadres through concrete struggles covering all aspects of life. Only after the attainment of such a standard, the rank and file members can play effective role in the inner-party polemics and ideological struggle..." (Why SUCI Is the Only Genuine Communist Party in India). Why and how this could not happen will be dealt in another place where we will present our Party's analysis. But whatever may have happened, this does not take away the due that Stalin so rightly

deserves by his life-long struggle and achievements.

AS DEFENDER OF THE SOCIALIST STATE AGAINST FOUL CONSPIRACY AND FASCIST AGGRESSION

Stalin has been assailed most by the imperialist and neo-revisionist spokesmen for his alleged 'ruthless suppression' of the left and right combination whose opposition turned to conspiratorial activities against the party and the state. A hue and cry was raised in the bourgeois world over the Moscow Trials (1936-38) and the great purge that liquidated many one-time leaders like Zinoviev, Bukharin, Kamenev, Pyatakov, Radek and generals like Tukhachevsky, next in command in the Red Army, etc., in separate but successive trials. Khrushchev in his 'secret' report said about the 'very grave consequences' to the war that followed because of the 'annihilation' of political leaders and military generals. He also questioned about the timing of the trials and the extreme punishment to hold Stalin's 'suspiciousness' and 'power greediness' responsible. The Gorbachev clique have gone further to repudiate the trials altogether and rehabilitate posthumously all those accused and punished. Two things need therefore to be judged dispassionately to get at the truth. First, what was Stalin's own view about the extreme punishment — whether it squares with Marxist view when related to defending the dictatorship of the proletariat and defending the state. And secondly the actual methods of trials—were those in full conformity with unbiased application of laws and natural justice. Let us examine those one by one.

First about the extreme punishment meted out to the persons accused of and proved to be

guilty of treasonable offence against the Socialist state. In the bourgeois world capital punishment in such offences does not raise the eyebrow of the bourgeois writers and spokesmen as was proved when the Rosenburg couple were executed in America on charge of espionage. The Marxists make no secret of stern action and severest punishment to those who challenge the socialist power by counter-revolutionary deeds. They believe in no greater moral than the defence of revolution. Now let us hear Stalin.

In reply to the question of Emil Ludwig, the German writer (interview on December 13, 1931) about the severity and ruthlessness of the Soviet Government against the enemies Stalin explained with concrete example the following: "When the Bolsheviks came to power they at first treated their enemies mildly... When General Krasnov organised his counter-revolutionary campaign against Leningrad and fell into our hands we could at least have him prisoner according to the rules of war. Indeed, we ought to have shot him. But we released him on his 'word of honour'. And what happened? ... This very Krasnov organised the white guard Cossacks... Very soon it turned out that behind the white guard generals stood the agents of the Western capitalist states—France, Britain, America and also Japan. We became convinced that we had made a mistake in displaying mildness..."

... To have persisted in that mistake would have been a crime against the working class and a betrayal of its interests... We learnt from experience that the only way to deal with such enemies is to apply the most ruthless policy of suppression to them."

We come to the second point about the veracity of the Moscow

Trials. It was alleged in the bourgeois world that the trials were nothing but well-rehearsed drama and that the accused were tortured to make confessions of their guilt and lastly drugs were administered on them to elicit the confessions. In order to determine the worth of the allegations certain facts should be taken into due consideration. First, the trials were open and before the scrutinizing gaze of all those attended among whom were shrewd foreign diplomats, lawyers, most intelligent foreign journalists and important foreign dignitaries like the US Ambassador to Moscow. Their testimonies nail the lie of the propaganda as we will see. Secondly, the accused were given the liberty to give their objection to the panel of judges and the public prosecutor appointed. Thirdly, they were offered appointment of their own lawyers in defence. Fourthly, they were given the opportunity to retract their statements of confession by allowing final statements. Fifthly, they were given the right to self-defence and they fully utilised it by delivering lectures whenever they wanted.

Such a method of trial giving full guarantee of right to self defence and ensuring natural justice is unthinkable in treason charges in bourgeois world. Yet the allegations were raised, perhaps out of frustration in the western world. The testimonies of the personalities and the sources we quote all from bourgeois world give sufficient answers to the canards that were circulated then now being trusted by the neo-revisionist traitors only to defame Stalin and dismantle the socialist system.

We start quoting the reporting of a bourgeois daily News Chronicle which wrote (26.1.37)

"All assertions about the broken spirits of the defendants and the administration of narcotics upon them by the state

(Contd. on page 6)

(Contd. from page 5)

to force proper replies is sheer nonsense. The accused are well dressed, appear to be well-fed and in good health. They speak their mind with rare interruptions from the prosecutor, often asking for the floor, and being given it in the course of fellow defendants' testimony."

Regarding the allegations of 'well rehearsed drama' and 'torture' on the accused, Mr. Dudley Collard, an English barrister and member of the Executive of the National Council of Civil Liberties and the Howard League for Penal Reform who was present at the trials wrote in the Daily Herald, January 28, 1937 the following :

"No set of seventeen men could act their parts so brilliantly nor sustain their activity in this way without a slip for four long days.

"They are clearly in full possession of their faculties, do not appear to be terrorized and look well. There is nothing to prevent any of them from alleging that the charges are 'framed'."

Now the testimony of Mr. Joseph E. Davies, the US Ambassador to Moscow : "... the so-called treason or purge trials of 1937 and 1938... I had attended and listened to... In reexamining the record of the cases and also what I had written at the time from the new angle, I found that practically every device of German Fifth Columnist activity, as we now know it, was disclosed and laid bare by the confessions and testimony elicited at the trials of self-confessed 'quislings' in Russia... All of these trials, purges and liquidations which seemed so violent at the time and shocked the world, are now quite clearly a part of a vigorous and determined effort of Stalin Government to protect itself from not only revolution from within but from attack from without. They went to work thoroughly to clear up and clean out all treasonable elements within the country. All doubts were resolved in favour

of the government. There were no Fifth Columnists in Russia in 1941—they had shot them. The purge had cleansed the country and rid it of treason". Further, "The most extraordinary part of this trial from a Western out-look, is that there should have been such a trial at all. The accused had all entered the plea of guilty. There remained nothing for the court to do but to hear possible pleas for clemency and to adjudge the fact and sentence the accused...."

"The other probable purpose was to disclose to the public in open court the bona-fides of the confessions of the accused. Had these confessions been made "in chambers", or produced over the signatures of the accused, their authenticity might have been denied. The fact of the confessions could never be disputed in the face of the oral self-accusation made "in open court".

(J. Davies' confidential report to US Secretary of State 17.2.1937 from "Mission to Moscow". London, Victor Gallanz Limited, 1944. pp. 179-184)

In such an extraordinary situation amidst intrigues and subversive activities by the enemies against the revolution, party and the state mistakes were not unnatural. In the Eighteenth Party Congress Report, Stalin had the guts to be self-critical. He admitted that : "It cannot be said that the purge was not accompanied by grave mistakes. There were unfortunately more mistakes than might have been expected." To admit mistakes and to rectify them is the hallmark in the character of a true revolutionary. Admission of mistakes openly and unhesitatingly is an anathema only to the revisionists. Stalin's character as a revolutionary rises in height by his sober admission of mistakes and faults. Only the diehard Stalin haters can impute motive on occasional slips and mistakes, that too not due to his personal fault, in the immense task of saving the party and the state from the

enemies amidst capitalist encirclement

The neo-revisionists are even reluctant to offer any credit to Stalin for his brilliant role in saving Russia and the world humanity from the mightiest attack of fascist Germany in the Second World War. The then international situation needs recalling to realise how grave was the situation in which Stalin had to work as the Supreme Commander of the Red Army. No less a person than George C. Marshall, the US Chief of Army Staff in his Biennial Report to the Secretary of war had to write this : "Germany and Japan came so close to complete domination of the world that we do not yet realize how thin the thread of Allied survival had been stretched. In good conscience this Nation can take little credit for its part in staving off disaster in those critical days." Further, "... the Soviet Union's heroic struggle against Nazi Germany, particularly the victory of the Soviet troops in the battle of the Stalingrad, saved American people from the invasion of the territory of the United States itself by Hitler's hordes."

Moreover, Anna Louise Strong in her celebrated book 'The Stalin Era' said :

"Shall we forget the Europe of 1940, when the armies of France collapsed in eleven days before Hitler and when Europe feared a new Dark Age of a thousand years? Shall we forget the assault on all mankind by the proclaimers of a master race against slave races and how this assault was broken on the men and women of Stalingrad? They built feverishly, wastefully but they built strength that stood when the world was reeling. And for this the world is in their debt today."

Marshal Zhukov in his book, 'Reminiscences And Reflections' (Vol. 1, pp. 363-364) wrote : "Stalin made a big personal contribution to the victory over Nazi Germany and its allies." He further wrote : "I realised during the war that Stalin

was not the kind of man who objected to sharp questions or to anyone arguing with him. If someone says the reverse he is a liar." Lie to those who depict Stalin as a dictator ! Those who are acquainted with facts about the great resistance that the Soviet Government could put up, if they are honest to history must admit the great role that Stalin played at this critical hour. To admit this, by no way takes away the supreme sacrifice of the Russian people and the heroism of the Red Army. It must be admitted that Stalin inspired the Russian people to wage a total war against the German attack. It is the high spirit and morale of the Russian people in particular that proved decisive in the victory over fascist war machine.

STALIN —THE REVERED LEADER OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

On this solemn occasion we cannot but recall the significant role that Stalin played as one of the most respected leaders in the international communist movement after Lenin. We must recall in particular the very important analysis and formulation of policy as strategy and tactics of revolution in the colonial and dependent countries, enunciated in his celebrated speech : "The Political Tasks of The University of the Peoples of The East" (May 18, 1925). In this speech Stalin divided these countries into three categories : "Firstly, colonies like Morocco, which have little or no proletariat and are industrially quite undeveloped. Secondly, countries like China and Egypt which are under-developed industrially and have relatively small proletariat. Thirdly, countries like India, which are capitalistically more or less developed and have a more or less numerous national proletariat." About these countries in the third category among which falls our country India, how marvellously

Comrade Stalin indicated the correct strategy and tactics to be adopted by the communists which went abegging due to absence of true revolutionary party of the communist then in our country. What was there in the name of Communist Party was no better than a petty-bourgeois parliamentary party since divided into mainly three parties and groups—CPI, CPI(M) and CPI(ML). What was Stalin's wise guidance? Stalin showed that in the countries like India : "Fire must be concentrated on the compromising national bourgeoisie, its treachery exposed, the toiling masses freed from its influence and the conditions necessary for the hegemony of the proletariat systematically prepared. In other words in colonies like India it is a matter of preparing the proletariat for the role of leader of the liberation movement step by step dislodging the bourgeoisie and its mouthpieces from the honourable post." It may be mentioned in passing that not only the undivided CPI failed at that time to prepare the Indian proletariat for the role of the leader of the liberation movement—but this party as also the CPI (M), CPI (ML) etc. do not find Indian capitalism so developed even today as to conclude Indian revolution being at the stage of anti-capitalist socialist revolution despite Stalin's observation that countries like India were "capitalistically more or less developed" as far back as 1925.

Besides, a team of leaders of the undivided CPI later on met Stalin and sought his advice as to how the stage of Indian revolution should be viewed. Stalin's reply to those leaders was that this question should better be decided by the Indian leaders and none else. So it is clear that the parties like the CPI could not only understand the teachings of Stalin correctly, but also by their behaviour and approach to the leaders of international communist movement they objec-

(Contd. on page 7)

(Contd. from page 6)

tively made Indian party appear as an appendage to the Soviet Party causing immense disservice to the communist movement in India.

Be that as it may, Stalin's contributions to the international communist movement are many and require a separate treatise. We may mention here some of his theoretical contributions in the contemporary world political situation. Stalin further elaborating Lenin's thesis on the relative stability of world capitalist market showed convincingly that it had disappeared after the Second World War and that production in the capitalist world was going on on a 'narrower basis' compared to productive capacity.

Of particular significance now was his steadfast defence of the Leninist concepts on war and peace and peaceful co-existence. He showed the falsity of notion about the peaceable intention of the imperialists and underscored the importance of the revolutionary content of Lenin's theory on peaceful co-existence which can never mean peaceful capitulation to the imperialists as the Gorbachev revisionist clique have shown. Lenin's concept of Peaceful Coexistence is a shield against imperialist interventions on the liberation struggles in the colonies and semi-colonies and acceleration of proletarian struggles in the metropolitan countries. In fact during Stalin's time there was surge in the liberation movement and proletarian struggles for emancipation on a global scale. Besides, the glorious events of successful revolution in China, Vietnam, North Korea and the countries of East Europe—all of which took place during Stalin's time — the victorious march of freedom movement in colonies and semi-colonies, practically marked this period as a watershed in history. But alas, in absence of this great man what a catastrophe has befallen the

humanity today the process of which started very soon after Stalin's demise but by now completed under the leadership of renegade liquidator clique of Gorbachev.

Another important pointer that Stalin gave and which is of contemporary relevance was about the world peace movement. He exposed the limited objective of the pacifist aim of present-day peace movement. Stalin said: "...the present-day peace movement as a movement for the preservation of peace, will, if succeeds, result in preventing a particular war, in its temporary postponement, in the temporary preservation of a particular peace... That, of course, will be good. Even very good. But all the same, it will not be enough to eliminate the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries generally... To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism."

(Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, pp. 41-42).

It may be noted in passing that Stalin committed a serious mistake in counselling the Chinese Communist leadership not to proceed in the decisive battle against Chiang's forces immediately after the Second World War. The Chinese leadership stuck to their own assessment of the situation and won decisive victory over Chiang's forces and liberated China. It shows the greatness of Stalin that he congratulated the Chinese comrades for their decision and made self-criticism of his own mistake. When Khrushchov accused Stalin of misdirecting the Chinese revolution, the CPC replied in their own document (Comment on The Open Letter of the C.C. CPSU by the Editorial Departments of 'People's Daily' and 'Red Flag') thus:

"When Stalin did something wrong, he was capable of criticizing himself. For instance, he had given some bad counsel with regard to the Chinese revolution. After

the victory of the Chinese revolution, he admitted his mistake... But what about Khrushchov? He simply does not know what self-criticism is..."

A FEW WORDS ABOUT STALIN'S CRITICS

Stalin said about himself in his talk with Emil Ludwig, the German author:

"As for myself, I am just a pupil of Lenin's and the aim of my life is to be a worthy pupil of his.

"The task to which I have devoted my life is the elevation of a different class—the working class. That task is not the consolidation of some 'national' state but of a socialist state and that means an international state; and everything that strengthens that state helps to strengthen the entire international working class. If every step I take in my endeavour to elevate the working class and strengthen the socialist state of this class were not directed towards strengthening and improving the position of the working class, I should consider my life purposeless."

The critics of Stalin, stated elsewhere, are either inveterate opponents of communism or the revisionists who are bereft of communist outlook. They start and end their criticism of Stalin in pointing to certain mistakes, omissions and commissions in the gigantic task of giving solid foundation to socialism and trade groundless charges against Stalin without specifying the particular acts or deeds for which Stalin should be held responsible personally. They dare not discuss the positive aspects and achievements of Stalin. Can it be called unbiased or balanced judgement? Again, their attacks against Stalin from bourgeois outlook become in reality defence for capitalism and capitalist moral values. They attack Stalin but their real intention is to attack Lenin, Marxism-Leninism. The Gor-

bachev capitalist roader clique now do not spare Lenin and even Marx. So from wild charges against Stalin have now come the open attacks against Marxism-Leninism. The critics therefore prove themselves to be the agents of capitalism. Stalin is to bear the brunt of attacks because his was a lifelong struggle against the enemies of socialism and the socialist state. We may recall here the brilliant analysis Comrade Shibdas Ghosh made in 1961 thus: "...the present understanding of Leninism distinct from social democracy and Trotskyism is due to Stalin... Stalin's understanding of Leninism is the correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism". "To black Stalin out would have the inevitable result of disowning his authority and consequently rejecting his interpretation of Leninism. It would objectively uncrown Lenin himself." (SW: Vol. 1; pp. 85-86). Naturally, restoration of capitalism in Russia has finally confirmed, although very painfully how the analysis of Comrade Ghosh that attack against Stalin meant an attack against Leninism and socialism finally destroying it altogether has come true.

CERTAIN NEGATIVE ASPECTS IN THE SOVIET PARTY AND WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

On this solemn occasion, true to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, we need to draw the historic lessons from the negative aspects that appeared in the Soviet Party and the international communist movement amidst very many achievements and glory. For, it is these very negative aspects not checked in time that had their snowball effects to directly encourage very many anti-Leninist thoughts and ideas to swamp the communist movement including the Soviet Party.

From the very inception of our Party, the

Party led by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, an eminent Marxist thinker of the era, has been pointing out that first, the sense of authority in the party body as well as in the international communist movement has been confused with authoritarianism which is alien to Marxism-Leninism; secondly, in place of a dialectical relationship between the leadership and the rank and file has developed mechanical relationship or blind allegiance to leadership giving rise in consequence mechanisation of thought process of a vast membership including leaders and growth and development of bureaucracy at the top both within the party bodies and in the international communist movement; thirdly, this has led inevitably to lowering of ideological, political and cultural standard of the communist leaders and rank and file; and finally, the impact of bourgeois humanism, nationalist thinking, bourgeois moral values, parliamentary democratic concepts has its alarming spell over vast sections of the rank and file, and even the top leaders of the international communist movement are not immune from it. This has not only retarded the forward movement from socialism to communism but also spelt the danger of reversion to capitalism. Historical evidences prove what was the serious apprehension of our party and to which it drew the most urgent attention of the international communist movement has come true over the time following the path of neo-revisionism. It is in no way to belittle the great historic role that a giant communist leader like Stalin played but just to show the loopholes, the lapses and shortcomings which objectively helped in bringing about a tragic turn in the party of Lenin and Stalin in particular and the world communist movement in general. It is worthwhile to recall the teachings of Comrade

(Contd. on page 8)

(Contd. from page 7)

Ghosh which he sounded as a note of caution as far back as 1968 thus:

"It is not that ideas are changing automatically along with changes in the economic base. If ideas remain at a low standard, then that low standard of thought must react dialectically with its base. As a result, it influences the environment and degenerates the system and this is what is happening in the Soviet Union.

"It should be borne in mind that this revisionism could appear because the economic ingredients conducive to breeding of revisionism were there... It is the low level of consciousness that increased this tendency. Such serious developments which could not occur earlier in the Soviet Union despite this low level could now occur just because of the absence of a particular leadership. There have

been many a mistake even in Stalin's time because of the general low level of consciousness, but these could not strike at the very roots. In the absence of that particular leadership, however, this tendency went on gaining in strength gradually because of the low level of consciousness." (SW: Vol. I, p-305)

STALIN —AN EXEMPLARY COMMUNIST CHARACTER

Facts of history show beyond doubt, whatever the enemies of communism and the revisionist-renegades may propagate to the contrary, Stalin's merits far outweigh his faults and because of preponderance of his good qualities over the bad, on the whole he was truly great.

As a close comrade-in-arms of Lenin, as a stout defender of Leninism and the interpreter

of correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism of today, as a pioneer in correctly handling the most vexed question of nationality based on Lenin's teachings, as the leader of socialist construction, as well as the supreme commander in the great patriotic war against Hitlerite fascist aggression Comrade Stalin saved the humanity from the gravest catastrophe and also as the revered leader of the international communist movement he must be given his honourable due in history. He had nothing personal in his life. His sole concern was the cause of the class, party and revolution. In him was personified and identified not only the cause of world proletarian revolution but also the nobility of proletarian internationalism.

We are firmly convinced that after the dust of calumnies and slanders of the bourgeois hirelings and neo-revisionist traitors settles down, the truth, as the rays of the sun will pierce through the mist of confusion and vindicate that Comrade Stalin earned his high place in history by his great service to mankind as the indefatigable defender and continuator of Marxism-Leninism by his high altitude of communist character and by his life-long arduous battles against the enemies of social progress and the onward and upward march of civilization and mankind.

Comrade J. V. Stalin
Red Salute !
Long Live Revolution !!

US must withdraw from Iraq and Gulf

—Comrade Nihar Mukherjee

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, SUCI, has issued on 27.2.91, the following statement to the press:

"Despite Iraqi pull-out—'the war goes on' declared by Washington proves once again how notoriously the US Administration dares to violate U.N. resolutions and accepted international norms in its unbridled gamble for power to forcibly capture oil resources in West Asia even by most savage but sophisticated and deadliest bombing of Iraq the world has ever witnessed.

All democratic minded and peace loving people the world over must be aware of the grave consequences ahead of this most unequal war and mount all out pressure on their respective governments to compel the US imperialists to immediately withdraw from the Gulf including the presently occupied area of South Iraq lock, stock and barrel and settle all outstanding problems of the region amicably ridding the U.N. of its present position of an appendage of USA for saving the humanity from still more perilous future."

Anti-Gulf War Demonstrations

KERALA

The Kerala State Committee of the SUCI organised anti-Gulf war demonstrations at Chavakkadu, Kuthiyadi, Tripunithura, Tenganal, Ambalapugha, Kayankulam and Changanassery. In Calicut an Anti-War Forum was formed comprising Keraleeya Yuvajana Vedi, Bodhana, Palestinian Students' Organisation and the SUCI, which organised a big anti-War demonstration on 25th January.

ANDHRA PRADESH

The AP State Organising Committee of the SUCI organised protest demonstrations against the barbaric US imposed War in the Gulf in

Hyderabad, Anantapur, Nellore and Bellary. Different mass organisations participated in it. At several spots effigies of George Bush were burnt.

JABALPUR, MP

Mahngai - O - Khadi Yuddha Birodhi Nagarik Samiti, Jabalpur organised a fortnight long protest programme. On 9th, 10th and 11th February street corner meetings were organised at Ranjhi Bazar, Malviya Chowk and Kanchghar Chowk respectively where speakers spoke against the US war in the Gulf and expressed concern over price rise. On 12th February a protest rally was organised.

Statement about ownership and other particulars about Newspaper Proletarian Era to be published in the first issue after last day of February:

FORM IV (Sec 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 per cent 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.

Sd/- Sukomal Dasgupta
Signature of Publisher

1.3.91

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : COMRADE NIHAR MUKHERJEE

Edited & 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.