

Neo-revisionism out to swamp achievements of Socialism—Be on your guard to defend Marxism-Leninism

—Comrade Nihar Mukherjee on 5th August

At a meeting held on 5th August last at the Study Centre of Marxism-Leninism-Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's Thoughts at Ghatshila in Bihar our beloved General Secretary Comrade Nihar Mukherjee gave an illuminating speech in the light of the teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. Below we publish the same. —ED. P. ERA



Comrades

In the "Study Centre of Marxism-Leninism-Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's Thoughts" built at Ghatsila, Singbhum, Bihar, following the decision of the Central Committee of the party, you—the workers engaged at this "Study Centre"—have assembled to observe "Comrade Shibdas Ghosh Memorial Day", this day of 5th August, when, twelve years back, our beloved leader, teacher, guide, an outstanding Marxist thinker and philosopher of this era and the founder General Secretary of our party departed us.

Today, we should, first of all, try to recall those teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh which he developed while concretising Marxism-Leninism on this soil and brought its understanding to a new height pertaining, particularly, to the problems confronting the international and national communist movement. We should, therefore, review and examine critically the problems of the international communist movement at present and the mass movements of workers, peasants, students, youth and the toiling people of our country in the light of his invaluable teachings and thoughts.

You all know that Marxism is a philosophy based on science. This philosophy, unlike all other philosophies of the world, has not developed on the subjective thinking, fanciful ideas or on the ideas and interpretations of any great philosopher of the world. What Marx depended on was truth and knowledge arrived at through experiment, proof and verification based on science and applied in every branch of epistemology—the natural world, society, life, history, etc. The fundamental difference of Marxism with all other philosophies lies in the fact that whereas others only interpreted the world, Marxism not only interpreted the world, but it found out a scientific method verified and tested in history to change the world. How scientific this philosophy of Marxism is, has been amply proved in human history through the success and victory of the Great October Revolution in Russia in 1917, led by no less a revolutionary than Comrade Lenin, the most able inheritor and continuator of the thoughts of Marx and Engels. If Marx showed the scientific laws of social development, that is, how society developed from one stage to the other following definite laws, starting from primitive clan communism to the stage of slave system to

feudalism and then capitalism and provided the theoretical foundation of development of capitalism to socialism, it was Lenin, who, basing himself on the correct understanding of these laws successfully implemented the teachings in practice through the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. It should be clearly understood that no society changes simply because some people want to change it or because they have become fed up with it. No, this is not true. We all know from history and from our own experience that everything, every phenomenon, each and every material particle is undergoing constant change, that is, everything is changeable—but these changes do not take place at anybody's will. Changes do take place everywhere—but always

Central Committee Statement on Situation in Burma

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, beloved General Secretary of our party, on behalf of the Central Committee, said in course of a statement:

We hail the popular upsurge of the Burmese people for the overthrow of the military rule and restoration of democracy and express our solidarity with the fighting people of Burma.

We find no words strong enough to condemn the most barbarous repression that the Burmese Government has let loose to suppress the movement. We hope that the fighting people of Burma would continue their struggle until democracy is restored fully and remain vigilant against any form of machinations either by the imperialists or by the local reactionaries.

following definite laws. Science, and Marxism for that, has established beyond doubt that everything in this world is law-governed, that is, nothing is beyond the purview of law. This is applicable in case of society also. The truth that has come out through scientific analysis of the cause of development of society, following both the course of evolution and revolution, has revealed the fact that no society changed till the necessary material condition appeared in that society. History is replete with instances of one exploitative social system being replaced by another—that, too, being based on exploitation—but one thing was sure that these changes always came follow-

CALL OF 5th AUGUST

Fifth of August takes back our memory to the fateful day in 1976 when Comrade Shibdas Ghosh passed away and we feel all the more passionately the presence of our beloved departed leader, teacher, guide and founder General Secretary of the SUCI within and around us, in his teachings which are the invincible weapons in our hand in the struggle to achieve emancipation. We recall the exemplary struggle and illuminating contributions of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the great leader of the proletariat, in the history of struggle for emancipation of the toiling masses. Imbued with the enthusiasm released by the historic First Party Congress of the SUCI held this year, the comrades spread out to different corners to rouse the people to be conscious of their tasks. The toiling people, too, throughout the country paid tribute to Comrade Shibdas Ghosh and recalled his teachings, attending quotation exhibitions, seminars, book stalls and mass meetings including State level memorial meetings.

(Contd. on page 7)

ing definite laws. In our case, too, we, who aspire to bring socialism, cannot bring it if we fail to understand these laws. Simply feeling concerned at the pain and anguish of the common people, observing their trials and tribulations, miseries and subhuman condition of life, we may be influenced by humanitarian thinking or, say, like the bourgeois humanists of the past, we may very well aspire to bring about a change for the better, bring a socialist society in place of the present exploitative capitalist

(Contd. on page 2)

Proletarian Era

Organ of Socialist Unity Centre of India
(Fortnightly)

Founder Editor-in-Chief :
COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

Vol. 22
Price 60 P.

No. 2

September 1 '88
Air Charge 5 P

'Perestroika' and 'Glasnost' of Gorbachev are Culmination

(Contd. from page 1)

society; but all our efforts will be futile—an exercise in "Utopian Socialism"—unless we can grasp correctly the nature of the hidden laws governing society and unless society becomes mature and ready—both subjectively and objectively—for such a change. History has proved that only Marx's ideas of socialism emerged as scientific socialism first in society rejecting all other varieties of socialism as utopian and idealistic. Marx could show the correct path because he depended on science and followed a correct and scientific course.

We should try to understand why the capitalist economic system with its political superstructure of the bourgeois parliamentary democracy—once highly acclaimed for its lofty ideals of democracy and humanism, for its concept of morals and culture—today has become absolutely corrupt, decadent and reactionary, standing as a stumbling block on the way to the development of individual and social progress. Is it because the Marxists wished it to be so? No, not at all. Capitalism has become crisis-ridden, rotten and reactionary, following the inexorable law of society. Therefore, a radical transformation of society, that is, a revolutionary change, can take place only when the proletariat as a class becomes conscious and organised and can give birth to a leading force, a vanguard detachment capable enough to lead the proletariat to power.

What is the situation today? The present society can no longer afford to fulfil the minimum of basic needs like food, clothing, education, health, hygiene, shelter, let alone development and flourish of the individual, i.e., cannot offer anything to the workers, peasants, agricultural labourers, landless poor peasants, students, and youth, i.e., to the toiling millions of this country. This society has nothing to offer to the people—rather it stands as a great obstacle on the path of its further progress. In fact, the equilibrium has been disturbed seriously, inviting one crisis after another not only in the political sphere but also in the economic, social, cultural, moral and educational spheres. Without going into detail, that is, in short, into the nature of the problems we are faced with, I have already pointed out that behind all these there is a source, a root cause, from where all these problems are emanating. To know and grasp clearly this root cause is a must for those who want sincerely to change this society. So those who are imbued with the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Zedong and Comrade Shibdas Ghosh and have taken to the path of social revolution, who are engaged in safeguarding the nobility of Marxism-Leninism both from the Right and Left deviations should clearly realise the tasks ahead.

First of all, we must have a clear picture and idea about the present economic, political, social and cultural conditions of the society. This we are to do depending not on our fanciful ideas but on the basis of a

scientific and correct evaluation. Because, unless we can get to know correctly the nature of the disease, we cannot find out the real remedy.

Secondly, we should understand what are the prerequisites, the specific conditions, attaining which the radical change of this society can take place. It is not correct to think that since capitalism has become extremely crisis-ridden and out and out corrupt it will crumble automatically all on a sudden. The matter is not so simple. It means, so long we have not before us a correct idea as to the strategy and tactics of the Indian revolution, so long we cannot acquire the necessary strength to make the common people free from the vile influence of the forces of compromise between labour and capital—the social democrats—whose object is to extend the lease of life of this moribund capitalism, and so long we are unable to organise and involve the people in a protracted revolutionary struggle on the firm foundation of high proletarian culture under the leadership of a genuine revolutionary party of the proletariat—the question of revolution, of emancipation of the people from exploitation of man by man will remain a far cry.

Thirdly, we should also try to grasp clearly the nature and character of the new society—the society which we aspire so deeply to bring in. We must know what will be the economic and political system of the new society—its social and cultural setup. All these are very important matters which, we, all of us, should know and grasp clearly. Because, we cannot forget for a moment that it is only the class conscious proletariat who can lead the revolution.

If we look back into history, we would find that every society—be it a primitive clan communist society, or a society based on the slave system, a feudal or a capitalist society—every social formation stands on a definite production relation, indicating the very nature of that society. Marx showed that production meant not only material production but also spiritual production, meaning all that man needed for his material and cultural satisfaction at a particular stage of development of the society. And it is clear to all that man's needs cannot remain stagnant or static—these always change and develop. Naturally, keeping pace with this growing human needs, the growing urge to produce more, the productive forces of a society goes on increasing within certain limits till an irreconcilable contradiction develops between production relation and the productive forces of that society. This means that the society has become pregnant with the possibility of and ready for a radical change or revolution, to give birth to a new production relation capable of coping up with the growing productive forces of the society. When the contradiction between production relation and productive forces becomes irreconcilable—when the balance or equilibrium is disturbed—that actually indicates that the society has reached the period of revolu-

tionary transition, the period of onset of revolution.

In today's society, we find in our country that in fields and factories production is going on and the working people have been involved in a definite production relation centring round a system where the nature and character of production is social but the ownership is private or individual, and, in a capitalist system too, when the State becomes the owner of any industry or factory, it does not indicate prevalence of the social ownership since the motive force of capitalist production is not to fulfil the social necessity but to earn maximum profit through exploitation. In such a society where the nature and character of production is social but the ownership is private or individual, based on appropriation of maximum profit by the owner, an irreconcilable contradiction is bound to appear giving birth to innumerable problems and that society can no longer fulfil the growing needs of the people. This very social urge for more production has in fact given birth to the urge for anti-capitalist socialist revolution. This concept of revolution, which, we, the Marxists, believe in, is not therefore our brainchild—it has a definite scientific basis.

Comrades, you can well understand that it is not possible to discuss everything in detail in a single speech. Even then I would urge you to try to know the truth meticulously and in minutest detail, because on it depends how far you would be able to discharge your responsibility as a revolutionary worker. I would take up today only a few points considered very urgent at the present moment. We should understand that a successful anti-capitalist socialist revolution means not only a radical rupture but also a complete destruction of the old political, economic system and power setup of the country, and thereby a radical transformation of the superstructure, be it a parliamentary system or not—a revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism a kind of which was heralded in Russia first through the successful Great October Revolution led by Lenin. You know that later on socialist systems have been established in a number of countries following the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Socialism today has become a world system, meaning thereby that it has been established in a number of countries.

What, however, I like to stress here as the most important point is that the victory of Marxism-Leninism had never been uninterrupted, not suffering from any attack from any quarter. No, this is not the reality. As Marxism, as an invincible weapon, has provided us with the correct and scientific understanding of social development, kindled the path of the historic destiny of human civilization, so also, since the time of Marx up to this day, it has had to suffer from attacks not only from outside but also from within. In the name of revising Marxism since the time of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Zedong

(Contd on page 3)

of Soviet revisionism ushered in by Khrushchov

(Contd. from page 2)

and even today different revisionist-reformist trends have appeared in the communist movement time and again and have caused serious confusion in the rank and file and incalculable harm to the movement itself. But despite these attacks and setbacks, the onward march of Marxism could not be halted. The reason is not far to seek. Since Marxism is a science and not a dogma, since it is based on experimented and tested truth of history, whatever the damage has been done to it and whatever the nature of confusion, even though temporary, the philosophy and the movement based on it have come out victorious every-time, gaining more strength, and have always withstood successfully these attacks. The vulgarisers of Marxism, the reformists, the revisionists have not been able to halt the onward march of Marxism. Let the revisionists 'prove' that Marxism is not a science, let them say that there is no need of science, or that science itself has become obsolete and outmoded today; let them 'show' that a scientifically verified truth is not a truth at all but an illusion which but none has the guts to assert, let alone 'prove' it or otherwise what they can do at best is to try to malign the nobility of Marxism and prove that they are "Marxists" in name only but not in deeds. These revisionists have a long history of disservice to the cause of communism which I don't intend to discuss it today.

Now look at this capitalist system of our country. The capitalist class, that is, the owners, will not produce anything if there is no profit. Previously, they had to be satisfied with average rates of profit because of free competition but with the advent of monopoly capitalism they have switched over to maximum profits. So, we say, that in a capitalist country profit is the motive force of production. This profit may be earned either by an individual owner or even by the capitalist State when the State holds the ownership. In case of the State-owned industries the profit is used in the interest of the capitalist class—the owning class of this society. And you know that in today's world of modern technology the capitalists are running after superprofit — they are modernising industries with an eye to earning superprofit—no matter whether common people are thrown out of employment or they go without food.

In our country, too, which is not yet a highly industrially developed capitalist country like those in the West, we find an urge for modernization of industries. If you examine the problem a bit more critically you would find that as there is an urge or craze for modernization of industries so to say, so also there exist some sorts of inhibition as reflected in the policies and measures of the capitalist class. The fact is that Indian capitalism is not taking resort to modernization in all spheres, particularly in the sphere of agriculture. Because, in that case it may be difficult for them to maintain whatever equilibrium exists between the production relation and productive forces of the society. Com-

rade Shibdas Ghosh showed that in order to boost up food production and solve the problem of unemployment what India needed today was to modernize and mechanise agriculture and take up a programme of uninterrupted development of industry which could absorb the already existing and the newly made surplus man power in the industry. But the crisis-ridden Indian capitalism was not undertaking this sort of allout planning which they could not afford to take up for obvious reasons. When in India the necessity was to lay stress on labour-intensive industries to absorb the vast multitude of unemployed youth, the Governments — both at the Centre and in the States—as also the monopoly capitalists are opting for capital-intensive industries where, taking advantage of modern technology, they can produce more using very little man power with a view to reducing the cost of production. This is what is meant by capital-intensive industries. The Governments or the monopolists feel least concerned for the fate awaiting the unemployed youth. Their only aim is to earn maximum or superprofit. And they cannot opt for this scheme unless it can assure them superprofit. In the present stage of development of monopoly capitalism, including of course the State monopoly capitalism, these are laying the rock-bottom economic foundation of fascism. In order to bring about an allout fascism, you know, the Rajiv Gandhi Government has taken a comprehensive plan towards that end—reflected very much in the new National Policy on Education, which our party has correctly described as a blueprint of fascism. Comrade Ghosh showed that capitalism had become so much crisis-ridden that it could not but resort to fascism. Fascism here presents a kind of society where most of the people, illiterate and politically unconscious at that, are brought under the spell of a kind of thinking which has blended spiritualism, obscurantism, anti-science old prejudices with technological aspects of science. In our country which is itself a multi-lingual, multi-nationality and multi-racial one fascism by fanning up, fostering and fuelling all sorts of parochial, casteist, regional and separatist trends and tendencies has taken to the path of creating cleavage in and dissension among the people so that they cannot unite against injustice and oppression. This is a measure of how the common people are being entangled in fratricidal bloodbath on the one hand and all sorts of draconian Acts are being enacted, making these a plea, on the other. This is the prescription which the present ruling class of India has been following since some time past.

We should understand that the society today is divided into fundamentally two opposite classes centring round the fundamental contradiction between labour and capital. On the one side there are the vast multitude of people — workers, peasants, agricultural labourers, landless poor people and those belonging to lower middle and the middle class — and on the other there is a microscopic minority, the owners—the monopoly capitalists and the rural bour-

geoisie. So, whatever the intensity of flare-ups centring round division between caste, religion, etc. is there in the society — this division does not constitute the principal contradiction of the society. Be that as it may, the main point I like to bring home is the fact that in such a situation of impending danger of allout fascism our party has been attempting to forge a broadest possible unity of the Left, democratic and Opposition parties against the fascist menace on the one hand and taking to the path of mass movements on the burning problems of people's life complementary to the anti-capitalist socialist revolution on the other.

But the tragedy is this that parties like the CPI and the CPI(M), acting as the social democratic forces of compromise between labour and capital, are following, in the main, the footsteps of the Congress(I) — particularly after coming to power in some States and are toeing more or less the same line as of the Congress(I) in case of both foreign and domestic policies. They have engaged themselves in defending the interest of capitalism while waving red banner and mouthing all sorts of Marxist jargons and vocabularies. Clearly, these are not the criteria to ascertain whether a party under a signboard of communism, Marxism, etc. is really Marxist or not.

All of you must have noted that recently, from 28th June to 2nd July, the 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU had been held with much fanfare which adopted some resolutions and took decisions to be implemented very soon. Obviously, these decisions have not been taken overnight. In fact, the process is on since Mikhail Gorbachev came to power three years back. And starting from the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 27th Congress held in February 1988 and then other Plenary meetings in between and the latest the 19th Conference — all these cannot but give pointer to a single conclusion that the Gorbachev leadership has taken an allout planning in its bid to implement what they call *perestroika* (restructuring). The 19th Conference is, therefore, part and parcel of this overall planning. In this connection I like to inform you that the whole issue of *glasnost* (openness) and *perestroika* (restructuring) is at present under the consideration of our Central Committee along with the party as a whole. Only after a thorough consideration a comprehensive view will be published in due time. Even then, from what I have been able to study personally and through exchange in the Polit Bureau meeting in the meantime, I wish to give vent to my feelings on some of the important aspects subject to their endorsement in the Central Committee meeting.

One point has really struck me very much — rather perturbed my mind seriously. Since Gorbachev became the General Secretary of the CPSU and assumed the overall leadership of the party and the State — the capitalist-imperialist circles through-

(Contd. on page 4)

'New Revolution' of Gorbachev is nothing but a blueprint of

(Contd. from page 3)

out the world greeted this occasion most cheerfully and with full of glee. Because, they felt that the revisionist path which the Khrushchov leadership stepped into in the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 was going to be made broader still under the leadership of Gorbachev. You all know that it was only our party, led by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, which for the first time warned that the 20th Congress of the CPSU would open the "floodgate of revisionism" — although most of the communist parties of the world hailed the occasion as one to illumine the path. Analysing the approach of the Khrushchov leadership on the questions of war and peace, peaceful co-existence, peaceful transition to socialism, fighting Stalin in the name of fighting the 'cult of personality' and very many issues pertaining mostly to the economic measures taken in the name of boosting production as also the phenomenon of nuclear war-phobia — our party showed that the revisionist leadership of the CPSU had been deviating from the path of Marxism-Leninism and posing the main danger before the world communist movement. What this revisionist leadership practised did not conform to Marxism-Leninism and had nothing to do with it. Comrade Ghosh showed: "Stalin's understanding of Leninism is the correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism" and that to denigrate Stalin means "to uncrown Lenin himself". This is why both the Khrushchov and Gorbachev leadership felt the necessity of spreading canards against Stalin and maligning his image in their bid to spread all sorts of revisionist trash.

The point is not that Stalin could commit no wrong or that he was infallible — an idea absolutely alien to Marxism-Leninism. Marxism does not consider any leader — be it Stalin, Lenin or even Marx, who propounded this philosophy — as infallible, since it has nothing to do with science. Marxism is science, not a dogma. Marxism, in fact, is not what Marx had said or written. There are instances that an analysis or a theory propounded by Marx under a particular condition lost its validity in a changed situation. This is quite natural. So, I repeat, it is not Marxism what Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin or Mao Zedong said. It is a method of analysis, a way of approach, to be specific, the dialectical methodology with the help of which we are to know society, the hidden laws therein governing its development and arrive at truth on all issues appearing before us. To speak precisely, this is what is meant by Marxism.

Now, before coming to the most important question of the recent developments in the Soviet Union, I wish to remind you some teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh which he gave us when the question of whether the Soviet State already had become a dark fascist State as characterised by the Lin Biao leadership of the CPC came up before us in the background of usurpation of the leadership of the Soviet party and the State by the Khrushchovite revisionists. These teachings are very much

relevant today. On the question as to whether there had been restoration of capitalism in the USSR Comrade Ghosh clearly showed that in order to prove this contention you had to establish, and establish beyond any shade of doubt, that the economic system, production relation and the motive force of production in the Soviet Union had undergone a radical change and the socialist production relation and the motive force of production had been completely replaced by the capitalist production relation and capitalist motive force of production, thereby changing the entire economic base. Comrade Ghosh also showed that "...between 'attempts at restoration of capitalism' and 'capitalism being completely restored' there is a gulf of difference. To say that there have been many deviations does not mean that a thing has automatically been converted into its opposite."

It is true that if the revisionist leadership remains in power for long without any resistance, if the policies are followed, without relent, the danger of restoration of capitalism remains. But whether restoration of capitalism has already taken place needs to be critically examined and the necessary conclusions should be drawn by the yardstick of the nature of the motive force of production, production relation and the system of economy as a whole. No other symptom, no other change, should be considered a necessary and sufficient condition to decide whether a socialist system or a socialist State has degenerated into a capitalist system or a capitalist State.

The Central Committee of our party is already engaged in examining very critically in the light of the teachings of Comrade Ghosh all the questions one by one — whether the party reared and trained by Lenin and Stalin has already degenerated into a non-working class party and whether capitalism has been restored and the process of restoration of capitalism in the State structure has been completed. It also needs a thorough examination that since the advent and sway of revisionism in the superstructure how far it has been able to pollute the base — the economic, political and social system of the country. True, the capitalist-imperialists the world over are jubilant over these developments in the Soviet Union. It is also true that some among the social democratic forces have been swayed and some others confused over all this. But, for us, we are not in a hurry to conclude that the base has been polluted completely crossing the nodal point. It is incumbent on us to make an unbiased and correct assessment of the situation and take a comprehensive view integrating and correlating scientifically all the vital issues connected with it.

Our party never lagged behind in waging a relentless battle against revisionism, nor shall we falter in future in our struggle to face the reality — if it is proved beyond doubt historically that capitalism has already been restored. No genuine communist can avoid facing the reality, however stark that reality appears to be.

What I feel is this that the Gorbachev leadership is out to complete the cycle of revisionist measures in different fields initiated by the Khrushchov leadership since the 20th Congress of the CPSU. Although Mikhail Gorbachev has boastfully claimed his programme of *perestroika* as a kind of 'revolution through reform', but facts will reveal that this is a comprehensive plan to take the country towards counterrevolution. In the 19th Conference of the CPSU Mikhail Gorbachev has pleaded for, among others, "self-financing and self-management of enterprises", "promoting cooperative movements", "promoting diverse contractual and lease arrangements" in the collectives, overcoming "estrangement between farmer and soil" so that people become "true master of production" "pocketing high profit" and "change the relations of production" both in industry and agriculture. Mikhail Gorbachev has clearly spelt out, in the background of the crisis of the Soviet economy, that nothing should be produced in the Soviet Union if it does not bring profit. He has also said that the workers will get more financial benefit in case more and more profit is earned and has held out a veiled threat of retrenchment and even closure if no profit is forthcoming. This is why he has stressed profit-loss accounting as the most important ingredient of the Soviet economy.

It is known to all genuine communists that Lenin, after the socialist revolution in Russia, suggested at a particular stage, that the entire land should, in due course, be converted into State property i.e. public property in order to do away with the vestiges of old production relation and to keep the onward march of socialism intact. The genuine communists of the world know it very well that in the field of agriculture the process of transformation into socialism is to pass from individual farming to cooperative farming, from cooperative farming to collective farming, and from collective farming to State farming. This has been accepted by all. But what Mikhail Gorbachev is out to do is to revert the entire process, going against the teachings of Lenin, not to speak of Stalin. He has categorically declared that the Central Committee of the CPSU has decided to promote cooperatives which were practically absent for a long time. Over and above, the present leadership is encouraging even individual ownership of the means of production in the name of *Khozraschot* — self management and self financing — as a means to earn profit and provide material incentives and all that.

Anybody having an iota of knowledge about Marxism-Leninism can easily understand that the measures mentioned just now express not only an attempt to introduce profit as a motive force of production but also a production relation based on individual ownership or a kind of proprietorship both in industry and agriculture which is not only incompatible with but also a reversal of the socialist economy.

It is also known to all genuine communists that commodity production and commodity circulation do not necessarily

(Contd. on page 5)

counterrevolution in Russia

(Contd. from page 4)

mean capitalist economy. In a socialist society, too, law of value, commodity production and circulation, money circulation, etc., continue for a long time but the process is also to restrict operation of all this and gradually step into the system of product-exchange within the framework of socialist economy.

During Stalin's lifetime in the period after revolution, leaving aside how he rejuvenated the war-ravaged economy and placed it on a firm foundation—where there was no problem of stagnation, inflation, unemployment, shortage of food production and the like, which the present Soviet economy is suffering from — he was not only contemplating free distribution of bread to the Soviet citizens but had also gone much ahead in creating a surplus after meeting all the necessities of the Soviet people through abundance in production by what is known as a planned and centralised socialist economy. This planned socialist economy played an important role, being based on a clear theoretical foundation of the economic laws of socialism, not only to meet the challenge of the then society but also to hold sway over the entire economy and in leading the Soviet economy stage by stage in a planned way towards communism. This scientific socialist economic planning is now under attack in the name of doing away with “command and administer system”, as Mikhail Gorbachev has put it, which is fraught with the danger of striking at the very base of centralised socialist economic planning, loosening its grip day by day and encouraging in its place decentralisation and the features of individual economy if not further anarchy in production. This policy of economic decentralisation, self-management and self-financing had been introduced long ago in Yugoslavia — with what consequences is already known to the discerning people.

Consistent with these economic measures, Mikhail Gorbachev is hawking some ideas in the ideological field which are divorced from science and Marxism. For instance, the way Gorbachev has put the slogan of ‘socialist pluralism’ as a ‘new thinking’ smacks of a rotten idea as if ‘monism’ is synonymous with dogmatism. But may we ask if there is anything like plurality of truth? Any student of science knows that science has long ago rejected such trash. In science truth is always concrete and relative. It is concrete because there cannot be “so many” truths at the same time pertaining to any field. But this concrete truth does not mean that it is absolute. No, it is far from reality. In this changing world the concept of truth is concrete no doubt, but it is not absolute, hence it is relative. But Gorbachev, in an air of ultrademocracy, appreciated very much in the capitalist-imperialist circles, has said that we do not lay claim to “monopoly of opinion”. It is correct that communists should move with an open mind to take lesson from anybody, even from an enemy, to accept what is truth. But the moment the truth is accepted and

proved as truth, does it not become the duty of the communists to conduct struggle in order to establish that truth? May we ask Mikhail Gorbachev if he is ready to allow freedom to accept or reject *Perestroika* and forfeit his claim of ‘monopoly of truth’ with regard to *Perestroika*? Probably, he is not!

Another stock in trade of Gorbachev's ‘new thinking’ is ‘humane socialism’. May we ask if scientific socialism is inhuman in Gorbachev's consideration? From the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and other giant communist leaders of the world, scientific socialism means the unfolding of historical course of progress and development of humanity as a whole. Why does Gorbachev claim his ‘humane socialism’ as a ‘new thinking’? Yes, it is something new inasmuch as Gorbachev stands at the opposite pole of Lenin invoking his great name and is suggesting a path just opposite to that shown by Lenin and other Marxist authorities of the past. What else his ‘humane socialism’ stands for is difficult to understand.

His concept of *glasnost* (openness) or democracy echoes the tune of bourgeois democracy i.e. speaking of democracy in a class divided society in general without any reference to class. Lenin once warned — whoever speaks of democracy in general, liberty in general, equality or freedom in general without referring to freedom, equality, democracy, for which class against which other classes — is an wolf in sheep's clothing, is the worst enemy of the worker. We cannot also forget for a moment the invaluable teaching of Lenin that he is not a communist who believes in the existence of classes and class struggles but does not extend it to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin also warned that prevalence of small production engenders capitalism not only daily, hourly but also spontaneously, and on a mass scale. We consider all these Leninist teachings extremely valuable to understand whither the Gorbachev leadership is leading the Soviet Union to. It was also Lenin who observed that proletarian democracy was million times more democratic than any bourgeois democratic republic in the world. The accepted understanding of the basic difference between the nature and character of democracy in a bourgeois society vis-a-vis a proletarian democracy lies in the fact that whereas the former is the democracy for one per cent and dictatorship against ninety-nine per cent, the latter is a democracy for ninety-nine per cent and dictatorship against one per cent of the people. May we ask which one is more democratic? Now one point has not escaped our notice. Beneath the din and bustle of democracy and *glasnost* there is an attempt to uproot the opponents. See, how democratic is this *glasnost* of Gorbachev. At a meeting with the heads of the mass media, ideological institutions and artistic unions held on May 7, 1988, Mikhail Gorbachev said: “Our position is that ardent supporters of *perestroika* should be chosen as delegates”. Comrades, the cat is out of the bag! No comment is perhaps necessary.

Now let me take up another point. We have observed that both on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Soviet People's victory in the Great Patriotic War and on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution Mikhail Gorbachev uttered, though in a very guarded way, a few words about Stalin as if it was in recognition of Stalin's service to the country and the people. But how is it that Mikhail Gorbachev who mentioned the role of Stalin for correctly conducting the ideological battle against Trotsky, whom Lenin also had to fight against, the same Gorbachev has now decided to rehabilitate Trotsky posthumously? If anybody is really interested, not excluding Mikhail Gorbachev, to take lesson from history then who can deny the great role played by Stalin not only in giving a crushing defeat to the fascist Hitler and saving civilisation and mankind from peril but also rejuvenating the war-ravaged Soviet economy in a way something unprecedented within so short a period? If Lenin made the October Revolution successful, it was Stalin, who saved, defended and consolidated the nascent socialist State from all-out attack, intervention and encirclement and gave it a firm foundation. If Lenin's theory of the possibility of victory of socialism in a single country had in it the seed of the concept of “Peaceful Co-existence” of two social systems — it was Stalin who not only elaborated the concept but took a leading role in unleashing a militant peace movement throughout the world, and freed peace movement from pacifist illusion. It was Stalin's policy of peaceful coexistence which guided the peace movement in preventing a particular war for the preservation of particular peace. To the liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the revolutionary movements in the capitalist countries also Stalin was, in fact, a source of inspiration who always offered unstinted support and cooperation to these movements. Stalin's contribution in the theoretical field of Marxism in analysing the stage of revolution in the colonial countries, on the question of the problems of linguistics, in solving the nationality question, in providing the theoretical formulations of economic problems of socialism in the USSR, to mention only a few, has hardly any parallel after Lenin.

We cannot but note with pain one recent development in Russia. Everybody knows that Russia is a vast country with so many nationalities and ethnic groups. Communists all over the world know it very well how this sensitive problem was magnificently tackled by Stalin. In fact the problem was practically resolved, so to say. But recently, inter-ethnic fratricidal bloodbaths have taken such a turn that it had to be controlled with the help of the Army. Can there be any shadow of doubt that the seeds of revisionism which had been sown three decades ago in Russia has now given birth to a very big poison tree in the form of interethnic riots and fratricidal strifes of this dimension?

Now, we all know that it was Khrushchov who, in the 20th Congress of the CPSU, raised a hue and cry over “cult of personality” against Stalin for fighting

(Contd. on page 6)

Speech of Comrade Nihar Mukherjee

(Contd. from page 5)

Stalin the man, but not the cult. This time again we find Mikhail Gorbachev is all praise for the 20th Congress, calling it a "hallmark" and going a few steps further, is speaking of "omnipotence of Stalin" besides his "personality cult", holding him responsible for the present ills of the society and even virtually painting him as a demon, a leader of massive repression and all that. Whatever it is — how can Stalin be held responsible for the present ills of the Soviet society is really difficult to understand. When the fact is that since the 20th Congress the revisionist leadership of the CPSU, starting from Khrushchov to others followed a different line — different from that of Stalin — then which policy should be held responsible for the present crisis — the revolutionary line and policy of Stalin rejected since long in the USSR, or the revisionist line of Khrushchov more or less consistently followed since 1956? To be more specific, the origin of the problems of "budget deficit", "food shortage", "economic stagnation", "undermining the stability of roubles", "fall in growth rate", "inflation" or "price rise", "parasitism", "laziness", the problem of "unearned income", so on and so forth should be traced in the revisionist line followed in the Soviet Union for a long time which is mainly responsible for generating problems in the economy of the nature capitalism is suffering from and definitely not to "cult of personality" of Stalin. This is true in the economic sphere, but it is no less true in the field of morality and culture.

Now, if the main contention of Mikhail Gorbachev is to fight bureaucracy and all its concomitant evils then let alone the question of raising the ideological standard starting from the leaders to the cadres, and developing a spirit of submission of individual interest to the interest of the party and the society, we cannot forget for a moment that it is one thing to fight bureaucracy from the party and State apparatus, but it is an altogether different thing to create confusion in the mass mind, raising doubts and suspicion as to the future of Marxism-Leninism and the prospect of communism itself. This way of approach has nothing to do with Marxism, rather it is a great disservice to the cause of communism done by the present Gorbachev leadership, far excelling both in degree and dimension what Khrushchov had done. The Gorbachev leadership has suggested that there should be separation of power between the party and the State but the task to delimit their power is yet to be finalised. In this connection Mikhail Gorbachev has mentioned just in a manner of passing reference that the party is the advanced detachment. But in point of fact it is clear that the present revisionist leadership conceives that the era of dictatorship of the proletariat is over. This concept actually gave birth to the "theory" of the "State of the whole people" or the "party of the whole people" as was advanced by Khrushchov himself. Mikhail Gorbachev has simply echoed what Khrushchov had said

earlier. These protagonists of revisionism have forgotten the basic tenet of Marx himself that socialism is a transitional phase of dictatorship of the proletariat between capitalism and communism, where there would be abolition of classes, withering away of State and there would be no exploitation of man by man. Neither Marx nor even Lenin did visualise any stage of human civilisation of a "State of the whole people", as if something supra-class. Now as the theory of "State of the whole people" undermines the basic tenet of the dictatorship of the proletariat, so also the theory of "party of the whole people" strikes at the foundation of the concept of leading role of the party which it plays as the vanguard detachment of the class.

Mikhail Gorbachev might have thought that the proposal to delimit the power of the State and the party might be viewed in this way that things would be more democratic now and thenceforth the State would be free from day-to-day interference of the party which was supposed to be highly acclaimed in bourgeois circles on the one hand and was liable to create more confusion among the communists on the other.

But one point has struck us. If the present leadership is out to bring in this separation of power then how is it that in the same breath he has suggested in his speech at the 19th Conference that the "first Secretaries of Party Committees" should be nominated, as a rule, "to serve as chairman of the respective Soviets." Are not these two proposals contradictory? Or, should it be assumed that if this proposal is accepted then after having firm grip over the party from top to the bottom, which Mikhail Gorbachev is very much after, he will try to establish firmer grip over the State machinery and get his position more entrenched in the State administration? If so, although speaking so loudly against the so-called 'command and administer system' he will prove himself more than a supreme command!

Now something on the question of war and peace. The Gorbachev leadership is trying to make people believe that the present-day imperialism is something different from what it was up to the middle of 20th century. He implicitly suggests that a new approach is therefore necessary and to stick to Lenin's proposition will tantamount to a practice of dogmatism. Now, in asserting that the character of imperialism is changing, Gorbachev has tried to impress that as if imperialism is being less rabid and less predatory in character, less war-oriented and more amenable to reason in the present-day international situation. Lenin said the law of inevitability of war would remain valid so long as imperialism would exist. During his lifetime he had shown how the advanced imperialist countries took to the path of militarisation of economy. Now, after Lenin, what changes have taken place in the international field? Of all the newly liberated nationalist countries which were colonies previously, most of them, particularly the advanced

among them, having no other alternative are gradually opting for militarisation. Secondly, nobody can deny, not even Mikhail Gorbachev, how arms race is going on today without any respite. If anything new has taken place in the meantime, it is nothing but invention of nuclear energy and nuclear armaments of all sorts including those dangerous Star Wars devices. It is known to all that everything has a law at least, that is how the genuine communists should approach. The stockpiling of arms will go on beyond all proportions but the danger of war will diminish even then — it is a proposition which rejects the reality of the situation and is beyond any reasonable explanation. What change of character of capitalism-imperialism has undergone? Has capitalism-imperialism as a system lost its character of exploitation and oppression of man by man? Mikhail Gorbachev should answer this question straight. So far as our experience goes we have shown earlier that today with the advent of modern technology and attainment of monopoly, capitalism has become far more exploitative and oppressive. So if, at all, it is a change it is not for the better, but for the worse. Lenin once observed, if capitalism could develop agriculture, could raise the standard of living of the masses, who were everywhere still halfstarved and poverty-stricken, in spite of amazing technical progress (in the period of monopoly capitalism or imperialism, —Ed. P. Era.), then capitalism would not be capitalism. This observation of Lenin prompts me to suggest that if imperialism turns its face away from export of capital, from market, from utilising cheap labour power and raw material of the backward countries for earning superprofit, from redivision of the world and from its predatory activities then imperialism would no more be imperialism! Mikhail Gorbachev's 'new thinking' of imperialism has proved beyond doubt that either he does not understand the ABC of Marxism-Leninism or has been caught in the trap of nuclear blackmailing of the imperialists or both. He should better understand that modern wars do not break out at the individual whim of the statesmen, nor can wars be averted appealing to their conscience. Although nobody should undermine the threat of nuclear war to thwart which the best course is to lay stress on a militant peace movement side by side with bilateral talks and negotiations — but it should be clearly understood that if the imperialists reduced the whole world to ashes then wherefrom will they earn superprofits or how would they maintain hegemony? Clearly, Mikhail Gorbachev has confused because of his nuclear war phobia, the danger of a war, say, local or partial war, with the inevitability of nuclear war ruining the entire mankind and civilisation. These are all utopian, unrealistic and baseless.

Otherwise, how can he say: "We are all passengers aboard one ship the Earth, and we must not allow it to be wrecked." He continues: "This understanding (of peaceful co-existence — Ed) of a dialectical unity of opposites fits with the concept of peaceful coexistence". He has also prescribed not only peaceful coexistence of 2 social sys-

(Contd. on page 7)

(Contd from page 6)

tems but also peaceful coexistence of ideology—not ideological struggle but ideological competition, etc., etc. All this suggests that his concept of unity of opposites perhaps covers unity of opposite ideas, even antagonistic, the kind of which is preached by the protagonists of class collaboration against the theory of class struggle. So it is clear that Mikhail Gorbachev's theory very well elates the capitalist-imperialists and not the genuine communists. This distorted idea of unity of opposites, unity of contradictory ideas, might have worked behind the decision to open an office of the ISKCON (International Society for Krishna Consciousness) in Moscow throwing to the winds all elementary understanding and concepts of Dialectical Materialism, thereby opening up further danger of religious revivalism. The so-called open door policy has already nakedly opened the door for all sorts of putrid and decadent culture of the West, now it will be further mingled with the "opium" of the people to lull them to slumber. Comrades, I like to cite one more example. You know that socialism recognises not only dignity of labour but also equality of right between man and woman. Engels once observed that in a capitalist society the husband was the bourgeoisie and the wife the proletariat. This is only a candid expression of patriarchal oppression prevalent in a capitalist country. After the October Revolution the womenfolk of Russia was freed from this patriarchal bondage, too, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. Real equality of right between man and woman and dignity of womanhood are some important cornerstones of the socialist morality. But listen to what Mikhail Gorbachev in his book "Perestroika" has said: "This is why we are now holding debates... about the question of what you should do to make it possible for women to return to the womanly mission (emphasis added)". It simply reminds me of Hitler's advice to women: "Go back to kitchen and be a good mother."

But Comrades, I would ask you not to lose heart. It has come out in the press that among nearly 5000 delegates, more than 200 delegates opposed the line of the

leadership. It is not known what is their contention. But this much is sufficient to prove, that Mikhail Gorbachev could not take everything for granted. I am sure the Soviet people will not accept everything lying down and the voice of the opposition cannot be muzzled for ever. One point we have noted. Although Mikhail Gorbachev has lamented the absence of a two-party system in Russia and initially thought of introducing such a system but in all probability, apprehensive of being caught red-handed before the Soviet people for making room for the capitalists to conduct their political activity openly in the country, he might have abandoned this plan.

True, Mikhail Gorbachev is going to give a final shape to his plans at the 28th Congress which he has already suggested to be held shortly. He will try his best, very cleverly of course, to spread confusion about communism, create cleavage in the rank of the communists and malign the nobility of Marxism-Leninism. I repeat even then that there is a difference between an attempt to do something and something already done. Marxism teaches us that every thesis has an anti-thesis. So if the present Soviet leadership continues to tread the capitalist path the anti-thesis is sure to take its course. This is the lesson of history. Please do not forget that the communists are optimistic — conscious as they are of the historical destiny of human society. Comrades, this is a redeeming feature no doubt. You are to understand that those who have been able to grasp the science of Marxism-Leninism—Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's Thoughts are the forces to come forward to save the communist movement from the present rot. In conducting ideological struggle we cannot forget the teachings of Comrade Ghosh not to suffer from bias. Our attempt will be to raise the standard of the communist workers here and abroad by bringing truth to all of them. Please, remember, truth is invincible as invincible is the science of Marxism-Leninism, based as it is on truth.

Our appeal to all well-meaning people is: Please do not lose your heart or turn your face from this noble ideology of Marxism-Leninism simply looking at the face of the sham Marxists. The present

attack of revisionism is causing a serious setback no doubt, but as in the past, this time also the setback is bound to be temporary. You know, science is immortal, endowed with endless life. So undying also is the philosophy of Dialectical Materialism, the beacon light for the advancement of human society and civilisation. No force on earth can halt its onward march.

So in order to get rid of the present impasse it is very urgent to present a united face against the warmongers and the imperialists and build up militant worldwide peace movement on the basis of a united forum without wasting a moment's time while conducting at the same time a relentless ideological struggle to give a crushing defeat to the revisionists. Only this struggle, this approach can save the communists in the country and abroad from the prevailing confusion and can help even those who are engaged in the struggle to defend the nobility of Marxism-Leninism in the Soviet Union itself. Please remember, it is not the bourgeoisie or their hirelings the revisionists, who tell the last word. It is the people — organised, conscious and imbued with a great ideal—who determine the destiny of society, civilisation and mankind. Our party is committed to continuing our appeal to the world communists to forge a united platform on a common ground of fight against imperialism and war. We will not cease in this attempt. The irresistible might of communism holding high the banner of proletarian Internationalism must be advanced to its goal. History has entrusted us with this task.

On the national plane, too, the dark cloud of fascism is looming large over the horizon. We appeal to all Left, democratic and Opposition parties to unite and fight this fascist menace on the basis of a common minimum programme and a code of conduct. On this day of 5th August while we pay tribute to our great departed leader, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh let all of us take this pledge to be equal to the task.

LONG LIVE
COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH
LONG LIVE REVOLUTION
LONG LIVE SUCI

Call of 5th August

(Contd. from page 1)

BIHAR

Com. Shibdas Ghosh Memorial Day was observed by the Bihar State Committee at Srikrishna Memorial Hall in Patna. The meeting was presided over by Comrade Amriteswar Chakraborty, Secretary, Bihar State Committee of the SUCI. Comrade Shankar Singh, Member, Central Committee of the SUCI, was present as the main speaker.

Volunteers in uniform of the AIDSO, Bihar Unit, presented a guard of honour to the beloved departed leader before the commencement of the meeting. The meeting started with the song on the Great Leader of the Proletariat.

Com. Shankar Singh started his long analytical speech, emphasising that observance of Com. Shibdas Ghosh Memorial Day was not a ritualistic affair for us. 'On this day, on the other hand,

we learn and re-learn the invaluable teachings from the life of the great leader.'

Referring to the present developments in the CPSU and the CPC, Comrade Shankar Singh observed painfully that these parties, being victims of neo-revisionism, had been vitiating the ideological foundation of the proletarian movement and of late engaged themselves in smashing the socialist construction with all its spectacular achievements, in their own lands. With pain and anguish Comrade Singh continued, "...without defeating this neo-revi-

sionist trend and onslaught on socialism, revolution cannot thrive." He appealed to the huge gathering to carry forward with the thoughts of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the living symbol of revolution, and organise the masses under the revolutionary banner of the SUCI.

With the Internationale sung the meeting came to an end.

RAJASTHAN

A large public meeting was held in Jaipur on 13th August with Com. Girijeswar, Rajasthan

State party organiser, presiding over the meeting. Com. Pritish Chanda, Member of the Central Committee, was the main speaker.

Com. Chanda explained how from the experience he gained through participation in the freedom movement Comrade Ghosh realized later the urgent need to build up a genuine Communist party on the Indian soil and thus built up the SUCI, the vanguard detachment of the Indian proletariat, brick by brick starting with only a handful of compatriots.

(Contd. on page 8)

Call of 5th August

(Contd. from page 7)

Turning to the national situation, Comrade Chanda explained the grand design of the ruling party in leaving the Punjab problem unresolved for such a prolonged period and exposed the myth of the so-called "terrorists" and demanded a political solution to the problem.

Analysing critically the recent dangerous role of modern revisionism in the international Communist movement in general and in the USSR in particular, Com. Chanda said that it was Comrade Ghosh who first sounded back in the late forties about the shortcomings and drawbacks of the international communist movement. Today incidents and developments particularly in the USSR bore out the full corroboration of his warning.

DELHI

At a public meeting held to commemorate the 12th anniversary of the passing away of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the great leader of the proletariat, Comrade Gian Singh, Secretary of the Haryana State Committee, presided while Comrade Ashutosh Banerjee, Member, Central Committee, addressed as the main speaker. A message of solidarity from the Iranian Students Association (Supporters of Iranian People Fedain Guerrillas (Minority) was read out in the meeting.

In his analytical speech Com. Banerjee inter alia observed, "Thought is a by-product of the life-long class-battles waged by the thinker. That is why, thought and thinker are intertwined. For our onward march, it is very necessary to cultivate the life-long class struggles conducted by the thinker — our leader, teacher, and guide Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. At the same time, our beloved departed leader and teacher taught us that however powerful a 'thought' might be, it would be sterile if it was not applied continuously to under-

stand and resolve the contemporary economic-political - social - moral-cultural problems of life and society."

Analysing the prevailing situation in the international communist movement, Comrade Banerjee said: "The SUCI holds the opinion that the 'revisionist leadership of CPSU' is guilty of following a policy of so-called revolution through conspiratorial means of 'coup' supported by foreign intervention, if necessary. And our party has shown unmistakably how this erroneous and anti-Marxist concept of having revolution through intervention, conspiracy and coup has given birth to this phenomenon of

READ

SUCI PARTY CONGRESS

DOCUMENTS :

Constitution	Rs. 2.00
Theses on International and National Situation	Rs. 4.00
Political-Organisational Report	Rs. 5.00

'hegemonism', and carving out anyhow the sphere of influence has become part and parcel of the foreign policy of the USSR. Com. Banerjee hoped that withdrawal of Soviet interventionist army from Afghanistan would help development of the natural social process under the leadership of the Afghan working class and they would be able to thwart successfully the US-imperialist machinations to put the 'fundamentalist' clique to power in Afghanistan.

HARYANA

Com. Shibdas Ghosh Memorial meeting was held at Rohtak on 7th August in Kaath Ki Mandi Dharmasala. The meeting was presided over by Comrade Gian Singh. Com. Ashutosh Banerjee, Member, Central Committee of the party, was present as the main speaker.

In an hour-long analytical speech touching on the present national and international situation, Comrade Banerjee dwelt in the main on the recent dangerous developments in the USSR. "The most alarming trend that has of late emerged in the USSR is the acceleration of the revisionist process there boosted by the 19th All Union Party Conference of the CPSU as a result of which the commanding role of the Communist Party is being negated and is being reduced to the position of an adviser. The State organs are being strengthened thereby, creating a positive obstruction for the withering away of the State which can only be done under the leadership of the Communist Party.

Pointing to the danger of allout fascism in the country, Comrade Banerjee stressed that it required of the working people to build up unity of all left democratic and opposition parties and forces for which the SUCI had all along striving.

KERALA

A big procession of party workers, supporters, sympathisers and toiling masses converged at Chinnakkada, the venue of meeting.

Com. A Jalaluddin, member, State Committee of the SUCI, was in the chair. Com. G. K. Lucose, State Secretary of the party, pointed out how the CPI(M)-led United Democratic Front was assaulting the SUCI comrades in various parts of the State to foil sustained movements organised by the party against the anti-people policies of both the Central and the State Governments.

Comrade Sukomal Dasgupta, Member, Central Committee, was the main speaker and in his long penetrating speech he said that Comrade Ghosh had taught us to learn ~~MARXISM-LENINISM~~ from those who were trying seriously to apply it in their own life and not from the pedants because Marxism was not a dogma but a guide to ac-

Central Committee on Earthquake and Flood Situation

The Central Committee of our party on 22nd August, '88 expressed its deep shock and profound grief for those killed and sympathy for the bereaved and the injured in the devastating earthquake of Bihar and called upon the people of the country to stand by the suffering humanity by extending every sort of help within their capacity.

The Central Committee also urged the Central Government and the State Government of Bihar to leave no stone unturned to do the needful at this hour of distress including giving adequate compensation to the families affected by this natural calamity.

The Central Committee has instructed all the party units to plunge in to collect money and materials in all States and rush relief materials to the quake-affected areas.

The Central Committee also expresses its sympathy for the people of Nepal affected by this earthquake.

* * *

The Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Centre of India expresses grave concern over the devastating flood that is raging Assam, Arunachal, West Bengal, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. The Central Committee expresses deep anguish over the report of inadequate relief and rescue operation and urges upon both the Central and the concerned State Governments to take them up on war-footing. The Central Committee, also has demanded long-term and effective measures against flood.

The Central Committee urges upon the State Governments to take help and cooperation of all the political parties in this regard, form all-party relief committees and distribute relief materials through them. The Central Committee instructs all the units of the party to collect relief materials for the flood affected people and send them straight to the respective areas.

tion inasmuch as it had to be applied creatively in one's life to change the very goal and mission of life.

Comrade Dasgupta pointed out how the ruling capitalist class was engaged in mounting fascist onslaughts on the people, one after another. In such a situation the need of the hour was to build up struggling unity of all Opposition parties to fight the onslaughts of the Congress(I) Government led by Rajiv Gandhi.

GUJARAT

The Gujarat Unit of the party organised a public meeting to pay homage to the great departed leader, teacher

and guide, Com. Shibdas Ghosh, on 12th August at Gujarat Sahitya Parishad Hall in Ahmedabad. Com. Vismay Shah was in the chair while Com. Krishna Chakraborty, Member, Central Committee, delivered the main speech. Paying homage to the most beloved departed leader Comrade Chakraborty explained how the thoughts of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh were acting today as the beacon light to the Indian proletariat.

For want of space all the news on 5th August could not be published. We shall try to accommodate these in the next issue. —Ed. P. Era.

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