

Just cause of the employees stabbed in the back

In the sordid act of calling off the four-day-old nationwide Telecom Employees' Strike against the entry of private capital and multinationals in the industry, the working millions of the country witnessed with much pain and anguish, a forced and tragic end of a strike which had enormous possibilities and potentialities to usher in a chain of struggles which the country's trade union movement currently afflicted with asphyxia, was aspiring for long. But unfortunately it was not allowed to proceed ahead even though the striking workers were determined to carry it forward. It is not that the illegal-declared strike was fizzling out as was claimed by the Minister of Telecommunications, Mr Sukh Ram on 22nd June evening. On the contrary, on the very day, even after the army takeover of all telephone exchanges, military deployments at large at various stations and issuance of order of termination of service to be effected if the strikers did not report for duty within 24-hours and notwithstanding leadership's reported hesitation to continue the strike, the striking employees were found more determined, united and unscared. *The Economic Times*, Calcutta dated the 23rd June, 1995, while informing strike situation as it was on 22nd evening, reported with reference to Mr Sukh Ram's claim, "This was, however, contradicted by a status report prepared by the DoT (Department of Telecommunications) at 1700 hours which said that 70 per cent of employees reported absent in eight DoT circles all over the country." This was the situation even after the Supreme Court overturned the stay granted by the Kohima Bench of Guwahati High Court on the opening of tenders from private sector firms to set up telephone services in the country and thus permitted the Government of India to open the tenders. Following the Apex Court's decision, it was opined by some quarters that the same had

shattered the very basis of the movement and upheld the government's policy of privatization against which the strikers were up in arms. Though this interpretation was legally untenable and the judgement had no adverse legal bearing on the ongoing strike, such interpretation was enough to create confusions in the rank and file and inflict a psychological setback in the strikers. But the report suggested that this did not happen as expected by many. The strikers refused to give in. On the other side, the strike was gradually picking up support and solidarity of various segments of the working people of the country. Its dimension was expanding. The day the Army was deployed to terrorise the strikers and order of termination of service was issued, the National Federation of Postal Employees called upon its six lakh employees to stand by the struggling telecom workers and resort to a two-hour sit-in, pendown strike from 11 a.m. on June, 26. Other sections of the employees were also coming forward. In reality, the Telecommunication Ministry and the Government of India, despite various oppressive measures against the strikers, miserably failed to crush the strike.

That the employees and workers were determined to continue the movement was the most important and encouraging aspect of the telecom workers' strike. More so, because it was a movement not on some economic demands, but against the policy of privatization of service sector, which, if not resisted, will do harm not only to the lakhs of public sector employees and workers and their families, but to the vast masses of the people also. If privatization is allowed, the employment potential will be further squeezed affecting the jobless millions of our country. If private operators — be it Indian or foreign — are allowed in the telecom service, they will, on the plea of giving better service, go on increasing the service charges affecting the middle and low

Proletarian Era

Organ of SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA
Founder Editor-in-Chief:
COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

Vol. 28 No. 17

July 7, 1995

Price Rs. 2.00

Air Surcharge 0.5 p.

income telecom subscribers of our country. By this telephone would become an exclusive privilege of only the rich people. Thus, if viewed in proper perspective, the telecom workers' battle was not a simple trade union movement of a particular section of employees, it carried the elements of a people's movement against the disastrous policy of the government. The movement was also the first of its kind since the initiation of new industrial policy by the Government of India. The struggling telecom employees were also set to become the pioneer in the anti-privatization movement in India. But all these possibilities and potentialities were frustrated by the compromising leaderships.

With the overwhelming support and participation of the employees when it was the time to gear up the strike to strengthen the resistance battle further, by motivating the employees of other public sector industries which were also threatened with privatization, all the morning dailies of 23rd June reported that the leaders of the striking federations had resolved their differences to end the strike and the same was likely to be called off the very day. It appears that when more than four lakhs of strikers spread

(Contd. on page 5)

FALL OF MULAYAM SINGH GOVT IN UP

Real face of 'moralist' BJP nakedly exposed

Once again a drama enacted in the Uttar Pradesh Assembly has further eroded the credibility of Indian parliamentary system. The Mulayam Singh government in UP was dismissed by passing the Assembly and in its place the minority Mayawati government of BSP was installed with the backing of the BJP flouting all democratic norms. The horse-trading of MLAs engineered by the BJP in this sordid game of bringing to power a government at its beck and call has nakedly exposed its out and out opportunist and unscrupulous character.

The way the Mulayam Singh government was dismissed without allowing it any scope of proving its majority on the floor of Assembly is no doubt beyond all democratic norms. The later events of intervention in the domain of Speaker of the UP Assembly, appointing a person as presiding officer to conduct the proceedings of the House after the Speaker left the Assembly adjourning it, and election of a new Speaker the following day — all this has raised questions among the Constitution experts.

Though this sordid role of the BJP could not surface much due to the above turmoil, even then to come out of its cornered position at present in Uttar Pradesh, the most vital state in the Hindi belt, the way the BJP has caught hold of the rein

of administration in Mayawati's proxy has in reality nothing to do with morality or value-based politics.

In India the Congress was the main architect in the game of dismissing and installing governments to suit its purpose. Engineering defections in the ranks of its opponent government and thereby installing some persons of its choice for some time to facilitate its comeback to power has been the nasty parliamentary game of the Congress(I) as experienced from time to time in different states as well as at the Centre. All anti-Congress(I) parties including the BJP too condemned branding these as immoral acts. Though the BJP claims that they are against this unprincipled and immoral acts and instead they practise 'clean value-based politics', their activity and role in Uttar Pradesh has virtually laid bare this hoax.

What role the BJP played in UP? According to newspaper reports Lalji Tandon, the state leader of the Uttar Pradesh BJP, for a long period had been holding secret parlance with Mayawati and her ilk. After the talk progressed a little, Mr. Murli Monohar Joshi, on behalf of the central leadership of the BJP, started taking part in the discussion. What was their object of discussion with the BJP? The object was nothing but to break the SP-BSP combine and to kindle the aspiration

of Kanshiram so that the BSP deserts the combine.

In its national executive meeting in Goa, the BJP formally decided to help form a government in UP by supporting the BSP from outside. This decision prompted the BSP to withdraw support from the Mulayam Singh government. The BJP not only instigated the BSP in order to fish in the troubled waters it even attempted to divide Mulayam Singh's party too by luring its MLAs with the bait of ministership. (Source : *Ananda Bazar Patrika*, 2 & 3 June, 1995) In the words of Mr. L. K. Advani : 'Any method suitable to destabilise the Mulayam government is acceptable to us'. (Ibid) In reply to a question of the journalists as to why the BJP's support to the BSP be termed as opportunism, what Mr. Joshi had said was very significant. He said: 'Let's leave philosophy aside for the time being' (*The Statesman*, 5. 6. 95). After all this it needs no explanation to understand that their 'value-based politics' is nothing but a hollow slogan to deceive the people and has no relation with the reality.

What made the BJP declare a crusade against Mulayam Singh government? As per BJP's version the Mulayam Singh government has brought down oppression in different forms on

(Contd. on page 8)

Victory Over Fascism And Role Of Comrade J. V. Stalin

(The concluding part)

Few of Stalin's actions have evoked a greater storm, condemnation or criticism and caused more confusion than the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop or Non-Aggression Pact. Of course, there is nothing to be surprised about the outrage felt by the imperialists, especially the British ruling clique under Chamberlain. For, the latter had tried to secretly negotiate with Hitler another, a second Munich Accord. Chamberlain was ready to sell out Poland too in the belief and hope that this would direct Hitler's aggression to the Soviet Union while they would go scot free and Hitler on his part, desperate to foil an alliance directed against his aggression, kept up the pretence of talks. So, when Hitler's western backers especially in London found that the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact had frustrated all their plans, their fury knew no bounds. Yet so eager was Stalin to forge an alliance with France and Britain that even after he had been forced to conclude that it proved impossible, he still left the door open. On the one hand, after Stalin decided to respond to Hitler's overtures and to accept a Non-Aggression Treaty which Hitler offered for his own exigency, he gave the Anglo-French ruling clique one last chance to make up their minds, by officially announcing Ribbentrop's arrival in Moscow for talks two days in advance, with only four days to go before Hitler's planned attack on Poland. But still the former did not react, and on the same day that Ribbentrop, the German Foreign Minister, arrived negotiations were held and the Soviet-German Treaty of non-aggression was signed. The treaty contained provisions on non-aggression and the refusal to render assistance to a power that had attacked one of the contracting parties. On the other hand, even after concluding the pact, Molotov conveyed the Soviet readiness to continue negotiations for an alliance with France and Britain, holding that it did not stand in any way in contradiction with the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. Yet, though the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs after examining its legal implications found this to be true, the forces opposing it proved too strong.

Some people while criticizing this non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany opined that it didn't even hold any military advantages for the Soviet Union, but on the other hand was a compromise in the eye of public opinion. They held that without the pact the Soviet Union might have enjoyed peace for a longer time, or even if Hitler attacked at that time, she could have defeated Nazi Germany more easily before the latter had had time to acquire the terrible military and economic might that

fed on the power of vanquished countries. But to argue in such a way is to miss the main question, to start from a wrong premise that failed to take the world alignment of forces into account. Crisis had been galloping in the capitalist-imperialist world; the Great Depression of the early thirties shook its economic foundation and fascism was on the rise. Apart from the capitalist-socialist contradiction, the imperialist-imperialist contradiction assumed the major role in deciding the world events, tilting the balance towards another imperialist war. Clearly, in the imperialist camp, the rising fascist power backed up by the imperialists was the greater evil to socialism and mankind as a whole. But all Stalin's efforts for an alliance with the Anglo-French powers against the fascist German power failed because it was the design of the Anglo-French powers to aid and abet Hitler against socialist Soviet Union. So, the question that confronted Stalin was not one of the USSR versus Hitler or Nazi Germany alone, but the threat of a possible line-up of fascist forces both East and West aided and abetted by the entire capitalist-imperialist camp. And in a situation where Nazi stakes for the Ukraine with its fertile plains (the granary of the USSR), the Baltic and Balkan states were well known, with Soviet Russia's neighbouring countries such as Finland and Rumania tilting in Hitler's favour, Poland hostile and in danger of falling into German hands as Czechoslovakia did, and with the role which the Anglo-French ruling clique, treacherous even to its allies and desirous to find Bolshevik Russia vanquished, played at that time, this was no idle threat. All the more so, in view of the fierce fighting on the Soviet Union's eastern border where she was repulsing Japanese aggression against Mongolia preventing her from crossing the border and seizing portions of her far-east (Siberia). In such a precarious position

when the USSR was virtually in isolation at the state level, Stalin, clearly guided by the first and foremost duty of saving the only socialist state from destruction and safeguarding world revolution, handled the situation superbly considering the circumstances, by driving a wedge between Hitler and his western imperialist backers, on the one hand as mentioned before. On the other, the non-aggression pact, standing in contradiction with the anti-Comintern Pact, caused deep consternation among the fascist forces that rankled a long time. It was a setback for the military and fascist forces in Japan which had counted on help from Nazi Germany to carry out their aggressive designs on Siberia. Moreover, Hitler's well documented promise to Stalin that he would exercise pressure on the Japanese

and persuade them to adopt a different attitude towards Russia, a condition Stalin had made for entering into a Non-Aggression Pact, worked. And ultimately Japan gave up its aggressive designs and entered into a Non-Aggression Pact with Soviet Russia. Peace on her eastern border was safeguarded. While the world stood on the brink of a new world war, now the balance of forces had changed in the Soviet Union's favour.

Partition of Poland — inevitable outcome of failure to forge Anglo-French-Soviet alliance

Though tension for the Soviet Russia had ceased somewhat with the signing of the Non-Aggression Pact, Stalin realized of course that Hitler was going to attack the USSR sooner or later. The question was how long could he protect the first socialist state and the Soviet people from this terrible ordeal and how well could he prepare for it, politically and militarily. His subsequent policies as regards Poland, the Baltic states and Finland, taken with this aim in view, had been the object of most vicious vilification campaign by the imperialists and their stooges besides the confused people who had accused Stalin of grabbing the Baltic states and dividing Poland for narrow national interest. Before dealing with these issues we have to keep one thing in mind. In the Soviet Union, heavy industries and major defence industries along with important raw materials were concentrated near its borders with Poland, the Baltic states and Finland. That is why the question of relation with these countries was of vital importance to Soviet Russia, involving vital aspects of her defence against Nazi invasion. And the fall of these countries into the hands of the Nazis would have had disastrous consequences. When the desired alliance with France and Britain did not come off, and in view of Hitler's attitude towards Poland, Stalin realized that a new partition of Poland had become inevitable. For, just as anticipated and true to their colours the Anglo-French imperialists did not honour their guarantee to Poland. When Hitler attacked Poland, after a delay of a few days, on September 1, they did not come to its rescue. The Anglo-French ruling clique, after some initial hesitation, merely declared war on Germany and then sat back behind the Maginot defence line, the very response that Hitler had gambled on, for even at that time he did not yet possess enough military strength to successfully wage war on two fronts.

Of Stalin's genuine desire to protect the independence of the neighbouring

(Contd. on page 3)

CAUSE OF DELAYED OPENING OF SECOND FRONT

Imperialists wanted the whole brunt of Nazi onslaught be borne by the USSR

(Contd. from page 2)

countries acting as so-called buffers between the USSR and Germany, even German and French diplomats were convinced, as shown before. And it was only when this had proved impossible by the actions of the capitalist-imperialists and fascists that he had to accept the idea of partition of Poland solely for the necessity of Soviet security. Here it may be pertinent to mention that the way the imperialists view the question of 'buffer' is not one and the same as the way the true socialists do. Rather their attitude and approach are diametrically opposed. A capitalist state at one time wants to retain a buffer against aggression of another capitalist country, while at another it itself, driven by the economic law of capitalism, becomes the aggressor intent on penetrating or destroying the same. Whereas socialism stands for the interest of the majority of the people. It does not suffer from the aggressive economic compulsions of capitalism — which in fascism are manifested in its most extreme and naked form — and wants a buffer merely for its protection, and views the same for the protection of people's interest. So, when the Soviet troops moved into eastern Poland, mostly the territory that Poland had grabbed from the young Soviet state in its hour of greatest weakness — it was not a narrow national interest that motivated Stalin to this action, but the interest of the people, the people of the Soviet Union as well as the people in eastern Poland, mostly Ukrainians and Byelorussians, who had been subjugated to even worse than the Polish people by the ruling class and for whose fate at the hands of the invading Nazis he was deeply apprehensive. That is why we find that the people in Poland actually welcomed the Soviet troops with joy — a fact borne out by the negligible casualty to the Red Army, while it took the strategic town of Vilna at night. It was a move by Stalin that was superbly timed; just a few hours after the Polish government had become non-functional, as the ruling clique had fled the country and abandoned its people to the terror of Nazi occupation, and just before Hitler had timed to capture the strategic towns of Vilna and Lvov. Thus it effectively prevented the Nazis from moving into Rumania in the south and the Baltic states in the north, providing a check on Hitler's further advance, which the latter resented bitterly, but could do nothing about. This is also corroborated by the happenings in Rumania, where Premier Calinescu was assassinated. But the wide uprisings that had reportedly been planned by the Iron Guard to coincide with German advance did not materialise, except in one border town. And that, too, fizzled out when the Soviet troops were

spotted across the border. Hailing the Soviet role, Winston Churchill said in a radio broadcast on October 1, "The Soviets have stopped the Nazis in eastern Poland; I only wish they were doing it as our allies." Thus, facts of history clearly refute the accusation by the imperialists especially by the US ruling clique that Stalin cynically collaborated with Hitler in a division of Poland. Even Chamberlain was forced to admit to the House of Commons on October 26, "It has been necessary for the Red Army to occupy part of Poland as protection against Germany." Three times the boundary changed between Germany and the USSR till the border line was fixed at a conference on September 28. Had they agreed on a division beforehand in a secret protocol, as alleged by imperialist propaganda, there would have been no need for this.

As to the accusation, mentioned before, that Stalin had been activated by narrow national interests, to consolidate his personal power — were this true, then why did Stalin, after Soviet troops had effectively helped the resistance forces in Poland in the liberation of the country from the Nazi occupation, hand over the country to the Polish people? The truth is that Stalin was guided in his actions by the Marxist-Leninist principles laid down by Lenin himself on the Right of Nations to Self-determination. It must be borne in mind that Lenin had all along, while Poland had still been under the czarist rule, consistently taken the stand that the Polish people constituted a distinct nationality and had the right to self-determination, the right to secede from the Soviet Russia. The same applied to the Baltic states, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, as well as Finland.

The Question of War with Finland

Finland, too, had originally been part of the czarist empire. After the Kerensky government had come to power it turned down Finnish requests for independence. But Lenin, after the Bolsheviks came to power, granted its request. Stalin, too, in his capacity as the then Commissar of Nationalities on his part had recommended the same. And yet, despite these, Finland, on the eve of the Second World War, proved to be a most hostile neighbour. Actually, by then the early democratic government had been overthrown by force and socialist forces were suppressed by Baron Mannerheim, an ex-czarist General, with the help of Germans, i.e., the Kaiser's troops, and subsequently Finland had become a base for international reaction against the Soviet Union. And that was all the more the reason why Stalin tried to negotiate a territorial adjustment with Finland, so as to secure the defence of Leningrad that was situated a mere twenty miles from the

Finnish border. Leningrad was a most vital naval and industrial centre, not to speak of the raw materials in that area, and it could be easily shelled from across the Finnish border. Yet unfortunately the mere invitation for talks by the Soviet Union induced an immediate mobilisation of troops by Mannerheim in response. Despite this, Stalin offered an exchange of territory to protect Leningrad. In return for moving the Finnish border back by a few dozen kilometers which area was unpopulated or only sparsely populated — and for a naval base, to be leased for thirty years, Stalin offered an area twice that size. After a month of negotiation, the Soviet Union even offered thrice the size of the area in a territorial exchange and lease of Hangoe naval base, not for thirty years but only during the Anglo-German war and to be returned to Finland thereafter, fully equipped. Alexander Werth, in his book *Russia At War, 1941-1945*, says: "In 1945, Paasikivi and Kekkonen, both future presidents of Finland, who had favoured accommodation with the Russians, told me that they had considered the Russian proposals moderate and understandable, and maintained that the war could have been avoided had their policy prevailed." (p. 84)

Anna Louise Strong, who as founder and editor of *Moscow News* was intimately acquainted with conditions there at that time, wrote: "Many Finns were boasting of the 'smart bargain' their diplomats were getting. Then, suddenly, the Finnish negotiators broke off discussions with the cryptic remark that circumstances would decide when and by whom they would be renewed. The *N.Y. Times* reported that 'diplomatic quarters in Washington' thought the Finns were influenced by hope of loans from the USA. Since the Finnish Parliament had not even been summoned, Moscow took it as clear that the Finnish cabinet acted on secret pressures from those forces in the West that wanted to 'switch the war'. (*The Stalin Era*, pp. 81-82)

Finally, after several provocative border incidents when Finnish troops shot Red Army men, Soviet Russia declared war on Finland. After three months' of war, Finland sued for peace on March 4. A few days later the peace treaty was signed in Moscow, despite all efforts by Britain and France to prevent the same and turn the war against Russia. Little wonder that the imperialists who sought in the Finnish war an opportunity and pretext to strike at Soviet Russia, raised a hue and cry over Soviet 'aggression', etc., to turn public opinion against the Bolshevik state. It was a war, though, that Stalin was not proud of, even if it proved unavoidable for the Soviet Union's security.

(Contd. on page 4)

The Soviet people & Red Army under Stalin saved human civilization from Nazi slavery

(Contd. from page 3)

The peace terms, though harsher than the terms originally offered by the USSR, were mild. The Soviet Union got the Mannerheim defence line and the naval base at Hangoe, protecting both land and sea approaches to Leningrad. On the other hand, it returned Petsamo and its nickel mines, and demanded no indemnities, rather it agreed to send food supplies to a starving Finland." Since by March 5, the Red Army could easily have occupied Helsinki and other parts of Finland, the Finns may be said to have been let off lightly ..." comments Alexander Werth (*Russia at War, 1941-45*, p.93) while tracing the events of those days.

Stalin's Policy in the Baltic States

Just as Finland occupied an important strategic position for invasion of Russia on the north, so also the Baltic states, because of their strategic positions, were highways for invasion, providing excellent positions for attack on Russia. Hence the question of their strong defence capacity against Nazi aggression was of vital importance for the security of the USSR. When Stalin proposed a military alliance to Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, all agreed and signed such an alliance. Surely, they had convinced themselves about Stalin's true intention, if there was any need for that, after Stalin had restored Vilna to Lithuania, once her capital and which the Poles had seized twenty years earlier in defiance of the League of Nations. Surprisingly or perhaps rather not, this fact is never mentioned in imperialist propaganda, who are never tired of speaking of Russian coercion on the Baltic states.

The ease and swiftness with which Hitler had overrun one country after another in a series of blitzkriegs, starting in April 1940 with Denmark, Norway, followed by Belgium and Luxembourg and finally France, whose defence crumbled within only a fortnight, despite the fact that it commanded a modern and most well-equipped army, greatly alarmed Stalin. And in view of the increasingly disturbed conditions in Europe he asked for the right to send more troops to the small Baltic states to further strengthen their defence. Accordingly, he dispatched a considerable force of Red Army troops. As the Red Army troops marched into Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania whose governments had been somewhat pro-fascist dictatorships, the pro-Nazi officials fled. "Stalin beat Hitler into the Baltic by about twenty-four hours", said a correspondent in Vilna. Most Lithuanians I met agreed.", writes Anna Louise Strong, "I had the luck to be passing through from Berlin to Moscow. Learning what was happening in Lithuania, I remained and saw the amazing picture of a take-cover from within. It was very constitutional and very happy. When the pro-German president fled, this brought the Vice-President to power. He appointed a new premier and then resigned. This brought to power Justas Paletskis, a progressive journalist. Political prisoners were let out of jails; trade unions began to organize freely; all kinds of organizations came alive. Day and night, the singing did not cease in the streets of Kaunas, the capital. New elections were held for a 'People's government'. There was a tremendous turn-out to vote. The new Assembly met, declared Lithuania a Soviet republic, and applied for admission to the USSR. All this time, the jubilant workers and farmers, glad of the collapse of the

pro-Nazi dictatorship, thought they were only expressing their own desire. The Red Army did not mix in the politics, except as it exchanged Balls and theatrical performances with the Lithuanian army, on a basis of fraternal equality.

"On July 21, 1940, Lithuania applied for admission to the USSR. I went with their delegation by special train to Moscow; it was greeted by garlands and delegations along the way ..."

Thus, Stalin's actions and wise statesmanship enabled the people of Baltic states to freely exercise their will and choice. But the so-called votaries of democracy cried foul, because their ideas of democracy are so fundamentally opposed to it. What is their idea may be best illustrated in this context, if we take for example the elections they helped to conduct in Italy under their supervision or in Greece, both of which under British sphere of influence towards the end of the Second World War. Thus in Greece when the British troops landed after Hitler pulled out in September, 1944: "It became clear, late in 1944, that a 90% British responsibility in the area might be interpreted as the right to impose a government against the clearly expressed wishes of a nation; to reimpose a royalist regime whose army had proved hostile to its claims, and whose people, *The Times* was later to report, were four-fifths against the king's return. The British authorities ordered the disbandment of ELAS, the military wing of the anti-fascist popular movement EAM, which, Anthony Eden admitted, controlled seventyfive per cent of the resistance forces, declined to punish quislings and collaborators, and reformed

(Contd. on page 4)



Victory Parade at Red Square, Moscow on 24th June 1945. The Nazi flags are being thrown at the foot of the Lenin Mausoleum.

Telecom employees have to establish genuine working class leadership to achieve victory

(Contd. from page 1)

over throughout the length and breadth of the country were passing sleepless night on 22nd June in working out strategy to face the government onslaughts and carry forward the struggle, the leaders of three striking federations having allegiance to AITUC and CITU, INTUC, BMS after several rounds of discussions with the concerned Ministry, were passing a tensed night working out a scheme on how to call off the strike and stand unitedly in rescue of the government. The later developments suggest that they -- the leaders of rightist INTUC, diehard rightist BMS and the traditional compromising forces between labour and capital, the leftist CITU and AITUC -- all became one and stood firmly, shaking off all hesitations, on 23rd morning against the hopes and aspirations of the working millions of the country and signed the surrender deed, which they refused to sign two days back. The surrender deed was signed without the knowledge of those whom they wanted to surrender. This, they called, 'an agreement' following which the four-day long strike was called off.

The first of the questions that are haunting many is why the leaders did not sign the so-called agreement on 21st itself and withdrew the strike? Why on 23rd? Did the leaders think that they would not be able to force the government to concede to their demand? If so, why did they hasten to sign surrender deed only within two days while the situation was favourable enough to go ahead with the strike? Who and what considerations forced them so? Neither the strike situation nor the strikers forced them. The government could not force either. Did the Supreme Court judgement alter the situation drastically against the strike? No, it is foolish to argue that the Apex Court by its decision in favour of opening the tenders, created a bar against onward march of the strike. One may prefer to argue that the agreement is not a surrender deed, there are many 'positive achievements' in it. Though the leaders had not claimed such things publicly as yet, we like to have a glance at the text of the agreement. On the issue of privatization of telecom industry and the entry of private capital -- be it domestic or multinational -- the agreement is silent on the plea that the matter is sub judice. If this issue of privatization was sub judice on 23rd, it was also sub judice before the strike began. Then why the strike was initiated?

Secondly, the majority of the clauses of the terms of the settlement are devoted for the cause and measures to be adopted to upgrade technical skill of existing employees and make restructuring strategy, as was agreed earlier, a success. There is a clause taking advantage of which the management, for their own lapses or failure in providing satisfactory services to the consumers, may hold the employees responsible and punish them accordingly. In another clause, the management agreed to postpone deduction of strike period wages pending decision of the Cabinet on Federation's submission for non-deduction of the same. The management also agreed not to take disciplinary measures against the strikers except in cases of 'suspected sabotage'. The implications of these words 'except in cases of suspected sabotage' should

be viewed and understood from the past experiences of movement in other industries. However, this is all in brief, as regards the terms of the settlement. The agreement suggests that as if the strike was for the demand of implementation of earlier decisions relating to training facilities and arrangements and some other issues, not for the demand of 'no entry of private capital and multinationals in the industry'. It may safely be concluded that although the employees were given to understand that they were fighting against privatization, to the leadership it was not a fight to resist privatization, it was for something else. One may ask 'what for'? Refuting the charges of abject surrender to the government, Mr O.P.Gupta, Secretary General, National Federation of Telecom Employees (controlled by CITU & AITUC) said immediately after the withdrawal of the strike, "We wanted to highlight the issue of the entry of the multinational and its impact on DoT." (*Asian Age*, 24.6.95) One would wonder whether such a strike with a single point demand of 'no privatization' was at all needed only to 'highlight the issue'! The statement of O.P.Gupta also makes it clear that the leaderships did not want to resist the privatization move. This is further corroborated by a report published on the first day of the strike in some newspapers which runs as follows: "The unions called for a postponement of the privatization move until after the general elections due next year". (*The Asian Age*, 19.6.95) So, they wanted postponement till next election is over. The petitions by the unions before the Supreme Court also did not challenge the policy of privatization or privatization move; what they challenged were the conditions of the tender, which according to them, favoured the multinational and foreign capital. Hence they wanted correction of some wrongs in tender or postponement, which they could project as victory. The leaders thought that either they would be able to persuade the government to postpone the move until the general election is over, or the Supreme Court might come in their rescue by at least allowing continuance of stay granted by the Kohima Bench of Guwahati High Court for some time. But none of these happened. But more of these happened. The leaderships then tried a third course. On the day of Army deployment and issuance of order of termination of service, Mr O.P. Gupta while expressing his conviction that the government would rescind its stand soon, said, "But workers have families, they need to eat, some of us may not remain strong." (*The Telegraph*, 23.6.95) What he said was a fact. But could any responsible trade union leader express such utterance to the Press when the workers were in the midst of battle against the onslaught let loose by the government? Does not such statement help generating weakness amongst the strikers? The question haunts -- did the leadership want a situation to crop up where on the plea of weakness and hesitation on the part of the strikers, they could say, it was not possible to continue the strike? But alas, neither of the three options matured and came in rescue of the leadership. Hence the leadership had to, all on a sudden, call off the strike on 23rd. Because, they could not allow the strike to continue. If it was allowed to continue, the trouble could, in course

of time, assume a character of true anti-privatization struggle and could pave the way for releasing struggle in other public sector industries and in the process a countrywide anti-privatization movement encompassing all sectors and people could emerge threatening and challenging as a whole the new industrial policy of the Government of India and its participation in the GATT, 1994.

Now, one very pertinent question arises as to why the telecom union leaders did not want a really broadbased and truly all-out movement against the policy of privatization? The reason is very clear to understand and even the Press could not but point out the same. The INTUC being guided by Congress(I) and BMS by BJP, cannot and will not sincerely fight privatization, because these two ruling political parties are in favour of the so-called liberalization. But what about the CITU and AITUC, the trade union wings of CPI(M) and CPI respectively? *The Economic Times* dated 25.6.95, citing a trade union source, reported: "Trade union sources in Calcutta told *The Economic Times*: 'The telecom leaders in West Bengal were told not to proceed any further with the strike as doing so would send all the wrong signals to potential foreign investors in the state.'... a central trade union official said the CPI(M) wanted to dispel any possible fears that would arise in the minds of potential investors, particularly as the West Bengal Chief Minister, Mr Jyoti Basu, and the West Bengal Industrial Development Corporation (WBIDC) chairman, Mr Somnath Chatterjee, are presently abroad soliciting investments." So, the cat is out of the bag. The employees, who felt betrayed and who in Calcutta out of anger and humiliation, on the day of calling off the strike attacked the union leaders of the Joint Action Committee, bit them black and blue and forced them to burn the copies of the agreement, should realize from the experience of the movement that the actual cause of betrayal is political, that not only the Central Government but also the non-Congress(I) State Governments -- be they controlled by the CPI(M)-led Left Front or by the BJP, are no less enthusiastic in implementing such policies; that the leadership of their organization could not go against the basic policies of economic reforms and liberalization and for that matter could not lead anti-privatization movement to their destination. The sooner they realize this truth and acquire this lesson, the better for working class movement. The tragic failure of the telecom employees strike, after the incident of failure of the historic railway strike of 1974, once again has brought to the fore the question of establishing a genuine struggling leadership in the arena of working class movement in the country. It is the time to undertake and plunge into such struggle which only can honour their tears, pains and humiliation.

Read Documents adopted at the First All India Plenum of the SUCI

Resolution on National Situation	Rs. 1.00
Thesis on International Situation	Rs. 4.00
Constitution	Rs. 3.00
General Secretary's Report	Rs. 3.00

Only in the USSR Hitler could not find a single quisling

(Contd. from page 4)

the National Guard with officers trained by the Nazis. The ensuing war, fought between the British and the resistance forces who had both fiercely opposed the Nazis and liberated Athens from the departing Germans, was imbued with the spirit of Churchill's message to his military commander: that the Greek forces should be deprived of their control of Athens 'with bloodshed if necessary.' Only when EAM had been crushed, its leaders and thousands of its members jailed, exiled or shot, and the government, including all the machinery of intimidation, placed firmly in Rightist hands, were elections permitted. Yet after thus breaking a popular opposition, Churchill felt himself capable to announce that he had but one principle for the liberated countries: 'Government of the people, by the people and for the people', set up on a basis of free and universal suffrage election, with secrecy of ballots and no intimidation." (*Containment and Revolution*, Ed. David Horowitz, p. 103) These are the same people who cried foul over Soviet actions in the Baltic states and Poland. Avowed democratic indeed who would put people's rights under their jackboot while canting 'of the people, by the people, for the people'!

Blunting Nazi challenge

When Hitler sprang his surprise attack on the Soviet Union before dawn on July 22, 1941, hurling the bulk of his troops simultaneously from Poland, Rumania and Finland, in a military operation that surpassed in fury and scale anything ever witnessed in history, he was confident of easy victory within a matter of weeks. Hitler was convinced that his military superiority and the resulting heavy losses from the invasion would immediately produce a political upheaval in Soviet Russia and that Stalin would be overthrown by his own people. But for once Hitler's calculations proved completely wrong, both militarily and politically. It is true that the surprise attack caused heavy losses to the USSR which was forced to abandon large stretches of territory in the western region to the Nazi invaders. Khrushchev, after Stalin's death, began a tirade on this point against Stalin accusing him of failing to prepare the country for war, and of all sorts of defects, such as being a bad strategist, with whom none could argue, etc. In the same breath, he condemned Stalin as cruel because of the purge and painted the same as an attempt to consolidate his personal power or dictatorship. Yet the great purge was precisely one among the important preparations for the coming war. How necessary had been the great purge, to weed out treasonable elements from the party, army and administration became all the more clear at that time. No doubt these had been harsh measures demanded by the extraordinary international situation and in the process unfortunately some

mistakes were made and some innocents lives lost, a fact admitted by Stalin himself in his Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU. For, Soviet Russia was the only country where Hitler found no fifth columnist to help him. It was the only country where the people and the army stood firm as one man courageously facing militarily superior enemy forces and did

not lose their deep faith in the leadership of Stalin even at the darkest hours of the Nazi invasion. And here lies Hitler's second political miscalculation. It was beyond his comprehension and imagination that here he would find a people whose life had become uplifted, a people who had left behind slavery, illiteracy, hunger, social injustice and cultural backwardness and were transformed into a healthy, educated, happy and efficient human beings whose relationships rested on a new sense of brotherhood, modesty and simplicity; in one word, a people freed from the exploitation and bondage of capitalist rule, a people led on the path of socialism by Stalin. Stalin, every fibre of whose being was tuned to the joys and sorrows of the masses and strained to bring about their upliftment and advancement. Here lies the source of their unending heroism and faith in Stalin, on which broke Hitler's mighty military machine. Thus, at a reception in honour of the commanders of the Red Army, at the end of the war, Stalin was able to say: "... we have had our moments of desperation in 1941 and 1942 when our army was retreating, abandoning our native villages and towns in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldavia, the Leningrad region, the Baltic area and the Karelo-Finnish republic; we abandoned them because there was no other way. Another people might say to their government, you have not justified our expectations, clear out and we shall put in another government which will conclude peace with Germany and ensure us a quiet life. But the Russian people had not done so, for they have faith in the correctness of the policy of their government and have made sacrifices to ensure defeat of Germany. It is this trust of the Russian people in the Soviet government that proved to be the decisive force which has guaranteed the historic victory over mankind's enemy — fascism." (Vasilevsky, p. 452) Are these the words of a dictator usurping the credit due to the people for himself as claimed by Khrushchev?

There is no denying the fact that when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union she was not yet fully prepared to meet this terrible blow. But was this the fault of Stalin because he had failed to make preparations? At that time, who was prepared to stand up to Hitler's overwhelming military might? No country, however strong, could do so. Even France, who despite her political weakness possessed a most well-equipped modern army and

was aided by British troops, suffered an ignominious military defeat.

Besides, Stalin was busy building up a socialist state in no time. Only someone who most maliciously distorts truth can accuse Stalin like that. The truth is that Stalin achieved the near impossible by correctly applying the tenets of Marxism-Leninism, turning the Soviet Union from a famine-stricken, war-ravaged and most backward state into a modern, technologically advanced nation through herculean efforts of political and organizational skills and by enthusing the people to give more than their best in inspired and creative efforts.

Rather, it is a credit of Stalin that without compromising peaceful construction of socialism, and without impairing in any way the balanced and overall growth in industry which was to sustain the Soviet Union so well in its long and bitter war with Germany, he continuously accelerated to the utmost the production in heavy and defence industries, in view of the growing threat. Straining the resources to the utmost, no effort was spared to train and build up the Red Army into a most efficient modern well-equipped army, well grounded not only in scientific theory, but revolutionary morality and political consciousness. However, to finish preparations Stalin needed desperately one more year: he was racing against time. At the same time, Stalin was very careful not to give Hitler any pretext for attacking the USSR, to prolong the breathing space to the utmost.

Allegation of lack of war preparedness and the fact

Some people in line with Khrushchev argue that Stalin made a great mistake in not fully mobilizing his troops to stave off an attack by Nazi Germany. But Stalin knew better. This would have been regarded by Hitler as an act of aggression or aggressive intentions and provoked him immediately to war for sure. Besides, Stalin realized it well that there was need to expose Nazi Germany's true character and aggression before the world and people and build world-wide opinion against it. This is all the more true when we remember that within two days after Hitler had attacked the Soviet Union, Senator Harry Truman had written in the *N. Y. Times*, June 24, 1941: "If the Germans are winning we should help the Russians, and if the Russians are winning we should help the Germans, and that way let them kill as many as possible." Even more telling is the example of France. France, even when she had already been six months at war with Hitler without striking a single blow during the 'phony war' following Hitler's attack on Poland, seriously contemplated at the time of the Soviet-Finnish war an attack on the Soviet oilfields in the Caucasus to put her out of action. General de Gaulle, commenting on this wrote

(Contd. on page 7)

Striving in the right course can only bring victory

(Contd. from page 6)

later : "Certain circles saw the enemy in Stalin, rather than in Hitler. They busied themselves with finding means of striking Russia either by aiding Finland or bombarding Baku or landing at Istanbul, much more than in coming to grips with Germany." (Quoted in *The collapse of the Third Republic*, William L. Shirer, p. 537) Hence in view of this political situation, of the political attitude of the capitalist-imperialists it was all the more imperative that Stalin should not appear as aggressor before the world and fascist aggression should be exposed in full before the people.

Long after the war and after Stalin had died, many of the leading military commanders of the Soviet Union of that time published memoirs in which they all highly acclaimed Stalin's role in leading the army and people of the USSR to eventual victory over the seemingly invincible and terrible war machine of Hitler that had grown from strength to strength on the loot, the industries, and slave labour of the conquered nations, as well as additional raw material and troops from its vassal states. Praising Stalin's great skill as a strategist, Marshall Zhukov in his memoirs wrote : "The activity of the Supreme Command is indissolubly associated with Stalin's name. ... His prestige was exceedingly high. ... He could find the main link in a strategic situation which heseized upon in organising actions against the enemy, and thus assured the success of the offensive operation. It is beyond question that he was a splendid Supreme Commander-in-Chief." The competence of Stalin as a strategist is beyond question. To this is added his exceptional organisational ability, not only so apparent during the period of socialist construction, but even from the very beginning of the war when Stalin for example ordered all major industries to be shifted from the western part of Russia, whether immediately threatened or not, to the safer Ural and far east securely out of reach of the enemy. Thus, even at the height of German invasion under constant bombardment, between July and November, 1941, no fewer than 1523 industrial enterprises, including 1360 large war plants, had been moved to the east

along with the part of the population and with the workers needed to operate the same. The 'evacuation cargoes' amounted to a total of one and a half million railway wagon loads. "This transplantation of industry and its 'rehousing' in the East must rank among the most stupendous organisational and human achievement of the Soviet Union during the war", Writes Alexander Werth. (*Russia at War, 1941-45*, p. 208) This gigantic operation, unthinkable in a capitalist country with private ownership of the means of production, was of fundamental importance in sustaining Soviet Russia's war efforts, and is another demonstration

of the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

On the other hand, giving an example of Stalin's organisational skill, Zhukov noted that after preparations for chalking out the strategy and plans for the entire offensive of 1944 that was to drive the Germans over the frontiers of the USSR and some neighbouring countries which demanded enormous and precise preparations for precisely timed interaction of different fronts and army units. Zhukov noted that Stalin as "the supreme commander kept a worry eye on the preparations for the 1944 operations. He had the vigour and the energy to keep the back-up of the projects within his field of visions, devoting special attentions to armour, the airforce, artillery, and the party-political work in the battlefield and on the home front."

Thus, despite some initial mistakes that had occurred, as Stalin himself was to point out later, and which no doubt occurred at the very beginning under the heavy onslaught of surprise attack, the initial communication gaps with some fronts, there is no denying the fact that Stalin, as is evident from Zhukov's description and praise, was able to assimilate, summarize and elaborate the collective military knowledge derived from the experience of countless military leaders and troop commanders and mastered in course of battles with the enemy that led to fundamental innovation in military science. Soon after the war the Supreme Command, under the able leadership of Stalin began to function more and more harmoniously as a well-knit team, able to lead the Soviet Army and people with growing skill to glorious victory.

Zhukov's account of Stalin also runs counter to what Khrushchev had to say on this score. Zhukov wrote, "I realized during the war that Stalin was not the kind of man who objected to sharp question or to anyone arguing with him. If someone says the reverse, he is a liar. ... What I liked about Stalin was the complete absence of formalism...." (pp. 362)

Throughout the world there was jubilation when the Red Army in the battle of Stalingrad — a masterpiece of strategic planning — achieved a tremendous victory, that was to wrest all initiatives from the Nazi enemy and force them to gradual retreat. Hitler's military war machine was badly shaken and the myth of its invincibility lay shattered. Everywhere the democratic anti-fascist forces found new heart and the morale of the partisan forces active in the vanquished countries received a tremendous boost. Though the Stalingrad victory turned the tide of war, that does not mean that the Nazi power to fight was broken; for two more years the Red Army and the Soviet people had to wage a bitter war before being able to drive out the Nazi troops and liberate its own and

neighbouring countries and finally crush the Nazis in their own capital.

Superb leadership of Stalin even in war

The war had cost the Soviet people dearly : more than 20 million were killed. There was not a single family, including Stalin's, who did not mourn over the killing or torture of some of its members at the hands of the Nazi enemy. But the war did not have been so bitter and long drawn had Britain and the USA opened a second front in the West in 1942 or 1943. Yet, even though Hitler had withdrawn all his able bodied troops from the West to fight in the USSR, and his defence posts in the West were reduced to nothing more than a bluff, Churchill under one pretext and excuse after another did not agree to do so, and persuaded Roosevelt instead to undertake some operation in North Africa, merely a peripheral theatre of war of the fascist axis, while the one thing Hitler still dreaded was a second front in the West. When discussing his plans for actions with Roosevelt, Churchill said that plans should also be made for coming to the aid of the conquered population by landing armies of liberation when opportunity is ripe." (*Their Finest Hour*, p. 223, Churchill cited in *Containment and Revolution*, ed. David Horowitz, p. 86) And that opportune moment arrived at last when it became a question of beating the Russian troops in their advance to Berlin. Still then it is true that the help the allies provided the Soviet Union in terms of raw materials, some weapons, etc., was welcome, though by no means on a scale that could have influenced the outcome of the war. Thus, in September, 1944, in a congratulatory message Churchill conceded that ; "It is the Soviet Army that tore the guts out of the German military machine. The Russian resistance broke the power of the German armies." And in the USA General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the US Army, noted in his secret biennial report : "The Soviet Union's heroic struggle against Nazi Germany, particularly the victory of the Soviet troops in the battle of Stalingrad saved the American people from invasion of the territory of the United States itself by Hitler's hordes."

The contrast of the capitalist countries surrendering in quick succession to Hitler's onslaughts and the USSR emerging victor from the most terrible ordeal brings to sharp focus the role and leadership of Stalin, the true character and historic significance of this leadership, its enduring message for us to bear in mind. Those capitalist countries had their bourgeois leaderships and states in antagonism with the masses of the people in the spheres of class interests and in daily interactions. At times of war between nations, compulsions of national existence may prevail over antagonism, the nationalist spirit binding the capitalist-

(Contd. on page 8)

UP governor unabashedly worked as mere agent of Cong (I)

(Contd. from page 1)

the backward and weaker sections of population in the state, known as 'Dalits'. In such a situation the BJP 'cannot play the role of a silent spectator'. How could the two contradicting forces in the caste-ridden UP, who until recently were at loggerheads and unleashed a hate-campaign against each other, join hands? The BJP's explanation was that their aim was to grant their due rights and dignity to the 'Dalits' and hence they have for the first time established a 'Dalit rule' in a state, the BJP claimed. One thing has been quite clear from these contentions of the BJP known as the party of the caste Hindus that it is posing itself as the 'friends of the Dalits' in an attempt to deceive the people and satisfy its greed for power. Just one utterance of a senior BJP leader will suffice to prove as to how much dignified is their attitude towards the downtrodden when he says: 'It suits the BJP to have a puppet government in the state with the option of pulling it down whenever it desires.' (*The Statesman*, 2.3.95)

Behind BJP's claim of establishing a 'Dalit-rule' by installing the 'puppet government of Mayawati' works this particular interest of controlling the state administration, the real key to power. Because, to win the coming parliamentary elections the rein of state administration must be in the grip of BJP. To

fulfil its dream of ascending the Central power in the coming elections taking advantage of naked in-fighting and group rivalry of the Congress(I) the BJP will have to fare well in this important state in the Hindi belt. Because, the BJP got a severe jolt in UP for its rabid Hindu communal stance resulting in the death and bloody holocaust throughout the country as an aftermath of the demolition of the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya. In the recent Panchayat poll and Assembly byelections held last month in UP the performance of the BJP was not upto its expectation. This naturally prompted the BJP to intensify its hate campaign against the Mulayam Singh government. And ultimately keeping Mayawati at the fore the BJP grabbed the administrative power of UP. Because, nowadays to win elections the control of the police-administration is more important than mass support. This is the real reason behind BJP's sudden spurt of 'love for the Dalits'.

The Congress(I) leaders of UP for sometime past were desirous of the fall of the Mulayam government. And for this they had been putting pressure on Mr. Narasimha Rao to withdraw support from Mulayam. As the time was not ripe, Mr. Rao did not agree with them at that time because a shrewd politician as he is he was only waiting for the opportune moment. The BSP's withdrawal of support gave the Congress(I) that

scope. Initially Mr. Rao tried to bring Mayawati to the Congress(I) fold by eulogising her widely here and even abroad. But the open entente of the BJP and BSP made it difficult for the Congress(I) to extend support to Mayawati. Hence the Congress(I) posed itself as neutral. They even took the decision not to support either of the two in the trial of strength in the Assembly. But their garb of neutrality was torn apart by the role the UP governor Mr. Motilal Bhora played as instructed from New Delhi. Shedding all norms of administrative neutrality and misusing his chair he played as a mere agent of the Congress(I). What prompted the Congress(I) to utilise the post of governor in its sordid game of ensuring the fall of the Mulayam government? The calculation of the Congress(I) was that the BJP-BSP combine may not survive. In that case the Centre would proclaim President's Rule in UP and thus the Congress(I) can grab the rein of administration as the President's rule is nothing but the central Congress(I) rule in proxy.

Thus the role played by the BSP, BJP, and the Congress(I) to pull down the Mulayam Singh government is totally against the norms of parliamentary democracy and is most despicable.

Pointing to it Mr. Mulayam Singh is trying to pose himself as a martyr and the saviour of the Dalits. This is also a lie. While in government what Mulayam Singh did should better be termed 'goonda raj' instead of 'Dalit-raj'. Sitting in power, in the name of protecting Dalit's interest he has spread the venom of vile casteism, and not only that, he has suppressed democratic movements, any mass protest with the help of the police force and party hoodlums accusing that those were anti-Dalits. To save its government he had joined hands with the anti-people Congress(I) and ran the administration in collusion with the Centre. After the BSP withdrew support Mr. Mulayam Singh too stooped low in purchasing MLAs, although he finally failed to save himself. The matter of fact is that all parties which participated in the game of toppling the government are anti-people, opportunist and power greedy. As people do not expect anything from any of these parties, no remarkable reaction could be noticed among them in this game of change of government.

From this incident the backward people should derive important lessons. What the different political parties are doing in the name of Dalits are doing so in electoral interest only. So they are dragging the exploited masses into vile caste strifes, thus misleading them on the basic question of working class unity and class struggle in a class divided society. Beside communal divide, they are injecting caste divide, thereby shattering the prospect of class unity. All these parties are only strengthening the exploitative bourgeoisie and their state machine by dividing people in this manner. This is the reason why backward and exploited people are being used as pawns in election politics. Strengthening class struggle is the only way out for the toiling people to come out of this trap.

Striving in the right course can only bring victory

(Contd. from page 7)

imperialist rulers and the people for the time being, as it did in Britain, for instance, but it is not the kind that can merge the interests of the two into one. Hitler could not only plant quislings but did succeed in overrunning the capitalist states of Europe under fire of his military machine. Between Germany and the USSR, however, it was not a war between two nations; it was a struggle between a fascist power that had temporarily succeeded in whipping up a nation with national jingoism and a people imbued with the noble ideology of socialism whose interests had identified with the interests of the state and the leadership and the two had fused together. The fusion of identity of the Soviet people, the Red Army and the CPSU withstood all the terrible fire of the fascist military machine without wilting at the fiercest of onslaughts and ensured ultimate victory. And this fusion, it is important to learn, was brought about under the leadership of Lenin's worthy successor, Stalin. The victory of the USSR signalled much more than a military victory, far more than the victory of the Anglo-French-US alliance — a victory of the historically determined socialist power over the imperialist-fascist powers. So it was a victory of mankind, a great stride of history, a demonstration which instilled confidence in the inevitability of the ultimate victory of people's struggle, a

fountain of inspiration and hope in all future ordeals of humanity. So it brought jubilation among people all over the world.

If today there is more than ever, in the name of commemorating the 50th anniversary of victory over fascism, a concerted effort in the world to distort the facts of history to downplay and discredit the role of Stalin and to malign him, there is a good reason. The imperialists know it well that it is Stalin who saved mankind from the threat of fascist military might, from the horrors and indescribable barbarity of Hitler's Nazi hordes, whose atrocious deeds have blackened the records of history. That civilization still endures is due to his great role in leading the people away from slavery into liberty. Today socialist forces have suffered a serious setback, but ideas, thoughts and examples do not die. They assert, and they are asserting today in the slogans of the people on the streets of towns of Russia against the imperialist-revisionist combine, on the streets of towns and villages across the world against imperialist exploitation and machinations. Search has begun afresh for the right course. That is the silver lining of hope in the cloud of the present ordeal of mankind, which exhorts people to recall the lesson of the victory over fascism fifty years back: strive in the right course, victory will be yours, no matter the adversities. (Concluded)

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : NIHAR MUKHERJEE