

# Proletarian Era

Volume 45 No. 13  
February 15, 2012

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

Price : Rs. 2.00

## Supreme Court ruling on 2G licence allocation

# Startlingly reveals the hideous underbelly of government action but allows principal offenders escape unscathed

In its ruling on a case filed at the Supreme Court by Janata party leader Subramanyan Swamy alleging irregularities in allocation of 2G spectrum licences to telecom firms, a division bench of Justices G S Singhvi and A K Ganguly scrapped all 122 2G licences issued by the Congress-led UPA government in January, 2008 and held the entire process illegal. The Court criticized the very policy of allotment by 'first-come- first-serve basis' (FCFS) as against open auction, clearly indicted the then Telecom minister for favouring "some companies at the cost of public exchequer". There is "no room for doubt that everything was stage-managed to favour those who were able to know in advance changes in the implementation of the first-come-first-served (FCFS)

principle" and the government's act has been "wholly arbitrary, capricious and contrary to public interest apart from being violative of the doctrine of equality", held the Court. The common people who are the worst victims of rampant corruption at the highest levels of governance have welcomed the verdict for having unravelling the hideous underbelly of the bourgeois government serving the vested class interest of the ruling monopolists flouting and trampling underfoot all established norms, procedures and legalities. Since there is euphoria in the bourgeois media over the judgment which is hailed as a landmark in the history of judicial pronouncements in the country, it is necessary to have an in-depth study of it.

### Saga of the dubious allotment process

It may be recalled that the BJP-led NDA government in 2003 mooted the highly controversial policy of FCFS. First UPA government took office in 2004. In August, 2007, Department of Telecommunication headed by A Raja started the process of allotment of 2G spectrum and UAS (Unified Access Service) licences and brought forward the cut-off date for responding by intending applicant companies from October 1, 2007 to 25 September 2007 allegedly for the benefit of some of the real estate companies who did not have any experience in dealing with telecom services and who had made applications only on 24 September. The change in the cut-off date was

kept a secret until January 10, 2008 when the government announced the decision to issue licences on first-come-first served basis and thus followed the same policy of the erstwhile BJP government which the Apex Court held "discriminatory per se". Following that, some firms which had submitted applications in 2004 or 2006 were pushed down in the priority and those who had applied between August and September 2007 succeeded. The Telecom ministry also placed a cap of 121 licenses out of 575 applications overriding the recommendations of TRAI (Telecom Regulatory Authority of India) of "no cap". Many such other procedural violations and mala fide moves

*Contd. on page 2*



Countrywide massive support to signature campaign for the Parliament March — Gujarat, Haryana, Tripura, Bihar [clockwise]

# In dying capitalism, judiciary is gradually dispossessed of relative neutrality

*Contd. from page 1*

were reportedly resorted to. It also remained no secret that this unusual favour showered on hand-picked monopoly groups and their associates were in exchange of huge monetary and other benefits to the people in the seats of governance. As a result, only a few companies including some 'shadow' as well as dummy companies owned or floated directly or indirectly by top monopolists like Tatas, Ambanis, Mittals and their ilk bagged the licences at virtually throwaway price causing enormous loss to the public exchequer. The scam was of such a magnitude that it could not be kept under wraps. Petitions were filed in the courts, while the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) illegalities in spectrum allocation to Loop. On 31 March, 2010, CAG (Comptroller of Auditor General of India) reported large-scale irregularities. On November, 2010, CAG in its report mentioned that the scam caused a loss of Rs 1.76 lakh crore to the exchequer. "We have no doubt that if the method of auction had been adopted for grant of licence... the nation would have been enriched by many thousand crores", said CAG report. It is pertinent to mention that while presenting the union budget last year, the Finance Minister estimated total revenue deficit to be Rs 2, 69, 844 crore. So the amount of loss due to 2G spectrum scam has been as high as 70% of the central revenue deficit. Incredible indeed! But for CAG's initial pointer and subsequent detailed revelation in the Supreme Court verdict, this scandal would not have come to light.

## Why were principal actors let off ?

But a question that naturally arises in the mind of any thinking person is—when the Supreme Court opined that natural resources "are vested with the government as a matter of trust in the name of the people of India, and it is the solemn duty of the state to protect the national interest, and natural resources must always be used in the interests of the country and not private interests" and snubbed the government for having "virtually gifted away the important national asset at throwaway prices", how is it that only the Telecom minister was held responsible and the principal functionaries like the Prime Minister, Finance Minister and other important cabinet ministers who are members of the policy-framing EGOM (Empowered Group

of Ministers) have escaped unscathed? Even the Division Bench who gave this commendable ruling declined to consider a petition filed by Subramanyam Swamy seeking a CBI probe into the alleged complicity of the then Finance minister (FM) P Chidambaram in the scam? What prompted the Supreme Court to shift the matter to lower court raising a technical point that "since the intervener (Swamy) has already filed an application before the Special Judge CBI before whom he is appearing in person in the complaint case instituted by him and made a prayer for summoning Chidambaram as an accused, the bench does not consider it proper to entertain his prayer for issue of a mandate to the CBI to investigate Chidambaram." Thus, SC not only gave breather to Chidambaram but such a pronouncement on its part might well have sent a signal to the lower court as to how to dispose of the matter. And as expected, the lower court dismissed the prayer for summoning the then Finance Minister, P. Chidambaram, as an accused for allegedly conspiring with the former Telecom Minister, A. Raja. Instead, it appeared as if the SC was convinced that Raja unilaterally committed the crime keeping the PM and his entire cabinet in the dark. Is it to be believed that such a crucial decision could have been taken without any knowledge of the principal actors? When the Finance Minister, both past and present, as well as the Prime Minister have been customarily talking of 'fiscal prudence' and finding avenues for 'increasing revenue collection', when auction of 2G and 3G spectrum as possible source of sizeable additional revenue had regularly featured in all discussions, discourses and even budget speeches, how could the policy and process of auction or banking on any other mode like FCFS be left to much junior a minister of the concerned department? In fact, there have been enough evidences to show that everyone was aware of it.

It has come in the media that the Prime Minister in a letter dated 2.11.2007 advised the Telecom ministry to maintain transparency and fairness in the matter of allocation of the spectrum. But the Telecom Minister A Raja rejected the same by saying that it would be unfair, discriminatory, arbitrary and capricious to auction the spectrum to new applicants because it would not give them level playing field. It

is also reported that in the said letter the PM asked Raja not to take any action on allocation without informing him. Could a Minister dare not to keep the PM informed about the matter and simply brush aside the PM's suggestions as 'unfair' to the bidding companies unless he was sure he would not be pulled up for that and the letter issued was nothing but a routine formality or camouflaged consent to go ahead with the planned move? How could the Prime Minister responsible for the overall functioning of the government refrain from following up the matter and satisfying himself about 'transparency and fairness' of the procedure? Even in the media, several write-ups appeared between October and December, 2007 expressing apprehension of a possible fraud in the offing. Is it that neither the PM nor his office noticed any of them? The Supreme Court order also said that Raja had rejected the suggestion made by the Minister of Law and Justice for placing the matter before the Empowered Group of Ministers (EGOM). Is it to be understood that there was no feedback from the law ministry to EGOM on this? Are we to accept then that the Government of India functions as a conglomerate of isolated 'self-dictating' ministries in a most non-cohesive manner with a PM atop having no power, interest or intention to intervene even if there is an indication of possible fraud or irregularity? Or are we to understand that Raja received enough signals to go ahead with his sinister move? It may also be recalled that when the controversy over the illegal conduct of Raja first surfaced, both the Prime Minister and Congress supremo Mrs Sonia Gandhi had said that Raja had done nothing illegal and against the policy of the Government. A few days after the CAG presented its report on 2G spectrum scam the PM could not help hiding his feelings of dismay at the report when addressing a conference of CAG officers; he advised them to make a distinction between "genuine error" and "wrongdoing". Obviously, the PM was trying to put what Raja did in the category of "genuine error" and not a crime. What else is it other than abetting a crime which is a punishable offence under law?

Moreover, it emerged that the finance ministry had on March 25, 2011 written a note to the Prime Minister's Office placing some blame on P Chidambaram for the 2G mess. The note was reportedly

prepared with inputs from several ministries including law, finance and telecom, as well as from the Cabinet secretariat and the PMO. That note was circulated by the Cabinet secretariat. The note, it is understood, had pointed out that the secretary (finance) had suggested auction for initial spectrum, while Chidambaram later sent a "non-paper" to Raja conveying that "in principle" decision may be taken to price the spectrum beyond 4.4 MHz. Even Justice Saini of CBI trial court which is hearing the petition of Subramanian Swamy in regard to involvement of Chidambaram is on record to have stated that "the decision regarding spectrum pricing was to be taken by Finance Minister and ministry of communication and IT and after this decision was taken, P Chidambaram agreed that it would be the price as discovered in the year 2001 and also told A Raja that there is no need to revisit the same". The said note went on to say that Chidambaram "implicitly agreed to imposition of same entry fee as that prevailing in 2001 for licences allotted up to December 31, 2008". The ministry note went on to further detail a meeting on January 30, 2008, 20 days after 2G spectrum LoIs (Letters of Indents) were issued to companies, between Chidambaram and Raja and stated that, "It was noted by the Finance Minister that he was for now not seeking to revisit the current regimes for entry fee or revenue share." It is, therefore, clear that notwithstanding some cosmetic opposition—which Raja and others knew very well was nothing but a mockery — the then Finance Minister Mr Chidambaram did not prevent Raja from moving forward with his policy of issuing the 2G licenses. In other words, on 25 March 2011, if not earlier, the PM and his senior Cabinet colleagues were aware of what Mr Raja was doing. They took no action against him. The Secretariat of the Joint Parliamentary Committee (JPC), mandated to inquire into the telecom licensing policy and the 2G spectrum scam, had formally written to the Finance Ministry, asking for a copy of this March 25 note to the Prime Minister's Office (PMO). The note generated so much of heat and an obvious conflict between the present and former Finance Ministers that Pranab Mukherjee was forced to make a public appearance alongside Chidambaram and distance himself from all "inferences and

*Contd. on page 6*

# Ludicrous interpretation of Marxism by an apologist of capitalism

When logic ceases to weigh, one is apt to choose the other way. Nothing else other than this proverbial saying befits better the columnists and economists running short of even spruced up arguments to defend capitalism gasping in its death throes. The sheen has worn off the doctrines of globalization, liberalization, market-economy, so-called reforms and development that the ruling capitalists and their hirelings were boastfully claiming to be scripting the growth story of the common people. From their life's experience, the toiling millions round the world have found that such high-pitched terms were coined to fool them and camouflage the sinister capitalist design of exploiting them much more severely so as to fatten the swelling coffers of the handful of 'haves' and rich. So there is surge of global protest against capitalism. 'Uptight' is the only word that can describe the state of flux the troopers of capitalism are in. Every speech they utter in favour of capitalist set up is viewed as a bottomless pit of apostasy, every writing of theirs a plaintive cry couched in innuendoes. So, the focus is shifted from capitalism to Marxism. Instead of penning doggerel verse in support of sinking capitalism, the 'scholars' on the payroll of the ruling capitalists are now out to prove that the basic postulates of Marxism are not founded on objective reality. More the people are spontaneously bursting out against capitalism, more the apologists of capitalism notwithstanding their claim of Marxism having been outdated and obsolete are haunted by the fear of onward march of Marxism and are intensifying their attack against it.

## Swaminathan A Aiyer—the 'Analyst' of Marxism

One such instance of raucous scholasticism is the article captioned "Unexpected Marxist utopia on Wall Street" by Swaminathan A Aiyer published in the Times of India on 28 November, 2011. In a sarcastic manner, Mr Aiyer, "The Analyst", has contended that "the greedy executives of Wall Street who commandeered all the surpluses for themselves, leaving virtually nothing for shareholders" have corroborated Marx's theory that in corporations, "true value is created by employees, not capitalist owners." What can be said about these agents of capitalism? Such is the degree of their ignorance that Mr Aiyer. "The Bootlicker" dares to suggest that Marx had espoused the cause of the bourgeois executives who run steamroller of ruthless oppression on the toiling people. He further said that "the top financial companies of Wall Street, whose borrow-to-gamble spree caused the 2008 financial crisis, are outstanding examples of employees walking off with millions while the owners—the shareholders—were left with enormous losses and decimation of wealth. This was a Marxist dream of employee rights come true, in rather unexpected fashion." He argued that "big capitalists don't own top financial companies anymore; share ownership is widely dispersed among millions of shareholders, ranging from Arab sheikhs and sovereign wealth funds to big pension funds and small investors. The top bank honchos are highly paid employees who kept their huge

incomes and bonuses. But the shareholders—owners of capital—were largely wiped out." Hence, according to him, "Contrary to Marx's ideals, big financial corporations that maximize employee interests while decimating shareholder interests are scams, not paragons of virtue." He also hastened to add that since "today's big financial companies have millions of citizens as depositors, mutual fund owners and members of pension funds, governments almost always rescue large financial companies from bankruptcy — the political compulsions are overwhelming." This is sequestered chicanery at its best! Snooping under the guise of an astounding observation, Mr Aiyer has sought to show that the severe insoluble crisis capitalism has plunged into is not due to ramping up maximum profit by the capitalist owners but because of the money-making greed and acts of the employees of some big financial institutions. Since ownership of these institutions is not with any capitalist owners but distributed among various shareholders, big to small, and the day to day operation is handled by the highly salaried skilled employees who merrily walked away with all their high compensation packages while shareholders' value dipped following the market crash, it is the employees who have 'expropriated' the 'surplus value'. This is how, Mr Aiyer, the 'Intellectual', sought to establish that Marxism which holds that the capitalists usurp surplus value to generate profit stands repudiated.

## Marxism is a science, not fancy

Sorry Mr. Aiyer! Marx was not an 'Economist' of your standing. He has not said anything off the cuff or indulged in any kind of distortion or deception to propound his epoch-making philosophy. Your pedagogics is nothing but trash. Yet, as your anti-Marxist tirade might create some confusion, we have preferred to uphold the quintessence of universal truth. Marxism is a historically determined scientific process to understand evolution, course of development and the future roadmap of the changing human society. It is not a fanciful formulation of any all-knowing self-styled intellectual nor is it a product of any fertile brain breeding trash and rubbish day in and day out to exhibit self-glory. The Marxian science enables mankind to comprehend the inherent laws governing a given social system, its economy, politics and the political principles of a given state. Essence of Marxism cannot be grasped by mere acquaintance with its conclusions, but by correctly acquiring and comprehending the methodology of Marxist analysis. Perhaps, Mr Aiyer, "The Columnist", thought otherwise and hence is his peril to even distort Marxism properly.

Marx approached the study of history in order to trace the natural laws which run through all human history, and for this purpose he did not look simply at some individuals but human category as a whole. It is in course of this study based on science and not on so called self-realization of any individual, Marx showed that primitive society was not divided into rich and poor, haves and have-nots. Only with the appearance of stable property in society or to be more exact, productive system reached a stage creating conditions for stable ownership of the means of production and bringing in its wake the condition for appropriation of others' labour and usurpation and augmentation of wealth that classes emerged in society; the society became class-divided. And when Marx looked at peoples (after the stage of primitive society) to be understood as the entire human category, he found that there are different sections of the people, some pulling one way and some another, not as individuals, but as classes. Based on the science of historical materialism, Marx discovered the "law of motion" of capitalist society. He clearly brought

out three distinct features as yardsticks to judge the character of an economic system: i) mode of production, ii) production relation and iii) motive force of production. Based on these yardsticks, he showed that in capitalism, while character of production is social, ownership of the means of production is private. It is labour and capital which denotes the production relation while the motive of production is not to meet the need of the people at large but to secure maximum profit for the capitalist owners of the means of production.

Capitalism had not always existed but appeared at a particular juncture of social development to meet emerging social necessity. But capitalism has not remained static but had grown up gradually; it was not the same in Marx's day as it had been at the time of the "industrial revolution" in Britain in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The problem was not merely to describe the capitalist method of production of his own time, but to make an analysis which would show why and in what direction it was changing. Marx first analyzed the origin of surplus value, and then went on to consider its division into profit, interest, and ground rent. He categorically showed that at a certain stage in the development of commodity production money becomes transformed into capital. The formula of commodity circulation was  $C - M - C$  (commodity — money — commodity), i.e., the sale of one commodity for the purpose of buying another. The general formula of capital, on the contrary, is  $M - C - M'$ , i.e., money as capital is invested in commodity production to come back to the capitalist owner as augmented capital because of accrual of profit. The increase over the original value of the money put into circulation Marx called surplus value. Surplus value cannot arise out of commodity circulation, for the latter knows only the exchange of equivalents; it cannot arise out of an addition to price.

Perhaps, it needs a little more explanation lest Mr Aiyer, the "Economic Commentator", puts words in the mouth of Marx to float another 'unique' version of Marxism. In order to derive surplus value, the owner of money "must ... find ... in the market a commodity, whose use-value possesses the peculiar property of being a source of value" — a commodity whose

*Contd. on page 4*

# Deliberate falsehood camouflaged under intellectual discourse

*Contd. from page 3*

process of consumption is at the same time a process of creation of value. It is human labour power which constitutes that commodity. Its consumption is labour, and labour creates value. The owner of money buys labour power at its value, which, like the value of every other commodity, is determined by the socially necessary labour time requisite for its production (ie, the cost of maintaining the worker and his family). Having bought labour power, the owner of money is entitled to use it, that is, to set it to work for the whole day — twelve hours, let us suppose. Yet, in the course of six hours (“necessary” labour time) the labourer creates product sufficient to cover the cost of his own maintenance; and in the course of the next six hours (“surplus” labour time), he creates “surplus” product, or surplus value, for which the capitalist does not pay. In capital, therefore, from the standpoint of the process of production, two parts must be distinguished: constant capital, expended on means of production (machinery, tools, raw materials, etc.), the value of which, without any change, is transferred (all at once or part by part) to the finished product; and variable capital, expended on labour power. The value of this latter capital is not invariable, but grows in the labour process, creating surplus value. Therefore, to express the degree of exploitation of labour power by capital, surplus value must be compared not with the whole capital but only with the variable capital. Thus in the example given, the rate of surplus value, as Marx calls this ratio, will be 6:6, i.e., 100 per cent. The historical prerequisites for the genesis of capital were, firstly, the accumulation of a certain sum of money in the hands of individuals and a relatively high level of development of commodity production in general, and, secondly, the existence of a labourer who is “free” in a double sense: free from all constraint or restriction on the sale of his labour power, and free from the land and all means of production in general, a free and unattached labourer, a “proletarian,” who cannot subsist except by the sale of his labour power. The worker spends one part of the day covering the cost of maintaining himself and his family (wages), while the other part of the day he works without remuneration, creating for the capitalist surplus-value, the source of profit, the

source of the wealth of the capitalist class. The doctrine of surplus-value is a cardinal point of Marx’s analysis of capitalism. He established that profit is not clutched out of the thin air but created in the process of operation of capitalist economic law by appropriation of surplus value as explained above.

## **Predicament of Mr Aiyer and his ilk**

We are sure, Mr Aiyer, “The Theoretician”, that you and your ilk would not like this theoretical premise as this uncrowns you as commentators on economic reality. We are sure you cannot by any means prove by facts that capitalist economy is not in operation and exploitation of labour by way of appropriation of labour power is not taking place. What you have cunningly distorted is the very definition of labour. Marx has used the terms, workers, working class and labour. He has never used the word ‘employee’ in defining basic capitalist law. Next you have sought to argue that in modern capitalism, ownership of production (i.e. firm, company) is distributed among the shareholders and hence no individual capitalist can be pinpointed as owner. Capitalists are also just shareholders and rank *pari passu* with even a small investor in the total share capital. What an innocuous statement from Mr. Aiyer, “The Simpleton”! As if, with emergence of corporate houses tracing the root of evolution of joint stock companies at a particular stage of development capitalism, the basic laws of capitalist economy have ceased to operate. The other contention of Mr Aiyer, “The Academician”, has been that in today’s economic system, big financial institutions like banks, pension funds, broking firms, insurance companies and mutual funds handle junk of the investment and it is the ‘top honchos and other employees’ of these financial institutions who usurp maximum benefits by drawing fat salaries and bonuses and the price of their incorrect handling of the huge investment portfolio, the shareholders—the owners of capital — suffer decimation of wealth following stock market crash.

But Mr Aiyer, “The Realist”, the reality that you have sought to shield is the changing operation of capitalism as it grew, entered monopoly stage, gave rise to financial oligarchy by way of merger of industrial capital with

banking capital and finally finance capital and following laws endemic of the system landed in multiplying insoluble crisis, reached decadent and moribund phase and is now gasping in the death throes. In the early days the industrial capitalists were distinct from the bankers, who had little or no direct interests in industrial concerns, although, of course, they lent money to them and took a share of the profits in the form of interest. But with the growth of industry and the wide establishment of the “share company,” the men who owned the banks also began to take shares in industrial companies, while the richer industrialists took shares in the banks. Thus the very richest capitalists, whether they started as bankers or industrialists, became banker-industrialists.

This combination of capitalist functions in one and the same group enormously increased their power and created a financial oligarchy through merger of banking capital and industrial capital. The best illustration of the merging of the banks with industry is the increasing number of directorships in other concerns held by the directors of banks. Of course this does not mean that the banks own the other concerns; the point is that the powerful figureheads in the banking world are also among the top echelons in the world of trade and industry. The very concept of raising capital for an industry or business concern by way of selling shares in the market also came in course of development of capitalism. A study of capitalism would show that its transition has been from *laissez faire* to monopoly to financial oligarchy and finally to the highest stage, imperialism or finance capital. What Mr Aiyer, “The Interpreter of Marxism” has not stated is that once capitalism faced crisis of over production due to a decline in market demand on account of constantly falling purchasing power of the pauperized working people, the surplus capital in the hands of the capitalists needed opening up of widespread speculative avenues to maximize profit. Shareholding, emergence of corporate sector, Multi-National Corporations (MNCs) with cross-border shareholding (International Corporatization) as well as Stock market, debt market, money market, derivative market, loan securitization, future and forward trading have all arisen to meet that pressing need of the crisis-ridden capitalists. These are all integral

parts of exploitative capitalist economy. Not the oppressed workers but the oppressive capitalists have introduced such operative methods or methodologies to ensure the motive of profit maximization. As the big capitalists-monopolists once floated banks to mobilize people’s savings for the purpose of using the same as capital for investment with a view to maximizing profit and later mooted the concept of private limited companies to garner more capital by mopping up share subscription, similarly they are now creating junk capital by building huge corpus of insurances, mutual funds, pension funds, etc., through mobilization of public savings and using the same for pumping more money in non-productive speculative market. Besides mopping up capital from market to strengthen financial power of the promoter owners, the very concept of share market and shareholding, as is getting increasingly clear today, is inseparably linked with widespread speculation which is one of the mainstays of crisis-ridden capitalism. And the very term ‘risk management’ has been coined to camouflage gambling skill of the punters in the speculation. So, all these are descendants of crisis-ridden capitalism, one of the last resorts of dying capitalism to survive on ventilation, and no brainwave of any bumper salary-drawing employee. And the beneficiaries are no one other than the capitalist owners.

In this backdrop, let us take the issue of shareholding of a company as placed by Mr Aiyer, “The Sapien” who contends that capitalists are just ordinary shareholders. Is it so? Though the ownership in technical term is dispersed among the shareholders, the reality, not unknown to Mr Aiyer, “The Professor” is that the owner capitalist or a group of owner capitalists keeps control over the concern even by keeping a minority stake i.e., say 15% of the total share holding as the rest is distributed among many others. Management of the company, policy decisions, business strategy everything is decided and controlled by the owning capitalists. When shares of a company are issued for subscription in the market, it is the promoter or the owner capitalist individual or monopoly house who decides the number of shares to be issued, price of each share, whether to retain over subscription and such other details.

*Contd. on page 8*

## BJP a party with a difference : claim and reality !

BJP, the self-proclaimed 'party with a difference', has once again come out with its difference. Or rather, it has proved how different it is from others. Three MLAs of the party in Karnataka, of which two were ministers were involved in an act of seeing pornographic video inside the sacred citadel of parliamentary democracy, the Assembly House, while the session was on. One of them had supplied the others with his cell phone containing the video of an uninhibited party, called a "rave party" involving even foreigners that had taken place at Udupi on 3 February already creating adverse effects in state. The two others, sitting immediately behind the chief minister and the law minister promptly got busy with the gift and the media noting the furtiveness and glee with which they were busy in their business, equally promptly recorded it in camera and propagated it over the country.

As reported, the culprits, as plea, tried to convince that they were equipping themselves with the facts of the "rave party" for any eventual debate in the house. But the nationwide commotion and its effect on the prospect of the party in the forthcoming polls in Uttar Pradesh, forced the BJP leaders to compel the errant MLAs resign. It may, however, seem queer how it would take more than a month for the party to probe and submit report on an event that has been vividly recorded and glaringly shown all over the country. The concerned MLAs can console themselves with the facts that though watching pornography in public by MLAs was apparently unique and thus 'different' and though it is a criminal offence liable to court case, this act of theirs was only an addition in the long list of various kinds of practice of immorality and vulgarity, corruption, defiance to laws and such other criminal offences perpetrated every day by some or other politicians of this or that major parties that rule the roost in the bourgeois parliamentary

democracy of the country. And why the politicians only, none of the leading organs of the state, the bureaucracy and executives, the army, the police and all branches of security forces, even the judiciary can not claim to be not including any corrupt or immoral character. The Indian monopolists tend to rank in numbers among the richest in the world, and the 500 billion rupees of black money must have a lion's share of them too. The offenders in the present case can also hold their post as being only the latest among the fifteen legislators of their own party in Karnataka only including one former chief minister, who had to be dealt with more or less severity for charges of corruption, rape, closing illegal deals and so on. So really it was nothing different.

Media have covered the event and its aftermath. But they too seem to be oblivious of, if not avoiding, this point. It is the capitalist system of the country, now strangled in insurmountable crisis, economic-political-social, that is breeding every second uncontrollable and unquenchable thirst for power and pelf which in its turn generates irresistible desire and drive for corruption, cultural-moral degeneration, desperate arrogance and high handedness. And that only makes MLAs dare enjoy pornography inside the Assembly, caring the least for what is there happening around.

Interestingly, leave aside the bourgeois parties even those which claim themselves as big lefts, do not seem to have been moved much by this obnoxious incident involving their colleagues in parliamentary politics. The mass organizations of the SUCI (Communist) have come out in Karnataka in a bold protest over the incident, attesting to the truth that it is only the revolutionary party that does not fail to pick up the cudgel against cultural and moral degeneration with whatever strength it has.



At Gulbarga (above) and elsewhere in Karnataka, AIDS0, AIDYO, AIMSS protested Karnataka BJP MLAs watching pornography during Assembly session

### PLEASE CONTRIBUTE TO PARTY CENTRAL OFFICE BUILDING FUND

For quite a long time, search has been going on for an appropriate premise for the central office of the Party. Of late, a definite possibility has arisen in this regard. To avail of the same, we need funds urgently. The Party makes a fervent appeal to all its leaders, workers, supporters, sympathizers and well-wishers for liberally contributing to this Building Fund. Cheques /Drafts may be issued favouring — Socialist Unity Centre of India (Communist).

Debaprasad Sarkar  
Office Secretary, Central Committee, SUCI(C)  
48 Lenin Sarani, Kolkata-13 Phone : 033 2265-3234

### Posters on Parliament March in different state languages

Against  
**Pricerise  
Unemployment  
Corruption**  
14 March 2012  
**CHALO PARLIAMENT**  
**SUCI(C)**  
Socialist Unity Centre of India (communist)  
CONTACT : www.suci-c.in Ph. No. 9441273684

**14 मार्च-संसद चलो**  
• आकाशवाणी महंगाई • बेरोजगारी • भ्रष्टाचार  
• पत्नी, बिल्ली, शिक्षा व स्वास्थ्य के निजीकरण-व्यापारिकरण  
• बेरोजगार पास करने • कृषि भूमि अधिग्रहण • एक.डी.आई  
• श्रमिक अधिकारों के हनन • महिलाओं पर बढ़ते जुलम  
व अन्य जनसमस्याओं के खिलाफ  
जन आन्दोलन तेज करें  
**एस.यू.सी.आई. (कम्युनिस्ट)**

**चलो  
दिल्ली**  
१४ मार्च  
• भोंडवारी  
• बेरोजगारी  
• भ्रष्टाचार  
तथा शिक्षण-आरोपनु पश्चात्तन्तु  
अने तथाप हीः विसेशी नीतिओ साथे  
**संसद  
डूय**  
**S.U.C.I.(C)**

ಬೆಲೆಬಿಡಿ, ನಿರುದ್ಯೋಗ, ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ,  
ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ - ಆರೋಗ್ಯದ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರೀಕರಣ,  
ಮನುಷ್ಯರ ಮೇಲೆ ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯ,  
ಭೂಕುಲಕಳೆ, ರೈತಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ವಿರೋಧಿ  
ನೀತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಭಟಿಸಿ  
14 March 2012  
**ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಾಪಲಕ್ಷ ಜನತೆಯ  
ಪಾಲ್ಟಮೆಂಟ್ ಚಲೋ**  
**SUCI(C)**  
Socialist Unity Centre of India Communist

কেন্দ্রীয় চৰকাৰৰ জনস্বার্থবিৰোধী নীতিৰ বিৰুদ্ধে  
৮ দফীয়া দাবীৰ ভিত্তিত  
**পার্লামেন্ট  
অভিযান**  
১৪ মার্চ, ২০১২  
এছ ইউ চি আই (কমিউনিষ্ট)  
**SUCI(C)**

Make countrywide General Strike a total success on 28 February at the call of Central Trade Unions against anti-worker policies of the government

# People's movement, not exclusive reliance on judiciary, can only stem the rot

*Contd. from page 2*  
interpretations" in the note, of course after intervention of the PM, to keep things under the carpet.

## Role of CBI Court

The lower court order has also been equally baffling. On being referred back by the Supreme Court, the lower court (CBI special Court) held that Shri Chidambaram's acts were "not illegal acts," as these were not "per se illegal, nor was it prohibited at the relevant time" and not done with any "criminal intent." If defrauding public exchequer and silently concurring to preferential treatment to a handful of monopoly houses in exchange of monetary and other favours is not a criminal act, what else is it? It is clear that notwithstanding the legal verbose and sickening attempt to underplay an act with definite malevolent intentions, the effort was to ensure non-implication of the former Finance Minister who is one of the most trusted political agents of the ruling monopolists. Like many of the previous cases, a scapegoat was found in Raja who no doubt is guilty of the crime but could not have done this without tacit approval of his other ministerial colleagues including seniors who mattered. History will bear out that since 1990s, a series of mega scams have unfolded to show how the evil of rampant corruption has pervaded the highest level of governance under the aegis of an unholy nexus of self-seeking ministers-power-greedy politicians-unscrupulous bureaucrats-dishonest businessmen-industrialists-blackmarketers-hoarders market manipulators basking under the tutelage of the ruling capitalist class. It is also evident that after some initial din and bustle, things cool down, case files rot in cold storage, enquiry commission reports are either not submitted or gather dust and the culprits, both identified and cunningly shielded, freely move around and even continue to carry out their unscrupulous activities. There is no reason to believe that things would be otherwise this time.

## Role of judiciary

This is where the role of the judiciary comes under the scanner. It becomes obvious that the relative neutrality, equity and fairness expected of the judiciary have been dumped in the instant case. Though sensing the mood of the people of the country, the SC had to dismiss the 2G allocation as *ultra vires*, it

threw away the epaulet of neutrality to shield and let off the hook the principal operators. Thus instead of a judiciary functioning with relative impudence strictly within the spirit and intent of democracy, we saw a judiciary acting in a partisan manner to shield high-ups in the government. Why has our experience been so disappointing and sordid? Because, the judiciary in any capitalist-imperialist country today cannot operate otherwise. It has to be committed to the aggregate class interest of the ruling bourgeoisie for which it has to shed its relative neutrality, overtly or covertly due to definite socio-political reasons. Every student of political science is aware that along with legislature and executive, judiciary is a permanent wing of the bourgeois state machine. As per the enunciation of bourgeois democracy, judiciary is entrusted with the responsibility of interpreting the existing law and is within its right to quash any act, behaviour, policy or practice which is violative of prevailing law. Forefathers of bourgeois democracy which evolved as political superstructure of capitalism envisioned that judiciary ought to function with relative neutrality and treat everyone equal in the eyes of law. During the rising period of capitalism as a progressive system by crumbling the age-old inertia of obsolete reactionary feudal order, the judiciary to a great extent functioned with relative impartiality and sought to safeguard rule of law. However, following inexorable course of history, capitalism today has lost all its progressive role, turned reactionary and been impeding social progress. In order to provide extra lease of life to its decadent moribund existence, ruling capitalist class is systematically subverting all democratic ethics, morality, codes, norms and practices. In the circumstances, it, in its vested class interest, cannot allow the judiciary to function with the relative neutrality lest that should pose threat to its oppressive class rule. In a class divided society, the state which is coercive machinery in the hands of the ruling class cannot but ultimately protect the class interest of the rulers. So, the judiciary as an inseparable organ of the capitalist state, in the ultimate, cannot go against aggregate bourgeois class interest. Aggregate class interest of the ruling bourgeoisie mandates a committed judiciary today bereft of the relative neutrality. So, people

find from life's experience that the judiciary is no more functioning with relative neutrality. While the rich and affluent, the capitalist owners and their hirelings, the 'who is who's are shown undue clemency by the judiciary, the common people, the deprived, deceived and repressed have-nots are denied justice more often than not. Even access to judicial process often eludes the suffering masses, let alone seeking judicial remedy of crime and injustice they are meted with in the exploitative capitalist rule. Often, trial becomes mockery; connivance of the judicial functionaries with the power that be surfaces nakedly. Partisan attitude of the judiciary in favour of the ruling class, its government and hang-ons no more remains a secret. Judiciary almost gets identified with the coercive capitalist state and government. This is what is meant by a committed judiciary which does not judge a case or dispute on merit and on the anvil of law and natural justice but in the manner conducive to protect and serve aggregate class interest of the ruling bourgeoisie. The present Supreme Court verdict once again reaffirms this vital truth.

## Both government and opposition subserve bourgeois class interest

It is pertinent to mention that this questionable aspect of the ruling has not been highlighted by the bourgeois press which hailed the judgment as "landmark", "a big blow against corruption" and so forth. Rather, it has been deliberately suppressed. Even the bourgeois opposition like BJP as well as the pseudo-Marxists like CPI(M), CPI who did not miss the occasion to take a dig at the Congress-led government solely from the objective of deriving electoral mileage also made no reference to this aspect. BJP leaders in their first reaction demanded resignation of the PM but did not pursue the matter anymore. All blusters spluttered into silence in no time. On the other hand, CPI (M) Polit Bureau in its statement dated 02-02-12 merely demanded implementation of the judgment and asked Kapil Sibal to resign forthwith. It is but natural because all these parties are also subserving bourgeois class interest for pelf and power and hence are themselves mired in corruption. So, they cannot go beyond a point lest that should stir a hornet's nest, skeletons tumble out of their desks and work against

the aggregate class interest of the ruling bourgeoisie.

Equally despicable and brazenly anti-people has been the role of the ruling Congress. If even rudiments of bourgeois democratic values had resided in those running the government, the Prime Minister and the entire Cabinet would have resigned taking moral responsibility. That has long been the tradition of bourgeois democracy. Even upto a certain period after independence, such instances have been seen by the countrymen. Any indictment on the government was viewed as no confidence on the Cabinet. But, in the instant case, we find the cabinet ministers are elated because there is no indictment of the Prime Minister or the then Finance Minister in the Supreme Court's judgment. Not only that. The present Telecom Minister Kapil Sibal who became the spokesperson of the government after the judgment was delivered, did not mince matter to say that though the FCFS policy has been ruled as discriminatory by the Supreme Court, there was no question of the government pre-empting a revision of the policy in other sectors. "Why should we pre-empt? There are statutes in other sectors. Let the Supreme Court strike it down," he said. In other words, he conveyed that this policy might well be followed in areas other than Telecom. Moreover, when asked as to whether the Court verdict refutes his assertion that the scam caused "zero loss", the Minister said there would not have been any question of loss if the policy (FCFS) was found right. It meant that as current in-charge of the concerned ministry, he never considered the policy erroneous earlier and is still reluctant to accept the same as faulty. So, he is giving an ambiguous answer to an otherwise straight question. Why should not he then be charged with contempt of court? This is the extent of degeneration of bourgeois democracy and its custodians today.

## Task of the people

In this backdrop it would be self-defeating if one places exclusive reliance on judiciary for seeking justice in the current world situation when capitalism is gasping in its death throes and destroying democracy to prolong its mutilated existence. At the same time, there has to be storm of protest against establishment of a committed judiciary. Every effort should be made to preserve whatever little of

*Contd. on page 8*

# Communist Party of Pakistan on recent developments in that country

[ In our last issue, we published an article on the recent developments in Pakistan. We now publish, ad verbatim, a press statement issued by the Communist Party of Pakistan, International Department, on the current situation there. ]

“The Pakistan’s current political crises, is the most horrific tussle among its top institutions, has morphed grievous consequent deadlocks for the running of the affairs of the state. In order to understand its fundamental reasons, here, we would need to analyze its background circumstances. The Pakistani military is no more a mere security agency, but an industrial and business corporation, in real terms. The economic and business positions of the army Generals, has over taken in many folds, the volume of the civilian business enterprises. On the basis of these economic interests, being a class in stake, the political privileges, advantages and access to power or supremacy over the political dispensation is for now realized to be an oxygen for them. Therefore, military, as a class no way can afford any civilian government to deliver things, independent of the gunmen’s prior approval. Among, the many businesses of the army, apart from industries and imports-exports, “JEHAD” is adapted to be the most credible business corporation, which has been for long greatly flourishing in leaps and bounds, under US imperialist’s patronage for the last 40 or so many years, as a result almost all 5 stars Generals and Major Generals have turned billionaires and down to the rank of Majors, have become Millionaires, in quite short span of life. The Obama’s administration (democrats), seems interested to work out some settlement for the Afghan issue, in order to cut down its colossal expenditures, there. They earnestly aspire for to have been successful in installing a US amicable government in Kabul, which would mean for the Pakistani Generals to wash off hands from the Jihad dividends. Consequently, the Generals have to resort, applying every means to keep up the past madcap policy on Afghanistan intact, so as to let the Jihad business go on. The present elected government, has opted for, greatly, a US harmonious policy on this issue. 4) There is also, exists a profound contradiction between the army and the civilian government over the establishment of relations

viz a vis, India concerned. The government desires to normalize relations with India, which is a total opposite perspective to the basic policy stand of the Generals. Keeping the Kashmir issue alive at all costs to legitimate the false security apprehension from India, so as to justify the persistent un-auditable increase in military budget and its personnel strength. This is subject to keep intact the security state, status of Pakistan, through enhanced empowerment and role granted to play by the military institution. 5) There exists another substantial difference between the civilian government and the army, over the policies of Pentagon/Republicans viz a viz concerning Iran. We understand, that there are two power centers in America. One is White House and the other is Pentagon. Similarly, in Pakistan too, two power centers have been evolved; the presidency, supported by the parliament and the progressive, liberal democratic forces of the society, where the GHQ (General Head Quarters) is the second power center, which enjoys the overwhelming support of the Judiciary (Supreme court of Pakistan), the coterie of the extremist religious fundamentalists and the center of the right forces of the country. The fore mentioned differences between the two power centers has reached its climax, and its further deterioration is a wide reason, that Pentagon, one of the power centers in America, seeking, under afresh terms and conditions, the logistical support and help of the Pakistan army, in the wake of possible military action against Iran. Where the civilian government, trying to somehow tactfully maneuver, the White house, in effort to divert the impending US military doom against Iran. At the same time, the failure in the considered strategic depth policy of Pakistan regarding Afghanistan and the enhanced role due under play by India, there is high reason for the Pakistani Generals, to express deep abjection White House, also. There does not exist even an iota difference between the civilian government and the Pakistani Military establishment about the IMF and world’s bank imperialist economic policies. The supreme court of Pakistan has morphed into being a de-facto respondent, readily knuckles to put to trial the civilian government, in almost every pretext able situation in order to default the

civilian dispensation, at all costs. But ironically it is totally numb and dumb in matters of public interests, the military operation, genocide in Baluchistan, the thousands disappearing of the political workers and their subsequent heinous murders and the ISI undue interference in the political affairs of the state. That’s why, now a greater majority of the conscious Pakistani polity has started calling “Chief Justice Iftikhar Mohammad Choudhry, the Lieutenant General Iftikhar Mohd Choudhry”. The way, the current government has resorted to run the affairs of the state in utter political inability, nepotism, corruption, along with the diktats of the world’s economic and imperialist institutions, has resulted in sky rocketing inflation, and catastrophic crises in the services and production sectors are due to unfold. Every time, when, there is in power, an elected government, then the progressive left and Communist forces, do evolve joint strategies for binding the government to democratic dispensation as well as finding ways to relieve it from the pressures of imperialist economic institutions and military establishment’s dictates. At the same time, the military bureaucracy starts hatching conspiracy pretexts for bringing down the government, in which scenario, the pro-people forces have to step back and put into force every strength to protect the elected system. If, in case the government is brought down prematurely, then these progressive and left forces, have to take two steps back from its class struggle front, in order to fight against dictatorship, forging in unwanted alliance with the ruling class. Because, the dictatorial regimes not only strangle the public’s democratic rights, but also kick off the notorious “JEHAD” business corporation by staunch reorganization of the obscurant and Jehadi militants. The whole society engulfs into religious sectarianism. In our point of view, the ruling Govt. must be allowed to complete its due term, the deposing authority from power must lie with the people, either through vote, mutiny or whatever. In the current critical situation, there is not only looms a substantial danger for the elected government, but the army has tasked to assemble together all the so called moderate religious (extremist obscurantist) forces, in the name of change, under the

leadership of Imran Khan. And on the other hand, at the same time, around “Jummat-u-ddawaa” (Lashkar-e-tayeba), the drive for unification of all JEHAD political and Center of the right forces, in the name of “Pakistan’s defense council” would greatly end up quite soon in making Pakistan a medieval theocratic state. Internally in Pakistan, lives would be further greatly endangered for progressive and democratic individuals. Similarly, interferences in the region by the religious forces would boom up and as a result Pakistan would become an epicenter of the devastating crusades. Present in the society, Center left, center of the left, left, the left nationalist forces of Baluchistan, Shiaa and other religious minority forces support the current government, only for the obvious above stated reasons and do raise their joint voices for election only in time, matured. They are now facing harsh persecutions, threats, intimidations and oppressions, at the hands of the religious extremist forces. On one side, there is an armed institution along with its armed to teeth Jehadi bands, fully backed by the supreme court of Pakistan against the meek unarmed progressive secular democratic forces, believing in the popular strength of vote. This collision is fast intensifying. Due to default economic policies of the elected government, the forces for democracy, ironically sticking to a very loose pitch. In this situation, we resort to the real popular front i.e. trade unions, peasantry movement, women and students, ought to be organized to fight back these audacious fascist forces. The Communists should reorganize its various fronts, according to the prevailing circumstances, in order to provide an alternative political force in the society, where the left forces should unite on minimum program, for holding workers conferences, peasantry conferences, students, youth conferences and women conferences, highlighting the struggle for their rights, is to be the core objective agenda for Pakistani political culture. For the 3rd stage, showing the strength, the left forces must develop inter mutual working relationship along with the other secular democratic forces of the country for tracking forward the elected system towards true stable democratic dispensation for future and peace in the region and beyond.”

# Lackeys of capitalism have no other go but to distort Marxism

*Contd. from page 4*

Even how much dividend (share of profit) would be distributed to the shareholders is decided by the company's management (Board of directors or the real owners). By cornering shares of a company, one industrial house replaces the other from the ownership of a company. Mergers and acquisitions of companies also take place through change of hands in shareholding of large industrial houses or monopoly groups. Would Mr Aiyer, "The Teacher", still claim that in all these management games, capitalist shareholders and ordinary shareholders play same decisive or manipulative role? Even if an industrial concern does not book profit or incur loss due to wrong management or any other reason pertaining to capitalist economic and commercial operation, the industry becomes sick, the ordinary shareholders lose money but not the owning industrialists. Ultimately shutters are downed on that industry, the workers who sold their labour power to produce goods in that industry lose jobs, more often than not forfeit their dues and turn into street beggars. Have anyone ever heard of an industrialist having ownership of multiple business becoming destitute? At best, the capitalists can have a temporary hit on their profit expectations or even incur marginal loss in an overzealous effort to net super profit. And this is also in the process of operation of capitalist economy. Just the other day, sub-prime crisis engulfed the entire capitalist world. Millions of common people were turned beggars overnight. Massive job loss and retrenchment made working people paupers. How many "ordinary shareholder industrialists or corporate giants" were affected? Statistics showed that wealth of billionaires and trillionaires multiplied to reach all time record. Would Mr Aiyer, "The Statistician", deny that? How is it that an ordinary shareholder, the number of which is also abysmally small in terms of quantum of holding, suffers because of a stock market crash while a

capitalist shareholder whom Mr Aiyer, "The Pundit", put in the same bracket finds his coffer overflowing? What kind of "equity" then Mr. Aiyer, "The Sage", is preaching then?

Next point is who are the shareholders? In the capitalist world where the gap between handful of rich and myriads of poor is widening every day, 1% is cornering maximum wealth and prosperity by depriving 99% of populace, would Mr Aiyer, "The Shareholder", say that but for a few 'poor' like him, those languishing in abject poverty are owning shares of a company? In India, according to government constituted Arjun Sengupta Commission has stated in no uncertain a term that 77% of the population does not earn more than Rs 20 a day. If one has to endorse the contention of Mr. Aiyer, "The Sociologist", one has to admit that these semi-clad semi-starved continuously pauperized countrymen are among the shareholders. Unfortunately, the fact is not what Mr Aiyer, "The Factfinder", has sought to project. Shareholders are mainly big capitalists, their lackeys, large financial institutions, operators of 'pooled resources' like insurance companies, mutual funds and pension funds and a few moneyed individuals. The individual shareholders mainly belong to upper middle-class and their holding is also significantly less. They are all inseparable parts of dying capitalism. Boom or loss, 'bull or bear' as the terms indicate rise and fall in share value, affect these class and that too occur following inexorable law of capitalism.

## The exploiting 'employees' of Mr Aiyer

Last of all, Mr Aiyer, "The Scholar", has bracketed high level executives, top management staff as employees whose labour is supposed to be appropriated by the capitalist owners. Are these people, the big guns in the giant financial institutions just 'employees' because they draw salary? Even

Anil Ambani, one of the top ten rich in the world, draws salary from his concerns in the capacity of managing director. Is he an employee? This salary, it may be added, is over and above the profit he earns from his enterprises. The Prime Minister also receives salary. Is he a wage earner like a daily labour or unorganized sector worker? These highly paid corporate executives are cog and screw of the oppressive capitalist machine. They receive fat salary because they skillfully implement the business policies of the capitalist owners. They, in fact, receive a part of the appropriated profit. Mr Aiyer, the 'Market Observer', has blamed these executives for defaulting in their risk estimation and bringing in its wake a crash in the speculative market leading to wiping out the value of the shareholders' money, to be exact, the speculative investment of the market players. These top guns receive instructions from their capitalist masters in regard to mode of operation in the market and are guided by the general principles of profit maximization. So they are no labourers, workers or employees but inseparable part of the process of capitalist operation. Marx had also shown that the capitalist state machine comprises military and bureaucracy as essential wings. All military officers and bureaucrats receive salary. Would one say that Marx had categorized these salary-

earning bureaucrats and military officials as labour whose labour power is appropriated to create surplus value?

## Bourgeois propaganda goes full-throttle

These trickeries, Mr Aiyer, "The Juggler of Words", are too old-fashioned to distort reality and hoodwink people. Delivering provocative homilies or drowning out reason in shrillness in a tearing hurry to quash scientific basis of Marxism could well be a pedantic drivel with self-styled erudition or aimed at securing prominence as a trusted foot soldier of ruling capitalism in the arena of economic journalism. "Occupy Wall Street" is a spontaneous expression of people's outrage against capitalist-imperialist oppression and only goes to corroborate Marx's prognosis and Lenin's enrichment of Marxian science. Sprucing up a theory of 'employees usurping surplus value' and 'owners suffering from decimated wealth', we are sorry, will not hold water. Let us remind Mr Aiyer, "The Sympathizer of Oppressive Capitalism", that Lenin had long back warned that they, the capitalist owners, are exhausted, not their propaganda machine. One can see how Mr Aiyer, "The Bourgeois Propagandist" has corroborated Lenin's prognosis by uttering a downright falsehood under cloak of pedantic discourse.

## Ruling on 2G licence allocation

*Contd. from page 6*

relative independence and democratic functioning of the judicial process. But that can be done only under pressure of a countrywide conscious powerful sustained organized democratic movement. It has been seen in lot of instances that there is definite impact of a strong public opinion on judiciary and on occasions, perverted outright anti-people verdicts could be prevented under pressure of movement from being prejudicial to people's interest and

shorn of due cognizance of all relevant facts and circumstantial evidences. The oppressive ruling class always tries to take advantage of any slack on the part of the conscious people in sustaining this pressure and stiffen its strangulating rule with more and more curtailment of democratic functioning. So, people have to remain ever agile and continuously assert their power through organized democratic mass movement along right track and under correct leadership.

**Make Historic Parliament March on 14 March  
A Grand Success  
to Press for Burning Demands of People's Life**

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : PROVASH GHOSH