

GREAT STALIN
And a reply to
the anti-communist smear campaign

PROVASH GHOSH

Socialist Unity Centre of India (Communist)

GREAT STALIN And a reply to the
anti-communist smear campaign — Provash Ghosh

First English Edition : 7 July, 2014

Published by : Manik Mukherjee
Socialist Unity Centre of India (Communist)
48 Lenin Sarani, Kolkata 700013
Phone : 2265-3234, 2249-1828

Printed at : Ganadabi Printers and Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
52B Indian Mirror Street, Kolkata 700013

Price : Paperback Rs. 50/-
Hardbound Rs. 60/-

Publisher's Note

On the occasion of the formal publication of a book "On Stalin", containing a collection of articles, reminiscences and interviews of eminent personalities of the past, Prometheus Publishing House invited our General Secretary Comrade Provash Ghosh in a programme held on 13 August, 2010 at Moulali Juba Kendra in Calcutta and also requested him to speak on Stalin. His speech was later published in a book titled "Great Stalin" by the publishing house in October 2010.

Later, before second printing of the book by our party, Comrade Provash Ghosh added more points and relevant materials. Subsequently two more editions in Bengali have been published. Hindi translation of the book is also published. A translation in English was long due and that is now published with the title "Great Stalin and a reply to the anti-communist smear campaign". For any error in translation, responsibility is ours.

In the light of the revolutionary teachings of our teacher, an eminent Marxist thinker of this era Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, this discussion of Comrade Provash Ghosh, we hope, would help to understand the greatness of Stalin and his outstanding contributions in the world communist movement as well as the reasons behind the motivated malicious propaganda against him.

7 July, 2014
48, Lenin Sarani
Kolkata-700013

Manik Mukherjee
Member, Polit Bureau
SUCI (Communist)

GREAT STALIN

And a reply to the anti-communist smear campaign

Prometheus Publishing House has invited me here today on the occasion of formally publishing their book titled 'On Stalin'. I have agreed to discharge this responsibility with deep respect and emotion as a soldier of the international communist movement, inspired by the revolutionary teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin-Mao Tse Tung-Shibdas Ghosh. The organizers have requested me to speak something on this occasion. I strongly feel that in the context of the all pervading global crises today, a comprehensive and in-depth study of the life and character of Great Stalin is very much an urgent task. I have in my mind, particularly the present generation, who have hardly any opportunity to gain a proper and correct idea about Stalin; rather they are accustomed to derogatory and misleading propoganda about him. So it is necessary that the exact truth be told. You know, I am one of the students of the great Marxist thinker of this era, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh and as such and with my limited ability, I shall speak on the basis of what I have learnt from his teachings.

Comrade Stalin, a worthy successor of Marx, Engels, Lenin, is an unforgettable, noble character in the history of mankind's struggle for emancipation. The great Mao Tse Tung, Shibdas Ghosh and numerous other communist revolutionaries had learnt from him the invaluable lessons on Marxism-Leninism. Stalin, the worthy disciple and comrade-in-arms of Lenin had played an epochal role as the builder of soviet socialism and as the guide to the world

communist movement in the post Lenin period, as the savior of human civilization from the fascist onslaught in the Second World War, as the inspiration to the national liberation movements of the colonies and finally as the unwavering sentinel of world peace. While speaking on this occasion, memories of my boyhood are coming back to me like today's special guest Prof. Tarun Sanyal., It was the last days of second world war and I cannot recollect much. Naturally at my present age one cannot recollect all the things of one's adolescent days. But it is still fresh in my memory that I used to often hear two names in the discussions of my elders at home and of the teachers at school. The first one was about Netaji Subhaschandra Bose. How and when he would defeat the British raj and bring freedom to our country was the focus of the discussions. The second was about Stalin who was deemed to defeat Hitler and save mankind. This is how I became acquainted with the names of these two great personalities.

Then the war ended. The teachers of an unknown school of an unknown village in the then British ruled East Bengal called a meeting and asked us to bring flowers and garlands. I do not remember all the deliberations, but what remains untarnished in my memory is the full length picture of Stalin, published in some Bengal daily, garlanded and decorated with flowers. From then on my attraction towards Stalin and communism began to grow gradually, though I was too young to really understand any of the political theories. Subsequently in 1947-48, from the newspapers, I came to know about the advancement of Mao's liberation army, Stalin's message of congratulations to Mao Tse Tung after the success of revolution in china. All these news were inspiring to us. Sometimes I would see in the newspapers that a comment or some views of Stalin were creating a stir in the world. The politicians, political analysts throughout the world became busy in interpreting and explaining them.

In 1950, I came to Calcutta and could collect some books of Stalin with his photos in them. I tried hard to

understand those writings, but I had not yet the ability. One thing I remember clearly that by simply touching those books I felt inspired. During these days, in 1950, I came in contact with SUCI (Communist), the party, founded by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. From then on, through intimate association with him, slowly and bit by bit I began to understand revolutionary politics.

Stalin in the eyes of eminent humanists and freedom fighters

The day was 3rd or 4th March in 1953. The terrible news arrived that Stalin's condition was critical and he had gone into deep coma. The whole world, including our country began waiting anxiously for further news. There was no television then in our country and so all ears were tuned to radio broadcasts. Then in the morning of 5th March, finally came the heartrending tragic news that Stalin was no more. The shock was so deep that it seemed the world stopped moving. Not only in Russia, but in Europe, Asia and in our country also, schools, colleges, factories, offices all stopped functioning. We too broke down. In the noon of that very day, we got assembled in our party office to hear from Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, and from his discussion we derived new strength just as after Lenin's death Stalin had provided the strength and inspiration to the communists and the working class of the world and Russia. Again on that very day Calcutta saw one of the biggest condolence rallies in its history, where people from all walks of lives joined. I remember the condolence message of Mao-Tse-Tung which came in the newspapers. His appeal to the communists and the exploited masses of the world was — 'our task is to transform grief into strength'. Virtually a wave of grief and sorrow swept the whole world with numerous mournful rallies and meetings in different countries, condolence messages of eminent personalities — all to mourn the death of Stalin.

An eminent Bishop of England, the Dean of Canterbury, Hewlett Johnson even said, "*if Jesus was alive*

today he could not but say something on Stalin.” (Daily Worker, 15 march, 1953)

The Prime Minister of India Pandit Jawarharlal Nehru, in the Indian Parliament spoke in a tearful voice — “*...perhaps no single figure has moulded, affected and influenced the history of those years more than Marshal Stalin. He became gradually almost a legendary figure.., he was not only famous in this generation but he was in a sense intimately concerned, if I may say so, with millions & millions of people...vast numbers thought of him in an intimate way, in a friendly way, in an almost family way..He was great in his own right, whether he occupied office or not, and I believe, that his influence was exercised in favor of peace. When war came he proved himself a very great warrior.*” (Labor Monthly, vol 35, 4th issue, April, 1953)

Acharya Vinoba Bhave, the true successor of Mahatma Gandhi, said, “*Marshal Stalin commanded respect and confidence of the people of this earth because he had some noble qualities which the world would never forget.*” (The Hindu, Madras, March 8, 1958).

These persons whom I have referred here are known as opponents of communism. Now listen to what Netaji said. When the Azad Hind Army was defeated in the war, Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose with deep respect and full confidence said, “*In postwar Europe, there is only one power that has a plan which is worth trial, and that power is Soviet Union. If there is one man in Europe today who holds in his hands the destinies of the European nations for the next few decades, that man is Marshal Stalin.*” (Radio speech from Singapore, quoted in ‘Subhas Chandra and National Planning’ by Sankari Prasad Basu). The famous scientist J.B.S Haldane opined — “*He is a great man, he did extraordinary work.*” (The life and works of J B S Halden). The eminent scientist Satyendra Nath Bose in a condolence message on 6 March, 1953 said — “*Stalin is no more—this very news has deeply moved me. He is known to the world for long thirty years. His towering*

achievement of saving his mother land remains an eternal pillar of his glory.” (Condolence message of scientist Satyendra Nath Bose on 6th March, 1953).

Stalin seems to have opened a new chapter of classical age — Romain Rolland

The remarks of great thinker Romain Rolland is unforgettable. He wrote, *“His intelligence.. is always alert, unfaltering, straightforward, always true, though a little grave. This intelligence does not waver before taking any decision. He has no practice of saying something in a roundabout way. His diplomacy does not include any crookedness, neither has it any place to eulogy and acclaim...It appeared to me that the cornerstone of the whole edifice of his nature lies in his sharp rationality, boundless patience, will force, indomitable spirit and wisdom. ...By giving honour to human emotions... and by leading the Soviet Union to Communist Internationalism for expanding the true understanding of proletarian democracy, Stalin, as it were, opens a new chapter of classical age in the annals of Russia and the people of the world.”* (Moscow Diary) This noble humanist of the twentieth century, during the last days of his life, in course of his quest for truth, decidedly regarded communism as the correct ideology

Real freedom exists in Stalin’s Russia — Bernard Shaw

George Bernard Shaw, another eminent humanist, intellectual and playwright of the 20th century drawing a comparison between Stalin and the then statesmen of the imperialist World, said, *“Stalin is a statesman of unique experience compared to whom the rulers of the western powers, hanging on to an automatic and evil system with an equipment of empty phrases, fictitious histories and obsolete routines, seem like rows of rickety figures in a worn-out waxworks.”* (G B Shaw, H Pierson — A postscript, colynis, 1951).

The eminent citizen Eleanor ‘O’ Connell, a close acquaintance of Bernard Shaw, desiring to move to United States from England on the assumption that there was more freedom and democracy in America than England, approached him, whence he told her — *“There is only one country in the world where you can enjoy real freedom — it is Russia where great Stalin is still alive.”*(*New Statesman and nations, December, 1934*).

Not only that, on 6 August, 1950, in his last interview with Renald News, when he was asked — “Mr. Shaw, are you a communist ?” Bernard Shaw unhesitatingly replied. *“Yes, I am certainly a communist. Fighting communism is a very terribly distinct act of ignoranceFuture remains with that very country which can carry communism ahead to the farthest and in the speediest mode. .”* (*G B Shaw — R P Dutta*).

Romain Rolland, though had lent his general support to the Russian revolution in its early days, he had also expressed his differences on certain questions. Later, after a thorough study of Soviet Socialism, his ideas underwent certain changes and in 1931, he wrote in one of his letters — *“I believe in the work of the USSR.I shall defend it as long as there is breath in my body.”* (*I will not rest*) In 1933, going one step further, this great man, in reply to a question wrote — *“Communism is today the only world-wide party of social action which, without reservations and without compromise, is carrying the flag and making its way, with a considered and courageous logic, toward the conquest of the high mountain lands The rest of the army will follow-though, it may be, at a distance and with desertions and withdrawals more than once..we do not need to wait for them...The marching column never stops”* (*For whom I write, I will not rest-Romain Rolland*). Just before this, Romain Rolland had written *“Within Communism, I have found a new people’s power and in the battle against Fascism, this will be the most powerful of all the powerful armies.”*(epilogue, *ibid*) It is obvious that when bourgeois civilization of the west was sinking in

grave crises, these two great humanists of the twentieth century became overwhelmed with joy and got attracted to the ideals of communism in their last phase of lives at the sight of a new civilization unfolding in Soviet Union under the stewardship of Stalin.

Stalin leaves us a rich monumental heritage

— **Paul Robeson**

Let us see what were the views of the world famous singer and lyricist Paul Robeson regarding Soviet Union and Stalin. He said, *“So, here one witnessed in the field of arts- a culture national in form, socialist in content. Here was a people quite comparable to some of the tribal folk of Asia...but now their lives flowering anew within the socialist way of life twenty years matured under the guidance of Lenin and Stalin. And in this whole area of development of national minorities- of their relation to the Great Russians –Stalin had played and was playing a most decisive role.*

Today in Korea - in Southeast Asia - in Latin America and the West Indies, in the Middle East one sees tens of millions of long oppressed colonial peoples surging toward freedom. ...And arrayed against them, the combined powers of the so called Free West ,headed by the greedy, profit-hungry, war-minded industrialists and financial barons of our America. The illusion of an ‘American century’ blinds them for the immediate present to the clear fact that civilization has passed them by-that we now live in a people`s century — that the star shines brightly in the East of Europe and of the world. Colonial peoples today look to the Soviet Socialist Republics. They see how under the great Stalin millions like themselves have found a new life...In all spheres of modern life, influence of Stalin reaches wide and deep...his contributions to the science of our world society remain invaluable. One reverently speaks of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin-the shapers of humanity`s richest present and future. Yes, through his deep humanity, by his wise understanding, he leaves us a

rich monumental heritage. Most importantly, he has charted the direction of our present and future struggles. He has pointed the way to peace-to friendly co-existence-to the exchange of mutual scientific and cultural contributions- to the end of war and destruction...He leaves tens of millions all over the earth bowed in heart-aching grief.” (www.northstarcompass.org.)

On the other hand, how deep was the esteem and trust of the revolutionary leaders of the anti-imperialist freedom struggle towards Marxism and Soviet revolution can be understood from a remark of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, the legendary revolutionary leader of the Indian freedom struggle . In the Indian political conference, in London in 1933, he said — *“During the nineteenth century Germany made the most remarkable gift through her Marxian Philosophy. During the twentieth century Russia has enriched the culture and civilisation of the world through her achievement in proletarian revolution, proletarian Government and proletarian culture.”* (*Speeches in Indian political conference at London, 1933*). Again from a speech of Subhashchandra Bose that he delivered as the elected president of National Congress at Haripura in 1938, it was clear that the freedom fighters found in Soviet Union their most dependable friend. In that speech, while dealing on the influence of the imperialist powers in the world, he said, — *“Against this background of unrest stands Soviet Russia, whose very existence strikes terror into the heart of the ruling classes in every imperialist state”*. (*Crossroads — Subhaschandra Bose*). In the Tripuri Session of Indian National Congress in 1939, as Congress President, he had expressed his anxiety over the conspiracy of the imperialist block to destroy Soviet Union — *“The so-called democratic powers, France and Great Britain, have joined Italy and Germany in conspiring to eliminate Soviet Russia from European politics,”* (*Crossroads — Subhas chandra Bose*).

See how Netaji named England and France as the ‘so-called democratic powers.’ Now those ‘intellectuals’ of

our country, who are delighted at the fall of soviet socialism and are all praise for parliamentary democracy, would say about Netaji`s observation? Moreover, this observation of Netaji was made after the well-known Moscow trial — which even today evokes malice & slander against communism. Not only Subhash Chandra, but the great freedom fighters of all countries including the nationalist revolutionary leader of China, Dr.Sun-yat-sen, had similar profound trust, respect and love for Soviet Union.

In 1939, in a meeting at Purulia, West Bengal, Subhashchandra went a step further and expressed the hope — *“The countless currents and counter-currents in the present world system can be divided into two main forces — the imperialist forces and as their counter-current the surging forces of communism. So the defeat of Hitlerism means the establishment of communism.”* (*Crossroads — Subhash Chandra Bose*)

In 1930, the great poet Rabindranath, old by age, had visited Soviet Union. He was overwhelmed in admiration and wrote *“Once upon a time the French Revolution is caused by the pressure of inequality. The oppressed realized that the humiliation and misery of inequality were universal. Thus it was during that revolution that the message of liberty, equality and fraternity was carried across the frontiers of France. But it did not endure. Here also the revolutionary appeal is universal. In the world, the people of this country at any rate are thinking of the interests of the whole humanity, transcending all national interests... They have no time to lose, because the whole world is their opponent; they must prove without delay that what they want is not wrong, that is not fraud; a decade or two is determined to prevail against a millennium. Very small is their material strength, but the daring of their willpower defies comparison... I am in Russia; had I not come, my life`s pilgrimage would have remained incomplete.”* (Tagore Letters from Russia. Letter No. 3, Moscow, 25th September, 1930.)

In 1939, the poet in a letter to a younger poet Amiya Chakraborty again showered profuse praise on Soviet Union, wishing it all success. Needless to say that in the meantime, the trial of the counter-revolutionaries in the Soviet Union was over, regarding which fascist Germany, the reactionaries and the present bourgeoisie world had reveled in anti-Stalin slander. However, Rabindranath was not confused by it at that time and in this letter wrote —

“Does the majority have to sacrifice itself always to the will of the minority? ... When I see in front of me an impenetrable helplessness of such dimensions, I come to understand that until and unless there is a change in the basis of this ruthless civilization to the weak, we would be unable to live on the breadcrumbs thrown from the banquet table of the rich in utter disregard... I saw this attempt to change the basis of civilisation, when I went to Russia. In spite of many defects, I would see the shape of a new era for mankind in that hermitage and so I became full of joy and hope. Nowhere else in the history of mankind did I observe such a permanent cause of joy and hope. I am aware that Russia has established this new era on a revolution; but this revolution is against the most cruel and powerful vices of mankind; this revolution is a verdict of atonement against long years of sin. This new Russia is engrossed in an arduous practice of removing a death missile from the ribs of human civilization — that which is known as ‘greed’. This prayer — that their struggle be victorious — eventually comes into being out of its own.”

In this letter, he clearly stated that — ‘nowhere else in the history of mankind did I observe such a permanent cause of joy and hope.’ (Letters of Rabindranath Tagore, Vol II, Viswabharati Granthan dept.) What a profound confidence he had about the Russian Revolution in 1939. His another judgement as a humanist was outstanding. Through the ages, religious ideas has propagated that greed and lust are the products of sin committed under the influence of Satan, these traits are absolute, hence will always remain in the society. To the bourgeois thinkers and philosophers

also these are primitive traits, eternal in character, at best can be somewhat controlled by ethics and morality. Against this, Marxism says – “Inequality did not grow out of greed, rather society based on inequality gave birth to greed.” (*Marxism and Development of Human Society* — Shibdas Ghosh) In other words, after the establishment of private ownership of property and inequality in the society, the sense of greed was born in the human thinking and only after the end of class exploitation and establishment of social ownership would this mental complex of greed would be abolished through cultural revolution. On seeing that such a task was taken up in the Soviet Union, Rabindranath wrote “...*This new Russia is engrossed in an arduous practice of removing a death missile from the ribs of human civilization — that which is known as ‘greed’.*” Rabindranath wished success of this noble task.

During the Second World War, when Rabindranath was critically ill and bedridden, he had reposed all his hopes only on the Soviet Union in the fight against fascism, the arch enemy of civilization. Scientist Prasanta Chandra Mahalanobish writes — “During the last stage of his illness, when Germany attacked Russia, Rabindranath used to repeatedly ask about what was happening in Russia. He repeatedly said — ‘I will be happiest if Russia wins.’ On every morning he would wait to get the daily news of the war. If on any day the condition of Russia was bad, his face would turn pale and he would throw away the newspaper. On the day of his operation, just half-an-hour before the operation in the morning, I had this last conversation with him, he asked — ‘Tell me the news of Russia’ I told him that it seemed to be a bit improved, they have perhaps been able to stave off the Germans. His face lit up and he said “such was sure to happen,, only they can do this and they would succeed.” — (Kabikatha — Prasanta Chandra Mahalanobish, Biswabharati Patrika, 1350 Bengali Year) Note what a deep confidence, trust and emotion this great poet had about the Soviet Union led by Stalin.

Moved by the great success of Soviet Union in the war

under the leadership of Stalin, the eminent scientist Dr. Meghnad Saha, in October 1942, in his article ‘Twenty five years of the Soviet Union, Science and Culture’, wrote — *“Twenty five years ago the proletariat came to power in Russia, emancipated all the colonies of czarist Russia, consolidated their revolution against heavy odds, both external and internal, and set to the task of industrialization and modernization on a scale unheard of in all history..... The titanic struggle which the Soviet Union has been putting up against the most powerful military machine of all times has been a surprise to most governments and peoples of the world including even Germany..”* I narrate all these for those who could not see that era, did not pass through those times. That even today I could stand firmly with my ideological conviction, could still remain unwavering in the struggle with the flag of communism, is because of the teaching and inspiration that we have got from Comrade Shibdas Ghosh on the unique communist character and the revolutionary ideas of Stalin. Today, I would try to show some valuable aspects of the life struggle of Comrade Stalin. I do also like to answer to some of the smear campaign against him.

**In the preparation for the November revolution
and in protecting the fledgling Soviet Socialism,
Stalin was the most reliable disciple and
comrade-in-arms of Lenin.**

All of you know that Stalin joined the revolutionary movement at a very early age and he came from a real proletarian family. His father was a cobbler and his mother a washer woman. At that time in Czarist Russia, he was imprisoned many a time, sent on several occasions to exile and again he had managed to escape also Quite a history! He started organizational activities through his work among the railway and oil-field workers. Stalin drew the attention of Lenin for his exemplary determination, courage, dutifulness and sincerity in taking up the cause of the party and revolution at any and every time whenever

necessity demanded. The word ‘Stalin‘ means steel and his party comrades gave him this name for his steel like revolutionary character. This was not his actual name. His original name was Josef Vissarionovich, abbreviated as J.V. It was in 1913, when Stalin did not yet become Great Stalin, he made a contribution to the Marxian treasury of knowledge on ‘National Questions’. In a letter to Gorky, Lenin had mentioned Stalin’s name in appreciation. Afterwards,, impressed by Stalin’s ability Lenin once said — *“If the politbureau faces a problem which demands the utmost discretion for its analysis, it is none but Stalin who should be entrusted with the task”* (A theses social — Jean Loui Richer Block)

In 1917, Stalin was released from imprisonment after the February revolution but Lenin could not yet return to Russia from his foreign exile. In Petrograd, the headquarter of revolution and in Moscow the capital of the country, the Bolshevik Party was virtually leaderless. Stalin arrived and took up the reins of the party organ ‘Pravda’ and other responsibilities. Then Lenin returned from abroad. In Russia the bourgeois Kerensky government had just assumed power and it, on the basis of various charges brought against Lenin by the erstwhile Czarist government, asked him to surrender, promising him fair trial. Trotsky, Zinoviev and others advised Lenin to surrender. From Lenin’s wife Krupskaya’s writings we came to know that on hearing this news Stalin out of anxiety rushed to warn Lenin that if he surrendered, the Kerensky government would surely kill him. Stalin made arrangements to shift Lenin elsewhere and saved his life. Had not Stalin been there the world might have lost Lenin much earlier. In the month of April,1917 that is only two months after the February revolution, there arose in the party an intense ideological debate on Lenin’s April Theses on the strategy and tactics of revolution and in this battle Stalin stood firmly by the side of Lenin and fought hard against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev in support of the strategy of the anti-capitalist socialist revolution. With the support of Stalin

and others, Lenin adopted the line of socialist revolution and successfully organized the historic November revolution in 1917 itself. Stalin played an outstanding role as Lenin's trusted comrade-in-arms in the preparation and in the fight for seizure of power in this revolution.

Many of you are perhaps not aware that in the year 1917 Russian economy was in an extremely backward condition.. Feudalism had significant hold on agriculture and in the field of industry also Russia was very backward with foreign capital having a significant sway. Naturally, the question arose — why then Lenin at this stage had called for an anti-capitalist socialist revolution ? A serious debate on this issue raged at that time. In his historic 'April Thesis', Lenin explained that through the February revolution, the bourgeois class had seized power disposing off the feudal Czarist rule and to that extent the bourgeoisie democratic revolution of Russia was completed. Lenin explained that as the principal question of revolution was the determination of the class character of the state, so in Russia after the ascendancy of the bourgeoisie in state power, the character of the next revolution would be anti-capitalist socialist revolution and this socialist revolution would accomplish the unfinished tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution. He reasoned that in this era of imperialism, when internationally capitalism had become moribund, decadent and completely reactionary, the democratic revolution if led by the bourgeoisie would no longer be completed, rather would end in halfway. So this task is also to be taken up by the proletariat today

In the first world war Russia became devastated, condition of famine was persisting. Just think, in such a backdrop, revolution was taking place. Civil war was ravaging Russia, there was no end to it, at such a moment in 1918, the imperialists, the "flag bearer of democracy", jointly launched an armed attack on Russia. They had neither cited any reason, nor declared a war officially. The attack lasted for four long years, yet you won't find any mention of this unilateral attack in the history books

written by the bourgeoisie. Why did they attack Russia? In the successful revolution by the Russian working class, the world bourgeoisie saw a grave threat to world imperialism-capitalism. They were afraid that if the newly born working class state was not destroyed, the working class in their countries, inspired at the example of Soviet Russia, would also rise up against the ruling class.. So the imperialists vowed not to allow the existence of an exploitation-free socialist system on this earth. This is how the 'champions of democracy' offer worship to democracy! Thus Russia then faced a mortal danger and the existence of the infant socialist state was threatened. In such a situation Lenin had relied most on Stalin. In the battlefield, wherever the crises became acute, Lenin sent Stalin to deal with that. Stalin would rush from one front to the other to save revolution. This was how Stalin discharged his great responsibility. But you should also know that while the working class of Soviet Union fought desperately to save the first socialist state, the working class of the imperialist states also had put up resistance struggle against their respective states to compel the rulers to stop attack on Soviet Union. And ultimately they had to stop.

It should be kept in mind that in the First World War the Russian economy virtually got ruined. Severe famine was going on. In such a condition historic November Revolution was made successful. Then came the imperialist attack, the counter-revolutionaries were also active in subversive work. During such a critical time Lenin introduced war communism. This entailed hard measures in various sectors. It was decided that whatever a peasant would produce, after keeping a necessary part for his own living, rest were to be sold to the state to prevent severe food crises which was about to engulf the whole country, people would die of starvation and the red army which was fighting the imperialists in the fronts would be deprived of ration. It was difficult to persuade the peasants to agree to this. The counter-revolutionaries were inciting them. Here also Stalin played important role

in convincing the peasantry to accept the plan. When foreign imperialist attack was repulsed and the counter revolution inside the country suppressed, Lenin declared the end of the period of war communism and started implementing his famous ‘New Economic Policy’. With the object of urgent and rapid industrial development in an underdeveloped and extremely backward country, national and international capital was allowed the scope of limited investment in certain spheres under the strict control of the socialist state. Over this NEP, many a confusion was created. A group of ultra-revolutionaries began to say that Lenin had abandoned the path of revolution. Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others started to sow the seeds of despondency inside the party. At that time also Stalin stood firmly by the side of Lenin and resolutely fought against these confusions.

Stalin used to work almost silently. In protecting the party and revolution, in implementing Lenin’s instructions and in every other sphere Stalin played a unique role. In this context, I cannot but help referring to Issac Deutcher, who penned a biography of Stalin. Deutcher was a known supporter of Trotsky and was out and out opposed to Stalin. But despite his conscious effort to portray Stalin as a villain in his book, he too could not but admit certain truths. In course of explaining his ideas about the characteristic features of the leaders, at a point, Deutcher himself posed the question — why not Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev, Kamenev but Stalin could assume the position of the highest leader? Deutcher himself replied- those leaders were always engaged in bickering over lifeless theories. They were also rivals to one another in the race to the post of the next leader. But for Stalin, the only mission of life was to save and protect the party and the socialist state and he went on working silently to fulfill the task. He did not bother about who would assume leadership. It may be mentioned here that on Lenin’s proposal Stalin became a member of the central committee in 1912 and became the General Secretary of

the party in 1922. History has proved beyond doubt that Lenin had given the responsibility to someone worthy of it. On Stalin, Deutcher further wrote — “*it is impossible to narrate the private life of Stalin*”. Why did Deutcher say like this? Deutcher wrote that there was nothing to write separately about the personal life of Stalin, since nothing was available on that count. Stalin did not even write a simple personal letter to anybody. Being a communist of high standard, Stalin`s personal life, the party and the revolution, all got merged into an integrated whole. There was no gap. This made the vast difference between Stalin and Trotsky or others.

In different countries, in Russia, in China or in our country too, a group of intellectuals have joined the communist movements who are apt in parroting quotations about Marxism from here and there. They bear no links with the soil or reality. In absence of proper understanding of Marxism they remain busy only to show off their pedantry. Lenin had to confront them and he had proved that those pedants were not standing on Marxism, rather lying down on it. Lenin further said — “*concrete analysis of concrete situation is the living soul of Marxism*”. To Lenin and Stalin, cultivation of theory was necessary only for the cause of revolution, for the searching of truth in order to advance the struggle for the emancipation of the working class. They never bothered about personal recognition, fame or whether they were being admired or glorified. That was why Lenin did not fail to identify the very person, worthy of taking the great responsibility. You know Lenin was shot and became seriously ill. Within only two years after assigning the charge of the General Secretary to Stalin, Lenin breathed his last. Standing by Lenin`s body Stalin took the oath to safeguard the party`s unity, to strengthen soviet socialism and the international communist movement. Till his last breath Stalin had kept this pledge in letter and spirit.

Russia was then passing through very hard days. Soviet socialism was still in the stage of New Economic Policy. It

may be surprising to know that till 1926, the economic condition of Soviet Russia was far worse than that of pre-first world war Czarist Russia, that is, of the period before the revolution. Then after a little growth, Russia's total production in 1927 became equal to that of 1917 level. You can imagine the then miserable economic condition of the country. The world war, famine, again foreign invasion, civil war — all these had caused such a devastation that it took ten long years only to bring the country back to what it was in 1917. It was evidently not an easy task. Many battles were waged to prop up the economy. Then came the period of five year plans. The first five year plan started in 1929 and was completed by 1934. In the end of the first plan, it was found that Russia could produce more than triple of the amount of the pre-first world war production, that is, pre-1917 level. In this way, only in seven years, (i.e. from 1927 to 1934), an agriculture based backward country was transformed into an industrially developed nation. Such a rapid progress of any country was never seen before in the world and this became possible only due to Stalin's leadership.

In 1937, Russia could produce seven times more than what it could produce in 1917. Actually during these years, the party and the soviet government accomplished a task of such a gigantic scale which the world had never witnessed before. At Stalin's call, the working class and the people of Russia unitedly laboured for days and nights. The renowned American journalist Anna Louis Strong and other foreign newsmen were direct witness to it and all these were amazing to them. Stalin knew that unless Soviet Union could be rapidly made powerful, and the gap with the advanced capitalist countries in economic development could be reduced, soviet socialism would not be saved. Stalin at that time had said that we were lagging by fifty to one hundred years behind the advanced capitalist nations. We would have to overcome this gap within ten years. Either we would do it or we would perish. The huge responsibility that Stalin had to bear to

make the five year plans successful, has perhaps no parallel in history.

For this he had to inspire the party and the people and convince them about the achievability and necessity of socialist construction. Again he had to combat the conspiracies of the Trotskytes, the opposition from the Zinoviev, Bukharin, Kamenev faction. People had to be convinced about the possibility of building socialism in one country even being encircled by the imperialist-capitalist countries. Also he had to defeat the counter-revolutionaries inside the country..Braving such enormous adversities, this great leader turned the impossible into possible. This success took the economists and the intellectuals of the western world by surprise because many of them believed, even some had forecast that Soviet economy would soon crumble due to increasing crises. They had no idea about the strength of the science of Marxism-Leninism when applied correctly under a worthy and able leadership. This was a unique struggle in the history of human civilization. All of them later expressed their unreserved admiration and awe for this achievement of Soviet. Overwhelmed with emotion and respect, Bernard Shaw, could not but say, “Stalin has delivered the goods to an extent that seemed impossible ten years ago; and I take my hat off to him accordingly”. (Political conservatism and classical liberalism — Bernard Shaw)

Stalin protected the revolutionary kernel of Lenin’s thoughts from distortion

Remember that Comrade Stalin had to simultaneously wage another vital ideological battle against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others who were trying to vulgarize Lenin’s ideas. By quoting from Lenin in random and without context, this coterie was conspiring to distort Lenin’s teachings. It was Stalin, who defeated this conspiracy and protected the kernel of Lenin’s revolutionary ideas and placed those before the world. Had he failed to do so, a distorted and erroneous view of

Lenin's teachings would have been created both inside and outside Russia, consequently neither socialism in Russia could be saved nor the world communist movement could have developed. 'Leninism' — this very expression that we often use today and is known throughout the world was conceived by none but Stalin. Stalin was the first to say — "Leninism is the Marxism in this era of imperialism and proletarian revolution" (*Problems of Leninism — Stalin*) Leninism provided the contemporary higher understanding of Marxism. The revolution in China, Vietnam and various other revolutionary and freedom movements in different countries that grew and developed later were all guided by Leninism.

It was Stalin who through his widely known book 'Problems of Leninism', had explained precisely the meaning and significance of 'Leninism' and why 'Leninism' ought to be defined as the Marxism of this era. The book also contains answers to various distortions done by the opponents and some invaluable analyses on certain important theoretical questions. Without this book, it would have been extremely difficult to know and understand Leninism, particularly in the context of the attempts by Trotsky and others to distort it. In this book, Stalin had comprehensively elucidated to the members of the CPSU, to the Soviet people and to the international communist movement that why Leninism is Marxism of this era. The book explains thoroughly where exactly Lenin had developed the ideas of Marx and Engels, where, by applying dialectical materialist method Lenin had explained the new conditions in the post Marx-Engels era and had made new theoretical contributions. This book was a great contribution of Stalin..

Thus on the one hand there was the huge task of socialist construction of society and its economy and for that to rally the working class and the people behind this day and night struggle, to inspire the party and the whole country in this fight and to keep them united, while on the other there was the ideological battle against all opposition

in order to place before the people of the country and the working class of the world, the real understanding of Marxism-Leninism in the concrete conditions. These extremely difficult tasks were accomplished by Stalin simultaneously,

How and why the likes of Trotsky and Zinoviev degenerated

Why was the opposition defeated in the ideological battle? Because however scholastic they might have been, however adept they were in quoting from here and there, they lacked in one essential thing and that was the correct realization of Marxism and genuine communist character. On this point Comrade Shibdas Ghosh gave us a brilliant observation. While discussing on M N Roy (Manabendra Nath Roy) episode, Comrade Ghosh said that he (M.N. Roy) had gone through all the branches of knowledge and in this regard he had no parallel in his time in India. Yet not only he failed to become a communist but turned into an anti-communist in the last days of his life. How did it become so? Actually he had failed in dialectically coordinating the theories of different branches of knowledge and thereby in understanding their essence. Thus he could not acquire the dialectical materialist outlook and failed to adopt Marxism as the guiding philosophy of his life. This was the reason for which he failed to understand that his conduct, habits, personal life style, family life style and character were not based on Marxism and not conducive to the revolutionary movement. From this ignorance came his failure to identify himself with the party and revolution. This observation of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh is applicable in respect of Trotsky and his likes too. These very essential things made the great difference between them and Stalin. Scholasticism could not save them from degeneration. They could not accept that Leninism is the correct understanding of Marxism in this era of imperialism. Trotsky and others used to preach that socialism was not possible in one country although the

hollowness of this idea was theoretically exposed by Lenin and later specially by Stalin. Not only in theory, but in practice too the unprecedented development through socialist reconstruction in Russia, despite being encircled by world imperialism-capitalism along with their conspiracies and other hurdles, pointedly showed how grossly wrong was Trotsky's theory. Yet he did not mend, rather being isolated, he formed a coterie and embarked on a heinous conspiracy. This coterie had the scope of ventilating their views in the country as they could publish books and papers. But soon those turned out to be the den of counter-revolution and gradually they developed links with foreign imperialists and fascists. How much damage the soviet state had suffered due to its initial lenient approach towards the opposition, can be understood from a comment of Stalin in one of his interviews in 1931. Jean Risher Bloch, a French author, for whom Romain Rolland had great affection, had published the interview in 'Adisis Sociale' magazine in 1949. In West Bengal it was published in a leftist Bengali magazine 'Parichay' after Stalin's death. In that interview Stalin had said — "After seizure of power, the Bolsheviki adopted a policy of forgiveness towards their enemies. The programme carried out by the Mensheviks had not yet been declared illegal till then. Their organ was also allowed to be published. When General Kresnov began his counter-revolutionary attack against Petrograd, we succeeded in taking him captive and according to the rules of battle we could have imprisoned him or shot him dead. But we freed him after extracting some verbal promises only. What benefit did we derive from all these? Immediately it could be seen that this soft method had weakened the basis of Soviet rule. We had erred in showing compassion to the enemies of the working class. Had we repeated the same mistake, it would have been tantamount to crimes against the working class" (*Translation from Bengali, ours*)

In this context, I like to point out one important thing. When some people were eager to show that Trotsky and

others worked all along as agents of imperialism, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh did not agree to this view. To him, this was an oversimplified and mechanical way of judging things and therefore erroneous. In some cases this may be true. There might be some people who, as agents of capitalism-imperialism, may infiltrate revolutionary movements. Again in respect of many, it is seen that despite their initial honest mind in joining the revolutionary movement, the influence of individualism, craving for name, fame, post, habit of showing off, egoism instead of true sense of self-respect and dignity, failure to fight bourgeois culture, failure to admit mistakes and to correct them, compromise with various weaknesses in personal lives, gradually and unknowingly push them to degeneration even to the extent of their becoming accomplices of counterrevolution.

Egoism works in subtle way. 'I am correct on all points, I cannot make mistakes' 'I will suffer a loss of prestige if I am defeated by someone in an ideological debate' — this type of egoist thinking erodes one's character from within. They cannot even know how and when they get detached from the party and revolution by continuously rationalizing their wrong positions. This happens to some in the revolutionary movements in different countries. Initially they come with the dream of revolution, but turn against revolution later. Once a revolutionary becomes a renegade later.

So who were agents from the beginning and who through degeneration subsequently turned into renegades must be differentiated and we should be able to understand that difference. If recognized in time, then at the beginning of the process of degeneration, when it remains within corrigible limit, the appropriate leadership can save them, but that too is possible if they respect the party authority and are ready to accept reason and rectify themselves. But Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Bukharin and others, since the time of Lenin, considered themselves as above all others, created many a theoretical muddle and were not ready to agree about anything easily. Actually they were

pedants in Marxism, had high intellectual ability, but could not become declassed as they had failed to apply Marxism in their personal lives, in their conduct and behavior. This inevitably gave birth to extreme vanity, know-all attitude and high aspirations in them. Another significant point was there. Stalin considered Lenin as his teacher, as the authority of Marxism. To Stalin, Leninism is ‘Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution’, and hence universal guide to revolutions. But Trotsky and others did not think like this. They considered Lenin as one of the leaders of the Bolshevik party and themselves as almost at par with Lenin. They could not accept Lenin as their teacher and an authority. This was one of the root causes of their degeneration.

Trotsky denied the role of the poor peasantry in the revolution

Trotsky even said in 1913 that “Lenin is the ‘professional exploiter’ of the backwardness of Russian working class movement” (*On opposition — Stalin*). Zinoviev considered “Leninism is only conducive to the revolution of a backward agrarian economy based country like Russia” (*On opposition — Stalin*) and thereby meant that Leninism was not applicable to developed countries. Bukharin claimed that it was due to the influence of his writings that Lenin was able to develop the theories in his famous book ‘The State and Revolution’. Trotsky, for the entire period from 1903 to February 1917, had vacillated between the Bolshevik and Menshevik lines on the question of who was right. This was the standard of his high theoretical knowledge! Trotsky joined the Bolshevik party on the eve of the November revolution, but from the very beginning one after another serious theoretical differences started to surface between Trotsky and Lenin. Since the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia was incomplete and feudalism had significant hold over agriculture, there remained a role of poor and middle peasantry in the revolution. It was for this that though

Lenin called for a socialist revolution yet raised the slogan '*No Tsar but a workers and peasants` government`*'. Trotsky opposed this. He considered the poor and middle peasantry as reactionary and therefore had no role in the revolution. Trotsky`s slogan was '*No Tsar but a workers` government`*'. In spite of his arguments getting rejected repeatedly by the party, he held on to this idea till the end. Lenin showed that in the era of imperialism, socialist revolution was possible even in a backward country and due to uneven development of capitalism in different countries, socialism could be established and built up in a single country. Trotsky opposed this theory in the same tune with Kautsky and the Mensheviks. His idea was that victory of the socialist revolution in an underdeveloped and backward country like Russia was not possible and even if by any chance seizure of power became possible, it could not be sustained unless there were revolutions in the advanced countries and help did not come from them to Russia. On this reasoning, he believed that socialism in a single country could not be established and made successful. Trotsky`s theory of permanent revolution meant simultaneous revolution in all countries. He castigated Lenin`s theory of possibility of socialism in a single country as falling victim to '*sectarian national mentality`*'.

In the last days of First World War, when Czarist Russia was facing defeat, Russian revolution took place, but war was still going on. Lenin felt the urgent necessity of peace and as a result a bipartite peace talk with Germany was arranged in the city of Brest. Trotsky was sent there as the representative of Soviet state, but in defiance of Lenin`s instructions, he decided not to have any settlement. Trotsky was in favour of continuance of the war as he thought war would bring revolution in Germany. This wrong decision of Trotsky gave Germany scope to move German troops further into Russia. Pushed to disadvantageous position, the infant Soviet state had to make peace conceding more territory to Germany and

thereby causing significant damage to Soviet Union.. Trotsky also opposed the policy 'War communism' and 'New Economic Policy'. For this Lenin described Trotsky's ideas as 'Non Bolshevism'. Exasperated by Trotsky's theoretical bragging, Lenin once said "All that glitter is not gold. There is much glitter and sound in Trotsky's phrases but they are meaningless" (*On Opposition* — Stalin) Zinoviev, Kamenev too started opposing various correct observations and decisions of Lenin from the very beginning. When the Bolshevik party was preparing for insurrection just after the February revolution, the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries formed a Provisional council of Republic or pre-parliament in an attempt to thwart the revolution. Lenin's proposal was to boycott this pre-parliament but Zinoviev and Kamenev insisted on joining it. The central committee of the party rejected their views and in accordance with Lenin's proposal decided to go for insurrection. This made Zinoviev and Kamenev furious and they divulged the plan of the impending insurrection to the newspaper of the Mensheviks. As a result the Bolsheviks were compelled to change and fix the date of insurrection to an early date. After the seizure of power, they put forward a bizarre proposal to form a coalition government with Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries instead of only the Bolsheviks forming the government. Both of them opposed NEP and argued that socialism was not possible in a backward country like Russia. To make the party alert about Zinoviev and Kamenev, Lenin before his death gave the caution that the disclosure of the date of insurrection to the Menshevik newspaper by these two was not accidental. By this Lenin meant that their heinous act was linked to their outlook and character.. Bukharin was against the policy of laying emphasis on state and collective farming. He also opposed the programme of class struggle against the kulaks or rural bourgeoisie. His idea was that "the kulaks can also be the supporting forces of socialism" and on this ground he

opposed the party line. On Bukharin, Lenin's observation was though he had read a lot and a scholar himself, he had no understanding of Marxism.

Why Stalin had to take stern steps against Trotsky and the likes

All of them formed separate groups and fractions inside the party and opposed Lenin's theoretical premise that a genuine revolutionary party of the proletariat should be democratically centralized and monolithic. To them this Leninist concept was tantamount to bureaucracy, hence they demanded certain ultra democratic privileges. Initially the groups had differences on issues among themselves. But with the passage of time, as they were facing defeat in polemics in various party forums and losing their influence in the party, they became close to each other and ultimately became united in a single group. Since Lenin's time differences and debates on various issues were going on with them in the party. But after Lenin's death their attack centering those issues became more forceful against Stalin's leadership. We should keep in mind that Soviet Union at that time had not yet completed the stage of NEP (New Economic Policy) and socialism was in an infant stage. In this regard, some observations of M N Roy are significant. M N Roy was in a responsible position in the communist international during Lenin's time. though later due to differences of opinion he excused himself and in his last days became anticommunist and anti-Stalin. He was present in the meeting in which Trotsky was expelled from the party. Later, even being anti-Stalin, he had observed in an article titled 'Trotsky and Stalin' — *"In fact, there was never any personal conflict between the two...The policy Trotsky severely opposed as Stalinism was identical with the new Economic Policy formulated by Lenin. This policy was no deviation from Marxism. Rather it can be said, that in the given context, it was purported to match the reality with Marxism... Trotsky always believed that he only was right*

and all others were wrong and that ultimately the party would be compelled to accept him as a model leader. With that hope, he out of a sense of charity engaged himself in party activities...If Stalin was removed from the party leadership by accepting Trotsky's opinion, then perhaps there would be no existence of Soviet Union today". (Chaturanga Patrika, Aswain, 1334, issue-1)

Trotsky and the likes actually made Leninism their target of attack while Stalin was tirelessly fighting to defend and apply Leninism in practice. Since Lenin's time, even during Stalin's time till 1929, Trotsky and others were given enough opportunity to put their views in various party forums. Yet, by willfully violating party discipline, they were, at times, airing their views in the open, and even organised meetings clandestinely where they resorted to campaign against party decisions. They were repeatedly criticized inside the party. While sometimes they pretended to admit their errors in party forums, but in secret meetings they went on opposing party's decisions. Subsequently they started gradually building close links with foreign anti-Soviet powers. Continuing in the same way when they felt that under Stalin's leadership the party and the socialist state were gaining strength day by day, the confidence of the entire party and the people were getting stronger and there was no hope of seizing leadership of either the party or the state, they became desperate and came to the conclusion that if Soviet Union faced defeat in the impending second world war, the entire leadership along with Stalin would fall and they would get the opportunity to seize power of the state and the party.

Lust for power debased them to such an extent and they stooped so low that they even started hatching conspiracies one after another against the Soviet state. They were in the leading committees of the party and so had some influence. Using this position, they formed secret groups inside the party, the state and the red army and increased their anti-party ,anti-state activities. These

conspirators even made a clandestine agreement with Nazi Germany on the eve of the second world war. A blueprint was outlined and the plan was to take advantage of Hitler's attack on Soviet Union, to kill the leaders of the party and state and to seize power by engineering a military coup. The conspiracy came into the open just before the start of the second world war, when Stalin's trusted compatriot Comrade Kirov was assassinated.

How grim was the situation could only be conceived when in 1934 Comrade Kirov, one of the most prominent leaders and policymakers of the party and state was murdered inside a well-protected place in Leningrad. Investigation revealed that in various levels of the party, state and the red army, counter-revolutionary secret coterie were active and waiting for inciting counter-revolution by taking advantage of the impending war. The situation was so grim that to weed out the enemy agents from inside the leadership, so strong a party like soviet communist party had to decide to take back the party-cards from all of its members,. All the members had to return their party cards and after screening those were reissued by the party. This very step shows how grave was the danger and how critical was the situation.. So Stalin had no other option but to take stern measures. We only came to know of the horrific nature of the conspiracy during the trials of various cases held between 1933 and 1938. Actually through the confessions of the accused the conspiracies were properly exposed. Even during the initial exposures the party was not aware that the network of the conspiracy was so widespread and so dangerous. That was why at the initial stage trial and punishments were confined for some persons only in the removal from the responsible position of the party and for some others in expulsion from the party. This made the leadership so certain about the health of the party, that a new constitution was introduced replacing the first constitution framed just after the revolution and universal voting rights was granted for the first time.

No distinguished personality of the time voiced any doubt over the fairness of the Moscow Trials

However, since 1933, none of the trials in Soviet Union was held in secret. All were in the open and in full public view. Journalists, lawyers, diplomats and political leaders from other countries were invited to be present in the trial rooms and many were present. Such an open trial of the traitors against the state and that too in presence of the foreign personalities were never seen in any country of the world before. All the foreign dignitaries present during the trial, had pronounced in one voice that the world had never before seen an adjudication conducted in such a democratic manner. They also said that a great conspiracy was undoubtedly hatched.

I cannot but help citing the opinion of Joseph Davis, the then ambassador of the United States in Soviet Union. Being an eyewitness to the trials, he wrote in his famous book “Mission To Moscow” that after observing the proceedings he was convinced that there was no coercion on the accused to confess their guilt and the soviet state had been able to prove the crimes of the accused beyond any doubt. He further remarked that in the face of conclusive evidence, witness accounts and cross examinations, the accused were compelled to admit their crimes one by one. It became clear to him and also to other foreign dignitaries that there was no sign of torture or coercion in the bearing of the accused. Davis also said that because of the success of the soviet state in punishing the traitors in such a way that Hitler could find no fifth column or German agents in Russia, which Hitler easily found in other invaded countries. US ambassador Davis after his talk with Stalin was so impressed that he commented in a letter to his daughter — *“He(Stalin) gives the impression of a strong mind which is composed and wise. His brown eye is exceedingly kind and gentle. A child would like to sit in his lap.... He has a sly humour.....He has a very great mentality. It is sharp, shrewd and above all thing wise...If*

you can picture a personality, that is exactly opposite to what the most rabid anti-Stalinist could conceive, then you might picture this man". (Mission to Moscow) All the invited diplomats, lawyers, journalists and others of the foreign imperialist nations said that in the democratic framework of their own countries, traitors were not allowed such an open and unprejudiced trial like Moscow trial. They were all praise for this trial. D. N. Pritt, an eminent lawyer of Great Britain turned into an admirer of communism after witnessing the trial. The humanist intellectuals, authors, scientists and politicians of the western world like Romain Rolland, Bernard Shaw, Einstein and others like Rabindranath, SaratChandra, Premchand, Nazrul, Subhashchandra, Nehru of our country – none of them voiced any doubt at that time on the fairness of Moscow trial. They were convinced about the necessity of the trial to save soviet socialism. To remove any doubt the full text of the proceedings of the trial was also published in English from Russian under the instruction of Stalin.

In 1934, in the aftermath of Kirov murder there were mass arrests and detentions in soviet union. A group of intellectuals and journalists asked Bernard Shaw whether the Russian revolution had ‘attracted the degenerate types’. Shaw’s answer was remarkable. He replied — *“on the contrary, it has attracted superior types all over the world to an extra-ordinary extent, wherever it has been understood”*. (*Shaw and Stalin*). It deserves special mention that in protest of the various slander campaign against soviet union, on the initiative of Bernard Shaw a statement of 30 eminent persons including Shaw was published in Manchester Guardian, a daily news paper on 2nd March, 1933, The statement declared *“Increasing unemployment and the failure of private capital to cope with it throughout the rest of the world is causing persons of all classes and parties to watch with increasing interest the progress of Soviet Union. And yet this is precisely the moment that has been chosen to redouble the intensity of the blind and*

reckless campaign to discredit it. No lie is too fantastic, no slander is too stale... particularly offensive and ridiculous is the revival of the old attempts to represent the five year plan as a failure, the new enterprises as bankrupt and the communist regime as tottering to its fall. We the undersigned are recent visitors to the USSR. Some of us traveled throughout the greater part of its civilized territory. We desire to record that we saw nowhere evidence of such economic slavery, privation, unemployment and cynical despair of betterment as are accepted as inevitable and ignored by the press as having 'no news value' in our own countries. Everywhere we saw hopeful and enthusiastic working class, self respecting, free up to the limits imposed on them by nature..." The French philosopher Jean Paul Sartre in a letter to his close acquaintance Claude Lefort, known for his anti-Stalinist views, wrote — *"you who declare yourself hostile to 'Stalinism' have removed yourself from the means of condemning it, whereas, I do not hide my sympathies with many aspects of communist enterprise and yet maintain my right and option to appraise it. What you reject on principle, I accept without constraint...."*

Alas! you would probably say... that this communist bureaucracy exploits workers. I say that you live in a world of fantasy... Stalinism appears at the moment when capitalism has nothing more to offer to the working class". (From the Answer to Claude Lefort). Even the British Prime Minister Churchill, the die-hard imperialist and a rabid anticommunist had to admit in his radio address on 16th February, 1942 that Hitler, to his dismay, did not get the fifth column in Russia. Thus not even the imperialist media in those days did dare to raise any doubt about the veracity of the Moscow trial. But now they are spreading all types of cock and bull stories, vulgarizing the truth and facts to their likings.

Can it be said that all the judgments during those stormy days were flawless? No, that is out of question. Few thousands were put to trial, the party had to depend on the

administrative machinery of various levels to execute justice, in most cases administration acted correctly, in some cases the administration erred. Some people, in the name of purging the bad blood, conspired to eliminate their rivals. All these led to serious mistakes also. Stalin himself in his report to the 18th Congress of CPSU said — **“it cannot be said that the purge was not accompanied by grave mistakes. There were unfortunately more mistakes than might have been expected... Nevertheless the purge of 1933-1936 was unavoidable and on the whole its results were beneficial.”** (*Problems of Leninism — Stalin*). Had this purge not been done, Hitler’s fifth column would have infiltrated the party, the state and the red army and could entrench their position. One of Hitler’s chief aides Goering had written in his diary on 8th May 1943 that Hitler regretfully informed him ‘the collapse that I expected in the Red Army did not take place’ Why? This was because Stalin could weed out all efforts in organising the fifth column. Had he failed in this attempt, the agents would have incited sabotage inside the country, organized revolt and engineered breach in the red army during the Nazi attack. Consequently, it would have been very hard to save Soviet Union. But for this trial, not only soviet socialism would have been destroyed, Europe and the entire world could not be saved from Hitler’s attack.

In fact, all had admitted that without the valiant role of Stalin and Soviet Union, it was not possible to defeat fascist Germany. Actually no worthy person raised any doubt over the trial. On the contrary, standing firm in favor of the trial, the eminent scientist Albert Einstein said — *“By the way, there are increasing signs that the Russian trials are not faked, but that there is a plot among those who look upon Stalin as a stupid reactionary, who has betrayed the ideas of the revolution... I was firmly convinced to begin with that it was a case of dictator’s despotic acts, based on lies and deception, but this was a delusion”*. (Has science discovered God — A. K. Kotton). In this regard, the famous scientist Max Born commented- *“He*

(Einstein) believed that when threatened by Hitler the Russians had no choice but to destroy as many of their enemies within their own camp as possible." (Marsh Barn – Einstein letters, Walker and Company) This was the reality. In that period, other than Hitler's propaganda machine and a few die-hard anti-communists and Trotskyites, nobody had spread any slander against the Moscow trials. The whole world recognised the indispensability of this trial and its role in banishing the conspirators.

Stalin was not in favour of capital punishment

While narrating his impression about Stalin after meeting him in an interview, Romain Rolland noted in his *Moscow Diary* — "He does not impose his own opinion on others. I felt that he was always ready to reconsider his own decisions and make amendments upon them." While talking about capital punishment "Stalin said *'There is no pleasure in inflicting corporal punishment or in sentencing somebody to death. That is utterly abominable. To remain out of politics and to have one's hands free from any stain — may perhaps be safe, but if anyone hopes to deliver mankind emancipation from slavery can never have the right to remain beyond politics. And when one, who cannot help remaining in politics, must remain active for the State-not for oneself though.'*" This was Great Stalin.

The revisionist renegade Khrushchev clique raked up, from the dustbin of history, the slanders once spread by the Trotskyites and Hitler's media machine. The communist parties of different countries from their blind allegiance to the soviet communist party were carried away by this and subsequently almost all of them jumped into the sailing ship of revisionism. The opportunity was readily grabbed by the capitalist-imperialist world and with the aid of their powerful propaganda machine rushed to prove the so-called terrible cruelties of Stalin. They even suppressed the direct witness reports and opinions of the diplomats, lawyers and journalists of their own countries, who were physically present at the trials. Yet, could they provide till

today any definite proof or documents by which it can be proved that the Moscow trial was fake, the witnesses were tutored and the given punishments were arbitrary, without proper evidence?

I wish to put another question to the politicians, journalists, intellectuals who like to be called ‘worshippers of democracy’. If, in their own countries a group of traitors are found to be involved in anti-state conspiracy in collusion with foreign invaders, would they spare these traitors in the name of ‘democracy and justice’ or would demand severe punishments for them? It deserves special mention that John Gunther, a journalist and admirer of the then US President Roosevelt, made, in his own way, a comparison and remarked “ Associates worship Hitler, fear Mussolini and respect Stalin, this seems to be the gist of it.” (Stalin — an article published in Harper Magazine)

He had understood the necessity of the Moscow trial and said — “30000 communards were killed after the fall of Paris Commune. Bolsheviks took lessons from it and understood that if socialism was destroyed by counter revolution, thousands of communists would be slaughtered. They therefore felt the need to give capital punishment to some counter revolutionaries in order to save socialism.”

One could unhesitatingly voice one’s difference of opinion with Stalin

You would often hear that Stalin was such an autocratic leader that none could voice their opinions in front of him. It is also said that his very appearance generated fear and he did not like to listen to any opposing view. The eminent historian H.G. wells, on the contrary, said — “*I had thought before I saw him that he might be where he was because men were afraid of him, but I realize that he owes his position to the fact that no one is afraid of him and everybody trusts him.*” (Experiment in Autobiography.)

Anna Louis Strong too described a similar experience. She as a journalist lived in the Soviet Union for long and

had met and talked to Stalin. She also had discussions with many others about Stalin. Let me quote from her writing — *“In any meeting, he is usually last to express his opinion. He does not want to block the full expression of others, as he might easily do by speaking first. Besides this, he is always learning by listening”*. (Stalin Era)

When Khrushchev said that none could open mouth in front of Stalin, M.N. Roy was still alive and with a protest he said — “Khrushchev is not speaking the truth on this point. I, myself have argued with Stalin and I have seen that he is in the habit of listening with great patience and he appreciates reason.” (Trans. ours and from Bengali). Note the experience of M. N. Roy, who himself was known as against Stalin.

Marshal Zhukov, who was the Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the Red Army during the second world war spoke of a similar experience in his memoirs — *“I realized during the war that Stalin was not the kind of man who objected to sharp questions or to anyone arguing with him. If someone says the reverse, he is a liar”* (Reminiscences & Reflections vol. 1) Opposing the view of Khrushchev that Stalin used to take decisions by himself and did not give due importance to the opinions of others, Zhukov has written *“After Stalin’s death, the idea became current that he alone took decisions on questions of military and strategic nature. I cannot agree with this. I have already mentioned above that when someone who had a good knowledge of the matter made a report to him, he would take notice of it. I even know of cases when he changed his mind with respect to decisions previously taken”* (*Ibid*)

Alexi Ribin, a common man and Stalin’s bodyguard also recounted in his memoirs — “We used to argue with Stalin, but he listened very patiently to all we had to say. He had a phenomenal power to listen. Sometimes he used to say that I will consider your views. Those who say that Stalin disliked oppositions are speaking wrong.” (Trans ours)

There are other lies about Stalin. It is alleged that on

Stalin's orders the Berlin Wall was erected. Again, it is alleged that Stalin had sent soviet armed forces to suppress the revolts in Poland, Hungary and East Germany. All these are absolute lies. Actually the Berlin Wall was erected during the time of Khrushchev, not in Stalin's period.. Rather, at the end of the Second World War, Stalin wanted that the people of Germany be allowed to form their own government. It could not be done because of the opposition from American, British and French imperialist powers. Consequently, Germany was divided into two parts. During Stalin's time soviet armed forces were never sent or deployed to suppress any grievances or agitation in any country. Even when Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia went against the decision of the Cominform, Stalin did not intervene militarily there, though if he wanted, could have easily done it. All military interventions in other countries by Soviet armed forces took place during the time of Khrushchev. Stalin, though had acquired the capacity to make nuclear bombs, yet appealed to all the imperialist countries for nuclear disarmament and ban on nuclear weapons. The imperialist powers turned a deaf ear to it. Stalin was also opposed to the making of weapons of mass destruction, to increase in war tensions or going for any military agreements. When the imperialist powers, in spite of repeated warnings, built up the NATO military block and bases surrounding Soviet Union and East European socialist states Stalin in self-defence was compelled to go for Warsaw Pact with the socialist states of East Europe.

**In a class divided society, democracy always is
class democracy, parliamentary democracy is
democracy for the bourgeoisie**

I like to discuss one important issue here. A propaganda has been going on for long that Soviet Union was under one party rule, hence it was a dictatorship without any democracy and Stalin was the dictator. Unable to understand the subject properly, a section of honest people also get confused. In fact, the clamour of the

bourgeoisie about ‘pure democracy’ is completely hollow and deceptive. On this Lenin had aptly remarked — *“If we are not to mock at common sense and history, it is obvious that we cannot speak of ‘pure democracy’ as long as different classes exist, we can only speak of class democracy”*. (*The State and Revolution — Lenin*). To understand this subject correctly, we have to know the characteristics of capitalist democracy and socialist democracy and the fundamental difference between the two. The capitalist system is class divided. This system cannot be conceived of without the working class, because the bourgeoisie as the owners of the means of production invest capital and derive profit by appropriating the unpaid labour of the workers. Therefore, the existence of capitalism is inevitably associated with the existence of the working class.

Now,, at the inception of capitalism, when monopoly capital did not yet develop, multiparty democracy evolved out of the free competition among the numerous small capitalist groups Thus bourgeois parliamentary democracy at that time was far broader, more liberal and democratic in all respects than present days, though parliamentary democracy during those days also had served the interests of the bourgeois exploitative system. Now if you critically go through history, you will find that the capitalist democracy even when was at its best, the state, at the initial days, resorted to arms to thwart the attempts at restoration of dethroned feudalism in different countries. Later in 1871, in order to crush the Paris commune, the working class insurrection in France, this capitalist state did not hesitate to spill the blood of thousands of imprisoned workers without even a semblance of a trial. In 1886, in the United States, the demand for the eight hour working day and the workers movements in various countries were crushed mercilessly by the capitalist states.

In none of the cases the bourgeois states did follow their so called ‘democratic path’, though they always mouthed the pretexts of protecting democracy, constitution,

law and order etc.. Thus the bourgeois state — ‘the flag bearer of democracy’ — whenever felt itself endangered, did crush the opponents with arms, did never bother about their much vaunted ‘democracy’ The democratic veil of the bourgeoisie fell off further and their real face seen nakedly when capitalism in course of attaining the character of imperialism went on occupying and plundering the colonies, brutally crushing the freedom movements, generating wars and killing millions of people in different countries. You have to understand that capitalism allows that much of democracy and to that extent which is permissible for capitalism and would not hurt its interests. Do the bourgeoisie allow or can even think of allowing the democratic right to overthrow capitalism? What goes here in the name of elections, in Lenin`s words, is nothing but to choose at regular intervals the party which would serve the bourgeois class and that choice is also done by the bourgeoisie themselves in the name of the people. Lenin has shown that in the capitalist countries, the vast majority of the exploited working class and the poor peasantry remain deprived of formal education, lack political consciousness and are mostly unorganized. They have to toil day and night to earn bread and therefore cultivation of politics for them is akin to luxury of the rich. Consequently they are not in a position to use even the minimum scope available in bourgeois democracy. Moreover you should note that despite being the overwhelming majority of population of all countries the sons and daughters of the workers and peasants virtually find no place or if at all, a negligible minimum place in the elected parliaments of the so called democratic countries. Of course, we must understand that even the workers coming from working class families, if not politically class conscious, would continue to be guided by the bourgeois outlook and thus can never be a true representative of the working class. So, in the final analysis, parliamentary democracy is an instrument to protect capitalism and to crush any opposition to capitalism. This is why, in reality this

democracy does serve the interest of bourgeois exploitation and behind the veil of democracy the bourgeoisie run their dictatorship against the proletariat. In fact, this is bourgeois dictatorship under the vail of parliamentary democracy. In capitalist states, any form of rule, be it multiparty, two or three party, single party or military rule — all are essentially bourgeois dictatorship against the working class. In the capitalist system there exist conflict of interests between various sections of the bourgeoisie — among the monopolists, between the monopoly and the non-monopoly capital, between the big and the small capital. The existence of numbers of political parties are the reflection of these conflicting interests of the various sections of the bourgeoisie. The more capital becomes centralised, less becomes the number of bourgeois parties. At present, multiparty exists only in words. In reality two or three bourgeois parties dominate in the parliament. The existence of more than one party gives some scope, by availing of which the working class also in some places can form their own party. The bourgeoisie, in show of democracy allows it but only to the extent the bourgeoisie do not feel threatened.

**In a socialist state, democracy
serves the interests of the working class**

AS against this, the working class state or socialism is established by overthrowing the bourgeoisie from power. The open declared aim of socialism is to root out capitalism from the society so that the bourgeoisie do not get the scope to destroy socialism through counter-revolution. Thus in socialism there remains no social basis of the existence of any other class-party except the party of the working class, nor it is permitted. We should keep in mind that human society had to pass through a few thousand years of various forms of private property ownership, class exploitation and class rule one after another in slave societies, feudalism and capitalism, then came socialism. For this continuous long existence of class

exploitative systems in human society, the hold of the pro class-exploitative social psyche, property, habits and practices of people remain strong. In comparison, socialism, as the first ever exploitation-free society, is too young in age and therefore its hold on the social psyche is also very less. Moreover, the overthrown bourgeoisie, from within the socialist society always conspire and desperately make attempts to recapture the state power. In his book 'Left wing communism — an infantile Disorder' he further remarked — "*The bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased tenfold by its overthrow (even if only in one country), and whose power lies not only in the strength of international capital, in the strength and durability of the international connection of the bourgeoisie, but also in the force of habit...the force of habit of millions and tens of millions is a very terrible force.*" They get all out support and patronage of capitalism-imperialism from abroad. In such a condition, the working class of the socialist state has to keep a constant vigil to thwart the attempts at restoration by the overthrown bourgeoisie. The state of the working class has to guard that. So democracy in a socialist state is democracy for the working class and dictatorship against the bourgeoisie. On this question, only the Marxists have dared to declare openly that socialist democracy is, in reality, the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the bourgeoisie out of hypocrisy do not admit that parliamentary democracy is nothing but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie under the garb of democracy. In capitalism, democracy works in the interest of the bourgeoisie and therefore it is dictatorship against the working class whereas in socialism, dictatorship of the proletariat is a dictatorship against the bourgeoisie and therefore democracy in the interest of the working class. In socialism, the working class having been free from exploitation and having got the right and scope to freely study politics, economy, science and others become politically conscious, play an active role in socialist democracy. Here also, the working class has to build up a

dialectical relation with the party and the state. If the working class does not acquire adequate standard of political consciousness and neglects the struggle to continuously improve their cultural standard and thus fails to establish dialectical relations, then that will help to give birth to bureaucracy even in socialism. Lenin and Stalin had repeatedly cautioned about this.

If bureaucracy does appear in socialism, it has to be fought out by raising the standard of political consciousness and cultural standard, but by no means bourgeois democracy is desirable in place of socialism. Today, the people of Russia and of the whole world can see how tyrannical is the rule of bourgeois democracy which has now been established in Russia by destroying socialism.

With the abolition of all classes and the state, period of democracy in history will also be abolished

There is something more which you should also understand. As, following the laws of history, proletarian democracy or proletarian dictatorship comes replacing the bourgeois democracy or bourgeois dictatorship, so also it will disappear in future. In course of development of socialism, class struggle would intensify and through that process classes will disappear not only from the political sphere but also from economic, social and cultural sphere and with that the proletarian state or the proletarian dictatorship will wither away too. This process will start only when socialism is established as a world system, not confined to one country only. Through this course when there will be no classes or state, humanity will step into the communist society. Here we should know that between feudalism and communism lies the stage of democracy — first bourgeois democracy and then proletarian democracy. The bourgeoisie while fighting against feudal monarchy, raised the slogan of ‘equality-fraternity-freedom’, but they, being exploiters themselves, could not and cannot actually practise it in society. Only the working class democracy can

achieve this by putting an end to class exploitation. Democracy- be it bourgeois or proletarian — always means class democracy, class rule, class state with its own definite constitution, own law and coercive machinery. According to the class character of this democracy, certain rights are allowed, certain rights are denied, and certain rights are curbed if necessary. So, in no social system ‘pure democracy’ can be found. With the disappearance of classes, the state also will wither away and the phase of democracy in human society will come to end, no question of allowing or disallowing rights would arise, nothing like a state’s constitution, law or coercive machinery would be there. It will be a human society where exploitation-profit-greed, the mentality of cheating and deceiving others will be gone forever, in the words of great Marx ‘socialized humanity’ would develop, people of their own will lead highly ethical lives, which will become normal and natural lifestyle of the people. So the necessity of control by the rule of law will not arise. That is why great Lenin said, *“Democracy is a state ... an organization for the systematic use of force by one class against another; by one section of the population against another...that the withering away of the state means the withering away of democracy...in communist society, democracy will wither away in the process of changing and becoming a habit ...since people will become accustomed to observing the elementary conditions of social life without violence and without subordination.”* Until then democracy would either serve the bourgeoisie or the proletariat. That class division, class exploitation and the state would wither away through this process could never be even conceived by the spiritualists and humanists. So the bourgeois claim of ‘pure democracy’ ‘holy democracy’ is sheer hypocrisy. We know that like bourgeois democracy or bourgeois dictatorship, proletarian dictatorship or proletarian democracy also appeared in history, not out of any individual’s wish, but following the laws of social progress and will again disappear following the laws of social progress. So, Lenin,

Stalin or Mao Tse Tung- none was a dictator as a person .Each of them was an elected administrator of the dictatorship of the proletariat or the proletarian democracy.

**The concepts of modern democracy,
individual freedom, individual rights are not
eternal in the history of mankind**

In this context, I like to discuss on two more points. A section of the intellectuals, denouncing the soviet rule under Stalin and the socialist system in general, shout that there is no place for freedom of individual in socialism, while bourgeois parliamentary democracy do give and protect this right.

Is this a correct idea? To examine this point, we should first know that the concepts of modern democracy, freedom of individual, the rights of individual etc. did not eternally exist in human civilization. These concepts did not come in 'primitive society', 'slave society' or in 'feudalism'. Actually these ideas grew out of the social necessity of fighting against feudal monarchy during the era of the establishment of bourgeois republic and bourgeois parliamentary system. So these concepts and rights are neither eternal nor absolute. It is true that the bourgeoisie, born in the womb of feudalism, fought for the right of ownership of individual over the means of production and the wealth produced, against the absolute ownership of the monarch and the feudal lords — the acknowledged representative of the 'almighty god'. With this struggle evolved the conducive ideas like freedom of individual, rights of individual etc. The social necessity arose for a new bent of human mind or outlook on the basis of scientific, rational, secular and humanist ideas, for emancipating the human intellect from the grip of medieval spiritualistic and obscurantist beliefs like the `universe is created and controlled by a kind of super natural power`, `the religious scriptures are divine revelations which cannot be transgressed`, `the power of the Almighty is eternal and the rule by god's representative on earth — the king and

the feudal lords — is inviolable` and so on.. The right of every individual to be the owner of properties, the right to pursue knowledge, the right to freedom of thought and speech, the right to protest and change the government, the right to sell one's labour power according to one's free will — all these bourgeois democratic ideas and concepts also came into being as conducive to the development of the society itself. As the then struggle to establish the capitalist mode of production in place of the feudal mode of production was in the interest of social progress, the concept of bourgeois individual freedom was also progressive in character and hence helped the development of the society. Subsequently, however, in the era of reactionary capitalism, this very sense of individual freedom has given birth to utter individualistic and selfish mentality and wantonness devoid of any social obligation.

Now, Hegel's idea that "freedom is the recognition of necessity" has been properly elaborated and its understanding developed further by Marxism. This 'necessity' does never mean the necessity of a particular individual. Actually the necessity which comes into being out of the operation of the laws of change in nature and from the inherent laws of social progress, the necessity that arises out of the contradiction between production relations and productive forces and indicates a definite and indispensable course to be followed in the interest of the progress of social production, is the real necessity. To be able to comprehend this necessity in the realm of thinking and to act accordingly is to achieve real freedom. So freedom does not mean doing things at one's sweet will. It is not wantonness, neither it is for satisfying one's self interest at the cost of social interest, which is now rampant in capitalist world. Was it to achieve such vulgar freedom that so many people laid down their lives in French revolution and in the democratic revolutions and freedom movements of different countries?

There is an widely held notion that an individual's power of thinking and thought are completely independent

and absolute, no control can work here. This notion has come from bourgeois idealistic outlook. It is unscientific and unhistorical. In this context, our teacher and the great Marxist thinker of this era, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has shown that an individual's thinking, however talented or genius one might be, is the personification of social thinking. Everyone's thinking, even that of a genius is limited from two sides. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has said — **“Even freedom of the mind has its limits. These limits arise from two sides. One is the objective condition, the other is the method of thinking.”** (Science of Marxism is the scientific dialectical methodology, P 402, Vol. IV.) This objective condition means the prevailing objective material condition of a particular social system at a particular stage, from which comes the material ingredients of thought. The human brain through an inter-dialectical interaction with this objective material condition gives birth to thought. So he pointed out that the thoughts of any great genius or thinker always belong to a particular era, i.e. limited by space, time and surroundings. Consequently none of them could or can think for all ages to come. Space, time, surroundings and the person who thinks, all undergo continuous changes, so does thinking. As examples, he showed that Buddha, Jesus Christ, Hazrat Mohammed, Socrates, Plato and others, despite their amazing genius and greatness in their times, were unable to think of the modern concepts of science, philosophy, politics and culture, because the ingredients necessary for these ideas to form in the human brain, were not present in the objective material conditions of their times.

Besides the limits of the objective material conditions, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has described a second aspect. That is, the thinking of a person is guided by a given outlook, a particular method of thinking and culture that he or she gets from the particular social system where he or she is born and brought up. For the majority of the people it works without their cognizance, but for some conscious people it works in full knowledge of them. In a class

divided society, classes exist in contradiction and each class has its own separate outlook and culture. The outlook and culture of the ruling class hold the dominant position in society and until the exploited masses become class conscious, they also remain, in the main, influenced by the outlook, thoughts and culture of the ruling classes. Then,, what we take as one's 'independent thinking' is objectively the personification of social thinking and in a class divided society, it is the expression or manifestation of the thinking of one class or the other. If this is not properly understood, an honest individual too, may, in the name of freedom of thought, become unconsciously or unknowingly, a representative of bourgeois class thinking. A methodology or outlook obviously works in one's thinking and that is why different persons may hold different ideas about a particular or same phenomenon. It is seen even in the thinking of great persons also. The difference in ideas between Vidyasagar and Vivekananda, between Rabindranath and Saratchandra, between Gandhiji and Netaji in their times, bear testimony to this.

**Once right to private property came
as a tool of progress, today its abolition is
essential for the very sake of progress**

I have already told you that since the struggle for bourgeois private ownership in place of feudal absolute ownership was in the interest of the development of productive forces and production relations, it was conducive to social progress. So in that era, the ideas and concepts born out of this struggle, like the concept of bourgeois individual rights, bourgeois sense of freedom of the individual, were also progressive in character. But in course of time, the bourgeoisie, on the one hand, got seated in state power and turned reactionary and hence the ideas and concepts about individualism and individual freedom became reactionary too. On the other hand, following the laws of development of capitalist economy, small scale industries were getting replaced by big industries.

Production started to be organised not by individual labour and to satisfy individual's demand but to meet the demands of the market of the society, in the large industries collective labour of many workers started to be used at different levels of commodity production. Thus the character of production and labour power became social but the character of ownership over the means of production remained private. The exploitation of social labour continues in the interest of the private appropriation of maximum profit and from this contradiction capitalism get plunged into market crises, the advancement of productive forces also get impeded. In this way, the capital-labour production relation becomes fetters in the further advancement of productive forces or in other words, in the further advancement of labour-power and the instruments of production. Thus arises the imperative necessity to change this relation of production, i.e. to abolish private ownership and to establish social ownership over the means of production in the interest of the progress of social production, in the interest of the progress of the productive forces,

During the emergence of capitalism in society, true understanding of the freedom of individual was to be able to recognize the historic social necessity of the establishment of private ownership and its corresponding ideas of bourgeois individual rights and freedom. Likewise a new necessity has arisen i.e the necessity to abolish private ownership and establish social ownership over the means of production. This social necessity calls for identifying the individual with the social or collective interest by freeing individual from the grip of bourgeois individualism. To recognize and accept this imperative necessity consciously, is the proper understanding of the changed and completely new sense of freedom of individual in the new and changed conditions. In the context of the changed material conditions when private ownership has become reactionary in character, the old bourgeois concepts of individual rights and liberty also

have turned reactionary.

In the capitalist system, production is not done by a single individual but by the collective labour of numerous workers. The produce is also not meant for a single individual but for numerous buyers in the market, for the consumption of the entire society. But the profit from the production is appropriated by a few private owners. In a society established on such a contradiction and inequality, the talk of equality-fraternity-liberty, government of the people, by the people, for the people sound hollow. Thus in bourgeois democracy, right of all to become owners of properties actually turns into the like of right of everybody of becoming millionaire in lotteries. Thousands buy lottery tickets in the craze for getting lakhs of money, but 'fortune' smiles for one or two and the rest become penniless. In the capitalist system, monopoly capital gradually and steadily swallows the middle and small capitalists and turn them into street beggars. So, the socially effective role that the democratic concepts of individual rights and freedom of individual once played during the dawn of capitalism, is no more to be found. Under capitalism, the owners' only concern is to earn maximum profit at any cost. No matter what happens to the workers — whether they are thrown out of job, are in starvation with families, without medicine in sickness — nothing can deter the owners from their lust for profit. It is for this, that bourgeois sense of individual freedom is everywhere giving birth to utter waywardness, wantonness, irresponsibility, desire to live unethical lives and indifference to society. This is the tragic outcome of bourgeois humanism.

Today the bourgeois humanist sense of individual freedom is an impediment to social progress.

In this context, it should also be noted that bourgeois humanism is based on the principle of private ownership, its criterion of justice is that one would take one's 'legitimate share' and the rest would be given to others. These were the views from secular humanist Feuerbach to

spiritualist Mahatma Gandhi. Both of them failed to acknowledge the objective reality that society is class divided and every individual would certainly belong to this or that class of the society of a given era. Their failing led them to place individuals beyond any particular era or above any class. Engels in his book ‘Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of German classical philosophy’ in course of dwelling on the morality and ethics of bourgeois humanism in the early stages of capitalism in the 19th century, showed that to Feuerbach, on the basis of Feuerbach’s own understanding, this was — “Rational self restraint with regard to ourselves and love again and again love — in our intercourse with others”. In the 20th century, i.e. in the reactionary era of capitalism, Mahatma Gandhi propounded the same idea, though in a different language, by addressing the bourgeoisie directly in his book ‘socialism of my conception’. Gandhi said “Take what you require for your legitimate needs and use the remainder for the society”. According to Feuerbach each person would exercise rational self-restraint in regard to personal need and the rest he would give to others as expression of love. What would be one’s needs and to what extent one would exercise rational self restraint, is to be decided and determined by the individual. Therefore, it is easily understandable how and in what way a private owner in the capitalist system will determine and exercise these parameters. It is also quite clear what a capitalist as an individual would take as ‘legitimate’ as per Gandhi’s thinking. Their thinking contain the belief that mutual co-operation between capital and labour is the basis of production and so this relation is also eternal. Thus they consider inequality between rich and poor, exploiter and exploited is eternal. Hence the conclusion is that the private owner by investing capital takes profit as his ‘legitimate due’ and gives the rest to the worker as wages.. This ethical conception that they propounded as eternal, was actually born in the era of capitalism from the social basis of capitalist private ownership. If following their ideas, appropriation of profits

is regarded as 'legitimate dues', then by the same logic it also becomes legitimate and rational for an owner to increase his profits or in other words to intensify the degree of exploitation of labour power in order to sustain and to become powerful in bourgeois competitive markets. By the same logic, in order to increase profits war and invasion of another country, loot and occupation — all these become 'rational and legitimate'. Even the domination of men over women becomes 'legitimate'. But personalities like Feuerbach and Gandhi were men of integrity with high standard of character, even in their worst nightmares they could not dream of this eventual fallout of their ideas. But since they denied the scientific laws of social change, the existence of class division in society, class struggle and antagonistic class interests and class outlook and let themselves to be guided by bourgeois class outlook and approach, the values they upheld turned them, without their knowledge, into spokesmen of the interests of the capitalist ownership.

During the progressive era of capitalism, the slogan of 'democracy' and 'equality, fraternity, liberty' too, in the main, contained these very bourgeois humanist values. And today, in the present era of reactionary capitalism, the idea of individualism and freedom of individual have come to mean that individual would consider first his own interest and after that, if possible, would consider the needs of others. Proverbially it means 'first save myself then comes my father if possible,' otherwise just 'save myself'. As the inevitable outcome, this sense of individualism and 'freedom of individual' in the society today has alienated the individual from the society itself, has made him/her self-centric, selfish, wayward and dehumanized having no feelings of love, affection, attachment, human values and conscience. The entire bourgeois world is in this condition today. That individualism and individual freedom would suffer such a deplorable end could not even be dreamt by the fighters of the French revolution and other democratic revolutions in their nightmares and even the eminent

humanist of the 19th century Ludwig Feuerbach and others like him had no inkling of this. However Great Marx, the exponent of dialectical materialism could scientifically foresee this with the help of their scientific philosophy and so he had put forward the concept of new human values. To show his differences with Feuerbach and others like him, Marx in the 'thesis on Feuerbach's note' said — "The highest point attained by contemplative materialism, ...is the contemplation of single individuals in 'civil society'. The standpoint of the old materialism is 'civil society', the standpoint of the new is 'human society' or socialised humanity". Here, by 'old materialism' Marx obviously meant the 'secular humanism' of Feuerbach and 'mechanical materialism' of that era. Again by 'new materialism', he had 'dialectical materialism' in mind. The old materialism gave emphasis on individual, or in other words individualism, whereas the new materialism has brought forth the idea of 'socialized humanity' free from individual interest.

**Individual interest and private property
mental complex can only be removed
by abolishing class exploitation**

You should know that during the crisis of human civilization, the necessity of social progress gave birth to the idea of socialist freedom of individual on the basis of Marxist scientific outlook. Between capitalism and communism, socialism is a transitional stage. In socialism, intense class struggle remains between the defeated bourgeoisie and the victorious proletariat, conspiracies by the defeated bourgeoisie to overthrow socialism through counter-revolution also remain. So, there remains the inevitable task of the proletariat to forcibly suppress the attempts of counter-revolution in order to save socialism. This task of forcible suppression of counter revolution necessitates the existence of working class state as an weapon. The call for equality, fraternity, liberty', once put forward by the bourgeois democratic revolution and later

thrown to the wind by the very same bourgeoisie has been translated into reality only in socialist democracy. This is why great humanists like Rabindranath, Romain Rolland were all praise for soviet union after witnessing this reality with their own eyes.

Castigating the intellectuals of the capitalist world who were raising a hue and cry over “absence of individual freedom” in soviet union, Romain Rolland wrote “...when the USSR announced to the whole world, by brilliant results it had achieved, the victorious power of revolutionary and constructive Leninist-Marxism; it is since those days that the intelligentsia of Europe has become selfishly alarmed for its own position. After having flirted with the shadow of a Communism they imagined to be Utopian, they recoil and crouch down before its real presence ; and they unmask without shame what they had until then kept concealed, what they had concealed even from themselves ; their aversion from and their fear of the advent of the world of the toiling workers which would impose equality on them. They are employing sophistry to prove to the younger generations, over whom the word revolution always exercises a prestige, that the real revolution is not that of class struggle, but the supremacy of the privileged class of intelligence ; and that is what the intelligentsia pompously call in France, the “*Revolution of the Spirit.*” (I will not Rest)

Socialism means establishment of collective and social ownership in place of private ownership. It is, therefore, not possible to build it on the basis of bourgeois individualism and the sense of individual freedom born out of private ownership. Thus came the new sense of ‘freedom of individual’ in socialism, a concept which was subsequently enriched by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. This new concept is that the individual has to free himself/herself from the subjugation of the sense of bourgeois individualism and individual interest and to identify the self completely with social interest. This would be the proper sense of individual freedom in the period of socialism. Through the complete

identification of individual interest with the social interest, the individual psyche can be transformed, can be lifted to that cultural level where one would voluntarily consider social interest as one's self interest. The character and the very object of socialist freedom of individual is to engage the mental and physical labour of the individual in the interest of social progress. These ideas and concept of ethics could not be conceived in the past. Religious and humanist values could not think of such concepts for historical reasons or limitations. The religious thinkers and even the pioneers of the humanism in the past could not imagine that one day class exploitation and class rule would be abolished and so also the individual interest, private property mentality, greed-lust, exploitation, deception-cheating, doing injustice, tendency of authoritarianism, of exercising domination upon others and such other vices in the society could be done away with. They believed that these were the unchangeable basic instincts of human beings and would remain as absolute for all time to come. Actually, they had taken it for granted that private ownership and the disparity between rich and poor were eternal. Their only endeavour was how to keep those under control, restrain and to restrict as much as possible these 'evil' instincts through the awakening of human conscience with the help of spiritualist or humanist values. They could not think beyond this due to limitation of historical factors. Marx was the first to point out that this idea was wrong. Marx, in his 'Critique of Political Economy' wrote — "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being but on the contrary their social being that determines their consciousness". He further explained — "the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political super-structure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness". Later, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, in course of refuting the spiritualist and humanist ideas about human greed and lust, explained in a very simple language — "I am discussing all these only to show how erroneous are

those who consider that 'greed' is an eternal trait of man — It was always there, it will remain forever... They tell this not from history but from their fanciful ideas. Otherwise they could have realized that it was not the base instincts that gave birth to inequality in society; rather it was the society built on inequality which gave birth to and helped sustain these base instincts in man." (Marxism and Development of Human Society, p 7-8, vol. II) Thus he has shown that private ownership of the means of production and property along with class division of society formed the basis of the origin of these mental traits and therefore, only after abolition of this class division would it be possible to eliminate these.

So, the abolition of private ownership and class exploitation in the society and alongwith that a relentless, protracted battle in the superstructure for releasing a conducive successful cultural revolution only would make it possible to eliminate individual interest and sense of property, traits of deception, greed, lust and other such vices.

I have already said that it was not possible for the religious preachers of the past to think of these aspects due to historical limitation. They had taken it for granted that as their contemplated God was existing with Satan, so also the good and evil in the human mind would exist forever. They were only trying to restrain, as far as possible, the evil traits of the human mind by preaching the idea of sin and piety. Even though the bourgeois secular humanists, did not accept the idea of the existence of God, they believed in the idea of unchangeable basic instincts of human mind. Their thinking, therefore, also remained confined in the concept of controlling and restraining human beings by a set of values. To them, it was impossible to completely abolish these human traits from society. Marxism has shown that this 'impossible' can be made possible, though the task is extremely difficult and complex. Great Lenin, after the victory in the November Revolution in Russia, had said that the abolition of a few big bourgeois private ownerships

could be accomplished with relative ease, but it was extremely difficult to eradicate the forces and traditions of the old society, its ideas, habits, culture and behaviour from among the millions of common people. To succeed in abolishing these, a sustained struggle in the ideological and cultural sphere is to be waged for a long period. When these things persist within the socialist system, the traits like personal greed, lust, quarrel over self interest and sense of private ownership will also prevail for a long time. These naturally endanger socialism, because by utilizing these, foreign imperialism and the dethroned bourgeoisie within the country can engineer counter revolution. So under socialism, people must be imbued with the new sense of 'freedom of individual' so that all would collectively work for the advancement of socialism and being imbued with internationalism, would extend help to the freedom movements of the colonies and the working class revolutionary movements of different countries; would cause immense progress in science and philosophy and through continuous improvement of technology would help reduce the labour time of the individual, and by that allow an individual greater opportunity to lead a culturally happy life, would help in the all round development of individual by making him free from the shackles of division of labour, abolish the disparity between village and town and ensure real equality between man and woman. The desire to give voluntary labour happily in the interest of the progress of civilization will be born in place of being forced to sell labour in order to survive. There will be abundance of material and spiritual production so that the law of *'from each according to his ability, to each according to his deeds'* is replaced in the society by the system of *'from each according to his ability to each according to his needs'*. In this stage, there will neither be existence of classes, class struggle, state, the coercive machinery of the state, nor the antagonistic contradiction between the individual and the society. After the overthrow of capitalism and transcending the transitional stage of

socialism, when the society would attain this stage then only would the establishment of communism be achieved. On this system, Great Engels had observed — “Both Christianity and the workers’ socialism preach forthcoming salvation from bondage and misery. Christianity places this salvation in a life beyond, after death, in heaven; socialism places it in this world, in a transformation of society.” Thus Christianity and other religions of the past, considering establishment of equality in this world as impossible, dreamt of a heaven after death, without the existence of class division, class exploitation. So people would become free from sorrows and sufferings, from the shackles of bondage there in the heaven. But the Marxists, with the help of science, showed that a real heaven can be established here on this earth itself, that is, they laid down the way of how to establish communism in this world. Remember that only in communism individual will be completely free and freedom for all will be the condition of freedom for individual. It is, therefore, clear that individual freedom in bourgeois parliamentary democracy exists only for a handful of capitalists, while in socialist democracy it exists for the working class, which constitutes the overwhelming majority of the population and in both the system there are some ‘restrictions’ and ‘coercions’ in the interest of the class in power. Only communism, after the abolition of classes, can ensure true and full freedom of the individual by freeing the individual from the state, state statutes and the coercion of the state.

**To follow the science of Marxism
is not regimentation of thought**

While speaking on Stalin, I like to discuss on a particular allegation against communism. It is alleged that in a communist party, thinking of the members is regimented and cast in a definite mould in the name of democratic centralism. This is also a completely erroneous idea. Like democracy in the capitalist system, democracy in a bourgeois party is also formal, that is, ceremonial in

character. Listening to everyone's opinion, taking final decisions through committee meetings and conferences – all these are present in a bourgeois party as in bourgeois parliamentary democracy where everyone has the formal right to express one's opinion or cast votes. But what occurs in reality? Is the government or the administration truly run on the principle of 'by the people, for the people, of the people'? All these principles formally exist in statutes. But its application is nowhere to be seen or felt. In the production system, as worker labours at the dictates of the owner, so also in the political system the state and government are run in the manner the bourgeoisie want them to. In administration, the employees are to work according to the wishes of the bureaucracy. Likewise in a bourgeois party, a particular individual or a group of individuals who represent the bourgeois class interests, have the last word. Like bourgeois multiparty democracy, bourgeois party also contains multiple views, but all of them in the final analysis reflect only bourgeois class interests, nothing is granted contrary to it.

On the other hand, Marxism is a scientific philosophy. Marxist scientific dialectical outlook along with its method of analysis has emerged through coordination, correlation and generalization of the discovered various laws operating in different branches of science. You are aware that in the laboratory of science, in all the fields like physics, chemistry, biology, botany, geology, zoology etc. including medical science, the research for finding out truth, is always done through definite scientific process. Lessons gained through each experiment, if necessary, is exchanged among the scientists and if there appears difference of opinions, then it is again resolved through scientific process and accordingly on each subject a single definite conclusion is reached. None can decide on issues on his own sweet will and no conclusion would be accepted if not arrived through proper scientific process. Can this method of arriving at the truth through scientific process and law-governed experiment, which is universally followed in

science, be termed as regimentation?

As in agriculture, industry, construction work, transport and in all other fields, a law governed definite scientific process has to be followed, nothing can be done on one's whims and fancies, otherwise proper results would not be obtained, so also in the communist party, to decide on its ideology, principles, programme and in all other aspects, science of Marxism is to be applied. Differences or conflicts of opinions may come over ascertaining which opinion or view reflects the true or proper Marxist science. On this, deliberations, debates and experimentation are conducted to ascertain the correct Marxist method of analysis. But again all these deliberations and debates are also held on the very basis of Marxist scientific outlook and methodology. Thus to arrive at a single universal conclusion through the Marxian scientific method cannot by any means be termed as regimentation of thought.

To be able to judge and decide things on the basis of Marxist scientific method means to follow the correct scientific outlook which is universally uniform for all. This scientific outlook is to be developed in the party means developing one process of thinking. In this way, if things are judged by applying correct Marxist method of analysis, then on any issue or subject, there would be only one definite conclusion or uniformity of thinking. In science, if one asks the what is water, what is fire, what is atom and molecules, the answers, following correct scientific method, would be one or same in all countries. Could anybody call this oneness as regimentation of thought? In medical science, when the doctors after exchange of opinions among themselves come to a definite conclusion about the cause and remedy of any particular disease, would anyone term their collective uniform opinion as regimentation of thought? Likewise in a communist party, if answers to various questions of politics, society, organization including of all aspects of life, are sought on the basis of correct Marxist scientific methodology, conclusion would be one and same. This too cannot be

called regimentation of thought. Consequently oneness in approach develops i.e. oneness in articulation of thought and in its practical application which is directed to fulfill the singleness of purpose of accomplishing social revolution or progress of the society. But we should also understand that any party with merely a label of Marxism or parroting the vocabularies of democratic centralism, does not ipso facto contain these characteristics or qualities. Only a party, built up on correct Leninist principles and having at all levels of the party a high standard of Marxist scientific consciousness and practice of communist culture, can possess these characteristics. If these are absent in a party, relations among the comrades, relations between the leaders and rank and file become mechanical instead of dialectical. In place of democratic centralism, there develops bureaucratic centralism, blind allegiance towards the leadership. These characteristics are found in social democratic parties labeled as Marxists. The discipline seen in these parties is imposed, not voluntary, and their centralism is also mechanical or bureaucratic. This is what regimentation means. This is what operates in a fascist bourgeois party. The proletarian democratic centralism and bureaucratic centralism are poles apart in character and essence, two cannot be equated by any means.

The object of proletarian centralism is to arrive at a particular and concrete truth on various questions by following the Marxist scientific methodology of thinking, science of logic and dialectical process through the involvement of all the members of the party from the lowest to the highest level. That is why, much emphasis is given within the party on improving the level of ideological consciousness of the members, their ability to reason, their capability of judging things and their ability to engage in arguments on various issues at all levels.

On the other hand, in a regimented party the very process of developing the ability to acquire rational mind and capability of argumentation is destroyed and a sense of

blind allegiance to the leadership is developed and encouraged at all levels. It is, therefore, clear that if, in the name of fighting regimentation, Marxism is abandoned, then the scientific outlook in the process of thinking would be abandoned too. Consequently idealistic or spiritualistic process of thinking would certainly take its place which would help fascist regimentation to grow in thought process. I hope, you will deeply ponder over these observations.

You will have to understand also that, until and unless the leaders and cadres are free from individualism, true proletarian democracy cannot develop within a working class party and however much the party talks about Marxism, in reality bourgeois democracy would prevail inside the party. It is although true that individualism cannot be eliminated within the party by one stroke. It needs an arduous and a very long struggle. The more the advancement in this struggle, more would be the development of proletarian democracy and less would be the impact of individualism. Anyway, you should always keep in mind that to follow science and scientific principles in the quest for truth on any question is not at all regimentation, by no means it can be defined like that. Those who call it regimentation are mistaken.

**Stalin always listened to the opposing views,
practised democracy as widely as possible**

Now let me go back to my earlier discussion. The point is whether Stalin allowed anyone to speak or express any difference with him. The historic book by Stalin titled 'Economic Problems of Socialism in USSR' was published in 1952. It contains the opinion of a person, Yaroshenko by name, who made an appeal to the Politburo to allow him or for that matter to give him the task of writing a book on socialist economy as he held a different view from Stalin on this question. Yaroshenko's views on this subject with his logic and reasoning, though opposed to Stalin, are printed in the same book with due importance along with

Stalin's reply. Point by point Stalin explained why and where Yaroshenko's views were not in conformity with Marxism. Why did Stalin allow the views of an unknown person like Yaroshenko to be presented to Russia and the whole world, especially when those views were against the views of a leader of Stalin's stature? He could easily not print it at all. But he did so in order to help all to judge the right and wrong on their own.

Can it then be said that Stalin could not tolerate opposing views? We find in Marshal Zhukov's memoirs "Reminiscences and Reflections" that Stalin used to take decisions through collective process. During the war Stalin never singlehandedly made any final strategic plan, he would always seek suggestions from the commanders in charge of different fronts. Before going for any new military operation or taking any big step, Stalin would send the suggestions of the front commanders to various military departments for their opinions. Thereafter he would summon the commanders, note their suggestions and then he would sit with the Politburo. The entire planning as decided in the Politburo would again be sent back to the fronts for their further opinions. The opinions from the fronts would again be discussed in the Politburo and only then the final decision would be taken and implemented. Thus Stalin has left a remarkable example before us of how to take decisions by involving all. Even during war time, he used to take decisions after seeking others' opinions. On this Zhukov recalled — "Vasilevsky and I signed the map of the counter offensive and the words 'I approve' were added by the Supreme Commander." The Supreme Commander, that is, Stalin, though himself approved the plan, yet had forbidden Zhukov and others to send it to the front instantly. His instruction to General Vasilevsky, in charge of the Headquarters, was — 'Without disclosing the essence of our plan, the Front Commanders must be asked for their views on future operations'. In other words, even after giving his full consent to the plan, Stalin sought the opinions of the Front Commanders for better suggestions

if any. And to help the front commanders to give their opinions freely, Stalin wanted that his approved plan be not sent to them in advance. This is a bright example of how Stalin instead of imposing his own opinions on others, used to give due consideration to others opinions Zhukov recalled that Stalin's nature was to talk less and listen more to others and with much attention. He had an intense dislike of bragging. He would like precise reports. Unnecessary discussion, excessive talk, vague and erroneous reports would make him very irritated.

He used to listen to others critically, would analyze their views and then only would arrive at the decision. The distinctive feature of Stalin's character was that on all issues he would consider all the aspects comprehensively, subject it to thorough and minute scrutiny and then only would come to a decision. As he was the leader of all, he never made any casual or hasty remarks, and whatever little he would say in a few words did contain profound thinking and analysis Stalin was very much against imposing decisions by force. His method was to implement decisions, however correct they were, not by imposition but by making others understand the correctness of the decision. In 1930, while a massive movement in the agricultural sector was being conducted to organise collective farms, he came to know that in some places the reluctant peasants were being compelled by overenthusiastic party workers and government officials to join the collective farms. Severely criticising and urging to stop these undemocratic acts immediately, Stalin wrote an article in the party organ Pravda. Stalin followed this democratic method also in resolving controversial issues in economics and science. What are the distinctive features of soviet socialist economy, what would be the course of transition to communism — on these issues a stormy debate was going on in the then Russia. Stalin's instruction was to form a committee where all differing parties to the debate would get representation. They would exchange all their views thoroughly and through dialectical discourse

would try to arrive at the truth. Then their opinions, views and proposals would be placed before the politburo for final decision. In such a democratic manner Stalin used to work..

The extent of Stalin's practice of proletarian democracy can be well understood from the character of the new soviet constitution and the way it was framed. In 1917, after November revolution, the constitution framed under the guidance of Lenin could not afford to provide universal franchise as socialization of the country's economy was not yet completed and there was considerable influence of small ownership in both industry and agriculture. Subsequently in 1936, after the abolition of small private ownership in industry and agriculture, the party led by Stalin took the initiative to frame a new constitution with the object of granting universal franchise. The committee formed for this, at first, as instructed by Stalin studied the constitutions of all the states of the world, even those of mass organizations and social organizations of different countries and then prepared a draft of the proposed new constitution. Millions of this draft were printed and distributed among the citizens of the Soviet Union so that they could extensively deliberate on it and send in their suggestions or proposals for additions, alterations and corrections. There were hundreds of thousands of meetings in the country to discuss the pros and cons of it. In this way after extensive discussion and thorough review of the opinions of all citizens, the new constitution was finalized. Could you name any other country of the world, where the constitution has been framed in such a manner? This was the only constitution which for the first time in the world provided the voters with the right to recall or replace an elected person if the voters lost faith in him. The soviet state was formed by uniting many nations, it was an Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In 1922, during the time of Lenin, the soviet state made the declaration that any nation, if it desires, had the right to secede from the Soviet Union. The 1936 constitution too recognized this right. No other

state consisting of more than one nation except Switzerland has recognized this right, though in capitalist Switzerland, it exists only on paper. In Soviet Union, however, this right was recognized in letter and spirit. In fact, Rabindranath Tagore and others became overwhelmed with joy when they saw, no animosity, but a bond of friendship and goodwill between people of different languages and religious beliefs in Soviet Union. He wrote about this experience in ‘Letters from Russia.’

**Stalin opposed encomia about him,
never indulged in any show of blind respect to him**

Let me say another point. Stalin did never try to show off, rather he despised such an attitude. All along his life Stalin would say that he was a student of Lenin and was striving to be Lenin’s worthy student. When the eminent German writer Emil Ludwig, recalling Stalin’s contributions was all praise for him in admiration, Stalin with profound humility replied — *“I am just a student of Lenin and I am struggling to become his worthy pupil.”* (*Problems of Leninism*). In 1926, Ksanofontov, a member of the party wrote a letter to Stalin and at the end of the letter designated himself as ‘a disciple of Lenin and Stalin’. Stalin’s reply to this has become an unforgettable example in history. *He said — “I have no disciple. But you have no grounds for calling yourself a disciple of Lenin’s disciple.... Call yourself a disciple of Lenin”.* (*Problems of Leninism*) In 1952, a year before his death, he had replied to the senior leader Molotov in the same vein. In an extended meeting of the central committee, Stalin had severely criticized Molotov for some of his defects including that of weakness towards his wife. Molotov admitted his errors and said — “I am and I will always be a faithful disciple of Stalin.” Vexed at this Stalin said — “This is nonsense, I have no students at all. We are all students of great Lenin”. Even when Stalin became an accepted supreme communist leader in the world, he used to have in front of him a photo of Lenin at all times in his

bedroom and in his daily work room too. He even used to carry a photo of Lenin while going out on work. This is an example of how profound was his respect, emotion and loyalty to Lenin. Lenin was the source of inspiration to Stalin throughout his revolutionary life and work. During the war when the embalmed body of Lenin was being shifted from Moscow to a safe place, to everyone's surprise Stalin turned up to give Red Salute. Remember that Moscow was then under attack from all sides with heavy enemy fire and aerial bombings, none could think that in such a condition Stalin would come in the open.

The Nazi army had surrounded Leningrad in 1941 from all sides, it lost link with the mainland. Hitler openly announced that the fall of Leningrad was imminent. As Leningrad became inaccessible by land route, Stalin sent Zhukov by air to save the city. In response to Stalin's appeal, not only the Red army, but all men and women, young and old, children and even patients from hospital beds came out with whatever they could lay their hands on to join the battle to save Leningrad. Around midnight Marshal Zhukov received a phone call from Stalin. Stalin asked – 'Will you be able to save Leningrad?' Zhukov replied in the affirmative. Stalin said — "Answer me as a communist". Yes, that answer was given by the gallant Red Army and the people by fighting back the fascist forces. 'Leningrad' — what an emotional chord this name strikes in the mind of the Soviet people, communists all over the world and the working class.

A biography of Stalin was published in 1938. It contained exaggerated account of his childhood and of his later years including many misrepresentations. Exasperated by it Stalin remarked, "*The book is filled with a mass of factual distortions, untruths, exaggeration and underserved encomia. The author has been misled by lovers of fairy tales – by liars (perhaps honest "Liars") and time-servers. The main thing is that the book has the tendency to inculcate in the Soviet people (and people in general) the cult of the personality of chiefs and infallible*

heroes. That is dangerous and harmful —.My advice is to burn the book.” (Selected Works, Stalin)

In 1926, Stalin went to Tiflis. It was among the railway workers of Tiflis, Stalin had started his first organizational activities. The workers of Tiflis and some of those whom Stalin once considered his leaders were present at the meeting. In his speech he said — *“I must say in all conscience, comrades that I do not deserve a good half of the flattering things that have been said here about me...that is absurd comrades and quite unnecessary exaggeration. It is the sort of thing that is usually said on the graveside of a departed revolutionary, but I have no intention of dying yet.”* He further said — *“It was here, among these comrades that I received my first baptism in the revolutionary struggle. It was here, among these comrades that I became an apprentice in the art of revolution. As you see, my first teachers were Tiflis workers..... Permit me to tender my sincere comradely thanks to my Tiflis Teachers... I recall further, the years of 1907-09, when by the will of the party, I was transferred to work in Baku... It was there in Baku that I received my second baptism in revolutionary struggle. There I became a journeyman in the art of revolution. Permit me to tender my sincere comradely thanks to my Baku Teachers... Lastly I recall the year 1917, when by the will of the party I was transferred to Leningrad... There in the society of Russian workers and in direct contact with comrade Lenin, the great teacher of the proletarians of all countries...I received my third baptism in revolutionary struggle. There in Russia, under Lenin’s guidance, I became a master workman in the art of revolution. Permit me to tender my sincere comradely thanks to my Russian teachers and to bow my head in homage to the memory of my great teacher — Lenin”.*(Problems of Leninism) On the 58th birthday of Stalin, felicitations and congratulations poured in from many quarters. In reply Stalin remarked — *“I dedicate these felicitations to the party, the party which has given birth to me and has helped me to develop. I will fight to*

the last drop of blood for the world communist revolution, to save socialism in Russia and for the emancipation of the working class”(Problems of Leninism) See, how he gave all the credit to the party, not to himself, for what he became as Stalin. To think in this way and to pledge to fight to his last drop of blood for the emancipation of the working class of the world, for saving socialism in USSR and for the establishment of world communism, show the greatness of Stalin`s communist character.

Stalin played a unique role in the victory in war, but gave all the credit to Red Army and soviet people

Khrushchev maliciously propagandized that in the Second World War, Stalin had tried to appropriate the glory of the Red Army in the victory. Let me cite one or two incidents which are enough to show that Khrushchev lied. After the war, all were almost certain that Stalin would receive the salute in the victory parade. But Marshal Zhukov, recounted a memorable conversation with Stalin on the day before the victory parade. Zhukov said in his ‘Reminiscences and Reflections’ — “He asked me whether I had forgotten how to ride a horse. ‘No I haven’t’, I replied. ‘Good,’ said Stalin ‘you will have to take the salute at the victory parade, Rokossovsky will command it’. I replied, ‘Thank you for the great honour, but would not it be better for you to take the salute? You are the supreme commander-in-chief and by right and duty you are to take the salute’. Stalin said — ‘I am too old to review parades. You do it, you are younger”. It was very natural for entire soviet people, the Red Army along with Marshal Zhukov to expect Stalin to receive the salute in the victory parade as it was for his great leadership and guidance that such a historic victory could be achieved. Stalin however knew that under his guidance Zhukov had rendered outstanding services in the war. He had tackled many a crises by sending Zhukov in extremely difficult situations. It was in recognition of his outstanding services that Stalin had asked Zhukov to receive the salute. General Marshal

Vasilov, who had always been at the Headquarters to assist Stalin, wrote in his memoirs— “I was with Stalin and I was very close to him, but not for a single instance did I ever hear from him taking his own credit for the victory in the war. On the contrary, he was always all praise for the other Generals, officers and the Red Army.’ In Marshal Vasilov’s words, ‘After the war so many felicitations have taken place in honour of Generals and Officers and we have been accorded with so many titles and medals. Suddenly it struck us that Stalin, the person under whose leadership we had gained victory in the war, had not been felicitated and no medals had been accorded in his name. We the Generals then sent a written appeal to the President of the State for arranging this felicitation. Then it was arranged.’” There also Stalin gave a very significant and educative speech. He said—”The entire credit for the victory in this war goes to the Soviet people and the Red Army.” He further said “The leadership erred in the beginning”. It means that Stalin himself admits his own mistakes in the initial days of the war. He went on “Had this been the people of any other country, they would have thrown out the leadership, but we could gain success only because the Russian people had fought on keeping complete confidence on the leadership.” See how Stalin by acknowledging his own mistakes in the early part of the war, praised the role of the soviet people and the Red Army for the victory in the war. Here is the greatness of Stalin. None can erase the name of such a leader from history.

In this context, Marshal Zhukov recalled in his memoirs, “To err is human and of course the Supreme Commander did make mistakes early in the work until the Stalingrad battle, but he took them close to heart, gave them deep thought and sought to draw due lessons from them so as never to repeat them again. Looking back, I take the liberty to say that no political or military leader of any other country could have survived such trials or found a way out of the extremely unfavourable situation.” See how deep was the respect of the world famous General Marshal

Zhukov towards Stalin.

It is true that during revolution and later in the war against the counter revolutionaries, Stalin played a very important role. But he had no direct knowledge of modern warfare. So, when in the Second World War, after being given the responsibility of the supreme commander of the armed forces, Stalin in a very short time, acquired a comprehensive knowledge of the details of the war, even the seasoned Russian Generals were taken aback. During the strategic meeting with Churchill and Roosevelt, the British and American Generals too were surprised seeing Stalin's extraordinary knowledge and grasp about the science of war. He even provided guidance in formulating the war strategy of their Western Front. That a Marxist revolutionary leader, even in old age, if necessary, can muster highest efficiency in all fields was eloquently exemplified by Stalin. In the early phase of the war when Soviet anti-aircraft rockets repeatedly failed to bring down German fighters and bombers, Stalin in order to find out the reasons went to the field to see the firing of the rockets with his own eyes. He then went to the ordnance factory to discuss about his observations with the engineers. During enemy attack he would even, all of a sudden, go to the front to inspire the soldiers of the Red Army and to know their difficulties. When Moscow was under around attack, his colleagues and comrades became anxious and repeatedly requested him to move to a safe place, but Stalin steadfastly refused. Subsequently Moscow became almost surrounded by Nazi forces and was constantly under fire. Stalin, even risking his own life, had openly observed November Day, May Day and delivered speeches in Moscow. Just after an enemy bombing in Moscow he used to move about from one street to another to see the extent of civilian damage. The people found strength and inspiration on seeing him in this way. Stalin would always place full confidence on the people and he would give them all the news of the war — win, defeat, disaster or whatever it might be. Was there any other leader in history

to have played such a role? Everything he did was not only to save the first socialist state, but also the people of the whole world from the attack of the fascists. Recalling those days Stalin in conversation with Romain Rolland, had said “we cannot leave our field of activities for a moment even when the whole surroundings will appear utterly frustrating. When the enemy forces made a siege of Moscow, and when not even a few hours were left to capture it –we still continued to work only to build up the future of the world.” (Moscow Diary) The British Prime Minister Churchill in full admiration of Stalin after meeting him during the war said in an impassioned speech in the House of Commons on 8 September, 1942 — *“It was of great interest to me to meet Premier Stalin... It is very fortunate for Russia in her agony to have this great rugged war chief at her head. He is a man of massive outstanding personality, suited to the somber and stormy times in which his life has been cast ; a man of inexhaustible courage and will-power and a man direct and even blunt in speech ...Above all he is a man with that saving sense of humour which is of high importance to all men and all nations, but particularly to great men and great nations. Stalin also left upon me the impression of a deep, cool wisdom and a complete absence of illusions of any kind.”* (Wikipedia)

As a matter of fact, Stalin throughout his life had to fight against odds tirelessly. He fought before and after revolution, fought to build up a socialist economy, fought against the counter revolutionaries, battled ceaselessly against the enemies within the party. He knew that if there was a slightest laxity, soviet socialism would be endangered as it was surrounded on all sides by capitalist-imperialist enemies. He knew how by taking advantage of the mistakes of the revolutionary forces, the counter-revolutionaries could smash the Paris Commune, the first insurrection of the workers in the world. This was not to be allowed in Soviet, because Soviet Union was the only hope not only to the working class of Russia but to the mass of exploited people all over the world and also to the

anti-imperialist freedom fighters of colonial countries.. It is for this reason that when after the November Revolution, the world capitalists-imperialists pounced upon the Soviet Union to crush it, the working class of those imperialist countries rose in vigorous protest and came out in the streets to stop it.

. Thus Soviet Union had to be saved at any cost was Stalin's pledge and to fulfill this, Stalin even at his old age used to work day and night with youthful energy. Marshal Zhukov recalled that "we could not make out when Stalin took time to sleep or time to rest. Though we were younger in age, we failed to keep pace with old Stalin." During the war, another aspect of Stalin earned the admiration of both friends and foes. He gave definite instructions not to behave rudely or show any revengeful attitude towards the German prisoners of war; rather they should be treated humanely. He also told the Red Army that on entering Germany, they should make, first of all, proper arrangements of food, medicines and security for the citizens of Germany.

Stalin's impersonal approach on family, an example for the communists of the world to emulate

Stalin's outlook and approach on his own family would remain as a noble example for the communists of the world to follow. As the wife of Stalin, she did not enjoy any privilege. Let me tell you the experience of Sidney and Beatrice Webb of England. Mr. and Mrs. Webb went to Russia to see socialism and after coming back wrote a book on their experiences. They were eager to know the whereabouts of Stalin's wife and came to learn that she worked in a factory. They thought she would certainly be enjoying a high position, but on visiting the factory, they found to their surprise that Stalin's wife was only an ordinary worker. At the end of the working hours, they saw Stalin's wife coming out of the factory in worker's uniform. Stupefied in wonder, Mr. and Mrs. Webb asked her – "Despite being Stalin's wife, you are working here as

an ordinary worker!” Her reply was, “Comrade Stalin is the head of the state because he is worthy of it and I have become an ordinary worker according to my ability. All of us are working for socialism according to our respective abilities”.

The directors of the school where Stalin’s children were admitted was specially told not to let any other know about their family background and not to provide any special privilege to them as Stalin’s son and daughter. From the personal account of Stalin’s bodyguard Alexi Ribin, we come to know that once a furnished and spacious flat was allotted to Stalin’s daughter Svetlana. On hearing this Stalin became angry and said — “Is she a member of the central committee or politburo that a separate arrangement has to be made for her? She has to stay with all others”. Stalin’s son Yaakov was a lieutenant in the Red Army and had been taken captive by the German army. Hitler had proposed to free Stalin’s son in exchange for a German General imprisoned in Russia. Stalin disapproved of this and said that a General of the Nazi forces should not be released in exchange for an ordinary lieutenant. One day Zhukov saw Stalin in a very thoughtful and pensive mood. Zhukov thought that Stalin might have been thinking of his son. He asked Stalin — “Comrade Stalin, I’ve been meaning to ask you for a long time about your son Yaakov. Have you heard anything about him?” Stalin replied — *‘Yaakov won’t be let free. The fascists will shoot him first. From what we know, they are keeping him separate from the other POW’s and are putting pressure on him to betray his country... I hope, Yaakov will prefer any kind of death to betrayal.’* Stalin sat silent for some time; then as if continuing his thoughts aloud, he said — *“What a terrible war, how many lives of our people it has carried away. There are probably very few families of us left who haven’t lost their children”* Zhukov could understand that Stalin’s pain was not for his own son but for the sons and daughters of the whole country. This is Stalin. Throughout his life, he did not have more than two or three sets of dresses.

Alexi Ribin, his personal bodyguard writes — “If his coat was torn, he would get it stitched. Many a time, we would be cross with him, seize his old clothes and replace them with new ones. He was very reluctant to change his worn out shoes unless insisted on.” This was the lifestyle of a giant statesman of such a vast country like Russia! The Government used to give him three coats annually and his bodyguards used to get two. Ribin writes that Stalin used to tell them wittily — “I am rich and you are poor”. Till his last, Stalin did not forget that he was a son of the Russian working class. When he died, he left behind nothing but a few clothes, shoes, some items of personal use, books and a few rubles. There was nothing else. Ribin further recalled that Stalin’s favorite dish was pork and one day, he was served a delicious dish of cooked meat of a piglet. Stalin asked from where it came. He was told that someone had brought it by an aircraft. He became furious and said — “Ask him whether an aircraft flies on water or oil? Who gave him the right to waste public money?” This is called a character! This was his life. He used to mix freely with his bodyguards and attendants like one of them, chatted with them, played and dined with them, a fact mentioned by many of them with deep emotion, respect and pride.

In the theoretical field, Stalin’s contribution is outstanding

Stalin made immense contribution in the theoretical sphere too. In addition to his ‘On National Question’ and the historic book titled ‘Problems of Leninism’, he has made outstanding contributions to the treasure of Marxism. Basing himself on the teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin, he wrote ‘Dialectical and Historical Materialism’, which is an invaluable piece of work. This work has helped the world communist movement very much to grasp the Marxist philosophy. Towards the end of his life, he made two other outstanding contributions, one on linguistics and the other on economic problems in socialism. In the then Russia, a

debate or polemic began on questions like what is language, how does language develop, how language gets enriched and undergoes change. There was also the question on whether language belonged to superstructure of a society and if so, then do languages change with the change of base and superstructure of a given society? Stalin, in his book 'Marxism and Problems of Linguistics' showed — *“A Marxist cannot regard language as a superstructure or the basis...the superstructure is the product of one epoch...it is eliminated and disappears with the elimination and disappearance of the given basis. Language, on the contrary is the product of a whole number of epochs... A language therefore lives immeasurably longer than any base or any superstructure.”* He showed — *“The formulation regarding class character of language formula is erroneous and non Marxist.....Language, as means of intercourse, always was and remains the single language of a society, common to all its members...”* He further said — *“.....Grammatical system and basic word stock constitute the foundation of language, the essence of its specific character....the grammatical system of a language changes even more slowly than its basic word stock”*. He also explained how a language undergoes a qualitative change — *“Marxism holds that the transition of a language from an old quality to a new does not take place by way of an explosion, of the destruction of an existing language and the creation of a new one, but by the gradual accumulation of the elements of the new quality, and hence by the gradual dying away of the elements of the old quality.”* Stalin proved his profound scientific wisdom on the question of how and in what process a common language would develop in the world. He elucidated— *“...the epoch after the victory of socialism on a world scale...when the exploiting classes are overthrown and national and colonial oppression is eradicated; when national isolation and mutual distrust among nations is replaced by mutual confidence and rapprochement between nations; when national equality has been put into practice; when the policy of suppressing*

and assimilating languages are abolished; when the co-operation of nations has been established and it is possible for national language freely to enrich one another through their co-operation. It is clear that in these conditions there can be no question of the suppression and defeat of some languages, and the victory of others.....but hundreds of national languages, out of which, as a result of prolonged economic, political and cultural co-operation of nations, there will first appear most enriched unified zonal languages, and subsequently the zonal languages will merge into a single international language, which, of course will be neither German, nor Russian, nor English, but a new language that has absorbed the best elements of the national and zonal languages.” On questions of language, he was the first to provide a scientific outlook and analysis which will go a long way to act as a guide to the linguists of all countries.

The second invaluable book that he wrote in the last years of his life was ‘Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR.’ In the first part of the book, the way he had elucidated the difference between the laws enacted by any government with the laws of natural science and political economy, did amaze not only the communists, but also the scientists and philosophers of the world. Actually a section within the soviet party was then thinking that the soviet state could, if it so desired, ‘abolish’ some laws of political economy and ‘create’ new ones. In order to point out their erroneous idea, Stalin explained — *“they confuse laws of science.....with the laws which are issued by governments, which are made by the will of men, and which have only juridical validity. Marxism regards laws of science-whether they be laws of natural science or laws of political economy- as the reflection of objective process which take place independently of the will of man. Man may discover these laws, get to know them, study them, reckon with them in his activities and utilize them in the interests of society, but he cannot change or abolish them. Still less can he form or create new laws of science....having come to know*

the laws of nature, reckoning with them and relying on them, and intelligently applying and utilizing them, man can restrict their sphere of action, and can impart a different direction to the destructive forces of nature and convert them to the use of society.” In this book, we find an elaboration on the differences between the basic economic law of modern capitalism and socialism. What are the main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism? Stalin answers — “*the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systemic robbery of the people of other countries, especially backward countries, and lastly through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits.”* This is the basic economic law of modern capitalism. Then he explains — “*The essential features and requirements of the basic law of socialism might be formulated roughly in this way; the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques”.*

In this context, Stalin dealt on the then crisis of capitalism and showed that the relative stability enjoyed by the world capitalist economy before the first and second world wars ceased to exist in the post second world war period. Today what we see as the deadly crises of modern capitalism, Stalin could discern its beginning, and he was the first to point out that because of market crises, present-day capitalism would have no other option but to go for militarization of its economy. In other words, he showed that due to gross reduction in the purchasing power of the people, the market for consumer goods suffer significant contraction and consequently the capitalist- imperialist states are compelled to create artificial markets of military goods where the state with the money collected from public

taxes becomes the sole purchaser. As a result, the burden of taxes in public life continuously increases and on the other allocation of public funds to education, health and other social sectors are curtailed and high inflation becomes the order of the day. This is how the imperialists try to artificially stimulate the economy. Consequently they create war-tension and generate wars. Stalin also pointed out that it was wrong to think that war ravaged Germany and Japan would never be able to rise again, rather these two war ravaged imperialist nations would in future become strong rivals of US imperialism, a prediction which later became a reality. These ideas and teachings of Stalin still today work as guidelines for us. These two invaluable books were concrete examples of how the ideas and thoughts of Stalin on Marxist epistemology were developing in an extraordinary way. Had he lived longer he could have after Marx, Engels and Lenin definitely made more valuable contributions, to the epistemological treasury of Marxism.

As a great Marxist philosopher and thinker, Stalin has left an indelible mark of his profound knowledge in every field like philosophy, politics, economics, science, literature and culture. When soviet science faced various differences and confusions from among the soviet scientists on some questions, Stalin played a crucial role in correcting the confused ideas. He did this through extensive discourses, discussions and deliberations with the scientists. In resolving the differences and arriving at truth, Stalin always emphasized on debates and discussions, not on dictates from above. One of his observations in this regard cannot but be mentioned. In his report to the 19th conference of CPSU Stalin said , *“However, in a number of branches of science, we have not yet fully put an end to the monopoly of various groups of scientists who bar the way to fresh and growing forces, fence themselves off from criticism and seek to settle scientific questions by administrative fiat. No science can effectively develop in a musty atmosphere of mutual laudation and hushing up of*

errors. Whenever individual groups of scientists endeavour to establish a monopoly for themselves, the inevitable result is scientific stagnation and decay.”

He had deep knowledge of and interest in literature and culture

Stalin's extraordinary knowledge on the literature and culture of the western countries amazed Bernard Shaw, Romain Rolland and other intellectuals. Stalin always gave encouragement to the young litterateurs of Soviet Union and helped them to develop while pointing out their mistakes. His advice to them was to be the true successors of the humanist writers of the previous era like Pushkin, Tolstoy, Turgenev, Dostoyevsky and Chekov and to the likes of Gorky of the later period. He had also liking in performing arts like drama, music and even would make time from his most busy schedule to go to see and listen theater and music. Stalin would discuss with the artists on how to improve their skills. There arose a debate on whether it would be right and proper to produce plays and religious music of the old czarist period in soviet cultural institutes. Stalin clearly stated that these should be presented and that too without making any tampering of history. Stalin had not only built up systems of free education and free health homes for the workers and peasants, but ensured that many drama and music theaters were built up in villages and cities all over the country. Under his instruction classical literary works of different countries were printed in thousands and freely distributed to the workers and peasants. Scientists, writers, theatre-workers, artists and such others were provided with financial and other helps from the state to enable them to devote full time to artistic activities. In order to help soviet citizens to cultivate science and knowledge; to develop their intellectual faculty and to acquire a sense of culture. Stalin had opened widest scope, which no other country could even dream of.

Lowering of ideological standards responsible for the growth of the cult of individual or blindness

You are aware that the renegade Khrushchev and company propagandised many a slanders about Stalin. They alleged that Stalin himself had encouraged the practice of his own cult. This is totally a false allegation... I have already cited instances from history to show how deeply he was opposed to encomia and blindness about him. While refuting the anti-Stalin canards of Khrushchev, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh clearly explained why and how the allegation of encouraging Stalin-cult could not stand test and therefore was a lie. To Comrade Ghosh the source of the cult was different. To understand the point, you have to perceive some other things. In fact, in 1948, the year SUCI (Communist) was formally founded, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh while discussing on a serious issue of the international communist movement, that of the expulsion of Marshal Tito and Yugoslavia from COMINFORM for his fundamental deviation from socialist principles, had explained that unless the root cause of degeneration of Tito and the Yugoslav party could be detected and rectified, these types of serious crises would continue to rear their heads in the communist movement in future. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh at that time in his book 'Self-criticism of the Communist Camp' further said — *“while acknowledging with just pride and deference the very many achievements and successes and glorious sacrifices of the world communist movement, we have not failed, even for a moment, to point out the serious shortcomings in it.....These serious shortcomings and defects are largely due to the fact that the present leadership of the world communist camp is, to a very large extent, influenced by mechanical process of thinking”*. Eight years later in 1956, when renegade Khrushchev, in the name of fighting the cult of individual attacked Stalin and along with it presented various erroneous anti-Leninist thoughts and ideas, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, soon after the publication

of the 20th congress reports, with condemnation said — *“Today they are leveling so many charges against Stalin....But to substantiate the charges necessary documents should have been placed, which they have not done. As if all these problems concern the CPSU alone and none else — this seems to be their attitude. The CPSU is trying to monopolize the Stalin affair, although, in our opinion, any question relating to Stalin is not merely an affair of the Soviet Union but is a matter of concern to the toiling millions of the whole world. So in our considered view, it was highly improper on their part to come unilaterally to a conclusion on such a vital issue like this, without showing any regard for the opinions of the communists of the world. Had they been serious about fighting the cult of individual, they ought to have observed this code. So it appears that in the name of fighting the cult of individual, they are fighting a person who has departed... no doubt that this idea of Khrushchev will help give birth to trends of revisionism-reformism in the communist movement of different countries”*. (Shibdas Ghosh, Selected Works Vol-I) He further said — *“20th Congress would open the floodgate of revisionism”*. He again explained that the cult of individual or the blindness towards the leadership which had grown in soviet party and in the international communist movement, was due to the lowering of the ideological standards of the leaders and rank and file of both the soviet party and the international communist movement below the required level. It is the lowering of the level of consciousness of the leaders and rank and file and growth of mechanical relations instead of dialectical relations in the party which help to grow this kind of cult or blind allegiance.. At that time Comrade Shibdas Ghosh pointed out — *“...the philosophical development of Marxism–Leninism which ought to have been made in the face of multiplicity of newer problems of life and class struggles in keeping with the spectacular progress of natural sciences that marked the post Lenin period, was not made.”* (Shibdas Ghosh, Selected Works

Vol-I) Further he said — “...it was necessary to maintain a high and accurate ideological and cultural standard of consciousness by conducting cultural revolution and ideological struggle ceaselessly within the party, on the one hand, while on the other, it was necessary to develop and enrich Marxism continually not only in the economic and political spheres but also for confronting the newer and newer problems arising in the changed condition in human life even the theories of Marxism which retain their effectiveness still today, their theoretical understanding should be enriched.” (Shibdas Ghosh, Selected Works Vol-I,)

But this was not done for a long period till the last years of Stalin’s life. Lenin although had said long ago. “We do not regard Marxist theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the cornerstone of the science which socialists must further advance in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life”. (Lenin selected works, Vol-II)

Stalin’s failure, if any, was his inability to timely perceive that the lowering of ideological standard, the mechanical relations and the blindness had become so alarming in the party and society. However, he had repeatedly emphasized on elevating the level of ideological consciousness in the party. In 1950, in the last years of his life, Stalin, realizing the necessity of further developing Marxism, said — “As a science, Marxism cannot stand still, it develops and is perfected. In its development, Marxism cannot but be enriched by new experience, new knowledge, consequently some of its formulas and conclusions cannot but change in the course of time, cannot but be replaced by new formulas and conclusions, corresponding to the new historical tasks. Marxism does not recognize inviolable conclusions and formulas obligatory for all epochs and periods.”(Marxism and Problems of Linguistics)

Since the publication of this book Stalin lived only for 2 years and seven months more. But during this short span,

he, through two new writings made invaluable contributions to the treasury of Marxism. It seems that he either failed to perceive in time the necessity of further developing Marxist philosophy and theory in the post Lenin period or being immersed in volumes of work, engaged in combating many attacks, particularly the second world war, he could not make necessary time to give attention to it. However in 1952 at the 19th party congress, he himself acknowledged the necessity of advancement of various branches of epistemology including philosophy and remarked — “*The discussion on philosophy, biology, physiology, linguistics and political economy disclosed serious ideological failings in various fields of science...*” Due to his sudden demise, he could not do much in this regard, but had he lived longer, he would have definitely made lasting contributions in this field. I like to reiterate that Comrade Shibdas Ghosh as the only voice in the international communist movement warned in the very beginning that to deny the authority of Stalin was tantamount to deny the authority of Lenin and Leninism, for the communists all over the world could learn Leninism from none else but Stalin. If Stalin is denied, then that would make Leninism, which is Marxism of the present era, subject of various distortions and that would open the floodgate of revisionism. This is exactly what happened. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh further said that in the name of criticism, Khrushchev and the likes were undermining Stalin’s authority. By attacking the concretized expression of the collective leadership, they were actually attacking democratic centralism in the party, were jeopardizing the true understanding of Leninism. This was expediting revisionist degeneration in the communist movement. Castigating the Khrushchev coterie, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh observed painfully — “*A glorious memory is associated with Stalin. His name, his honour and his authority is inseparably linked to an interpretation of Marxism-Leninism, to understand which, an intense desire can be found in the people. Stalin’s*

guideline is essential to learn about Marxism-Leninism and it is his yardstick that has to be applied to any concept for determination and judgment of what is right and what is wrong. This mental frame of the toiling people and the communists all over the world was destroyed by maligning Stalin and disowning his authority.” (Shibdas Ghosh, Selected Works Vol.1) Comrade Ghosh further said — “Our party has shown that his shortcomings were practically negligible compared to his overall excellence. So, there is no question of maligning Stalin. His position in the world communist movement is still that of a giant, powerful and exemplary communist character. He is still our teacher and leader” (Soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia and revisionism, S.W. vol.1))

CPC led by Mao-Tse-Tung initially lent support to Khrushchev

The fallout of the misdeeds of the Khrushchev and co. in the international communist movement was catastrophic. We cannot but say that had the Communist Party Of China led by Mao-Tse-Tung, opposed the Khrushchev leadership and the report of the 20th Party congress of CPSU exactly in the beginning, i.e.in the year 1956-57 and did provide a correct guideline, this catastrophe perhaps could have been avoided to a great extent, because all those who were present, were taken aback by the Khrushchev’s anti-Stalin speech at the 20th congress and could not believe it. But since the allegations were raised by the very leadership of the CPSU, none could ignore it altogether .Besides, as the then normal practice, almost all the communist parties of the world were having blind loyalty to CPSU. As an authority in the international communist movement, Mao-Tse-Tung was next to Stalin and hence whatever he would say on this issue would have great importance. The name of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh and SUCI(C) at that time were almost unknown not only in other countries but even in India itself. Unfortunately the Chinese communist Party in its Eighth congress and in a number of subsequent

documents almost lent support to Khrushchev's line. Accepting almost all of Khrushchev's allegations against Stalin, CPC's only differing opinion was that Stalin's qualities were greater than his shortcomings. Regarding the serious danger of revisionism, CPC, at that time, did not utter any single word of caution. Rather, we have to say, though with pain, that the leadership of the CPC in the beginning supported the decisions of the 20th Party congress and criticized Stalin almost in the same tune with Khrushchev. In 1956 itself, the CPC under the leadership of Mao-Tse-Tung held two extended politburo meetings to discuss on the decisions of the 20th party congress. The substance of the discussions in these two meetings was published in the party organ 'People's Daily' on 5th April and 29th December, 1956 respectively and in 1959, a book titled 'Historical Experiences of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat' was published. The first submission in this book says — **“During the latter part of his life, Stalin took more and more pleasure in cult of the individual, and violated the party's system of democratic centralism and the principle of combining of collective leadership with individual responsibility. As a result he made some serious mistakes as the following; he broadened the scope of the suppression of counterrevolution: he lacked the necessary vigilance on the eve of the antifascist war; he failed to pay proper attention to the further development of agriculture and the material welfare, made a wrong decision on the question of Yugoslavia. On these issues Stalin fell victim to subjectivism and one-sidedness, and divorced himself from the objective reality and the masses”**. In the second submission it was written — **“A sense of victories and eulogies which Stalin received in the latter part of his life turned his head. He deviated partly, but grossly from the dialectical materialist way of thinking and fell into subjectivism.....After the extermination of classes, the class struggle should not continue to be stressed as though it was being intensified, as was done by Stalin**

with the result that the healthy development of socialist democracy was hampered. The communist party of the Soviet Union is completely right in firmly correcting Stalin's mistakes in this respect." It was also written that — **"the 20th congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union showed great determination and courage in doing away with blind faith in Stalin, in exposing the gravity of Stalin's mistakes and in eliminating their effects."**

So when the immediate urgent necessity was to expose the revisionist design of renegade Khrushchev in the 20th Party congress and to free the communists and working class of the world from all confusions and to make them conscious, alert and united, the CPC led by Mao-Tse-Tung did the opposite. This was not only unbecoming of them, but was obviously saddening and surprising. However in 1963, seven years after the 20th congress, the CPC in a reply to an open letter by soviet communist party criticized the Khrushchev leadership and the 20th Congress itself. In this reply, it was said about CPSU that — "Their revisionist line began exactly with the 20th congress and became fully systematized at the 22nd congress. The facts have shown even more clearly that their revision of the Marxist-Leninist theories...is inseparably connected with their complete negation of Stalin." It was further said — "After Lenin's death, Stalin became not only the leader of the party and government of the Soviet Union; but the acknowledged leader of the international communist movement as well....Stalin defended and developed Marxism-Leninism in the fight against various kinds of opportunism, against the enemies of Leninism". CPC's reply also raised and critically dealt the question as to why the soviet communist party under the leadership of Khrushchev made mala fide attempts to unilaterally impose decisions in respect to questions on Stalin without any prior discussion with communist parties of different countries. These statements were undoubtedly correct. But CPC did not say these in 1956 when it was proper and timely, rather

they lent support to Khrushchev during 20th congress. Then after the lapse of 7 years, this criticism of Krushchev, however correct it might be was futile because the obvious damage was already done. Khrushchev and company during this time went on spreading slanders against Stalin and those were gleefully taken up by the capitalist-imperialist media. They were aware that such a golden opportunity to strike at socialism and international communist movement never had come to them before.. Consequently, confusions permeated the international communist movement, revisionism pervaded and misled the movement, the forces of counter-revolution got emboldened in Soviet Union and in the socialist camp. A few years later differences arose between the Soviet Party and the Chinese Party on international communist movement but then also attempts were not made through open polemics to involve the communists and the working class of the world in this ideological struggle, rather the leaders of both the parties preferred closed door discussion on a 12 party document and later on 81 party document. These documents were however prepared through a compromise between the revisionist line of the Soviet Party and the revolutionary line of the Chinese Party. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh castigated these compromising documents as well as the decision not to engage in open polemics on ideological issues. Later, at the end of the 60's, when the CPC led by Mao-Tse-Tung openly opposed the revisionist line of the Soviet Party, our party under the leadership of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, though pointed out some errors in their approach, but in the main, supported the CPC's stand. But it was too late, serious damage was already done and you all are aware of the catastrophic consequences..

After Lenin, Stalin was the authority in the international communist movement

In those days Comrade Shibdas Ghosh dwelt on certain important issues which are still pertinent to think over and would help to understand the Stalin question as well as

would work as a guide to the present world communist movement. He said that collective functioning did not mean mere committee functioning, bourgeois parties did also have committee functioning. According to Lenin, collective knowledge of all the members of the party is collective leadership. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh by further developing this Leninist concept, said — “...*collective leadership can be established only when the collective knowledge of the leaders and members of the whole party derived through struggles and interaction of ideas, knowledge and experiences has been personified and concretized in the best manner in a leader of the party. Hence the concept of collective leadership or the sense of authority can never be abstract. And for this reason, when we say that collective leadership has emerged in a party, we mean that the collective knowledge of the party has been personified in the best way in an individual of the party.*” (Selected Works Vole-II) This was how first Lenin and then Stalin emerged in the Russian Party Again, in CPC, Mao-Tse-Tung was the concrete expression of the collective leadership. They were the authority. By way of explanation Comrade Shibdas Ghosh said that all in the party think and ponder, but realisation of all cannot be and is not same. From among all, the leader, who, in the best way, understands and can express the collective thinking derived through the dialectical interaction of the thoughts and ideas of all the leaders and members of the party, is the concrete expression of the collective leadership and hence the authority in the party. When such a collective leadership emerges in the party, only at that stage, it can be said that proletarian democracy too is effectively working in the party. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has explained that there will remain difference in standard between the chief leader and other leaders, between the standard of the leaders and rank and file, again there will remain differences in standard between the members of the party and the people. This is a reality. The level of consciousness of all cannot, simply by wish, be lifted up at one stroke.

This being the reality, some mechanical thinking would also remain, which calls for the continuance of the ideological struggle inside the party. The degree of lessening of mechanical thinking depends on the degree of development of ideological consciousness. Stalin in his last days being alarmed over the lowering of the level of consciousness, felt the necessity to elevate the standard and started working for it. Therefore, the necessity is to constantly develop Marxism and on the basis of that developed understanding to remain engaged in ceaseless ideological struggle in order to upgrade the standard of the leaders and the rank and file of the party. But for that, the presence of an authority to conduct this ideological battle and to guide the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary party is a must. This authority is not imposed from above; it is evolved through the struggle to develop collective leadership.

Why this authority is so essential in revolutionary movement? Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has explained that for the movement as a whole, an authority is essential as a living symbol of ideology and struggle, it is necessary also to inspire the masses. People do not understand the correctness of an ideology at one stroke, but can understand the leader and it is by seeing the leader they become attracted towards the ideology. This leadership acts as a uniting and cementing factor both inside and outside the party. Revolutionary movement needs a leader whose appeal awakens the entire country, the whole world. Inside the party too, an authority is needed to protect the unity. In the party, when differences surface on ideological grounds and achieving unity of ideas become difficult, this authority in whom the collective knowledge of the party has its best and concretized expression, gives the correct explanations and brings back ideological unity. As for example, when differences arose in the second international on the question of ascertaining the correct interpretation of Marx-Engels, on true understanding of their teachings in the changed situation, Lenin provided the

correct answers and also improved the Marxian science. Thus he became the authority. Again, after Lenin's death, controversy developed over the correct interpretation and understanding of Lenin's teachings and Stalin gave the proper answers, so he became the authority. In this way subsequently Comrade Mao-Tse-Tung and Comrade Shibdas Ghosh too became authorities in the international communist movement.

We should know that though authorities of such heights may not appear for all time, but for a particular party of a particular country an authority as the product of a collective dialectical struggle, must be there. This authority, if lent blind and mechanical allegiance, gets weakened, the party's cause is harmed, the blind followers are also harmed. Again, if in the name of fighting blindness and mechanical approach, defiance of the authority develops, that is also tantamount to blind or mechanical opposition which endangers the unity and discipline of the party and creates ideological confusions. As a result, in place of democratic centralism, a sense of ultra-democracy and liberalization develop within the party and various individualistic tendencies grow. Proper submission to authority, therefore, means to submit on the basis of dialectical relations; to engage in dialectical interaction with the authority on the basis of communist code of conduct; not ventilation of differences and disagreements here and there according to one's whims as done in a bourgeois party. For this, it is necessary to acquire a high revolutionary consciousness and cultural standard. Dialectical relation with the authority means that I do not accept any opinion or decision blindly, but accept only after judging its correct or incorrectness in the light of Marxian science. In the same way if differences arise, I engage myself, abiding by the party discipline and method, in arguments, and if mistakes are mine I get clear understanding about it, and if found otherwise I try to free my leadership from its mistakes and thereby make it more strong. This struggle is completely impersonal. In these cases, the final decision would be

taken by the collective, not by any individual. If on any occasion, the collective commits mistakes, then, on the basis of experiences, the collective itself would rectify those mistakes and the individual has to accept the collective decision happily. In a bourgeois party final decisions are taken by an individual. As against it, in a proletarian party, final decisions are taken by the collective. Sometimes, through submission to and dialectical interaction with an authority, another authority emerges, as Comrade Shibdas Ghosh emerged by accepting Stalin and Mao-Tse-Tung as his authority.

**Mao-Tse-Tung and Comrade Shibdas Ghosh showed
how to dialectically submit to an authority**

In this connection, I like to mention two brilliant examples of dialectical submission. Mao-Tse-Tung while revering Stalin as the authority, did not fail to ventilate, by following the communist code of conduct, certain differences with Stalin. In this era what would be the role of the working class in the liberation movements of the colonies and semi-colonies, was enunciated by Stalin on the basis of Leninist guidelines and Mao-Tse-Tung applied that very political line creatively and brilliantly in china's revolution. But, when Mao placed his line in the party, the then leadership who enjoyed the support of Stalin, had opposed Mao's formulation of the strategy and tactics of revolution and went to the extent of removing Mao from the central committee. But, for this, Mao-Tse-Tung had never aired any criticism, dissatisfaction or grievance against Stalin. In fact, he presented Stalin before the Chinese party and the people as a leader of high communist character and an authority after Marx-Engels-Lenin. Mao simultaneously conducted ideological-organisational struggle against the then leadership who had failed to understand the concrete situation in China, concretise Marxism-Leninism in China's concrete situation. In course of this struggle Mao-Tse-Tung virtually formed a new party. During the Second World War, because of the

repeated efforts of the CPC and pressure from the freedom loving people of China, recalcitrant Chiang-Kai-Sek was compelled to form an United Front with the communist party against Japan. After the defeat of Japan, Chiang turned the guns against the communists and pushed the country to civil war. Mao-Tse-Tung thought the situation was ripe to give the call for seizure of state power. He sent Chou-En-Lai and Liu-Shao-Chi to Soviet Union to seek support. Stalin told them, that if at that time insurrection took place in china, the United States would openly involve itself in support of Chiang Government and for the war-ravaged Soviet Union it would not be possible to provide direct support to CPC in the resistance war against the USA. Accordingly he advised not to proceed at that moment for revolution. The leaders from China agreed to this position and on their return narrated the whole thing to Mao-Tse-Tung. But Mao-Tse-Tung differed and explained that in the given international situation there was less chance of the US army invading China at that time, but obviously USA would give all kinds of support and patronage to Chiang. In such a situation if Soviet Union, without direct involvement could give help in other ways, the internal situation of China was such that the people led by the CPC would be able to achieve victory in the revolution. Only material help from the Soviet Union would be enough. You can therefore understand that Mao-Tse-Tung did not follow Stalin's advice blindly. Then after the victory in the revolution, he went to Moscow to meet Stalin. With deep emotion Stalin embraced Mao-Tse-Tung and congratulated him for not following his wrong advice and thereby ensuring the victory in the revolution. See what a great person Stalin was.

Almost similar thing we find in respect of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in India. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had to build up SUCI (Communist) as the true communist party in India by conducting intense ideological struggle in order to unmask the non-Marxist character of CPI. But to Stalin and Mao-Tse-Tung CPI was the genuine communist party on

this soil and hence got their recognition and support. In such a condition you can well understand, how hard and difficult was Comrade Ghosh's task. But Comrade Shibdas Ghosh did never say anything against Stalin and Mao-Tse-Tung for their wrong evaluation about CPI. When Stalin was the leader of the international communist movement, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, though was critical of the leadership for its failure in adequately developing the ideology of Marxism in conformity with the demands of the time, for lowering of the ideological consciousness in the communist movement, for the development, to a great extent, of mechanical relations in place of dialectical relations etc. yet, he had always revered Stalin as a great Marxist thinker and his teacher. When anti-Stalin canards were being spread like a fire in the Soviet Union and in other countries, it was Comrade Ghosh who firmly stood up against those slanders and countered each of their accusations on the anvil of Marxian science and methodology of analysis. The CPC led by great Mao-Tse-Tung, at first lent its support to CPI, then to CPIM and subsequently to the Naxalites while Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in order to strengthen SUCI (C) was waging continuous ideological battle against these parties. Despite this Comrade Shibdas Ghosh himself considered and taught our comrades to regard Mao-Tse-Tung as a leader of the international communist movement next to Stalin. Comrade Ghosh was also against the CPC's political stand in signing the 12 party and 81 party documents as those were products of a compromise between CPC's revolutionary line and the then Soviet leadership's revisionist line. Subsequently, when the ideological polemic between the Chinese party and the Soviet Party came into the open, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, though pointed out some errors in the mode of presentation of the Chinese party, yet in the main, endorsed the CPC's views. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh called the historic great proletarian cultural revolution ushered by Mao-Tse-Tung as "magnificent", but nevertheless pointed out some errors and limitations in it. In all these instances, he had aired his differences with due reverence to Mao-Tse-

Tung as an authority.

One very educative example he had set in respect of his critical evaluation of the report of the ninth congress of CPC. The political statements and analyses made in the 9th party congress of CPC, appeared to Comrade Ghosh as grossly wrong. The most striking point to him was how Mao-Tse-Tung, being present in the party congress, could allow it. He felt deeply concerned, and said that a Marxist thinker like Mao-Tse-Tung could never allow such a wrong evaluation to be placed in a party congress. Hence he apprehended that Mao-Tse-Tung might have been virtually arrested by the Lin Biao clique. Many of our party workers requested him to make his apprehension public in printed form. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh did not allow it. Subsequently the 10th Party congress of CPC made it clear, by placing a correct analysis. Those serious errors committed in the formulations of the 9th party congress document were corrected. The corrections made in the 10th Congress document were almost similar to the views of Comrade Ghosh. He, in the main, welcomed the tenth congress report and explained to our party comrades why he was against publishing his discussion on ninth congress. He said that some of our comrades thought if we could publish our opinion on the report of the ninth congress, our party could claim the credit of pointing out the mistakes even before it was rectified by the CPC. But, Comrade Ghosh said, this was not at all communist way of thinking. He said, as communist, whatever we would do, our object would always be not to take any credit, but to make the international communist movement stronger. He further explained that he did not agree to publish it for it was based on his surmise and it could undermine the authority of Mao-Tse-Tung and the dignity of CPC which he by any means could not allow.

I have narrated these incidents to show you that Mao-Tse-Tung and Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had left behind shining examples of how to accept and honour an authority and at the same time, maintain a dialectical relation with it.

Stalin was against suggesting of ways for the communists of other countries

I like to discuss one pertinent point here. An idea has been floated both in our country and abroad that Stalin as the leader of the international Communist movement used to dictate and determine the political line of the communist parties of other countries. This is a lie and history bears the proof. But why and how this wrong notion could gain ground? To blame only the so-called communist party CPI alone would be wrong. The role of several communist parties of other countries are responsible for it since all of them followed the soviet party and international communist leadership blindly. Long back, Lenin had opposed this blind approach. In context of Russia, he had said — *“We think that an independent elaboration of the Marxist theory is especially essential for Russian socialists, for this theory provides only general guidelines and principles, which in particular, are applied in England differently from France, in France differently from Germany, and in Germany differently from Russia.”* (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol II) In other words, the communist party of each country has the duty to apply the general line of the international revolution in the particular situation of each country and thereby to determine the particular strategic line of revolution. This is known as ‘concrete application of the general line’. That Stalin stood firm on this Leninist teaching is confirmed from a conversation he had with Romain Rolland in Moscow in the month of June in 1935.

Romain Rolland had said, *“... You are quite in the know of how the millions of the Western people regard the Soviet Union. They envisage the incarnation of their hopes and ideals in the Soviet Union. But sometimes their thoughts and ideas are very self-contradictory and confused. At this time of economic and ethical crisis they expect necessary guidance from the Soviet Union in order to forge ahead in this struggle. They expect that the Soviet Union will sort out all of their misgivings.”* Now see what was Stalin`s

reply. Stalin said — *“You said, we should chart out the path for our Western friends. I can’t help saying that we hesitate to take up this responsibility. We cannot do that as it is very difficult to ascertain the duties and responsibilities of those who live in a completely different milieu and circumstances. Every country is special in its ambience and characteristics. It amounts to an audacity on the part of Moscow to suggest ways for the people of other countries. We restrict ourselves to general discussion. If we had behaved otherwise, we would have to shoulder a responsibility that is beyond us. We have tragic experience of what may happen if ways are borrowed from outside. At the beginning of this century before the war, at the heart of international communist movement were the German Communists. We the Russians followed them. They used to try to show us the way. If we had allowed them we could not have developed the Bolshevik Party nor organized the revolutionary upheaval of 1905, nor even the revolution of 1917 would have been possible. The working class of every country should have its own communist leadership. Otherwise they cannot move along.”* [Original in French. Voyage A Mascou (Juin – Juillet – 1935) — Romain Rolland] So, what was Stalin’s outlook and approach on relations with other communist parties is now clear.

Now, I like to remind you that Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, strongly criticising the blind allegiance of the so-called communist party of our country (now divided into CPM, CPI and Naxalites) towards the international communist leadership, that is, Soviet and Chinese communist parties, had said — *“This practice of blindly following the international leadership has done immense harm to the communist movement in our country on the one hand and on the other.... They have maligned the nobility and lowered considerably the honour and prestige of such a noble ideology as communism which was once held in high esteem by the people in our country. They have also tarnished the image of the international communist leadership which was in the exalted position of admiration and reverence before*

the exploited masses and the intelligentsia of our country. Needless to say, this blindness and sycophancy of these so called communist parties are primarily responsible for the denigration of the international communist leadership in the eyes of the people...” (Why SUCI (C) is the only genuine communist party in India. S.W. vol.2) On question of how the communist party of a particular country should view the international communist leadership or the fundamental general line of the international revolutionary movement, Comrade Ghosh said — “... *nowhere and in no country can revolution be organized by copying in toto this general line even while it may be correct in the given international situation. Because, to wherever you may apply this general line in a country, certain differences and contradictions are bound to crop up depending upon the specific concrete conditions, particular situations and peculiarities of that country. And if you are able to realize these contradictions correctly, then and then only can you formulate the particular line of revolution by objectively analysing the particular concrete conditions of the country and that becomes the particular line of that particular revolution.*” (*ibid.*)

In 1942, a revolt in our country against British imperialism, known as “August Revolution”, burst into flames. The so-called communist party of our country opposed this historic insurrection and instead lent support to British imperialism on the logic that in the then international sphere Soviet Union was having an alliance with the British government in the anti-fascist war. What a tragic consequence of blindness. Many in our country thought it must have been Stalin on whose instruction CPI took such a treacherous position. Now from the conversation between Romain Rolland and Stalin, all would understand how wrong was their impression about Stalin. That the agreement between Soviet Union and the Government of France during the second world war was not at all applicable with regard to the French Communist Party, rather the party was to move with its own

independent programme was made clear by Stalin when he said — *“If the Soviet Union is to take part in this war, which side would it join? Naturally on the side of the bourgeoisie democratic states, which are not working against peace. That is why considering the possible attack against the aggressive fascist states we are interested in the arms build-up of France. In collaboration with them we shall strengthen one side in the war between the fascists and anti-fascists, between aggression and non-aggression so that maximum forces may rally against fascism. This is the basis behind the agreement between us and France. This is the approach of the Soviet state. But should the communist party of France take the same stand on the question of war? I think no. There, the party is not in power. The capitalists-imperialists are in power. The Communist party is only a small group in opposition. Is there any guarantee that there the French bourgeoisie will not use its army against the working class? Certainly not! The relation between Soviet Union and France is based on mutual assistance. But the Soviet Union by any pact cannot ensure that the French Government shall not use its army against the working class there. You must realize that the condition of the communist parties of the Soviet Union and France are different. The condition of the French Communist party cannot be akin to that of the Soviet Communist party, which is in power. So the relation between the French Communist party and the State of that country will remain the same as it was even after the agreement with the Soviet Union.”* (Voyage to Moscow) It is clear from this valuable and guiding discussion of Stalin, that he never advised, nor could have advised the so-called Communist Party of India to lend support to the British rulers during the war. So, those who thought otherwise were absolutely wrong.

On this question, let me remind you once again a pertinent observation of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. Without knowing anything about Stalin’s concrete opinions,, he while dealing the issue in an article in 1948, wrote — *“But*

in fact as the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the task of CPSU to accelerate the international proletarian revolution are not diverged from each other, so also it will be equally wrong to conceive these two as one and the same... In formulating the Soviet foreign policy, the leaders of CPSU are to keep an eye... to protect the Soviet socialist state against influence, intrigues and onslaughts by the world imperialism-capitalism, the forces of international reaction and keep uninterrupted the march of socialism. Hence it would be dangerous to conclude that any political or diplomatic move at state level, from time to time, prompted by the necessity of the foreign policy is the policy of the international proletarian revolution. But this type of misconceptions and mistaken views are creating newer and newer confusions in the communist camp today.” (Self-Criticism of the Communist Camp, S.W. vol. 1) On the issue of supporting the British imperialists in 1942 in India, the CPI leaders had to face sharp rebuke of Stalin when they in 1951 went to Moscow and during a discussion Stalin came to know about it. Dr. Ranen Sen, once a frontline leader of CPI has narrated the story in his book on the history of CPI.

Stalin had cautioned about the danger of capitalist counter revolution in socialism.

It is necessary to remind you that Stalin could foresee the possible threat to soviet socialism. Underscoring the significance of this danger, Comrade Stalin in his every speech to the party workers repeatedly emphasized on elevating the ideological standard. He said that more socialism would advance, more would be the intensity of class struggle. He even said that the economy was advancing but the level of consciousness was lagging behind, advancement in the realm of human thought does not occur as quickly as the economy because of the lingering influence of the old thinking. In his report to the 17th Congress of the CPSU, he said — ‘many of our leaders and workers are not giving due importance to the

ideological struggle, they keep themselves engaged only in day to day works, are putting more emphasis on technical work than on the ideological struggle. They fail to understand that if politics and ideology are not understood, even practical work cannot be well done.' But the most significant warnings came from him in his report to the 19th party congress. This was the last congress of his life. On reading this report one can feel the depth of Stalin's anxiety over the future crises that soviet union was about to face. Such deep worries and anxieties were never found in Stalin even during previous difficult days of foreign invasions, internal conspiracies and Second World War. His worries were more noteworthy because the then favorable situations did not apparently warrant for it. The Second World War had just ended with the defeat of Germany, Japan and Italy. It became universally recognised that because of Stalin's presence and his leadership over the red army that the fierce military power of the fascists could be defeated. Holding high the banner of Stalin a great wave of communist movement was sweeping the whole world along with the anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist struggles. On the other hand, the economic development of USSR was astounding. Taking 1929 as the base year, the economic progress of Soviet Union in 1945 was 466% while it was only 155% in the US economy. It was 466% just after the war in 1945 and within 6 years shot up to 1266% in 1951. One single country could achieve such a huge economic development despite the unparalleled destruction in the war. Was there any other country which had to bear so much of devastation in the Second World War as the Soviet Union? America was far away from the fire of the war. Now, Stalin, despite such tremendous successes was deeply worried about the future of Soviet socialism. Zhukov had reminisced that during the war-period Stalin seemed to be a young man — full of energy, summoning anyone at anytime, working day and night, rushing to the battlefield all on a sudden. It was this role of the great leader that served as the source of the mental

strength of the Russian people in facing the brutal war. After the war, Stalin seemed to Zhukov as tired, exhausted and mentally overburdened. That the exhaustion was not fully due to his enormous hard labor of the war-period, can be understood from the report to the 19th congress in 1952.

Stalin paid utmost importance to self-criticism

In the report to the 19th Congress, Stalin said: it is true we have won the war, but hitherto practiced democratic process of functioning of the state and party at various levels was hampered due to the war. The work in the main was done through administrative fiats, in a bureaucratic manner. As a result the democratic manner of functioning in the party was damaged. He also said that there were leaders at different places who were putting obstacles to self-criticism. Previously also Stalin had put much importance on self-criticism. Why he did so ? Stalin himself had once explained in a conversation with Gorky. Maxim Gorky once asked Stalin — “why are you putting so much emphasis on self-criticism within the party? The foreigners will come to know of our defects and weaknesses and that will harm the party”. Stalin`s reply was — *“Let them know. What harm will be there? As we need oxygen and water to live, so do we need criticism and self-criticism to strengthen the party. Without this, one type of communist bureaucracy will rear its head among us and a sense of complacency will be born.”* (Selected Works) In fact, Stalin was very much critical about himself also. In the report to the 18th Congress, while dealing on the issue of inner party battle of the period from 1933 to 1936 and subsequent purge of the anti-party elements from the party, Stalin said — *“..it cannot be said that the purge was not accompanied by grave mistakes. There were unfortunately more mistakes than might have been expected. Nevertheless, the purge of 1933-36 was unavoidable and on the whole its results were beneficial”*.

I have already told you about his admission of his own mistake committed at the start of the Second WorldWar.

Again, You are aware how he admitted his mistake in giving wrong advice on some points to the Communist Party of China. On this point, the CPC in 1963, with deep respect had recalled — *“when Stalin did something wrong, he was capable of criticizing himself. For instance, he had given some bad counsel with regard to the Chinese revolution. After the victory of the Chinese revolution, he admitted his mistake’*

On observing lack of self-criticism within the party, Stalin in 1952, out of deep anxiety said in the 19th Party Congress, there were a number of leaders in the soviet communist party who tried hard to keep the mouth of others shut, they stifled the voices of those who opposed them; who dared to criticize them were removed from their positions, were punished, but they preferred the sycophants very much. Stalin said that this was causing severe harm to the party. He said that criticism had to come from the lower levels of the party and it was the responsibility of the leaders to open the scope of criticism and if this was not done the party would face serious trouble. He further pointed out that these leaders were holding meetings to engage in self-adulation, to show off their deeds. They seemed to feel that since we had won the war, the world was at our feet, we had no more any danger; a tendency had crept in among a section of the leaders to delegate responsibility to persons not on merit or political standard, but on the consideration of blood relations, personal friendship, affinity, on one's likes and dislikes, on one's ability to sing praise for the leaders. These were damaging the cause of the party. Not only these. The practice of sending fabricated reports, concealment of many things were there. Moreover, a number of leaders and senior comrades thought that the laws of the Soviet State and the rules of the party were to be obeyed by the junior comrades, not by the leaders. They thought that since they had made some contributions to the party in the past, they could do whatever they like. He cautioned that these were very serious problems before the party.

To Stalin the most grave problem was the negligence of ideological struggle. In that report to the 19th congress he specifically cautioned — *“Ideological work is a prime duty of the party and underestimation of its importance may do irreparable damage to the interests of the party and state. We must always remember that if the influence of socialist ideology is weakened the effect is to strengthen the influence of bourgeois ideology”*. Obviously after Stalin’s death, when the revisionist Khrushchev coterie appropriated the leadership, willfull disregard to Marxist-Leninist ideology, rather vulgarization of it through revisionist ideas became the order of the day which helped in increasing the influence of bourgeois ideology and consequently caused irreparable damage to the party and the state. Stalin also warned in the 19th congress report against putting much emphasis on economic production while neglecting revolutionary politics. Stalin said in the report — *“some of our party organizations tend to devote all their attention to economic affairs and to forget ideological matters, to relegate them to the background. Ideological work does not receive sufficient attention even in so front rank a party organization as the Moscow organization”*. During the cultural revolution of China, this very subject, whether politics or production would be in command became the issue of a serious debate. Comrade Stalin was the first to raise the point since he realized that these problems had already appeared in the country .If the ideological questions are neglected and economy or production get more attention, how the counter revolutionaries would take advantage of that and increase their might was pointed out by Stalin — *“whenever attentions to ideological questions are relaxed, a favourable soil is created for the revival of views and ideas hostile to us. If there are sectors of ideological work which for any reason fall out of the purview of party organizations, if there are sectors in which party leadership and its influence have slackened, alien elements, the remains of anti-Leninist groups smashed by the party,*

will try to get hold of these sectors and utilize them for the promotion of their own line, for the revival and spread of all sorts of un-Marxist 'opinions' and 'conceptions'.” He has clearly foreseen the impending danger in the Soviet Union.

Stalin in his last days could comprehend the problems of individualism at its beginning

In his 19th congress report Stalin raised another significant and serious issue of private property mental complex or in other words, the mental complex born out of the existence of private property in society. To understand this subject, one has to know and realize an important teaching of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. In 1948, during the formative days of our party, Comrade Ghosh could understand the problems of private property mental complex or in other words the problems of individualism and he gave much importance to it while building up our party.

Later explaining this problem Comrade Shibdas Ghosh showed that during bourgeois democratic revolutions, individualism had played a socially progressive role. In our country, even during the freedom movement against imperialism, individualism was relatively conducive to the struggle against imperialism. But when capitalism internationally lost its progressive role and became reactionary, particularly in the stage of monopoly capital, this individualism also became a serious hindrance to social progress and hence reactionary in character. Thus it cannot serve the interest of revolution today not only in the developed and powerful capitalist-imperialist states, but also in a country like India which is a relatively developed capitalist country. So, in these countries, those who will come to the leadership of the working class parties, should not only not possess private property materially, but also must free themselves from private property mental complex, that is from personal want and desire, personal likes and dislikes; craving for name, fame, and post and

on questions of family life, conjugal life and personal life; on questions of love and affection, in a word, in all aspects of life they should free themselves from individualist approach. Individual, being free from individualism, has to identify his/herself with the interest of the party, working class and the revolution. On the basis of this understanding about individualism Comrade Shibdas Ghosh founded our party in 1948. Comrade Ghosh had fought against Indian capitalism which was far more developed than capitalism of pre-revolution Russia, so he could experience the ugliest form of individualism. It helped him to deeply understand this phenomenon. But this problem of individualism did not appear in this form, either in the revolutionary movements of undeveloped capitalist Russia or in the more backward semi-colonial, semi feudal China.

To comprehend the problems of individualism in the Soviet Union in 1952 was also very difficult. It was the time when capitalist ownership of the means of production was abolished, not only a strong socialist economy was built up in the USSR, advancement of socialism also had reached its peak. Situation was such that only on a call by the party, on a call by Stalin, millions would have come forward to fight any battle. In such a condition, it was very difficult to see through the problems of individualism. But Stalin could. In the last years of his life he could grasp the essence of the problem. What an extraordinary insight he had! In the report to the 19th congress, he said — *“there is no class basis, there can be no class basis for the domination of the bourgeois ideology in our soviet society.... But we still have vestiges of bourgeois ideology, relics of private property mentality and morality. This relics do not die away of themselves; they are very tenacious and may strengthen their hold....”* However, he could not go further into any elaborate discussion on this, but Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, his worthy disciple was able to grasp this as early as in 1948 and he made a thorough discussion on this.

Now, on the lurking danger in the Soviet Union, Stalin

had sounded another caution — *“Nor are we guaranteed against the infiltration of alien views, ideas and sentiments from outside, from the capitalist countries or from inside, from the relics of groups hostile to the Soviet state which have not been completely demolished by the party. It should not be forgotten that the enemies of the Soviet Union are working to inculcate, foment and foster unhealthy sentiments, ideologically to corrupt the unstable elements in our society.”* He then placed specific tasks before the party to fight the menace — *“The ideological work of the party must play an important part in purging the minds of people of survivals of the capitalist mentality, of prejudices and pernicious traditions inherited from the old society”*. He further said that on ideological questions, on questions on science, debates were being silenced which was not at all proper. You will find these observations of Stalin in the report to the 19th Congress. It clearly shows how deep and unique was his Marxist insight and how profound was his wisdom. It also shows that to save soviet socialism he was actually preparing for another battle and for that he was making the party, the working class, the state alert and was trying to prepare them through the Nineteenth congress. Unfortunately he breathed his last within a few months after the congress and hence could not initiate the struggle. If he could do that, Soviet Union would not have faced such a catastrophe. But, after his demise, those very counter revolutionary forces against whom Stalin wanted to fight, who were the target of his criticism, ultimately usurped the leadership of the party and the state. Khrushchev was the representative of these forces of counter revolution. They were revisionists i.e. the forces of social democracy. I have already told you that due to the lowering of the level of consciousness of the leaders and the rank and file, a mental frame of blind submission to the party leadership had already grown within the Soviet party. Moreover, in the Second World War, more than hundred thousand of the best leaders and cadres of the party lost their lives and as a result the standard of the party got

further lowered. Taking advantage of this, the Khrushchev coterie, mouthing some slogans of Marxism-Leninism, did spread erroneous and confusing ideas, slanderous allegations against Stalin and fulfilled their mission. Though in the beginning many could not accept Khrushchev's anti Stalin allegations, but in the absence of a correct guideline and leadership, could not differentiate truth from lies.

Capitalist attack in Soviet Union came from the superstructure

It should be kept in mind that even after many years of revolution, there was significant influence of bourgeois ideology on the Russian people. In fact, so long all the people adopt Marxism as the guiding principle in all aspects of their lives, un-Marxist thoughts or in other words, the influence of bourgeois ideology and culture would remain in some form or other. That is why, the majority of the people outside the party, though lend general support to revolution and socialism, there remains enough influence of bourgeois thoughts and culture in their outlook, taste, culture, habits, customs and mode of life for a long time.

So Lenin sounded the caution that through the entire stage of socialism, there would remain the danger of restoration of capitalism. *In his book 'Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky', Lenin explained — "The transition from capitalism to communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration."*

Lenin said further, *"It is a thousand times easier to vanquish the centralised big bourgeoisie than to "vanquish" millions and millions of small proprietors, who by their everyday imperceptible, elusive, demoralising activity achieve the very results desired by the bourgeoisie and which restore the bourgeoisie."*

It is a very difficult and arduous task to remove this

force of habit and traditions of the old society. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in his book 'The Cultural Revolution in China', has showed that in the revolutions in the undeveloped capitalist state like Russia and in the semi-colonial and semi-feudal state like China, the concept of communist character based on bourgeois humanist values — where the interest of revolution was taken as primary and self-interest as secondary could serve the revolution. However, after sometime, with the advancement of socialism, when relative stability is achieved in the state and particularly in the economy, the very bourgeois sense of sacrifice once born out of bourgeois humanist values, lead one to a comfort and luxury seeking mental frame if the consciousness and character of the leaders and cadres of the party and the people are not elevated to the higher level i.e. being free from individualism, interest of the individual become one and same with the interest of party and socialism and there remains no separate existence of the interest of the individual. In the light of the teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, I have already showed that the idea of bourgeois individualism was not fought out in the revolutions of both Russia and China, nor was it necessary also in the given circumstances. But subsequently when socialism achieved stability through economic advancement, this very individualism appeared as a big problem.

As a result, under socialism, the role that an individual after freeing him/herself from individualism is to play in order to pass over to communism through abolition of classes and class struggle, and being inspired by proletarian internationalism, is to render effective help in making revolution victorious in different countries, which get hindered due to this problem of individualism. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh defined this phenomenon as socialist individualism which is nothing but a growing tendency of seeking more and more personal privileges from socialist state at the cost of the interest of the advancement of internationalism and socialism.. This is a bourgeois

individualistic mentality which, if not fought out, grows steadily and finally threatens the very existence of socialism. Stalin too, in the last years of his life could notice that the danger of private *property mentality and ethics* was still there among the people. The post-Stalin leadership, instead of putting up a fight against this, actually had encouraged and strengthened this tendency through liberalization.

We should take note of another point. The new generation in the Soviet Union did not experience the pre-revolution Russia's wretched conditions — the miseries, exploitation, oppression, death from starvation of the people, did not experience the horrors of civil war which their forefathers had to witness with untold sufferings.. The new generation came to know of all these only from reading books, just as we in India have learnt of the exploitation and oppression of the slave-owning society, of feudalism and imperialist rule from the books only as information without any emotional concern. If through deep theoretical exercise the understanding of theory does not reach the realm of consciousness, if the devotion to acquire advanced communist character is absent, then emotional attachment to the toiling millions also dies out, realization about the nobility of communist ideology falters. This has actually happened in case of the new generation of Soviet people. They became alienated from the struggles of the past, hence took socialism as a privilege.

Another serious aspect is also to be noted. Among the people there was also a section whose forefathers were once the owners of factories, businesses and were agricultural kulaks with a vast areas of land in their possession. These people though living in the socialist system and verbally lending support to socialism, were actually harboring the ardent desire and were dreaming of regaining their wealth and position as owners. These people or families were relatively wealthy with educational high degrees and hence they were intellectually advanced from the very beginning. It was surmised that in course of

time they were transformed and became socialist intellectuals. But in reality, apart from a small section, many were not transformed. Even the intellectuals from the working class and the peasant families also eventually fell into the clutches of individualism. These intellectuals and experts, using their high positions in the party, in administration, in military and in the education sector imported bourgeois liberal thought in the name of democratization of socialism. It is for these reasons that Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had said that even though the elements of capitalism were almost abolished in the base, that is, in the economy of the Soviet Union, the bourgeois attack came from the superstructure, from the ideological-cultural sphere, from the realm of ideas. These do not automatically change with the change in the economy i.e. in the base, rather the hangover and influence of the old ideas and culture persist for a long time. So, in the cultural field i.e. in the superstructure too, class struggle has to be conducted separately, otherwise the superstructure would destroy the base. This is what happened in the Soviet Union. The idea that with the change of the base, the superstructure will change automatically is not Marxism but economic determinism. It is however undoubtedly a very hard and difficult task to fight, on the one hand, against imperialist armed attack from outside, to battle against counter-revolution from within, and on the other, to work on the gigantic programme of economic reconstruction and at the same time to conduct a ceaseless struggle in the ideological and cultural fields. If failed to do this hard task then that would obviously endanger socialism and this had exactly happened in Russia and China. It is for this reason that in 1967, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh while discussing on the Cultural Revolution in China said — “...*the Russian experience has clearly shown that if along with the tremendous growth and development of the economy, military science and technology of a socialist country, the ideological-cultural-ethical standard of the society as a whole — starting from*

the philosophical understanding and cultural-ethical standard of the collective to the minutest detail of the individual behavior, habits and practices – cannot be elevated to keep pace with the need for all round development of socialist economy, then the gap that will be created is bound to lead to a lowering of the standard in the ideological sphere. And if the level of consciousness and the cultural standard remain low, then it may give birth to revisionism-reformism at any moment, in a critical hour under favourable conditions and may lead to counter-revolutionary upsurge, peaceful or violent... If backwardness continues to persist in the fields of epistemology and culture, then the entire party and the working class, being misled, tread the revisionist-reformist path and bring about restoration of capitalism while waving the banner of Marxism- Leninism and chanting socialist slogans.”(Cultural Revolution of China — S.W. Vol.1 P 203-04). I have already told you that this is what happened in Soviet Union and subsequently in China, after a considerable period of establishment of socialism.

When Khrushchev launched his attack against Stalin, as I have already pointed out, the immediate task of waging a battle within the communist movement was not taken up. This failure was due to the rampant mechanization of thought in the then communist movement. At the time of Stalin too, whatever was told by the Soviet Party, all other communist parties except CPC mechanically took that as correct. Likewise, when Khrushchev leveled those allegations against Stalin, though many could not accept it by their hearts, but they did not enter into any critical judgment and out of mechanical allegiance agreed to Khrushchev's observations since he was the General Secretary of CPSU. Not only this, except Comrade Shibdas Ghosh none else did raise the serious question that the evaluation of an international communist leader like Stalin could not be a subject of the Soviet party alone. Only an international forum could do this with documented true information. Later, after the lapse of 7 years, this point was

raised by the CPC. So what the bourgeoisie had failed to do through direct armed attack, that was, to destroy Soviet Union, to crush socialism from outside, the revisionists did that easily from within. Recall the teachings of Lenin that the social democratic forces, the revisionist forces are the most dependable agents of the bourgeoisie. They destroy the communist movement from within. This was what the revisionist Khrushchev leadership did on behalf of world capitalism-imperialism. How this Khrushchev leadership brought disaster in the soviet socialist economy has been shown by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh — *“due to the influence of modern revisionism, a group of socialists think that the main object of socialism is to anyhow increase production. These so called Marxists, in utter disregard of the inherent internal contradiction and the fundamental economic laws of socialist system, even advocate introduction of policy of ‘material incentive’ to gear up production. As a result rate of production may be boosted temporarily but in no time it may put at stake the socialist economy and endanger the socialist system by generating in all branches of production a speculative trend and by bringing about anarchy in production.”* (Cultural Revolution of China- S.W. Vol.1 P-237) The Khrushchev & co. did exactly these things after Stalin’s death.

**Imperialist aggression failed to destroy
soviet socialism, but the revisionists
could destroy it from within**

Has the collapse of soviet socialism brought harm only to the communist movement? No doubt socialism has suffered immeasurable damage. But, it is an undeniable fact, though the present generation may not be aware of it, that after the Second World War there was a high tide of communist movement along with anti-imperialist struggles throughout the world. The imperialists were pushed to a cornered position. The United States dared to invade socialist North Korea but was rebuffed by the people of the small country in the land war. USA then launched a sudden

naval attack from behind. China sent volunteers and with the help of these volunteers, North Korea marched forward and the superpower like USA was defeated. It was only for this ideological strength that a small country like Vietnam could win in wars one after another by defeating the French, Japanese and American imperialism. It was on the strength of Marxism that they could defeat the enormously powerful American imperialism. The world situation became such that it seemed as though the world revolution was at the door. In such a juncture, the revisionists acted like agents of capitalism-imperialism and struck the communist movement from within. Social democrats are destined to play such a role. So, where the imperialists from outside failed even by armed attack and conspiratorial activities, the revisionists succeeded there from within.

What is the guarantee against ascendancy of revisionism?

How could the revisionists usurp leadership? This was the result of the lowering of the standards of consciousness and culture of the leaders and rank and file of the communist movement which was repeatedly and emphatically pointed out by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. Thus he was continuously urging since long to improve the standard of revolutionary consciousness and culture, otherwise dialectical relations, though may be enshrined in the party constitution as a rule to follow, actually will cease to operate within the party, How could this be prevented, what can give the guarantee? The guarantee lies in the improved standard of revolutionary consciousness of the party workers. It means they should be able to think dialectically and should acquire the capacity to analyse things by using the dialectical methodology. I have already mentioned a teaching of Comrade Ghosh that the ideas of any individual, however great one's thinking power may be, are limited by two factors. Firstly, no individual's thinking can surpass the limit of the existing material conditions. Secondly, every person's thinking is guided by

an outlook and a particular culture which are ingrained in one's mental frame since childhood. It seems to me that whatever I think is 'my thought', 'my analysis', 'my judgment'. This is not a correct idea. Is your outlook scientific? Do you have a culture of high standard? Have you been able, with the guidance of the party, to free yourself from bourgeois outlook and culture? Are you engaged in continuous struggle to attain these? Unless you do so, your thinking, without your knowing it, is bound to be guided by the bourgeois outlook and culture. It is found in history that some of the honest and great persons too, despite their honest desire to do good for the society actually caused harm by their deeds because they did not bother to examine whether their outlook, thinking and culture were correct. Hence they failed to comprehend that in the class divided society, they were unknowingly bearing a class outlook and culture which did more harm than good for the society. Again, there were some who had joined the Marxist movement and had initially done some commendable job too, but later being failed to correctly apply Marxism in the changing objective conditions, they themselves degenerated. We should not forget that Lenin in the early years of his life took Plekhanov and Kautsky as his teachers. But later Lenin himself had to wage ideological battle against them in order to save the revolutionary kernel of Marxism. So, correct understanding of Marxism is necessary, higher and still higher understanding in conformity with the changing conditions of the time, is indispensable. With the change in the objective conditions and in the context of new and newer ideological attacks and problems, Marxism has to be continuously improved and enriched. Again, with the new and newer discoveries in science, Marxian science is to be further developed. To do this, correct ideological struggle under an appropriate leadership is necessary. This calls for constant collective exchange of thinking and ideas and collective discussions. Hard work is not all, sacrificing lives is not sufficient. Revolution cannot be saved unless

there is continuous improvement in the ideological consciousness and culture. At the initial stage, when a revolutionary party remains very small, it has to fight against heavy odds all around. At that time the leaders and cadres have to know and understand many things, the party has to advance inch by inch and for that theoretical exercise receives much importance and attention. But when the party becomes big, hindrances to organizational expansion get reduced and complacency creeps in, then the eagerness in theoretical exercise among the leaders and workers tend to decline. So, Lenin in 'what is to be done' gave the caution — *'Those who are in the least acquainted with actual state of our movement cannot but see that the spread of Marxism was accompanied by a certain lowering of theoretical standards'*. He did not mean it to be inevitable. But there is every possibility of this and actually it may so happen unless the complacent attitude is fought out. Again, once acquired ideological standard, considered as high in a given time, will not remain so for ever and may become even inadequate or ineffective and lower if the leadership fails to develop the understanding of Marxism in the context of newer problems and accordingly to raise the level of consciousness of the leaders and cadres.

Even if the leadership correctly determines the political line, unless the leaders and cadres understand its significance and implement it properly, danger cannot be averted

There is also another complex problem which has been continuing to persist in society for a few thousands of years. A trend of thought traditionally works in the minds of the working class and common people that as in society we see only few persons are rich and the rest remain in poverty, likewise, intellect also is not for all, only a handful of persons do possess intellect and the rest or the majority of the people cannot have that power of thinking. This idea is so tenacious that thousands of efforts fail do away with it. It makes people think that to decide on right or wrong

for the people is the prerogative of the intelligent leaders and the people need not bother or think deeply over anything. Their tendency is to remain blind to intellectuals. As a result, in the communist movement too, in the field of theoretical exercise, a section, like Trotsky in Russia, M.N. Roy in India had engaged themselves in mere pedantry, in show off, in self-adulation and consequently got deviated from revolutionary Marxism but a section of people were misled by them. While the majority of the honest cadres, generally with an average superficial understanding of the theory, responding to the appeal of revolution fight in the practical field sacrificing everything but do not critically judge the leadership. They avoid theoretical education or inclined to superficial understanding. Only a handful of the cadres of revolution actually devote themselves in constant pursuit of all round knowledge by grasping the significance of the teachings of Lenin-Stalin-Mao-Tse Tung and Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. But one thing is to be noted. Despite earnest attempts it is very hard to raise the level of consciousness because to free the people from the mental frame built over thousands of years is very difficult. The old wrong ideas like “not everybody can understand everything;” “all do not have the grasping power”; “we are ordinary people, we have no business to bother on complex matters” are so tenacious that even after accepting the logic that these are erroneous ideas, people cannot free themselves as these have become like prejudices. We see that the cadres who are ready to give hard physical labour, eager to shoulder any difficult responsibility, but very much reluctant to study and practice theories. In all countries, this appeared as a difficult problem in the working class movement and in the revolutionary movement. If we study the history of post revolution Russia and China, we would find that the zeal for theoretical exercises, however, was there before revolution, waned significantly after the victories in the revolutions, and the achievements in the socialist economy. The dominant attitude became like ‘we have won

everything'. The repeated appeals by Stalin and Mao-Tse-Tung could not much prevent this downslide. The result we all can see in the great setback. This does also show that even if the leadership is correct and determines the correct line, unless the leaders and the rank and file at different levels understand its meaning and significance and correctly follow and implement it, danger cannot be averted. This is why Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has urged the comrades to struggle ceaselessly to acquire adequate political standard, dialectical outlook and higher ethics and culture. Without these, dialectical relations will cease to operate and without dialectical relations, blindness and mechanical outlook is inevitable to grow.

Beside this, I have already mentioned, the problem of individualism has not been comprehended in time and this also remains as a big problem in the world communist movement.

**Fall of socialism has caused severe damage
not only in the communist movement,
but to the human civilization too**

I would like to mention another point here. Communist movement and socialism are not the only sufferers due to the fall of socialism. We believe in communism and socialism, so naturally the fall has deeply hurt our feelings. Please recall what the great thinker Romain Rolland once said. I have already told you that Romain Rolland was attracted to communism and the Soviet Union in the last days of his life. You can read his opinions and observations in his famous book titled. 'I will not rest'. In 1927, with deep anxiety, he said — *“Russia is in danger. A formidable coalition of imperialist powers is being formed in the world against the Union of Soviet Republics, and under the pressure of the British Empire. ... If it is crushed it would no longer be the proletariat of the world alone who would be enslaved, but all liberty, social or individual;...the world will be thrown several stages behind “* In 1931, he further said — *“I will always stand*

by Soviet Union whenever it is endangered by any enemy...If Russia is crushed, I will never again think over the future of Europe...I will then consider that an all pervading darkness has descended there for some coming centuries.” Almost same was the observation of George Bernard Shaw. In 1931, while speaking on Lenin in Russia before some people, Mr. Shaw concluded with the following words — *“If the future is the future as Lenin foresaw it, then we may all smile and look forward to the future without fear. But if the experiment is overthrown and fails, if the world persists in the capitalistic lines, then I shall have to take a very melancholy farewell of you my friends.”* (‘Lenin in Profile’, world writers and artists on Lenin, Moscow, 1975)

Now it has happened like that. Had there been the erstwhile tide of communist movement today, there would have been an exercise in ideology, a devotion to acquire high standard of character. In the twentieth century, in the era of imperialism, when bourgeois humanism, bourgeois democracy, its values and the call of equality-fraternity-liberty were trampled underfoot, darkness descended upon the bourgeois civilization of the west, then in the east, the successful revolution in Russia, along with the extraordinary progress of Soviet socialism; the defeat of the fascist forces at the hands of the Red Army led by Stalin; the successful revolutions in China and Vietnam through the tortuous battle for 30-40 years against the ruthless attacks of US imperialism, had not only inspired the communists and the exploited masses all over the world, but it had also roused the freedom fighters and democratic minded people in all countries. Any mention of struggle, would have then immediately evoked the glorious memory, people would have felt a greater strength of mind and confidence, their spontaneous response would have been - ‘We shall fight like Russia, like China, like Vietnam’. In the struggle to acquire higher standard of character Stalin and Mao-Tse-Tung were ideals before the people, they dreamt to be great like them. Even the non-communists

had respects for their greatness and were eager to know what to learn from them. The presence of such great leaders, in effect, keeps alive the struggle in the world to beget nobility in character, the struggle to maintain the acquired standard of character. The presence of a great man, a great character disseminates an influence which ignites in others a desire and struggle to achieve greatness and nobility in character. That was why, when ideas of humanism lost its fervor and glorious role, the humanists like Roman Rolland, Bernard Shaw, Einstein, Rabindranath, Saratchandra, Netaji Subhaschandra and many others, without being Marxists, heartily welcomed and paid their tribute to Soviet socialism. When the degeneration and crisis in bourgeois civilization made them restless, they found a ray of hope in socialism. But, today, even the necessity of high character, need of moral values – are almost absent in the societies of all countries. This is not at all a small damage. The collapse of socialism, the undermining of a great authority like Stalin — all these have caused an irreparable damage. Yet, I shall say, not all are finished. We know that the inexorable laws of history gave birth to Marxism-Leninism. So also socialism came in course of the law governed process of history and behind its downfall there were concrete reasons. It will act as an invaluable lesson. Paris Commune was the first working class victorious uprising in the world, it could protect the victory for a few months only and then was defeated.. When the defeated revolutionaries were taken to the gallows, they marched and sacrificed their lives with the song of international in their lips composed by an enchained worker. The very song was sung by the revolutionaries of Russia, China, Vietnam and other countries. Again, after the fall of Paris commune, Marx taking a lesson from it wrote in ‘Civil war in France’ — *“The working class cannot simply lay hold of the readymade state machinery, and wield it for its purposes.”* He further wrote — *“I declare that the next attempt of the French revolution will be no longer, as before to transfer*

the bureaucratic military machine from one hand to another, but to smash it...”. These invaluable teachings of the Paris commune guided the Russian and the Chinese revolutions in building up a new working class state through the smashing of the old state of the exploiters. Likewise we have to critically examine, with our heavy heart, why socialism fell, why such a disaster could set in. In the coming days whoever would organize revolution guided by the teachings of great Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao-Tse-Tung and their worthy disciple Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, they would remain cautious and alert to avert such a disaster. Revolution is inevitable as the inexorable laws of history. Capitalism is in death bed now and the stinking smell from its putrefied decomposed and polluted body is spread everywhere. The civilization, which is dehumanizing, turning humans into beasts are sure to die. The entire capitalist world economy is surviving on ventilation, on artificial economic stimulation by the Government. The whole world is now under the capitalist market system, yet world capitalism is suffering from market crisis. Shall the working class remain bowed down to this terrible capitalist-imperialist attack on them? Will the exploited toiling millions of the world remain silent? Already they are bursting forth in agitation. There will be more agitation, more struggle. The banner of Marxism–Leninism will again fly high everywhere. This is the law of history. And to raise the banner of Marxism – Leninism, great Stalin and his teachings have to be recalled. Those who have tried to smear Stalin would themselves be smeared in history while Stalin would remain unscathed and live on in our hearts as an unblemished great character.

Capitalists-imperialists still spend sleepless nights over the memory of Stalin

I told in a public meeting on 5th August, 2010 at Kolkata, that a state while facing foreign invasion had to purge those elements who were involved in anti-state conspiracies in the country. A few hundreds of conspirators

were put to death after being convicted in the open trials. They were traitors. This had to be done to save the socialist state. Does any bourgeois state spare such conspirators? Hitler, the ruthless fascist had killed millions of people only to foist Germany's hegemony over the world. Hundreds of thousands of Jews and communists were sent to the gas chambers to die horrific death. But none of the "brave nationalist media", now-a-days even mention Hitler's name as was uttered with hate during pre and also for some times in the post 2nd war world. While Hitler seems to have been forgotten, almost every day you will find in newspapers, in talks in TV channels, the self-proclaimed 'champions of democracy' cry hoarse on Stalin's 'misdeeds', how Stalin destroyed democracy, how cruel he was etc. and all without any proof or documents. Not only this. You should also note that before the Second World War, when the battle to establish a republic was being fought in Spain against dictator Franco who were having the support of Hitler and Mussolini, thousands of democracy-loving people were ruthlessly slaughtered by Franco. Even today, thousands of citizens of Spain are listed as 'missing'. Their relatives, sons and daughters have been desperately searching for any news of them. But you won't find a word on this genocide in the writings or speeches of the bourgeois democratic world, as if nothing did happen in Spain under Franco. In the Second World War after the surrender of defeated Germany and Italy, Japan was about to surrender. Then, all on a sudden, US imperialists dropped atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and killed lakhs of innocent people, the horror of the destruction was beyond description. This was done by USA only to prevent Japan from surrendering to Soviet Red Army. The mass killing of the Vietnam people, the barbarity inflicted on them by French and US imperialists only to crush Vietnam's urge for freedom, is known to all. In Indonesia, in 1965-66, when Mr. Sukarno, the renowned anti-imperialist nationalist leader, was the head of the State and the communists were in his support, the military junta

headed by General Suharto with the direct backing of CIA seized power. Then between October 1965 to April-May 1966, the military with hired civilian murderers had slaughtered at least 5,00,000 communists and their supporters. Even people having sympathy towards the communists were not spared. Dead bodies were thrown into rivers in such a huge numbers that the colour of the river-water became red. Bodies were simply dumped in fields. Yet, you won't find a word of condemnation against this CIA sponsored mass killing in bourgeois media or in the talks of the 'democratic' intellectuals. Now, very recently US-UK invasion of Iraq on a purely false and manufactured pretext and the consequent mass killing, destruction of an ancient civilization, the continuing civil war are now open for all to see. Same is the fate of Afganistan and Libya. In the Latin American countries like Honduras, Columbia, Guatemala and others, the US supported regimes are murderers of democracy, have been killing people of their own country because they demand freedom and democracy. Till date, the prisoners in the US prison of Guantanamo bay are subjected to barbaric medieval tortures. All know that the US intelligence agency CIA is associated with several secret assassinations, thousands of ruthless killings, kidnapping of elected government heads of other countries, military conspiracies, engineered coups. Regarding all these, the so-called guardians of democracy are reluctant to waste a single word as to them the United States is the savior of their 'holy democracy'. But on any mention of the name of Stalin, they would at once combine together and would not lose a moment to depict this great son of mankind as a demon, as a dangerous killer. Can these persons be considered as human beings even ? Are they really intellectuals? Even when they utter the name of Hitler, their motive always remains to show that Stalin was as brutal as Hitler. You might have seen that the news of unearthing of human skeletons from mass graves in various places of Russia and East European countries

which fell into German clutches in the Second World War, are published in media. But more nauseating is the allegation that these killings were executed by Stalin's order. I shall not be surprised if the liars one day allege that not Hitler but Stalin was responsible for the Second World War.

While a section of the intellectuals hired by capitalism-imperialism have been spreading these malicious lies, another section being confused are believing these without exercising their judgment at all. History will never forgive these vile liars.

We must not forget that this attack is not against Stalin as a person; actually it is an attack against the noble ideology of Marxism-Leninism; it is against communism; it is also against the socialist system; against the liberation struggles of the working class and the exploited masses; finally it is against the progress of human civilization. Since Stalin, being the true successor of the great Marx, Engels and Lenin was the living symbol of these struggles, the panicked and terrified capitalist imperialist reactionaries are still continuing their attack against him. The living memory of dead Stalin, even today robs them of their sleep. But this design of the reactionaries may harm the cause of civilisation for some time, but cannot prevent the progress of civilisation for all time to come.

Finally, for the communists and the democracy loving people of the world I would like to recall the last appeal of Comrade Stalin, which he made a few days before his death. On 14th October, 1952, in his concluding speech at the Nineteenth Congress, he tore apart the democratic veil of the bourgeois parliamentary democracy and showed its true character to the world. He said, "*Formerly the bourgeoisie permitted itself to be liberal, championed bourgeois democratic freedom and in doing so created for itself popularity amongst the people. Now not even a trace of liberalism remains. Gone is the so called 'freedom of the individual', the rights of the individual now are recognized only in the case of those who have capital,*

while other citizens are regarded as human raw material and fit only for exploitation. The equality of people and nations has been trampled underfoot; it has been replaced by the principle of full rights of the exploiting minority and no rights for the exploited majority of citizens. The banner of the bourgeois democratic freedom has been thrown overboard.”

He further said — *“Formerly the bourgeoisie was considered the head of the nation, it championed the rights and independence of the nation, placing them ‘above everything’. Now not a trace remains of the ‘national principles’. Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars. The banner of international independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard”*. His evaluation and of the modern bourgeoisie has been proved beyond doubt by the so-called globalization. The great leader then with much expectation and emotion said — *“There is no doubt that you, representatives of communists and democratic parties, will have to pick up the banner and carry it forward, if you wish to be patriot of your country, if you wish to become the leading force of your nation. This is how matters stand at the moment....”*

Pointing to the direction of history Stalin said — *“all roads lead to communism”*. We will have to honour this appeal. Capitalism has to be overthrown and genuine equality, fraternity and liberty established in the World. Let me remind you that the future belongs to communism. The names of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao-Tse-Tung and Shibdas Ghosh will forever live on in history. A new history, in the days to come shall be written on the path shown by them.

**Long Live Revolution
Red Salute to Great Stalin**