

*Prohibition
Era*



Long Live GREAT NOVEMBER REVOLUTION

Volume 32, No. 5 November 1, 1998 Rs. 4.00

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

Great November Revolution shows the surest path of emancipation

We are observing this year the 81st Anniversary of the Great November Revolution at a very critical stage of development in both international and national arena.

We cannot forget that the Great November Socialist Revolution by overthrowing the exploiting capitalist class from power, established the rule of the proletariat first in world history. It thus convincingly demonstrated that the idea of scientific socialism enunciated by Marx and Engels, concretely applied and brought to reality by Lenin, is not utopia but an inevitable outcome of the law of class struggle working irrevocably within society.

The dismantling of socialist system in Soviet Russia and countries in East Europe engineered by US imperialism in particular with the active support and assistance of the revisionists usurping the leadership and power both in the party and state administration, became possible through a counter-revolution under the leadership of the renegade revisionists led by Gorbachev clique.

The big jolt or setback unprecedented in revolutionary communist movement is nothing but temporary. It can in no way disprove the scientific basis of communist ideology and rob the noblest of international movements its ultimate victory in the emancipation of humanity from the bondage of class rule and exploitation of man by man.

Our party taught and led by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, an eminent Marxist thinker of the era, the founder General Secretary, has been alerting, since inception, the leaders of international communist movement about the grievous faults and erroneous practice noticed both in communist movement as also in socialist state.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh reiterated again and again that Marxism being the only scientific philosophy and not a set of dogma has got to be studied and continuously improved upon with the changing needs of time. Any slackening on this score and deviation from the basic tenets will

bring restoration of capitalism. For, in socialism, the transitional period, class struggle does not cease rather sharpens manifold because the dispossessed capitalist class desperately tries to regain their exploitative rule. The Leninist teachings reiterated and enriched by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh later on in various ways went unheeded. The reversal, however unwanted, was therefore not unapprehended by our party.

Our party guarding and defending the dialectical materialist scientific philosophy of Marxism told the proletariat and exploited and the oppressed all over the globe two things. First, the dismantling is not of scientific socialism, of Marxism but is caused by vulgarisation by the revisionists. Second, the proletariat as the great class leading the proletarian revolution to bring about ultimate end of class rule can very well absorb the shock of whatsoever intensity, learning from the failures of even disastrous dimension.

The US imperialists, the leader of the imperialist-capitalist world, after committing this heinous crime on humanity assured the end of 'cold war', arms race, bellicose activities and dawn of a 'new world order' where peace, democracy, all-round progress and prosperity will prevail. The worth and motive of this assurances will be best judged by concrete facts and happenings taking place, internationally and nationally. But can we forget the concrete historical experience of socialist Russia hailed by Romain Rolland, Rabindranath Tagore, Sidney and Beatrice Webb and such other great men of the time as the birth of a new civilisation, a holy place for humankind? Were they the agents of Soviet Russia in grim struggle surrounded by hostile world? Only scientific socialism did the miracle in history. With unprecedented speed it transformed the 'sickest nation in Europe' into a most vibrant one with allround developments, — economic, social, political, cultural, everything. Peoples of that great land mass, disunited on

many counts — language, regional bias, degree of economic and cultural development, religious faith, so on and so forth were united in the gigantic Union of Soviet Socialist Republic — the bastion of socialism. So long scientific socialism was in practice, at one time during the 18th Party Congress of the CPSU it was seriously thinking of making food and transport free. In social security measure, compulsory health and medicare it surpassed all other states including the most advanced imperialist-capitalist states. Food was available then with prices decreasing, prostitution was unknown, workers got salary in time, no beggar on the street.

After the counter-revolution, restoration of capitalism and 'democracy' as also rehabilitation of Czar what is the spectacle ? Can an ordinary bourgeois democrat in Russia or elsewhere feel proud ? All these which were unknown or forgotten are now standing insults. A great nation of heroes has become the nation of beggars to reap the benefits of capitalism and democracy !

Now has peace dawned on earth ? Have the evermounting military expenditure, armsrace, posting of military bases overseas, constant improvement on satellite system as the most modern means of surveillance and espionage stopped ? The plausible plea of 'cold war' is no longer there, socialism dead and Marxism evaporated in thin air, as they held. Why then the most barbarous attack is organised on Iraq for their only crime of not parting with their natural wealth — oil to the US multinationals ? Why the economic sanction to bring pressure to bear upon the Iraqi people to dislodge Saddam Hossain, their leader from power ? Why missile attacks on Afghanistan and Sudan on trumpeted charges ? Why are so many military interventions mainly by the US imperialism in hosts of countries made all over the globe, using the UN, the world body, as a rubber stamp ? Does it not vindicate the Leninist teaching that the root cause of war lies in the contradiction within the capitalist-imperialist camp and not that between the imperialist and the socialist camp ?

Is not a different picture becoming clear and vivid ? The picture of world peace greatly threatened by the belligerent activities intensified and made regular occurrence. And freedom and sovereignty of national states never suffered so

much danger, so much humiliation as at present.

Both Lenin and Stalin warned that the imperialists seek to solve their conflicts for more share in global market by means of war for its redivision when all other means fail. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh explained that the usual tactics followed by the imperialist-capitalists is "war manoeuvre to peace manoeuvre and vice-versa." This is but two sides of the same coin imperialism-capitalism. On the economic field the world capitalist system at its dire state despite trying all the devices like globalisation, 'free market without control' and now to welfarism is faced with the grave danger of global depression. And this, according to the leading bourgeois economists, will surpass the earlier one during the thirties both in depth and dimension. The victims will surely be millions upon millions of toiling masses. What was being called so long recession, now being called depletion, snowballing into depression, spreading from South-East Asian countries including Japan to Europe and the USA, spilling over to Argentina, Brazil and other Latin American countries. The ailment is endemic and of global proportion.

Anticipating such a situation emerging, our party, SUCI, took the historic initiative in 1995 in trying to build up broadest possible anti-imperialist unity and militant international movement against imperialism with the genuine communist parties and forces working as core conducive to revolution. We are happy this is bearing fruit. Communist parties in revolutionary current are coming more and more in number to defeat war manoeuvre and defend peace should such a situation arise. The anti-capitalist movement for the establishment of socialism in today's concrete historical perspective is thus inextricably linked up with anti-imperialist movement to prevent war and guard revolutionary working class movement against imperialist intervention.

Let us look at the national scenario. The bankruptcy of branded bourgeois and revisionist parties has created a disabling situation for genuine united left and democratic movement to grow, to be an intervening force, on minimum agreed common programme and code of conduct. Indeed the parties calling themselves left have persistently avoided our sincere and repeated calls

(Contd. on page 24)

Science of Marxism is the Scientific Dialectical Methodology — Vindicated by November Revolution

Shibdas Ghosh

[On 16th November 1971, in observance of the 54th anniversary of the Great November Revolution, a meeting was organised by the West Bengal State Committee of our party, SUCI, at Mahajati Sadan, Calcutta. The Great Leader of the Proletariat, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, was the main speaker. This speech was delivered when in the national scene Indira Gandhi, the Congress leader, was up to misguide people with her so-called radical slogans and measures which actually served the aggregate interest of the capitalist class. The speech was printed in the November Revolution Special issue (16.11.97) of Ganadabi, the Bengali organ of our party. An English rendering of the same is now presented hereunder. In case of any mistake or inadequacy the responsibilities is ours.— Ed. Proletarian Era]

Present situation in the country

Comrades,

The problems before the country in every respect at present, especially those facing the left and democratic movement and all the various struggles of the people, have assumed very serious proportions. The ruling Congress Government is pursuing a dual policy for years together. On the one hand, it is trying to confuse the people and to create illusions in them with sweet words of pseudo-progressive slogans. On the other, it has plunged into a murderous spree of annihilating very fast all progressive movements, the class struggle in the countryside, the struggle of industrial workers as well as all the progressive, leftist, revolutionary forces, seizing upon whatever confusion and illusion has thus been created by its 'progressive' slogans and more so the disunity among the democratic and leftist parties and forces in the present stage of democratic mass movements.

Faced with this situation the militant movement in India and the leadership at its head should keep in view certain lessons with serious concern. All of us, those who know and

understand the teachings and experiences of the November Revolution and also those who knew but have forgotten them by this time should recall these teachings again and again. It is necessary to relearn them with all seriousness in order to overcome the puzzle and get rid of confusions that



have crept in our thinking. Because, to merely criticise the opponents without putting our own house in order is a negative approach and harmful at the same time. By this, the suffering multitude may perhaps be incited to an extent to serve an interest for the time being, but it is absolutely impossible to advance the cause far. By agitating the masses who have suffered the onslaughts of oppression and tyranny of the ruling Congress again and again and are still suffering, many a party or combination of parties have reaped benefit,

secured some immediate gains, that is, they increased their numerical strength by various means at different points of time in the history of this country. But only this much. The mass movements have not gained in strength by all this, because they never sought to build the mass movements on a firm basis. So, even today, those

who are getting confused by the sweet words of the pseudo-progressive slogans of the Congress, cannot be retained in this vortex of the movement. Even those who are facing the tyranny and rampage of the Congress, who directly confront this onslaught and realize its character from direct experience — if we try to organise them just against this Congress oppression with some agitating slogans, the stronger among these parties may perhaps achieve it better, then some temporary gains may be made, but that too cannot be ultimately protected. How can we forget that a large section of people whom the Congress has been able to confuse today and mislead successfully with so-called radical slogans, had once become supporters of the very left movement in increasing numbers, being disgusted with the Congress oppression. But now they are turning away from progressive, leftist movements, being confused and misled into other directions. Therefore, even if with militant slogans against oppression we can temporarily hold together those who are directly facing the attack and suffering the onslaught — even that movement will not make much headway unless there is a correct understanding of the problems, the ideology, principles and course of movement, unless there grows a clear concept about the leadership and if the people continue to trail the wrong leadership for mere redressal of the oppression.

Cause of current despair and confusion

So, I repeat that there has been many a struggle in this country. Those of you who will live much longer will witness many more struggles, whether you want it or not. Struggles will build up. The suffering people, who are at the receiving end, even if nobody is there to lead them, would burst forth on their own after a certain time and a leadership of whatsoever kind would come up from among them; but even if a kind of leadership springs up spontaneously, nothing tangible would be achieved by it ultimately. Again, suffering engulfs, confusions gather and despondency sets in.

The root cause of this confusion and despair is that the political-ideological-moral-ethical question to solve the fundamental problem facing the country still remains confused before the people. Confusion still persists on these questions.

Well-being of the people has to be brought about and the country advanced — all this is correct. Everybody is saying these. Now that the people have been awake somewhat, even if not in the correct sense, they are thinking themselves and speaking out, peasants and agricultural workers who were not considered to be human beings earlier — even are using their brains in their own way. In such a situation, no political party can keep its sway over the people intact without holding out various programmes or raising militant slogans, as each seems fit, for removal of the misery of the peasants and workers. So, all the parties are mouthing such talks. But this in itself in no way makes clear the specific political-ideological-ethical-cultural concept required for solving the fundamental problem before the country. That is, the moot question remains unclarified : What is that law, governed by which the social system we live in in India today has reached in course of change ? It could not have come about all on a sudden in a day. The society went on changing in stages to arrive at its present stage. There is a definite historical and scientific law governing this change. What is that law ? In the second place, what is the character of the present social system of India ? What is the real character of the economic system of India ? What is the character of the Indian state ? Above all, what is the morality and ideology amidst all these which is prevailing in the mental makeup of the Indian people ? Unless we know these, if confusion persists over them, if we are guided by fanciful theories, unhistorical ideas and concepts, and if we want to understand the issues arbitrarily basing ourselves on such concepts and yet we want to change this society and bring about all round well-being of the people — can that be possible ? No, that cannot be. But this is exactly what is happening in our country in the name of bringing about a social change.

Many people say that the problems of life arise from this society — this social system. There are others, however, who say that it is not like that. They try so that the fanciful theories aired by them gain currency. However, even those who assert that the social system is the root cause do it in a general, vague and superficial manner. Such superficial analysis will not do. It has to be understood clearly what is the character of this

society and how the problems originate from this society. If this is grasped correctly then can it be understood clearly how this society is to be changed and where the blow is to be directed for the purpose.

Marxism-Leninism — invincible weapon

Those who do firmly believe that all the problems are originating from the existing social order, the state structure of the country, those who aspire to bring about a radical transformation of the society through revolution, who wish truly to discharge the duty toward revolution, who do not just wish to comfort or confuse the people by agitating them somewhat with talks of revolution— the first thing that they ought to examine and understand is whether the social, state and economic system of India has any progressive role left in the context of the present international situation, or whether its progressive role having been historically exhausted, the present order now stands obstructing the path of progress or not. What is the character of this existing social system ? What are the respective dispositions of the classes in this society, their correlation ? Which class is to be overthrown from the state power through revolution and which class is to be replaced ? Secondly, the question that comes up is how the present social system will be changed. The course to achieve this is not determined by any fanciful idea of any amongst us, neither mine, nor yours.

As I have already said, there is a historically determined scientific process of changing society. It was Marxism that made this known to man for the first time. Again, in the present era, the era of moribund world imperialist-capitalist system and international proletarian revolution, those who call themselves Marxists, add the word Leninism to Marxism and emphasize that Marxism-Leninism is the only weapon to bring about social revolution in this era. This weapon does not mean cannon, gun, pistol or bomb — it is a far more powerful weapon. Once this weapon is mastered, such mighty strength, such organizing power and ability of planning crystallizes among the exploited toiling masses as can provide them the invincible power to carry on protracted battles. Those who seek to obstruct the struggle of the exploited masses with armoury of guns and

cannons are at a loss to understand the 'mystery' of this strength.

That is why, from Marx to Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong all have said that this ideology is the most powerful weapon in the hands of the proletariat, the exploited masses, much more powerful than any devastating explosive bombs or weapons of mass annihilation. For, it is Marxism-Leninism that teaches man to know and understand the real problems of his life — their character and the root cause. All the other ideologies are busy covering up the real problems of human life and to divert man's attention to wrong channels with skillfully worded arguments, flowery language and showy postures and using sugar coated sermons and catchy slogans. Their object is to emasculate man by injecting in his mind some idea as truth what is not really the truth. But Marxism-Leninism teaches one to grasp and to understand where lies the malady, where lies the root-cause of the problems, and what is the law governing the changes in this changing society.

Only by grasping this law, can man direct the struggle to transform the society along the correct course just as a scientist can harness a force of nature only when he has unveiled properly and has known and grasped the inherent law of nature which guides a specific activity of nature ; only when it is possible to correctly understand the law governing a change can man change a force of nature, or matter, or the society by exerting influence on it or accelerating the change through his efforts in accordance with the law governing the change and in continuity with the sequence and course of change already present. Without this, all ideas about effecting a change, bringing about a change of the society, an advancement of man are figments of imagination, utopian ideas and concepts cooked up by the brain of an individual. By this people are deceived, human effort is wasted and all struggles become a fruitless exercise — the society is not transformed. It is Marxism, the science of dialectical materialism that has held aloft this truth before the people for the first time.

That is why, before the emergence of Marxism, many a thinking person, starting from the clergy and priests, pious men and saints, religious preachers, had occupied themselves with

the questions of why this humiliation of man, why this oppression of man by man, and why all this pettiness, mean-mindedness in the human mind; and they wanted and tried to curb all these. But they had not been able to show the path of the revolution which is essential for emancipating man from his present plight. Many of them had even talked of socialism. But those were either systems of utopian socialism or else crude or wrong concepts of socialism, — sweet dreams that all men would become equal and lead life in equal comfort, share same kind of food and dress. In their concept of socialism also worked an idea that since all men were the children of God they would have to be made equal. Such kinds of thoughts acted in them. In the name of socialism, some people raised a hue and cry and even laid down their lives by holding up such unreal, unhistorical and unscientific sweet utopian dreams; but these achieved nothing. They could not change the condition of man and of society, because they did not understand the law governing the motion and change of society. It was the Marxian science that shed light on these correctly for the first time. Unless one grasps the laws, processes, and course of social change and progress — such as why and how wage workers came into being, what process did capitalism emerge through, and through what process its decay has set in — if the aspects of the social system that can be discerned to be harmful even with bare eyes are sought to be remedied through quackery, the disease will not be cured, the patient will die. The scientific method of treatment is to determine the course of the disease. So, we have to know the basic cause of the social problems. We have to know the concrete law of social change which operates beyond common knowledge. The Marxian science enables man to grasp the underlying laws of change of social system, economy, politics and state as also the inherent laws of political principles governing a given state. If the toiling masses can master this science, they would know the truth and possess the power to change the society. It would then no longer be possible to crush their struggle with bombs and bullets. That is why you will find that whatever military might the capitalists-imperialists may deploy against the revolutionary struggle of the working class, the target on which

they continually concentrate their real attack is Marxism-Leninism. The tactical line of this bourgeois attack is to distort Marxism-Leninism, to push it astray, to pass off such things in the name of Marxism-Leninism as would suppress the true Marxian science and its concepts and misdirect its thinking process bereft of its essence. Because, they find that the influence of Marxism-Leninism is ever increasing. This is inevitable, for the indomitable inclination and desire of people for emancipation draw them towards Marxism-Leninism.

You should keep in mind that Leninism is a methodology of analysis, a comprehensive outlook in this era for comprehending the process of revolution in each and every country of the imperialist world order, keeping in view the concrete differences of time and place from country to country. It is Leninism that has held aloft what should be the fundamental strategy of revolution in each country in this era. For this reason, Leninism is called the Marxism of the present era, the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. It means that in the present era when capitalism is decadent and moribund and has become utterly reactionary having attained the highest stage of its development by giving birth to imperialism and is crushing freedom and democracy in country after country, it is Leninism that has held aloft the fundamental guiding principles for comprehending the concrete process of revolution in the capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries of the imperialist world order, and for working towards the social transformation.

Perspective and fundamental principles highlighted by November Revolution

It is by wielding this Leninism as weapon that the working class of Russia led by the Bolshevik Party organized revolution. The character of November Revolution was not national but international. November Revolution has thrown up before all countries a perspective of revolution and its fundamental principles in this era. It has demonstrated that the working class is capable of organizing revolution. November Revolution has conclusively proved that with the end of the era of bourgeois democratic revolution, world capitalism has become decadent and moribund

and opposed to progress, national freedom struggle, individual liberty and democracy, and therefore, it stands as the obstacle on the path of social progress. Extreme crisis is appearing in production despite all technological development and modernization, which the capitalist class cannot do away with. Due to the competition among the capitalists and the two pronged exploitation of the people — by the indigenous capitalists as well as the foreign ones — the shrinkage of purchasing power and market relative to the augmented productive forces is continually bringing about crisis in production. On the other side, this crisis is casting its shadow on the process of advancement of knowledge and the sciences, technology, arts, philosophy, literature, culture, ethics — all that springs from the contradiction between man and nature — curbing them in the process. Thus, from all angles, capitalism is decadent and stands against progress. So, it is to be overthrown with the force of revolution. Of course, it is the proletariat class which will lead this revolution. Therefore, the present stage of revolution internationally is the stage of anti-capitalist socialist revolution led by the working class.

Secondly, in the backward capitalist countries the world over— the countries which are backward compared to the advanced capitalist countries in the sense of capitalistic development, where capitalist state has been established and the progressive role of the bourgeoisie has been exhausted — socialist revolution is to be made successful by overthrowing the bourgeoisie through achieving workers-peasant alliance under the leadership of the communist party.

Thirdly, even those countries where the bourgeois democratic revolution has not come about or the countries which are still in the stage of anti-imperialist, anti-colonial national freedom struggle, or national liberation movement, is to be organized by forging a national liberation front under the leadership of the working class with the workers peasants and any sections of the bourgeoisie that comes out to participate in the struggle, is in a position to do so ; but it is to be viewed as a part of the world socialist revolution, the proletarian revolution and it must be conducted under the leadership of the working class, the proletariat. If some people will think

otherwise then they would commit a mistake and would have to pay dearly for this mistake in the sense that their revolution would not be successful at all. Because, unless the working class can exercise the leadership, the bourgeoisie of the country would usurp the leadership and as part of the reactionary international bourgeoisie, it would obstruct progress and the path of the revolution. Thus, the bourgeois democratic revolution would end in a truncated and half-baked way. As a result, people's emancipation would not come about, rather capitalism would get consolidated and even the national freedom, after being attained, would run the risk of being endangered. Even the neo-colonialism that is being talked about today is recognized in Lenin's analysis of imperialism. He himself has spoken about it. To me, it is not the point whether Lenin used the term neo-colonialism or not. But the essence of neo-colonialism, that the imperialists in this era would virtually exert political and even military control over the backward independent bourgeois states through exercising economic domination, is to be found in Lenin's analysis. Imperialism, old style, would not continue; it would appear in a new form through establishing and expanding the sphere of economic domination. Therefore, in this era, the national freedom movements can reach correct and successful culmination, achieve the main object only if working class leadership can be established over them. That is, it would be possible to lead the revolutions of these countries stage by stage, along the course of development on to the stage of socialist revolution, and even national freedom will be fully attained and protected thereafter.

Parrotting Lenin's sayings do not indicate understanding of Leninism

But these and many other important teachings of November Revolution and of Lenin are known by heart to all the parties calling themselves Marxists or Leninists. Many who are more or less informed and have read Lenin's treatises can repeat these words. No doubt, it is necessary to know these. There is the necessity of teaching these to all as a part of elementary education. How can revolutionary workers of today draw the masses towards them unless they know these, or lacked these elementary knowledge of history ?

The point I want to stress is, however, whether a party is really Marxist-Leninist or not, whether its understanding of Marxism is correct or not, its thinking and theories are correct or not, cannot be judged by whether its leaders and cadres can reproduce these teachings nicely or not.

Think, how many years have passed by after the big parties were formed in our country in the name of Marxism-Leninism! How many movements have been conducted under their leadership! But what has been the outcome? I am not raising the question whether they have succeeded in organizing revolution or how far they have progressed along the path of revolution. That revolution could not yet be organised does not itself prove that the revolutionary theory or thinking was wrong, because only the correctness of thinking does not automatically effect a revolution. The endeavour to advance towards revolution on the correct course is not the only force acting in the society. As there is the force in favour of revolution in the society so also are there present the forces to obstruct revolution, forces which continually act against revolution in various ways in the given condition of the society. At what time and how strongly this condition and the forces opposed to revolution are acting is to be kept in consideration. Had the organisation standing in favour of the revolution progressed by leaps and bounds and revolution came about quickly just because the revolutionary theory was correct in essence, then Marx could have organized revolution in his country in his own hands. In that case, there would have been no instance in history of a giant revolutionary facing defeat although remaining correct throughout his life. Such notions are simply childish. Those who realise the theory correctly know that even as the revolutionary theory may be correct it does not depend on the theory alone whether the progress of revolution would be rapid or slow.

So, that is not my point. My question concerns the realization on the basis of which they formed such big parties. Was that realization and the process of formation of party adopted by them in consonance with Leninism? Are the analyses of the particular situation in India which they have put forward and the stage of revolution which they have characterized on its basis in consonance with the science of Marxism-Leninism? These are

the basic questions. Supposing these had been all right, but still they would have found it difficult to carry forward the tasks for revolution, then that would have meant that even though their theory and course of action were correct, it is the adversity of situation that was hampering them. In that case, the main question would have been: How to accelerate the tempo of revolutionary movement by combating the adverse circumstances — how much and in what manner? But that is not the position here.

Parties like the CPI, and subsequently the CPI(M) and the CPI(ML), were formed in this country enjoying recognition of the international communist movement and by capitalizing on the worldwide glory of the communist movement that was there. As a result of the irresistible attraction towards Marxism-Leninism that naturally springs in human breast from their yearning for emancipation, about which I have already spoken, the people rallied behind these parties listening to their leaders speaking of Marxism-Leninism. You see, once a party grows large in size, then on that basis, a favourable attitude towards it develops among the people. Whether the party leadership is correct or not, the people under its influence start jumping about with delight just because the party is big. Their mental make-up and thought process undergo a change. They no longer want to examine and judge anything else. They are ready to lay down life in a struggle, but do not want to enter into any examination or analysis. Again, if they ever come into polemics, even then their process of analysis becomes unscientific, and arbitrary, because the party controlling them actually moves in the name of Marxism-Leninism in a thought process and methodology of analysis alien to Marxism-Leninism. So, because the process of thinking and analysis of the leaders and workers of these parties and of the people under the influence of their politics are un-Marxist, the conclusions that they arrive at are unfounded and arbitrary in the perspective of scientific law governing the social change. It is these very people who, when they subsequently find that their efforts have proved barren, turn away from the movement, even if temporarily.

So, as I was saying, revolution would not come about even if the theory is correct, if organisational strength adequate for giving it the

concrete shape cannot be acquired because of various attendant causes. Again, if a party mouthing Marxist-Leninist verbiage gains substantial strength by taking advantage of favourable circumstances and becomes a big party with a large following, even then it cannot organise revolution by sheer force of strength if its theory, process of thinking and methodology of analysis are wrong. It cannot come about that way. The matter is not so simple.

Methodology of analysis & thinking, process of thinking : the most important thing

So, what I have said about the method of analysis of a party leadership, the thought process of its leaders and cadres and the process of thinking of those under its influence is one very important point. Here you have to bear in mind another important point, too. The science of Marxism-Leninism means a correct, scientific methodology of analysis — the scientific thought process of dialectal materialism. Mastering this does not depend just on the intelligence and intellectual faculty of an individual; rather, how an individual's intelligence and intellectual faculty would be patterned, that is, what shape would these take depends on the particular individual's thought process. Take the example of the world communist movement. Those who were adherents to the views of Trotsky, Bukharin or others of their camp or were staunch supporters of Khrushchev subsequently, they very easily believed and asserted that Stalin had done irreparable harm to the Soviet Union; and they even said that Stalin was the devil incarnate. On the other hand, those within the folds of the Third International, who had unwavering trust for and allegiance to the Lenin-Stalin-Mao leadership — their belief about the conspiratorial activities of Trotsky or that the modern revisionists under Khrushchev had done irreparable damage to the movement was above any scrutiny. And you see, both the sides call themselves communists and are within the communist movement. But their outlook and opinion on such important and fundamental issues are diametrically opposite. How all this happens ?

You see, in our country, too, there are many leaders and workers of the CPI, CPI(M) and such other parties who believe heart and soul that the

politics of our party, the SUCI, is creating rifts in the united left movement to the advantage of the Congress. On the other hand, there are even many ordinary workers in our party whose conviction about the true revolutionary character of the SUCI cannot be shaken by the leaders of any other party.

So, the process of thinking is very important here. This is where lies the limit of freedom of thinking of an individual. The talent or genius, whatever, of an individual does not enjoy unlimited freedom. He cannot really think or act at will. Everyone considers that he is thinking with a free mind, very freely. It is true that human mind has a freedom, but that freedom is not limitless, it is relative. Even the freedom of mind has limits. The limits are from two sides. One is the concrete surroundings. The other is the process of thinking, that is, the process through which his mode of thinking has developed within him, in a manner known or unknown to him, the process that limits the freedom of his mind or thinking. This is why each of us understands Marxism, Leninism differently and also expresses it differently. Many in the society consider Marxism to be correct and they talk about Marxism in their own ways. Many consider that since they have read books on Marxism, so they know all about it; since they have had no difficulty in understanding Marxism thus, there is no inadequacy or shortcoming in their understanding. If those who think like this start a discussion on Marxism among themselves, it will be seen that on any point, perhaps their analyses tally for the first two lines but the third line will show that there is no unanimity among them. But all of them consider that they know Marxism. So, clearly what one feels is not the deciding factor, the crux of the problem cannot be grasped by this. This is where the question of true understanding of Marxism-Leninism comes in.

Now, what is meant by true understanding of Marxism-Leninism? What do we understand by this 'true' ? From a logical discussion, one has it that its real meaning is the true understanding of the correct scientific method of analysis, that is, scientific dialectical method of analysis. By leaving out this correct method of analysis, if something appears to be "true" and correct while discussing a point and even if there be unity

centring round it, nothing is gained thereby. What appears to be true and correct today may be shown to be thoroughly muddled and confusing in the light of an incident the very next day. So, what is achieved in this way is only a temporary unity. That is what is called arriving at a general consensus. But this can happen even in the case of two persons with diametrically opposite process of thinking. Even such persons do often arrive at apparent, superficial general unanimity on many an issue. Even persons adhering to diametrically opposite poles of philosophy do get united on a common issue through an overall analysis and work together. Otherwise, how do the united fronts comprising different parties and forces come about? The essence of united front politics is to work out unity on some general issues. But whether a party is truly Marxist-Leninist or not, cannot be judged by this yardstick. If we try to understand whether a party is truly Marxist-Leninist and whether its realisation of Marxism-Leninism is correct, then it is very important to understand the character of its methodology of analysis and thought process — whether these are in consonance with Marxism-Leninism or not. But this point has never been thrashed out in the Marxist-Leninist movement in our country. At first, the CPI was here. Then it split to give rise to the CPI(M) which again split later on to give rise to the CPI(ML). The CPI(ML) is, of course, rapidly splitting and re-splitting again and again. What is the understanding of Marxism-Leninism of the CPI and the CPI(M), the two parties born out of the original undivided CPI that came up in our country in the name of Marxism-Leninism and became big parties basing themselves on the recognition by and capitalising on the glory of international communist movement? No one wants to thrash out this crucial issue. While examining their political resolutions and conclusions, we have seen at every step that except for some minor points, their political analysis and stand are allthrough totally wrong. If we examine any fundamental issue like the economic system of India, its state structure, stage of revolution and the concept of the international communist leadership, it would be found that the CPI and the CPI(M)'s theories, analyses and stands in respect of all such issues are all wrong.

But I wish to draw your attention to an even

more basic point. By a correct Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory we do not just mean the correct determination of the stage of revolution in a general way although correctly determining this is very important. To a party that has to work among the people on the basis of a revolutionary programme, a party which has to organise the masses and draw them into movements against the state, the questions of the character of the state, stage of revolution and which classes would combine to dislodge which class from the state power all are very important and major issues no doubt. Without these, a political movement cannot stand on its legs. These comprise the concretised form of revolutionary theory guiding a political movement. But my point concerns whether it can be said that the theories of two parties correspond just because their stands are identical on these issues? Some will say that it is so. But I think otherwise. Only this does not constitute identity. For instance, we of the SUCI say that India is a capitalist country and the revolution here would be an anti-capitalist socialist one led by the working class. The RSP, the Workers' Party and the RCPI, too, say like this on this soil. Even such persons are to be found in this country who take pride in their theoretical knowledge and who, when questioned, would reply like this: 'The Indian State is a capitalist state. The bourgeoisie are in state power here. They would be overthrown by the workers-peasants-lower middle classes under the leadership of the proletariat. The revolution here would be anti-capitalist socialist.' Can it therefore be said that the SUCI's basic stand and theories correspond with those of these parties and persons? No, it cannot be said like that. To come to a correct conclusion on all this, it would have to be seen whether the foundation of their thinking on basic issues like method of analysis, thought process, understanding of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism in the widest sphere and sense, collective thinking, collective leadership and its concretised expression, is identical with that of ours. That is, whether the base from which their ideas, concepts and thinking about Marxism-Leninism arise, is identical with that of ours.

What is correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism ?

This true understanding of Marxism-

Leninism, that is, correct methodology of analysis, cannot be mastered through learning by heart the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. In Russia, too, many a pundit, in trying to interpret the Russian society through quotations from Marx and Engels, failed to carry forward the Russian revolution. They parroted that Marxism was not a dogma, but themselves reduced it to a dogma by their profession and practice. In the perspective of his times, Marx thought that proletarian revolution would first come about in the advanced capitalist countries. Viewing the liberal atmosphere in the then bourgeois democratic order, Marx even said that revolution would be achieved through peaceful means in those countries. Many Marxist pundits in Russia tried to understand revolution by repeating those words of Marx. Lenin had to wage an intense ideological struggle against them.

It was Lenin who showed the differences between the present imperialist era and the era of Marx, and how, because of these differences, the nerve centre of revolution would shift away from the advanced capitalist countries to the relatively backward countries, the weakest links of the world-wide chain of imperialism to bring about revolution there. Lenin also showed theoretically that since the bourgeoisie from country to country were now getting more and more attached to militarism and bureaucracy and less attached to freedom and democracy, the revolution in every country was henceforth bound to be armed revolution. Besides these, Lenin had to engage himself in bitter polemics with Plekhanov, Trotsky, Kautsky and others on many a basic issue like the character and form of imperialism, principles of organisation of the communist party and its concept of democracy, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the role of the working class in the proletarian revolution and the role of the peasantry, etc. Why this polemics? We all know that all of them knew the works of Marx and Engels by heart, even then why such controversies arose at all? Because all of them considered the various observations and conclusions of Marx and Engels to be their theory. But Lenin did not consider just their observations or the conclusions they had arrived at in the perspective of their times to be the theory of Marxism. He considered the science, the scientific methodology of analysis

and reasoning by applying which Marx had arrived at the conclusions in his time to be Marxism. For example, Marx himself, seeing the liberal democratic atmosphere in England, had concluded that the proletarian revolution would be accomplished there peacefully and through democratic means. Subsequently, in the light of the experience of the Paris Commune, Marx himself changed his idea in his famous treatise *Critique of the Gotha Programme*. The difference in time between the two was not much Marx had reached a conclusion of a type before seeing the naked aggressive character of the bourgeois state. The experience of the Paris Commune corrected him. Are they really Marxists, those who are used to quote Marx out of context and argue that 'This particular observation of Marx has proved to be correct in history, but that particular remark has not'? I repeat, are they really Marxists? They have not understood Marxism at all. Lenin grasped correctly that these are not Marxism, Marxism cannot be understood this way, nor applied.

In the same way, whatever Lenin said are not Leninism. The science applied by Lenin, the way he enriched and developed that science and method of analysis as well, to the extent possible, through applying it concretely in a concrete condition and determined its principle are the fundamentals, and the methodology is Leninism. Unless one can master these, mere parroting of Lenin's observations from memory is tantamount to blind copying. Likewise, the processes of formation of party during Lenin's time and in present-day India cannot be identical. In particular, in view of the fact that the form bourgeois individualism has taken today was not there at that time.

The current spate of bourgeois individualism, the major problem

In the present society, the question of development of the individual does not appear as the main problem. At the stage of full-scale bourgeois democratic revolution, that is, at the stage of the revolution to smash feudalism and establish the bourgeois order in its stead, stirring the individual entity based on the longing for individual freedom is a problem. But in an established bourgeois society where bourgeois

rule has been there for long decades and where the bourgeoisie tried to establish and operate bourgeois democratic institutions of some kind or other from whatever outlook — advanced or backward — since the society has already become a part of the international capitalist system, the same signs of bourgeois individualism would appear in this society even though the particular country may be relatively backward compared to advanced capitalist countries. Even in such a relatively backward capitalist society, bourgeois individualism is found to have been reduced to a privilege, like in the advanced bourgeois societies. That is, the way in which an individual today thinks about, examines and demands his right of individual freedom, that right is no longer in the stage where it used to be won by struggle.

Attainment of individual freedom in the era of bourgeois revolution was a matter of achieving something by fighting against despotic rule, feudal restrictions, religious superstition and malpractices, and imperialism. In those days, this struggle for individual rights was complementary to the struggle to establish a society based on bourgeois democratic concepts of ethics and morality. So, then there was no question of individualism creating any major trouble in the social movement. The individual did not come in the way of the democratic, patriotic and revolutionary movements to pose major problem. Perhaps it created some problem but that was no overall impediment to adoption of a social outlook — that individualism was mainly limited to contradiction between individuals. But where class struggle has intensified within the advanced bourgeois system of today, in countries like the USA, UK, or France, the form individualism has taken is no longer a slogan of the revolution — it would discharge no responsibility in this regard. Instead of being an instrument for securing rights, it has become reduced to a privilege. It is called the worst form of crass individualism. Some symptoms of this are discernible even in India. In the social environment, this vulgar individualism is operating in each person. Any communist party or its entire range of revolutionary activities or movement is not divorced from this environment.

In India, as the lease of life of the capitalist society is being lengthened here and the reactionary face of the bourgeois society gets

exposed increasingly, the influence of bourgeois individualism is more and more appearing within the society in the form of opportunism. The Russian or the Chinese Revolution did not face this problem in the present-day form, so they did not perceive it as we do now. The Chinese revolution was a democratic, people's democratic revolution against imperialism and feudalism under the leadership of the working class where the national bourgeoisie was also an ally of the revolution. Upto a certain stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia, the bourgeoisie there advanced along the path of revolution and stayed in alliance with the communists. Even after that, before the bourgeoisie could continue in power to provide stability to the bourgeois class rule, the proletariat in Russia rapidly transcended the bourgeois democratic stage and went on to make successful the socialist revolution. Whereas, here in India, it is the bourgeois rule that is being lengthened. If this had not happened and if we could have organised the socialist revolution successfully after exhausting the stage of bourgeois democratic revolution by 1930, or say, by 1947, then at the time of forming the party we would not have been required to give all this importance and pay such close attention to the problem of individualism which is nakedly manifest in our bourgeois social atmosphere existing so long. But it has become necessary for us to pay utmost attention to this issue, because the bourgeois rule in India has not been short lived. We cannot, therefore, forget that unless we proceed paying close attention to this matter of bourgeois individualism, all our efforts would ultimately come to nought. We have to advance with an eye to this and tackle this problem at the right place, however painstaking may that be. Dialogues and polemics, criticism and self-criticism within the party, its internal democracy — all these are to be protected from the vile influence of vulgar bourgeois individualism. It is to be pointed out and explained how, where and in what form does individualism rear its head in these spheres, how it pollutes an individual and how the atmosphere of proletarian democracy in the party is threatened thereby. It is to be shown how individualism eats into proletarian democracy to reduce it to a privilege. Proletarian democracy is not for providing advantage to any particular

individual exclusively, for the individual's benefit alone. It is for educating all individuals to work selflessly in the aggregate interest of society. Proletarian democracy is for protecting the democratic process from the influence and attack of individualism in the over-all interest of the movement of the entire working class. The present-day revolutionary movement cannot advance without understanding the question in this light.

The present ugly form of bourgeois individualism : how to combat it

Influence of individualism was there within the Russian party, too, but it did not assume such an ugly form as in the present bourgeois society. There was individualism during the days of freedom movement in our country, too, but in the background of the anti-imperialist struggle it had not turned into a privilege till then. The slogan for individual freedom still signified a struggle. But today it has been wholly reduced to opportunism and its effect now acts on the educated middle class and the lower middle class, the youth and even upon the leftist political workers. In the background of the anti-imperialist freedom struggle, it was not there in the present form. As capitalism gains more lease of life, individualism is assuming more and more an ugly form. Twenty or thirty years hence, a communist party in a capitalist country would witness such ugly manifestation of bourgeois individualism as cannot be viewed now. A communist party would now have to think about its organisational problems and their solution keeping this problem in view. In order to do this, one has to understand the true significance of the Leninist teachings by concretising and elaborating them as may be necessary, and to apply the same in one's own country. This cannot be accomplished by learning Lenin's works or observations by rote. Those who try to understand Leninism in this way might think that since Lenin did not say something or did not put a point in this or that particular manner, there is no necessity to try to understand it that way. They might think that if Lenin's party could have accomplished revolution without viewing the problem like this, why then they would not be able to accomplish revolution in India today? If we try to understand the question

with this attitude, we, too, shall be in disarray as has been the case with the CPI and the CPI(M). By this I do not, however, mean that if our concept, understanding and theory regarding this is correct, then that is everything; that is, if that much is correct, there is nothing incorrect about us — we have no defects and shortcomings and whatever we are doing is correct. I consider we do have many defects and shortcomings. But just because these are there, our theory or conception does not become incorrect thereby and to fight our theory by citing any such defects and shortcomings is meaningless. It is not the way to remove the shortcomings. The right method would be to understand correctly and to be able to provide the correct exposition of that theory. Only through this shall we be able to fight out our mistakes and shortcomings correctly. You see, accomplishing the task of giving shape to a true Marxist-Leninist party on the Indian soil does not merely depend on the correct determination of the stage of revolution in India. Or else, leaders of the renowned, so-called Marxist-Leninist parties in our country did know very well the principles and constitutional norms to be pursued in the formation of a Leninist party as laid down in the books. But has this helped these parties to develop into a correct communist party? Their leaders have become embodiment of the worst type of individualism. This is a matter which cannot be grasped by looking at the outward conduct only. Many are very polite outwardly and humble and apparently lead a simple and frugal life, washing their clothings, cleaning their rooms and maintaining their office files themselves. Such is their effort of self-purification, such is their purity! But worms have eaten into their minds — there they wallow in dirty mire. Vileness, envy, meanness, vindictiveness and conceit — all these bad traits have got entrenched in their character. And they are maintaining their purity only in their sparing dress and food! This is masochism, not Marxism. Can vile individualism be banished through such deceit? Rather, through these, the ego of vile individualism is nursed and fostered. This is not the way of self-rectification of the Marxists. In reality, they adopt this conduct with an eye to gaining cheap popularity. The character of this phenomenon cannot be grasped unless understood philosophically. Such cheap populist

conduct deceives the people all the more. Those people need it who are weak and whose only recourse is to adopt such populist behaviour and conduct in order to gain popularity. Examined closely, it becomes clear that this is but bureaucratism in a reverse form. Does bureaucratism always mean holding the whip in hand? Do not seasoned bureaucrats indulge in sweet talks? Those who are experienced and have, say, gone to jail, those who have dealt with seasoned government bureaucrats have seen that nobody else can talk so sugar-coated as they can. For this, I say, such outwardly simple behaviour and sweet talks lead us nowhere.

It does not follow that I am advocating a life of luxury and comfort. That question does not arise at all. The attitude of a Marxist should be such that he can voluntarily and smilingly accept any type of hardship in the interest of revolution and the party. Why should he have a tendency to show off or any prevention about this? The party may have a worker or a supporter who has the means of providing a leader with a good dress or a pair of shoes. Why should that leader hide it away and not use it? He should use the dress, wear it but never should get attached to such things. But I observe that even some of our party leaders are getting addicted to good living, without which they find it difficult to pursue their day to day work for the revolution because a kind of disinclination for simple, frugal life has appeared in them. This, too, is but another form of the same vulgar bourgeois individualistic culture. What I wish to drive home is that the Marxists have not preached any short-cut method of self-rectification. The method of self-rectification of the Marxists, the communist revolutionaries, is to free themselves from all sorts of mean-mindedness, pettiness, narrowness, vile selfishness and individualistic propensities — even from private property mental complex in every sphere of life.

Marxism-Leninism is to be continually concretised, elaborated & developed

Will methods and constitutional formalities of the party work similar in form with which the Russian party or the Chinese party faced individualism and combated it, be adequate now? If we want to copy those methods then we

will not be able to advance, nor will we be able to solve the problem correctly this way. Here lies the urgent necessity of correctly understanding and grasping Leninism and its basic principles in order to apply these in accordance with the history, social conditions and the particular situation of one's own country.

Lenin clearly pointed out the issue of the working class party and its correct leadership, and repeatedly emphasized its indispensability. He never said that a party would be able to organise revolution just because it subscribed to Marxism-Leninism. Rather, he said that a revolution could not come about without a correct revolutionary theory. By theory he meant the collective knowledge, the comprehensive knowledge of the party leadership, covering all aspects; he did not merely mean a political or an economic theory because the serious problems of the society cannot be tackled with just these. In order to correctly know the character of various problems and their origins, the collective knowledge of a leadership should have to be comprehensive and all-embracing.

Another basic conclusion of Leninism concerns the understanding of the salient principles of Marxism. It is that the basic principles of Marxism that were determined and enunciated by Marx, Engels and Lenin through application of the Marxist-Leninist methodology of examining and analysing the basic situation in their era — those principles shall remain valid as fundamental and guiding as long as the era and the situation in the main remain fundamentally unaltered in regard to class co-relationship. But the understanding of these fundamental principles would not remain static and a difference, a contradiction would arise while applying them. To drive home this truth among the common people, Lenin made a point nicely in the political language. He said that whenever a basic principle is sought to be applied to a particular case, a contradiction is sure to arise. This contradiction is between the general and the particular, that is, between the general understanding of the basic principles and their particular application. This means, whenever the basic principles are sought to be applied to a particular situation, their understanding does not remain fixed to that of the earlier stage. It gets developed, elaborated and

amended, if necessary; it expands in category. This is why so much stress is laid on the particular analysis in a particular situation, on the objective condition. Otherwise, the whole question of revolution gets reduced to subjective day-dreaming. Even if it is known, can a leadership correctly understand and apply this conclusion or principle? Lenin showed that due to uneven development of capitalism, the development in each country is different, with different characteristic features. So, naturally the application of the basic principles of Marxism would have to be made differently in England than in France, differently in Germany, and in Russia, and so on. Suppose one understands this conclusion of Lenin politically and even learns it by heart. But that does not prove he has really understood it and can apply it correctly. Even many among us talk about this Leninist principle, but they do not take cognizance of the concrete differences during actual practical work. This can be done only when one has grasped the basic Marxist methodology of study and analysis through pursuit of which Lenin arrived at this conclusion. Only then can he realize the true essence of this theory. And once he has done that, can he detect and understand the particular contradiction, particular difference arising in applying the theory in the particular condition. Again, the basic Leninist principles do not get altered because of such differences. So long as they remain valid as the basic guiding principles, their application, too, remains the same, irrespective of the situation in so far as the basic principles are concerned. But despite this fundamental identity, in the details of analysis they would not remain the same. So, how the identity is there at the fundamental level and, again, how it differs in the detailed exposition with wider ramification, and what is to be emphasized depending upon the specific condition of a country or a situation, such understanding is the correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism.

Leninist concept of party, party leadership & authority distorted by modern revisionists

Through November Revolution, Lenin brought to the fore the concepts of the party, party leadership and party authority. Why is the

question of leadership so important? Is it only for running the party in a disciplined way? No, not just that. Leadership and authority are needed to draw the masses into an active role. Many talks about mechanical thinking, bureaucratism, cult of the individual, etc., have come up centring round this concept of authority of the communist party. We are fighting against such concepts. We know that because of the concrete conditions, there is a gulf of difference between the level of consciousness of the leadership and that of the party cadres, the rank-and-file. There is even gap in many respects in the minimal level of consciousness that the cadres should have. Again, there is a lot of difference between the level of consciousness of the party workers and that of the masses. Can the leadership reduce at will this gulf of difference between the leadership and workers in the matter of minimal level of consciousness? This will be reduced through a long process. So long as that does not happen, mechanisation of thought is bound to be there in the understanding of any theory and, accordingly, in its practice as well. But just because this would be there, we cannot remain unalert about it, nor can we allow it to go increasing. The mechanical thinking that is there is an objective limitation. So, we have to understand its character and to work continually for uplifting the level of consciousness through struggles, discussions and dialogues, study classes, etc. Creation of an environment of polemics and discussions in dialogue in the internal party life, mass movements and in the country is the concrete method for continuous development and raising the level of consciousness, to combat mechanical thinking and to keep it under control. This is the concrete process through which the party workers can be kept away from the mechanical approach and attitude and the vices stemming therefrom. But because it is so, can we bring at will the standard of every one on a par? Such things are unrealistic. No Marxist has thought like this. This difference at the level of consciousness, this limitation of mechanical approach in the matter, of understanding of theory and its application would be there. And that is why the concept of authority is a practical necessity. Nothing substantial or significant can be achieved without this.

So, if there be any attempt to undermine the

authority in any way under cover of tall talks on democracy and rights, in practice it would mean putting an end to the party leadership, to the coherence and unity of the party and pushing the people, now leaderless, into utter indiscipline and chaos. If the concept of authority is discarded, then that would reduce even ideological struggle to arguments and altercations in a free for all; that would degrade a revolutionary party to an aimless debating society. No revolutionary party can ever think along these lines. So, any tendency or attitude to denigrate or undermine the authority in the name of fighting the cult of the individual or mechanical thinking and approach cannot be viewed lightly, not to speak of being supported. If I undermine in any way the party authority through a particular method of discussion, by a manner in which I bring about a subject or raise a question, then I would be committing a serious offence. No revolutionary party can or should accept this. Here lies the limit. In the democratic process of the inner party life, the party accords an extensive right to discuss and debate any point. But this "extensive" does not mean exceeding all limits. The limit is that, in the name of debating, no one may undermine the party authority. If anybody feels that the understanding about the authority is mechanical on a particular point, then he may discuss it, but on a definite and concrete issue. That is, he should raise the issue over which he feels that the understanding is mechanical, and should point out: 'The concept of authority is getting mechanical here because of incorrect understanding of the issue. Had it been understood this way, such mechanical approach would not have crept in.' The question should be raised in such a way that it goes to help the revolutionary movement. Instead, if the issue and the discussion over it are pushed along in such a manner, may even be under cover of big talks, as to lead to questioning the party authority itself, then that cannot anyway be agreed to, because that would cause a grave damage, as it happened in the communist movement through revisionists like Khrushchev. In the name of fighting the cult of personality, they undermined the authority of Stalin and in the process opened the flood gate of revisionism in the communist movement. After the demise of Lenin, the interpretation and understanding of Leninism found correct, concrete

and definite expression through Stalin. Khrushchev and his ilk destroyed it. Thus, the basic tenets of Lenin became a subject open to interpretation as per the fancy of one and all, which in turn opened the door to infiltration of revisionism-reformism into the ideological sphere. Otherwise, in many a country the communists had a record of self-sacrifice, struggle, revolutionary work and advancement. The world communist movement had advanced far. From then, for quite a long time, the movement has been stepping backward. Dark times descended upon the communist movement. In the name of struggle against the cult of personality, the Khrushchevites brought about the disaster. It is not that easy to fight the personality cult. To do that it is necessary to know the root cause of this cult. The Khrushchevites did not think about all this. By undermining the authority of Stalin, they destroyed the whole concept of authority in the communist movement. Stalin was not just an individual. He was the concrete embodiment of the concept of authority. What is it which determines the people's role in regard to Stalin? A glorious recollection is associated with the memory of Stalin; his name, memory, prestige and authority are invariably linked with a comprehensive understanding and interpretation of Marxism-Leninism which the people are all eager to know and learn. To learn Marxism-Leninism they have to tread the path which Stalin had paved. The right or wrong of an interpretation has to be decided in the light which Stalin handed down. This mental orientation of the toiling masses and the communists the world over was destroyed through denigration of Stalin and demolition of his authority.

This concept of authority in the communist movement, too, is a Leninist party concept. If there is no clear-cut concept about this in the party and if discussing on it go round and round in vague terms, then leadership carries no meaning in that party. There is discussion by Stalin on this point. Explaining the concept of this leadership or authority in a discussion with Trotsky, Stalin said that in a communist party the concept of leadership is not vague or abstract; it is definite and concrete. Otherwise, the term leadership carries no meaning at all. The Soviet party led by Stalin proceeded this far on this

point. They did not elaborate this point any further, nor established it theoretically.

Our party has done it. We made no mistake on this point. By establishing a definite concept about leadership theoretically, we have tried to save our party from onslaughts of ultra-democratic tendencies, bourgeois individualism and revisionism-reformism, even as we are suffering from all our shortcomings and limitations, so that the same consequences do not befall our party which have overtaken many parties of the world, including the CPI and the CPI(M) in our country.

Problem of individualism in socialist society

Thus we see that the revolutionary theory, the concept about the process of formation of a revolutionary party, and all such questions are not limited to determining the stage of revolution, or to chalking out some political and economic programmes. It is a total category of knowledge through integration and generalisation upon the truths culled by all the branches of science and knowledge, namely, history, philosophy, politics, economics, arts, literature, culture, morality and ethics in the background of the contemporary world and the particular society. Till a party gets equipped with this comprehensive knowledge, it cannot get access to the correct revolutionary theory, however much might it talk about the stage of revolution and whatever might it quote from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. In the countries where a revolutionary party organised revolution successfully, relying on its own strength, and not relying on the help of others, the revolutionary party had to master this comprehensive knowledge by coordinating and integrating the particular knowledges and truths culled by the different branches of knowledge and science. The party had to provide guidance to people on its basis in all spheres of life. We have two models before us in this regard. Once the Soviet party under Lenin accomplished this task. In China, too, the party led by Mao Zedong effected the best synthesis of knowledge acquired under Lenin and that culled by the Chinese party from the Chinese society. But it would be wrong to consider either as the ultimate. But if in the face of their problems of today, they cannot

further expand their knowledge by integrating the conclusions of science and epistemology on these problems, they would not be able to tackle them that would be created in a new form by bourgeois individualism in the socialist society. Despite economic, technological and cultural advancement, the problem of individualism has not yet been identified in the socialist society. The questions before the yearning for individual freedom and how these are to be solved has not been resolved. Whether the analysis which could shed light on these questions or resolve the problems over the longing for individual freedom before revolution can be useful in solving and rooting out those problems in the post-revolutionary situation, or whether they would themselves create problems have not been given thought to. So, unless they can correctly provide the theory governing how the struggle for individual freedom would have to be conducted in the new situation and how individual freedom is to be attained, then there would be problems coming up. Although this tendency of individualism in the socialist society is bourgeois individualism essentially, in terms of character, its form and working in the post-revolutionary socialist society are not identical with bourgeois individualism. To point out the difference between the nature of the two, we have called this form of individualism in socialist society as "socialist individualism". It has to be kept in mind that establishment of socialist society has not *ipso facto* put an end to bourgeois individualism within the working class. The struggle for attaining individual freedom which the bourgeoisie has begun has not been finally settled. What has been attained is equal right of the individual in the bourgeois sense and nothing else. But the question of freedom of the individual for which the individual had begun the struggle has not been resolved. So, the question will arise again and again that individual freedom is being curbed. This question cropped up in the Soviet society even such a long time after the establishment of socialism. But it is not only because of revisionism that it came about in the political sphere. The question would have cropped up any way. The desire of the individual is : 'I am not being allowed to express my feelings in the manner in which I want to.' The socialist society

cannot really grant this right in practice and that is correct. But why and how this happens; that it does not amount to curbing the freedom and the interest of the individual have to be explained clearly to the people.

Continual all-round theoretical development of Marxism-Leninism essential

To show this, it would have to be pointed out where and how historically lies the way to individual freedom and emancipation. It is to be shown why, in the socialist society, no separate struggle is necessary for attaining individual freedom. The character of the contradiction between the social interest and the individual interest and how this contradiction is to be resolved — these are to be shown. How will the social mental make-up conducive to the ultimate victory of the socialist society come about unless the complete theory covering these questions is evolved? We have not come across any discussions on these issues in the Soviet or in the Chinese literature. For this we say that there has been a deficiency in the matter of coordinating and integrating ever anew the theory, the truths culled by the different branches of knowledge and science as was done by the Bolshevik Party under the leadership of Lenin. Since the time of Lenin, the new questions that have arisen in the spheres of philosophy, science, social science and history and findings thereon have not been explained, interpreted, coordinated and integrated to be elevated to Marxist-Leninist theoretical knowledge.

Many may feel that these are not necessary, that we may do without these. I do not think so. Otherwise, did Lenin write down *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* to show off his knowledge? I hold, if revolution cannot totally defeat the reactionaries at the intellectual level then the preparation made for the revolutionary battle in the factories and fields cannot make much headway and this battle is bound to tumble before long. Revolution does not mean just military warfare, just winning an armed battle. Revolution means rapid radical change of the society and thus keeping unobstructed the process of continual onward advancement of society. Unless this is ensured fully, revolution cannot continue to advance. That is why the revolution in East

Europe, after capturing power through the backing of others, has today suffered this setback. The same thing may happen to Vietnam, too. What a glorious struggle against the US imperialism are the Vietnamese people conducting today! They had put up a struggle, one which is worthy of emulation in history. What great moral strength they are showing! But I do not know how much they have achieved at the theoretical level. Perhaps they have. But if it is like this that they lag in developing theory and are just fighting for national independence, then their problem would snowball to assume great complexity afterwards. Just as the Chinese revolution is proving to be very hard afterwards. The appeal of national independence is understood by all, and everybody responds. But if the overall understanding of even the communists remain good and correct only up to this and if, beyond this, everyone understands as per one's own fancy, then that revolution would not ultimately make headway, despite sacrifice of thousands of lives. Lenin also made this point. Following the teachings of Lenin, Mao Zedong during the Cultural Revolution declared : The enemy can be directly recognised as such during the revolution through seizure of power; it can be explained to the people with comparative ease as to who are the enemies, who are to be fought against and how. But in the socialist society the issue gets much more complex. There, when you try to explain what is to be done to the people, resistance comes from within the people themselves. This phase of revolution is much more complex. While remembering November Revolution in our country today, our primary task lies herein. Please keep in view the basic tenets, the methodology of analysis of Leninism that I have just spoken about. There are many other lessons of the November Revolution. It is not possible to discuss all these in one meeting. Besides, I have made this discussion in a different vein.

Try to assimilate the party's teachings elaborating & developing Marxism-Leninism

What I wanted to put clearly before you is: Try to master the Leninist methodology of analysis, not just the observations of Lenin. When the erudite would try to assert their knowledge and learning by just quoting from Lenin, you

should try to examine and find out whether they have been able to master the methodology of analysis pursued by Lenin while saying those things, whether their way of expression bears out that they have mastered it. I am saying this to our party workers and leaders alike. This is the main point. If you acquire this capacity, you have access to Leninism. If we acquire this, we would be able to apply Leninism to the concrete situation in our country. It is not enough if only the leaders acquire this capacity. If the party workers fail to acquire this capacity, that is, if we as a party fail to master this, then our work would advance much slower. Despite our will and character and despite our main analysis and base political line being correct we should not be able to generate the momentum that we could have generated even amidst the present adverse circumstances and there would be deficiency in the organisational capacity of our party workers.

Also, try to understand and grasp the Marxist-Leninist concepts and thoughts on the process of party formation that have been concretised, and enriched by our party through elaborate discourses. In a word, the struggle to build up a concrete concept about collective leadership, is, in one sense, the struggle to build up a correct party. We have emphasized this as a pre-requisite while explaining and elaborating democratic centralism. I discussed this point in detail in my address, *Why SUCI is the only genuine Communist Party on the Indian soil*. This has not been done to gain some advantage for us. It has been our effort to elevate it to the level of a theory through elaboration of Leninism.

The leaders and cadres of the party should have to understand all this. If a comrade has any difficulty in understanding a point, he should not try to instantly oppose it with his own imaginary or confused idea. One should first try to understand any interpretation or analysis of the party. If one is convinced, even after repeated attempts to understand that the exposition of the point is incorrect or defective, then one should point out the mistake theoretically. The party, too, would benefit from it if the party is still on the right track. But to assert at the very beginning that 'it is not correct' and thus to start from the other end is not the correct method to learn. Nobody can learn anything this way. Both yes or

no, the positive and negative aspects, are inherent in the dialectical process of learning. Wanting to learn correctly means that the contradiction is taking place the right way. Without this, if one starts with dissent and distrust, how can one learn? To begin like this means one is disregarding the authority knowingly or unknowingly. With this attitude even if one says that one wants to learn, that would be only a verbal assertion and not real attitude to learn. Had he truly wanted to learn, the attitude would have been different.

Supposing one has some reservation on a point. At the stage of learning some doubts may appear. My advice to him would be: Try to understand first, do not presuppose that you know everything already. Remember, one cannot learn anything without accepting an authority. And, of course, this 'authority is to be from within the party, not an outsider. Lenin began as a pupil of Plekhanov, he went to Plekhanov to learn from him. Starting as a pupil did he begin by saying 'What do you understand?', 'This is not correct', and 'That is not correct?' No, no genuine student begins to learn from a teacher this way. Lenin went to Plekhanov with the mind of a student, with an attitude to learn. Through this process Lenin could understand the limitations of Plekhanov later on. We were in the *Anushilan Samity** to start with. In the course of learning from the leaders there who initiated us into Marxism, we became aware of their limitations and eventually we moved away from them. Such is the dialectics. Those who know what polemics is as is conducted through the dialectical process also know that debate or altercation in any form is not dialectical conflict of opinions or arguments. A main condition of dialectical polemics is that it is conducted consciously and the participants are all guided by a concept of authority and a basically correct understanding of the fundamental principles of party and revolution. If one does not understand the question this way, one would only be adding to one's discomfort and opposition on the basis of just one's personal ideas.

The object is to keep the inner party

* A leading organisation representing uncompromising trend in freedom movement of India.

democracy living and to elevate the level of consciousness of the party workers within the framework of the concept of authority and the correct understanding of the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism. There is no question of discouraging polemics. It is good for the party to allow the right to discuss any question. But there is a limit to it, and to the method of discussing 'any question'. From my mentioning of 'any question' please do not assume that we can raise any question in any forum at any time. It is not that. What I like to convey is that it should be ensured that various questions are debated in various forums and that there is struggle of opinions over the widest spectrum possible. For example, there can and should be conflict between one opinion and another on a particular slogan, policy, programme, tactic or regarding whether there should be unity with a particular force or not. But if the opposition is on the very fundamental principles, then it ceases to be an inner party struggle, it becomes a struggle between the party and outsiders. So, there is no question of not accepting the basic principle of the party. There can be discussion to understand the fundamental principles, to understand these in a better way and to clarify the nature of confusion which one may suffer from. But the basic principles cannot be questioned because that would mean expressing doubt about the fundamental principles on which the party stands. This is not acceptable. Perhaps many comrades indulge in it from lack of proper understanding. They do not understand that the party authority is slighted by this even if unintentionally. What remains of the party then? No revolutionary party can accept this. However free may be the atmosphere of democracy within the party, that has no relation with this. This is a phenomenon of quite different category. This cannot go on. All comrades should remain alert about this. Otherwise, ultrademocracy and individualism would get entrenched in the party in the name of Marxism. And all that would remain of democracy would be just formal democracy. As a result, in such a condition the party would degenerate into a bureaucratic one. It is to stall bureaucracy and fight out blindness that authority is needed. Blindness is not generated by obeying an authority, it is engendered by a low level of

consciousness. Blindness does not come from repeated exhortations to accept and obey an authority, it comes from saying such things without understanding them properly. Proper struggle against this trend means to maintain a critical attitude to whatever comes about the concept of authority, if there is anything wrong, to point out what is correct.

Some organisational problems

If we can consolidate the party on the basis of correct understanding of these questions, we will advance despite our shortcomings and the multitude of problems. Our problems are many. Perhaps the number of dedicated cadres in our party is more in proportion compared to other parties. We feel pride for the quality of the character of our cadres. From the point of level of consciousness, the capacity of our workers to discuss and debate is not inferior, but rather better than that of the workers of the other parties. In case of a group of comrades, the standard in this respect is quite advanced, even better than that of the leaders of other parties. But despite this, our deficiency is that we lack adequate knowledge and capacity to tackle problems. Examined in this respect of our capacity relative to the necessity demanded by the objective situation, we are of course, deficient. This weakness will not do.

The level of competence with which the CPI and the CPI(M) can make do is inadequate for our party workers. Firstly, our party workers suffer from financial crisis and privations, we cannot make them free from this problem. So, most of our active workers have themselves to take care of their financial problems, and struggling with this they have to discharge their political responsibility. On the other hand, those parties keep most of their active workers free from the financial hardships so that they can work somewhat like whole-timers. Secondly, those are big parties. They enjoy the backing of the international leadership. The media conduct propaganda in their favour. The people of the country know them to be big parties and over this, a mentality of supporting them works among the people. Side by side, consider our position. What hard times we are having just to prove to the people that we are communists! Today, it is proved. But what are our aims and our stand and

what sort of a party we are — we have not yet been able to convey this to the people as good as we need to. On the one hand, we have to fight the bourgeoisie, its oppression. Along with this, there is a host of problems including those of financial constraints, conducting effective propaganda etc. Besides, there is the problem of explaining to the people why none of the two established communist parties is a genuine communist party and why we call them pseudo communists. There is also the problem of freeing the masses from their influence through this process.

In such a complex situation, can our party executives and organisers develop themselves as easily as those of the CPI(M) ? Even if our organisers have had a little more education, theoretical grounding and organising capacity than those of that party, it would be seen, while assessing organisational experience, that our organisers are not being able to perform as well as the CPI (M) organisers. So, we have to elevate our level. Besides, we have dearth of capable organisers, leaders and conductors of study classes in adequate numbers. We need to hold not one or two but study classes on a wide scale, but we do not have as many organisers equipped to conduct these classes. Does this mean that we have dearth of people who can conduct these classes after going through the Marxist literature ? No, we can find out such people if we search. There is the professor circle and there are many others who can explain what Lenin said, book by book, and what is what in Marxism, as is done in the CPI and the CPI(M). In those parties, there are separate groups of people for running the party, for becoming the leaders and for conducting the study classes. A true revolutionary party knows that the study class is a powerful weapon for building up correct political consciousness. New workers would come to these study classes. So, it becomes very important how they run the classes and explain and interpret Marxism, how they place the political line and policies of the party, how they draw the references into the discussion and explain them. Because, unless the outlook of the party, its concept about morality-culture-ethics, mental orientation, thought process and methodology of analysis can be inculcated in the

workers through the study class, the whole effort gets wasted. Who can accomplish this task ? Only those who are the leading organisers, who are themselves part of the party life, have imbibed and are inspired with the thought and mental orientation of the party and have no misgivings about the party authority. This they do not express in just their utterances, this is clearly reflected in their work, conduct and behaviour, gestures and attitude, appearance — in everything in fact.

Can the responsibility of conducting the study class be entrusted to anyone except such people on consideration that he is well-versed in Marxism ? In that case, the professors would have served the purpose. No, that cannot be the course, because that would undermine the very uniformity of thinking of the party. No revolutionary party can do this, or should do this. Considered from this angle, the number of such capable comrades in our party is meagre. We do not have the requisite number of people fit to hold the study classes. So we need more capable organisers. We need, starting from the level of local secretaries upwards, such leaders at all levels as can gain the confidence of the comrades. I mean organisers who, whatever be their personal problems or problems in the mutual understanding among themselves, are more or less capable of gaining the confidence of all comrades at their respective levels and are each considered an authority in his own sphere of work — an authority not imposed from above but emerging naturally from among the workers whom all the workers accept. As a result, they can help comrades discharge their responsibilities efficiently. We are in dearth of such organisers and executives. What is going on now ? A committee is formed to look after the work and someone made its in-charge, and so the command does not work properly in many cases. Even if it works somewhere, it lacks the capacity to maintain mass contacts and influence the people.

The question of advancement of the party is linked up with this problem. If we do not specifically and precisely understand the real problem and its character and then try to solve it, and if we indulge in adhoc and unplanned thinking, then the work of the party would not advance.

**Shake off inertia & despondency,
— advance in bold strides !**

These are some aspects of the problem. We need to get rid of these soon. Another point needs to be stressed. At present, our party is growing in importance. Already, one thing has happened. Internationally, no big communist party is today unaware of our party, whether they want to accord us recognition or not. Many of them show interest in knowing our viewpoint, subscribe to our organs and exchange their party literature with ours. Although we are yet to reach the stage of playing any role in the communist movement, not to speak of the need as also what is required of us, we have gained some ground. They have come to know at least this much about us that we think along Marxist-Leninist line and we are a party of the communist camp. Whenever we have been able to send someone of us abroad, we got confirmation that a large number of parties are enthusiastic in having our publications and literature. So, if we can strengthen our party a little more and play a bigger role in the democratic movements of the country and continually increase the same, we can come to the position of playing some role in the international communist movement, too.

In conclusion, I should say a few words on one more point. Some influence of the present despondency in the democratic movement and among the common people is seen to act in the mentality of a section of our workers, among the good workers. Although they do not speak about it, a certain inertia is manifest in their activities. This should not happen to the revolutionary workers. We have become revolutionary workers so that we may help the people most in their hours of need. The people are suffering from despondency and so are the workers of the democratic movement. This is the worst time for the people participating in the democratic movements. In such dark hours, it is the cadres of the revolutionary party who should tirelessly work to help them, and should step up their own initiative. When a car runs smooth and fast, one needs only to hold the steering wheel. It is when the car does not run well then labour and utmost care are needed. Same is with the question of the political situation of the country and of the mentality of the people. The more adverse the

situation, the more hardworking, active and upcoming with initiative should be the mode of existence of the revolutionary political workers. Otherwise, it is the design of the reactionaries which would be fulfilled. If our workers truly have this conviction that the people, despite being victims of onslaught, would again and again rally in the arena of struggle, but the struggle would be fruitless again and again and political parties of all shades would continue to exploit the grievances and disaffection of the people to serve their petty interest by forming ministries or governments and despondency will engulf till such time the revolutionary party, the SUCI, emerges with adequate strength to provide proper leadership to guide the movements and the militant people along the correct course towards the culmination — then they should pursue their work with even more determination in the face of the present spate of despondency. Not only of the party workers, the mental approach of even the supporters and sympathisers of our party who cannot always put in as much work as the active workers do, should be : Whatever we can do, whatever monetary and physical support we can provide for the party work, we will do it and we will never say 'no'. How shall we tackle the problems if, instead, the despondency prevalent in the society and in the democratic movement pervades the mentality of our workers, leading organisers and leaders somewhat and they become afflicted with attachment to the hackneyed and stereotype work ? Even a big party would have been disheartened at this. And we are yet small as such. Despite the expansion of the party we are still small compared to what necessity demands in the context of acquiring sufficient strength to lead the democratic movements in the country. Besides, there are attempts to corner us through all-out attack from all sides. In such a situation, we must protect our strong bases and step up our activities and strengthen our organisation by working among the despondent and confused masses. If we really mean revolution and do not want to play with it, then this is the time to stand up with great vigour and might. There is no sense in playing about. If one is in the revolutionary activity but one does not perform one's duties, and one is with the party considering it to be correct but does not discharge one's responsibilities — this will not do.

This is fooling around and has no use. You should think over this point deeply.

I wish to remind you another point. We need a powerful weapon to tackle the present situation. This powerful weapon is, firstly, steel-strong unity and unwavering morality of the party workers. They would have to shake off despondency of all sorts. It will have to be ensured that the despair prevalent in the society and democratic movement does not influence them. Secondly, the supporters and sympathisers should be exhorted to put in as much work as they can in their own way, to think out themselves

ways and means to help the party. Thirdly, the concept of leadership of the party is to be kept living in you. Fourthly, you are to go to the people all the time, stay among them and try to build up movements on their problems. Successfully attending to these four tasks would lend invincible power in you and equip you with such a powerful weapon as would surely enable us to overcome the present difficult situation. With this, I conclude my speech on the occasion of the November Revolution anniversary.

Long Live Revolution !
Long Live the Great November Revolution !
Long Live Comrade Lenin !

Great November Revolution shows the surest path of emancipation

(Contd. from page 3)

for building up powerful democratic movement to ward off the menacing offensives coming down on the working people be it sky-rocketing price-rise, back-breaking taxes, retrenchment of work-force in thousands in the backdrop of soaring figure of unemployed so on and so forth. Life has become unbearable. Capitalising this situation the BJP has come to power at the Centre with clear fascist motive and intention. While it maintains the continuity, as it must to be in power, the bourgeois class policy of market economy free from control and regulation, globalisation with sprinkling of *swadeshi* to rope in the support of that section of the monopolists who are crying for level-playing meaning government support to cope with anyhow the technically advanced foreign forces whose products have edge over theirs both as regards quality and price. It is very modern in this matter. But it is busy with its agenda of demolition of mosque and building temple there to whip up communalism, Hinduisation of educational syllabus, and brings to life obscurantist thoughts and ideas. It is nothing but fascist device of fusion of spiritualism with technological aspects of science to wean away the suffering people from class consciousness and solidarity.

Its intention of communalising all political and social issues, fanning up religious fanaticism to create division among principal communities,

championing Hindu fundamentalism against Islamic fundamentalism of Pakistan all have the singular purpose of defending a bankrupt capitalist system in dire crisis and prolonging the unbearable sufferings of toiling people.

Our party, has taken upon itself the task of building up democratic mass movement with whatever might we have inviting at the same time all genuine leftist secular democratic parties and forces to join us to strengthen the movement. Fascist move must be nipped in the bud. Communalism, separatism must be defeated by strength of powerful democratic mass movement having the goal of anti-capitalist socialist revolution.

The world today presents excellent opportunities for the class conscious proletariat and other toiling masses to turn the table on their exploiting class the imperialist-capitalists. There is absolutely no reason to despair. The bitter experiences of savage exploitation of capital and the heinous treacheries of the compromising forces, the hated revisionists must be used to instill in people the courage to proceed along the path shown by the Great November Revolution.

On to Struggle, On to Revolution !
Long Live Great November Revolution !
Long Live Marxism-Leninism !
Long Live SUCI - Shibdas Ghosh Thought !
Long Live Revolution !

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : NIHAR MUKHERJEE

Edited & Published by Sukomal Dasgupta from 48 Lenin Sarani, Calcutta 700 013 and printed by him at Ganadabi Printers and Publishers Private Limited, 52B, Indian Mirror Street, Calcutta 700013