



## REMEMBERING LENIN

*Is there such a thing as Communist ethics ? Is there such a thing as Communist morality ? Of course there is. Often it is made to appear that we have no ethics of our own, and very often the bourgeoisie accuse us Communists of repudiating all ethics. This is a method of shuffling concepts, of throwing dust in the eyes of the workers and peasants.*

*... We say : 'Morality is that which serves to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all the toilers around the proletariat, which is creating a new Communist society'.*

# LENINIST TEACHINGS – INVINCIBLE WEAPON IN COMBATING PRESENT SETBACK

On the occasion of the 68th anniversary of his demise, \* the working class, the exploited toiling masses of the world pay reverent homage to Lenin, the architect of November Revolution and founder of the first working class state of the world, the Great Leader of the Proletariat. On this occasion, and especially in view of the current complex situation, crisis and reverse in the world communist movement, communists of all countries have to study and re-study Lenin's revolutionary life, struggles and teachings and take lessons from them in order to equip themselves to squarely face the present difficult situation. The total switchover to capitalism engineered by Mikhail Gorbachev has culminated in the dismantling of the Soviet Union. Questions are being raised about the validity of Marxism-Leninism itself. These should be examined, unswayed by emotion or the prevailing confusion, in the light of concrete historical experience to arrive at the truth and determine the correct course of action.

## MARXISM HISTORICALLY VINDICATED

Marxism arose in the course of social development as a comprehensive philosophy and guide to action in response to the objective conditions and in fulfilment of the social urge of the era, by integrating and generalising the particular truths culled by the different branches of science and in consonance with the then scientific development. Both Marx and Engels hailed from Germany. November Revolution, the first practical application of the Marxist theory of proletarian revolution to establish socialism and the transition therefrom to the classless communist society, arose in a different country, Russia, and at a different time, long after Marx and Engels had breathed their last. Can it be denied that the November Revolution succeeded against unbelievable odds or that under socialism the backward Russia was transformed in just two decades into a mighty industrialised country amidst hostile imperialist-capitalist encirclement and attacks which defied and then crushed Hitler's dreaded war-machine and caught up with the USA, the doyen of imperialist powers — industrially, militarily and in space research? No, these are facts that cannot be erased from history. Similarly, can it be denied that inspired by the November Revolution, there was a rising tide of national liberation struggle resulting in emergence of newly independent resurgent nations in Asia-Africa-Latin America tearing off the shackles of imperialism or that the wave of proletarian revolution swept over the globe from East Europe to China, from Cuba to Vietnam? No, these too, are incontrovertible historical truths. The fact that counterrevolution has now gained upperhand in the Soviet Union and East Europe is damaging and painful no doubt. The imperialist-capitalists are naturally full of glee at this. Confusion has arisen even among communists and within communist circles. But whatever be the respective reactions, that cannot obliterate past history and history is the final arbiter. In spite of the present events, it can in no way be denied that in 1917 the first working class state of the world came into being in Russia under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party by overthrowing the capitalist state and that this momentous event had effected a break in the world-wide imperialist-capitalist chain, advanced the Russian society to the stage of socialism, the intermediate phase for onward transition to the classless communist society by putting an end to exploitation by capital and opened the door of all-round development in all fields. Neither can it be denied that revolutionary upheavals came about in a large part of the globe directly inspired by the November Revolution and the November Revolution

therefore marks the inception of a new era — the era of proletarian revolution.

The causes of the present reverse are to be understood and analysed and the truth or otherwise of the questions being raised about the validity of Marxism is to be examined in the light of Lenin's life struggles and teachings because these were which set in motion the historical sequence of world-shaking events starting with the November Revolution. If the revolutionaries can do this properly, take appropriate lessons and apply the same in practice correctly, then that would be the best homage they can pay to Lenin.

## ALL-ROUND DEVELOPMENT OF MARXISM BY LENIN

Karl Marx had shown that just as nothing in nature is static but all things keep on changing continually through the dialectical process and are law-governed, the course of social evolution is law-governed too. He showed by materialistic analysis that the human society has traversed from the slave system to feudalism and from feudalism to capitalism through the course of class struggle and it is through class struggle that the capitalist society will reach the classless communist society with socialism as the transitional phase between the two. What Marx had visualised conceptually through originating and establishing Dialectical and Historical Materialism on the basis of the then scientific development by coordinating, integrating and generalising the particular truths discovered by the different branches of science — Marxism which is a philosophy and a science at the same time, the science of all sciences — that thought was proved to be correct in practice through the Russian revolution led by Lenin. Had Marxism been the mere brainwave of a genius, an abstract theory, and not reflected correctly the concrete historical process of social development, then Lenin could not have brought about a radical change of society by applying it. On the other hand, Lenin could not have achieved what he did had he simply applied mechanically the concepts developed by Marx and Engels in the ever-changing world and society. Marx and Engels never considered Marxism a static gospel truth, a dogma. Rather, they considered it to be a living science, a guide to action in changing the world and the society, which had to be continually developed in the context of new situations and problems and the latest scientific developments by adhering to the principles of Dialectical and Historical Materialism.

Lenin viewed it the same way. He said that Marx and Engels had laid the foundation and the

guiding principles and it was the task of subsequent revolutionaries to develop Marxism in all directions, covering all spheres. He achieved this himself in the light of scientific developments since the time of Marx and Engels and in the context of monopoly capitalism and imperialism which arose after Marx and Engels. By further developing the Marxian theory and concepts he moved ahead, vindicated and re-established Marxism philosophically on scientific basis against attacks by detractors, worked out the strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution in the era of imperialism, determined and put into practice the correct methodology of a working class party in the day-by-day movement, gave structural shape to the proletarian revolutionary party as an effective instrument of struggle, conceptually elaborated the structure of the state after proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and put it into practice after the successful November Revolution, set out the concrete tasks of the party towards socialistic development of society after the revolution and put these into practice with an eye to all-round development of the toiling masses. In a word, he brought about a comprehensive development of the theory and practice of Marxism to meet the needs of the time. In the process, Marxism became Marxism-Leninism, the Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

## LENIN DEFENDS AND ADVANCES MARXISM PHILOSOPHICALLY

Throughout his revolutionary life, Lenin had to wage ceaseless ideological struggle against idealist philosophers refuting their arguments and upholding the Marxist materialist philosophy. Of particular importance is the crushing defeat he gave to a host of idealist philosophers in the first decade of this century. It was a time when momentous discoveries were being made in the sciences, especially in Physics which set at naught many of the erstwhile scientific theories and hypotheses creating a disorder, a topsy-turvy situation in the scientific and philosophical thinking. In his lifetime, Engels had shown by dialectical analysis that since truth is relative, there can be nothing which is the last word in the realm of knowledge. Therefore, he averred, there was no reason to think that atom was the smallest particle constituting matter, which could not be further subdivided, and such thinking was against the ethics of science. This ran counter to the then general scientific belief which held that atom was the ultimate, minutest particle of matter and many scientists and philosophers ridiculed Engels for this.

But early in this century, though the atom had not yet been split, scientists had discovered that each atom consisted of a number of even smaller particles with the smallest particles, the negatively charged electrons, revolving round the positively charged central particle (which would be called proton later on). This fully vindicated Engels' considered opinion formed well ahead of his times. But this and other discoveries nullified many a concept of earlier Physics and Mechanics. Some idealist philosophers and scientists even

\* The editorial board regrets delayed publication of the issue.

started arguing that the discovery of electron which was so minute that it could not be measured, that is, by the then available instruments, signified that matter disappeared if broken up into smaller and smaller particles.

And if matter itself vanished, what remained of materialist philosophy? And thus it happened that all over Europe sprang up idealist philosophers who sought to discredit and refute the materialist Marxist philosophy in the "light" of the latest scientific discoveries. Mach, the Austrian physicist and philosophical idealist, was a central figure among them and round him grew up a circle of Machists embracing scientist-philosophers of many European countries. Since they tried to refute Marxism, such "philosophers" were encouraged by the ruling bourgeoisie by all means. Matters came to a head at the beginning of 1908 when a volume of essays penned by a number of Machists came out titled *Studies In the Philosophy of Marxism*. The essays, under pseudo-scientific garb and on the pretext of defending Marxism, actually tried to hit at the very materialist philosophical basis of Marxism and skillfully preached idealism, mysticism. Lenin was outside Russia, on the European continent at that time. He decided that a fitting and thorough rebuff was a burning necessity because "At a time when the masses are assimilating the new and unprecedentedly rich experience of the direct revolutionary struggle, the theoretical struggle of the revolutionary world outlook i.e. for revolutionary Marxism, becomes the slogan of the day."

Lenin studied classical works on idealist and materialist philosophy, the works of the Machists and the latest literature on natural sciences, especially theoretical Physics. During the later stages of the work, he moved to London and continued his research at the British Museum. The result of nine months' arduous, painstaking work by Lenin's genius, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, came out in 1909. In this book he criticized and exposed from every angle the latest subtleties of bourgeois idealist philosophy, gave a profound exposition of the theory of knowledge of Dialectical Materialism and a philosophical materialist point of view of the new discoveries in natural science, especially in Physics. The problems of the theory of knowledge, he showed, could be scientifically solved only from the standpoint of materialism. The world is matter in motion. Nature existed before man; man's consciousness is the product of highly organized matter. Things exist outside of our consciousness and independently of it. "Our perceptions and ideas are their images. Verification of the images, differentiation between true and false image, is given by practice. ... The essence of the crisis in modern physics consists in the breakdown of old laws and basic principles, in the rejection of an objective reality existing outside the mind, that is, in the replacement of materialism by idealism and agnosticism. 'Matter has disappeared' — one may thus express the fundamental and characteristic difficulty in relation to many of the particular questions which has created this crisis. ... For it has become possible to reduce matter to electricity; .... It is consequently possible to reduce the physical world from scores of elements to two or three elements (inasmuch as positive and negative electrons constitute 'two essentially distinct kinds of matter') ... Hence natural science leads to the unity of matter — such is the real meaning of the statement regarding the disappearance of matter, its replacement by electricity etc. which is

leading so many people astray. 'Matter is disappearing' means that the limit within which we have hitherto known matter is vanishing and that our knowledge is penetrating deeper; properties of matter are disappearing which formerly seemed absolute, immutable and primary (impenetrability, inertia, mass, etc.) and which are now revealed to be relative and characteristic only of certain states of matter. For the sole 'property' of matter with whose recognition philosophical materialism is bound up is the property of being an objective reality, of existing outside our mind. ... But Dialectical Materialism insists on the approximate, relative character of every scientific theory of the structure of matter and its properties; it insists on the absence of absolute boundaries in nature, on the transformation of moving matter from one state into another, which is to us apparently irreconcilable with it, and so forth. However bizarre from the standpoint of 'common sense' the transformation of imponderable ether\* into ponderable matter and vice versa may appear, however 'strange' may seem the absence of any other kind of mass in the electron save electromagnetic mass, however extraordinary may be the fact that the mechanical laws of motion are confined only to a single sphere of natural phenomena and are subordinated to the more profound laws of electromagnetic phenomena, and so forth — all this is but another corroboration of Dialectical Materialism. It is mainly because the physicists did not know dialectics that the new physics strayed into idealism." To solve the crisis in Physics, said Lenin, the crying need was to take recourse to Dialectical Materialism. He declared: "Modern physics is in travail; it is giving birth to dialectical materialism." He considered that "the electron is as inexhaustible as the atom" — a truth that has been proved by science since then.

Thus Lenin gave a crushing defeat to those whom he called philosophical revisionists of Marxism. This had a tremendous effect in furthering the cause of Marxist revolutionary philosophy and ideology in the teeth of opposition from bourgeois idealist philosophy. Truly it has been said that without *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* of 1909, November, 1917 would not have been possible.

Since Marxism is a living science, there is the need to develop it continually, like any other science, in the context of newer problems and discoveries in different branches of science. In our time, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the founder General Secretary of our Party, the SUCI, our leader, teacher and guide and one of the foremost Marxist-Leninist philosopher-thinkers of the present era, had shown by detailed analyses in his discussions and writings that the latest discoveries made by quantum physics and wave mechanics, especially about the minutest subatomic particles, much smaller than the proton, neutron or the electron, have further corroborated the truth of dialectical materialism.

#### STRUCTURE OF PROLETARIAN PARTY AND ITS MODUS OPERANDI

What is the concept of a proletarian party? How should it conduct working class movement? What should be the structure of such a party?

Marx and Engels had not left any detailed readymade prescriptions in their works for these.

It was Lenin who developed these concepts, starting from the scratch and building brick by brick, so to say, by following the basic Marxist prin-

ciples and creatively enriching the same, amidst the heat of struggles in the face of concrete problems — and applied the concepts developed by him to practice.

In *Where to Begin?*, he wrote that it was necessary "to call for the establishment of a revolutionary organisation, capable of combining all the forces and of leading the movement *not only in name*, but in deed, i.e., *an organization that will be ready at any moment to support every protest and every outbreak*, and to utilize these for the purpose of increasing and strengthening the military forces required for decisive battle."

What sort of a party would it have to be capable of this? Lenin provided the answers in his *What Is To Be Done?* In this work, in opposition to the harmful concepts and practice of Economism that had appeared as the chief opportunist trend in Russian movement at the beginning of this century, Lenin developed and set forth in detail the correct Marxist revolutionary method of conducting movements, of fulfilling organisational tasks and of building up a centralized Marxist revolutionary party. Inter alia, he attacked and exposed amateurishness in party work and the theory of "spontaneity" of revolution.

In this work, Lenin emphasized the importance of a correct revolutionary theory thus: "Those who have the slightest acquaintance with the actual state of our movement cannot but see that the wide spread of Marxism was accompanied by a certain lowering of the theoretical level. ... Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This thought cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand in hand with an infatuation for the narrowest forms of practical activity. ... *the role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory*".

Economism seeks to confine working class movement to agitation on the economic demands only without raising the political consciousness, class consciousness of the workers which alone can lay bare to them the inherent exploitative character of the existing system which is the root cause of their economic problems and misery. Advocates of "spontaneity" in working class movement hold that spontaneous movement of workers on their immediate demands and on their own is the all-cure, there is no necessity of imparting political education to them. Thus, the theory of "spontaneity" is complementary to the civil of Economism and often the two work hand in hand.

Lenin showed in *What Is To Be Done?* that "spontaneous working class movement ... by itself is able to create (and inevitably creates) only trade unionism, and working class trade-unionist politics are precisely working class bourgeois politics. ... Worship of spontaneity seems to inspire a fear of taking even one step away from 'what can be understood' by the masses, a fear of rising too high above mere subservience to the immediate and direct requirements of the masses. ... Taken by themselves, these strikes were simply trade union struggles ... the workers were not, and could not be, conscious of the irreconcilable antagonism of their interests to the whole of the modern political and social system, i.e., theirs was not yet Social Democratic consciousness. ... It could only be brought to them from without. The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade union consciousness. ... The theory of Socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical and economic theories that

\* Modern science has rejected this ether hypothesis.

were elaborated by the educated representatives of the propertied classes, the intellectuals. ... Class political consciousness can be brought to the workers *only from without*, that is, only from outside of the economic struggle, from outside the sphere of relations between workers and employers. ... To bring political knowledge to the workers the Social-Democrats must *go among all classes of the population* ... all worship of the spontaneity of the working class movement, all belittling of 'the conscious element', of the role of Social Democracy, *means, quite irrespective of whether the belittler wants to or not, strengthening the influence of the bourgeois ideology over the workers.* ... Social-Democracy leads the struggle of the working class not only for better terms for the sale of labour power, but also for the abolition of the social system which compels the propertyless to sell themselves to the rich. Social-Democracy represents the working class not in the latter's relation to only a given group of employers, but in its relation to all classes of modern society, to the state as an organised political force. ... Revolutionary Social-Democracy always included, and now includes, the fight for reforms as part of its activities ... (but) it subordinates the struggle for reforms, as the part to the whole, to the revolutionary struggle for liberty and for Socialism."

Showing that the right-reformist deviation of Economism and the left adventurist terroristic deviation both served to deviate the working class from the main task, Lenin observed: "... calls for terror and calls to lend the economic struggle itself a political character are merely two different forms of evading the most pressing duty that now rests upon Russian revolutionaries, namely, to organize comprehensive political agitation."

On the question of how to raise the level of consciousness of the masses, Lenin said: "The consciousness of the masses of the workers cannot be genuine class consciousness, unless the workers ... learn to apply in practice the materialist analysis and the materialist estimate of *all* classes, strata and groups and groups of the population. ... comprehensive political exposures are an essential and *fundamental* condition for training the masses in revolutionary activity. ... We must take upon ourselves the task of organizing an all-round political struggle under the leadership of *our* Party in such a manner as to obtain all the support possible of all opposition strata for the struggle and for *our* Party. We must train our Social-Democratic practical workers to become political leaders, able to guide all the manifestations of this all-round struggle."

What sort of a party is needed to correctly guide such struggle? Lenin outlined its structure thus: "The political struggle of Social-Democracy is far more extensive and complex than the economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government. Similarly (and indeed for that reason), the organization of a revolutionary Social-Democratic party must inevitably be of a *different* kind than the organizations of the workers designed for this struggle. ... I assert: 1) that no revolutionary movement can endure without a stable organization of leaders that maintains continuity; 2) that the wider the masses spontaneously drawn into the struggle, forming the basis of the movement and participating in it, the more urgent the need of such an organization, and the more solid this organization must be (for it is much easier for demagogues to sidetrack the more backward sections of the masses); 3) that such an organisation must consist

chiefly of people professionally engaged in revolutionary activity; 4) that in an autocratic state, the more we *confine* the membership of such an organisation to people who are professionally engaged in revolutionary activity and who have been professionally trained in the art of combating the political police, the more difficult will it be to wipe out such an organization, and 5) the *greater* will be the number of people of the working class and of the other classes of society who will be able to join the movement and perform active work in it. ... the spontaneous struggle of the proletariat will not become its genuine 'class struggle' until this struggle is led by a strong organization of revolutionaries".

In his celebrated work *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, Lenin elaborated the fundamental organizational principles of a proletarian party, gave the concept of democratic centralism and highlighted the vanguard role of the party in relation to the working class and other exploited masses. In this work, he analysed: "When I say that the Party should be a *sum* (and not a mere arithmetical sum, but a complex) of *organizations*, does that mean that I 'confuse' the concepts Party and organisation? Of course not. I thereby express clearly and precisely my wish, my demand, that the Party, as the vanguard of the class, should be as *organized* as possible, that the Party should admit to its ranks only such elements as *lend themselves to at least a minimum of organization.* ... The matter therefore reduces itself either to the consistent application of the principle of organization, or the sanctification of disunity and anarchy. ... the stronger our Party organizations consisting of *real* Social-Democrats are, and the less wavering and instability there is *within* the Party, the broader, the more varied, the richer and more fertile will be the influence of the Party on the elements of the working class *masses* surrounding it and guided by it. After all, the Party, as the vanguard of the working class, must not be confused with the entire class, ... precisely because there are differences in degree of consciousness and degree of activity, a distinction must be made in degree of proximity to the Party. ... To forget the distinction between the vanguard and the whole of the masses which gravitate towards it, to forget the constant duty of the *vanguard* to *raise* ever wider strata to this most advanced level, means merely to deceive oneself, to shut one's eyes to the immensity of our tasks, and to narrow down these tasks. ... We are the Party of a class inasmuch as we *in fact* direct almost the entire, or even the entire, proletarian class in Social-Democratic fashion; ... Unity on questions of program and tactics is an essential but by no means a sufficient condition for Party unity and for the centralization of Party work ... The centralization of Party work requires, in addition, unity of organization, which, in a party that has grown to be anything more than a mere family circle, is inconceivable without formal rules, without the subordination of the minority to the majority, of the part to the whole. ... But as we proceed with the building of a *real* party, the class-conscious worker must learn to ... *insist* that the duties of a Party member be fulfilled not only by the rank and file, but by the 'people on top' as well; ... In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but *organisation* disunited by the rule of anarchic competition in the bourgeois world ground down by forced labour for capital, constantly thrust back to the 'lower depths' of utter destitution, savagery and degeneration, the proletariat can become, and inevitably

will become, an invincible force only when its ideological unification by the principles of Marxism is consolidated by the material unity of an organization which will weld millions of toilers into an army of the working class."

An organized, centralized party acting as the vanguard of the exploited classes and masses is of cardinal importance in organizing revolution, holding the state power against counterrevolutionary attacks and building up socialism. So, it is not accidental that the revisionists who are out to destroy the socialist system from within, begin by undermining the leading role and authority of the party. This process was begun by the Khrushchev revisionist clique in the Soviet Union after Stalin's demise.

## STATE AND REVOLUTION

By steadfastly applying correct revolutionary strategy and tactics, the Bolsheviks led by Lenin organized the victorious November Revolution in Russia against stupendous odds, belying the widespread belief that it was impossible for the poor, illiterate workers and peasants to capture state power and hold it. But this would not have been possible unless Lenin had concretised and developed the Marxist theory of state and revolution.

In their earlier works, Marx and Engels had stated that peaceful revolution was possible in countries like England where bourgeois democracy was at its liberal best. But later on and especially in the light of the experience of Paris Commune, they concluded that the form of state in the transition period of socialism in between capitalism and communism could be nothing but the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin showed by concrete analysis that with passage of time and particularly after the appearance of imperialism, the bourgeoisie had lost their earlier attachment to freedom and liberty and turned utterly reactionary and more and more attached to the bureaucracy and the military as the means for holding to power and so, in order to dislodge them, violent revolution had become the general rule, applicable even to countries like England. He also outlined the form and characteristics of the dictatorship of the proletariat to be set up after the revolution.

In his *The State And Revolution*, refuting the revisionist distortion of Marxism by Kautsky at each step, he showed that "A democratic republic is the best possible political shell for capitalism, and, therefore, once capital has gained control of this very best shell ... it establishes its power so securely, so firmly, that no change, either of persons, of institutions, or of parties in the bourgeois-democratic republic, can shake it. ... The centralized state power that is peculiar to bourgeois society came into being in the period of the fall of absolutism. Two institutions are most characteristic of this state machine: the bureaucracy and the standing army. In their works, Marx and Engels repeatedly show that it is the bourgeoisie with whom these institutions are connected by thousands of threads. Only he is a Marxist who *extends* the recognition of class struggle to the recognition of the *dictatorship* of

In those days, the term Social-Democratic meant Communist and Social-Democratism meant Communism. Later on, when these terms became discredited and hated especially in view of betrayal of the working class by most of the Social Democratic leaders of the Second International, these terms were replaced by the words Communist and Communism.

*the proletariat.* The forms of bourgeois states are extremely varied, but their essence is the same: all these states, whatever their form, in the final analysis are inevitably the *dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.* The transition from capitalism to Communism certainly cannot but yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: *the dictatorship of the proletariat.* ... Democracy for an insignificant minority, democracy for the rich — that is the democracy of the capitalist society. ... And the dictatorship of the proletariat ... cannot result merely in an expansion of democracy. *Simultaneously* with the immense expansion of democracy, which *for the first time* becomes democracy for the poor, democracy for the people, and not democracy for the moneybags, the dictatorship of the proletariat imposes a series of restrictions on the freedom of the oppressors, the exploiters, the capitalists. We must suppress them in order to free humanity from wage slavery, their resistance must be crushed by force; ...".

Lenin ended the book with a detailed analysis to show how Communism can be attained through withering away of the state only after the necessary economic, political and social bases for such withering away have been created during the transition period of socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

After the demise of Stalin, the Khrushchevite revisionists started a total reversal of these Leninist principles. Khrushchev broached the "theory" of ushering in socialism in imperialist-capitalist countries by transforming the bourgeois parliaments into "instruments of people's will" — thus undermining the cardinal necessity of revolutionary movement and revolution. This concept of peaceful transition to socialism could not but have the effect of lowering the guard and seriously weakening the dictatorship of the proletariat within the Soviet Union itself.

## IMPERIALISM AND WAR

Marx, in his *Capital*, had dissected and laid bare the character and working of capitalist economy. When the First World War began, Lenin, Marx's able disciple, by Marxian dialectical method, made a thorough, detailed and all-round Marxist study and analysis of imperialism. Output of the vast research was the book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism.*

In this book, Lenin summarized the main features of imperialism to show that under imperialism, "1) the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life; 2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this 'finance capital', of a financial oligarchy; 3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance; 4) the formation of international monopolist capitalist combines which share the world among themselves, and 5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed."

Lenin also showed that imperialism denotes that the stage is ripe for proletarian revolution, "imperialism is the eve of the proletarian social revolution", for it further increases the contradictions rather than diminishing them, further accentuates the uneven rate of growth of different parts of the globe and is decaying, moribund. To quote him: "Finance capital and the trusts do not diminish but increase the differences in the rate of

growth of the various parts of the world economy. ... The world has become divided into a handful of usurer states and a vast majority of debtor states. ... alliances ... whether of one imperialist coalition against another, or a general alliance embracing all the imperialist powers, are inevitably nothing more than a 'truce' in periods between wars. Peaceful alliances prepare the ground for wars, and in their turn grow out of wars; the one conditions the other, giving rise to alternating forms of peaceful and non-peaceful struggle out of *one and the same* basis of imperialist connections and relations within world economics and world politics.... Monopolies, oligarchy, the striving for domination instead of striving for liberty, the exploitation of an increasing number of small or weaker nations by a handful of the richest or most powerful nations—all these have given birth to those distinctive characteristics of imperialism which compel us to define it as parasitic or decaying capitalism. ... From all that has been said in this book on the economic essence of imperialism, it follows that we must define it as capitalism in transition, or, more precisely, as moribund capitalism."

Even today, after so many years, this characterisation of imperialism is still essentially and vividly valid. Domination by finance capital has increased even more, the world is still divided into a handful of haves and great majority of have-not nations. Direct colonialism is almost extinct, but its place has been taken by neo-colonialism, ruthless exploitation by imperialist finance capital over sovereign national bourgeois states. Those who think that Lenin's diagnosis about the crisis of imperialism is wrong and technological advances under imperialism-capitalism can yet lead to increased well-being of the people have but to cast their eyes on the state of affairs in the capitalist world. Despite enormous technological development since Lenin's time, the whole capitalist world is beset with endemic crisis of capitalism and even the most advanced capitalist countries like the USA are reeling under it-

In the face of all-round crisis of imperialism, the imperialist-capitalist powers have resorted to militarisation of their economies to provide artificial stimulation to production through the military demands — but to no avail. Parasitism and speculative nature of monopoly capitalism have developed much more since Lenin's time to reach such a stage that the USA, in spite of its political and military domination, is no longer in a dominant position economically and faces the danger of being eclipsed economically by Japan. Japan, Germany and Great Britain are now competing with the USA for dominance, thus adding a new dimension to the contradiction of imperialism. Crises and contradictions of imperialism have reached a new height and imperialism as a world system is quite unable to resolve these. All these corroborate Lenin's analysis of imperialism. Even the euphoria in the states of the erstwhile Soviet Union on being admitted into the capitalist paradise has evaporated—there are widespread disaffection, even protest demonstrations by the people. How far they can advance will of course depend upon the policy and quality of their leadership.

But it does not follow from this that crisis-ridden imperialism will disintegrate of its own. The crisis is very intense but the crux is to provide correct ideology and leadership and build up concerted revolutionary working class movement from country to country against imperialism-capitalism.

After the revisionists came into power in the Soviet Union, Khrushchev discarded step by step the policy of peaceful co-existence, a policy formulated and implemented by Stalin as a brilliant advance of the Leninist concept of safeguarding the revolution in a single country amidst capitalist encirclement and at the same time furthering the cause of world revolution which, coupled with militant world peace movement, could provide the only deterrent to imperialism-capitalism, put a stop to imperialist interference in other countries and thus allow the national liberation and revolutionary movements there to gain strength free from imperialist interference — as it had been doing for years. Khrushchev's policy amounted to peaceful capitulationism which disarmed the world people in the face of imperialistic onslaughts. Instead of being the bulwark of peace which guaranteed peace and security to the Third World countries against imperialist attack, the Soviet Union became reduced to a mere onlooker while the imperialists headed by the USA went on perpetuating international brigandism. The sad outcome is there for all to see.

The Soviet revisionists eventually went on to say that the danger of war had receded in the nuclear age owing to the mutual fear of the awesome destructive power of nuclear deterrent, implying thereby that Lenin's thesis about the inevitable possibility of war under imperialism was no longer valid. History has proved them utterly wrong through a series of wars engineered and perpetrated by the imperialists, particularly the US imperialists, directly or by proxy, the recent Gulf war being the latest one.

Moreover, the intense contradiction among the leading imperialist powers arising from their competition for global domination shows that outbreak of war between imperialist countries is not impossible — thus confirming validity of Lenin's analysis that imperialism generates war.

## CLASS STRUGGLE AFTER REVOLUTION

On the morrow of the November Revolution, fourteen imperialist-capitalist powers jointly launched attack on the Soviet Union to crush the infant socialist state. They did not succeed because the Soviet people fought with rock-like determination under the correct party led by Lenin and upheld the noble banner of Communism and proletarian internationalism and because the exploited toiling masses in different capitalist countries rose in protest movement against the imperialistic onslaught.

Lenin taught us: capture of state power does not mean that the working class can slacken its vigil thereafter; on the other hand, class struggle is to be persistently continued against the dispossessed bourgeoisie, the bourgeois elements in the society and against counterrevolutionary attempts throughout the period of socialism and carried to its logical conclusion till the classless communist society is attained when, because classes have ceased to exist, the state, an instrument of coercion in the hands of one class against another, becomes superfluous and withers away.

Just after the November Revolution, the renegade leaders of the Second International whose chief spokesman Kautsky was, who had betrayed the working class through justifying the imperialist war as war for the defence of respective bourgeois fatherlands instead of trying to convert it into a proletarian revolutionary war against their own bourgeoisie, began to level charge against

the Bolsheviks for their 'arbitrary' behaviour towards the Russian bourgeoisie after the revolution. In his *Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky*, Lenin gave a fitting rebuff. He wrote: "This historical truth is that in every profound revolution, a prolonged, stubborn and desperate resistance of the exploiters, who for a number of years retain important practical advantages over the exploited, is the rule. ... The transition from capitalism to Communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration. And after their first serious defeat, the overthrown exploiters — who had not expected their overthrow, never believed it possible, never conceded the thought of it — throw themselves with energy grown tenfold, with furious passion and hatred grown a hundredfold, into the battle for the recovery of the 'paradise', of which they have been deprived. ... The whole point is that a bourgeois state which is exercising the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie through a democratic republic cannot confess to the people that it is serving the bourgeoisie; it cannot tell the truth, and is compelled to play the hypocrite. But a state of the Paris Commune type, a Soviet state, openly and frankly tells the people the truth and declares that it is the dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasantry; ... Proletarian democracy, of which the Soviet government is one of the forms, has brought a development and expansion of democracy hitherto unprecedented in the world, precisely for the vast majority of the population, for the exploited and toiling people. ... The Soviet government is the first in the world (or strictly speaking the second, because the Paris Commune began to do the same thing) to enlist the masses, specifically the exploited masses, in the work of administration."

When Khrushchev declared that the Soviet state had become a State of the Whole People, he acted against a fundamental Leninist principle, against the dictatorship of the proletariat by obliterating the role of the state as the coercive instrument in the hands of the proletariat for waging class struggle against the remnants of the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois elements within the society, thus paving the way for restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Later on, when the great leader of the Proletariat, Mao Zedong, exhorted the party workers in China to take class struggle as the key link, he was upholding a cardinal Leninist principle in the face of opposition from the capitalist roaders headed by Liu Shaoqi and subsequently Deng.

### STALIN'S IMMENSE CONTRIBUTION

After Lenin's demise, Stalin, as his able disciple and continuator, being at the helm of affairs in the Soviet Union, steadfastly upheld and pursued the Leninist principles against deviations of all sorts through intense ideological struggles. It was under his leadership that the Soviet Union was transformed, in less than two decades and amidst the extremely difficult situation of attacks and encirclement by hostile imperialist-capitalist powers, from a backward to a modern, industrialised socialist country through the revolutionary fervour and enthusiasm generated by the November Revolution which actuated tens of millions of workers and peasants to create history — achievements unprecedented in the annals of mankind. In the process, Stalin emerged as the leader of the world proletariat. He elaborated and

further developed the Leninist principles of self-determination of nations and put these into practice to achieve unity of the various disparate nationalities and ethnic groups of erstwhile Tsarist Russia, who had earlier been subjected to autocratic repression, on the basis of equal right, to weld together the happy family of the Soviet nation. It was under his leadership again that the Soviet people stood up like one man, fought with exemplary heroism and valour and dealt a crushing blow smashing up the Hitlerite war machine under the impact of which the advanced West European imperialist-capitalist countries had been reeling, thus freeing the humanity from the scourge of fascism — again achievements unprecedented in the annals of mankind. It was under Stalin's leadership that the Soviet state and the people restored the war-ravaged economy within the short span of seven years and the Soviet Union went from strength to strength to be on a par with the doyen of the imperialist countries, the USA, both industrially and militarily. The East European countries, liberated by the victorious Soviet army, took to the path of socialism. The Chinese revolution under the able stewardship of Mao Zedong, blazed a new trail of glory. At one stroke, backward China stricken by famines, abject poverty and squalor came out of mediaeval darkness into the arena of modern world — a vigorous great nation vibrant with new hopes and aspirations, building up socialism. The wave of revolution swept across the globe, from Cuba to Vietnam. The national liberation movements, greatly inspired and influenced by Marxism-Leninism and the socialist ideal, got a tremendous boost and imperialism had to retreat from many a country in Asia, Africa, Latin America, including our country. To the people of the world, the Soviet Union became a citadel of freedom, liberty and peace. The Third Communist International founded by Lenin was instrumental in spreading communist movement from country to country under Stalin's guidance.

Stalin conducted persistent and intense ideological struggle against social-democratism. Lenin had called the social democrats agents of the bourgeoisie within working class movement. Stalin showed by detailed analysis that social democracy is the compromising force between labour and capital and so it is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to social-democratism first, and social-democratism is but a variant of revisionism. It was Stalin who elaborated and correctly explained the different aspects of Leninism and it is to him that we are indebted for the correct and comprehensive understanding of Marxism-Leninism.

### NEO-REVISIONIST ASCENDANCY

After the demise of Stalin, the neo-revisionist clique headed by Khrushchev succeeded in usurping the power of the party and the state of the Soviet Union. In power, they immediately started violating and working against the fundamental Leninist principles and teachings

Khrushchev's starting moves caught the world communist movement unawares and few could detect his ulterior motive. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our leader, teacher and guide, understood the crux of the matter and sounded clear caution at that very time in the late Fifties that Khrushchev's policies, if continued unchecked, would open the floodgates of revisionism; he cautioned that in the name of fighting the so-called Stalin cult, Khrushchev actually sought to

destroy the influence and authority of Stalin, his real motive in trying to black out Stalin was to uncrown Lenin, that is, to undermine the socialist system itself; by attacking Stalin, he was hitting at Lenin himself, for it was not possible to attack Lenin without hitting out at Stalin who represented the best personification of the Leninist policies.

The caution went unheeded. After about thirty years of revisionist practice from Khrushchev to Gorbachev, the neo-revisionists in collusion with world imperialism-capitalism have succeeded in sliding back the Soviet Union and the East European people's democracies to capitalism.

### LOW LEVEL OF IDEOLOGICAL-CULTURAL CONSCIOUSNESS ROOT CAUSE OF PRESENT SETBACK

The inadequate level of ideological-cultural consciousness among the people of the erstwhile socialist countries provided the social basis on which neo-revisionism thrived and worked for restoration of capitalism. Continual struggle to uplift the ideological-cultural standard within the party and among the masses is of vital importance in maintaining good health of the communist movement. For long, Lenin had been worried at the prevailing inadequate level of consciousness in the movement. Many years before the November Revolution, he had expressed concern in his *What Is To Be Done?* that the wide spread of Marxism had been accompanied by a certain lowering of the theoretical level and had given a call for all-round ideological-political struggle under the leadership of the party. Even with the November Revolution victorious, Lenin's revolutionary genius clearly comprehended the fundamental problem that unless the masses could be freed from the thinking, culture and habits of the old society that persist for long even after revolution through intense educational programme and ideological struggle, proletarian culture and ethics could not make headway through socialist construction and economic advance only and the danger of revisionism, and even of restoration of capitalism, would remain. In *Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder*, Lenin cautioned: "The abolition of classes means not only driving out the landlords and capitalists — that we accomplished with comparative ease — it also means abolishing the small commodity producers, and they cannot be driven out, or crushed; we must live in harmony with them; they can (and must) be remoulded and re-educated only by very prolonged, slow, cautious organizational work. ... The force of habit of millions is a terrible force. Without an iron party tempered in the struggle, without a party enjoying the confidence of all that is honest in the given class, without a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, it is impossible to conduct such a struggle successfully. It is a thousand times easier to vanquish the centralized big bourgeoisie than to 'vanquish' the millions and millions of small owners; yet they, by their ordinary, everyday, imperceptible, elusive, demoralizing activity, achieve the very results which the bourgeoisie need and which tend to restore the bourgeoisie. ... the bourgeois atmosphere, proprietary habits and petty-bourgeois traditions will hamper proletarian work ... inevitably in every field of social activity, in all cultural and political spheres without exception. And the attempt to brush aside, to fence oneself off from one of the 'unpleasant' problems or difficulties in one sphere of activity

is a profound mistake, which will later most certainly have to be paid for”.

Later on, in his last writings penned by surmounting the obstacle of rapidly failing health, we find Lenin returning again and again to this theme, cogitating as to how to combat effectively the thinking, culture and habits of the old society persisting among the masses and imbue them with socialist, proletarian culture and ethics. In his *On Co-operation*, written about the peasants' co-operative movement launched by the Party, Lenin said just one year before his death: “Strictly speaking, there is ‘only’ one more thing we have to do, and that is, to make our people so ‘civilized’ as to understand all the advantages of having them all take part in the work of the cooperatives, and to organize this participation. ... But to achieve this ‘only’, a complete revolution is needed; the entire people must go through a whole period of cultural development. ... formerly we placed, and had to place, the main weight of emphasis on the political struggle, on revolution, on winning power, etc. Now the weight of emphasis is changing and is being shifted to peaceful, organizational, cultural work. ... And the economic object of this educational work among the peasants is to organize them in cooperative societies. ... But the organization of the entire peasantry in cooperative societies presupposes such a standard of culture among the peasants (precisely among the peasants as the overwhelming mass) that this cannot be achieved without a complete cultural revolution.

But regrettably, side by side with its achievements and enormous expansion, inadequacies and shortcomings started creeping into the world communist movement since the Second World War. These made for a low level of ideological consciousness and the thought-process tended to become mechanical rather than dialectical. Naturally, the sense of discipline too became mechanical and not dialectical. With discipline enforced from top, the tendency of blind allegiance grew – both in the inter-party and the intra-party spheres. In the Soviet Union, the ideological-cultural standard of the masses, instead of being continually advanced through painstaking struggle fighting and rooting out the thinking, ideas, habits and culture which had persisted as hangovers from the old society, started coming down because of neglect of this cardinal task, while material advancement proceeded ahead. In this context we are to remember the difficult situation created by the capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union with the ever-present threat of imperialist attack and the fact that over two crore of Soviet people perished in the Great Patriotic War against Hitlerite Germany, among them a multitude of leading cadres of the Party at all levels who had been in the forefront as the carriers of socialist ideology and culture.

Stalin was aware of the problem and the growing menace it represented. In the Report to the 19th Congress of the CPSU (B) held in 1952 prepared under Stalin's guidance we find the openly expressed concern of the Party leadership at the lowering of ideological-cultural standard within the Party itself, not to speak of the people at large. Stalin had formulated the countermeasures but he could not implement these as his demise, coming within a few months, caused a break. Seizing this opportunity, neo-revisionism raised its head. The low level of ideological-cultural consciousness strengthened the persisting bourgeois thinking, habits and culture and provided the social basis for outbreak of neo-

revisionism. The process went on for about thirty years from Khrushchev to Brezhnev and so on, to culminate in the total switch-over to capitalism by Gorbachev through his counterrevolutionary schemes of Glasnost and Perestroika and the dismemberment of the Soviet Union itself.

Present manifestations of economic destitution, ideological vacuum and moral degeneration in the states of the erstwhile Soviet Union are not the outcome of socialism as the bourgeois scribes and economists would have us believe, but merely the first signs of “advancement” along the capitalist path – a foretaste of evils like ever-increasing unemployment, spiralling inflation, spurt of crimes and utter moral-ethical-cultural degeneration that plague even the advanced imperialist-capitalist countries including the USA.

### BASE AND SUPERSTRUCTURE

How is it that shortcomings and backwardness in the superstructure could exert such a strong retrograde influence on the economic base so that this base itself moved back towards capitalism in the Soviet Union and East European states? Does not Marxism teach us that the economic base is prior and that once this base changes, the superstructure too changes to suit?

Such a conception does not reflect correct understanding of Marxism. Marxism-Leninism is a guide to action in the hands of the working class to accelerate the historically determined concrete process of social development. It is not that there can never be any slowing down or even temporary reversal of this process under any circumstances. The original propounders of Marxism certainly did not think like this. In the last writings of Engels, especially in his letters, he analysed to point out that a misconception had grown that he and Marx ruled out the possibility of the superstructure affecting the base; the misconception arose because throughout their lives they had to struggle hard to establish the materialist philosophy in opposition to idealist philosophies which held that thoughts and ideas were supreme and the reality did not count, and in so doing they had to lay utmost stress in their writings on the prior, determinant character of the material world so that a casual perusal of these could give an impression that the realm of thoughts and ideas had no influence on the material base; but although the economic base is generally the main determinant, the superstructure also influences the base and even acts on it to bring about changes in it at times.

Lenin had a profound and correct dialectical conception of this or else he would not have cautioned that if the educational-cultural work among the masses is neglected, that may generate a slide-back to capitalism

When in the Sixties the deep-rooted thinking, habits and culture of the old society in China not only persisted but was engendering growth of selfish individualism detrimental to the socialist system that threatened to engulf the Party and the people and provided a fillip to revisionism, the great leader of the proletariat Mao Zedong unleashed and conducted the mighty, countrywide Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution as the magnificent remedial measure.

Over two decades back, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, analysing on different occasions the phenomenon of growing tendency of revisionism in the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, China etc., showed that the concept that once the economic base is changed, it automatically changes

the superstructure to conform with it – is a mechanical and not dialectical understanding, is non-Marxist and influenced by economic determinism; base and superstructure act upon each other interdialectically; if the thoughts, habits and culture of the old society persist in the superstructure of a socialist country and are not eradicated by continual ideological-cultural movement this kind of superstructure is bound to act adversely on the socialist economic base, corrode it and eventually lead to the restoration of capitalism in the economic base as well.

### REAL CHARACTER OF BOURGEOIS FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY

Bourgeois Press and other media are spreading confusion by propagating that since bourgeois democracy offers a multi-party system, it is democratic whereas the absence of such a system under socialism means negation of democracy. Such assertion is deceptively confusing but found to lack substance on analysis. What is the concrete experience?

Even in its purest, best form, bourgeois democracy stands on the basis of wage slavery of working class with the right to amass private property by the bourgeoisie through exploitation of workers sanctified by law. For the bulk of the people, the exploited millions, this democracy is just formal and not real. Whenever they want to register their right to dissent with the basic and inherent injustice and exploitation of the system on a serious scale, the whole coercive state machinery of the bourgeoisie is let loose upon them to drown their right to dissent in blood. In the imperialist-capitalist countries, not only the advanced ones like the USA but even in relatively backward countries like, say, India, the only political freedom the people enjoy, their only right to dissent in practice, is the right to choose between candidates of this or that bourgeois or social democratic party in periodic elections – all such parties being political agents of the ruling capitalist class; the real power is wielded from behind the multi-party political facade by a coterie representing the industrial-bureaucratic-military complex which projects the “image” of or manufactures “wave” of mass support behind its chosen party or combination through orchestrated campaign by the media to make credible in public eyes the pre-determined election results obtained through deception and use of money and muscle power or, as we have experienced in this country, even through all-out centralized administrative rigging of the election; from behind the mask of democracy peeps fascism, the worst enemy of civilisation, with its dual character of deception and repression. Such is the true character of bourgeois democracy despite the high praise bandied about it.

State is the instrument of coercion in the hands of one class against another. In a bourgeois state the democracy and freedom are for the minority exploiters while the bulk of the people are exploited and oppressed. In a socialist state, the democracy is for the vast majority who have been freed from exploitation while the state power is consciously directed by the working class through their vanguard, the Party, against the erstwhile ruling exploiters and the capitalist-roaders for suppressing their counterrevolutionary activity. Elaborating, developing and enriching the Leninist concept of withering away of state, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has shown that the very fact that state exists means that there is

coercion. And so, even under socialism, there is coercion by the state, albeit against the minority erstwhile exploiters. Therefore, there cannot be freedom for all even in a socialist state. This curtailment of freedom may tend to generate disaffection and dissent which may assume intense form at times, a contradiction between individual interest and social interest. This contradiction can be resolved only by identification of individual interest with the social interest, by the merger of the former into the latter brought about through conscious, intense and continual ideological-cultural struggle along with creating material plenty through socialist construction. Only then the people, freed from private property mental complex, can taste total liberation from all sorts of exploitation and oppression – real freedom of individual, emancipation. The state as the instrument of coercion becomes obsolete, an useless appendage, and withers away.

So, it should be clearly understood that individual freedom and liberty in the true sense are unattainable in a class-divided society.

Those who really aspire for these should not be confused by bourgeois propaganda about freedom and liberty but work steadfastly for transition to Communism through the dictatorship of the proletariat to do away with the class cleavage of society only after which can true freedom and liberty blossom.

### MARXISM-LENINISM IS INVINCIBLE

Once the cause of the present setback in the movement is clearly understood and the remedy grasped scientifically, there remains no reason for despondency. Marxism did not arise in society as a brainwave of the genius Marx but because the objective conditions created by the then philosophical and scientific development cried out for a scientific philosophy to understand the world and the historical process and then to change the society for the better on its basis and Marx was the genius who personified this social urge and gave it the best concrete expression. Study of Lenin's life and struggles shows that the movement led by him came out victorious against heavy odds not just because he was a genius but because his genius lay in correctly understanding the unfolding process of history through Marxism, dialectical and historical materialism and in conducting struggle throughout his life, through the twists and turns, ups and downs, against the adversity on the basis of correct, scientific analyses of the situations. Nothing arises in history and society that is God-ordained or fortuitous. Every effect has a definite cause. If tens of millions of people had marched under the noble banner of Communism with their revolutionary fervour sweeping across the globe as they did, it was not accidental but they represented a great historical force in consonance with historical need, with the concrete historical process. Just as correct application of a philosophy or theory begets success, inadequacies and mistakes have to be paid for with reversals and setbacks but these can be remedied again by persistent struggle on the basis of correct analysis and methodology, with appropriate lessons taken from the past mistakes. In the present historical period of transition from capitalism to

Communism, temporary setbacks are liable to occur but these are sure to be offset before long because the historical process is bound to reassert itself, as capitalism is all the time working at digging its own grave, objectively strengthening the historical process of transition from capitalism to Communism. The task of all of us in quest of truth and emancipation is to conduct struggle with correct method to accelerate it. Since its very birth, our party, the SUCI, led by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, noted with concern the growing tendency of discarding the dialectical principle in the matter of internal organization of various working class parties of the world and also in the sphere of relationship between the fraternal parties so that the parties moved with a mechanical sense of enforced discipline and not dialectically, and sounded caution about the dangerous outcome if this process continued. Comrade Ghosh has concretised, elaborated, developed and enriched many a Marxist-Leninist concept and raised the understanding of Marxism-Leninism to a new height. Comrade Ghosh has shown that the only way to ensure uninterrupted growth of theoretical, ideological and cultural consciousness is to unleash and conduct incessantly a two-fold struggle by all – from the leaders to the rank and file members of the party. By this two-fold struggle he meant, first of all, a struggle within our own self covering all aspects of life to change our outlook, tastes, habits and culture in order to acquire higher communist character and elevate our level of consciousness and, secondly, to involve all in class and mass struggles conducive to the revolutionary movement for emancipation of the people in a way which would help further steeling of our character in a new mould tested and tempered in the heat and fire of mass struggle.

The need of the hour is for genuine communist and workers' parties of all countries to close up their ranks and work for forming a new Communist International. But to achieve this, the first step is to organize a forum on the basis of a minimum agreed common programme against imperialism – US imperialism in particular— against neo-colonial attacks and imperialist war, against the impending danger of fascism, the arch enemy of mankind and civilization, against revisionism in general and the counterrevolutionary designs of Glasnost and Perestroika in particular, for cementing the unity of the fraternal parties in common struggle following the principle of unity-struggle-unity and for upholding proletarian internationalism and the noble banner of Communism – continually striving unitedly for concretising and developing Marxism-Leninism as a living science in response to newer and newer developments, problems and challenges along with building up the working class movements.

Capitalism cannot be the last word in the onward march of history. Such a concept is unhistorical and unscientific. Marx in his time showed by profound analyses that capitalism cannot solve the irreconcilable contradictions that it generates and that it would be historically replaced by Communism, civilization of a higher order. Capitalism could not solve the problems of the people in Lenin's time. In our time, the ugly

face of capitalism is seen in the soaring unemployment, sky-rocketing inflation, poverty, destitution and all-round moral-ethical-cultural degradation in the capitalist countries.

The muchvaunted technological revolution of capitalism with the computers and robots has not been able to disprove Marx's epoch-making discovery of the law of surplus value which still provides the fundamental basis of exploitation inherent in capitalism and consequently has not been able to even mitigate exploitation and the glaring social disparity, nor arrest the decadence and moral-ethical-cultural degeneration in the capitalist world. During the hundred years since Marx's time, capitalism has not been able to hold up before the humanity any noble philosophy or ideology that can generate hope and show the path in onward progress of civilization.

Socialism in the Soviet Union and East Europe did not suffer reverse because of the alleged superiority of the capitalist system but because of its internal weaknesses. What could not be achieved by concerted foreign imperialist military intervention nor the fascist military might, was brought about by attacks from within. So, the reverse can be remedied through giving a crushing defeat to revisionism to restore and then augment the internal strength of the movement. In this context, the stress laid by Stalin on fighting out social democracy assumes profound importance for revisionism springs out of social democratism.

Capitalism is philosophically, economically and historically bankrupt, a spent force. Let us study and restudy the lives, struggles and teachings of great revolutionaries like Lenin to imbibe courage, confidence and correct understanding and march forward under the noble banner of Communism, undeterred by temporary setbacks and reverses, for Great Lenin himself taught us that the bourgeoisie, in its bid to contain the fire of proletarian revolution may cause temporary reverses, that "It is possible that in certain instances, in certain countries, and for certain brief periods, it will succeed in this. We must reckon with such a possibility, and there will be absolutely nothing terrible for us if it does succeed. Communism 'springs' from positively every sphere of public life: its shoots are to be seen literally everywhere. ... Life will assert itself." and that "The world revolution is not far off, but it cannot develop according to a special timetable. ... We know however that although the imperialists cannot contain the world revolution, certain countries are likely to be defeated, and heavier losses are possible. ... There is no cause ... whatsoever for despair or pessimism ... even if they can crush one country, they can never crush the world proletarian revolution, they will only add more fuel to the flames that will consume them all".

Red Salute Comrade Lenin !  
Long Live Marxism-Leninism !  
Long Live Proletarian Internationalism !  
Long Live Proletarian Revolution !

### EDITOR-IN-CHIEF : COMRADE NIHAR MUKHERJEE

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