

LONG LIVE COMRADE STALIN

“Generations of Bolsheviks would be accused of crimes they never committed. But the gusty winds of history will inevitably sweep away the dead leaves of slander from our graves, unveiling the truth.”

— Stalin

**Proletarian
Era**

50th Death Anniversary Special Issue

Quoted in 'Hammer and sickle', Feb-March 1996 published from Crashmoyark.

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

REMEMBERING STALIN

Nihar Mukherjee

The 50th anniversary of Comrade Stalin's demise falls on 5th March of this year. With millions of communists and progressive people all over the world, our party remembers Stalin with boundless love and esteem. Stalin's achievements as a great leader of the world proletariat are too many. I shall confine this discussion around his most remarkable ones only.

Stalin's place in history is relevant even today and it is impossible for his enemies also to deny it. Relentless anti-Stalin imperialist propaganda itself proves that it has not yet succeeded to completely wipe out Stalin's memory. Undermining Stalin has been an integral part of imperialist offensive but it gained momentum particularly since the 20th Congress of the CPSU of 1956 when Khrushchovite revisionism first launched anti-Stalin campaign. For the common people, uninformed, it was really impossible to separate the truth from the lies. Even communists everywhere were not unanimous in their assessment of Stalin's contributions. This confusion, differences of opinion and division within the communists proved an advantage to imperialism. Failure to take into due account the advance of humanity at a given period of history and the role played in it by the individual who leads it always retards further progress and creates setbacks. This has happened, and we are having to pay its price. The clarity of idea and unity of action of the communist movement have been undermined. The socialist camp has collapsed. Imperialism is strangling the world in its tentacles of globalization and war. The so-called Stalin question therefore concerns not only the communists. It concerns all anti-imperialist, anti-war and progressive individuals as also all toiling masses of the world. Observing the 50th anniversary of Stalin's demise demands that we communists set right the widespread false perceptions about Stalin — by first of all getting rid of these ourselves. The critical analysis and exposure of the revisionist stand of the CPSU leadership, taken at the 20th Congress in 1956, made by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the founder and most beloved leader and teacher of our party, will be of great value in this endeavour.

Stalin's place in history

A good deal of the progressive and revolutionary traditions, fervour and morale that inspire present day anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggles are Stalin's heritage. To understand it, one will have to know Stalin's role in history and especially in the post-Second World War history. But few people are conscious of it today. How many people are aware that the greatest minds of that time like Romain Rolland and George Bernard Shaw, among others, considered Stalin as the greatest living person! Stalin was a giant communist leader. In the past one century and a half the world-historic battles in philosophy, politics and culture have been waged between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the two main classes of our time. The communists are the vanguard of the proletariat.

Accepting or not accepting the communist ideology should not therefore be seen as a mere personal choice. In real life, one cannot help taking sides just as one cannot take oneself out of the social and historical scene. If one does not want to unwittingly serve the handful of profit-greedy capitalists, one should know and form a definite idea about communism. He should equally unbiasedly re-examine the Stalin question also.

After Lenin's demise, the tasks of building the socialist economy of Soviet Union, directing the Soviet state apparatus, ensuring all-out material and cultural development of the Soviet people, guiding the Soviet Communist party and the world communist movement fell on Stalin. In about 6 years, Stalin transformed NEP Russia into a giant socialist power. New Russia was distinguished by the new masses of educated, cultured, healthy and happy Soviet citizens. The fascist war revealed the high socialist morale of this new people. Soviet Red Army led by Stalin resisted and destroyed the Nazi aggressors which brought the Second World War to a close. Humanity was saved.

Victorious Red Army dispersed Nazi occupation forces from the countries of East Europe, their peoples brought down the puppet governments and established the people's democracies. The war had exhausted the imperialist powers, save America. Now they lost a great part of Europe as it became People's Democratic and afterwards socialist. The heroic battle, sacrifice and victory of the Soviet people and the Red Army encouraged working class movements everywhere, particularly in imperialist Europe. The example of it is the role of the working class in the French resistance

=====

**Accepting or not accepting
the communist ideology
should not therefore be seen
as a mere personal choice.
In real life, one cannot take
oneself out of the social and
historical scene.**

=====

struggle. The new wave accelerated anti-imperialist national liberation struggles in Asia and Africa as well. This rapidly changing global situation compelled the imperialists to finally wind up their colonial empire by transferring power to the native bourgeoisie. This is how India also became independent. The face of the earth was changed. Had the war ended in the victory of any imperialist power or bloc — instead of in Soviet victory — this would not have happened. But the Soviet victory became possible, in its turn, because the infant Soviet state had turned into a mighty socialist power under Stalin.

Thus, Stalin played an outstanding role in changing the world of his time. Churchill's grudging admiration is notable when he said: Stalin made us, whom he called imperialists, fight against one another. Now recall Churchill's words that no one had been a more persistent opponent of communism than he had been for 25 unbroken years! When such an enemy admits Stalin's superior political wisdom, what better tribute can there be?

Revisionist attack on the plea of fighting the cult of individual

But in 1956, at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, Stalin was depicted by Khrushchov as an "egotist", "power hungry" and "blood thirsty" person who encouraged his own "cult", exterminated "opposition inside the party" and was "disloyal" to the party and to Lenin. The Khrushchovite revisionist attempt of blacking out Stalin became more comprehensive and naked at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU in 1961.

All this began in the name of fighting the 'cult of the individual', a non-Marxist cult grown around Stalin since long which our party had been pointing out since its foundation itself in 1948. "So, when the slogan against the cult of individual has been raised at the 20th Congress" — Comrade Shibdas Ghosh explained in a speech on May 20, 1956 — "we have particular reasons to be glad ... But, we are constrained to say at the same time that we are unable to appreciate the very method that has been adopted ... In the name of fighting out the cult of individual, we are afraid, they are in reality directing their fight against an individual and not the cult itself." "Khrushchov has deliberately attempted to undermine the role of Comrade Stalin." (*SW, Vol. I, p 15-19*) — Comrade Ghosh said.

Subsequently, the Party of Labour of Albania and later the Communist Party of China also came out to defend Stalin. However, inspite of the Great Debate between the CPSU and the CPC, and participation in it by many other communist parties, the root cause of the cult of individual was not categorically pointed out in the analysis of any of them. So, the 20th Congress caused great confusion among the communists.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh alone explained that, "Collective knowledge of all the members is the collective leadership of the party. And development of this collective knowledge is mainly determined by the level of consciousness of the members and workers of the party. So, collective knowledge can grow and develop only when on the basis of this higher level of consciousness, there is conflict or interaction of ideas between the leaders and the workers in a party. So, democratic centralism does not come into being merely through adoption of a model democratic constitution. The real foundation of democratic centralism is the high ideological-cultural standard of the comrades. Because, otherwise, what is sure to develop is blind allegiance either to an individual or likewise to a

committee. So, just as blindly following a particular leader is the other name of the cult of individual, so also blindly following the Central Committee, ... is nothing but another form of expression of the same cult of individual". He concluded by saying that "...Taking into account all these points, we are of the firm opinion that these ... ought to have been discussed in the 20th Congress, which was not done. So, ... there seems to have been no break in the old tradition of mechanical process of thinking. The manner in which almost all the communist parties are accepting the decisions of the 20th Congress unquestioningly proves our above apprehension as correct." (*SW Vol. 1, p16-17*)

Stalin — identified with socialism

After Marx, Engels and Lenin, it was Stalin's unique deeds which had raised the prestige of the communist ideology to an unprecedented height. Just as Marx and Engels are the undisputed founders of the communist movement and Lenin is the leader of world's first successful proletarian revolution as well as founder of world's first proletarian state, so also Stalin remains and will ever remain the great architect who built world's first socialist society following Lenin's teachings. Moreover, by successfully building world's first socialist society, Stalin inspired progressive and revolutionary movements of the proletariat and the other toiling masses which influenced world politics itself. Refusal to acknowledge Stalin's role amounts to mutilating the history of the communist movement and therefore, blunting the communist consciousness. The attack upon Stalin's authority did exactly this and lowered the prestige of the communist cause in the public eye. Ideological clarity of the communists has not yet been restored from the revisionist, Trotskyite and left adventurist influences which gained ground in the aftermath of the 20th Congress and de-Stalinization. Those who are conversant with the communist movements of different countries today will agree with me that their ideological and theoretical standard, compared to that of the time of Lenin and Stalin, is considerably low even when they are waging heroic struggles against capitalism and imperialism. On the other hand, we find that after revisionist Khrushchov and Brezhnev, later day revisionists like Deng Xiao-ping and Gorbachov also made their appearance and confused the vast majority of communists and left-minded and progressive intellectuals. It shows that grave confusions are still swaying the communists and they are still groping under revisionist ideological influence. A sad but bitter reality ! Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had anticipated already in 1961 that, "... like his predecessors Marx, Engels and Lenin, Stalin also is an authority on Marxism-Leninism. To black out Stalin would have the inevitable result of disowning his authority and consequently of rejecting his interpretation of Leninism... It would mean invitation to all sorts of counter revolutionary ideas to pass off as Marxism-Leninism and the ideological foundation of the communist movement would suffer a set-back." (*Ibid, p-85-86*) Clear enough.

De-Stalinization served the revisionists, from Khrushchov to Deng Xiao-ping to Gorbachov to bring about gradual weakening and the final dismantling of the socialist camp. It is easy to see why Stalin is still being abused so filthily. Stalin

is identified with socialism and communism.

Root cause of revisionist deviation

The question is that how could revisionism find a way into the party of Lenin and Stalin. A few words on it are necessary. Revisionism is not a new malady. Since the days of Marx and Engels, vulgarization of Marxism, or revisionism, had repeatedly disrupted working class movement wearing the 'socialist' or 'communist' mask. Revisionism is nothing but bourgeois liberal or social-democratic vulgarization of Marxism. While talking in abstract and vague terms about class struggle and revolution, revisionism distorts the most revolutionary kernel of Marxism — the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is why, all communist authorities fought against revisionists more fiercely than they fought against the open advocates of the bourgeoisie. Marx and Engels combated Proudhon, Lassalle and Duhring. Lenin exposed Bernstein, Axelrod, Kautsky and the Mensheviks. Only thus could he draw the Russian proletariat to the side of Bolshevism, and ideologically steel the Bolsheviks. Our comrades also need to make a real study of the history of the struggle of revolutionary Marxism against revisionism for grasping more concretely the contributions made by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in this regard. After Lenin, Stalin also continued this struggle against the Trotskyites, Bukharinites and Titoites. But Khrushchovite revisionism appeared after Stalin's demise and Deng Xiao-ping's revisionist line triumphed in China after the demise of Mao Zedong. So, where lies the strength of revisionism which rises over and over again, destroys mighty parties like the CPSU and the CPC and even socialist societies ? This question has been answered by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. It has been further clarified by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in the light of the Soviet and Chinese experience.

It may sound astonishing, but it is a profound truth, the most important fact, that the soil for revisionist deviation exists in the economic base and especially in the ideological superstructure of socialist society itself! The social root of revisionism existing in capitalist society, can be easily understood. The point is that, do conditions of survival of the elements of capitalist economy and bourgeois ideology completely disappear in socialist society? That is the widespread notion, but, not a historic or a scientific one. Socialist society is not classless society. It is a society in transition from capitalist society to classless communist society. Socialism does away with exploitation of man by man, no doubt, and thereby ensures continuous material and cultural development of all. But yet, elements of capitalist "property relations" and remnants of bourgeois class-thinking and culture continue to exist tenaciously, as an alloy, so to say, in the framework of socialist society.

Germens of revisionist deviation lie dormant in these 'elements' and 'remnants'. Even when exploitation of man by man disappears, and the economic differentiation almost disappears between different social strata, so that antagonistic classes may be said to have disappeared in the 'economic' sense of the term, the antagonistic class-thinking and culture etc. do not disappear automatically with it. And the danger of revisionism remains precisely there. The class struggle in a socialist society is thus to

be fought out with particular intensity in the domain of ideas. This struggle becomes much more fierce, subtle and tenacious than was the struggle for capture of power. Because, firstly, the enemy cannot be seen but exists in the old culture and mental make-up still existing in people and even in the communists! Stalin spoke of capitalism remaining in the "private property mentality" and "private property habits" of people in Soviet society. Secondly, complacency born of the economic well-being resulting from the success of socialism tends to dull the consciousness of the communists themselves. So, an ideological battle should be aimed at

Like his predecessors Marx,
Engels and Lenin, Stalin
also is an authority on
Marxism-Leninism. To black
out Stalin would have the
inevitable result of
disowning his authority.

overcoming the remnants of bourgeois influence by raising the level of proletarian consciousness and culture not only in society at large, but all the more so within the proletarian party. If this vigilant struggle slackens for whichever reason, remnants of bourgeois ideology gather strength and revisionist degeneration becomes unavoidable.

So, the point is not that revisionism appeared in the party of Lenin and Stalin, not even that it finally usurped the leadership of the party. But the point is that it did so without confronting any serious resistance. How could it happen? After the revolution also, Lenin had to fiercely combat the left deviation of Trotsky and the right deviation of Bukharin, when both were prominent Central Committee members of the party. But 'Left' and 'Right' deviations are nothing but the two poles of one and the same bourgeois liberal distortion of Marxism. It shows that bourgeois liberal tendency had tried to raise its head within the Soviet party during Lenin's own lifetime after the revolution. It was nothing unnatural and Lenin was fully aware of the danger latent in it. In fact, bourgeois liberalism had strong influence on the Russian working class movement since its very beginning. The Economists, Mensheviks, Socialist Revolutionaries were its representatives in Russian politics. Trotskyism was another variant of it. Bolshevism grew only by freeing the Russian proletariat from this influence. But remnants of this tendency still existed both inside the socialist society and the party. This was the source of possible new deviations. But due to the vigorous ideological struggle conducted by Lenin and after him by Stalin with the entire party involved in this struggle, this reformist tendency, although it existed in varying forms for a long time, could not influence the party as a whole nor its leadership — until after Stalin's demise.

Mechanical process of thinking

Does it mean that just upon Stalin's demise, revolutionary vigilance and level of

consciousness of the entire party fell all of a sudden? Gradual decline of the communist ideological standard had started since long, and not only within the CPSU. The proof of it is the mechanical attitude of blind and uncritical allegiance to the CPSU shown by most communist parties during Stalin's time. The exaggeration of communists' sense of loyalty to Stalin to the extent of his eulogy is another evidence. In 1948 itself, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh pointed out that, "...the leadership of the world communist camp is, to a very large extent, influenced by mechanical process of thinking" (*SW, Vol.1, p.2*) The lowering of ideological level

The same mechanical thought process and blind sense of loyalty to leader which earlier prompted most communists to extoll Stalin to the skies now prejudiced them against him.

of the communists had not escaped Stalin's notice either. It is clear from his Report to the Seventeenth Congress of the CPSU of 1934, which speaks about "serious and urgent problems of ideological-political work on which there is lack of clarity, confusion and even direct departure from Leninism in certain strata of the Party." (*CW, Vol.13, p.371*) Stalin initiated an ideological struggle to free the party from the shortcomings. But the war was nearing and hence, speedy building up of the economy and defense measures demanded greatest attention by the party. The war, continuing from 1941 to 1945, left the country in ruins. Reconstruction was completed in unbelievably short time. But not only a long time has elapsed since the 17th Congress, there was also a colossal loss of the best communists during this period. The Report to the Nineteenth Congress of 1952 makes clear that he was planning a comprehensive ideological struggle to raise the level of consciousness of the party. He passed away shortly afterwards. The absence of his powerful personality coupled with the insufficient level of ideological consciousness and the tendency of mechanically following the party and the leadership — completely alien to communist ethics which nevertheless grew considerably — helped the revisionists to usurp the leadership without hindrance and deceive most communists with anti-Stalin demagoguery. The same mechanical thought process and blind sense of loyalty to leader which earlier prompted most communists to extoll Stalin to the skies now prejudiced them against him.

In our country, the CPI, although it grew as a social democratic and not a genuine communist party, removed in hot haste Stalin's portrait, works and everything associated with his memory after the 20th Congress. The CPI(M) leaders 'rediscovered' Stalin eight years after, in 1964 — when they split from the parent CPI ! This new found 'loyalty' to Stalin concealed from their own rank-and-file and the people that from 1956 to 1964, when they were in the CPI,

they were also slandering Stalin and lauding Khrushchov. Why does the Indian capitalist media yet call the CPI(M) 'Stalinist' ? They do it for craftily serving capitalist interest by posing arch-revisionist CPI(M) as 'Stalinist' and thereby confusing the people and maligning communism.

But even experienced communist parties and their leaders who defended Stalin, in the main, also revised their study of Stalin and Stalin's theoretical works after the 20th Congress. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh observed in all these "... a very bad tendency of obeying a leader and teacher so long as any of his shortcomings is not noticed, but as soon as any shortcoming comes to light, he is denounced. In this tendency is inherent the idea that a leader is without shortcomings, a very dangerous idea that engenders blindness to the leaders and paves the way for the practice of the cult of individual." (*Ibid, p88*) Comrade Shibdas Ghosh made this observation in his brilliant work *On the steps taken by the CPSU against Stalin*, written after the Khrushchovite revisionists mounted, at the 22nd Congress of 1961, their drive of de-Stalinization. In this work, he made a comprehensive evaluation of Stalin's contributions. He dealt elaborately on the 'cult' also. He said, "In our view, mechanical understanding of the sense of authority coupled with the presence of the powerful personality of Stalin was responsible for the growth and development of the cult of individual in general and Stalin-cult in particular." (*SW, Vol. 1, p65*)

At the same time he cautioned that, "Let not the wrong practice of the past, i.e., the habit of unnecessary glorification ... of Stalin, push the communists now to the other extreme. ... The tendency to abjure the leading role of the leader and abhor the sense of authority, as distinct from authoritarianism, is bound to reduce the communist parties organizationally into social-democratic parties ..." (*Ibid, p67-69*) The truth of this analysis has been vindicated long ago.

Explaining further, he showed that "the danger of the cult lies not in offering praise to the leader, not even in the magnitude of the praise. Sense of authority even is not responsible for it. It is precisely the blind sense of authority, i.e., authoritarianism, the absence of dialectical relation between the leader ... and the rest of the collective whole, between the leadership as a whole and the rest of the party and the degeneration of democratic centralism into centralism based on formal democracy that create conditions favourable for the growth and development of the cult of individual." (*Ibid, p-69-70*)

The real source of the cult of individual

Communist consciousness does not remain at one level for all time. It has to be continuously raised with conscious efforts to keep pace with the ever changing times and the newer problems of life as well as the ever widening human knowledge in all domains like philosophy, arts and the sciences. If this struggle ceases for whichever reason, then despite the scientific content and character of communist philosophy, communists become unwitting victims of mechanical process of thinking.

What is the harm of mechanical process of thinking? Its irreparable harm is that it obstructs a balanced appreciation and a correct conception of reality. This influences not only the outlook

and attitude of individual communists but in the long run also the Marxist-Leninist understanding, outlook and organizational life of the party. Paradoxically, indeed, it encourages in the party an atmosphere of unquestioning allegiance to leadership and blind adherence to Marxism-Leninism, which itself shuns all blind faith and develops through continuously overcoming blindness on all questions of life. This narrows the scope and dilutes the content of inner party democracy and facilitates the growth of bourgeois liberalism and individualism. This situation is bound to encourage inside the party the cult of the individual, especially around a leader who enjoys enormous prestige and loyalty. In such cases, expressions of quite justified respect and love also take on the form of unnecessary exaggerations and eulogies. This is how the atmosphere conducive to the cult of individual grows.

This cult grew to absurd proportions centring round Stalin, despite his bitter criticism against it, during the last part of his life. This is true. And this is yet another plea in the hands of the revisionists for slandering Stalin. But the fact remains that with all the force of his bitter sarcasm and withering criticism, Stalin could not eradicate it. Nor was it possible either, without reversing the process itself which gave birth to the cult. Without taking into account the concrete situation, the growth of mechanical thought process in the communist movement of his time cannot be attributed solely to Stalin. Such an approach smacks of the same mechanical way of thinking. And indeed, that is what had happened. Blind Stalin worship has been replaced by a still more blind hatred towards Stalin. Sustained anti-Stalin hate campaign of the past fifty years has now obscured the true image of the man.

Modest and sobre

The renowned bourgeois intellectual H. G. Wells, the same man who had complained that Stalin was "only playing the same old record" of socialism and was rebuffed on this account by George Bernard Shaw, says in his *Experiment in Autobiography* : "I have never met a man more candid, fair and honest, and to these qualities it is, and to nothing occult and sinister, that he owes his tremendous undisputed ascendancy in Russia. I had thought before I saw him that he might be where he was because men were afraid of him, what I realize was that he owed his position to the fact that no one is afraid of him and everybody trusts him."

Now to the observation made by Churchill about Stalin : "He is a man of inexhaustible courage and will-power, a man of direct and even blunt speech. Above all, he is a man with a saving sense of humour which is of high importance to all men and to all nations. Premier Stalin left upon me an impression of deep, cool wisdom and a complete absence of illusions of any kind." (*'Stalin' by J. T. Murphy*)

Stalin's modesty is seen particularly in his esteem for Lenin. He wrote to a comrade : "I object to your calling yourself 'a disciple of Lenin and Stalin'. I have no disciple. Call yourself a disciple of Lenin... But you have no grounds for calling yourself a disciple of a disciple of Lenin's. It is not true. It is out of place." (*CW, Vol.9,p-156*) In a letter to the Children's Publishing House, dated 16.2. 1938, Stalin said : "I am strongly opposed to the

publication of 'Stories About Stalin's Childhood'. The book is filled with a mass of factual distortions, untruths, exaggerations and undeserved encomia. The author has been misled by lovers of fairy tales — by liars (perhaps "honest liars") and timeservers. A pity for the author, but facts remain facts. But that is not the main thing. The main thing is that the book has the tendency to inculcate in the Soviet people (and people in general) the cult of the personality of chiefs and infallible heroes. That is dangerous and harmful. ... My advice is to burn the book." (CW Vol.2 p-34-35)

Singleness of purpose

The tales of Stalin's so-called "terror" have influenced many people and even many Left intellectuals despite their admiration for socialism. There has grown in them, willy nilly, a certain reservation against Stalin, if not against socialism. But this has made them uncertain and sceptic in their attitude towards socialism and communism. This is how reactionary influence worms its way into progressive minds also. They miss the point that the judgement of one's actions and character requires the examination of the concrete condition in which he or she existed as also the purpose behind his or her actions. In a class divided society, political terror also has either a revolutionary or a reactionary character. There has not been a single social revolution without the reactionary ruling class trying to impose its terror on society and the revolutionary class answering it with revolutionary terror in order to free society. Marx said long ago that "Force is the midwife of history." The 'literate' lackeys of imperialism know all about the 'terror' of Cromwell and of the French Revolution. They only forget this when it comes to the proletarian revolution and particularly — to Stalin's role as the architect of Soviet society! Marxists openly proclaim that they are against all capitalist and imperialist terror aimed at subjugating the toiling masses. They are for all revolutionary "terror" which culminates from and conduces to the revolutionary movement of the toiling people. Further, the use of revolutionary force is directed, always, including in the bourgeois revolutions, against a reactionary minority. But clever imperialist propaganda makes it appear as if communist's use of force — "terror" — is directed against the masses themselves! The revolutionary martyrs of the Indian freedom struggle like Kshudiram Bose, Bhagat Singh and Asfaqullah make us proud. But in the eyes of the British imperialist rulers a revolutionary was a "terrorist". But should we change our position for that and cease to respect these martyrs? Is not war an act of mass terror? But the foundation of the nation was laid in two such wars — the War of Independence and the Civil War. In the American Civil War, Abraham Lincoln led one group of American states against another and united the nation through much bloodshed. Stalin fought for a still greater cause. He was a "terror" only to the enemies of socialism.

Stalin was building a new civilization free from exploitation as unprecedented in written history, in Europe's most backward peasant country, encircled by the imperialist powers from all sides. In the circumstances, Stalin had to be and had the right to be exacting, unyielding, unflinching and firm. Without having these attributes of character and a singleness of

purpose Stalin could not have played the exceptional role which he played during the Civil War of 1918-20, when the infant Soviet Union was encircled by fourteen imperialist countries and invaded by the White Guard armies of old Tsarist generals and capitalists backed by the blockading imperialists — and thus save the Soviet state from imminent destruction. Voroshilov says: "In the period from 1918 to 1920 Comrade Stalin was probably the only person whom the Central Committee shifted about from front to front, selecting the most vulnerable spots, the places where the threat to the revolution was most imminent. Stalin was never to be found where things were comparatively quiet and going smoothly ... During endless nights, foregoing sleep, he organized things, took the leadership into his own firm hands, relentlessly broke down all obstruction — and the tide of affairs would turn, an improvement would set in." (Voroshilov : *Stalin and the Red Army*) When the all powerful Council of Defence was formed on November 30, 1918, with Lenin as Chairman, Stalin was appointed its Deputy Chairman. Stalin wrote in a letter to Lenin during the Civil War, "You may rest assured that we shall spare nobody, neither ourselves nor others, and shall deliver the grain in spite of everything." (CW Vol.4, p-120) The gain saved the citizens of Moscow who had been starving for nearly a month. Stalin's unshakable devotion to his duty earned him the name of Stalin — meaning 'the man of steel'.

Marshal Zhukov said that during the war, "Stalin wanted daily reports on the situations at the fronts. And one had to have the facts at one's finger tips to report to the Supreme Commander. One could not go to him with maps that had "white spots" on them, or report approximate, much less exaggerated, information. ...He saw them instantly" (Zhukov : *Reminiscences & Reflections, Vol.I, p-364-65*). "As a rule, he was business like and calm; everybody was permitted to state his opinion. ... He had the knack of listening to people attentively, but only if they spoke to the point, if they knew what they were saying ... He opened conferences without introductory words. He spoke quietly, freely, never departing from the substance of the matter".

Stalin was fully aware of the grave responsibilities upon his shoulder, and was single-minded, severe, if necessary, in their discharge. This severity is often misunderstood. And, another side of his is hardly ever noticed. Zhukov wrote about it, long after the 20th Congress, that, "I realized during the war that Stalin was not the kind of man who objected to sharp questions or to anyone arguing with him. If someone says the reverse, he is a liar." (*Ibid, p-364*)

Because of this firm will power together with an open mind, besides his other rare qualities — and not "egotism" — "Stalin produced a strong impression on whoever spoke with him. Free of affectations and mannerism, he won people's hearts by his simple ways. His uninhibited way of speaking, the ability to express himself clearly, his inborn analytical mind, his extensive knowledge and phenomenal memory, made even old hands and eminent people brace themselves and gather their wits when talking to him." (*Ibid, p-365*) Such a giant is being dwarfed with slanders!

How Stalin emerged as an outstanding historic figure can be best understood from Stalin's own words to Emil Ludwig that, "The task to which I have devoted my life is the elevation of a different class — the working class. That task is not the consolidation of some "national" state, but of a socialist state and that means an international state; and everything that strengthens that state helps to strengthen the entire international working class. If every step I take in my endeavour to elevate the working class and strengthen the socialist state of this class were not directed towards strengthening and improving the position of the working class, I

Without taking into account the concrete situation, the growth of mechanical thought process in the communist movement of his time cannot be attributed solely to Stalin.

should consider my life purposeless." (CW, Vol.13)

Lenin's worthy continuer

Stalin's entire life fully confirms what he expressed in these few words. That is why, his worst enemies and malicious opponents also could not point to a single incident in his long life, even incidents in which they condemned Stalin's role most vociferously, in which Stalin's action was influenced by personal motives or personal considerations of any sort. On the contrary, Stalin has often been blamed for having no personal feelings and emotion! Many anti-communist or non-committal bourgeois authors also had to admit this fact, which appeared to them as enigmatic, that Stalin seemed to have no personal life except his political life. Even revisionists found it impossible not to accept this fact. Khrushchov in his secret speech at the 20th Congress, was obliged to admit it in a nily and crafty manner when he said that, "The question is complicated by the fact that all this which we have just discussed was done during Stalin's life under his leadership and with his concurrence; here Stalin was convinced that this was necessary for the defence of the interest of the working classes against the plotting of enemies... he saw this from the position of the interest of the working class..." (Source : *The Stalin Question* — Banbehari Chakraborty)

If the memory of Stalin's noble character did not stand as an insurmountable mountain, beyond the reach of all slanders, Stalin's revisionist detractors would never have needed this cunning manouvre. I have mentioned Churchill's reluctant admission of Stalin's superiority. It can be clearly seen that not one single authentic representative of the different variants of reactionaries starting from imperialists, diehard anti-communists, liberal bourgeois scholars to downright revisionists could assail the moral authority and force of character of Stalin. It shows that Stalin indeed emerged as 'a worthy pupil of Lenin' and a noble-hearted revolutionary.

Beginning his underground revolutionary activity in 1898 in Tiflis, and then shifting to Baku in 1907-09, and subsequently “wondering from one prison to another”, he was transferred to St. Petersburg, in 1917 — coming into direct contact with Lenin for the first time. He was one of the five-member “military revolutionary committee” appointed by the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party for directly supervising the insurrection. In 1918, he became Deputy Chairman of the Council of Defence. From before 1917, Lenin considered Stalin as the most competent leader, next to him, on the complicated nationality question. On its correct solution

Stalin had not only already surrendered his personal interest to the interest of revolution and the party at the time of Lenin's demise but, had in fact, advanced to a great extent in the struggle for completely identifying his personal interest with the interest of the party also.

depended the very future of the Soviet Republic. Stalin was entrusted with the Commissariat of Nationalities and also that of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. Explaining the vesting of such great power and authority to Stalin, Lenin said in the 11th Congress of the Party, in 1922, that in order to settle the difficult national question, the party needed a man who should be competent to handle these problems and acceptable to representatives of all concerned nationalities. Lenin said he didn't think that one “could suggest any better candidate than Comrade Stalin”, just as, explaining Stalin's looking after the other Commissariat, he said that it “must have at its head a man who enjoys high prestige.” On Lenin's motion, Stalin was elected Secretary-General at a Central Committee Plenum in the same year. In 1924, Lenin passed away and the great responsibilities borne by him until then fell on Stalin.

Stalin — identified with revolution

I want to touch upon one aspect here, very briefly, since it directly points to Stalin's character and values, which are qualities without which intellectual and theoretical ability alone is not sufficient for becoming a revolutionary. About Trotsky, Lenin had observed a little before his demise that “he is personally perhaps the most capable man in the present Central Committee.” Yet, evidently, Lenin entrusted Stalin, not Trotsky, with the greatest responsibilities. Why? Because, in the conduction of their life struggle with the object of making their personal interest secondary to that of revolution and the party, not only Trotsky, but also the other prominent Central Committee members like Zinoviev, Kamenev and Bukharin fell far behind Stalin. All of these leaders, and particularly Trotsky and Bukharin, were

considered intellectually and theoretically more “accomplished”. But they could not rise above the influence of bourgeois individualistic outlook, ego and mode of existence. These were incompatible with the interest of revolution, socialism and party. It is important to remember that the ideas of bourgeois humanism had appeared in Russia in mid-nineteenth century itself and the bourgeois revolution had triumphed in the February of 1917. But the appearance of communist ideology in 1848 internationally, the beginning of proletarian revolutionary struggle in Russia in end-nineteenth century and the proletarian revolution in the November of 1917, before bourgeois rule could be consolidated — exhausted the revolutionary role of bourgeoisie in Russia. For the communists, leading communists particularly, of Russia, it became an indispensable task to make a complete break with bourgeois humanism and bourgeois individualistic way of life.

Let me mention the teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh here that, in view of the all-out crisis of the present day imperialist and capitalist countries, and in view of the fact that the appeal of bourgeois humanism has been completely exhausted today owing to this crisis, the old moral values and old standard of communist character and culture of surrendering one's personal interest to the interest of the party is no longer sufficient. The aim of the life-struggle of communists today, at least of the advanced section of communists, should be complete identification of their personal interest with that of the party. In this connection, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had observed that if, while conducting this struggle, influence of bourgeois individualism and ego continue to remain in one, in however subtle form may be, then it is bound to give birth to revisionism and opportunism some day. To return to the point of discussion, Stalin had not only already surrendered his personal interest to the interest of revolution and the party at the time of Lenin's demise but, had in fact, advanced to a great extent in the struggle for completely identifying his personal interest with the interest of the party also. Naturally, in the matter of acquiring the communist culture and safeguarding party interest, Stalin came most nearer to Lenin and the latter also entrusted him with the greatest responsibilities. As history has shown, Lenin's judgement was correct. Stalin, who accepted “the elevation of the working class” as his life's mission not only intellectually, but also morally and culturally and in his entire mode of existence, alone succeeded in correctly guiding the working class movement along the Leninist path. He alone succeeded in correctly understanding and interpreting Leninism. Those leaders who failed in their life-struggle to assimilate Marxism-Leninism in all aspects and fell victim to individualism, ego and factionalism, ultimately betrayed the revolution politically also.

Stalin's interpretation of Leninism is the only correct one

During the entire period of building the Soviet socialist society since Lenin's demise, as serious differences of opinion grew between Stalin on the one hand and Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev, Kamenev etc. on the other on questions concerning party, socialist economic construction, attitude to the peasantry and to the

bourgeoisie, the nationality question, etc., Stalin indicated the correct solution of these questions by interpreting and elaborating upon Lenin's teachings on these. In this way, Stalin indicated the new enrichments made by Lenin to the general treasury of Marxism. It was Stalin again who systematically coordinated these enrichments, gave them the name of Leninism and correctly described Leninism as “Marxism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution”. “To be more exact”, Stalin said, “Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general” and that of “the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular”. This precise definition, and its elaboration by Stalin on a number of major problems of socialist construction, party, world communist movement in general as also on certain questions of science and philosophy provided communist movement with the correct understanding of Leninism and completely exposed Trotskyite and Bukharinite and Titoite deviations. Stalin's contribution to Marxist-Leninist political economy made in ‘Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR’, his contribution to the Leninist understanding of the nationality problem contained in his writings, his analysis of the problems of Linguistics are invaluable contributions to the treasure-house of Marxism-Leninism. This is why, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh upheld in 1961, against the anti-Stalin tirade of the 22nd Congress, that “In fact, the present understanding of Leninism, as distinct from Social-Democracy and Trotskyism, is due to Stalin”. Furthermore, “Stalin's understanding of Leninism is the correct understanding of Marxism-Leninism. This understanding has brought the communist movement to its present stature”. Consequently, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh showed, “To black out Stalin would have the inevitable result of ... rejecting his interpretation of Leninism ... In short, it would objectively uncrown Lenin himself.” (*SW, Vol. I, p85-86*)

Stalin's gift as an organizer can never be even hinted at in one discussion, let alone discussed exhaustively. How great must be the capacity of a leader like Stalin who inspired and organized a whole nation in three unprecedented and successive historical upheavals. The first time for socialist construction. The second time in the anti-fascist great war. And again, a third time, to reconstruct the war-devastated socialist land. And every time, it was a rising of not only the communists and the proletariat, though they were the vanguard, but a rising led by the party and the proletariat, of an entire people from adolescents to greybeards. Never, in no other land than in this land of socialism, and under Stalin's inspiring leadership, has it happened. So because, such genuine rising of the masses cannot be ‘ordered’ by any bureaucratic apparatus. The old and rotten lie against Stalin of enforcing ‘forced labour’ and the later day inventions of ‘gulags’ or accusations of ‘command-administrative method’ do not square with this reality. Of course, Stalin's singular achievement was the building of the world's first socialist society. And it has been vindicated by history that without the leadership of Stalin, upholding Leninist line in socialist construction, in both theory and practice, the “opposition” could not have been defeated and socialism could not have triumphed. Struggle between Stalin and the “Opposition” reflected class struggle in Soviet society.

Laying of the economic foundation of a socialist society was extremely difficult in economically "backward" Russia — with its widespread "small peasant economy", poorly developed industry and trade, and an insignificant home market. In this situation, Lenin devised the policy of allowing "restricted" growth to private capitalism in industry and trade as well as "concessions" to kulaks — under proletarian state control. This was the NEP, introduced in 1921. You can see what a highly complicated and dangerous, yet necessary step had to be taken to consolidate socialism. And what an astute and able political, organizational and administrative leadership was required to arrive at a socialist economy by starting from NEP, can be seen not only on the economic or administrative front but on the political front also and above all in Stalin's ideological struggle with the "Opposition".

Class struggle continues under the dictatorship of the proletariat

Trotsky, a principal leader of the "Opposition" held that: "Without direct state support from the European proletariat, the working class of Russia will not be able to maintain itself in power and to transform its temporary rule into a lasting socialist dictatorship." (*Our Revolution*) This was open repudiation of the Leninist thesis of "the possibility of socialism in one country". Trotsky lacked faith in the power of the proletariat of "peasant" Russia! This led him to the theory of "state support", i.e., of "export", of revolution. The revolution and the activities of socialist construction could not be denied. Yet Trotsky stuck to his theory that "real progress of a socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the major European countries." (*Trotsky's Works. Vol.3, Part I, p-93*) With his articles, speeches, discussions, Trotsky spread this pessimism and despairing mood — against the party's line.

On the other hand, Bukharin organized his platform of 'conciliation' with the NEP men and the kulaks. The essential import of both Trotsky's Left adventurism and Bukharin's Right deviation was that the building of socialist economy was an impossibility. A section of other Central Committee members like Kamenev, Zinoviev, Rykov, Tomsky also joined with the "Opposition". Pre-revolution social psychology was distinguished by feudal and specifically peasant, tribal, communal and craft exclusiveness as well as bigoted outlook. Added to this was nationality complex with very strong influence under socialism also. But the overriding influence was exerted by bourgeois liberalism and bourgeois individualism. Those leaders of the CPSU who, instead of reflecting the principled, open and collective communist way of struggle in their conduct sank into petty factionalism showed not only their own vital weaknesses — but also the presence of these tendencies within the party life. Being victims of bourgeois individualistic tendency, they created parallel centres of leadership, continued factional activities — and disrupted economic construction on various "theoretical" grounds.

Viewed objectively, the party struggle reflected the acute class-struggle in socialist society. This was the substance of the inner-party "discussion" with which the "Opposition" sidetracked the all-important issues of economic

construction. Victory over this disruption from within the party was impossible without Stalin's exposition of Lenin's teachings and the exposure of the 'Opposition' "theories".

Stalin showed, "Trotsky has so far never said — neither in his pamphlet 'Towards Socialism or Capitalism?' Nor in his subsequent writings — that we can *completely* build socialism. Neither Zinoviev nor Kamenev deny, or ever have denied, that we can begin to build socialism in our country, for it would be sheer idiocy to deny the obvious fact that socialism is being built in our country... But they emphatically repudiate the thesis that we can *completely* build socialism. On this point Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, Smilga and the rest are united by their denial of Lenin's thesis that ... we have "all that is necessary for building a *complete* socialist society." (*CW, Vol.8 p-217-18*)

Further: "We cannot build without prospects, without the certainty that having begun to build a socialist economy we can complete it... If there is no certainty..., there can be no will to build socialism... Further, if the proletariat's will to build socialism is weakened, that is bound to have the effect of strengthening of capitalist elements in our economy." (*CW, Vol.8 p-293*) How correct Stalin was! "...within our party a separate Bukharin group has been formed. It demands", Stalin said, "...a slower rate of development of our industry, ... curtailment of the formation of state farms and collective farms... the granting of full freedom to private trade..." (*CW, Vol.11, p-332-33*). See how Bukharin's economic prescriptions foreshadow revisionist economic practices of Khrushchov, Brezhnev and Deng Xiao-ping. Where would have Soviet Union been, had it followed the line of Bukharin and Trotsky instead of the line of Lenin as interpreted and applied by Stalin?

Step by step, Stalin organized the "voluntary association of middle peasants" in collective farms. Collective farm products rapidly increased — thus increasing the peasants' income and consequently widening the domestic market. Continuous widening of the markets, and state investment, boosted industry. As the socialist sector in industry and agriculture expanded, "elimination of kulaks and private capitalists" was realized since their economic foothold was lost. In 1928, the First Five Year Plan was declared, and was achieved in four years. Here are a few examples of the reaction of the astounded capitalist world.

Gibson Jarvie, British capitalist and the President of the United Dominion Trust, said in October, 1932: "Now I want it clearly understood that I am neither communist nor Bolshevik, I am definitely a capitalist and an individualist... Jokes have been made about the five year plan, and its failure have been predicted. You can take it as beyond question, that under the five year plan much more had been accomplished than was ever really anticipated... In all these industrial towns which I visited, a new city is growing up, a city on a definite plan. With wide streets in the process of being beautified by trees and grass plots, houses of the most modern types, schools, hospitals, workers' clubs and the inevitable creche or nursery, where the children of working mothers are cared for... Russia today is a country with a soul and an ideal, Russia is a country with amazing activity... and perhaps most important of all, all these

youngsters and these workers in Russia have one thing which is too sadly lacking in the capitalist countries today, and that is — hope!" (*Ibid, p-168-9*). The American bourgeois magazine, *The Nation*, wrote:

"The four years of the Five year Plan have witnessed truly remarkable developments... The face of the country is being changed literally beyond recognition... Hundreds of new district power stations and a handful of 'giants' like Dnieprostroi are gradually putting reality into Lenin's formula: 'Electricity plus Soviets equals socialism'... Electricity is penetrating the village, and radio and newspaper have conquered it.

=====

Stalin ... inspired and organized a whole nation in three unprecedented and successive historical upheavals. The first time for socialist construction. The second time in the anti-fascist great war. And again, a third time, to reconstruct the war-devastated socialist land. And every time, it was a rising of not only the communists and the proletariat, though they were the vanguard, but a rising led by the party and the proletariat, of an entire people from adolescents to greybeards.

=====

Workers are learning to operate the world's most modern machines; peasant boys make and use agricultural machinery bigger and more complicated than even America has seen." (*ibid, p-170*) Grudging admissions! But admissions nevertheless! This superiority of socialist economy could never be established without Stalin establishing Lenin's teachings on socialist economic transformation as against Trotsky's and Bukharin's deviation.

Proletarian democracy

A few words in this relation on inner-party democracy during Stalin's leadership — a pet theme in the media. "If Bukharin and Tomsky" said Stalin in the same speech which I cited earlier, "violate a Central Committee decision by stubbornly refusing to work in the posts entrusted to them, then all the more the party members have the right to criticize them for such conduct. If this is what they call "being put through the mill", then let them explain what they understand by the slogan of self-criticism, inner party democracy, and so on..." "Yet, not only is the Central Committee not demanding that either of them should be excluded from the Central

Committee but it is confining itself to attempts to persuade them to remain in their posts, while at the same time, of course, exposing their non-party, at times downright anti-party, lines. What greater mildness do you want?" (*Ibid*, p-333-40)

Of course, Stalin's 'mildness' was due to revolutionary necessity and not due to liberal considerations. As he wrote in a letter : "I am absolutely against a policy of expelling all dissident comrades. I am against such a policy not because I feel sorry for dissidents but because such a policy generates in the party a regime of intimidation, a regime of fright, a regime that kills the spirit of self-criticism and initiative. It is

The Soviet Union appeared as the only country in the world free from economic crises, stagnation, over production, unemployment, beggary and prostitution. General health, life expectancy and rate of population growth surpassed European standards. Prices were reducing, real wages were increasing, transport and certain basic food items were gradually distributed free. Soviet scientific research and inventions flourished. The material and cultural development of the Soviet people amazed the entire world.

not good if the party chiefs are feared but not respected". (*CW*, Vol. 2 p-34-35)

To Maxim Gorky : "We cannot do without self-criticism. We simply cannot, Alexei Maximovich. Without it, stagnation, corruption of the apparatus, growth of bureaucracy, sapping of the creative initiative of the working class, is inevitable". (*CW*, Vol.12, p-179). Stalin understood well the social and political repercussions of the socialist economic transformation while the Soviet masses were displaying great heroism in construction, the kulaks, the capitalists, the "Opposition" and the bureaucracy were its sworn enemies. From all points of view, consolidating the party and the state became the key question of the day. Stalin's repeated emphasis on "self-criticism", "criticism from below", "inner-party democracy" and his bitter criticism of "communist windbags", and "communist bureaucrats" in his writings of this period shows it clearly.

"Bureaucracy is one of the worst enemies of our progress. It exists in all of our organizations ... the trouble is that it is not a matter of the old

bureaucrats. It is a matter of the new bureaucrats, bureaucrats who sympathize with the Soviet Government, and finally, communist bureaucrats. The communist bureaucrat is the most dangerous type of bureaucrat. Why? Because he masks his bureaucracy with the title of party member. I think that there is not and cannot be any other way of combatting this evil than by organizing control from below by the party masses, by implementing inner-party democracy. What objection can there be to rousing the fury of the mass of the party membership against these corrupt elements...? There can hardly be any..." (*CW*, Vol.11, p-75)

This was his speech to the members of Communist Youth League. He said to the Workers of the Moscow Party Organization : "The strength of Bolshevism lies precisely in the fact that it is not afraid to admit its mistakes ... so that there may be no stagnation, vegetation, decay in our work and our construction ... That is the chief thing just now".

"Critics are sometimes abused ... because their criticism is not always 100 percent correct. The demand is often made that criticism should be correct on every point ... It is a dangerous misconception. Only try to put forward such a demand, and you will gag hundreds and thousands of workers ... We would get not self-criticism, but the silence of the tomb... That is why I think that if criticism is even only 5 or 10 percent true, such criticism ... should be listened to attentively, and the sound core in it taken into account. Otherwise, I repeat, you would be gagging all those... who are devoted to the cause of the Soviets, who are not yet skilled enough in the art of criticism, but through whose lips speaks truth itself." (*CW*, Vol.11 p-33-34)

Secondly, he was trying to shake off complacency in the party : " I know there are people in the ranks of the party who have no fondness for criticism in general, and for self-criticism in particular. Those people, whom I might call "skin-deep" communists... shrug their shoulders at self-criticism, as much as to say: ... again this raking out of our shortcomings — can't we be allowed to live in peace"! (*Ibid* p-31).

The most relevant lesson for us here is that without intensifying the party struggle it is not possible to build and expand organization and the mass struggles. Stalin was vigorously promoting this inner party struggle not at a period of relative tranquility and stability but at a time of feverish struggle to settle the question who will win — capitalism or socialism, in economy. I regret that I cannot discuss this point in greater detail. But it being too vital, particularly for our party today I will refer to his speech in the 17th Congress, where, after speaking about "the survivals of capitalism in the minds" of people Stalin said, "Add to this the not very high theoretical level of the majority of our party comrades, the inadequate ideological work of the party bodies and the fact that our functionaries are over burdened with purely practical work, which deprives them of the opportunity of augmenting their theoretical knowledge and you will understand the origin of the confusion on a number of questions of Leninism." And you will find in the Report to the 19th Congress in 1952, the same critical note. Although there is a lapse of nearly 20 years in between but the criticism is more sharp : "achievement has bred in the ranks

of the party a tendency to self satisfaction, to make a pretence of all being well, a spirit of smug complacency..." Further, "Ideological work is a prime duty of the Party and underestimation of its importance may do irreparable damage to the interests of the Party and the state. We must always remember that if the influence of socialist ideology is weakened the effect is to strengthen the influence of the bourgeois ideology. ... we still have the vestiges of the bourgeois ideology, relics of the private-property mentality and morality. These relics do not die away of themselves ; they are very tenacious and may strengthen their hold and a determined struggle must be waged against them."

Thirdly, together with his effort to raise the ideological level of the party, Stalin made endeavours to raise that of the masses also. He raised the "question of the masses and the leaders". Let those who slander Stalin for encouraging his own 'cult' learn a little from these words. Stalin explained that it is "in itself a great achievement for the party that it has a group of leaders who have risen excessively high and enjoy great prestige." But he also showed that "the mass of the working people are rising extremely slowly", looking up at these leaders "from below with blinking eyes" and "do not venture to criticize them". He warned that this may result "in the leaders becoming conceited and regarding themselves as infallible". This can only bring, Stalin said, "the ruin of the Party." The situation within the country and particularly within the party leadership might have worried Stalin. But more important was his steadfast application of the Leninist principle that "we must make it possible for Soviet people to "go for" their leaders, to criticize their mistakes so that the leaders may not grow conceited, and the masses may not get out of touch with the leaders". (*Ibid* p-35)

Finally, to comprehend the entire sweep of the struggle for developing proletarian democracy not only in the party but embracing the entire working class, Stalin's teaching should be grasped that the "question of the cultural powers of the working class is a decisive one". Stalin was, in fact, having in view a cultural revolution involving the entire Soviet working people. "If the workers criticize shortcomings in our work frankly and bluntly, to improve and advance our work, what does that mean? It means," Stalin concluded, "that the workers are becoming active participants in the work of directing the country, economy, industry". (*Ibid*, p-41) Stalin had in view not the mere physical participation but the conscious, critical and active participation of the proletariat in the exercise of its power.

The operation of this proletarian democracy aroused an unprecedented labour heroism in the proletariat and the peasantry around the period of the First Five Year Plan. Its personified symbol became Stakhanov, a Russian worker who devised an ingenious method of increasing labour output and thus created a world record, without "technical expertise" but armed with the determination to do his best for socialism. Stakhanovites started to appear in all corners of the Soviet Union. In 1932, the First Five Year Plan was fulfilled, and then the second and the third, each before schedule. The ground was laid for complete socialist industrial and agricultural economic construction and therefore, also for the

elimination of the capitalist producers and the kulaks as exploiting classes. The development and fraternal union of the different nationalities flourished greatly. The Soviet Union appeared as the only country in the world free from economic crises, stagnation, over production, unemployment, beggary and prostitution. General health, life expectancy and rate of population growth surpassed European standards. Prices were reducing, real wages were increasing, transport and certain basic food items were gradually distributed free. Soviet scientific research and inventions flourished. The material and cultural development of the Soviet people amazed the entire world.

The appearance of Soviet Union on the world scene as a giant socialist power influenced working class and national liberation struggles of the world in a profound manner. It encouraged communist movements in the countries of both Western and Eastern Europe. Communist movements in Asia, Indo-China and China benefited greatly. It was the period of the exuberant youth of world communist movement. Stalin also guided the Comintern established by Lenin for coordinating and guiding communist parties in distant corners of the world. Stalin's writings make clear that he was extremely well informed not only about political developments in the West but equally well about the revolutionary national liberation movements in remote Asia and Africa — and about the details of the Indian freedom movement also. He spoke as far back as in 1925 about the division of the Indian national bourgeoisie into "a revolutionary part (the petty bourgeoisie) and a compromising part (the big bourgeoisie), of which the first is continuing the revolutionary struggle, whereas the second is "entering into a bloc with imperialism". (*CW, Vol. 7, p147*) Our party's analysis of the Indian independence struggle being led by the "reformist oppositional" compromising bourgeois section led by Gandhiji, and the powerful but secondary position of the uncompromising "petty bourgeois revolutionary" led by Netaji current accords with Stalin's. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh himself arose from this petty bourgeois revolutionary current. Being a true communist leader, Comrade Mao Zedong acted correctly and brilliantly in a near similar situation. Mao Zedong acknowledged Stalin's contributions in the victory of the Chinese revolution.

Treason Trials

However, Stalin did not lose objectivity. In his Report to the 17th Congress, Stalin observed, in 1934, that immense achievements notwithstanding — "Does it mean that all is well in our party; that there will be no more deviation in the party; and that, therefore, we may now rest on our laurels? No, it does not. The 17th Conference of our party declared that one of the fundamental political tasks in fulfilling the Second Five Year Plan is "to overcome the survivals of capitalism in economic life and in the minds of people"... naturally, these survivals cannot but be a favourable ground for a revival of the ideology of the defeated anti-Leninist groups in the minds of individual members of the party." (*CW, 13, p-355-56*)

The caution was well founded. Revival — not only of the ideology but also of conspiratorial activity of the anti-Leninist groups of Trotsky,

Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin was discovered right in 1934 — after Kirov's murder. The accused were tried — in open sessions of the Soviet Supreme Court in presence of foreign diplomats and journalists, found guilty and were executed. There was also a massive party purge. At the same time, Stalin placed openly before the 18th Congress in 1937 that this urgent step "was accompanied by grave mistakes". Nevertheless, he concluded that "on the whole, its results were beneficial." Was this conclusion objective? It was.

Many bourgeois politicians, diplomats and authors had admitted after the Second World War, as Howard Smith did, that : "Had Russia not liquidated a few thousand bureaucrats and officers, there is little doubt that the Red Army would have collapsed in two months". (*The Last Train from Berlin, p-325*) But imperialists and their 'learned' lackeys whitewash even this "bourgeois" admission of the necessity of the trials and cry that they were "framed" ! So, let them reckon with a piece of their "own" imperialist confidential correspondence : a note of 4th February, 1937 sent by Joseph Davies, the then US Ambassador in Russia to the US President. It said, "The most extraordinary part of the trial, from a western outlook, is that there should have been such a trial at all... Naturally, I must confess that I was predisposed against the credibility of the testimony of these defendants". But, "viewed objectively, however, and based upon experience in the trial of cases, I arrived at the reluctant conclusion that the state had established its case." (Source : *A Mission to Moscow*).

Eminent English barrister and Civil Liberties activist Dudley Collard wrote in the *Daily Herald*, January 28, 1937 : "In my opinion, there can be no question of a 'faked' trial, either with or without the connivance of the accused. No set of 17 men could act their parts so brilliantly nor sustain their activity in this way without a slip for four long days. There is nothing to prevent any of them from alleging that the charges are 'framed'!"

Davies wrote four years later in 1941, just after Germany invaded Russia : "Someone in the audience asked: "What about Fifth Columnists in Russia?" Off the anvil, I said : "There aren't any — they shot them"... As I ruminated over this situation, I suddenly saw the picture as I should have seen it at the time the story had been told in the so-called treason or purge trials of 1937 and 1938, which I had attended and listened to. In re-examining the records of these cases, ... I found that practically every device of German Fifth Columnist activity, as we now know it, was disclosed and laid bare... at these trials of self-confessed "Quislings" in Russia ... There were no Fifth Columnist in 1941 — they had shot them. The purge had cleansed the country and rid it of treason" (*Ibid, p-179-84*)

Stalin would neither have been able to save the Soviet power nor crush German fascism if he had not taken this "strong measure". Did Stalin then sin against humanity and the noblest human values, or did he save these from extinction in the fascist holocaust by acting timely with firmness? Those who are misled by the grossest imperialist tales and mistake this firmness for cruelty, mess up everything.

Is it so difficult to see that had Stalin been moved by personal dislikes, or animosity, or the

alleged vendetta against his ex-colleagues then, backed by the Central Committee majority he could have easily expelled them long ago ? Why did he then give them one chance after another for self-rectification ? How could they occupy top positions in the party and the state with Stalin's full knowledge and approval before being apprehended and tried ? Stalin knew better than anybody else about their factional activities. Yet, he allowed them to remain in their posts only on the basis of their "admission" of mistakes. Only a few months before the revelation of their plot, Stalin observed : "Would it not be truer to say that we are thereby, perhaps, involuntarily

"The strength of
Bolshevism lies precisely in
the fact that it is not afraid
to admit its mistakes ... so
that there may be no
stagnation, vegetation, decay
in our work and our
construction"

encouraging their factional anti-party "work" ?" Why did he not remove them from their positions and put them under surveillance even at that point ? All bourgeois governments — 'democracies' — would have done just this ! But proletarian democracy allows all possible opportunities, inside the party and also in the socialist society, to the errant individuals to rectify themselves. That is how a genuine communist party treats its deviating members until they turn into renegades. Stalin's approach was thus ethical as well as scientific, as our own experience also confirms. Zinoviev confessed in the trial that, "the party saw where we were going and warned us ... Stalin, Voroshilov, Orjonikidze, Dzerzhinsky and Mikoyan did all they could to persuade us, to save us. Scores of times they said to us : "You may do enormous harm to the party and the Soviet Government, and you yourselves will perish in doing so". But we did not heed these warnings... My defective Bolshevism became transformed into anti-Bolshevism and through Trotskyism I arrived at fascism." (*Report of Court Proceedings quoted in The Stalin Question : Banbehari Chakrabarti*).

Stalin and revolution completely merged

Those who feel instinctive repugnance for Stalin's consent to the trial and execution of his one day colleagues sadly fail to see that quite contrary should have been their response. Indeed, few things reveal Stalin's complete selflessness and complete identification with the interest of revolution — the noblest of all his qualities — more than this incident. We communists, have a great lot to learn from this. To a bourgeois liberal, the explanation will be that Stalin was magnanimous even to opponents. The reason lie elsewhere. And it is difficult, indeed, for a bourgeois to see it. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh repeatedly taught us that everyone has his positive as well as negative sides ; it is possible to make one free from his negative sides and shortcomings only by encouraging one's qualities

and positive sides. Stalin also was guided by this dialectical approach. Free from personal prejudice, he gave the opposition leaders all opportunities of self-rectification. He criticized them unsparingly but sincerely wanted them to become worthy communists. Here was his greatness.

But, for this very reason, once their conspiracy was established doubtlessly, he could no longer consider them except as counter revolutionaries. So, he considered it necessary, absolutely correctly, to deal with them as the interest of revolution urged him to. By permitting the execution of them, he did just that. The bourgeois world pretends to be horrified at this! And the common masses, even many communists influenced by liberal sentiments, are touched! For them, it is of course, natural. For, a much higher moral standard is required to fully fathom the lofty sense of values of Stalin for whom, helping a deviating colleague to rectify himself and awarding supreme penalty to the same person turned a class enemy flows from the same unflinching sense of loyalty to the working class, revolution and the party. Stalin had nothing personal in him. Here is the glory of Stalin.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh explained that, "To a revolutionary, revolutionary necessity stands supreme; all other things like love, affection, personal relationship, friendship, etc., which to a humanist are so important and precious and make life worth living are subordinated to it." He explained profoundly that, "In the annals of human society, humanism is not the last word. It is undoubtedly the most lively air that the oppressive bourgeois thinking is capable of producing. But the march of progress of society does not stop there and hence, the sense of moral values does not find its zenith in humanism. Communism begins where humanism ends. ... Only with proper understanding of communist ethics can many of the traits of Stalin's character be correctly appreciated, which, judged by the yardstick of humanist moral values, would appear

as negative qualities of character." (*SW.Vol.I,p-84-90*)

Path Ahead

Stalin's exemplary character and rare achievements as a great theorist and organizer has left behind a rich heritage for all communists of the world. However, while Stalin emerged as the foremost Marxist-Leninist of his time, the communist movement under his leadership failed to rise to the necessary height. History has proved it sufficiently, I think. It is wrong to presume, of course, that the role of the leader is alone sufficient to determine the course of development of the led, be it an individual or an entire movement. Otherwise, the Workingmen's First International founded by Marx and Engels would not have gone astray. And I have already discussed, which Comrade Shibdas Ghosh

=====

**“To a revolutionary,
revolutionary necessity
stands supreme; all other
things like love, affection,
personal relationship,
friendship, etc., which to a
humanist are so important
and precious and make life
worth living are
subordinated to it”**

=====

pointed out long ago, that the post-War communist movement grew as a colossus organizationally with feet of clay, ideologically. It had not been steeled through prolonged and painstaking ideological struggle fought by communists in different countries, against all

sorts of bourgeois liberal and humanist ideological and moral influences. On the contrary, as Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had clearly shown, "humanistic appeal of the anti-imperialist struggles" and "liberal sentiment against capitalist exploitation" considerably contributed to its growth. It is precisely for this reason that the communists of the world, in spite of their unquestionable loyalty to Stalin, could not properly appreciate his values. Consequently, they could not defend him either in the face of revisionist assault.

So long as the communists cannot exhaust the influence of bourgeois humanism ideologically, culturally and morally, proletarian democracy cannot grow and fully function inside the party. So long as they cannot eradicate all sorts of liberal tendencies in inner party life, the process of democratic centralism cannot grow and develop inside the party fully and properly. In short, the collective leadership of the party cannot take concrete and effective shape. And in that case, the party cannot grow as a conscious, iron-disciplined revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat nor can make the proletariat conscious and organized to fulfil its historic mission, let alone influence the other strata of society. The disarray among the communists at large since the collapse of the Socialist Camp — the process of which actually started through de-Stalinization in the 20th Congress of the CPSU — is an indication of this. The situation, therefore, strongly urges upon the communists of the world to fulfil this long overdue task. Unmitigable crisis in the imperialist 'globalized' economy and irrepressible outbursts of the discontent of the toilers of the world call upon the communists to advance with giant strides and fulfil their world historic mission.

**Red Salute to Comrade Stalin, Great
Leader of the World Proletariat !
Long Live Proletarian Internationalism !
Long Live Revolution !**

Inevitability of Wars Between Capitalist Countries

"Some comrades hold that, owing to the development of new international conditions since the Second World War, wars between capitalist countries have ceased to be inevitable. They consider that the contradictions between the socialist camp and the capitalist camp are more acute than the contradictions among the capitalist countries; that the USA has brought the other capitalist countries sufficiently under its sway to be able to prevent them going to war among themselves and weakening one another; that the foremost capitalist minds have been sufficiently taught by the two world wars and the severe damage they caused to the whole capitalist world not to venture to involve the capitalist countries in war with one another again — and that, because of all this, wars between capitalist countries are no longer inevitable.

These comrades are mistaken. They see the outward phenomena that come and go on the surface, but they do not see those profound forces which, although they are so far operating imperceptibly, will nevertheless determine the course of developments.

Outwardly, everything would seem to be

"going well": the USA has put Western Europe, Japan and other capitalist countries on rations; Germany (Western), Britain, France, Italy and Japan have fallen into the clutches of USA and are meekly obeying its commands. But it would be mistaken to think that things can continue to "go well" for "all eternity", that these countries will tolerate domination and oppression by the United States endlessly, that they will not endeavour to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development.

Take, first of all, Britain and France. Undoubtedly, they are imperialist countries. Undoubtedly, cheap raw materials and secure markets are of paramount importance to them. Can it be assumed that they will endlessly tolerate the present situation, in which, under the guise of "Marshall plan aid", the Americans are penetrating into the economies of Britain and France and trying to convert them into adjuncts of the United States economy, and American capital is seizing raw materials and markets in the British and French colonies and thereby plotting disaster for the high profits of the British and French capitalists? Would it not be truer to say

that capitalist Britain, and, after her, capitalist France, will be compelled in the end to break from the embrace of the USA and enter into conflict with it in order to secure an independent position and, of course, high profits?

Let us pass to the major vanquished countries, Germany (Western) and Japan. These countries are now languishing in misery under the jackboot of American imperialism. Their industry and agriculture, their trade, their foreign and home policies, and their whole life are fettered by the American occupation "regime". Yet only yesterday these countries were great imperialist powers and were shaking the foundations of the domination of Britain, the USA and France in Europe and Asia. To think that these countries will not try to get on their feet again, will not try to smash the US "regime", and force their way to independent development, is to believe in miracles.

It is said that the contradictions between capitalism and socialism are stronger than the contradictions among the capitalist countries. Theoretically, of course, that is true. It is not only

Contd. on page 11

Inevitability of Wars Between Capitalist Countries

Contd from page 10

true now, today; it was true before the Second World War. And it was more or less realized by the leaders of the capitalist countries. Yet the Second World War began not as a war with the USSR, but as a war between capitalist countries. Why? Firstly, because war with the USSR, as a socialist land, is more dangerous to capitalism than war between capitalist countries; for whereas war between capitalist countries puts in question only the supremacy of certain capitalist countries over others, war with the USSR must certainly put in question the existence of capitalism itself. Secondly, because the capitalists, although they clamour, for "propaganda" purposes, about the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, do not themselves believe that it is aggressive, because they are aware of the Soviet Union's peaceful policy and know that it will not itself attack capitalist countries.

After the First World War it was similarly

believed that Germany had been definitely put out of action, just as certain comrades now believe that Japan and Germany have been definitely put out of action. Then, too, it was said and clamoured in the press that the United States had put Europe on rations; that Germany would never rise to her feet again, and that there would be no more wars between capitalist countries. In spite of this, Germany rose to her feet again as a great power within the space of some fifteen or twenty years after her defeat, having broken out of bondage and taken the path of independent development. And it is significant that it was none other than Britain and the United States that helped Germany to recover economically and to enhance her economic war potential. Of course, when the United States and the Britain assisted Germany's economic recovery, they did so with a view to setting a recovered Germany against the Soviet Union to utilizing her against the land of socialism. But Germany directed her forces in the first place against the Anglo-French-American

bloc. And when Hitler Germany declared war on the Soviet Union, the Anglo-French-American bloc, far from joining with Hitler Germany, was compelled to enter into a coalition with the USSR against Hitler Germany.

Consequently, the struggle of the capitalist countries for markets and their desire to crush their competitors proved in practice to be stronger than the contradictions between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp.

What guarantee is there, then, that Germany and Japan will not rise to their feet again, will not attempt to break out of American bondage and live their own independent lives? I think there is no such guarantee.

But it follows from this that the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries remains in force To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism."

— J. V. Stalin

Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR

Deceitful Railway Budget

The Railway minister, in whose tenure the countrymen have been witnessing disastrous train accidents almost at regular periodicity, has now come out with his budget for 2003-2004. The prescription on the eve of Assembly elections in five states, is captioned "No hike in passenger fare" obviously, keeping the electorates in mind. Though he has reported satisfactory revenue earnings, he has not cared to pass on the benefits of this "satisfaction" to the common passengers by either withdrawing the safety surcharge or announcing any reduction in the existing fare-structure of local and ordinary trains systematically hiked over the last few years on an exorbitant scale. The minister has, however, been very generous to the handful rich, businessmen

and bureaucrats by declaring some lowering in the ticket cost of Rajdhani, Satabdi and Jana-Satabdi Express trains which carry these elite passengers. Also reduced are the freight charges on petro-products, iron and steel much to the glee of monopoly capitalists who carefully ensure that such reliefs are never reflected in the market price but absorbed in their wallet of profit. So the industry barons and chambers of commerce have showered so much of praise on the Railway Minister. However, there is no guarantee that surcharge and interim hike would not be introduced through mid-year ordinance once the elections are over as such instances are not, of late, in short supply. And from that perspective, budget is no more reflective of the concrete picture of income-expenditure but a policy statement subject to changes and amendments, as and when so desired by the government.

And now to turn on to the non-revenue aspect of the budget, the minister has fixed the responsibility of train accidents on "human error" but has not cared to ensure passenger safety in accident prone Indian Railways by adopting any concrete step to modernize the signal system and operational techniques, repair the bridges and cracks on the tracks and employ adequate running staff etc. Also, he is conspicuously silent over legendary corruption that engulfs the Railways and the luxury as well as other amenities enjoyed by the Railway Board members and bureaucrats who have least concern about the passengers' welfare. With a nominal increase in the budgetary support that could hardly spur any developmental work, the minister, riding populist overtures, announced 50 new trains and extended destinations of some of the existing ones so that it could take care of the row over Railway Zone division and allied issues that might feature in the ensuing elections.

In fine, the BJP-led NDA Government has tabled an extremely cunning document before some of the states go to the polls which is a deceit to the common people but a welcome measure for the ruling monopoly capitalists.

Central Committee Condemns Stoking Communal Fire

Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, General Secretary, SUCI, issued the following statement on 21st February, 2003 to the press :

"In its bid to reap harvest in the hustings in the ensuing elections and divert people's attention from the burning problems of life, BJP and Sangh Parivar is out to stoke communal fire following notorious Gujarat line raising the bogey of cow slaughter, Ram Mandir etc. This criminal game of the greedy politicians will again bring in its trail holocaust with immense bloodshed, rapes and destruction. As usual, Congress is also pursuing the same politics under the garb of 'secularism'. Election-oriented opportunistic politics of CPI(M) cannot resist this dangerous attacks of the fascist saffron brigade.

"Crying need of the hour is to develop powerful, well organised united and mighty mass struggles on burning issues combining all — irrespective of religion, cast, linguistic and ethnic divisions incorporating along with it the struggle against communalism."

US Nobel Laureates Oppose War Against Iraq

Around 40 Nobel laureates from USA many of whom have received national medal of science and/or have worked in the defense department released on 28th January, 2003 the following statement opposing the unilateral attack on Iraq by the United States :

"The undersigned oppose a preventive war against Iraq without broad international support. Military operations against Iraq may indeed lead to a relatively swift victory in the short term. But war is characterized by surprise human loss and unintended consequences. Even with a victory we believe, that the medical, economic, environmental, moral, spiritual, political, and legal consequences of an American preventive attack on Iraq would undermine, not protect, US security and standing in the world." (Source : Internet)

Statement about ownership and other particulars about newspaper PROLETARIAN ERA to be printed in the first issue after last day of February :

FORM IV (See rule 8)

Place of publication : 48 Lenin Sarani
Kolkata 13

Periodicity of its Publication : Fortnightly
Printer's Name : Sukomal Dasgupta
Nationality : Indian
Address : 48 Lenin Sarani
Kolkata - 13

Publisher's Name : Sukomal Dasgupta
Nationality : Indian
Address : 48 Lenin Sarani
Kolkata - 13

Editor's Name : Sukomal Dasgupta
Nationality : Indian
Address : 48 Lenin Sarani
Kolkata - 13

Name and address of individuals who own the Newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one per cent of the total capital :
CENTRAL
COMMITTEE
SOCIALIST
UNITY CENTRE
OF INDIA

I, Sukomal Dasgupta hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Sd/- Sukomal Dasgupta
Signature of Publisher

1.3.2002

16 February, 2003 Hyde Park, London

21 February 2003: Anti-war demonstrators block tracks in the station of Monselice, northern Italy, trying to stop a train full of US war materia.

22 February 2003: Man holds a up a poster reading 'Disarm Bush' as 3,000 people block the main gate of the US Rhein-Main Air Base.

**People
Rise
Against
US War
Threats**

Chennai, 10th February, 2003

Patna 15th February, 2003

*Also protest
demonstrations
were held at
Bokaro, Bangalore,
Kottayam, Bhopal,
Muzaaffarpur, Sagar
and other places.*

Trivandrum, 15th February, 2003

Guwahati, 15th February, 2003

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 Phone : 2244-1828, 22442234 E-mail : suci_cc@vsnl.net