

WHY

# COUNTER REVOLUTION

COULD DESTROY

# SOCIALIST SYSTEM



Lessons  
from  
GREAT  
NOVEMBER  
REVOLUTION

PROVASH GHOSH

## **Publisher's Note**

On the occasion of 106 anniversary of Great November Revolution a mass meeting was held in Kolkata Moulali Yuba Kendra on 7th November, 2023 under the auspices of SUCI Communist Central Committee. Comrade Pravash Ghosh, the General Secretary of the Party addressed the meeting while the senior PB member Comrade Asit Bhattacharjee presided over it. Considering the importance of the discussion of the General Secretary we are publishing it in a book form.



# **Why Counter Revolution could Destroy Socialist System. Lessons from Great November Revolution**

PRAVASH GHOSH

Today I like to speak less and read out more from different writings of the Marxist authorities. Today is 7<sup>th</sup> November. This very day carries me many decades back to the time of the British rule in our country. A teacher of a very remote village of present day Bangladesh told me about the November Revolution. I was then a school student. That was a time when the names of Great Lenin, Great Stalin, and Great November Revolution were known to many people. It was just after the Second World War, in which, under the great leadership of Stalin, fascist Germany and Italy were defeated, entire Europe was liberated and Great Stalin came to be considered as the saviour of humanity. Entire Eastern Europe accepted the flag of communism. In China, under the great leadership of Mao Ze Dong, People's Liberation Army was on the verge of victory. In Vietnam, a protracted battle was going on under the leadership of another great leader Ho Chi Minh. In Africa, Asia, Latin America waves of anti-imperialist struggles were surging on. Throughout Europe, there was a powerful current of communist movement. This was the world situation at that time. Now the situation has altogether changed after the sad destruction of the socialist system due to counter-revolution engineered by the global imperialism-capitalism and internal counter-revolutionaries. Many have forgotten the November Day. The present-day young

generation is mostly not aware of this great revolution.

### **November Revolution Showed exploitation of man by man is not eternal**

For thousands of years, it was a belief that the division between rich and poor, exploiter and exploited is eternal, unchangeable. But November Revolution first proved that this belief is quite wrong rather a blatant lie. This division can be abolished once for all. There have been social changes in the by-gone days. Slave system changed into feudalism, feudalism changed into capitalism. But exploitation of man by man did not at all end. Rather one form of exploitation replaced another. November Revolution was the first revolution to end the exploitation of man by man. It was not so easy to prepare for, to organize such a revolution. There was the campaign that the Marxist view is unrealistic, utopian. Great Lenin is the first Marxist thinker who proved that Marxism is a science which can be applied in practice and what Great Marx predicted can be proved as a reality. How was it proved as a reality? Let me narrate it very briefly.

Lenin joined RSDLP which was considered as a Marxist party in Russia at that time. After some time Lenin felt that it was not a real communist party. Remaining within the RSDLP, Lenin propagated his views based on the correct understanding of Marxism—how to build a real communist party and what should be its revolutionary outlook. There was a bitter struggle within the RSDLP. Lenin had to fight with his teacher, the man who introduced Marxism in Russia, i.e. Plekhanov. At one time Lenin accepted him as an authority. But later Lenin's understanding of Marxism taught him that Plekhanov was not following the real Marxist line and he had to fight against leaders like Plekhanov, Martov, Axelrod and others in RSDLP. He could convince a good number of cadres on the correctness of his fight and the party was split into Bolsheviks (majority) and Mensheviks (minority). Lenin's followers were called as Bolsheviks. This battle lasted for a decade.

In 1905, there was a revolutionary uprising in Russia; workers' strikes were there. To mislead the workers, a Christian Bishop named Gapon, told the workers of St. Petersburg that the Tsar was a very kind hearted man and he would listen to our appeal if we submit a petition with our demands. Lenin knew that it was a conspiracy, but the Bolsheviks could not convince the workers as they were very religiously blind about Bishop Gapon. Guided by Lenin the Bolsheviks had joined the agitation being fully aware that it was led by a conspirator. As the demands were legitimate and as the common workers were in the demonstration, Lenin asked the Bolsheviks to join the demonstration in order to remain with the workers and to expose the Bishop as a traitor. This is a lesson for us also. To crush the demonstration the Tsar-deployed army killed thousands and injured even more. It resulted in a revolt of the workers; spontaneously soviets of workers (i.e. workers' committees) were formed. But the Tsar ruthlessly suppressed the revolt. 'Potemkin', a battleship of the naval force also joined the movement.

### **Economic strikes were turned into political strikes**

While evaluating the 1905 revolt, Lenin said that its content was bourgeois democratic, but method was proletarian, because it started with a workers' strike. In 1905, workers of Russia turned economic strikes into political strikes; with arms they fought against the Tsar and formed workers' soviets, a new type of organization for battle. This is also to be noted. Later on Lenin said that 1905 revolt was a dress rehearsal of future revolution. In 1917, when Lenin was in exile in Switzerland, while discussing 1905 revolt, Lenin said in conclusion, we the old generation would not see the future revolution. But you the younger generation would definitely see it. I am not quoting his exact language. But the essence of his speech was this. He said it in January 1917. Soon in February, again a revolution started in Russia. At that time, the 1<sup>st</sup> World War was going on. One side there was Britain, France and Tsarist Russia,

and on the other side, Germany and Austria. In that war, the Tsar's army faced defeat after defeat. There was a cry in Russia, 'Stop the war, we want peace'. Severe famine also affected Russia. People started demanding 'bread'. The demands were, 'end of war', 'we want peace and bread'. Another slogan also was raised, 'liberty for the people'. Further they wanted parliamentary democracy and also land to the tillers. These were all demands of bourgeois democratic revolution. Struggles started; workers' and soldiers' soviets were formed in St. Petersburg, Moscow, and in different towns and villages also. The Tsar could not suppress it. A provisional bourgeois government was formed with the help of the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries as they, the social democrats compromised with the bourgeoisie. Side by side, armed soviet power was developed in the cities, towns and villages. Workers and peasants were armed.

### **How the dual power came into existence**

Thus the dual power came into existence. One was the bourgeois power i.e., the provisional bourgeois government and parallel to it the other was the Soviet power. At the beginning, the Bolsheviks were in minority in the soviets. During the time of the battle, Bolsheviks were in the streets, and exploiting that situation Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, the petty bourgeois forces, captured most of the seats in the soviets. Another reason was also there. The veteran workers of the industries mostly were in the war field, compelled by Tsar. Those workers were replaced in industries by shopkeepers, artisans, small owners and peasants. They formed the soviets and they were by nature compromising, vacillating forces due to their petty bourgeois character. Our comrades must understand this situation. How Lenin masterly applied his Marxist understanding in such a difficult situation to organize the next revolution i.e., the November Revolution – it is a lesson for all revolutionaries. For a few months, starting from February to August, Bolsheviks were in the minority in the soviets.

There was an attempt on the part of Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries to hand over power to the provisional government and dissolve the soviets. That was the conspiracy. Lenin asked the Bolsheviks to conduct ideological struggle within the soviets to win the support of the majority members of the soviets. This strenuous work was done by the Bolshevik party members. Ultimately they could convince the members of the soviets. Workers and peasants from the soviets then raised the demand 'no provisional government, all power to the soviets'. In this way, in course of time, the Mensheviks, Socialist Revolutionaries who were so long leading the soviets, were defeated. They were replaced by the Bolsheviks in the leadership. In the month of August, Bolsheviks became majority in the soviets. Then Lenin gave the call for the socialist revolution.

### **Bourgeoisie lost its revolutionary role in this era**

But there were differences in the party also. Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Trotsky, all front ranking Central Committee members, differed with Lenin on the insurrection. They argued, let the bourgeoisie complete the task of democratic revolution and then only party can go for socialist revolution. They were supported by the leaders of the second International. Refuting them, Lenin said, although in Russia, the villages, the rural areas were predominantly feudal and though capitalism was developing, we cannot expect revolutionary role from the bourgeoisie because in this era of imperialism and proletarian revolution the bourgeoisie had lost its earlier revolutionary role. Therefore it cannot any longer accomplish bourgeois democratic revolution fully and thoroughly. This responsibility has also now fallen on the proletariat and these democratic tasks are to be added in the socialist tasks of the proletariat. Lenin explained that the question of state power is the decisive question in every revolution. By the February revolution the bourgeoisie captured the state power in Russia; to that extent, bourgeois democratic revolution was completed and to that extent

the next revolution would be the socialist revolution against the bourgeoisie. It will be the task of the new proletarian state to fulfill the unaccomplished tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution. That was done by the Soviet Union later. This was his historic formulation. Ultimately Lenin could convince the entire party on this line.

In India, we find the so-called communists could not understand—in this era of imperialism and proletarian revolution— Lenin’s historic formulation at all and chewed the cud of people’s democratic revolution. In India, under the British rule, particularly during the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War, monopoly capital had developed and it was the compromising national bourgeoisie who led the freedom struggle and through independence that Indian bourgeoisie came to power and thus India came to be a full fledged bourgeois state. How can it then be in the stage of people’s democratic revolution? By this the so called communist parties went against Lenin’s formulation. Now at present you can see it is a very developed capitalism in our country reaching the stage of imperialism. In countryside feudalism has been abolished, land, agricultural products, village labour power, all have become commodity; there is no trace of any local or regional market, entire rural market has become part and parcel of the national market. Prices of all rural and agricultural products are determined by the national market. But the so-called communists invented a new theory in the name of Marxism. They say that India is a bourgeois landlord state headed by the big bourgeoisie. Our leader eminent Marxist thinker Comrade Shibdas Ghosh repeatedly had put forward the question, who is this big bourgeoisie? Is it comprador bourgeoisie or national bourgeoisie? Who are these landlords, feudal landlords or bourgeois landlords? They could not answer. Till today, they are sticking to this slogan and consider the national bourgeoisie and rich peasants as their allies in ‘revolution’. This is their position at a time when Indian capital has not only reached the stage of monopoly, but India has

emerged as an imperialist power exporting capital to not only backward countries but even to advanced imperialist countries and Indian monopoly capital has become partners in multinational corporations. They did not understand Lenin's teachings at all. Of course their formulation serves their election-oriented politics. Sometimes they combine with the national bourgeois party BJP in the name of fighting Congress's authoritarianism, and sometime combine with the national bourgeois party Congress in the name of fighting BJP's communalism. Now let me turn to the Russian Revolution.

### **New soviet state faced a gigantic task**

After the capture of power by the Bolshevik party, Russia faced a very hard situation. The country was fully devastated by war. Severe famine gripped the country. Industries were destroyed in the war. In such a situation, all the imperialist-capitalist countries surrounded the Soviet Union and mounted attack to destroy the newly born working class state as it posed a danger for them. If working class revolution survived in the Soviet Union, it would be a danger for all other imperialist-capitalist countries, because workers of those countries would also be inspired by this revolution. So they tried to destroy the Soviet Union fully. At the same time, the defeated bourgeoisie of Russia also organized counter-revolution. Now the new Soviet state was confronted with severe economic crisis, famine, all-out attack by the imperialist-capitalist countries, internal counter-revolution and Lenin had to face it assisted by Stalin. In such a very critical situation, war communism was introduced which meant appropriation of surplus agricultural products from the peasantry to supply those to the towns and battle fields. It was called war communism. Imperialist attacks were defeated not only by the heroic role of the Red Army, but also by the fraternal support of the workers of England, France, Germany who refused to help in the war against the working class state. They raised the voice 'stop attack on the

Soviet Union', 'stop supply to the war field'. The Navy of those countries revolted, the railway workers revolted. In this way the working class of other imperialist countries also stood up in solidarity with the Soviet Union.

### **NEP a creative application of Marxism**

Next came the period of 'NEP', the New Economic Policy. In a devastated precarious economic situation, CPSU decided to give incentive for production and allowed free trade to a certain extent and operation of certain small industries under private ownership for a limited period. It was called the New Economic Policy. These were all creative applications of Marxism in a particular condition only to save and develop socialism. In 1924, Great Lenin expired. A crisis came in the party. Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin were not ready to accept Stalin's leadership. But the party as a whole accepted Stalin. Their conspiracy was defeated.

### **First five year Soviet plan**

The ten years from 1917 to 1927 was a period when the Soviet Union was economically weaker than Tsarist Russia. In 1927 Stalin started the first 'five year plan'. He called upon the Soviet people to build up socialist economy. Within three years, the targets were achieved. When the first five year plan was completed the Soviet Union became the second most powerful industrial state in the world. Such was the advancement of the Soviet economy under the leadership of Great Stalin, following the teachings of Great Lenin. After that, there was uninterrupted development of the Soviet society economically, politically, educationally, culturally and in science and other fields.

### **A New Civilisation**

I shall now read out from the writings of some of the great men of the twentieth century who hailed the Soviet Union as a

‘new civilization’. You know of Rabindranath Tagore, Romain Rolland, and Bernard Shaw all great personalities of 20<sup>th</sup> century. Bernard Shaw said, *“If you want to see real freedom, go to Soviet Union where Great Stalin is in the leadership”*. I will now read out from Rabindranath. I know some of you are aware of it, but new comrades and people may not be acquainted with this. Rabindranath said, *“They have no time to lose, because the whole world is their opponent; they must prove without delay that what they want is not wrong, that is not fraud; a decade or two is determined to prevail against a millennium. Very small is their material strength, but the daring of their willpower defies comparison ... I am in Russia; had I not come, my life’s pilgrimage would have remained incomplete.”* (Tagore letters from Russia, Letter No. 3, Moscow, 25 September, 1930). In 1939, he wrote to poet Amiya Bhusan Chakraborty, *“I was immensely happy and hopeful by seeing ... a new era of humanity. I have not come across reason for such permanent joy anywhere in the history of human beings. This revolution is against the most cruel and powerful enemy of the people. New Russia is engaged in the cult of extracting a lethal shell called greed from the rib of human civilization, automatically springs my wish that let their endeavour be successful.”* Rabindranath was not a communist, he was a humanist.

Another great man of that century Romain Rolland said, *“I believe in the work of USSR. I shall defend it as long as there is breath in my body. ... Within communism, I have found a new people’s power and in the battle against Fascism, this will be the most powerful of all the powerful armies.”* (I will not rest) I want to refer here that when Rabindranath was at his death’s door, the Second World War was going on. Prasanta Chandra Mahalanobish wrote that, every day Rabindranath asked for the news of the war field. If he heard that the fascist army was advancing his face became gloomy. But on the very day of his

operation when he heard that the Red Army was advancing, his face lit up, and he uttered, "Yes, only they can win. Surely they will win." With how deep respect and hope did these great men view Soviet Union!

Again I want to refer to Romain Rolland. He said, "*If it (Soviet Union) is crushed, it will no longer be the proletariat of the USSR alone would be enslaved, but all liberty, social or individual, will be destroyed ... world will be thrown several ages behind.*" (*I will not rest*) That is what we are witnessing at present. Many years have gone by since that prediction of Romain Rolland. He was also not a communist, but an admirer of communism. Why had they admired? Because they could feel that when old civilization was dying in capitalist countries, a new civilization was rising in Soviet Union as a new hope for future mankind.

### **Liberty Equality Fraternity achieved only in USSR**

French revolution raised the slogan 'equality-liberty-fraternity'. But after a certain period it remained as a mere slogan in capitalism. The bourgeoisie had thrown the idea to the wind. Is there any equality in any capitalist country? Now in all capitalist-imperialist countries we find that it has a few multi-millionaires or billionaires having grandiose palaces; one percent of the world population, that is the billionaires, own two-thirds of the wealth of mankind. This wealth is the product of the human labour. Others are reduced to almost half-beggars or full beggars, street-dwellers; billions are unemployed and retrenched workers. This is the present situation in the world. Can there be any equality between the exploiters and the exploited? In capitalist countries, there is liberty for the exploiters to crush the human raw material i.e. labour power by the exploitative machine for maximum profit and liberty for the exploited to die in penury and starvation and commit suicide in frustration. Aggression, war, subjugation, racial-ethnic-religious conflicts leading to massive mass killings is now the real face of

fraternity. But the Soviet Union provided real equality liberty and fraternity. There was no division between the rich and the poor. In the Soviet Union, the socialist state declared that nobody would remain without work, and who would not work, would not get food. The Soviet Union totally abolished unemployment, beggary, and prostitution. In the Soviet Union, people got house, food, essential commodities at cheap prices. They got electricity, fuel, water, transport, factory dress without any cost. It was free. In the Soviet Union, men and women got equal opportunity, equal work with equal wage. There was no differentiation. There was pre-natal maternity leave for eight weeks, and after birth for eight weeks with full pay, for one year with partial pay. Women worker could join work with baby being kept in crèche under the care of the state. There was cooperative kitchen, cooperative laundry, and cooperative dining room to free the women from the drudgery of household works. In the Soviet Union, education was free up to the university level. College and university students got stipend from the state. Medical treatment was free. In case of any legal dispute, there was no court fee. State provided a lawyer at free of cost. Every year for half a month the workers and peasants enjoyed leave with pay for recreation in sanatorium at sea-side or on hills. The Soviet state arranged training for sports free of cost for all students and youths. That's why at that time in the Olympics Soviet participants scored gold medals in many events. Soviet doctors, teachers, lawyers, scientists had all facilities from the state to continue their work. The State encouraged it. Twelve scientists from the Soviet Union got the Nobel Prize despite of the fact that the Nobel committee was controlled by bourgeois persons. Such was the advancement of Soviet science.

### **Soviet Constitution was a Peoples constitution**

Who prepared the Soviet constitution? In all the capitalist countries bourgeois experts draft their constitution, not the common people. They draft it according to the class outlook of

the bourgeoisie. But in the Soviet Union in 1936, the draft constitution was distributed among the people. Millions of people discussed on that draft, placed their amendments, and basing on their opinions the constitution was finalized. 'By the people, for the people, of the people' are merely words in the capitalist countries. But it was objectively followed in the Soviet Union. In capitalist countries workers and peasants are merely formally allowed to contest in the elections, but in reality they cannot contest, or even cannot dream to contest, because contesting in election is very costly and their political backwardness is also an insurmountable hindrance. But in the Soviet Union, there were workers' constituencies, peasants' constituencies, so that workers and peasants could elect and be elected and decide freely about socialist development. There was a right to recall also. Elected representative had to report regularly what they were doing there. If necessary, they could be recalled and replaced.

### **Voluntary Union of Nationalities**

Sixteen nationalities voluntarily constituted the USSR. All the nationalities were allowed the right to secede. All the nationalities accepted the constitution of the Soviet Union but also had their own constitutions on the basis of their own specific characteristics. All nationalities had fraternal relationships among them. That's why Rabindranath, Romain Rolland, Bernard Shaw – all were charmed.

### **Why socialist system destroyed by counter revolution**

Now the point is this, despite of this tremendous development and advancement of the socialist system why the sad thing i.e. destruction of socialism happened? Was it inevitable? On this question, first I want to remind you a lesson from history that for the final victory of any ideology, any new system, it takes time, many decades, even centuries. If you view the preachers of different religions i.e. Christianity, Islam or Hindu religion who claimed that they were the messengers of God, Allah, Ishwar, but

for the final victory of those religions it also took hundreds of years of struggle. They had to face defeat-defeat-victory-again defeat-again victory. In this land also Vaidik religion was defeated by Buddhists who did not believe in God. Buddhist religion dominated here for a few hundred years. Again Sankaracharya defeated Buddhist religion and made Vedanta victorious. So for the final victory of a new idea, it takes hundreds and hundreds of years. So-called messengers of God had to face defeats in this battle. To replace slave system by the idea of divine rule, i.e. feudalism, it took thousands of years. Again replacement of feudalism by bourgeois democratic revolution, starting from renaissance to the final victory of parliamentary democracy, it also took 350 years of struggle following the course of defeat and defeat, again defeat, then victory, again defeat and victory. Marxism, communism is a new idea. This idea is challenging the beliefs of thousands and thousands of years starting from the slave system to capitalism i.e. the rule of class exploitation. The earlier changes were change of one form of class exploitation by another. But socialism was to end class exploitation once and for all. It had to fight against thousands and thousands years of class exploitation and survived only for seventy years braving all attacks, conspiracies, difficulties, but after that foreign imperialists and internal counter-revolutionaries destroyed this new system. By that, can it be concluded that there is no future of socialism? Is it the lesson of history?

### **Antagonistic Contradiction between Marxist and non-Marxist ideas remain very much in socialist society**

Now let us examine certain points which are relevant here to understand the causes which engendered counter-revolution. When revolution was organized in Russia and China, people accepted the revolution, because they felt it would remove exploitation, poverty, they would get better life, but all the people were not communists. In USSR say, the total population were 300 million, communist party members were say 10 million. Thus, among 300 million common

people only 10 million were communists. The people who were not Marxists or communists, what was their ideology? Definitely they were still carrying the influence of bourgeois ideology. If the entire society does not become communist, this antagonistic contradiction i.e. between Marxist and non-Marxist ideology would remain and in course of time one would defeat the other. So the influence of bourgeois ideology was predominant among the people. Moreover all the communist party members did not have the standard of Lenin-Stalin. The more backward they were the more bourgeois influence they had. Another thing we must understand here is that, abolition of private property does not mean abolition of private property mental complex i.e. property mentality, feelings like my family, my children, my love-affection, my fame, my position, my prestige etc.etc.

### **Change in structure does not automatically change the superstructure**

Let me go to a next point. As Marxism taught us, economy is the basis, i.e., the structure on which a society stands. Upon the structure there is superstructure. Superstructure means ideological views, concepts, philosophy, social life, political life, moral life, legal system, love-affection, approach to family, this and that. On the basis of a structure, a superstructure develops. But when structure changes means economically it is changed and politically also changed – that does not mean other aspects of the old superstructure like, philosophy, ideology, ethics, moral values, love relation, forces of habits these will be automatically also changed. As Marxism scientifically considers economy is the basis, it does not follow that Marxism preaches economic determinism. Hence there is a necessity of separate and simultaneous class struggle also in the field of superstructure along with structure. Moreover, bringing change in the superstructure takes more intense struggle and time than structure. This was not conducted in the Soviet Union as required. Accordingly, bourgeois ideology, morality, property complex in different forms, forces of alien habits remained there despite the

glorious advancement of the society. Perhaps as the Soviet Union encircled by imperialism was attacked again and again, and within the party also there were many conspiracies, the leadership was very engaged to defeat these attacks. It was a very hard and difficult struggle, just after revolution in a famine-stricken country, to advance economically very speedily. Moreover, after the death of Lenin, the party had to defeat many internal conspiracies also. In 1934, there was another conspiracy. Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin —these leaders in league with Fascist Germany conspired to oust the Soviet leadership particularly Stalin from power. A prominent leader, almost the right hand man of Stalin, Kirov was murdered in Kremlin. The next target was Stalin which was revealed by the assassin. It was also revealed that Hitler tried to develop a fifth columnist group in Soviet Union by combining with this group and within military also. There was a great trial. For this trial, Stalin is maligned by bourgeois forces even today. But those who were accused were actually conspirators. They conspired with fascist Germany to murder the Soviet leaders to capture the leadership. It is to be noted that it was an open trial. Stalin invited ambassadors of all capitalist countries to be in the court room. All presses were invited. Eminent lawyers of other countries were also invited. In that trial, the accused confessed that they committed crimes. Those who attended the trial said that it was the most fair trial they had ever witnessed. Even the then American ambassador in the Soviet Union Mr. Joseph Davis wrote an article appreciating the fairness of the trial. Rabindranath, Bernard Shaw, Romain Rolland and leaders of freedom movement of our country including Netaji Subhas Chandra never criticised Stalin for this trial because they understood its justification.

### **Problem of Individualism as pointed out by Shibdas Ghosh**

Another point was pointed out by our great teacher Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. While building up our party here, he noticed a

problem, i.e., the problem of individualism. Individualism was a progressive trait at the time of bourgeois democratic revolution. At that time it was a struggle to win the right to have private property. Under feudalism, common people had no right to have private property; only kings, monarchs, feudal lords as the ‘representatives of God’ enjoyed this right. Rising capitalism raised the slogan that every individual must have the right to private property. Accordingly to have private property, private right and individual right, individual freedom – all these ideas came to the fore at that time to achieve the right of the rising bourgeoisie to own individual property and accelerate the process of industrial revolution. So at that time, the slogans of ‘freedom of the individual’, ‘right of the individual’ were progressive. With these slogans the serfs combined under the bourgeoisie for a change of society. Thus individualism then had a social appeal, had a spirit of social progress. But with the establishment of capitalism, individual ownership was established. A new era began. Individual capitalists were exploiting the workers. Individualism lost its progressive role. It became out and out reactionary, particularly in the stage of monopoly capital. Individualism leads to individual-centric approach, selfishness, indifferent attitude to the society. That’s why Comrade Shibdas Ghosh placed before us that at this stage of reactionary individualism, the individual is to be freed from the shackles of individualism to become identified with the society, with revolution, with revolutionary party and thus attain the highest communist morality.

From the very beginning Comrade Shibdas Ghosh felt the problem of individualism and placed this concept of morality before us. In our freedom struggle, individualism had a relative progressive role because bourgeoisie also had a relative progressive role in our freedom struggle. Interest of freedom struggle is prior, individual interest is secondary — that was the morality at that time. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had shown that the Russian revolution was socialist because bourgeoisie was in the

state power. But at the ground it was in the stage of bourgeois democratic revolution. Chinese revolution was in essence a bourgeois democratic revolution under the leadership of the working class. Their slogan was just like the slogan in our freedom struggle. Interest of revolution is primary and interest of individual is secondary. Thus interest of the individual was kept alive.

In Soviet Russia when the civil war ended and the economy developed, affluence in life also came. That individualism, which remained secondary at the time of revolution, gradually raised its ugly head. *Comrade Shibdas Ghosh* termed it as '*socialist individualism*'. This was a problem there. Those who started to organise revolution there, they had to face starvation and even death. The people of Soviet Union in 1950-60 were the third generation, who did not face that poverty-stricken condition. They did not experience the stormy period of revolution, which they knew only from books, but that cannot ignite the fiery emotion of revolution if proper politicalization is not there. Rather due to individualism, some sort of consumerism also developed. That also we should note. In the economic field also certain remnants of the bourgeois economy were there —commodity production, commodity circulation, law of value, wage differences were there. Families had poultry, livestock, cow, kitchen garden as personal property. Later in absence of higher ideological struggle, these also worked as a breeding ground to nurture the urge for more private property.

### **Contradiction between physical and mental labor led to opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat**

Another problem also developed around the contradiction between mental and physical labour. Unless the intellectual sections or the intelligentsia of the society is not identified with the revolution, unless they acquire the communist morality, they would become victim of a sense of superiority —'we are superior', 'I am a scientist', 'I am a doctor', 'I am a professor',

‘they are laborers’, ‘how we can accept dictatorship of the proletariat’. Through this they started to nurture the feelings of individual freedom, a bourgeois right. If proper communist education is not there, superiority complex would be manifested as a yearning for bourgeois rights. Through all these certain counter revolutionary trends of thought develop which in course of time gradually become powerful. This also happened in the Soviet Union.

### **Great Marx had foretold that socialism carries the birthmarks of capitalism**

Now in this context, let me read from Great Marx. On socialism (first stage of communism) Marx said, *“What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has developed on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it emerges from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally, and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges.”*(*Critique of the Gotha Programme*) That meant socialism in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society (capitalist) from whose womb it emerges. Unless these elements of the capitalist society eliminated fully by the intensification of class struggle, danger of restoration of capitalism would be there. Marx even said, *“In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; after labor has become not only a means of life but life’s prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-around development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly – only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to*

*his ability, to each according to his needs!” (Critique of the Gotha Programme)* This meant if the higher phase of communism was not achieved, the ‘narrow horizon of bourgeois rights’ among the people would remain. That means if the narrow horizon of bourgeois rights not crossed in its entirety, danger of restoration of capitalism remains there. This point is to be noted. Marx further said, *“Between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.”* (Critique of the Gotha Programme) Between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other – it means socialism can advance to communism if properly led; otherwise it can revert back to capitalism by ‘counter-revolutionary transformation’.

**“Resistance by the overthrown bourgeoisie increases tenfold” warned Great Lenin**

Great Lenin also said, *“Theoretically, there can be no doubt that between capitalism and communism there lies a definite transition period which must combine the features and properties of both these forms of social economy. This transition period has to be a period of struggle between dying capitalism and nascent communism—or, in other words, between capitalism which has been defeated but not destroyed and communism which has been born but is still very feeble.”* (Economics and Politics in the Era of Dictatorship of the Proletariat) He said further, *“The dictatorship of the proletariat means a most determined and most ruthless war waged by the new class against a more powerful enemy, the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased tenfold by their overthrow (even if only in a single country), and whose power lies, not only in the strength of international capital, the strength and*

*durability of their international connections, but also in the force of habit, in the strength of small-scale production.”* (*Left Wing Communism-an Infantile Disorder*) These words of Marx and Lenin indicate that they had foreseen the danger of restoration of capitalism if the struggle was not properly conducted.

**Comrade Shibdas Ghosh Observed ‘the leadership of the world socialist camp was very much influenced by mechanical process of thinking’**

Let me quote Comrade Shibdas Ghosh which is relevant here. When parallel to the capitalist-imperialist system, a socialist system was developed including Soviet Union, China, Eastern Europe as a powerful system and there was an onward march of communist movement throughout the world, even at that time in 1948, he gave a caution, “... *the present leadership of the world communist camp is to a very large extent, influenced by mechanical process of thinking. ... because of this there has been continuous violation of the Marxist dialectical principle ... most of the parties have chosen the easy way of mechanical centralization which has led to the formation of bureaucratic leadership at the top.*” (Self criticism of the communist camp) That means in the name of democratic centralism virtually and mostly bureaucratic centralism in different spheres of party organization developed. This led instead of dialectical relationship, firstly to blind support and then blind opposition to the leadership which turned ultimately into a cry for bourgeois liberalism and individual freedom. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh said further, “*So far, the communists of different countries mostly stressed one-sided routine work of organization without showing any regard to coordinating it with questions of ideology. On the other hand, these leaders have only exhorted the party workers about their duty to the party, the discipline (which is nothing but mechanical) and the need to expand anyhow the party organization.*” (Self-criticism of the communist camp) It means uplifting of ideological standard was

very much neglected. Lenin taught, “*Marx-Engels laid down the cornerstone of the science, which are to be developed in all direction if we are to keep pace with life.*” (Collected Works, Russian Edition Vol-II) Lenin did it in his life-time. On this point also, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh said, “*the philosophical development of Marxism-Leninism which ought to have been made in the face of multiplicity of newer problems of life and class struggles and in keeping with the spectacular progress of natural sciences that marked the post-Lenin period.... Nobody would perhaps, deny that at present the phenomenon of individualism and bourgeois sense of liberty are in the ideological sphere stiff obstacles in the path of development of class struggles in advanced countries... But not a single work that can claim to have dealt with the problem authoritatively and comprehensively has come out in the post-Lenin period.*” (*Steps taken against Stalin*) As a result ideological standard became lowered to a large extent, which also undermined dialectical relationship and helped to revive and strengthen bourgeois ideas. We must take note of this.

### **Khrushchev opened the floodgate of revisionism**

In 1956, when Khrushchev denounced Stalin, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh was the first leader in the international communist movement who protested and warned that the Soviet party had opened the flood gate of revisionism. He said, “... *this observation of Khrushchev is sure to generate the trend of reformism-revisionism in the communist movement of different countries.*” (on 20th Congress of the CPSU) Further he observed, “*Indeed, like his precursors 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, which is the present-day understanding of Marxism-Leninism. To the future generations, the chapter of relentless struggle waged by Stalin*

*against the Trotskyites and the Bukharinites to safeguard the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism would remain dark and black and they would be deprived of the opportunity of being ideologically steered. It would mean invitation to all sorts of counter-revolutionary ideas to pass for Marxism-Leninism and the ideological foundation of the communist movement would suffer a setback. In short, it would objectively uncrown Lenin himself.” (Steps taken against Stalin)* Subsequent development proved Khrushchev’s attack against Stalin did really undermine Leninism, causing tremendous damage to the world communist movement.

### **Need is a new concept of communist morality urged Comrade Shibdas Ghosh**

Again regarding the need for a new concept of communist morality Comrade Shibdas Ghosh said, *“In the socialist society of today, it is the old bourgeois concept of individual freedom and mental make-up that stands in the way of conducting a new struggle for the individual’s freedom and emancipation at this new stage. And this old mental make-up is obstructing the individual necessity and individual interest from merging and becoming identified with the social necessity and social interest.”(Cultural Revolution in China)* On the question of how revisionism develops and leads to capitalist restoration in socialist society, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had shown, *“if the backwardness continues to persist in the fields of epistemology and culture that the entire party and the working class may being misled, preach the revisionist and reformist path and bring about the restoration of capitalism while wavering the banner of Marxism Leninism and chanting socialist slogans.”(Cultural Revolution in China)* This has happened both in Russia and China.

### **Stalin’s agony as expressed in the 19th congress of CPSU**

I will now read out from Stalin which is very relevant.

After the Second World War when the Soviet Union was hailed by virtually the entire mankind, and the Soviet Union also advanced very much economically, politically, educationally, and in all other aspects including in the field of science overcoming war devastation, at that time the agony that was expressed by Stalin in his last speech in the 19<sup>th</sup> Party Congress of CPSU before his demise, that I want to place before you. This type of agony was never found in his earlier speeches. It indicates that in the last hours of his life, Stalin felt the danger. Probably, during the war, as the Chief of the party and of the army he went from town to town, from city to city and even from front to rear to inspire and mobilize the people against fascist aggression and supervised all the activities. He visited numerous places directly. At that time, he came to know many problems which were unknown to him earlier. I had read his speeches from earlier party congresses, his speeches against conspiracies of the anti-party groups after the death of Lenin, but I had not come across such agony which was expressed by him in the 19<sup>th</sup> Congress of CPSU, that was supposed to be a celebratory congress after the great victory in the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War and the spectacular reconstruction of a war-ravaged economy. Instead of quoting him, I will give the essence of his speech in my language. Firstly, he pointed out that not in all party organizations and nowhere by any means in full measure, have self criticisms and specially criticisms from below become the principal method of disclosing and overcoming errors and shortcomings, weaknesses and maladies. Here he pointed out that in the party, bureaucracy developed in different levels. Secondly, he pointed out that a section of the leaders did not face criticism from the rank and file. They stifled it, those who criticized, they persecuted them, punished them. Some executives sent false reports. A mentality has developed within the party that they had won the war, so there was no other danger. They could take rest now. They could live on the capital of their past services. There were

meetings only in praise of the leaders and the leaders liked it. Selecting the cadres for a particular work was not done on the basis of merit, but on the basis of kinship, that is family relationship, on the basis of town relationships, on the basis of friendships - all these things developed. There were some leaders who felt that laws and discipline were not for them. They were above all. These were only for ordinary workers.

Now I will read out the final and most important points of his speech. He said, "*Ideological work is the prime duty of the party and under-estimation of this work may cause irreparable damage to the interest of the party and state. We must always remember that any weakening of the influence of the socialist ideology signifies strengthening of the influence of bourgeois ideology.*" It is clear that at that time he felt the danger of lowering of ideological standard and as a result the danger of strengthening bourgeois ideology would cause irreparable damage to the party and the state. He criticized even the Moscow committee as it was emphasizing more on economical work than ideological work. And he pointed out that in different levels of the party the ideological struggle was being neglected. So it was a very serious warning from him. Then he gave another warning, "*We still have survivals of the bourgeois ideology, relics of the private property mentality and ethics.*" We know that Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had pointed out the danger of private property mental complex in 1948. In 1952 Comrade Stalin felt that danger in Soviet Union. He said further, "*These survivals do not die away of themselves. They are highly tenacious and may strengthen their hold, and resolute struggle must be waged against them*". Then he continued "*Nor are we guaranteed against the penetration of alien views, ideas and sentiments from outside, from the capitalist countries or from inside, from the remnants of groups hostile to Soviet state which had not been completely demolished by the party*". In the 18<sup>th</sup> congress it was reported that the anti-

party forces were completely eliminated, but in the 19<sup>th</sup> Congress he said, *“They are not completely demolished”*. That means these were detected after the 18<sup>th</sup> Congress, during and after the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War. He cautioned, *“Wherever there is relaxation of attention to question of ideology, favourable soil is created for reviving views and concepts hostile to us ...anti-Leninist groups ... seek to lay their hands on those sectors of ideological work ... to utilize these sectors for dragging in their line and ... and spreading various kinds of non-Marxist ‘viewpoints’ and ‘conceptions’ ... serious errors and distortions often creep into books, newspapers and magazines and scientific and other establishments in the ideological fields. ...In relation to the discussion on philosophy, biology, physiology linguistics and political economy disclose serious ideological flaws in various fields of science ... however in a number of branches of science we have not yet fully put an end to the monopoly of various groups of scientists who hold up the advance of the growing fresh forces ... and seek to decide scientific questions by administrative means, has not been completely eradicated.*

All these statements prove that Stalin was aware of the existence and spread of bourgeois ideology, private property mentality and ethics, bureaucracy, and activities of anti-Leninist groups, and was preparing the party for the struggle against these counter-revolutionary forces, which was hindered by his sudden, sad death in 1953. Meanwhile the counter-revolutionary forces took advantage of the death of this great revolutionary and raised their ugly heads.

The 20<sup>th</sup> congress of the CPSU was a congress for the advancement of revisionism, to prepare the ground for restoration of capitalism by denouncing Stalin in the name of fighting ‘cult of personality’. For that renegade Khrushchev is not the only one to be blamed. Khrushchev represented a trend i.e., the counter-revolutionary trend which was developing within the Soviet Union

and symptoms of which were already noticed by Stalin. As the ideological standard of the rank and file was low and they were habituated to follow the leadership blindly, they could not apprehend the conspiracy behind the slogan of fighting ‘cult of personality’, ‘liberalization’, ‘and democratization of socialism’. Similar thing happened in China. Great Mao Ze Dong at the outset could not feel the danger of the conspiracy of Khrushchev leadership and in the main supported his line of the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress and criticized Stalin for giving ‘excessive emphasis’ on class struggle and ‘undermining socialist democracy’, but after ten years, in 1966, he himself felt the danger of counter-revolution in China and launched the historic cultural revolution to counter it. He said, *“although the bourgeoisie has been overthrown, it is still trying to use the old ideas, culture, customs and habits of the exploiting classes to corrupt the masses, capture their minds and endeavour to stage a come-back ... at present, our objective is to struggle against and crush those persons in authority who are taking the capitalist road, to criticize and repudiate the reactionary bourgeois academic ‘authorities’ and the ideology of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes...”*. He initiated a bold struggle to save socialism, which was hailed by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, who at the same time pointed out some ideological limitations in this great struggle also. But the Cultural Revolution could not decisively defeat the bourgeois forces and ultimately the capitalist-roaders captured power after the demise of Mao Ze Dong in 1976 and restored capitalism in China.

One point that I must say here is that after the fall of the socialist system, the entire world communist movement practically faced severe crisis and fell in disarray; it suffered from complete dejection and faced disintegration. The French Communist party, the Italian Communist party, the Japanese Communist party, the Indonesian Communist party - all the parties who were once very powerful communist parties faced severe crises and disintegrated because of

their blind dependence on the Soviet or Chinese leadership. But although our party felt the pain, we did not face any crisis of disintegration or frustration, because Comrade Shibdas Ghosh had prepared us for this eventuality and guided us on how to tide over these problems. We faced it under the leadership of Comrade Nihar Mukherjee, and we are still continuing our struggle.

Now the question is whether capitalism will continue or socialism will ultimately win. We know that the urge for socialism did not arise because Marx and Engels desired it. It emerged as an inexorable social law based on contradiction between capital and labour and concretized scientifically by Great Marx-Engels. Without socialism what is the future of humanity? It will be only sinking in the ocean of endless crises. What are we witnessing today? In spite of the absence of socialism and parallel world socialist market, the powerful imperialist countries, USA, Germany, Japan, France, capitalist-imperialist China, and imperialist Russia, all are in the grip of severe crises, the crisis of market. They use a term 'slowdown of economy' to avoid the term recession. Slow down of the economy is continuously going on for a few decades. But they can't say at any moment that the economy is going up. If they find a ray of hope, they say it is 'fragile recovery', or 'bubble economy'. Because the economy is continuously going down, the market is getting squeezed. Who will purchase commodities? Billions of people are unemployed, retrenched. Thousands and thousands of factories are being closed down. As the multinationals and the monopolists ruthlessly exploit the workers and the toiling people, they are getting bereft of any purchasing power – this is what generates market crisis. One percent of the population amassed 70 percent of global wealth; on the other hand, 70 percent of population languishes in abject poverty, living without food, without shelter. Even in America there are thousands of people who are homeless. In our country millions are living on the pavement taking shelter under polythene sheets. Even children are born and dying there. Capitalism is in severe crisis, and it is beyond any solution. Even if

Adam Smith, Ricardo and Keynes sit together, they would not be able to find a solution to this problem.

You know that just now two wars are going on. Imperialists are engaged in this war directly and indirectly. Here I want to mention one incident. Suez Canal was owned by Anglo-French company. In 1956, the Nationalist Government of Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal. England and France attacked Egypt with the support of US Imperialists. Soviet Union at that time gave them only 12 hours ultimatum that 'either you stop the aggression or we will bombard London and Paris'. Simultaneously they told the people of London and Paris, 'you are not our enemy but your government is attacking and destroying Egypt, they must stop it'. Aggressor imperialists did not wait for 12 hours, within six hours the aggression was stopped. Had the socialist Soviet Union been in existence today, we would not see these painful incidents like in Palestine and Ukraine. Thousands and thousands of children and women are slaughtered; towns and villages are destroyed by imperialist-backed wars.

So, the entire humanity is in crisis. All the capitalist-imperialist governments are curtailing social welfare budget, and are increasing military budget; for militarization they are increasing taxation, leading to price rise, inflation - all these phenomena are there. All the governments are running on the basis of borrowing, giving rise to sovereign debt. They need war industry as pointed out by Stalin. Consumer market is squeezed; artificial market is being developed, that needs war industry. To fuel the war industry, they need war tension and war. That is what is happening now. So, the entire humanity is facing allout crisis. So, there is poverty, beggary, starvation, death on the one hand, and on the other there is crisis of morality, crisis of ethics, death of love and affection, death of human values – all these we are witnessing today. Can these be allowed anymore?

### **Take ideological struggle as the primary**

Simultaneously there is another danger. That is the danger of

global warming created by imperialist-capitalists. The scientists have warned that green house gases like carbon dioxide, that are emitted from the burning of fossil fuel, cause global warming. This results in warming of land and ocean, melting of ice and glaciers, rising ocean levels which in turn leads to loss of land; the consequences of climate change are frequent cyclones, floods and draughts. Scientists have repeatedly warned about the disastrous consequences of climate change. But imperialists, capitalists are not listening, will not listen to the repeated warnings of the scientists. Their unbridled greed for maximum profit will not allow them to curtail the use of fossil fuel, restrict the emission of methane gas, and thereby they are ignoring the danger to humanity. They are so inhuman! Will this continue? Shall we allow it to continue? Definitely we cannot. So we need anti-capitalist socialist revolution.

But everything is not dark. Yet there is hope also. The problems of life are compelling the people to raise their voice in protest. Spontaneous outbursts, protests are everywhere. A few years back there was the 'Occupy Wall Street Movement' that continued for seven months in USA, the chieftain of world imperialism. Wall Street was surrounded by students, unemployed youths, retrenched workers. US Government could not dare to deploy military, lest it invites a civil war. And such protests will be repeated again and again. Problems will push the people to movements. A few months back, India witnessed a year-long peasants' movement which claimed 700 lives. In Europe, continuous surging waves of strikes are going on. Without any prominent leader, without being led by any party, spontaneous outbursts of movements just like volcanic eruptions are happening here and there. Sparks of discontent are flying around everywhere. At any moment a big conflagration can develop anywhere. Objective condition is prepared. People desire protest. People protest. People desire change. But they do not know how to change, what will be the future. To realize that ideological leadership is necessary. So, the objective condition is prepared; the subjective condition is lacking. Only Marxism-

Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh thought can provide that leadership. In reality, capitalism is in death bed, spreading foul smell everywhere, but no social system dies out automatically, it requires conscious initiative of the crisis-ridden people to hasten the death of a dying society and build up a new society. That is the lesson of history. That is the crying need of the hour. We know that revolution is inevitable today or tomorrow or day after tomorrow; again there will be a victory of socialism. That victory of socialism will take lessons from the counter-revolution in Soviet Union and China. As Soviet revolution took lessons from the Paris commune which lasted for three months, similarly future socialist revolution will take lessons. Why, for what faults, for what weakness counter-revolution was successful — this will be a lesson for future socialist revolutionaries. We should feel in that way. Our party is armed with Marxism-Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh Thought. While observing the November Revolution Day, it is our task to place before the people that there is no question of frustration and hopelessness. There is a way out to put an end to this misery and sufferings, which demands of us to fight against capitalist exploitation and fight for socialist revolution. And it is our task to build up, develop and strengthen our party ideologically, politically, organizationally and morally, being armed with Marxism-Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh Thought to fulfill the historical responsibility bestowed on us nationally and internationally. **It is particularly necessary to put more emphasis on ideological struggle than on day-to-day routine work.** We must give proper emphasis to attain noble communist character defeating individualism in all aspects of our thinking, in our mode of life, in our feeling, in our relationships by following the teachings of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh. With this appeal I end today.

*Red Salute to November Revolution*

Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Shibdas Ghosh Thought

*Long Live SUCI(Communist)*

Long Live Proletarian Internationalism

Published by Amitava Chatterjee on behalf of SUCI (C)  
from 48, Lenin Sarani, Kolkata 700013 and  
printed by Ganadabi Printers & Publishers Private Limited,  
52B, Indian Mirror Street, Kolkata 700013.

Rs. 15/-