

LENINISM
&
SOVIET SOCIALISM

IN THEORY AND PRACTICE



BISWAJIT BASU



LENINISM
&
SOVIET SOCIALISM
IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

By
BISWAJIT BASU



MARXIST LENINIST RESEARCH CENTRE
Kolkata

Leninism & Soviet Socialism
In theory and practice
by Biswajit Basu

First Bengali Publication : January 2011
First English Edition : November 2016

Publisher : Utpal Basu
10, Netaji Subhas Road,
Kolkata-700 148

E-mail : mail2mlrc@gmail.com

Printer : Nandonik
Garfa, Jadavpur
Kolkata-700 078

Price : 80/-

INTRODUCTION

With the degradation of the socialist countries including the Soviet Union and China to capitalism, Marxism-Leninism is facing a deep crisis. Taking opportunity of this situation, the bourgeois philosophers, economists and social scientists are distorting the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism totally from the opposite view-points. Under the influence of uninterrupted slandering by the bourgeoisie and revisionists the Marxist-Leninist camp is experiencing confusion, dissension and disintegration.

The capitalists adopted the path of globalization with a view to developing a crisis-free economic system by destroying socialism. But today they have been immersed into a deeper and broader crisis, and cannot find a way out. Gradually realizing that capitalism is hardly able to solve the social problems, the common people in the capitalist countries are, therefore, searching for an alternative and getting more and more attracted by socialism.

Under these circumstances, I have authored the Book *Leninism & Soviet Socialism in Theory and Practice* in order to turn out the confusing propaganda by the bourgeoisie and revisionists, and unite different categories of followers of Marxism-Leninism, thereby defending the theoretical basis and fundamental tenets of Marxism.

Socialism became victorious in the Soviet Union under the leadership of Stalin on the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism guided by Lenin. In the post-Stalin period, on the other hand, the Trotskyites, Titoites and Khrushchevites, with their capitalistic thinking under the guise of Marxism-Leninism, started their journey through the road reverse to socialism. As a result, the Soviet socialism has been degraded to capitalism. The former was, therefore, the theory of development while the latter was that of degeneration.

The philosophical basis of Marxism-Leninism is dialectical materialism. I have tried to refute the arguments of the opposition with the help of dialectics from the philosophical point of view. The differences between materialism and idealism and between dialectics

and metaphysics have repeatedly come to the fore in the debate. In the sphere of class struggle, the conflict between the proletariat and bourgeoisie is absolute and so is the conflict between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism as well as that in the Party, between socialism and capitalism. But, instead, the theory of “combine two into one” has been put forward. That is to say, differences in opinion on the law of the unity of opposites have been noticed. Instead of the dialectical relation between analysis and synthesis, these two are usually shown as identical. The struggle between the contradictory aspects, transformation of one into the other, and the process of one being “eaten up” by the other are declined to put forward the question of handling the contradiction by the theory of combine two into one.

The methods of resolving contradictions in capitalist society and those in socialist one are different. For example, the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production as well as that between the economic base and the superstructure in a socialist society can be easily resolved by the planned economy. To this contrary, the opposition accuses Stalin of not finding out class struggle in the Soviet society.

The Book exclusively deals with the contradictions existing in the Soviet society during socialist construction and the methods adopted for their resolution. Differences between the external contradictions of capitalism and the internal ones of the capitalist system as well as the differences of the methods for resolving these two types of contradictions are shown. The Book also deals with the dialectics of the application of New Economic Policy (NEP) in the transitional period and explains the essence of the victory of socialism in one country. The bourgeois right “without the bourgeoisie” on the distribution of consumer goods remains in socialism and it will remain until communism becomes a reality. But the existence of such bourgeois right leads the opposition to conclude that the victory of socialism was hardly accomplished in the Soviet Union. Does this conclusion conform with Marxism-Leninism?

Stalin “deviated from the path of Leninism after 1936”— behind this allegation the opposition puts forward some arguments which are as follows:

Argument I. After 1936, Stalin concluded that the Soviet society did “no longer contain antagonistic, hostile, exploiting classes”. According to the opposition it was a wrong perception. On this matter extensive

analysis and explanation by Stalin have been mentioned to judge whether socialism can deserve to be victorious in a socialist society where antagonistic exploiting classes still exist. As the civil war did not attain to victory and the antagonistic exploiting classes could not be eradicated in China, socialism was not victorious in that country. Doesn't it go against Marxism-Leninism to find no difference between the higher phase of development of socialism in the Soviet Union and its relatively lower phase in China as well as to judge the socialism in the Soviet Union in reference to China? Some intellectuals who plead for "judging Stalin in reference to Mao" are lacking in scientific analysis. Would it be irrational to raise question on their political honesty and revolutionary morality?

Argument II. Not recognizing that "throughout the entire historical period of socialism there are classes, class contradictions and class struggle in the society", Stalin deviated from the path of Leninism. The opposition justifies Stalin's deviation by distorting Lenin's statements. The matter has been extensively dealt with in the Book.

Argument III. Regarding the practical steps, their forms and the time-limit in the transition from socialism to communism, Lenin had to leave the question entirely open, because "there is no material for answering these questions" due to historical limitations. Lenin's limitations were overcome by Stalin, who found out the problems and gave their solutions through practice in the transition to communism. Stalin's observations, e.g., "class struggle is as if getting intensified after the abolition of classes", and "the state will remain, continue in force for some time after the abolition of classes and even in the communist society" are the further development of Lenin's formulation on the dictatorship of the proletariat. Stalin not only solved the contradictions of the socialist society but managed to solve those in the communist society as well, as they were totally new and Lenin could not manage to solve them. These creative contributions of Stalin are sometimes interpreted as instances of Stalin's deviation from the path of Leninism. The matter has been thoroughly discussed in the Book.

The Book also deals with the objective basis of the Soviet-Yugoslav dispute.

The Tito clique of Yugoslavia infiltrated into the Communist Parties of different countries. Particularly, the Indian revolution suffered heavy losses as a consequence of the Trotskyite and Titoite lines followed by the then undivided Communist Party of India. Giving up Stalin's

teachings on colonialism, the CPI declined the existence of imperialism in India and the question of national liberation in Indian Revolution, and ignored the existence of feudalism in Indian agriculture to paint the country as an independent and democratic one. With the two stages of Indian revolution being intermingled, the struggle for national liberation was virtually given up to project the stage of socialist revolution. As a consequence, the effort for enhancing Indian Revolution by uniting the strength and stream of the anti-imperialist national liberation struggle with those of the anti-feudal agrarian revolutionary democratic struggle was discarded. With the help of Stalin the two-line struggle against the Titoites got intensified in the CPI, leading to the self-criticism by B T Ranadive, the then General Secretary of the Party. This matter has been dealt with in the Book with due importance.

As the Titoite line severely infiltrated into the Communist Party of China, the CPC could never take a strong position on the Soviet-Yugoslav dispute, oscillating off and on like a pendulum between Stalin and Yugoslavia under the international pressure. Com. Mao launched an intense struggle against the Titoite-Khrushchevite-Luite line, which has been illustrated in the Book.

Stalin's theory on the Party of a monolithic nature is a further development of Lenin's vision of Marxist-Leninist Party formation, the philosophical viewpoint of which has been analyzed in the Book.

At present the bourgeoisie and the revisionists are unleashing severe onslaught on Marxism-Leninism. In the name of uplifting the ideology of the working class the revisionists are propagating the basic theories and principles of dialectical materialism totally from the opposite direction. Our great international teachers Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao passed away, but they left behind their experiences on fighting revisionism, from which we get advices to enrich and strengthen our materialistic world outlook in the struggle against the onslaught of bourgeois ideology and revival of bourgeois world view. It is the best way of eliminating confusion and fighting revisionism which is the main danger in our epoch.

The young materialists in our country should deeply study the history of three international great debates and theoretical debates against revisionism. At the same time, they have to recollect the brilliant speech delivered by Stalin to the representatives of the fraternal communist and democratic parties at the concluding session of the 19th Congress of the CPSU in 1952: "Formerly, the bourgeoisie was regarded as the

head of the nation; it upheld the rights and independence of the nation and placed them above all else. Now not a trace remains of the national principle. Now the bourgeoisie sells the rights and independence of the nation for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard. There is no doubt that it is you, the representatives of the communist and democratic parties, who will have to raise this banner and carry it forward, if you want to be patriots of your country, if you want to become the leading force of the nation. There is nobody else to raise it.” Com. Mao called this speech as an invaluable directive by Com. Stalin to the communists all over the world.

Finally, I appeal to the readers to go through the Book with a deep attention so that it may, as I hope, eliminate their confusion and elevate their theoretical realization.

I am grateful to my friends who helped me in various ways to author the Book and also to Marxist-Leninist Research Centre, the organization that bears the responsibility of publishing the Book.

Kolkata, January 12, 2011

Biswajit Basu

C O N T E N T S

	Page
1. Communism an Entity Developing out of Capitalism	11
2. Dialectics & the Soviet Socialism	12
3. On Antagonistic & Non-Antagonistic Contradictions	17
4. On the Law of Unity of Opposites	19
5. On the Theory of Monolithic Party	22
6. Whose Deviation from the Path of Leninism?	24
7. Stalin & the Yugoslavia Question	35
8. Titoism & the CPI	38
9. The Stalin Question & the CPC	41
10. Stalin & the Cultural Revolution in the USSR	46
11. Stalin Profoundly Developed Leninism	48
12. Com. Mao on Stalin & the CPSU	52

LENINISM & SOVIET SOCIALISM IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

The word ‘communist’ inflicts hatred and panic not on the reactionaries alone but on a section of intelligentsia as well. The bourgeois philosophers preach capitalism as the highest stage of development of human civilization and culture, beyond which is nothing else other than ‘barbarism’. ‘Communist’ means something dreadful to those who have faith in such false notion. It is generally known that there is a process of inception, development and decline of every class-divided society. But they accept capitalist society as one that has an inception but will never decline, and, like the heaven, it is an unchangeable and everlasting system.

Afterwards, some bourgeois philosophers propagated equality, equal rights for all, etc., and put forward the idea of utopian socialism, i.e., to reach socialism through bourgeois democracy. There is a delusive philosophical outlook behind the origin of such idea. The process and method in cognition are of two types: one, from objective matter to subjective consciousness, from existence to ideas; and the other, from ideas, consciousness to matter, existence. The philosophers who give priority to the matter are materialists while those to ideas are in the idealist camp. The view-point of the idealist philosophers reflects in the maxim: ‘Brahma (the ‘Supreme Being’) is true while false is the material world’.

Some talented persons in a society, as the idealists claim, determine the laws, and the society runs accordingly. As a consequence of such false notion, the idealists could hardly search out the scientific causes of social development.

The materialists, however, got divided into two camps. A section was under mechanical materialism, against whom was launched a struggle by Marx and Engels who thereby brought about a great revolution in the field of philosophy, eliminating its incompleteness and imperfection and setting it erect on the base of science to found dialectical materialism. The doctrine is materialism while the method of its analysis

and explanation is dialectical. Marx’s **Theories of Surplus Value** and **The Materialist Conception of History** are the basis of this doctrine, wherein are sown the seeds of social development and class struggle.

In search of the causes of social revolution, Engels observed, “The ultimate causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men’s brains, not in their growing insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchanges. They are to be sought, not in the *philosophy*, but in the *economics* of each particular epoch.”¹

Ideological inspiration does, no doubt, play a vital role in men’s historical activities in the period of social changes. But where does this ideological inspiration come from? Why are the existing social and political relations recognized as unjust and “irrational”, and the necessity of their changes felt? All these questions bring men to the sphere of objective life from that of subjective consciousness. One can search for a new path as a consequence of changes in the objective and economic life through the development of the means of production. Men’s social knowledge is but the reflection of the economic condition of the society. Scientific and materialistic analysis of the society’s economic condition is, therefore, the basis of inception of a new ideology.

Following Marx and Engels, Lenin thoroughly analyzed the imperialist economy. Lenin and Stalin studied the contradictions in the era of imperialism and formulated the strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution. Stalin defined Leninism as “Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution”, and further, as “the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular.”²

In a historic document of May 16, 1967, the Communist Party of China specified, “Lenin and Stalin developed Marxism, solved various questions related to the proletarian revolution in the era of imperialism, and also solved the theoretical and practical problems of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country.”³

Marxism, the proletarian ideology, is a science. Stalin described Marxism as “the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, the science of building communist society.”⁴

In the light of this view-point, we are trying to present a brief outline of the application of Leninism and dialectical materialism by the CPSU under the leadership of Stalin in the construction of socialism in the USSR.

Communism an Entity Developing out of Capitalism

Marx showed that future communism would emerge out of the womb of the old capitalist society. Lenin observed, "Communism has its origin in capitalism, it develops historically out of capitalism, it is the result of the action of a social force to which capitalism gave birth."⁵ He further observed, "Imperialism is capitalism in transition to socialism."⁶ So, capitalism and communism are interrelated and opposite to each other. Applying materialist dialectics on the process of development, Lenin concluded, "Communism is an entity developing out of capitalism."⁷ Transition from capitalism to communism is inevitable *as per* the scientific laws of social development. Therefore, communism should not be taken as something horrible, and slandering can hardly eliminate its inevitability.

"Between capitalist and communist society", as Marx observed, "lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."⁸

Regarding the distinction between socialism and communism Lenin showed, "The scientific distinction between socialism and communism is clear. What is usually called socialism was termed by Marx the "first" or lower phase of communist society. In so far as the means of production become *common* property, the word "communism" is also applicable here, providing we do not forget that this is *not* complete communism."⁹

Showing differences between the task of bourgeois revolution and that of the proletarian one, Stalin concluded, "The main task of the bourgeois revolution consists in seizing power and making it conform to the already existing bourgeois economy, whereas the main task of the proletarian revolution consists, after seizing power, in building a new, socialist economy."¹⁰ Installation of the dictatorship of the proletariat is just the beginning of the proletarian revolution. The tasks of the second phase of revolution are to transform the capitalist economy and achieve victory of the socialist economy with the help of the power of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Fulfillment of these tasks are the part and parcel of socialist revolution. In the second phase, internal contradictions and methods for resolving these contradictions are different from those in the first phase. Here the class struggle usually changes its form.

Proceeding to make a concrete analysis of the conditions of life of a society in which there would be no capitalism, Marx said, "What we have to deal with here (in analyzing the programme of the workers' party) 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."¹¹ Here Marx mentioned such a communist society which had not developed on its own economic foundations, which was in every respect still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society.

Regarding the first or lower phase of communist society Lenin said, "The first phase of communism cannot yet provide justice and equality: differences, and unjust differences, in wealth will remain, but the *exploitation* of man by man will have become impossible, because it will be impossible to seize the *means of production*, the factories, machines, land, etc., and make them private property. ...Marx shows the *course of development* of communist society, which is *compelled* to abolish at first *only* the "injustice" of the means of production having been seized by individuals, and which is *unable* at once to eliminate the other injustice, which consists in the distribution of articles of consumption 'according to work' (and not according to needs)."¹²

It is, therefore, clear from Lenin that, in socialism, the exploitation of man by man will be no longer in vogue, i.e., "antagonistic, hostile, exploiting classes will be no longer in existence", because the means of production will no longer remain as private property, rather they belong to the whole society. So, this society is free of class contradiction and class conflict. In the report to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU (B) Com. Stalin described the then Soviet society as such a society whose features were different from those of capitalism and also from those of a complete communist society.

Dialectics & Soviet Socialism

Stalin, as accused by the opposition, could not realize that "even in the socialist society, there remains contradictions between the productive forces and relations of production as well as between the economic base and superstructure". "In the late years of his lifetime" or "one year before his death" he allegedly realized their existence. What an ordinary student of Marxism realizes could not be realized by the world's foremost

architect of socialism and recognized leader of the Communist International! It is not the fact, the allegation is rather motivated. Stalin himself remarked, “It would be wrong to think that there are no contradictions between our productive forces and the relations of production. There certainly are, and will be, contradictions seeing that the development of the relations of production lags, and will lag, behind the development of the productive forces.”¹³ Besides, according to the law of economic development, as Stalin further observed, the contradiction between the economic base and superstructure remains in every social system—capitalist, socialist, and even in communist society. Had this allegation against Stalin been correct, how would it be possible for the USSR to witness such huge amount of production hike with an unprecedented progress in living standard of the people? Suppose Stalin committed error, but was Lenin himself, who was alive seven years after the October Revolution, unable to realize the existence of contradiction of the relations of production with the productive forces in the socialist society? It is Lenin who left behind the economic theory for the construction of socialism. At the sight of the success of socialist construction, he concluded, “Throughout the world the bourgeoisie ...realizes full well that our success in reconstructing the social economy is inevitable, provided we are not crushed by military force, and its attempts to crush us in this way are not succeeding.”¹⁴ It is clear from this fact that the opposition, in the name of opposing Stalin, is opposing nobody else other than Lenin, and thereby, consciously or unconsciously, strengthening the imperialist hand against socialism.

Now, let us come to the point. There are differences between the aims of capitalist and socialist production. The aim of capitalist production is neither people nor increasing production but profit-making, whereas the aim of socialist production is not profit but people, gradually uplifting the living standard of the whole people. This aim is reflected in economic planning, which is, therefore, called planned economy. For this reason Lenin and Stalin insisted that the aim of socialist economy was “securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of the society.”¹⁵ Satisfaction of not only material but cultural requirements as well—is it not related to the relations of production? Here the phrase “constantly rising” bears a special significance. The requirements of the people are not always the same, they are constantly rising, keeping pace with the development of the productive forces. Satisfaction of this additional

requirements requires gradual elevation of the material and cultural levels of the people. It is from this objective that the phrase “constantly rising” is well-selected and accepted as a process. Stalin showed, “New relations of production cannot, and do not, remain new forever; they begin to grow old and to run counter to the further development of the productive forces; so, in socialism, timely measures are to be taken to adapt the relations of production to the growth of the productive forces.”¹⁶

In this regard, Mao said, “Herein lies the superiority of our planned economy. As a matter of fact, this balance, this unity, is partially upset every month or every quarter, and partial readjustments are called for.”¹⁷

The principle of satisfying the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the people was in vogue from the very beginning in the USSR. Thanks to their incapability of realizing this principle the opposition could not find out the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, and thereby wrongly concluded that Stalin failed to realize this contradiction.

The fundamental contradictions in the socialist system are basically different from the nature and condition of the contradictions between the relations of production and productive forces as well as between the superstructure and economic base of the old society. “The process of continuous inception and resolution of these contradictions is also related to the process of transition from socialism to communism. In this process, the workers, peasants and other toiling people, who constitute the ruling class, are not overthrown by the antagonistic forces and still remain as the master of the society. The system of ownership of the common people is not abolished, rather it is developed into the higher phase. In this sense, the contradictions in the socialist society are not antagonistic, and they can be continuously resolved through the socialist system.”¹⁸

In the capitalist society, there are two fundamental contradictions which are resolved through socialist revolution. The first contradiction is the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and proletariat which is external in nature while the second, an internal one, is the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of appropriation.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is established by the forcible overthrow of the bourgeoisie in socialist revolution. As the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and proletariat is primarily resolved through

this revolution, it is the primary but very important step of socialist revolution.

The bourgeois revolution is, as mentioned earlier, usually *consummated* with the seizure of power, whereas in the proletarian revolution the seizure of power is only the *beginning*, and power is used as a lever for transforming the old economy and organizing the new one.

The main task of the proletarian revolution after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to build up socialist economy and carry forward the revolution to the end to create the objective reality for building communism. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the basis of socialist superstructure. Building socialist economy is essential for placing this superstructure on its own economic base. Then and then only the superstructure will conform with the economic base, thereby duly establishing the socialist system.

As soon as the October Revolution was accomplished the lands of the big land-owners were seized with this objective, and within a few months factories, joint stock companies, banks, railways, etc., were expropriated and converted into the public properties in Russia.

Between the capitalism and communism, as Marx observed, there is a transitional period. Lenin showed, this period certainly bears the characteristics and nature of both capitalist and communist socio-economic formations, and witnesses the struggle between the dying capitalism and new-born communism. The distinction between the external and internal contradictions of capitalism must be realized. The former is resolved by the “act of violence” while the latter through socialist construction. Each process of resolving the internal contradiction is qualitatively different from others.

Three aspects of the fundamental contradiction of the transitional economy showed by Lenin and Stalin are as follows: (1) The contradiction of large-scale socialist industry with the market-capitalist tendencies of small-scale commodity economy. (2) The antagonism between the interests of the proletariat, the owners of socialist industry, and the capitalistic elements—elements which have been in part already expropriated since the October Revolution and to rout in the civil war, but are not yet finally liquidated, and in part are being born anew on the basis of NEP, on the basis of individualist, small-scale, peasant economy. (3) The contradiction between the still limited output of socialist industry

and agriculture in one side and the growing demands of the workers on the other.¹⁹

Class struggle assumes various forms, of which class-conflict (violence) is one. Rejecting the other forms, the opposition usually regards class-conflict as the only form of class struggle. It does not want to understand the process of development through the contradiction of opposing forces, i.e., contradictory development, and calls for class-conflict everywhere. Stalin showed, “The dictatorship of the proletariat, the transition from capitalism to communism, must not be regarded as a fleeting period of “super-revolutionary” acts and decrees, but as an entire historical era, replete with civil wars, and external conflicts, with persistent organizational work and economic construction, with advances and retreats, victories and defeats.”²⁰ The opposition is hardly ready to realize this observation by Stalin.

The methods for resolving contradictions in different stages of revolution are different as well. In Russia, the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and proletariat was resolved through the socialist revolution at the first stage while the contradictions during the construction of socialist economy at the second stage were resolved through industrialization, collectivization in agriculture and construction of the Soviet socialist farms. Here the economic development proceeded, as Stalin showed, not by way of upheavals. But this theory expounded by Stalin is not accepted by the opposition who fails to realize the dialectics of the New Economic Policy (NEP) adopted in the Soviet Union during the period of transition, rather it indulges in quibbles, averting the question of applying materialist dialectics for solving the problems.

Stalin observed, “The fact of the matter is that in our socialist conditions economic development proceeds not by way of upheavals, but by way of gradual changes, the old not simply being abolished out of hand, but changing its nature in adaptation to the new, and retaining only its form; while the new does not simply destroy the old, but infiltrates into it, changes its nature and its functions, without smashing its form, but utilizing it for the development of the new. This, in our economic circulation, is true not only of commodities, but also of money, as well as of banks, which, while they lose their old functions and acquire new ones, preserve their old form, which is utilized by the socialist system.”²¹

Regarding the relation between form and content, Marxism gives priority to the content. The opposition hardly draws any distinction between the commodity production in capitalist economy and the commodity production without capitalists in socialist economy, and thereby wrongly concludes that “capitalism remains” or “capitalism will stage a come back” and “the victory of socialism in one country has not been achieved”, as the commodity production or the external features of some conceptual characteristics of capitalism remained intact in the Soviet economy. These elements are likely to be perceived only in forms but not the contents which were basically changed in adaptation to the socialist economy. The young communists should attentively study the experiences Com. Stalin gathered by applying materialist dialectics in socialist construction.

On Antagonistic & Non-Antagonistic Contradictions

Stalin is often seriously accused of failing to differentiate contradictions of antagonistic and non-antagonistic categories. But the criticism is being raised in an abstract way without ascertaining which enemy was treated as a friend and which friend as an enemy by Stalin. Let us, however, examine how Stalin launched debates in the CPSU(B) on the question of handling the antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions.

During the collective farm movement Bukharin omitted differentiation among the peasantry and put forward the theory of the kulaks growing into socialism. Stalin, on the other hand, showed the peasantry consisted of various social groups, namely, the poor peasants, the middle peasants and the kulaks, and the attitude of the Party to these groups should not be the same: the poor peasant to be taken as the *support* of the working class, the middle peasant as the *ally*, while the kulak as the *class enemy*. To separate the middle peasants from the kulaks, Stalin adopted the programmes for organizing all small producers, including the middle peasants, in the collective farms while overthrowing the kulaks by the class struggle. At the same time, he kept on struggle against the capitalistic tendencies of the peasants despite the unity of the proletariat and the peasantry, because, he knew, small production gave birth to capitalism anew every day, every moment. Bukharin pleaded

for combining the small individual peasant economy with the large-scale socialist economy and maintaining this double system for decades to come. Stalin opposed Bukharin and asserted that maintaining the double system for decades would restore capitalism and oppose the victory of socialism. Look here, Bukharin equated the class-interest of the kulaks with those of the proletariat and peasantry to project the class-enemy kulaks as their ally, while Stalin overthrew the kulaks by organizing class struggle against their exploiting bourgeois tendencies. So those who falsely accuse Stalin of failing to differentiate the antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions are virtually putting Bukharin's doctrine of confusing antagonistic contradictions with non-antagonistic ones out of view, thereby supporting his line of rejecting class struggle and promoting class-collaboration.

In this context, Trotsky asserted that the contradiction between the proletariat and the peasantry was of the same character as that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. What did it mean? The nature of the contradiction of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie was antagonistic whereas non-antagonistic was that of the proletariat with the peasantry, i.e., these two contradictions were mutually opposite. Painting these two contradictions as the same in nature, Trotsky tried to confuse the antagonistic contradiction with the non-antagonistic one, thereby breaking the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry and throwing the peasantry, the partner of the dictatorship of the proletariat, into the camp of the enemy of the proletariat. The wrong philosophical outlook led Trotsky to the conclusion that there was no distinction between antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions, that antagonism and contradiction were the same, that all contradictions were antagonistic and the methods for their resolution were the same as well, and that the peasantry, like the bourgeoisie, should be overthrown by force.

On this wrong outlook of Trotsky Stalin remarked, “Nor can we regard as an answer of the opinion of(some) half-backed Marxists, who think that thing to do would be toexpropriate the small and medium rural producers and to socialize their means of production. Marxists cannot adopt this senseless and criminal course either, because it would destroy all chances of victory for the proletarian revolution, and would throw the peasantry into the camp of the enemies of the proletariat for a long time.”²²

On the Law of the Unity of Opposites

As some of the opposition strongly allege, Stalin departed from dialectical materialism and fell into metaphysics and subjectivism on certain questions. Further, Stalin, as some others maintain, referred only to the struggle of the opposites but did little to their unity.

The Deborin school in the Soviet Union held that every process began its development from stable equilibrium, when there were no contradictions; contradiction appeared in a process, not at its inception, but only at a certain stage of its development, and that happened as a result of the action of external causes. In a word, the school declined the existence of contradictions in a matter.

“In its proper meaning”, Lenin said, “dialectics is the study of the contradiction within the very essence of things.”²³ He further said, “Development is the struggle of opposites.”²⁴ In his famous philosophical article *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, Stalin noted, “The opposites are connected with, dependent on, and determined by, each other.” What does it mean? Contradiction is nothing but the unity and struggle of the opposites. The unity is conditional and relative, while the struggle is unconditional and absolute. In this article, Stalin outlined the essence of dialectics in this way: “Contrary to metaphysics, dialectics holds that internal contradictions are inherent in all things and phenomena of nature, for they all have their negative and positive sides, a past and a future, something dying away and something developing; and that the struggle between these opposites, the struggle between the old and the new, between that which is disappearing and that which is developing, constitutes the internal content of the process of development, the internal content of the qualitative transformation of quantitative changes.”²⁵ Here Stalin observed the existence of contradictions in all things and phenomena of nature. Doesn’t it mean the unity and struggle of the opposites? Mao said, “The law of contradiction in things, that is, the law of the unity of opposites, is the basic law of materialist dialectics.”²⁶

In the past, the heads of revisionist camp used to accept solely the aspect of identity while resolutely fighting for rejecting the other aspect, the aspect of conflict or struggle, of the law of the unity of opposites. They tried to utilize the idealistic interpretation of the law of the unity of opposites in order to defend capitalism and dismantle socialism. In

the Soviet Union, Lenin and Stalin had to launch severe struggle against the Deborin school of thought on this question. Bukharin’s theory of abolition of classes by means of the extinction of the class struggle and by the capitalists growing into socialism was nothing but the theory of extinction of class struggle between the bourgeoisie and proletariat and between the capitalism and socialism, respectively, and, therefore, was the theory of class-collaboration, against which Stalin launched a resolute struggle. In this respect, an article on *Three Major Struggles on China’s Philosophical Front (1949-64)* shows, “When, after the victory of the October Revolution, the Soviet people, under the leadership of Stalin, embarked upon socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization, Deborin & Co. jumped forth to frenziedly oppose Lenin’s theory of the unity of opposites. They maintained that contradictions appeared not at the inception of a process but only when it had developed to a certain stage and that the resolution of contradictions was the conciliation of opposites. This theory of ‘conciliation of contradictions’ of Deborin’s was a reflection in philosophy of Bukharin’s theory of ‘the dying out of class struggle’ which alleged that ‘capitalism will peaceably grow into socialism.’ This reactionary philosophy for the restoration of capitalism was sternly criticized by Stalin.”²⁷

In 1958, Yang Hsien-chen, agent of Liu Shao-chi in China’s philosophical circle, with ulterior motives, advocated “using identity of contradictions” and by insinuation attacked the Party (the CPC) because it “talked only about the struggle between the opposites, but not their unity”.²⁸ An example would make it clear how earnestly the defenders of capitalism tried to overlook the conflict and struggle of the opposites. On July 23, 1934, the American journalist H G Wells met Stalin and said, “What the USA is witnessing is, as I suppose, a deep and vast readjustment, the creation of a planned, i.e., socialist economy. Roosevelt and you are marching ahead from two different starting points. Is there not a relationship, kinship of thoughts, between Moscow and Washington? I get surprised to see just the same thing to happen in Washington what I have seen to happen here in Moscow.” “Many persons accept”, Wells continued, “the theory that the system based on personal profit has been collapsed. In this situation, I feel that the contradictions of this world should not be in any way brought to the forefront, rather

we should earnestly endeavour to synthesize all constructive movements, all constructive forces in the same line as much as possible.”²⁹ Stalin did, however, brilliantly refute his arguments with lucid language. Wells, on the other hand, optimistically informed that the USA had undertaken an extensive reconstruction, and created a planned as well as socialist economy. He felt that the antagonism between Moscow and Washington, i.e., between the two systems—socialism and capitalism—had been abolished and close relationship of thought between the two had developed. In this context, Wells further expected that the system based on personal profit was being collapsed on its own, and so the contradictions between the two worlds should not be brought forward, as the contradictions between the socialism and capitalism had been, according to him, alleviated or abolished. After the WWII the capitalists introduced state monopoly capitalism in the name of building socialism for overcoming the crisis of capitalism. But, as it failed to overcome the capitalist crisis in 1975, they put forward a theory of combining the socialism and capitalism by amalgamating the highly developed industry, science and technology of the two systems, i.e., the theory of Convergence, which would be neither capitalism nor socialism but a revised form of capitalism. And it was what is known as the Keynesian Theory.

Now, look here, those who declining the conflict and struggle between the opposites give priority to their unity which is conditional and relative adopt nothing but the Keynesian Theory, don't they? These persons are those who giving up the revolutionary theory of “one divides into two” accept the counter-revolutionary philosophical doctrine of “combine two into one”. According to them, “one divides into two” means analysis while “combine two into one” is synthesis. In fact, analysis shows how an entity divides into two different parts and how they are locked in struggle; and, synthesis shows how, through the struggle between the two opposite aspects, one prevails, defeats and eliminates the other, how an old contradiction is resolved and a new one emerges, and how an old thing is eliminated and a new one triumphs; in a word, capitalism is eliminated and socialism triumphs through the process of capitalism being “eaten up” by socialism. As a consequence of adoption of the theory of “combine two into one” and rejection of class struggle, the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries have been “eaten up” by and degraded to capitalism.

On the Theory of Monolithic Party

It is alleged that Stalin's doctrine of monolithic party lacks credibility, because, as the opposition argues, no communist party becomes monolithic; the party contains the difference of views; the doctrine of monolithic party stands against the principle of democracy, and so on. It is further alleged that Stalin stood for the monolithic party unity while Mao talked about the party as the unity of opposites.

We know, communist party is the party of the working class, and is guided by the ideology of this class. Its goal is to establish a social system free of exploitation, class and state through the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. None other than the working class nurtures this goal. In order to achieve this goal the communist party must have to be the party of the working class. The proletariat cannot share the state power with any other class. It should be by no means forgotten that the Party, Philosophy and Democracy—each of these three bears specific class-character.

What does the theory of monolithic party mean? Those who oppose Stalin's theory of monolithic party strongly argue that there are different views assembling in the communist party. Definitely, more than one views on different issues might be reflected in the party. Does it mean that the communist party would be formed accepting all the views? Definitely not. The communist party accepts only that view which conforms to the class-interest of the proletariat. How would it be accomplished? Different views are to be placed in the party committee for discussion, and after thorough debates and clashes of views the view of the majority would be taken through the democratic method as the final decision which all members of the party are bound to accept. All must act on a single will, on a single style of work. Both aspects of the principle of democratic centralism, the Marxist-Leninist principle for guiding the party, must be maintained. It is just what is Stalin's theory on the formation of a monolithic party.

The opposition finds differences between the unity of Stalin's party as a monolithic unity and Mao's party unity as the unity of the opposites, without mentioning where Mao talked about the party as the unity of opposites. What does the unity of opposites mean? Which one is the basic law of the formation of a communist party—the law of the unity of opposites or the unity between the opposites, i.e., one divides into

two or combine two into one? If the law of the unity of opposites is accepted, there would be no differences between Stalin and Mao on this question. There do simultaneously exist unity and struggle between the opposites. One prevails, defeats and transforms the other, and thereby the contradiction is resolved. Should the matter be viewed in this angle there would be no differences found between the theory of monolithic party and that of the party formation by the law of the unity of opposites. As the oppositionists find differences between Stalin and Mao, they definitely interpret the law of the unity of opposites as the theory of “combine two into one”. Com. Mao did, as we emphasize, never tell about the building of party in such an anti-dialectics metaphysical outlook. They are, in fact, trying to introduce the revisionist line of party building in the name of Mao.

As the opposition continues, Stalin’s theory of monolithic party is erroneous. That means, the party would be polyolithic in character, and not monolithic. Then which class would it belong to? Obviously, not to the working class alone. And, therefore, it would not be a communist party, rather a bourgeois party of the alliance of workers, peasants, petty-bourgeoisie, bourgeoisie and other strata of the people. Then we get a “party of the whole people” in place of the party of the proletariat, an “ideology of the whole people” in place of the ideology of the working class, and the “dictatorship of the whole people” in place of the dictatorship of the proletariat; and, over and above these, the working class would lose its role of leadership. Now, let us judge whether the opposition is pleading for the revisionist line of party building suggested by the renegade Khrushchev & Co.

Formation of a polyolithic party in place of a monolithic one means to recognize factionalism in the party. The Tenth Congress of the CPSU(B) adopted a resolution presented by Lenin on Party unity, where Lenin emphasized, “All class-conscious workers must clearly realize that factionalism of any kind is harmful and impermissible, for no matter how members of individual groups may desire to safeguard Party unity. The Congress hereby orders the immediate dissolution of all groups without exception formed on the basis one platform or another ... Non-observance of this decision of the Congress shall entail unconditional and instant expulsion from the Party.”³⁰

In opposition to the formation of Party on the Trotskyite line Stalin said, “According to Trotskyism, the CPSU(B) must not be a single, united militant party, but a federation of some groups and factions, each with

its own centre, its own discipline, its own press, and so forth. What does it mean? It means proclaiming freedom for the political factions in the Party. It means that freedom for political groupings in the Party must be followed by freedom for political parties in the country, i.e., bourgeois democracy. Consequently, we have here recognition of freedom for factional groupings in the Party right up to permitting political parties in the land of the dictatorship of the proletariat, disguised by phrases about “inner-party democracy”, about “improving the regime” in the Party.”³¹

Com. Mao observed, “Com. Stalin creatively developed Lenin’s theory of party-building.” Mao further observed, “The CPSU is a party nurtured personally by Lenin and Stalin. It is the most advanced, the most experienced, and the most theoretically cultivated party in the world. This party has been our model in the past, is our model at present, and will still be our model in the future.”³²

The above-mentioned speeches of Mao reveal the fact that Mao did follow the continuity of Lenin and Stalin in party building. But the oppositionists claim that on this question Mao was in opposition to Stalin, because their “combine two into one” metaphysical idealist outlook on party building is reflected when they interpret the unity of opposites as the unity between the opposites. What does it mean? It means that there would be no process of contradiction, conflict and conversion between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism in the Communist Party. Is it, therefore, not the fact that Mao was not in opposition to Stalin, but the oppositionists themselves, being in opposition to Lenin, Stalin and Mao, are immersed in deep marsh of revisionism?

Whose Deviation from the Path of Leninism?

By 1936, as the opposition alleges, Stalin came to a wrong conclusion that “the Soviet society today no longer contains antagonistic, hostile classes, the exploiting classes have been eliminated; the Soviet society knows no such antagonisms the feature that distinguishes it from any capitalist society.” It continues, Stalin declined Lenin’s observation that there did remain classes and class struggle in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now, let us look into what Lenin said in 1919: “Socialism means the abolition of classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat has done all

it could to abolish classes. But classes cannot be abolished at one stroke. And classes still *remain* and *will remain* in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat. ...but in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat every class has undergone a change, and the relations between the classes have also changed. The class struggle does not disappear under the dictatorship of the proletariat; it merely assumes different forms.”³³

How much changes the situation might undergo, our comrades of the opposition are, like the story of ‘the gentleman’s words’, mechanically reciting Lenin of 1919 in 1939 alike. The ‘Soviet society today’ means nothing but the Soviet society of 1939. We all know that the Soviet Union entered into the phase of transition from capitalism to communism with the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At that time Lenin adopted the New Economic Policy (NEP), the goal of which was to abolish the capitalist economy and establish a socialist one in its place. The concluding phase of NEP was at the same time the beginning of the first phase of socialism, which would be followed by the phase of direct construction of developed socialism. By this time the communist society would advance from its first and lower phase towards its higher phase, i.e., from the economy of “according to work” to that of “according to needs”. By 1939 the Soviet society was just like this type of society. As the socialist society is not an inert and static system, Stalin’s words and deeds should be viewed not from any abstract idea, but in the light of this changed reality.

The Seventeenth Congress of the CPSU(B) held in 1934 declared, “We are heading for the formation of a classless socialist society.” The oppositionists ignore or decline the great changes the political, economic and social fields of the Soviet society underwent during the long period of twenty years from 1919 to 1939, and hardly realize the significance of building a classless socialist society.

In 1935, Stalin made a dialectical-materialistic analysis of the class structure of the Soviet socialist society.

The proletariat of the Soviet society in 1939 was not in its previous condition. With the seizure of state power it had been by this time transformed into the ruling class, having all sorts of instruments and means of production and their control in its hand. The labour power was no more a commodity, not being sold and purchased in the market. The workers were no longer let on hire. They were workers, and at the same time owners as well. So, in the developed socialism, the working class was no longer proletariat as described by Marx. The proletariat

was now transformed into an entirely new class—the ruling working class emancipated from exploitation, the like of which the history of mankind had never known before. Do the comrades of the opposition accept this analysis made by Stalin? Stalin suggested to use the term ‘working class’ in place of ‘proletariat’. The peasantry was emancipated from exploitation, it was an entirely new peasantry, the like of which the history of mankind had never known before, too. The intelligentsia was also engaged in building the socialism.

Now let us look into the condition of the capitalist class. The capitalists, having lost the state power, were no longer a ruling class, rather they were now ruled. They neither enjoyed the ownership of the instruments and means of production nor had they any control over the production. Changes had already been witnessed both in the ‘relations of the ownership of the means of production’ and ‘the position of the capitalists in the field of production’. As a result, they had lost the instruments for creating the surplus value and carrying on exploitation. Lenin’s statement that “in the first or lower phase of communism, there remains not only the bourgeois right, but even the bourgeois state—without the bourgeoisie” clarifies that the bourgeoisie as a class does hardly exist in such a socialist society, and, under this circumstances, it cannot be recognized as an exploiting class.

The report to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) mentioned that the industrial output during the 1933-1938 period in the Soviet Union more than doubled (238.8 percent), and that, moreover, the whole increase in output was accounted for by socialist industry. In 1938, of the whole industrial output the share of socialist industry was as high as 99.97 percent, and that of the private industry was 0.03 percent only, i.e., the only system of industry in the USSR was the socialist industry, and the private industry had nearly ceased to exist. The collective farms were firmly established and consolidated, while the individual peasant farming was nearly extinct. All these facts justify that classes had been abolished in the Soviet socialist society.

Even then there were debates in the CPSU(B) on the abolition of classes and creation of a classless socialist society, in response to which Com. Stalin said in 1933, “Some comrades have interpreted the thesis about the abolition of classes, the creation of a classless society, and the withering away of the state as a justification of laziness and complacency, a justification of the counter-revolutionary theory of the extinction of

the class struggle and the weakening of the state power. Needless to say, such people cannot have anything in common with our Party. They are either degenerates or double-dealers, and must be driven out of the Party. The abolition of classes is not achieved by the extinction of the class struggle, but by its intensification. The state will wither away, not as a result of weakening the state power, but as a result of strengthening it to the utmost, which is necessary for finally crushing the remnants of the dying classes and for organizing defence against the capitalist encirclement that is far from having been done away with as yet, and will not soon be done away with.”³⁴

Stalin further asserted in the report to the Seventeenth Congress of the CPSU(B), “A classless society cannot come of its own accord, as it were. It has to be achieved and built by the efforts of all the working people, by strengthening the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat, by intensifying the class struggle, by abolishing classes, by eliminating the remnants of the capitalist classes, and in battles with enemies, both internal and external.”³⁵

Do the above-mentioned quotations reveal that Stalin gave up class struggle in the socialist society? Certainly not.

Lenin in 1918 characterized the particular stages of the transition to socialism. Stalin and the CPSU(B) followed that characterization by Lenin. The transitional period was the “great leap” itself and contained a number of transitional periods, a number of breaks, of leaps from stage to stage: the transition from war communism to NEP, the transition from the NEP to the period of reconstruction, the “great break” of the countryside to the side of collectivization in 1929, the entry into the period of socialism.³⁶ These were all clear examples of those leaps in which the epoch of the “great leap” was so rich. Moreover, the last stage of transitional period was at the same time the first stage of victorious socialist society, which would be followed by the adoption of the programmes for building developed socialism to enter into the higher phase of communist society.

In 1930, Stalin observed, “We have entered into the period of a direct and developed socialist construction along the whole front. We have entered into the period of socialism, because the socialist sector now holds in its hands all the economic levers of the whole popular economy.”³⁷ At that time socialism had ceased to be an embryo. It had become, in a remarkable degree, a developed analyzed quality that ruled

in the social life of the Soviet Union. And as the Seventeenth Party Congress showed, the Party would in the course of the second Five-Year Plan abolish classes and construct a full socialist society.

The victory and progress of socialism cause so much panic among the reactionaries that they indulge in denouncing and opposing socialism. As the part of it, they purposefully propagating that Stalin and Mao committed many ‘mistakes’ after 1936 and 1950, respectively. The revisionists are humming the same tune. As a result, many young Marxists and intellectuals are getting confused. In order to remove this confusion they should deeply study the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, and justify them in the light of reality.

The new Soviet Constitution was written in 1935 under Stalin’s direction, and it was adopted by the CPSU(B) in the following year. Analyzing the class-structure of the Soviet society, Stalin said, “The landlord class, as you know, had already been eliminated as a result of the victorious conclusion of the Civil War. As for the other exploiting classes, they have shared the fate of the landlord class. The capitalists in the sphere of industry have ceased to exist. The kulaks in the sphere of agriculture have ceased to exist. The merchants and profiteers in the sphere of trade have ceased to exist. Thus all the exploiting classes have now been eliminated.”³⁸

That ‘all the exploiting classes have now been eliminated’ was the basis of the new Soviet Constitution. It should not be forgotten that Law or Constitution can never be placed above the economic condition of the society. The Soviet Constitution was renowned as the most democratic Constitution in the world. If the comrades of the opposition think that Stalin was caught by metaphysics in analyzing the class-structure of the Soviet society, then they should oppose the Soviet Constitution, shouldn’t they? But they are not doing so.

Now, let us look into the history. Before the October Revolution Trotsky pronounced: In Russia, “the proletariat is not the majority of the nation”, “its cultural level is not so high”, “it has no experience for operating the state machinery”, and “it should not seize the power by now”. After the Revolution he proclaimed, “Building socialism in one country is hardly possible.” As the working class and toiling people of the Soviet Union developed socialism under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, Bukharin came forward to oppose socialism with the theory of abolition of classes by means of “the extinction of class struggle” and “the peaceful absorption of the capitalists into the socialist structure”.

Simultaneously, Trotsky put forward a theory from the left side that the contradictions between the bourgeoisie and proletariat and between the proletariat and peasantry were the same in nature, and the methods for resolving these contradictions were the same, too, i.e., overthrowing the peasantry by force. For the sake of the advancement of socialism, Bukharin's rightist and Trotsky's leftist and anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist theories were vehemently opposed and refuted by Stalin.

To justify the theory that "the stronger socialism grows, the more is their resistance intensified" the Marxist philosopher Maurice Cornforth used a quotation from Stalin which is as follows: "There have been no cases in history where dying classes have voluntarily departed from the scene. ...This is the social basis for the intensification of the class struggle. ...The dying classes resist, not because they have become stronger than we, but because socialism is growing faster than they, and they are becoming weaker than we are. And precisely because they are becoming weaker, they feel that their last days are approaching and are compelled to resist with all the forces and all the means in their power."³⁹

Joining hands with the rightists, the ill-fated Trotskyites took the path of desperate fighting against the Party and socialism. They turned into the paid agents of imperialism and indulged in destroying the dictatorship of the proletariat by unleashing attack from both inside and outside. In the period between 1935 to 1938, Stalin firmly suppressed the Trotskyites. The Soviet people, under his leadership, achieved a historic victory in the Patriotic War against the Fascism. Fighting the enemies both inside and outside the country, Stalin protected and developed the socialism and elevated it from the first or lower phase to the higher phase of communist society. During the period of the Second Five Year Plan, as Stalin observed, real wages of workers and office employees had more than doubled. The total payroll increased to 81 billion rubles in 1937 from 34 billion in 1933. The state social insurance fund rose to 5.6 billion rubles from 4.6 billion in the same period. Some ten billion rubles were expended on the state insurance of workers and employees, on improving living conditions and on meeting cultural requirements, on sanatoria, health resorts, rest houses and on medical service in 1937 alone.⁴⁰

The scenario of these achievements revealed the fact that the Soviet society, after accomplishing socialist construction, entered a stage of being gradually transformed into a communist society based on the principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his

needs". This historic event was embodied in law by the Constitution. The Soviet Union was the only country in the world which entered the stage of gradual transformation into the higher phase of communist society.

It is known that Trotsky argued on the question of possibility of building socialism in one country, and not on the question of victory of the higher phase of communist society. In this respect, Lenin observed, "In essence, when a learned professor, followed by the philistine, followed in turn by Messrs. the Tseretelis and Chernovs, talks of fantastic utopias, of the demagogic promises of the Bolsheviks, of the impossibility of "introducing" socialism, he has in mind the higher stage or phase of communism, which no one has ever promised or even thought to "introduce", because it cannot be "introduced" at all."⁴¹ Lenin had already given answer to this question in the International arena. But the debate still exists, and, in the name of opposing Stalin, the opponents are opposing Leninism itself which is revealed in their speeches and publications.

Politically and economically, the bourgeoisie had largely lost their rights. But "the narrow horizon of bourgeois right" still remained. This "defect is inevitable" in the first or lower phase of communist society, as bourgeois right in regard to the distribution of articles of consumption would not be totally abolished until the principle of getting "according to needs" was introduced. It follows that, as Lenin observed, "under communism there remains for a time not only bourgeois right, but even the bourgeois state—without the bourgeoisie."⁴² That means the bourgeoisie does not exist in such socialism, but there still remains the narrow horizon of bourgeois right which will be abolished in the higher phase of communism. "Remnants of the old surviving in the new confront us in life at every step, both in nature and in society."⁴³ It is the dialectical law of nature and social life. So, it is not rational to conclude that the victory of socialism was not accomplished in the USSR, under the pretext that there still remained the narrow horizon of bourgeois right.

The comrades of the opposition are not ready to accept Stalin's conclusion that the victory of socialism had been accomplished in the USSR, and obstinately raising unrestrained cobweb of arguments against Stalin. In this way, they are even discarding Mao's observation that "the victory of the anti-fascist war would remain beyond our imagination if the victory of socialism in the USSR was not achieved". Further, raising

the question of **final** victory of socialism, they are opposing the theory of victory of socialism **in one country**. The victory of socialism in one country means the victory of socialism in the national arena, whereas the final victory of socialism means the victory of socialism in the international sphere. These two are not the same. "The question of the victory of socialism should be viewed", as Stalin pointed out, "from two aspects, the domestic and the international....the victory of socialism in the USSR, as expressed in the abolition of the capitalist economy and the building of a socialist economic system, could not be considered a final victory, inasmuch as the danger of foreign armed intervention and of attempts to restore capitalism had not been eliminated, and inasmuch as our socialist country had no guarantee against this danger."⁴⁴

That Stalin was not conscious about the difference between the victory of socialism in one country and the final victory of socialism and also about the danger of the restoration of capitalism was, therefore, a false and intentional propaganda by the opposition. On the contrary, the opposition is keeping an astounding silence on the foreign armed intervention and the class struggle in the international sphere. It would be wrong to think, as Stalin insisted in 1937, that the sphere of class struggle was limited within boundary of the USSR; the one end of class struggle was active within the boundary of the USSR, while the other end was extended beyond the boundaries of the bourgeoisie states surrounding the USSR.

Taking account of different aspects of the contemporary International situation, e.g., capitalist encirclement, foreign armed intervention and the condition of victory of world revolution, Stalin moved away from the position of 'abolition of the state with the abolition of class' to assert that the state would for some time remain in the period of communism, too.⁴⁵

The answer to the question whether classes and class struggle would still exist even after the socialist ownership of the means and instruments of production was basically established was, as the opposition alleges, unknown to Stalin. Let us look into what Stalin said in this regard: "We have smashed the enemies of the Party, the opportunists of all shades, the nationalist deviators of all kinds. But remnants of their ideology still live in the minds of individual members of the Party, and not infrequently they find expression. The Party must not be regarded as something isolated from the people who surround it. It lives and works in its environment. It is not surprising that at times unhealthy moods

penetrate into the Party from outside. And the ground for such moods undoubtedly exists,...if only for the reason that there still exist in town and country certain intermediary strata of the population who constitute a medium which breeds such moods....But can we say that we have already overcome all the survivals of capitalism in economic life? No, we cannot say that. Still less can we say that we have overcome the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people. We cannot say that, not only because in development the minds of people lag behind their economic position, but also because the capitalist encirclement still exists, which endeavours to revive and sustain the survivals of capitalism in the economic life and in the minds of the people of the USSR, and against which we Bolsheviks must always keep our powder dry."⁴⁶

It is clear from this quotation that Stalin insisted on Lenin's assertion of carrying on uninterrupted struggles of different forms under the dictatorship of the proletariat even after the abolition of classes against the strength and tradition of the old capitalist society.

Regarding the importance of ideological struggle the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) under the leadership of Stalin observed: "Ideological work is a prime duty of the Party, and underestimation of its importance may do irreparable damage to the interests of Party and 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. There is no class basis, there can be no class basis, for the domination of the bourgeois ideology in our Soviet society. It is the socialist ideology that dominates in our country, and Marxism-Leninism constitutes its indestructible foundation. But we still have 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. Nor are we guaranteed against the infiltration of alien views, ideas and sentiments from outside, from the capitalist countries or from inside, from the relics of groups hostile to the Soviet state which have not been completely demolished by the Party. It should not be forgotten that the enemies of the Soviet Union are working to inculcate, foment and foster unhealthy sentiments, ideologically to corrupt the unstable elements in our society."⁴⁷

It is generally said, "You are accomplishing socialist revolution, but do you know where the bourgeoisie exists after the establishment of socialist ownership?" It is Stalin who first showed that the representatives

of the bourgeoisie were centralized in the Communist Party. The followers of Stalin and Mao in the CPC mentioned in their May 16, 1967 document, “Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist. He expelled a large number of counter-revolutionary bourgeois agents, including Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin, Rykov and others who had sneaked into the Party.”⁴⁸

In 1948, Stalin expelled Tito & Co. of Yugoslavia from the Communist Information Bureau in accusation of committing treachery with Marxism-Leninism.

As the opposition further alleges, Stalin could not theoretically recognized that classes and class struggle did exist in the society throughout the whole historical period of dictatorship of the proletariat. This question has been thoroughly dealt with earlier. In spite of it, we here put forward an evidence of intense struggle launched by Stalin against those who had declined the existence of classes and class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat: “The denial on the part of these comrades of the strengthening of the capitalist elements, and in connection with this, the sharpening of the class struggle in the village under the conditions of contemporary Yugoslavia, arises from the opportunist contention that, in the transition period between capitalism and socialism, the class struggle does not become sharper, as taught by Marxism-Leninism, but dies out, as averred by opportunists of the type of Bukharin, who postulated a decadent theory of the peaceful absorption of the capitalist elements into the socialist structure.”⁴⁹ The letter from the CPSU(B) signed by Molotov and Stalin to the CPY on May 4, 1948 dealt with the matter exclusively.

Who preached the line of dying out of class struggle in the transition period between capitalism and socialism? Obviously Tito & Co. of Yugoslavia and Bukharin preached this line, against which intense struggles were launched by Stalin and all genuine Marxists-Leninists in the world. Today, the descendants of those stamped opportunists-revisionists have changed their tactics to propagate from just the opposite side that Stalin could not theoretically recognized that classes and class struggle did exist through the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The counter-revolutionary bourgeois agents within the CPC, who were anti-Stalin and anti-Mao like Tito and Khrushchev, had a propaganda that “one year before his demise Stalin recognized and asserted that contradictions still continued to exist in the socialist society.”

We think, the victory of socialism was achieved in the Soviet Union and, after the accomplishment of the construction of developed socialism, the Soviet society was gradually entering into communism. If Stalin recognized the existence of contradictions in the socialist society just one year before his demise, how would the development of Soviet socialism be accomplished as long as 35 years from 1917 to 1952? Doesn't this propaganda against Stalin run counter to materialist dialectics? Not only the existence of contradictions in the socialist society that Stalin recognized but he recognized and showed the ways and methods to resolve the contradictions between town and country and between mental and physical labour in the communist society as well. During socialist construction the bourgeois agents within the CPSU(B) declined the existence of contradictions in the socialist society, on which a serious debate was launched. “If in developed socialism there were no contradictions—contradictions between productive forces and relations of production, between production and demand, no contradictions in the development of technique, etc.—then the development of socialism would be impossible, then instead of movement we should have stagnation. Only in virtue of the internal contradictions of the socialist order can there be development from one phase to another, from lower phase to higher. But each step in the development of socialism will denote not only a ripening of the *forces* making for a developed communist society, but also an *immediate* partial resolution of the contradictions of socialism. Just in the same way, each new stage in the transitional period denotes not only a growth of the *forces* making for socialism (which can enter into being once the leap to a new order is made), but also an *intermediate* construction of socialism, a partial resolution of the most basic contradiction of the transitional period.”⁵⁰

It is known to all that intense struggles Stalin launched against the line of dying out of class struggle in the socialist society, as preached by Bukharin and Tito, was not just one year before his death. On the other hand, in the Eighth Congress of the CPC held in 1956, who were not to recognize the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as the principal contradiction in the contemporary socialist society of China? It was not Stalin, of course. There is no way to cover the fact that they were the counter-revolutionary bourgeois agents within the CPC. Com. Mao accomplished socialist revolution by launching intense struggle against them. These bourgeois agents declined the existence of classes and class struggle in the Chinese society throughout the whole

historical period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and now they are trying to conceal their counter-revolutionary activities by imposing the burden of their crime upon Stalin's shoulder. In order to frustrate their ill-effort it is our duty to unmask these bourgeois agents sneaking into the communist camp and to follow the Marxist-Leninist line showed by Stalin and Mao.

When would it be concluded that there did no longer exist antagonistic hostile classes in the socialist society? To answer this question in October 1919 Lenin said, it would be concluded when the resistance of the capitalists was finally smashed, when the capitalists were eliminated, when the classes no longer existed, i.e., there were no differences among the members of the society in relation to the social means of production.

In the contemporary Soviet Union, did there exist any differences among the members of the society in relation to the social means of production? Stalin came to the conclusion taking account of the matters politically and economically inevitable in the socialist society emerging from the womb of capitalism. So, those who are opposing Stalin's formulation that the Soviet society "no longer contains antagonistic, hostile classes, the exploiting classes have been eliminated" in the contemporary condition of socialism are in reality defending Trotskyism by propagating that the victory of socialism was not achieved in the Soviet Union. We feel, they are committing serious mistake and they themselves have deviated from the path of Leninism.

Stalin & the Yugoslavia Question

On June 28, 1948, Tito & Co. of Yugoslavia were expelled from the Cominform under the leadership of Stalin. In the post-Stalin period, the renegade Khrushchev alleged that there was no objective basis for the development of the Soviet-Yugoslav dispute; it was due to Stalin's 'obstinacy and great-power chauvinism'. In order to investigate whether there was any objective basis the readers have to know about the nature of the disputes between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

With a view to opposing the revisionist line preached by Tito & Co. a letter signed by Com. Molotov and Com. Stalin on behalf of the CPSU(B) was sent to the CPY on May 4, 1948. The main points the letter dealt with were as follows: (i) on the withdrawal of Soviet military advisers from Yugoslavia; (ii) regarding the presence of British spies in

the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia; (iii) regarding the anti-Soviet statements by the Yugoslav leaders about the intelligence service and trade negotiation; (iv) on the incorrect political line of the CPY in regard to the class struggle; (v) on the incorrect policy of the CPY on the question of mutual relations between the Party and the People's Front; and (vi) regarding the alarming situation in the CPY (fascist campaign of repression on the revolutionaries — the Author).

The CPY declined, as the CPSU(B) mentioned in the letter, the roles of the class struggle and the leadership of the working class in the process of abolition of capitalism and development of socialism. In Yugoslavia, the CPY was not considered as the main leading force, but rather the People's Front; the Yugoslav leaders diminished the role of the Party and, in fact, dissolved the Party into a non-party People's Front. Only the People's Front entered the political arena and the Party and its organizations did not openly take part in political life under their own name. The banner of the Party was kept hidden; the tasks of the Party for gaining confidence of and spreading influence over the people through the propaganda of its opinions and programme were, as if, forgotten.

It is clear from the facts mentioned above that the leadership of the CPY abandoned the class struggle and denied the leading role of the working class in the process of liquidating capitalism and developing a socialist society. Besides, it dissolved the Party into the People's Front, made slanderous statements against the Soviet Union, carried on sabotages in the socialist land, propagated admiration of the US imperialism and played the role of its trusted agent, created a hostile atmosphere that lead to the withdrawal of Soviet military advisers from Yugoslavia, converted the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia into an outpost of the British spies, and, over and above these, followed the capitalist road in the name of creating a new model of socialism, rejecting the path of Marxism-Leninism and the Soviet model for building socialism. All these constituted the objective basis for the disputes between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. One who denies these facts obviously betrays Marxism-Leninism.

Afterwards, the incident of fuelling the counter-revolution in Hungary by the Yugoslav leaders did profoundly justify the decision Stalin had taken on Yugoslavia. The Moscow Declaration of 1957 as

well as the 81-Party Moscow Statement of 1960 recognized Titoism as a betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. Khrushchev & Co were, however, signatories to both these documents. As Khrushchev propagated that there had been no objective basis for the Soviet-Yugoslav dispute in spite of all these, it would not be hard to realize that he, like Tito & Co, was a running dog of imperialism, follower of the group of betrayers of Marxism-Leninism, and slanderer against Stalin and socialism. Tito was, as Com. Mao observed, “the preceptor of Khrushchev”.

Following the struggle against Tito, Stalin and Mao developed understanding among themselves and adopted a plan for launching a worldwide ideological struggle against the lines preached by Trotsky and Tito.

In 1948, an important article written by Mao with the heading ‘Revolutionary Forces of the World, Unite’ appeared in the 21st issue of the organ of Cominform, *For a Lasting Peace, For a People’s Democracy*. In this article Mao urged: “All the revolutionary forces of each country must unite, and the revolutionary forces of all countries must likewise unite, must form an anti-imperialist united front headed by the Soviet Union and follow correct policies; otherwise, victory will be impossible.”⁵¹ This appeal by Mao in commemoration of the 31st anniversary of the October Revolution enthused intense ideological struggle against the line preached by the imperialist agents and betrayers of Marxism-Leninism, the Trotskyites and Titoites, within the CPC and the CPI. As a result, an editorial column of *People’s Daily*, the organ of the CPC, published on June 16, 1950 with the heading ‘Armed People Opposing Armed Counter-Revolution in China’ in reply to the question raised by a reader, interpreted Mao’s famous article ‘Problems of War and Strategy’ as “an easily comprehensible analysis of the problems of war and strategy by Mao Tse-tung based on the theses of Lenin and Stalin and experiences of the Chinese Revolution.” To describe the protracted nature of the New-Democratic Revolution in China Stalin, in his speech delivered in the Chinese Commission of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on November 30, 1926, had asserted, “In China the armed revolution is fighting the armed counter-revolution.”⁵² This thesis of Com. Stalin’s was, as Com. Mao observed in his article, “perfectly correct”⁵³

Com. Mao launched struggle against the Titoite trends and encountered the anti-Stalin propaganda within the CPC.

Titoism & the CPI

Strong influence of the Titoite line existed in the undivided Communist Party of India, and it openly expressed itself in 1950. As a result of two-line struggle within the Party in co-operation with Com. Stalin, B T Ranadive, the then general secretary of the CPI, was compelled to submit a self-critical report announcing, “I will unmask myself”.

Ranadive admitted, “The articles of Com. Alexiyev and Com. Jukov (published in 1948 in the pages of *Bolshevik*, the theoretical organ of the CC of the CPSU) could not impress me. Just at that time when they were, for the benefit of our Party, repeatedly giving emphasis on the national liberationist as well as anti-imperialist and anti-feudalist character of our revolution I was preparing documents one after another to justify just the opposite, i.e., extinction of colonialism, ignoring the existence of imperialism and forgetting the presence of feudalism in agriculture, and so on.” Ranadive confessed, “Under the influence of Titoism my mind was over-whelmed with the concept of converting the liberation struggle as one interlacing the two stages of the Indian revolution—people’s democratic and socialist—virtually into the socialist revolution.” He said, “Left adventurism got further encouraged by the articles of Kardelj (the chief theoretician of the Tito clique) and other Titoite agents. I represented the Titoite trend having an anti-internationalist and bourgeois-nationalist character which isolated our Party from the broad international movement.” “Rejection of the Chinese Path was”, as Ranadive pointed out, “not only related to the matter of the form of struggle but to that of severely underestimating the peasant question and the strength of agrarian revolution in colonial condition as well. Besides, it also included the incapability of understanding the colonial character of the state of India.” Ranadive confessed, “I pretended to abide by only Stalin and the CPSU(B), and at the same time maligned Mao Tse-tung, thereby declining the practical application of Stalin’s teachings on the colonial question.”

“My bankruptcy was”, Ranadive continued, “totally exposed through my opposition to guerilla warfare and guerilla activities. I put forward the thesis of Democratic Front against the guerilla activities, more or less. I thought the Democratic Front could be formed through propaganda campaign, rally and at most the satyagraha-type struggles while turning a blind eye to the role of guerilla warfare as a component of the development of unity in the countryside. Build a Democratic

Front peacefully, i.e., without armed struggle, and afterwards think about the guerilla war. It was, however, nothing but to cast away the guerilla warfare as the immediate task and set it aside for the distant future. That means to underestimate the depth of crisis and reduce the weight of relying on armed struggle in the countryside.” Ranadive further admitted, “I turned a blind eye to the basically correct revolutionary nature of the political line presented by the Secretariat of the Andhra Provincial Committee, and attacked it from a blind left-sectarian and semi-Trotskyite angle of view.”

In his self-critical report, Bhowani Sen, Ranadive’s principal accomplice, wrote, “From September 1948 to February 1950 the Polit Bureau was following a policy hostile to the international communist movement. The leading Communist Parties of the world were attacked (through criticism on the articles on revisionism, on Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Path). The authentic documents of the Cominform and the Conference of the trade unions of the countries of Asia and Australia held in Peking in 1950, Liu Shao-chi’s article on national bourgeoisie, etc., were not published in the Party organ, whereas the slanderous articles of the Tito clique against the Cominform were circulated in all units of the Party. From this it reveals that the Polit Bureau headed by the General Secretary was following a bourgeois-nationalist policy, a policy hostile to the international communist movement. In this way the Trotskyite-Titoite line was introduced in all respects right from the left opportunist strategy and tactics on the question of Indian revolution to the open hostility towards the international communist movement.”

“Even after the expulsion of the Titoite fascists from the Cominform,” as Sen informed, “one Party sympathizer, to the very knowledge of the General Secretary, continued to run the agency of the organ of the Titoite fascists — *Tanjug*. ...I came to know that the reply of the Tito clique to the Cominform was available through this agency, the cyclostyled copies were circulated as news documents to all Party members.”

The self-critical reports of B T Ranadive, the then General Secretary of the CPI, and Bhawani Sen, his principal accomplice, were adopted in the Party in 1950. It is crystal-clear that they consciously followed the Trotskyite-Titoite line, rejecting the Marxist-Leninist line shown by Stalin and Mao. Even after the expulsion of Tito & Co. from the Cominform they loudly claimed, “We ourselves have devised the theory of revolution in our country.” It was just the rejection of the principle of

internationalism to adopt a bourgeois-nationalist policy. “We’ll learn only from Marx and Engels” means to abandon the Leninist theory founded by Lenin and Stalin in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. “Interlacing the two stages of revolution” in a country like India means to give up the anti-colonial and anti-feudal national liberation struggle, and, in the name of making socialist revolution, to move away from the path of revolution itself, with the recognition that India was an independent capitalist state instead of a semi-feudal and semi-colonial one. This doctrine led to abandoning the Chinese Path as well as to maligning Mao Tse-tung, thereby pushing the Indian revolution to futility. On the other hand, following the theory of Lenin and Stalin, the Chinese revolution achieved a historic victory under the competent leadership of Mao Tse-tung.

The CPI never launched any strong ideological struggle against the Trotskyism and Titoism, rather the Party leaders themselves were the protagonists of the Titoite line. As a result, an united All-India Communist Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism could not be developed.

Following this self-criticism B T Ranadive published a statement in *Communist* of February-March, 1950. Meanwhile the Editorial of the organ of Cominform, *For a Lasting Peace, For a people’s Democracy*, on January 27, 1950, advised the CPI to learn from the experience of the Chinese Revolution, asserted that the people of the most of the colonial and dependent countries should follow the path the Chinese people adopted for the establishment of their national independence and democracy. In his statement Ranadive said, “The CPC under the leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung has successfully applied the teachings of Lenin and Stalin in the victorious struggle for liberation of the Chinese people. The experience of the victorious liberation struggle of the Chinese people will act as an infallible guidepost to the Communist Party and working class of India, who are in charge of leading the struggle for national liberation.”

In this way the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union, China and India attained a political unity on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist line by launching an ideological struggle against the Titoite line. Afterwards the CPI adopted a Programme in 1951. But after the death of Comrade Stalin in 1953 the CPI turned back on the Khrushchevite line of revisionism.

The Stalin Question & the CPC

Thorough study and alertness are necessary for dealing with this question, as it is very significant and sensitive. We have a deep respect to and regard for Comrade Mao Tse-tung, because it is Com. Mao who was our international leader and great teacher in the post-Stalin period. But we took Com. Mao and the CPC as synonymous instead of taking their relation in a dialectical view-point. As a result, we felt whatever the CPC was telling was the view of Com. Mao, as the CPC was under Com. Mao's leadership.

Mao's literary style was so excellent and easily comprehensible that it attracted us instantly. We felt that nobody else other than Com. Mao had told these before. We blindly accepted a lot, as our knowledge of the history of the communist movement and our ability of analyzing it were not so sufficient. Not so enriched with the Marxist-Leninist philosophy and political economy through painstaking study, we averted or could not boldly put forward the important debatable questions. Besides, many of us were busy with territorial party work and felt that the higher leadership alone was entitled to look into the national as well as international political line, though on the correctness of this line would depend the success. As a result, the work of developing ourselves and our cadres as competent leadership was ignored, leading to the scarcity of cadres, organizers and leaders. We had been infected with the thinking that "practice and struggle are all while the political aim and objective bear not so much importance".

Now, let us come to main point. That there did exist an anti-Stalin and anti-USSR faction in the CPC was reflected in the letter sent by Mao on the occasion of Stalin's 60th birth anniversary, where Mao mentioned: "Stalin is the true friend of the cause of liberation of the Chinese people. No attempt to sow dissension, no lies and calumnies, can affect the Chinese people's whole-hearted love and respect for Stalin and our genuine friendship for the Soviet Union."⁵⁴ Mao had to make such pronouncement as there were lies and calumnies being waged in China against Stalin and the Soviet Union. Afterwards, on a different occasion, Com. Mao said, "With the convocation of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, some people who had been most enthusiastic for Stalin became most vehement against him. In my view, these people do not adhere to Marxism-Leninism, they do not take an analytical approach to things and they lack revolutionary morality." "Before it

rains in a typhoon", as Mao continued, "ants come out of their holes, they have very sensitive "noses" and they know their meteorology. No sooner had the typhoon of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU struck than a few such ants in China came out of their holes. They are wavering elements in the Party who vacillate whenever something is astir. When they heard of the sweeping denunciation of Stalin, they felt good and swung to the other side, cheering and saying that Khrushchev was right in everything and that they themselves had been of the same opinion all along."⁵⁵

Here we are trying to deal with some main allegations raised by the CPC against Com. Stalin. We think, the prime source of all lies and calumnies was the assessment of Stalin's work as "70 percent for achievements and 30 percent for mistakes". The opposition claims that this assessment of Stalin's work was done by Com. Mao himself. But, we know, Mao was never of the opinion in coming to such conclusion. Mao said, "It is the opinion of the Central Committee that Stalin's mistakes amounted to only 30 percent of the whole and his achievements to 70 percent."⁵⁶ As it was not his own opinion, Mao mentioned it as "the opinion of the Central Committee". He also asserted that the assessment of 30 percent for mistakes and 70 percent for achievements was "just about right". But at the same time Mao insisted, "As for Stalin himself, you should at least give a 70-30 evaluation, 70 for his achievements and 30 for his mistakes. This may not be entirely accurate, for his mistakes may be only 20 or even 10, or perhaps somewhat more than 30. All things considered, Stalin's achievements are primary and his shortcomings and mistakes secondary."⁵⁷ Over and above this, Mao always said, "Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist." If the assessment of Stalin's work be "just about fair", should it be rational to call him "a great Marxist-Leninist"? Therefore, the claim of the opposition that Mao himself gave a 70-30 evaluation for Stalin lacks credibility.

As a result of accepting this opinion of the CPC, the opposition is searching for 30 percent mistakes in every work of Stalin. And, in order to encounter it Mao declared in the Tenth Congress of the CPC that "Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution—this theorization by Stalin is entirely correct." That searching for 30 percent mistakes in all words of Stalin was hardly rational was the message Mao delivered through this declaration. In order to fill the 30 percent quota of Stalin's mistakes the opposition, getting influenced by others, raises allegation against Stalin without

any scientific analysis. Some of the intellectuals are saying, “Stalin performed many praiseworthy works and committed many mistakes, too.” Through this pronouncement of “many praiseworthy works” and “many mistakes” these intellectuals are, in fact, giving a 50-50 evaluation for Stalin, i.e., 50 percent for achievements and also 50 percent for mistakes. Is it not, for their part, the denial of Mao himself?

There was a two-line struggle in the CPC on Tito question which has been reflected in the CPC’s different documents.

Com. Mao was always on the side of Stalin in the debate between Stalin and the Tito clique. In the post-Stalin period, Khrushchev & Co. waged lies and calumnies against Stalin in their secret report presented in the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU. The fraternal delegates from the Communist Party of Albania attending the Congress vehemently burst out against the Khrushchev clique, and they even abstained from signing the document, whereas the delegates from the CPC maintained an astounding silence on this issue.

Afterwards the CPC, in the first article entitled *On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat* published on April 5, 1956, not only endorsed a lot of slanderous allegations including “the personality cult” against Stalin raised by the Khrushchev clique but did congratulate Khrushchev on such a “great and courageous fight” as well. In the mean time, as the involvement of Yugoslavia in the counter-revolutionary upsurge in Hungary had been exposed, Stalin’s stance on the Tito clique was profoundly justified. With a view to averting the danger of being marked as revisionist for supporting Tito & Co. the CPC hurriedly published the second article entitled *More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat* on December 29, 1956, eight months after the publication of the first one. Some allegations, including “the cult of the personality” against Stalin were discarded. As the reason for the CPC’s turning back in the second article from the first one Mao revealed that the Party wrote the first article on the basis of Stalin’s 70-30 evaluation, 70 percent for his achievements and 30 percent for his mistakes. It is, therefore, clear from Mao’s assertion that the CPC’s Stalin assessment (70 percent-30 percent) ought not be taken for granted.

The CPC’s both documents contain some common shortcomings and irrelevances: (i) The CPC failed to realize the real intention of the treacherous Khrushchev behind his opposition to the cult of the personality; to expect that Khrushchev would rectify his mistakes in

due time was a profound mistake on the part of the CPC. (ii) When the reactionaries all over the world were launching slanderous propaganda against Comrade Stalin the CPC raised allegations against him without any specific instances. Was it not intentional to raise such allegations against the international leadership? (iii) Regarding the question of Yugoslavia both articles asserted, “Stalin took a wrong decision on the Yugoslavia question”, placed ‘Comrade’ before the name of counter-revolutionary Tito, and projected Yugoslavia as a socialist country. Obviously this gesture of the CPC violated the Cominform resolution. (iv) On Stalin’s perception of class struggle, both articles alleged, “Despite recognizing the existence of contradictions in the socialist society, the existence of class contradiction and class struggle was not reflected in Stalin’s recognition, rather was reflected the opposite view.” “After the elimination of classes, the class struggle should not continue to be stressed as though it was being intensified, as was done by Stalin with the result that healthy development of socialist democracy was hampered.”

In fact, the position the CPC took on the question of Yugoslavia was but that of Khrushchev. The CPC was, however, able to identify the Tito clique as the betrayer of Marxism-Leninism and Yugoslavia a capitalist country in 1963 in the document of Great Debate entitled *Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country*. But, in the post-Mao period, the *Resolution on the Thirty Years’ History of the Party* adopted by the Sixth Plenary Session of the Eleventh Congress of the CPC in 1981 not only reconciled Josip Broz Tito, a well-marked counter-revolutionary and betrayer of Marxism-Leninism, honouring him as a “great Marxist-Leninist” but launched a slanderous propaganda against Mao as well. In this History Resolution the CPC said, “Mao began to commit serious mistakes after 1950 and to initiate the cultural revolution was the greatest blunder in his life, because there did never exist two lines and bourgeois headquarter in China.” “Struggle against the revisionism of Khrushchev was unnecessarily exaggerated.” “Labelling Russia as social imperialism was not a resolution adopted by the Party’s Central Committee.” It is, however, clear from these statements that, in the CPC, there did exist two lines, and there did exist the revisionist headquarter either. The leadership of the CPC in the post-Mao period represented the anti-Stalin and anti-Mao counter-revolutionary and revisionist headquarter. Following the adoption of the *Resolution on the Thirty Years’ History of the Party* the genuine Marxists-Leninists in different countries of the

world came to the conclusion that the CPC had become a bourgeois party and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, in place of the dictatorship of the proletariat, had been established in China. In this way the CPC, by violating the Cominform resolution on Tito, the Moscow Declaration of 1957, the Moscow Statement of 1960, the Great Debate documents of 1963 and so on, has revealed itself as the protagonist of Tito's bourgeois nationalist line from much earlier. The names of the followers of Stalin and Mao, on the other hand, will be glorified in history as they have uninterruptedly carried on intense struggle against the lines of Trotsky, Tito, Liu and Teng. It is the Great Debate launched by Mao that helped us realize the existence of two lines in the CPC. To have a thorough and deep study of these documents, and, side by side, to identify which one is the Mao line among the two and follow it while discarding the other are, therefore, of an urgent necessity.

Regarding the question of class struggle, the opposition sometimes alleges that Stalin abandoned class struggle in the socialist society, and further asserts, "The class struggle should not continue to be stressed" after the elimination of classes, as was done by Stalin. This allegation against Stalin reveals that the opposition seeks gradual pacification of class struggle. Stalin, however, insisted, "Classes will be abolished through the intensification of class struggle." Stalin's view is in conformity with Leninism, while that of the opposition is a downright revisionism.

During the period of Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution Mao's call was, as we all know, "Never forget the class struggle." So, on this question, the positions of Lenin, Stalin and Mao were in the same direction, while that of the opposition was just the reverse. What was the stance of the CPC in regard to Khrushchev's agenda of destalinization? A few examples will suffice to answer the question. (1) In a book entitled *How to be a good communist* written by Liu Sao-chi a number of Stalin's speeches had been quoted and in a page of the book had been written an imperative sentence: "Be a worthy pupil of Lenin and Stalin". But, following the anti-Stalin propaganda, the new edition of the book discarded not only Stalin's quotations one and all but his name as well, replacing "Be a worthy pupil of Lenin and Stalin" with the sentence "Be a worthy pupil of Marx and Lenin". (2) Not a single quotation from Stalin, the foremost architect of socialism in the world, had any place in the Political Report of the 9th Congress of the CPC which we boast of propagating. You cannot find even the name of

Stalin in this Report. It is, however, not a common mistake on the part of the CPC, rather the manifestation of the CPC's support to the line of destalinization by the imperialist agents Tito-Khrushchev clique.

In the Report of the Ninth Congress held in 1969, the CPC announced, "This era is the era of the total collapse of imperialism and worldwide victory of socialism." At another place in the same Report the CPC further announced, it is such an era "when the imperialism is heading for total collapse and the socialism is marching ahead towards the worldwide victory." The strength of imperialism should be neither underestimated nor overestimated. "This enemy", as Mao observed, "still has strength; ... This enemy has a weak and fragile foundation, he is disintegrating internally, he is alienated from the people, he is confronted with inextricable economic crises; therefore, he can be defeated."⁵⁸ So, in our view, that the imperialism is heading for total collapse is but the Mao line.

Is it not clear from all these facts that the Marxist-Leninist line of Stalin and Mao and the revisionist line of Tito and Khrushchev co-existed in the CPC? Certainly. So, in this regard, it is a compromising document which means "you are not to say anything in support of Stalin while we stop to say anything against him, and in this way Stalin's name can be silently erased from the pages of history". It is what is Khrushchev's theory of destalinization. As being minority in the Party, Com. Mao was compelled to accept this decision for the time being, but this wrong decision should not be accepted by any other communist parties of the world.

Stalin & the Cultural Revolution in the USSR

In order to eliminate the shortcomings and errors and to strengthen the Marxist-Leninist basis of the Party a sound programme was adopted by the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) held in 1952. The programme was as follows:

(1) "Ideological work is a prime duty of the Party, and underestimation of its importance may do irreparable damage to the interests of Party and state." (2) "Not in all Party organizations, and nowhere by any means in full measure, have self-criticism, and especially criticism from below become the principal method of disclosing and overcoming our errors and shortcomings, our weaknesses and maladies." (3) "It is particularly important at the present time to ruthlessly combat ... all who hamper the development of criticism of our shortcomings, who stifle

criticism, and answer it with persecution and victimization.” (4) “It would be a mistake to think that criticism from below can develop of itself, spontaneously. ...Our Party organizations and Party workers, indeed all our leading personnel, must take a lead in this and set an example in showing a sincere and conscientious attitude towards criticism.” (5) “Criticism from below reflects the creative initiative and enterprise of our working millions, their concern to strengthen the Soviet state. The more widespread self-criticism and criticism from below become, the more fully will the creative powers and energies of our people manifest themselves, and the stronger will grow the consciousness among the masses that they are the masters of the country.” (6) “The ideological work of the Party must play an important part in purging the minds of people of survivals of the capitalist mentality, of prejudices and pernicious traditions inherited from the old society. We must continue to foster in the masses a lofty sense of social duty, we must educate the workers in the spirit of Soviet patriotism, friendship among nations and concern for the interests of the state, and perfect those sterling qualities of our Soviet people—confidence in the victory of our cause, and readiness and ability to overcome all difficulties.” (7) “We must promote and perfect socialist culture, science, literature and art, and use all our means of political and ideological influence—our propaganda, agitation and press—to improve the ideological education of Communists, and to enhance the political vigilance and consciousness of the workers, peasants and intellectuals. It is the duty of our cadres, without exception, to improve their ideological knowledge and to assimilate the rich political experience of the Party, so that they may not lag behind developments and be equal to the tasks of the Party.”

The document on the Party adopted by the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU was, in fact, the programme of Cultural Revolution in the USSR. The document on the Chinese Cultural Revolution waged in 1967 was, however, the continuation of that of the Cultural Revolution in the Soviet Union. Hence it has been mentioned in the document of the GPCR in China that “Comrade Mao Tse-tung was fully aware of the overall historic experiences in the Soviet Union.” It is the continuation of Stalin’s leadership which Com. Mao followed on this question.

As Com. Stalin passed away in 1953, he could not manage to implement the programme of Cultural Revolution. In a changed situation after fourteen years, when socialism in the USSR had been dismantled and the followers of Tito, Khrushchev and Liu had gained a dominating

position in the CPC, when the International situation was not so favourable, Com. Mao, with an immense courage, called for the Cultural Revolution in order to maintain the proletarian character of the Party and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the post-Stalin period, Com. Mao Tse-tung, the worthy descendent of Lenin and Stalin and a great Marxist-Leninist, launched the world-shaking Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This glorious achievement of Mao is a bright beacon light in the path of progress of the world proletariat.

Stalin Profoundly Developed Leninism

Another question raised by the opposition is on the withering away of the state under the dictatorship of the proletariat. This question is related to the termination of the necessity of democracy. Democracy is, in turn, a form of the state, one of its varieties. Democracy is nothing but a stage on the road from feudalism to capitalism, and from capitalism to communism. It is by no means a limit not to be over-stepped, rather it is variable with a specific class-character, e.g., bourgeois democracy, people’s democracy and proletarian democracy. Bourgeois democracy is the democracy for a handful minority while dictatorship on the vast majority of the people. Proletarian democracy is, on the other hand, a genuine democracy for the majority and dictatorship on a handful of exploiters and oppressors. Here “quantity turns into quality”: such a degree of democracy is tied up with overstepping the bounds of bourgeois society, with the beginning of its socialist reconstruction. ‘From minority to majority’ will be followed by a ‘genuine equality, equal right and democracy for all’ with the abolition of all sorts of basic differences among the members of the society and elimination of classes. So only in communism, all members of the society will enjoy genuine democracy, having no need of applying force. Then the necessity of both democracy and state will be terminated. The difference between the first phase and the second or higher phase of communism may be attributed to the difference of economic maturity, difference between the phases of “according to work” and “according to needs”. Here lies the question of applying the materialist dialectical theory of development. Lenin observed, “We are entitled to speak of only the “inevitability” of withering away of the state and democracy, emphasizing the protracted nature of this process and its dependence upon the rapidity of development of the higher phase of communism, and leaving the question

of the time required for, or the concrete forms of, the withering away entirely open, because there is no material for answering these questions.”⁵⁹ Despite stoutly raising the general orientation of the ultimate goal directed by Marx and Engels, Lenin was compelled to restrict himself within the practical activities in socialism, i.e., the first phase of communist society, due to historical limitation.

In the post-Lenin period, Stalin, as directed by Lenin, successfully accomplished socialist construction for thirty years with a skilled effort, and thereby made Lenin’s dream for the victory of socialism in one country a reality. The Soviet Union gradually entered into the higher phase of communist society from developed socialism. The historic victory in the Patriotic War against fascism in the World War II prevented capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union. All these are creative contributions of Comrade Stalin in the post-Lenin period. “We do not know and there is no material for knowing what practical steps are to be taken and what will be their concrete forms in the higher phase of communist society”—this historical limitation of Lenin was successfully crossed by Stalin with the help of his own creativity.

After 1936 Stalin found out those unknown steps through the process of practice. In Stalin’s period, the Soviet Union not only witnessed the achievement of victory of socialism but gradually entered into communism after reaching the phase of developed socialism as well. These are, therefore, not the manifestation of Stalin’s deviation from the path of Leninism rather his creative contribution to the development of Leninism.

Regarding Stalin’s creative contributions Mao observed, “Comrade Stalin developed Marxist-Leninist theory in a comprehensive and epoch-making way and propelled the development of Marxism to a new stage. Com. Stalin creatively developed Lenin’s theory concerning the law of the uneven development of capitalism and the theory that it is possible for socialism to first achieve victory in one country; Com. Stalin creatively contributed the theory of the general crisis of the capitalist system; he contributed the theory concerning the building of communism in the Soviet Union; he contributed the theory of the fundamental economic laws of the present-day capitalism and socialism; he contributed the theory of revolution in colonies and semi-colonies. Com. Stalin also creatively developed Lenin’s theory of party-building.” “All of Com. Stalin’s writings are,” as Mao further observed, “immortal

documents of Marxism. His works, *The Foundations of Leninism*, *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik)*, and his last great work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, constitute an encyclopedia of Marxism-Leninism, a great synthesis of the experience of the world communist movement of the past hundred years. His speech at the Nineteenth Congress of the CPSU is a precious last testament bequeathed to the Communists of all the countries of the world.”⁶⁰ In order to denounce the great contributions of Stalin the opposition launched a false propaganda that Stalin had deviated from the path of Leninism after 1936.

Stalin left behind an extraordinary contribution to the development of the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) he delivered an important speech dealing with Engels’ proposition of withering away of the state with the abolition of classes. Abolition of classes and conversion of all means of production into common property would need a long time in a backward country where agricultural land was divided into small holdings. Besides, in the era of imperialism, there was no possibility of the abolition of the capitalist encirclement in near future. For these reasons the dictatorship of the proletariat could not be abolished rapidly as well. In reply to the question whether the state would remain also in the period of communism, Stalin said, “Yes, it will, if the capitalist encirclement is not liquidated, and if the danger of foreign military attack is not eliminated, although naturally the forms of our state will again change in conformity with the change in the situation at home and abroad.”⁶¹

Regarding the elimination of the antagonistic classes in the socialist society and the advance of the Soviet Union to communism Maurice Cornforth asserted, “In the condition in which socialism has actually developed, there has arisen the situation that even when antagonistic classes have been eliminated in a socialist country—the Soviet Union—encirclement by hostile capitalist powers remains. Hence the need for an organ of the public power in socialist society, for a socialist state, remains and will remain so long as capitalist encirclement remains, even if meantime the advance is effected right to the higher phase of communism. The socialist state is still required to guard the achievements of socialism.”⁶²

After the October Revolution in Russia Lenin was preparing to write a second volume of *The State and Revolution*, in which he intended

to elaborate and further develop the theory of the state on the basis of the experience gained during the existence of the Soviet power. Death, however, prevented him from carrying this task into execution. Stalin said, “We have been enriched with the experience gained nearly in the 20 years of running the dictatorship of the proletariat; huge valuable “materials” have come in our hand.... So what Lenin did not manage to do should be done by his disciples.”⁶³ It is a profound contribution of Stalin to the development of Lenin’s theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Seventeenth Congress of the CPSU(B) declared the Soviet Union was “advancing towards a classless socialist society”. Why did Stalin call it a classless socialist society instead of a communist society free of classes and exploitation? By calling it a classless socialist society Stalin meant that the society was free of classes and exploitation, no doubt, but not free of the state, although naturally, the forms of the state would change in conformity with change in the situation. To apply lesson from the Soviet experiences of the construction of socialism in the concrete situation of China Mao wrote in his article on the fifteen-point formulation for socialist construction, “If we want to resist the restoration of capitalism in the historic period of socialism we have to keep the dictatorship of the proletariat intact and carry forward the socialist revolution to the end to create the situation for transition to communism.” It is, therefore, clear that Mao followed the continuity of Stalin’s regarding the withering away of the state.

The point of debate was, however, on the question of victory of socialism in one country but the comrades of the opposition are extending it to the victory of communism and the final victory of socialism which is related to the question of the victory of world revolution.

Socialism is, as we know, different from both capitalist and communist society, rather it is a phase of revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. The economic difference between the socialist and communist society is that the distribution of articles of consumption is “according to work” in the former while in the latter, it will be “according to needs”. For this difference Marx applied materialist dialectical theory of development in the transition from socialism to communism. Incapability of realizing this theory of development have confused the opposition on the victory of socialism. As a result, the comrades of the opposition are opposing the theory of victory of socialism in one country and detecting Stalin’s mistakes, as the tasks of

the communism had not accomplished in the lower phase, i.e., socialism in the Soviet Union. We all know that Trotsky stressed on the impossibility of building socialism in a single country, Lenin and Stalin refuted Trotsky’s proposition and took the plan for building socialism in the Soviet Union. At the sight of the success of the plan Lenin ascertained the victory of socialism, “provided we are not crushed by military force, and the attempts to crush us in this way are not succeeding”. In the post-Lenin period, the great Lenin’s Comrade-in-arms in the October Revolution and his worthy descendant, the renowned victorious Commander-in-chief in the World War II, Comrade Stalin proclaimed the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, which justified the theory of building socialism expounded by Lenin and Stalin, and, at the same time, negated Trotsky’s proposition of impossibility of building socialism in one country.

Com. Mao on Stalin and the CPSU

To encounter the lies and slanders against the great Stalin by the revisionists Com Mao asserted in the document of the Great Debate, “The revisionism of the Marxist-Leninist theories on imperialist war and peace, proletariat revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies, the proletarian party, etc., is inseparably connected with the complete negation of Stalin.”⁶⁴ Therefore, to defend Stalin means to defend all these tenets of Marxism-Leninism.

On the significance of the victory of socialist construction in the Soviet Union Mao commented, “The achievement of victory in the anti-Fascist war would have been inconceivable without the victory of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. The fate of all humanity was bound up with the victory of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and the victory in the anti-Fascist war, and the glory of these victories should be attributed to our great Comrade Stalin.”⁶⁵

On the victory in the anti-Fascist war and the defeat of Japan which enhanced the victory of the Chinese Revolution Mao remarked, “These are days of tremendous change in the situation in the Far East. The surrender of Japanese imperialism is now a foregone conclusion. The decisive factor for Japan’s surrender is the entry of the Soviet Union into the war. One million Red Army troops are entering China’s

Northeast; this force is irresistible. Japanese imperialism can no longer continue the fight. The Chinese people's hard and bitter War of Resistance is crowned with victory. As a historical stage, the War of Resistance Against Japan is now over."⁶⁶

To counter the underestimation of the significance of the victory in the World War II Mao said, "If the October Revolution opened up wider possibilities for the emancipation of the working class and the oppressed people of the world and opened up realistic paths towards it, then the victory of the anti-Fascist Second World War has opened up still wider possibilities for the emancipation of the working class and the oppressed people of the world and has opened up still more realistic paths towards it. It will a grave mistake to underestimate the significance of the victory in the Second World War."⁶⁷

Acknowledging the extraordinary contributions of Stalin, the CPSU, in its Report to the Nineteenth Congress, said, "Comrade Stalin is constantly advancing Marxian theory. His classic work *Marxism and the Problems of Linguistics* raises to a new and higher level the fundamental tenets of the Marxian theory concerning the law-governed character of social development, and makes a thorough examination of the question of the economic basis of the society and its superstructure, and of the question of the productive forces and the relations of production. It develops further the theory of dialectical and historical materialism, as the theoretical basis of communism.... Comrade Stalin's works on economic problems and linguistics mark a new stage in the development of Marxism and provide a superb example of the creative approach to the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin."

Expressing deep faith and confidence on Lenin, Stalin and the CPSU, Com. Mao, as mentioned earlier, said "The CPSU is a party nurtured personally by Lenin and Stalin....The Chinese Communist Party is a party built and developed on the model of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." Mao further said, "Comrade Stalin, the greatest genius of the present age, the great teacher of the world Communist movement,...represented our entire new age. Com. Stalin's activities have let the Soviet people and the working people of all countries to turn around the whole world situation." "On the question of the Chinese Revolution", as Mao continued in *The Greatest Friendship*, "Stalin contributed his exalted wisdom. It was by following the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, along with having the support of the great Soviet state

and all the revolutionary forces of other countries, that the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people achieved their historic victory a few years ago."

How much devotion to Com. Mao the comrades of the opposition are likely to exhibit in the name of 'Maoism', they either do not know or fail to realize or accept these speeches of Mao. Is it not a fact that they accept Maoism but not Mao?

To conclude the Article I would like to mention the renowned litterateur and philosopher George Bernard Shaw's comment on Stalin: "In fact, the most talented scientist is he who can reach a correct decision every time, whatever tactic he may adopt. Such a man has not come into being till now, and even will not in future. That apart, the greatest scientist who can frequently or mostly attain to a correct decision is Stalin."

References

1. Frederick Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Foreign Language Press, Peking, 1975, pg. 74.
2. J V Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 3.
3. The Editorials, *The Red Flag & People's Daily*, Peking, May 16, 1967.
4. J V Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*, FLP, Peking, 1976, pgs. 52-53.
5. V I Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 103.
6. V I Lenin, *Imperialism and the Split in Socialism*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1966, pg. 7.
7. V I Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 119.
8. Karl Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1960, pg. 26.
9. V I Lenin, *op. cit.* pg. 119.
10. J V Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 168.
11. Karl Marx, *op. cit.* pg. 16.
12. V I Lenin, *op. cit.* pg. 113.
13. J V Stalin, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, FLP, Peking, 1972, pg. 69.
14. V I Lenin, *Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, Selected Works, Vol. III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, pg. 233.
15. J V Stalin, *op. cit.* pgs. 40-41.
16. *Ibid*, pg., 63.
17. Mao Tsetung, *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, Five Essays on Philosophy, FLP, Peking, 1977, pg., 95.

18. Fundamentals of Political Economy, Shanghai Text Book, pg. 238.
19. A Text Book of Marxist Philosophy, prepared by The Leningrad Institute of Philosophy under the direction of M Shirokov, NBA Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1975, pgs., 129-30.
20. J V Stalin, Problems of Leninism, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 41.
21. J V Stalin, Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, FLP, Peking, 1972, pg. 54.
22. Ibid, pg., 12.
23. V I Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, Russian Edition, pg. 263.
24. V I Lenin, Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol. XIII, pg. 301.
25. J V Stalin, Dialectical and Historical Materialism, NBA Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1972, pg. 7.
26. Mao Tsetung, On Contradiction, Five Essays on Philosophy, FLP, Peking, 1977, pg., 23.
27. Three Major Struggles on China's Philosophical Front (1949-64), FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 64.
28. Ibid, pg. 49.
29. J V Stalin, Marxism versus Liberalism (An Interview with H J Wells, July 23, 1934), Bolshevik, No. 17, 1934.
30. V I Lenin, Preliminary Draft Resolution of the Tenth Congress of the RCP on the Party Unity, Selected Works, Vol. III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, pp. 519-522.
31. J V Stalin, Political Report of the Central Committee to the Sixteenth Congress of the CPSU (B), June 27, 1930, Collected Works, Vol. XII, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1955, pgs. 366-67.
32. Mao Tsetung, The Greatest Friendship, People's Daily, March 9, 1953.
33. V I Lenin, Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Selected Works, Vol. III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, pg. 236.
34. J V Stalin, The Results of the First Five-Year Plan, Problems of Leninism, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 626..
35. J V Stalin, Report to the Seventeenth Congress of the CPSU(B), Problems of Leninism, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 737.
36. A Text Book of Marxist Philosophy, NBA Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1975, pg. 269.
37. J V Stalin, Concluding Remarks of the Speech at the Sixteenth Congress of the CPSU (B), 1930.
38. J V Stalin, On the Draft Constitution of the USSR, Problems of Leninism, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 800.
39. J V Stalin, The Right Deviation in the CPSU (B), Problems of Leninism, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 362.
40. History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1945, pg. 340.
41. V I Lenin, The State and Revolution, FLP, Peking, 1976, pgs. 118-119.
42. Ibid, pg. 120.
43. Ibid, pg. 120.
44. History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), FLPH, Moscow, 1945, pg. 274.

45. J V Stalin, Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU(B), Problems of Leninism, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 935.
46. J V Stalin, Report to the Seventeenth Congress of the CPSU(B), Problems of Leninism, FLP, Peking, 1976, pgs. 735-36.
47. G Malenkov, Report to the Nineteenth Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), October 5, 1952, FLPH, Moscow, 1952, pg. 77.
48. The Editorials, The Red Flag & People's Daily, Peking, May 16, 1967.
49. The Soviet-Yugoslav Dispute, Royal Institute of International Affairs, London & New York, November, 1948.
50. A Text Book of Marxist Philosophy, NBA Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1975, pgs. 145-46.
51. Mao Tse-tung, Selected Works, Vol. IV, FLP, Peaking, 1975, pg. 285.
52. J V Stalin, Speech Delivered in the Chinese Commission of the ECCI, November 30, 1926, Collected Works, Vol. VIII, FLPH, Moscow, 1954, pg. 379.
53. Mao Tse-tung, Problems of War and Strategy, November 6, 1938, Selected Works, Vol. II, FLP, Peking, 1975, pg. 221.
54. Mao Tse-tung, Stalin, Friend of the Chinese People, December 20, 1939, Selected Works, Vol. II, FLP, Peking, 1975, pg. 335.
55. Mao Tse-tung, Talks at a Conference of the Party Committee Secretaries, January 18, 1957, Selected Works, Vol. V, FLP, Peking, 1977, pg. 354
56. Mao Tse-tung, On the Ten Major Relationships, April 25, 1956, Selected Works, Vol. V, FLP, Peking, 1977, pg. 304.
57. Mao Tse-tung, Be Activists in Promoting the Revolution, October 9, 1957, Selected Works, Vol. V, FLP, Peking, 1977, pgs. 494-95.
58. Mao Tse-tung, Revolutionary Forces of the World Unite, November 1948, Selected Works, Vol. IV, FLP, Peaking, 1975, pg. 285.
59. V I Lenin, The State and Revolution, FLP, Peking, 1976, pgs. 117.
60. Mao Tse-tung, The Greatest Friendship, People's Daily, March 9, 1953.
61. J V Stalin, Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU(B), Problems of Leninism, FLP, Peking, 1976, pg. 935.
62. Maurice Cornforth, Dialectical Materialism, National Book Agency Pvt. Ltd. Calcutta, 1971, pg. 273.
63. J V Stalin, *op. cit.*, pgs. 931-32.
64. On the Question of Stalin, The Editorials of Red Flag and People's Daily, September 13, 1963.
65. Mao Tse-tung, The Greatest Friendship, People's Daily, March 9, 1953.
66. Mao Tse-tung, The Situation and Our Policy After the Victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan, Selected Works, Vol. IV, FLP, Peking, 1975, pg. 11.
67. Mao Tse-tung, Revolutionary Forces of the World Unite, Selected Works, Vol. IV, FLP, Peaking, 1975, pg. 284.