

Khrushchov's Role Before and After Stalin's Death by Rank and File Marxist

Bhupen Palit

In their celebrated 'Reports and Speeches' submitted to the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU, N. S. Khrushchov and A. I. Mikoyan vigorously condemned the cult of the individual "as being alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism" "making a particular leader a hero and a miracle worker", and put "paramount importance to reestablish and strengthen in every way the Leninist principle of collective leadership", which they asserted "had frequently been violated by a single leader"—and declared in the open Congress that "—for approximately twenty years we had no collective leadership", since "bureaucratic centralisation was introduced in place of Leninist democratic centralism".

By 'a particular leader' Khrushchov—Mikoyan refer to Stalin and the period covering 1930-53, a long period of about quarter of a century. It follows from this that during the above period the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U(B) had frequently deviated from the Leninist principle of collective leadership. If Khrushchov—Mikoyan's assertions are correct then it also follows that the C. C. of the CPSU (B) were in error for a period of about a quarter of a century.

In connection with the Party's mistakes, Lenin says: "Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it. analysing the circumstances which gave rise to it and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it is the *earmark* of a serious party'. (Lenin Sel. Works Vol. X p 98 — Foundation of Leninism p 25)

The champions of the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU only 'admitted the mistakes' (not in a frank manner of course) but 'no ascertainment of the reasons for it' — no 'analysis of the circumstances which gave rise to it' — and 'no thorough discussion for the means of correcting it' were made by them. It follows from this that they have again deviated from the teachings of Lenin.

Lenin also said: "—what applies to individuals also applies to politics and parties. Not he is wise who makes no mistakes. There are no such men, nor can there be. He is wise who makes not very serious mistakes and who knows how to correct them *easily and quickly*".

It took the champions of the 20th Congress about a quarter of a century to realise their mistake on such a vital and fundamental issue: namely 'deviation from the Leninist principle of collective leadership.'

Can such leaders be called wise leaders according to Lenin?

But, why were criticism and self-criticism and the 'analysis of the circumstances which gave rise to such a deviation' not made by the champions of the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU?

Is it perhaps, because the Leninist principle of collective leadership had never been violated before the death of Josep Stalin, 'the great continuer of Lenin's cause

and the great architect of communism' (Khrushchov. Mikoyan's Reports submitted at the 19th Party Congress held in 1952),

OR: was it a compromise with the 'evil force' which created and maintained for about a quarter of a century, the 'bureaucratic centralisation in place of Leninist democratic centralism'?

OR: should we believe that the present 'leaders' of the CPSU are politically so immature that it took them about a quarter of a century to realise their 'mistakes' on such a vital and fundamental issue?

FURTHER: were the champions of the 20th congress in the opposition when the "principle of collective leadership was violated", and "when the bureaucratic centralisation was introduced in place of Leninist democratic centralism", by an individual leader? No. WHY NOT? Because the present leaders of the CPSU were as 'faithful' Stalinists yesterday as they are Leninists today.

To continue: In his same 'report' Khrushchov contradicts himself by his next assertion when he says: 'the CC has always and undeviatingly been guided by Lenin's teachings on the Party, and the Party's unity has been built up over the course of many years and decades, it grew stronger in battles with a host of enemies'. Since "the CC has always and undeviatingly been guided by Lenin's teachings on the Party over the course of many years and decades" HOW could there be any "deviation from the Leninist principles of collective leadership", of the party during the same period?

The same contradiction has been reflected in the 'Editorial of For a Lasting Peace — For People's Democracy' (No. 8—381. dated 24-2-56) where it begins with: "The Leninist norms of the Party life which had frequently been violated before the 19th Congress", and ends with "The Leninist unity of the CPSU has always been the prime factor of its strength and might. Enemies of the Soviet people have made repeated attempts to split the Party's rank, but all the attempts of the enemies of Communism have been in vain, they have banged their hands against the Party's steel-like Leninist unity".

Which of the above assertions should be taken as 'correct' since the former not only contradicts but also excludes the latter? Khrushchov in his 'celebrated' report and Lasting Peace — in their editorial did not tell the readers.

Further, boasting over the liquidation of the Beria group, Khrushchov declares: "The CC resolutely put an end to the criminal conspiracy of the dangerous enemy and his accomplices. That was a big victory for its collective leadership". If according to Khrushchov, there was really no collective leadership after Lenin's death then "liquidation of Trotskyites, Bukharinites, bourgeois nationalists and other malignant enemies of the people" should go to whose credit? To the credit of individual leadership which created 'bureaucratic centralisation'? Khrushchov here

pays higher tribute to the 'role of the individual' since, as we all know, all the malignant enemies of socialism, namely: Trotskyites, Bukharinites and bourgeois nationalists etc. were completely eliminated during the period of 'cult of individual'.

To continue: it is amazing to note, when the champions of the 20th Party Congress assert in a 'Pravda article' that 'it was only due to the role of individual which prevailed during the last 20 years, the malignant enemies of Socialism, namely: the Beria group, could occupy important positions both in the State and Party administration.' Since there was no 'role of individual' and 'cult of hero-worship' prevailed during the period of Lenin how then "the enemies of people and Socialism, namely: Trotskyites, Bukharinites etc. could occupy the key positions both within the State and Party administration? One fails to find any answer from the long 'reports and speeches' of the champions of the 20th Party Congress.

There was no necessity for Khrushchov and Mikoyan to repeat what every-body knows is a basic principle of the communist parties that 'hero-worship and cult of individual' is alien to Marxism Leninism.

After Lenin's death, it was none other than Stalin who repeatedly discarded the idea of hero-worship, on many occasions. In a letter to Comrade Shatunovsky, as far back as in 1930 (when it is alleged 'the cult of individual and hero-worship' started) Stalin wrote:

"...You speak of your 'devotion' to me. Perhaps it was just a chance phrase. Perhaps... but if the phrase was not accidental I would advise you to discard the 'principle' of devotion to persons. It is not the Bolshevik way. Be devoted to the Working Class, its Party, its State, That is a fine and useful thing, But do not confuse it with devotion to persons, this vain and useless bauble of weak-minded intellectuals." (Stalin Work: Vol. 13 p. 20)

And again, in reply to a letter to Comrade Demyan Bedny, the notable Russian poet, Stalin wrote:

"...and you want me to keep silent on the ground that you, it appears, cherish a 'biographical tenderness' for me. How naive you are and how little you know the Bolsheviks." (*ibid* p. 27)

This is how, Stalin always discarded the 'principle of hero worship' and 'devotion to persons'. He always gave the classic expression of the danger of individual decision, unchecked by collective thought. When Emil Ludwig, and later Roy Howard, sought to learn how 'the great man made decisions', Stalin impatiently replied: "With us, individuals cannot decide... Experience has shown us that individual decisions, uncorrected by others, have a large percentage of error". He added "the success of the USSR came because the best brains in all arenas – science, industry, farming, world affairs – were combined in the Central

Committee, through which decisions were made.”

It is also alleged that in his ‘Letters to the Congress’ (1922-23) which were not intended for publication, Lenin suggested to the 13th Party Congress that in view of Stalin’s ‘rudeness’ it should consider the question of putting another comrade in Stalin’s place as General Secretary. These ‘Letters to the Congress’ have recently been published by the present ‘Leninist’ leaders of the CPSU, though Lenin did not want them to be published.

After Lenin’s death, in the year 1927 Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev group tried to abuse Stalin and the CC of the CPSU (B) that the Party had ‘concealed’ Lenin’s ‘will’ (Letters to the Congress). In his speech at the meeting of the Joint Plenum of the CC and Central Control Commission of the CPSU (B), held in October 23, 1927 Stalin in reply to the opposition group (Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev) remarked: “Yes comrades, it is true. I am rude to those who grossly and perfidiously wreck and split the Party. I have never concealed this and I do not conceal it now. Perhaps some mildness is needed in the treatment of splitters, but I am a bad hand at that. At the very first meeting of the Plenum of the CC after 13th Congress, I asked the Plenum of the CC to release me from my duties as General Secretary (suggested by Lenin in his letters to the Congress). The Congress itself discussed this question. And all the delegation unanimously, including Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev obliged Stalin to remain at his post.... As regards publishing the ‘will’ (Letters to the Congress) the Congress decided not publish it since it was addressed to the Congress and was not intended for publication by its author Lenin.... It is characteristic there is not a word, not a hint in the ‘will’ about Stalin having made mistakes It refers only to Stalin s rudeness. But rudeness is not and cannot be counted as a defect in Stalin’s political line or position.” (Stalin Works: vol. 10 p. 180-81)

It is also characteristic to note here that on Lenin’s motion the Plenum of CC, on April 23, 1922 elected Stalin, General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU (B) the same year (it is alleged) that Lenin suggested to the Congress to remove Stalin from the post of General Secretary.

Yet the present ‘Leninist’ leaders of the CPSU are playing the same tricks as Messieurs Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev tried to play some 30 years before.

In spite of all these, history confirms that Stalin had a ‘little’ modesty too. When interviewed by German writer Emil Ludwig (1930), Stalin paid glowing tribute to Lenin’s genius in transforming Russia, but of himself he simply said: “As for myself I am merely a pupil of Lenin and my life's aim is to be a worthy pupil of his”. And again in 1933 when Colonel Robins told him: “What is most interesting to me is that throughout Russia I have found the names Lenin-Stalin. Lenin-Stalin, Lenin-Stalin jinked together”. Stalin replied modestly: “That is an exaggeration—How can I be compared to Lenin” (Stalin Works: Vol 13, pp. 107 & 267). In the

later part of his life (when even Khrushchov-Mikoyan often referred to him as “the great continuer of Lenin’s cause – the great architect of Communism —our beloved leader and teacher—leader and teacher of the working people of the whole world—the inspirer and organiser of all our victories Comrade Stalin”) in 1947, during the time of discussion with Herold Stassen, Stalin said: “For the first time the idea of co-operation of two systems was expressed by Lenin. Lenin is our teacher, and *we Soviet people* are Lenin’s disciples” (Why Soviet Union Fights for Peace: Tass Publication: p. 23 1954). Khrushchov Mikoyan fail to find ‘modesty’ in Stalin today, the same ‘faithful-Leninist’ leaders who wrote on Stalin’s 70th birthday: “One cannot help being amazed at Comrade Stalin’s wise deliberation and *sober-mindedness*, inimitable coolness and daring in appraising facts and events even in exceptionally difficult times, at the sharpest and most abrupt turns in history’.

Yet, in spite of all these, if according to Khrushchov-Mikoyan there was really any trend that existed in the working-class movement of the world of ‘making a particular leader a hero and miracle worker; it was not Stalin but the leaders of the Communist and Workers Parties of all countries, without exception, including the present ‘Leninist’ leaders of the CPSU, that were responsible for it. Since 1930, there was not a single communist leader all over the world, who referred to Stalin’s name without paying the following glowing tributes to him:—

“Stalin is the leader of world Revolution. This is of paramount importance. It is a great event that mankind is blessed with Stalin. Since we have him things can go well. As you all know Marx is dead and so are Engels and Lenin. Had there been no Stalin who would be there to give us directions? But having him— this is really a blessing. Now there exist in the world a Soviet Union—and also a STALIN. We must hail him, we must support him and we must learn from him. We must learn from him in two respects: his theory and his work”. (Mao Tse-tung—On Stalin’s 70th birthday—‘Stalin and the Chinese Revolution: Chen Po-ta. p. 1)

“Our epoch – The Stalin epoch – in the epoch of the triumph of the ideas of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin. Stalin – the saviour of our people and all mankind – great and beloved leader may live as long as the highest mountains in our country.” (Enver Hoxha ; Greetings to the 19th Party Congress of the CPSU: on behalf of the Albanian Party of Labour).

“Comrade Stalin s splendid guidance on questions concerning the Chinese revolution was of tremendous, invaluable significance for the victory which the Chinese people won in the revolution under the leadership of the Communist Party of China”. (Liu Shao Chi: Ibid., on behalf of the CP of China.)

“The great leader and teacher of the communists all over the world—the architect of communist society, champion of world peace and of independence and sovereignty of all peoples, and friend and brother of the working people of the whole world – our beloved great Stalin.” (Maurice Thorez: Ibid: on behalf of the French Communist Party).

“For all of us Comrade Stalin is our teacher and leader—the brave and invincible fighter for democracy—for Socialism—for peace—the banner of Marx-Engels-Lenin- Stalin. For all of us Stalin’s works are priceless treasure” (Togliatti and Luigi Longo: Ibid: on behalf of C. P. of Italy.)

“Glory to our teacher and father Great Stalin”. (Klement Gottwald: Ibid: on behalf of C. P. of Czechoslovakia).

“Comrade Stalin—leader of all progressive mankind in the struggle for peace, for progress, for socialism. Our epoch the victorious Lenin-Stalin Epoch”. (Boleslaw Bierut: Ibid ; on behalf of the C. P. of Poland).

“Long life and many many years of good health to great Stalin—the inspirer of all our successes, true friend to the Hungarian people, splendid leader of the toiling mankind”. (Matyas Rakosi: Ibid: on behalf of C. P. of Hungary).

“Comrade Stalin—the teacher, guide and friend of the working people of the entire world—full, free happy and peaceful life that will mark a new ERA— Stalin Era in the history of the world humanity. The great leader of the CP of Soviet Union, the Soviet people and all working people throughout the world – Comrade Josep Stalin”. (Harry Pollit: Ibid: on behalf of C. P. of Britain.)

“The working people of the Rumanian people’s Republic are filled with boundless love for their liberator—Comrade Stalin —The best friend of Rumanian people, teacher and leader of the whole working people of the whole world.” (Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej: Ibid: on behalf of the Rumanian Workers’ Party).

“Our mothers, the women of the common people of our country, for whose children Comrade Stalin displays such warm solicitude, say: “Let God shorten our lives by years and add minutes to Stalin’s life, we are so many that he will live forever! (Nikos Zachariadis: Ibid. on behalf of the C. P. of Greece).

“We wish health and long life to the standard-bearer of world peace, to the great architect of communism, to our beloved Stalin.” (Wilhelm Pieck: Ibid on behalf of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany).

“We express deep gratitude to our Comrade Stalin for all his efforts to secure for the German people a just peace treaty and restoration of our national unity.

Long live the great leader and teacher of the working class of the whole world, the best friend of the German people—our Comrade Stalin.” (Max Reimann: Ibid. on behalf of the C P. of Germany, West).

“Dear Comrades, permit me on behalf of the Union of Yugoslav Patriots for the liberation of the peoples of Yugoslavia from the fascist oppression of the Tito-Rankovic clique and from imperialist bondage to convey fraternal greetings and to express boundless love for and devotion to the teacher and leader of the international proletariat, the standard bearer of peace and cooperation among nations, great Stalin – may great Stalin, brother of Lenin, and his cause, his glory and his name live for ages”. (Pero Popivoda: ibid. on behalf of the Union of Yugoslav Patriots).

“Our great leader and teacher, the organiser and inspirer of all the great victories achieved by Soviet people and the progressive mankind of the whole world—our Stalin teaches us that self-criticism is a part of the very foundation of our Party. This 19th Party Congress is arming the Party and the Soviet people with a grand programme of work in building a communist society. Armed with all-conquering theory of Marxism-Leninism, the Communist Party is uniting the working millions of our country ever more closely beneath the great banner of Lenin and Stalin. Long live the wise leader of our Party and people, the inspirer and organiser of all our victories— Comrade Stalin”.

Khrushchov sang in the same tune in his ‘speech’ at the First Session of the Supreme Soviet of USSR, held in April, 1954 (about a year after Stalin’s death), which reads:—

The road to Communism is illumined by ever-living life-asserting teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin” and again “The Party and CC headed by J. V. Stalin— the great continuer of Lenin's Cause”.

After Stalin’s death (March 5, 1953), hardly two years passed, and ‘faithful Leninist’ leaders Khrushchov-Mikoyan & Co. suddenly realised that: “J. V. Stalin—the great continuer of Lenin’s cause” “had frequently violated the Leninist principle of collective leadership”, and “had replaced Leninist democratic centralism” by “Stalinist bureaucratic centralisation”, and Khrushchov-Mikoyan have shamelessly reduced the ‘Leninist-Stalinist Central Committee’ to merely ‘Leninist CC’, ‘Our beloved leader and teacher, the great architect of communism, wise leader and teacher of our Party and the peoples of the whole world, the inspirer and organiser of all our victories— Comrade Stalin’ to simply J. V. Stalin.

The ‘Books’ on ‘The great Patriotic War, Marxism and Problems of Linguistics, Economic Problems of the USSR, which according to Khrushchov-Mikoyan were ‘like Comrade Stalin’s other writings, of immense importance to the ideological

education in our country’, and ‘which arms the Party and the people with theory for transition from Socialism to Communism’ and ‘which like Comrade Stalin’s other works is of immense value in the solving of the problems connected with the building of a Communist society in the immortal ideas of Marxism-Leninism’, and ‘which light up with Stalin’s genius both the great historical path we have traversed, as well as the road towards the more and more tangible communist future’, have now been discovered by them as something insignificant (not even worthy of reference), ‘doubtful whether we get any help from Stalin’s theses which require critical re-examination from the stand point of Marxism-Leninism.’”

Such a ‘revolutionary’ change is only possible for the ‘faithful Leninist’ leaders like the champions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

Since 20th Congress five years passed but no ‘critical re-examination from the stand point of Marxism-Leninism’ was made by the ‘Marxist-Leninist’ leaders of the 20th Congress. Why? Because, these renegade leaders ‘have for their own obscure objectives, inventing base slanders after slanders, against Stalin, to uncrown Lenin and to impose their own revisionist views on the world communist movement, in order to render services not to the international working class movement but to the world imperialist camp’. (Enver Hoxha)

To continue: Discussing the ‘Rights of the Party Members’ Khrushchov in his ‘report’, submitted to the 19th Party Congress asserted that: “Our Party has always attached great importance to the consistent practice of inner-Party democracy”, and “Every Party member has the right to address any question or statement to the Party body, upto and including the Central Committee of the CPSU”. Since every party member had the right to address any question to any Party body upto and including the CC of the CPSU” who then prevented ‘Leninist’ Khrushchov to challenge Stalin when he (Stalin) ‘established methods of personal leadership’, violating ‘Leninist principle of Collective leadership’ ???

One fails to find any answer from the long ‘reports and speeches’ of the 20th Congress, and comes to the natural conclusion that: either Khrushchov Mikoyan & Co. lied at the 19th Party Congress (1952) OR they are lying now at the 20th Party Congress (1956).

Condemning the swindlers Khrushchov, in his ‘report’ at the 19th Party Congress quoted the proverb: “One who lies can be nobody’s friend”. How rightly Khrushchov could be served today with his own ‘words’ quoted by him at the 19th Party Congress.

Further, it is perplexing to read and note the views of the present ‘Leninist’ leaders of the CPSU, who expressed their disapproval of Stalin’s great work ‘History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) Short Course’,

through an article published in 'Pravda', which reads: "The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) Short Course, is largely permeated with the cult of individual", which they suggested should be withdrawn from the circulation. The same 'book' about which Mao Tse-tung urged, in his celebrated article 'Reform our Study', that: "Stalin's great work 'History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) Short Course, should be used as *main text-book* for learning Marxism-Leninism", which according to Mao, "constitutes the highest synthesis and summation of the world Communist movement during the last one hundred years", and which "is the model of unity of theory and practice, and the *only perfect model* in the entire world." In this 'book', "by seeing how Lenin and Stalin combine the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with concrete practice of the Soviet revolution and in this way develop Marxism", Mao Tse-tung urges "we can understand how work should be done in China".

It appears that there is a great difference of opinion about the 'book' between the present leaders of the CPSU and the leader of the Chinese Communist party and people, Mao Tse-tung, who not only led the Chinese communist party and the people through all difficulties and trials and is now confidently leading them towards the goal of communism but has also enriched the general outstanding treasury of Marxism-Leninism by his theoretical contributions. Will Mao Tse-tung be obliged to 'correct' himself after a 'sermon' received from the champions of the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU, through the 'Pravda article'??

One has to wait and see.

To continue: After all their baseless and vulgar attacks on the 'departed' leader and teacher of the working people of the whole world, Khrushchov-Mikoyan tried to 'contribute' something theoretical to the general treasury of Marxism-Leninism, namely: that the "present international situation provides the possibilities of a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism in a number of separate countries." The future events and the sum-total experiences of the working-class movement throughout the whole world for their liberation who are still working under the heel of bourgeois draconic laws, will certainly reject and refute that the present international situation does not provide such an absurd transition from capitalism to socialism. But here we do not mean to discuss this particular point which requires a separate discussion. But the question is: is this 'thesis' expounded by the 'Leninist' leaders of the 20th Congress for the first time? Of course NOT. Who does not know that as far back as in 1924, Stalin (and none other than Stalin), in his celebrated work 'Foundation of Leninism' specifically said:—

"In the remote future, if the proletariat is victorious in the most important capitalist countries, and if the present capitalist encirclement is replaced by a Socialist encirclement, a 'peaceful' path of development is quite possible for

certain capitalist countries, whose capitalist, in view of the ‘unfavourable’ international situation, will consider it expedient ‘voluntarily’ to make substantial concessions to the proletariat. But this supposition applies only to a remote and possible future. With regard to immediate future, there is no ground whatsoever for this supposition”. (Foundation of Leninism: 1924: p. 45).

Is it too much to expect from the ‘Leninist’ leaders of the 20th Congress, the most simple modesty to acknowledge such facts??

To continue: The champions of the 20th Congress also accused Stalin for having done wrong to Tito—leader of the Yugoslav revisionists, who not only betrayed the Marxist-Leninist theories concerning the class struggle of the proletariat, the proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat and had completely forsaken the Marxist-Leninist doctrine about the Party of the proletariat, but even acted and has been acting as agent of the world imperialist forces. And yet, Tito was accepted as a bonafide member of the world socialist family by the 20th Party Congress, initiated by Khrushchov-Mikoyan & Co. whose political line is more identical with Titoism-Trotskyism than Marxism-Leninism.

Since the ‘20th Congress’, hardly one and half years passed, representatives of the world communist parties met in Moscow and were obliged to turn Tito again out of the world Socialist camp, because the ‘traitor’ they found remained traitor, acting as he had always been acting, as anti-communist vanguard for the world imperialist reactionaries.

The time must have come to denounce them openly who took initiative for this anti-Marxian, unholy alliance with the traitors.

To continue: In his celebrated speech at the 19th party Congress (1952) of the CPSU, Stalin, having acknowledged the ‘debt’ (in form of confidence, sympathy and support) received by the Soviet Union, since its inception, from the fraternal parties and peoples of the world, proclaimed:—“Naturally our Party cannot remain indebted to the fraternal parties, and it must in its turn render support to them and also to their peoples, in their struggle for emancipation and in their struggle for the preservation of peace.... It was very hard, of course, to perform this honourable mission so long as ours was a single and solitary ‘Shock Brigade’, so long as it had to perform this mission of vanguard almost alone.... Now it has become easier for our Party to perform this honourable mission since today from China and Korea to Czechoslovakia and Hungary, new ‘Shock Brigades’ have appeared in the shape of the People’s Democracies.... Those communist, democratic and workers’ and peasants’ parties which have not yet come to power and are still working under the heel of bourgeois draconic laws are deserving our particular attention”.

The ‘Leninist’ leaders of the 20th Party Congress not only denied tactfully to

pay their 'debt' i.e. to render active support to the working class movements of the respective countries whose working people are languishing in misery under the jackboot of their exploiting classes, as acknowledged and assured by Stalin at the 19th Party Congress, but have shamelessly made unholy alliances with the ruling classes of the respective countries, and thereby transformed Proletarian-Internationalism into national-chauvinism. Meanwhile, in their servile zeal, Messieurs Khrushchov & Co sank so low as to even kiss the bloody hands of the representatives of the imperialist countries, who are 'capable only of raping and not freeing nations' (Lenin), as Messrs Kautsky & Co. did during the period of betrayal of the Second International. President Eisenhower, representative of "U. S. imperialists who for the past ten years and more have without any scruples, adopted means of persecution a hundred times more savage than before, trampling upon the outstanding sons of the country's working class, trampling upon the Negro people, trampling upon all progressives, and moreover, recklessly declaring that they intend to put the whole world under their rule of violence" (Long Live Leninism: p. 23-24), is according to Khrushchov 'an angel of peace'. President Nasser, one of the bitterest enemies of communism, is a 'comrade-in-arms' of Khrushchov in whose prison house more than 2000 communists and progressives are being tortured today, as was observed in Nazi camps.

Khrushchov has developed a questionable tenderness and confidence in Nehru, who is never tired in repeating that 'Marxism has already become outmoded' and who regards Marxism-Leninism as having lost all its validity. The same Nehru who discovered a new type of 'socialism' which is acceptable to the 'liberal' bourgeoisie only. This Nehru-brand socialism includes in its programme the general recognition of socialist ideas and the gradual substitution of a 'new order' for capitalism in order to befool the masses and cast aside the revolutionary way of changing order which, according to Lenin "is the living soul of Marxism."

In his celebrated article 'On Peoples' Democratic Dictatorship' Mao Tse-tung said "Forty years' experience of Sun Yet-Sen and twenty eight years' experience of the Chinese Communist Party have taught us that all the Chinese people, without exception, must lean either on the side of imperialism or on that of Socialism. Sitting on the fence will not do, nor there is a third-road. We oppose Chiang Kai shek's reactionary clique which leans on the side of imperialism and we also oppose illusion about a third-road. Not only in China but throughout the world, all the peoples, without exception, must lean either on imperialism or on socialism. Neutrality is merely a camouflage: a third road does not exist.

"After Tibet's counter revolution against China flared in Lhasa, and the defeated counter-revolutionaries fled to India, and subsequent border incidents, Communist Party of China accuses Nehru "who had always used two faced tactics" and referring Nehru's 'middle course' C P. of China says in their statement that: "as a

matter of fact to put it more frankly, the Indian Government has always used two-faced tactics. It is indeed extraordinary to adopt such tactics towards a friendly country.”

Yet, Khrushchov finds a 'third road' in Nehru's foreign policy and a 'neutral India' under his leadership which also aspires for socialism! He judges Nehru not by his acts but by his benevolent speeches, although his (Nehru's) words are refuted at every step by his deeds.

Khrushchov talks too much and talks everything that is acceptable to liberals and bourgeois democrats and does not go beyond their (bourgeois) circle of ideas. But he does not talk about the main thing, namely: that 'the working class cannot achieve victory without breaking the resistance of the bourgeoisie, without forcibly suppressing its enemies'—(Lenin), and that: "the proletarian revolution is impossible without the forcible destruction of bourgeois state-machine"—(Marx).

To continue: The theory expounded by Stalin, submitted at the 19th Party Congress (1952) that: "Formerly, bourgeoisie could afford to play the liberal, to uphold the bourgeois-democratic liberties, and thus gain popularity with the people. Now not a trace remains of this liberalism. The so-called 'liberty of individual' no longer exists—the rights of the individual are now extended only to those who possess capital, while all other citizens are regarded as human raw material, fit only to be exploited. The principle of equal rights for men and nations has been trampled in the mud: it has been replaced by the principle of full rights for the exploiting minority and no rights for the exploited majority. The banner of bourgeois democratic liberties has been thrown over-board. I think 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 gather around you the majority of the people. There is nobody else to raise it," has also been negated by the champions of the 20th Party Congress of the CPSU. Past several years history has fully confirmed and the current international events are daily confirming the absolute correctness of Stalin's above views, since 'the banner of bourgeois-democratic liberties have already been thrown over-board' and are being thrown over-board, in the imperialist and capitalist countries throughout the whole world.

Khrushchov and the present CC of the CPSU also differ with Stalin in regard to "inevitability of wars between capitalist countries" and the means of preservation of world peace. It is alleged that Stalin believed in the inevitability of another world war (that is a total war between Socialist camp and the camp of imperialist warmongers). This is a downright lie. Stalin never said that another world war is inevitable. What he said was just the opposite. In an interview with Pravda correspondent in 1951, when he was asked: "Do you consider another world war

inevitable”? Stalin replied categorically: “No. At least, at any rate, at the present time it cannot be considered inevitable.” (Interview with Pravda correspondent—Foreign Publishing House—Moscow, 1951, p. 12). Of course, at the same time he did not forget to confirm the validity of Lenin’s well-known thesis that: “Imperialism inevitably generates war” and the “inevitability of wars between capitalist countries”. Discussing the question of inevitability of wars and of preservation of world peace, Stalin in his celebrated work ‘Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR’ said that... “the present day peace movement will not be enough to eliminate the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries generally. It will not be enough, because, for all successes of the peace movement, imperialism will remain continue in force—and consequently, the inevitability of wars will also continue in force”. He further suggested: “to eliminate the inevitability of wars, it is necessary to abolish imperialism”. In regard to preservation of peace Stalin said, in his reply to the Pravda Correspondent that: ... “Peace will be preserved and strengthened if the peoples take into their own hands the cause of the preservation of peace and defend it to the end”. But at the same time he did not forget to warn us that: “War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in enmeshing the popular masses in a web of lies, deceiving them and inveigling them into another world war”. (Interview with Pravda Correspondent: p. 14).

Khrushchov also poses to be an ‘advocate’ of peace but he believes that peace could be maintained only by having ‘paper treaties’, over tea-table conferences with the warmonger imperialist reactionaries; and the fate of peace rests in the hands of the ‘representatives’ of ‘big’ nations and not in the hands of the peoples of different nations. The history of past several years confirms beyond any doubt, the utter failure of Khrushchov's peace-policy since all his 'peace- missions' and peace-conferences have come to an end without yielding any positive result in favour of world-peace. Particularly characteristic is the fact that all his attempts for the promotion of peace have been sabotaged by those very ‘peace lovers’ belonging to the imperialist camp, who themselves were the ‘participants’ of such peace-conferences, initiated by Khrushchov. The violation of Soviet territory by U-2 Plane, just on the eve of Summit Conference in Paris, may be aptly cited as one of the numerous examples in this connection.

In this respect, in full conformity with Stalin's 'thesis', Wang Chia-Hsiang, on behalf of the Chinese Communist Party in an article published in the pamphlet 'In Refutation of Modern Revisionism' says: "We have at all times taken the view that peace must be defended resolutely and that it can be defended. But this can be achieved only if all the forces of peace unite and wage a staunch struggle against the machinations of war plotters. Here the question is not only that war must be firmly opposed. It should also be made clear that people really have the strength to overcome the threat of war".

It is also amazing to note the contradiction in 'dialectician' Khrushchov's views in regard to war and peace. In his speech submitted at the 3rd Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party held in June 21, 1960, Khrushchov starts with: "Directly related to the policy of peaceful co-existence is the thesis proclaimed by the 20th and 21st Congresses of our Party that in our time war is not inevitable... on this question we should not mechanically repeat today what Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said on imperialism decades ago (imperialism inevitably generates war) and go on maintaining that imperialist wars are inevitable until socialism triumphs the world over," and ends with admitting the fact that war is not only possible in our days but really there has been continuous warfare, started by the imperialist war-mongers. when he says: "And if the imperialists do unleash war, will our socialist camp be in a position to stop it? The answer is yes. In 1956, when France, Britain and Israel attacked Egypt, our intervention put a stop to this imperialist war, started by the aggressive forces in an attempt to deprive Egypt of her independence.... In 1957, we prevented an attack on Syria by Turkey, which was being egged on by the U. S. imperialism.... In 1958, after the revolution in Iraq, the Americans and British brought up their forces and were preparing to attack Iraq... the U. S government has so far been sowing only the seeds of war...."

In refutation of the above thesis proclaimed by the 20th and 21st Congresses, that 'war is not inevitable', the Editorial Department of Hongqu' in their celebrated article "Long Live Leninism", says: "Is the question of war and peace no longer an issue? Is it that imperialism no longer exists, the system of exploitation no longer exists, and therefore the question of war no longer exists? Or is it that there can be no question of war even if imperialism and the system of exploitation are allowed to survive for ever? The fact is that, since World War II, there has been continuous and unbroken warfare. Do not the imperialist wars to suppress national liberation movements and the imperialist wars of armed intervention against revolutions in various countries count as wars? Even though these local wars do not develop into world wars, do they not still count as wars?? Even though they are not fought with nuclear weapons, do wars using what are called conventional weapons not still count as wars? Does not the U. S imperialists' allocation of nearly 60 per cent of their 1960 budget outlay to arms expansion and war preparations count as a

bellicose policy on the part of U. S. imperialism?? Will the revival of West German and Japanese militarism not confront mankind with the danger of a new world war??" (Long Live Leninism: p. 12).

Meanwhile, another congress (22nd Congress) of the CPSU was held in the month of October 1961, and Khrushchov "the devil showed his horns again; who wants to stifle all criticism of himself and even liquidate every person who dares to oppose him"—(Enver Hoxha—leader of the Albanian Party of Labour).

In this 22nd Congress, M/s. Khrushchov & Co. came out once again with their baseless and vulgar slanders, not only against Stalin, but against all those who did not agree with their revisionist and anti-Marxist policy, which has destroyed to a great extent, and is destroying daily the international unity and solidarity of all Marxist-Leninist parties of the world.

People in general, throughout the world, with or without political creed and conviction, are horrified by seeing Khrushchov's brutal assault on a 'dead body', an inhuman action which can claim no political expediency far less moral justification. The method he adopted to fight the 'cult of individual' by assaulting a 'dead body', is without parallel in the history of world civilization, barring some exceptions of remote past.

His vulgar attacks on the Albanian Party of Labour and its tried leaders, have created great indignation not only among the vanguards of the working class but among the working people in general. Khrushchov accuses the Albanian Party of Labour and its leadership (Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu), as anti-Marxists, whose actions "prejudice the basic interests of the Albanian people and the unity of the socialist commonwealth as a whole", in the open Congress, in an arbitrary way; himself brutally violating the agreed declaration of 81 Party document which demands amicable settlement of all disputes among all Communist and Worker Parties of the world. The 81 Party Document reads: "Whenever a Party wants to clear up questions relating to the activities of another fraternal Party, its leadership approaches the leadership of the Party concerned; if necessary, they hold meeting and consultations.... The interests of the struggle for the working-class cause demand ever closer unity of the ranks of each Communist Party and of the great army of Communists of all countries; they demand of them unity of will and action. It is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist Party to work continuously for greater unity in the world Communist movement." (Documents of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties: Moscow. November-December 1960).

In this connection, it is amazing to read and note the 'speeches' delivered by Khrushchov, during his stay in Albania, (May 25—June 4, 1959) when he always greeted the Albanian Party of Labour and its leaders, particularly Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu, as "great Marxist-Leninists who adhere firmly and unswervingly

to Marxism- Leninism”. In his speech at a meeting in Korce on May 28, 1959 Khrushchov said “Dear Comrades, it gives us particular pleasure to visit your historical city, because this was the birthplace of the Albanian Party of Labour, the Party that stands firmly by Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. This has always made us, Communists of Soviet Union, happy. It adds to our pleasure to come here, among you, with the leader of your country and Party our dear friend, Comrade Enver Hoxha, who laid the foundation for the heroic Albanian Party of Labour in your city.” (N. S. Khrushchov—World Without Arms World Without Wars—Vol: 1, p. 355).

Hardly 1½ years passed, the same Khrushchov is accusing the Albanian Party of Labour and its tried leaders as non-Marxists who have been abnormal and pernicious for a long time, and whose leaders maintain their power by resorting to force and arbitrary rule’... ‘the Albanian Party leaders raised the cult of Stalin’s personality on high and began a bitter struggle against the decisions of the 20th Party Congress of the C. P. S. U., in an effort to divert the Socialist countries from the true course’. (Concluding Speech by N. S. Khrushchov at the 22nd Congress of the C. P. S. U.)

Since the Albanian Party and its leaders ‘have been abnormal and pernicious for a long time and raised the cult of Stalin’s personality on high and began a bitter struggle against the decisions of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. (1956) in an effort to divert the Socialist countries from the true course’—how then Khrushchov could be justified in certifying the Albanian Party and its same leadership as “the party that stands firmly by Marxist-Leninist theory and practice which adheres firmly and unswervingly to Marxism-Leninism... the Albanian Party of Labour headed by Comrade Hoxha is leading the people confidently along the road to Socialist construction and is fighting resolutely for the still greater unity of the Communist and Workers' Parties, for the community of the countries of the Socialist Camp, for the purity of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine”, in 1959? (N. S. Khrushchov—World without Arms—World without Wars Vol. 1 pp. 340/55/63).

Again one fails to find any justification, from Khrushchov’s long ‘reports and speeches’ of his contradictory and dual role and comes to the same natural conclusion that the ‘liar’ remains loyal only to lying.

The decisions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the C. P. S. U., have not only failed to convince the broad masses of the peoples but even the vanguards of the working classes, of their ‘Leninist’ stand, which is not only a departure from the teachings of Stalin but obviously a deviation from Marxism-Leninism. By their ‘Reports and Speeches’ the champions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses, have only created great confusion in the rank and file of working class movement, which disturbs the correct relationship between the vanguards (communists) and

the broad masses of the people.

To whose benefit it will go? To the benefit of the enemies of the working class and of Socialism.

All the above facts obviously follow that the champions of 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, are down-right liars and conscious betrayers to the Great CAUSE, committed to our care by the great leaders and teachers of the working people of the world—Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin.

To continue: It is said that the opinion of the majority of the Party must be accepted and executed under all conditions and circumstances, and a Leninist should never go against the opinion of the majority. This is a wrong conception of the teachings of Lenin, on the Party and its democratic centralism. Because Lenin—the founder of the CPSU (B) and creator of the Third International, did never become a captive of the majority when that majority had no basis of principle. There have been times in the history of both CPSU (B) and Second International when the opinion of the majority or momentary interest of the Party conflicted with the fundamental interests of the proletariat. On such occasions, Lenin would never hesitate and resolutely took his stand in support of principle as against the majority of the Party. Moreover, he did not fear and hesitate, on such occasions, literally to stand alone against all, considering, as he would often say that: “A policy based on principle is the only correct policy.”

Particularly characteristic, in this respect, are the two following facts:

1st Fact: It was in the period of 1909-11, when the Party (CPSU(B)) smashed by the counter-revolution, was in process of complete disintegration. It was a period of disbelief in the Party, of wholesale desertion from the Party, not only the intellectuals, but partly, even the workers; a period of Liquidationism and collapse. Not only the Mensheviks, but even the Bolsheviks then consisted of a number of factions and trends, for the most part severed from the working class movement. It was just at that period, the idea arose of completely liquidating the illegal organisation and organising the workers into a legal, liberal Stolypin Party. Lenin, at that time was the only one not to succumb to the widespread epidemic and to hold high the banner of Party principle, assembling the scattered and shattered forces of the Party with astonishing patience and extraordinary persistence, combating each and every anti-Party trend within the working-class movement and defending the Party principle with unusual courage and unparalleled perseverance.

2nd Fact: It was in the period of 1914-17, when the imperialist war was in full swing, and when all, or nearly all, the Social-Democratic and Socialist Parties had succumbed to the general patriotic frenzy and had placed themselves at the service of imperialism of their respective countries. It was a period when the Second International had hauled down its colours to capitalism, when even people like

Plekhanov, Kautsky, Guesde and the rest were unable to withstand the tide of chauvinism. Lenin at that time was the only one, or almost the only one, to wage a determined struggle against social-chauvinism and social-pacifism, to denounce the treachery of the Guedes and Kautskys, and to stigmatise the half-heartedness of the betwixt and between 'revolutionaries'. Lenin knew that he was backed by only an insignificant minority, but to him this was not of decisive moment, for he knew that the only correct policy, with a future before it, was the policy of consistent internationalism, that a policy based on principle is the only correct policy.

(Both the facts quoted from Stalin Works: Vol. 6: pp. 60/61)

Hence, it is clear that as a loyal Leninist one has not only the right but is duty bound to uphold the banner of fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism and stand alone, if required, against the opinion of even the majority, if that 'opinion conflicts with the fundamental interest of the proletariats'.

The decisions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU and the subsequent theses and theories formulated by its leaders, should be judged whether these formulations conflict with the fundamental interests of the proletariats and the proletarian internationalism. And if these formulations conflict with the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, should be combated as Lenin did during the periods mentioned above.

Yet, the most vital question remains unanswered: i.e. what are the objective causes and subjective preparations of the 'renegades and revisionists', which gave rise to such a deviation of a Party like Communist Party of the Soviet Union,—“the party founded by Lenin and fostered by J. V, Stalin” (Mao Tse-tung), the Party steeled in so many battles during the past several decades? Analysing the causes of the betrayal of the Second International, Lenin explains: "Opportunism is not an accidental thing, not a sin, not a slip, not the treachery of individual persons, but the social product of a whole historical epoch."