

On the Report of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU

While most communist parties had welcomed the Report as one to 'illumine the path', Comrade Ghosh in the spirit of fraternal criticism highlighted some serious defects of the Report and cautioned that certain observations of Khrushchev would generate the trend of reformism-revisionism in the communist movement of different countries.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU has created a great commotion not only in the bourgeois world but even amongst us, the communists. But whatever might have been the commotion, the scientific approach and due importance with which the Report should have been analysed were found missing. By this we mean that in no quarter discussion was made in a dispassionate way. None of those who have either supported or opposed it have done so in a dispassionate way. It is impossible to determine the truth about any matter without being free from blind emotion or bias. The report should be analysed calmly and in a dispassionate way on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and concrete facts. Not to speak of the Communist Party of India, not a single communist party of the world has so far approached the problem with this angularity and outlook — we do not know whether anybody will do so in future. The Central Committee of our party, after a careful analysis and thorough consideration of the Report of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, has come to certain conclusions. Here I shall confine my discussion exclusively to the Report of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and shall not enter into the observations made by different

communist parties on it. Even while discussing our observations, comrades should remain dispassionate.

First of all, let us see what were the topics of discussion in the 20th Congress of the CPSU. These were :

- (1) Whether the policy of peaceful co-existence is consistent with Marxism-Leninism.
- (2) Whether the law of inevitability of war is still valid or not.
- (3) Different forms of transition to socialism — the possibility of peaceful transformation of society from capitalism to socialism.
- (4) Present situation in the capitalist world.
- (5) Certain questions raised by Mikoyan and others on *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* by Stalin.
- (6) Cult of individual.

Besides these, some other points relating to the Soviet economy were also discussed which we do not consider here necessary to deal with.

Before entering into the main subject, I would like to discuss a few points. From the very inception of our party, we have been repeatedly stressing that authoritarianism is incompatible with Marxism. We have, all along, severely criticized authoritarianism. It is true that Marxism does not negate the conception of authority but the particular sense of authority that breeds authoritarianism has nothing to do with Marxism, rather it is completely alien to Marxism. Long back, we warned against the mechanical process of thinking and mechanical process of organization prevailing in the international communist movement. But we never concluded that this leadership had ceased to be Marxist. Serious lapses here and there notwithstanding, there was no deviation of fundamental nature. This is equally valid today.¹ What harm is caused if mechanization develops in the thought process? What is particularly wrong with mechanical thought process? Blind and mechanical support may cause even a great leader to commit mistakes. To follow a leader mechanically means

that when the leader is right, the party is right; but when the leader commits mistakes the whole party commits mistakes. It has already been discussed² and shown that everything develops through contradiction. So, if there is no real struggle or interaction between the thinking and ideas of the leader and those of the rank and file members then there can be no actual development of thinking of either the leader or the rank and file. Absence of this struggle and interaction of thoughts gives birth to bureaucracy. Even if not intended, mechanical thought process is bound to develop in practice if such struggle is avoided inside the party. Mechanical centralism will inevitably lead to the formation of bureaucracy at the top — as we know that the law of mechanics leads to the concept of Prime Mover.

In case of a party, too, comprehensive knowledge cannot be acquired by it if it is guided by formal logic. Mechanical and formal way of analysing things can, at best, lead one to partial truth. A party serious about making correct analysis and objective appraisal of any situation must give up the easy, simplified and one-sided method of analysis based on formal logic and cannot but adopt in its place the dialectical methodology. If the party follows, though not professedly but objectively, the process of mechanical centralism both in the organizational and ideological spheres of activities, then the ideological centralism is sure to give birth to authoritarianism, on the one hand, while, on the other, organizational centralism will lead to the formation of a bureaucratic leadership at the top. In the first case, the danger of fanatic bent of mind and blind allegiance to the leader or leadership is sure to develop among the cadres. In such a situation, the object of all discussions inside the party, that is, inner-party discussion, in place of ascertaining truth, gets virtually reduced to accepting whatever comes from the leader as truth without any question, thus avoiding the struggle to get at truth. As a result, the actual development of the thinking faculty inside the party is seriously impeded.

When we speak of democratic centralism we mean both organizational and ideological centralism and certainly do not mean only observance of certain democratic norms in the internal organizational affairs of the party. Since long we have been observing that although the ideological and the organizational activities of the international communist leadership are basically consistent with Marxism-Leninism, they are not free from serious defects and shortcomings. The symptoms of mechanical approach in the process of thinking and mechanical approach to organizational matters have been discernible since long in the international communist movement. Our old literature would bear it out. Long before, *we sounded a note of caution that unless the world communist movement and organization could be freed from the influence of mechanical thought process the Tito incident might not be the last one. History has testified that our apprehension was not unfounded.* But it would be wrong if we highlight only the shortcomings of the international communist movement. This is not its sole feature. On the whole, it is true that they have provided correct leadership to the international communist movement despite these shortcomings. Some self-styled communist 'friends' in our country then doubted whether we were at all communists as we dared to point out some faults and shortcomings of the international communist leadership. It goes without saying that raising such doubts had no real bearing. For, we cannot forget for a moment that just as we should give due weight to the experiences of the international leadership so also we can ill-afford to give up our own experiences. Progress is absolutely impossible if the relation between the leaders and rank and file is not reciprocal. It is not sufficient only to have the right to judge the leadership but what is more important is to apply it in practice. For a Marxist party this is vitally important in order to guard against possible mistakes and to keep itself on the right track. However, in this respect too it is very important to bear in mind that while judging or criticizing the leadership

we must be free from blind emotion and be dispassionate. We must be free from the influence of bourgeois trend of thinking, more particularly from vulgar individualism when we judge the leadership. Not only should the rank and file remain alert about this approach towards the leadership; for the leadership, too, on its part, it is indispensable to foster its cultivation within the party to ensure its own continuous development and progress. Thus, the sense of responsibility and the nature of relationship between the leadership and the rank and file are reciprocal. But very often it is found that this teaching of Marxism is forgotten. We have found workers of the Communist Party of India resorting to the queer argument : “Oh, you criticize the Cominform? That means you don’t abide by it? Then how can you remain any more a communist?” This way of reasoning is very much influenced by formal logic which has nothing to do with dialectics. Such an attitude towards the leadership finds no difficulty in turning a leader into a demigod and the next moment unhesitatingly denigrates him. Both these acts, though contradictory to each other, are the products of the same non-dialectical formalistic approach. This defect of formalism in the international communist movement was pointed out by us long ago, particularly regarding the role of leadership of a party and the correct approach to be adopted about it. Our comrades know very well that long back we had pointed out the erroneous analysis by the CPSU on the questions of Germany and China. But at that time, no other party within the international communist camp came to point out these mistakes — at least we are not aware of it. Judged in this context, the Central Committee of our party was not taken aback at the decision of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

So, when the slogan against the cult of individual has been raised at the 20th Congress, we have particular reasons to be glad and we hail this move. But while welcoming this move, we are constrained to say at the same time that we are unable to appreciate the very method that has been adopted

to eradicate the phenomenon of the cult of individual. In the name of fighting out the cult of individual, we are afraid they are in reality directing their fight against an individual and not the cult itself. Otherwise, when so much emphasis has been laid on the fight against the cult of individual, how is it that nothing has been said about the root cause of development of the cult of individual in the Report itself? In the Report, Comrade Stalin is said to have become proud, ambitious, self-complacent, egoistic, etc., in the later part of his life. But the most pertinent question as to how these defects and shortcomings could develop in a leader of Comrade Stalin's stature, and what were the factors and who were mainly responsible for all these, were not at all discussed. We must bear in mind that it is wrong to think that it is the individual who alone can indulge in personality cult. The activities of a body, or a committee even, can give birth to this phenomenon of the cult of individual if instead of removing the blind and mechanical allegiance of the workers and the people to it, these are indulged in and encouraged by this committee or body. So, we must remember that by fighting simply an individual we cannot fight out the cult of individual.

If a group of people work together, that does not automatically mean that collective leadership has been established. If a dialectical method in the process of thinking, conflict and interaction of ideas is there within the party, then only can it be said that collective leadership has been established. The allegation by the Khrushchev leadership that collective leadership ceased to operate in the later part of Stalin's life, in our opinion only reflects the operational aspect, solely basing upon which it cannot be said that collective leadership ceased to operate within the party during the later part of Stalin's life.

Karl Marx wrote the *Capital*. It was in a sense the product of the thinking of an individual. Does it follow then that the *Capital* was a product of an individual's subjective

way of thinking? Should we not say that social consciousness got its best expression through an individual which is really nothing else but collective leadership? Therefore, just as the influence of individualistic thinking can leave its impact on the thinking of a committee consisting of several individuals, so also the best expression of collective knowledge of the members and workers of the party may manifest itself through an individual. Social thinking in the form of collective knowledge of all the members of the party, when personified through an individual, is also collective leadership. What should be looked for is whether struggle and conflict in the sphere of ideas operates inside the party. The pertinent question may be raised that if collective thinking can be personified through an individual then what is the necessity at all of collective leadership? Well, otherwise, there is no guarantee of any guard against mistakes. And in order to guarantee that, collective functioning both in organizational and ideological activity is not only necessary but also imperative. An individual, whatever may be his stature as a revolutionary, may also commit mistakes. Consequently, if the practice of collective functioning is absent then, following the mistakes of the leader the whole party may one day even go to the extent of committing a fundamental deviation. So, the question of developing collective functioning and collective leadership within a revolutionary party of the proletariat is so very vital.

What do we understand by collective leadership of the party? Collective knowledge of all the members is the collective leadership of the party. And development of this collective knowledge is mainly determined by the level of consciousness of the members and workers of the party. So, collective knowledge can grow and develop only when on the basis of this higher level of consciousness there is conflict or interaction of ideas between the leaders and the workers in a party. So, democratic centralism does not come into being merely through adoption of a model democratic Constitution.

The real foundation of democratic centralism is the higher ideological-cultural standard of the comrades. Because, otherwise, what is sure to develop is blind allegiance either to an individual or likewise to a committee. So, just as blindly following a particular leader is the other name of the cult of individual, so also blindly following the Central Committee, or the mental makeup of blind allegiance to it, is nothing but another form of expression of the same cult of individual. Taking into account all these points, we are of the firm opinion that these important aspects of the problem ought to have been discussed in the 20th Congress, which was not done. Despite expressions of pious wishes and declarations to fight the cult of individual, the present leaders don't seem to have been able to cause a break with the old process of mechanical thinking. The manner in which almost all the communist parties are accepting the Report and decisions of the 20th Congress unquestioningly is affirming our above apprehension as correct.

The present leaders of the CPSU are saying that up to 1934 no deviation had been observed on the part of Comrade Stalin. What comes out from their own observations is that after the death of Lenin Comrade Stalin conducted relentless ideological battles against all kinds of deviations in the communist movement. That means the questions which are being raised now regarding the method and the style of work of Comrade Stalin, according to their own admission, those problems were not there within the party-life before 1934. Then the question arises: how and following which process could these deviations appear in the later phase of Comrade Stalin's life? Unless we can detect the root cause that worked behind these alleged deviations we cannot avert the danger of its future recurrence. With regard to the Tito incident, we stated the same point. Khrushchev, in his Report, has said nothing as to what are the reasons behind the appearance and development of the cult of individual nor has he said anything as to how it can be fought out. Judged from this angle, their

argument suffers from the defect of one-sidedness. Most arguments of Comrade Khrushchev³ suffer from the very same defects. For example, he has said : “It is wrong to praise Stalin for the victory in the Second World War — it is the Red Army that really deserves it.” It would be no exaggeration to call such an argument fictitious! Because, to give due recognition to the leading role of Comrade Stalin does not negate in any way the role of the Red Army. Without the role and contribution of the people, the question of the leading role of the leader does not arise at all. Thus it is clear that Khrushchev has deliberately attempted to undermine the role of Comrade Stalin. If we do not recognize the distinct historical role of an individual, it will give birth to ultra-democracy which in turn will bring on the burial of the very concept of concretized expression of leadership within the party. One needs to realize the difference existing between one individual and another individual. It is for this reason that we have observed earlier that their reasoning suffers from one-sidedness.

Likewise, when they are up in arms against the cult of individual, another pertinent question is sure to arise. Even if we assume that Stalin developed the cult of individual, then, no doubt, Stalin cannot be absolved of his due share of responsibility — but the present leaders are no less responsible for this. If constant blind support is extended to a leader, then it is not unlikely that he may fall a victim to the cult of individual. Today they are leveling so many charges against Stalin. Some slips of Comrade Stalin did not escape our notice. But to substantiate the charges they have now leveled against Comrade Stalin, necessary documents should have been placed, which they have not done. As if all these problems concern the CPSU alone and none else — this seems to be their attitude. The CPSU is trying to monopolize the Stalin affair, although, in our opinion, any question relating to Stalin is not merely an affair of the Soviet Union but is a matter of concern to the toiling millions and

communists of the whole world. So, we strongly feel that it was highly improper on their part to unilaterally come to a conclusion on such a vital issue like this, without showing any regard for the opinions of the communists of the world. Had they been serious about fighting the cult of individual, they ought to have observed this code.

We should remember one more point in this connection. Any and every act of a communist should be guided by a sense of purposiveness. To act without any purpose is to reflect a non-communist character. The question of rectifying or fighting an individual does not arise at all when he is no more — only his thoughts are there. So, it appears that in the name of fighting the cult of individual, they are fighting a person who has departed. Otherwise, in our opinion, it was incumbent on them to discuss and explain mainly their own role and contribution in the rise of this cult of individual. Because, if the root cause of development of the cult of individual is not thoroughly laid bare, then the cult of individual which is nothing but absolute authoritarianism may even be indulged in by the Central Committee of the CPSU through its activities.

From this criticism of ours, it should not be concluded that the present leadership has already deviated from the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. This would be wrong.⁴

Those comrades are definitely in the wrong who, viewing the present lapses of the CPSU, are asking whether the liquidation of the CPSU is warranted in the interest of developing a genuine communist party there. Such a trend of thinking is influenced by Trotskyism and is alien to Marxism-Leninism. First, as we have already shown, the present leadership has not yet made any fundamental deviation from the Marxist-Leninist principles. Secondly, we cannot deny the role of the Soviet people in forestalling the CPSU from committing any fundamental deviation. Here it is to be remembered that the idea of the role people can play in our

country is largely subjective whereas in the Soviet Union it is an objective reality. Apart from this, if a fundamental deviation had occurred in Stalin's leadership, then the gigantic socialist advancement that took place there can in no way be explained. However, before coming to the main point, we would like to say that the object of our criticism of the present leadership of the CPSU has no other purpose than to help them rectify their lapses and thereby strengthen it.

While discussing the Report of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, it would be wrong to concentrate wholly on the defects or shortcomings of the Soviet leadership without giving cognition to their contribution. It would be equally wrong to highlight their contributions only, support anything or everything they say and not to point out their lapses and shortcomings. Both these attitudes are improper. Since it is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union so it can commit no mistakes — this type of argument is tantamount to utter blindness. From this angularity we believe the Soviet leaders would at least calmly consider our views. Let us now take up one by one the subjects discussed in the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

On peaceful co-existence

Though the explanation of the CPSU leadership regarding peaceful co-existence between the capitalist and the socialist states is not wholly accurate — still, we are in broad agreement with that. We have explained it long ago that the policy of peaceful co-existence is not merely a diplomatic manoeuvre but is the reflection of recognition of the objective necessity and is consistent with the principles of Marxism-Leninism. It seems as if the 20th Congress has tried to explain the issue more or less in the same way.⁵

On the law of inevitability of war

On this issue, the present leaders of the CPSU have just reiterated the analysis of Comrade Stalin without however

mentioning his name even once. We are to take note of another aspect here. In the Report the entire issue has been divided into several parts and then analysed. In one part, it has been shown that since imperialism still continues in force and it is imperialism that generates war, so the "Law of inevitability of wars between the capitalist countries" formulated by Lenin still holds good as before. Again in another part, where it has been shown that war is not fatalistically inevitable, one-sided emphasis has been laid so much on the significance of the changed international situation, and particularly upon the increasing strength of the world peace movement, that a wrong impression may gain ground that war can be banished once and for all despite the existence of imperialism as a world system. This compartmentalized approach has already created some confusion. To cite an example, the Communist Party of Rumania has already observed that there is absolutely no possibility of war today. Judged from this viewpoint, Comrade Stalin's approach to this issue was far more comprehensive and a dialectical one.

On Stalin's Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR

In the Report of the 20th Congress, Khrushchev, and more particularly Mikoyan, have made certain criticisms of some of the theses contained in the above treatise of Stalin. Quoting from Lenin, Khrushchev has shown in his Report that the concept of complete stagnation or halt in the development of production in the capitalist system even when it is in the midst of severe economic crisis is non-Marxian. Although Khrushchev did not spell out whose concept of "complete stagnation" he was fighting against, from the trend of discussion it was quite clear that he meant Stalin and none else.⁶

That this assumption of ours is not baseless is proved by the report of Comrade Mikoyan.⁷ While supporting the

Report of the 20th Congress, Mikoyan engaged himself in criticizing some of the theses of Stalin, contained in the above mentioned treatise, which, in our opinion, was quite unnecessary and irrelevant. Mikoyan, unlike Khrushchev, criticized Comrade Stalin in a direct manner as if he had said that there would be “complete stagnation or halt in the development of production” in capitalist economies when capitalism is in the midst of severe crisis. In the above treatise where Comrade Stalin discussed about stagnation or halt in the technological development in capitalist economies at a time of acute crisis, it can never be construed that he meant a complete stagnation or halt. We are at a loss to understand how it was possible for leaders like Khrushchev and Mikoyan to present such a distorted version of Comrade Stalin’s proposition. Analysing the post-War condition of world capitalist economy, with which Khrushchev is also in agreement, what Stalin pinpointed is that the tendency towards stagnation in the capitalist economies had become all the more evident. To impute to Stalin something which he did not say is, in our consideration, a grave offence. What is more, to prove the contention of Stalin to be wrong, Mikoyan picked up some statistics from the reports of the Central Committee of the CPSU about the increase in production in capitalist economies even in the midst of crisis. Mikoyan thus challenged the correctness of Comrade Stalin’s contention by picking up only the last line of Stalin and linking that with the statistics of increase in production. Mikoyan chose to quote the following:

“Since the volume of production in these countries will diminish”. Although the full sentence reads:

“However, expansion of production in these countries will proceed on a narrower basis, since the volume of production in these countries will diminish.”

Thus, it is clear that in view of ever-increasing crisis of world capitalism and the changed international situation and as a result of further contraction of world capitalist market,

Stalin dealt with the possibility of diminishing volume of production in the capitalist countries and from this standpoint he made this exposition that “expansion of production on a narrower basis” would take place in all these countries. In this last sentence Stalin only indicated what was going to come in future and not what is actually taking place today. Any effort to disprove Stalin’s whole contention viewing the little advance in capitalist production at present, betrays utter ignorance about Marxism-Leninism. To prove the analysis and explanation given by Stalin about a particular decision Lenin made in the spring of 1916 as wrong, Mikoyan has again quoted from one of the writings of Lenin from that same period. Mikoyan probably preferred to forget that Stalin himself had already shown that in today’s changed context this particular thesis of Lenin was no longer valid. So, by stating what Lenin said, Stalin’s contention cannot be proved wrong unless it is proved wrong after examining it in the context of changed economic perspective of today. Another queer aspect cannot escape the attention of any Marxist if he goes through the entire proceedings seriously. Mikoyan was haunted so much with the spirit of fighting Stalin that in his bid to show Stalin’s error, he even contradicted the main contention of Khrushchev. Let us explain. In the background of post-World War economic situation marked by ever-deepening crisis of the capitalist economy, Stalin concluded that his thesis on the “relative stability of the capitalist market” as well as that of Lenin that “Capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before” had lost their validity. Stalin came to this conclusion in the perspective of the general crisis of world capitalism and the growing instability of capitalist market.

So, what was true in the period of relative stability of world capitalist market has lost its validity in the changed context of acute crisis in the world capitalist economy prevailing now. Khrushchev, in his Report too, has discussed in clear terms the acute unstable condition of the world

capitalist economy today. And the above quoted thesis of Stalin is intimately linked up with this question of instability of crisis-ridden capitalist market. From that point of view Mikoyan has even contradicted Khrushchev's contention. This is queer indeed ! All this presents two probabilities — either they have entirely misunderstood Stalin or they have deliberately distorted Stalin's contention.

On peaceful transition to socialism from capitalism

There can be no two opinions about the necessity of replacing the capitalist state structure with new state structure in all the capitalist countries as discussed by Khrushchev in his Report. But how can this be achieved — peacefully or through armed insurrection — that is the crux of the problem. At one time, Karl Marx expressed his opinion that socialism could be achieved in some countries through peaceful means. The objective conditions then were totally different. He pinned much faith on the growing democratic atmosphere in the then capitalist countries. But conditions changed with the change of time. This is why later on Comrade Lenin declared unequivocally that without mass uprising, without smashing the bourgeois state machine, socialist revolution could not be accomplished. It is still valid. Discussion of any issue without taking into consideration the concrete situation is opposed to the principles of Marxism. In those days, Lenin's concrete analysis did a tremendous service in crystallizing the idea in the mass-mind about the indispensable necessity of armed uprising of the people for the achievement of socialism. Lenin, however, noted the possibility of peacefully achieving socialism in the capitalist countries neighbouring the socialist states.

While explaining the possibility of peacefully accomplishing socialism, Khrushchev has said : "If the capitalists do not obstruct and do not apply force, then the communists will not take recourse to violence. But since it is certain that they will do so, we should remain alert." No

doubt, this approach is very useful in combating the slander that the communists are blood-thirsty. Had he stopped here, it would have been very good. But he has gone a step further by holding that in the changed context of present-day international situation, revolution can be peacefully accomplished in many of the capitalist and erstwhile colonial countries. We cannot agree with this trend of thinking. From Marxian standpoint, this is not at all acceptable. No doubt, this trend of thinking by Khrushchev is sure to generate the trend of reformism-revisionism in the communist movement of different countries. Communists in each capitalist country may start thinking that it is their particular country where revolution can be accomplished peacefully. As a result, preparation for revolution will be seriously hampered. This is one aspect. And another aspect, too, has not escaped our attention. On this issue Khrushchev's own contention suffers from self-contradiction. At one place he said that peaceful transition to socialism was possible only in the highly developed capitalist countries where democracy was traditional. Then again, in the next breath, he said that this was applicable only to "weak capitalist countries". Then again, in another context he asserted that in case of highly developed capitalist countries violent revolution was inevitable. Self-contradiction is the essence of all these observations ! In this regard, we consider the following observation of Comrade Stalin as the best and most adequate even today : "The question of establishment of socialism in a peaceful way can arise in that remote future when the present capitalist encirclement will be replaced by a socialist one".

Some queer arguments

This particularly relates to Mikoyan's observation. Mikoyan, in his attempt to defend Khrushchev's contention of the possibility of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism through parliamentary means, has cited some

examples of “peaceful development of revolution”. These illustrations are irrelevant, unreal and untenable. For, when the subject matter of discussion was whether peaceful transition to socialism from capitalism was at all possible, to cite, in that context, examples of countries like China, Czechoslovakia, etc., in support of development of revolution through peaceful means, is totally untenable. It is really surprising that in the Congress of the CPSU such standard of discussion and way of illustration are possible !

Summing up the whole discussion, I would say that their analyses of the policy of peaceful co-existence, law of inevitability of war and conduct of world peace movement from Marxian standpoint are in the main correct and so supportable.⁸ Judged from that point of view, the present leadership has not made any fundamental deviation from Marxism-Leninism. Yet we must say that some features in their analyses and explanations suffer from serious defects. This, therefore, calls for a serious, dispassionate and thorough examination of the whole matter. As we have said at the very outset, we hope everybody will take this criticism of ours as a comradely criticism. Once again we assure that the whole purpose of our discussion has been to point out and remove the shortcomings and defects of the present leadership and to strengthen it.

Speech on May 20, 1956.

First published in *Ganadabi*,
as a synopsis, on July 24, 1956.

NOTES

1. The leadership of the CPSU turned out and out revisionist later on.
2. This refers to the discussion on Marxism and dialectical materialism made earlier in a school of politics.

- 3 Later turned out to be a renegade.
- 4 This was the evaluation of our party in 1956 based on the experiences available to the international communist movement about the character of the CPSU. And it was the Central Committee of our party under the leadership of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh which subsequently pointed out, for the first time, the fact that the leadership of the CPSU had degenerated into a completely revisionist one, being unable to rectify its mistakes and get rid of this mechanical process of thinking and organization. But it would be wrong to conclude that since the leadership had turned out and out revisionist, the party had automatically degenerated into a non-working class party. Because the fundamental character of a working class party is not destroyed automatically and then and there with the usurpation of leadership by the revisionists.
- 5 Although we were generally in agreement with their explanation at the 20th Congress of the CPSU that the policy of peaceful co-existence is not just a diplomatic manoeuvre, subsequent events have proved beyond doubt that the present leadership of CPSU has not only failed to grasp the revolutionary significance of this policy but by their miserable failure to apply it correctly, they have virtually reduced it to a policy of peaceful capitulation.
- 6 This became all the more clear, later on, when the revisionist leadership of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev directed open attack against Comrade Stalin's formulations. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh gave a thorough exposure to the erroneous ideas and concepts of a group of Soviet economists who undertook a veritable campaign against the economic formulations of Comrade Stalin. The said Soviet economists wrote a treatise *The Basic Economic Law*, published in 1962, Issue No. 1 of the *Veprosy Ekonomiki* to which Comrade Ghosh's reply came under the title "*A Few Economic Problems*" originally published in *Socialist Unity* Vol. 3, New Series, September, 1962 and republished in *Proletarian Era*, Vol. 8, No. 20, August 1, '75 and Vol. 9, No. 1, August 15, '75.
- 7 Later turned out to be a renegade.
- 8 We have already stated that later on, our Central Committee led by our beloved leader Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, characterized the Soviet Party leadership as revisionist.