

In Memory Of Stalin

MONI GUHA

STALIN was born 91 years ago, on December 21. He died in 1953, 29 years after the death of Lenin. During these long 29 years Stalin was the undisputed and unquestioned leader of the Soviet Communist Party, the Soviet State and of the international communist movement. But the year 1956 marked a major watershed in the international communist movement and, by its consequences, in world politics. Everybody became "Leninist", shunned the path of "Stalinism" and carefully avoided calling themselves "Stalinists". In the course of the great destalinisation in Europe and America, especially in Eastern Europe "Stalinists" and "Stalinism" became the centre of severe attacks by the "Leninists". Thus a high wall was erected between Stalinism and Leninism.

Curiously enough, in spite of taking "more and more pleasure in the cult of the individual" Stalin never tried to introduce his own "ism" or "thought". He always considered himself "just a pupil of Lenin's and the aim of my life is to be a worthy pupil of his". (Stalin's talk with Emil Ludwig). But the "Leninists" compartmentalised Stalin; a "positive" Stalin up to a certain period and a "negative" Stalin from a specific period "in the latter part of his life". "The negative characteristics of Stalin...transformed themselves during the last years into a grave abuse of power by Stalin which caused untold harm in our party." (emphasis added, 'Khrushchev's secret report'). "During the latter part of his life, Stalin took more and more pleasure in this cult of the individual and violated the party's system of democratic centralism and the principle of combining collective leadership with individual responsibility" ("On the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat" issued by the CPC. Emphasis added.)

It would be appropriate on the occasion of Stalin's 91st birthday to discuss his contributions to the ideological armoury of Marxism-Leninism in his "last years" or the "latter part of his life."

It is said that "Mao Tse-tung Thought is Marxism-Leninism of the era in which imperialism is heading for a total collapse and socialism is advancing to worldwide victory." (Lin Piao's Report to the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China. Emphasis added). But it was Stalin "in the latter part of his life", in February 1952, who defined this era as the era of the total collapse of imperialism. In his "Remarks on economic questions connected with the November 1951 discussion" on the "proposals for the improvement of the draft textbook on political economy" addressed to the "participants in economic discussion," Stalin after elucidating the causes and consequences of the Second World War, said: "This state of affairs has confronted the economists with two questions":

"(a) Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Stalin before the Second World War regarding the relative stability of markets in the period of general crisis of capitalism is still valid?"

"(b) Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Lenin in the spring of 1916 namely that in spite of the decay of capitalism 'on the whole capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before' is still valid?"

"I think that it cannot. In view of the new conditions to which the Second World War has given rise, both these theses must be regarded as having lost their validity."

It is Stalin who defined "Leninism is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution." That, of course, was also the epoch of the "positive" Stalin. Be-

cause of the emergence of new conditions—the “negative” Stalin felt the necessity of further concretising the epoch of imperialism, when the relative stabilisation and overall growth of capitalism were no longer a reality. He not only concretised the new epoch, but also concretised and developed the “basic economic law of modern capitalism.” Marx discovered the secret of capitalist development, its fundamental contradiction, the cause of its periodic crises and the forces leading to its inevitable destruction with his law of surplus value. “But the law of surplus value” said Stalin, “is too general a law, it does not cover the problem of the *highest rate of profit*, the securing of which is a condition for the development of monopoly capitalism. In order to fill this hiatus the law of surplus value must be made more concrete and developed further in adaptation to the conditions of monopoly capitalism at the same time bearing in mind that monopoly capitalism demands not any sort of profit but precisely the *maximum profit*. That will be the basic economic law of capitalism.” (“Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR.” Emphasis added).

“Super-profits” arising from exploitation of colonial and semi-colonial countries, wrote Lenin in *Imperialism*, “are obtained over and above the profits which capitalists squeeze out of workers of their “home” country.” But profits secured from foreign countries are not confined today to the “super-profits” realised from colonial and semi-colonial countries. Monopoly exploitation now includes, wrote Stalin, “the conversion of a number of independent countries into dependent countries.” “No, (it is not the average rate of profit, nor yet super-profit, which as a rule represents only a *slight addition* to the average profit, but precisely the maximum profit that is the motor of monopoly capitalism”, said Stalin (emphasis added).

How does monopoly obtain maximum profit? Stalin categorised three ways: (1) through the exploi-

tation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country; (2) through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the people of other countries, especially backward countries; and (3) through wars and militarisation of the national economy. Apparently it would appear that there is nothing new in this formulation. Yet it is a brilliant and masterly development of Marxian economic theory which set the guideline in elucidating and explaining the present-day economic policy of neo-colonialism. As this article is not an economic dissertation, the author will not go deep into the matter, but just point out that economic aggression holds an important place in the neo-colonial policy by which maximum profit is realised today. The means are penetration or outright taking over of capital investment; exportation of loan capital where direct penetration is difficult for one reason or another; domination of foreign trade so that prices of import and export can be dictated; outright crippling or destruction of rival industries; control of fiscal policy through terms of government loans; “technical agreements” which are in the nature of non-financial investment but which assure the monopolies high profits in the shape of patent payments; “aid” to seize the natural resources of the underdeveloped countries and non-equivalent exchanges etc. Over and above these, the imperialists not only turn other countries into their military bases utilising their “military aid” as a bait, but also force them to appropriate huge funds, several times larger than the volume of “aid”, for military expenditure, thus plunging their economies into the abyss of ruin. How brilliantly Stalin explained the phenomenon! It is precisely the necessity of securing maximum profit that drives monopoly capitalism to such risky undertakings as the enslavement and systematic plunder of colonies and other backward countries, the conversion of a number of independent countries into dependent countries, the organisation of new

wars which to the magnates of modern capitalism is the “business” best adapted to the extraction of the maximum profit, and lastly attempts to win world supremacy.

It is impossible to understand present day neo-colonialism without understanding and grasping Stalin’s law of maximum profit. Neo-colonialism cannot be understood by rhetoric alone. One cannot reach Marxism-Leninism except via Stalin and Stalinism. There lies the historic necessity of resurrecting Stalin.

Hadrian VII

BY A DRAMA CRITIC

PETER Luke’s *Hadrian VII*, presented last week at Kala Mandir by The Amateurs, was an excellent production. The play is an adaptation of the fantasy-autobiography of Frederick William Rolfe, also known as Baron Corvo, written in the early years of the century. Rolfe is a bitter and frustrated man because he has been denied priesthood by the Catholic Church for his allegedly having no vocation. Twenty years of denial drives him to desperate means to eke out a pittance. Unable to find acceptance within the precincts of the Church, Rolfe has his vindication in fantasy, ‘romance’ as Rolfe called it, with a vengeance when he promotes himself to the position of the highest Pontiff.

Rolfe is turned into a recluse and is very sick and tired but he has been forced into it. In the fantasy part of the play he, however, looks intensely human and seems bent upon undoing all the wrongs perpetrated by the Church, even by divesting itself of some traditional powers enjoyed by it. This is all very sardonic and the vituperative outpourings of a tormented man are reflected in eccentric sarcasm in the dialogue which is a very strong element in the play. Acting credit in the production was almost evenly shared. Vimal Bhagat as the protagonist ac-