

## **Polemic-4**

# Contribution of Shibdas Ghosh – A Relevant Polemic

## *Preface*

Instead of continuing the polemical debate within the party maintaining the accepted guidelines, principles and discipline, two of our central committee members left the party with few workers and supporters. In view of the prevailing political situation of the country, how much responsibility they have shown to be judged by the political section in general and leftist in particular.

Polemical and political debate within the party and outside heightens the ideological standard. It enriches leaders and workers in comprehending critical aspects of politics. It extends the epistemological boundaries of the collective knowledge of the party. But if it was abandoned and was led towards the split of the party, it frustrates the main objective of the ideological struggle. However, for the interest of the party's development we want to continue this struggle. With this objective we are presenting here, with marginal editing, the discussion of the general secretary of our party as a reply to the points raised by Mobinul Hyder Chowdhury for the participation of all sections of the people with their opinions, advices and criticisms, so that we could be enriched.

We could not avoid errors and incompleteness in order to reach the masses in haste. We hope that we would be able to prepare another one free from incompleteness and errors after having opinions of the people.

With thanks

**Bazlur Rashid Firoze**  
**Member, Central Committee**  
**Socialist Party of Bangladesh (BASAD)**  
**Dhaka**

## **Contribution of Shibdas Ghosh – A Relevant Polemic**

In the last day of the six-day long meeting organized for District Conveners / Co-coordinators / Member Secretaries that was held in Vanguard Auditorium at 8/4 Segun Bagicha, Dhaka on and from 29th March to 3rd April, 2013, Com Mobinul Haider Choudhury placed two written opinions on the polemical discussion within the party. One of them was read out by himself and the other one was entrusted to another comrade for being read out. He described the formation of JASAD and his own arrival to post-liberated Bangladesh along with his role during the phase of formation of JASAD-BASAD and there after. We have discussed this issue elsewhere in the interest of upholding the correct history and we shall publish the same after incorporating a few more necessary facts so that the present generation is able to conceive the authentic history.

In his written opinion under the heading ‘Contribution of Shibdas Ghosh’, he said that as the concepts like Democratic Centralism, Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Proletarian Party etc. were not conceived by Marx-Engels-Lenin during the ‘period of revolutionary struggle’, those ideas were still in their embryonic stage. Emphasis was tilted towards ‘idea’. He raised the issues of ‘centralism’, ‘fusion of proletarian democracy’ etc. He discussed about the relative position of centralism and authority. Shibdas Ghosh elaborated and enriched much of these views after Lenin.

“Shibdas Ghosh developed and enriched the Leninist theory of party formation. He had to do so as there were inadequacies in Leninist theory. That is to say, in the present era that theory of Lenin is not sufficient – it is my opinion, it was not said by Shibdas Ghosh. .... At present we could not move forward in any country of the world with out this thought of Com Shibdas Ghosh.” -**Mabinul Haider Chowdhury**

We know that the thoughts of Marx-Lenin were not mere ideas devoid of any direct relation with struggle. They discovered the scientific laws of development of society and their path of progress in the field of actual struggle for the emancipation of working class. Although, they have theorized those with their incomparable intellectual competency.

Frederick Engels uttered the following at the funeral of Karl Marx:

“... in every single field which Marx investigated -- and he investigated very many fields, none of them superficially -- in every field, even in that of mathematics, he made independent discoveries.

... But this was not even half the man. ... For Marx was before all else a revolutionist. His real mission in life was to contribute, in one way or another, to the overthrow of capitalist society and of the state institutions which it had brought into being, to contribute to the liberation of the modern proletariat, which he was the first to make conscious of its own position and its needs, conscious of the conditions of its emancipation. Fighting was his element. And he fought with a passion, a tenacity and a success such as few could rival. ... crowning all, the formation of the great International Working Men's Association ( Marx founded it in 1864 and was lasted till 1872. This was the first bud of the proletarian party)-- this was indeed an achievement of which its founder might well have been proud even if he had done nothing else.

And, consequently, Marx was the best hated and most calumniated man of his time. Governments, both absolutist and republican, deported him from their territories.”<sup>1</sup>

About the life struggle of Karl Marx, Lenin said:

“... Marx abandoned the idea of an academic career. ... At the insistent request of the Prussian government, Marx was banished from Paris in 1845, as a dangerous revolutionary. ... On the outbreak of the Revolution of February 1848, Marx was banished from Belgium. ... The victorious counter-revolution first instigated court proceedings against Marx (he was acquitted on February 9, 1849), and then banished him from Germany (May 16, 1849). First Marx went to Paris, was again banished after the demonstration of June 13, 1849, and then went to London, where he lived until his death.”<sup>2</sup>

While describing the life struggle of Engels, Lenin said:

“Engels got to know the proletariat in England, in the centre of English industry, Manchester, where he settled in 1842, entering the service of a commercial firm of which his father was a shareholder. Here Engels not only sat in the factory office but wandered about the slums in which the workers were cooped up, and saw their poverty and misery with his own eyes. But he did not confine himself to personal

---

<sup>1</sup> Engels, F., ‘Karl Marx’s Funeral’, Collected Works of Marx-Engels, Vol-24, p-467

<sup>2</sup> Lenin, ‘Karl Marx’, Collected Works, Moscow, 1974, Volume 21, p-46

observations. He read all that had been revealed before him about the condition of the British working class and carefully studied all the official documents he could lay his hands on. The fruit of these studies and observations was the book which appeared in 1845: *The Condition of the Working Class in England*.

... The two friends were the heart and soul of all revolutionary-democratic aspirations in Rhenish Prussia. They fought to the last ditch in defense of freedom and of the interests of the people against the forces of reaction. The latter, as we know, gained the upper hand. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was suppressed. Marx, who during his exile had lost his Prussian citizenship, was deported; Engels took part in the armed popular uprising, fought for liberty in three battles, and after the defeat of the rebels fled, via Switzerland, to London.”<sup>3</sup>

They discovered theories and developed those in the midst of such a difficult and hard life struggle testified every time through ordeals by fire.

Mobinul Haider Chowdhury iterated further that the danger of individualism in the phase of decaying bourgeois humanism was not required to be faced by Lenin, Stalin and Mao-Ze-Dong, because they accomplished the revolution and constructed socialism while the relative progressive role of bourgeois humanism still existed. At the time of formation of the party in India, Shibdas Ghosh faced the individualism that came into existence out of bourgeois humanism that had already decayed to become extremely reactionary. Thus, he contributed to the epistemology of Marxism by introducing the theory of merger of individual interest with that of party interest instead of considering individual interest to be subordinate to the party interest. In support of his argument he provided an explanation of the Stalinist concept of ‘merger’ that, by saying ‘merger’, Stalin actually meant individual interest as subordinate to the party interest.

But, in the article ‘*The Proletarian Class and The Proletarian Party*’ written by Stalin on 1st January, 1905 as a reply in a discourse with Martov, we find that Stalin said:

“if our Party is an organization of leaders, it is obvious that only those can be regarded as members of this Party, of this organization, who work in this organization and, therefore, deem it their duty to merge their wishes with the wishes of the Party and to act in unison with the Party.”<sup>4</sup>

Therefore, it is in no way fair to claim that the merger of individual interest with the party interest is the theoretical concept that was first proposed by Shibdas Ghosh and it is a new contribution to the epistemology of Marxism.

The issue of ‘merger’ of individual interest with that of the party interest deserves to be discussed a little at this point. In the process of acquiring an enriched communist character, a

---

<sup>3</sup> Lenin, ‘*Frederick Engels*’, *Collected Works*, Vol-2, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972, pp-19-27

<sup>4</sup> Stalin, ‘*Proletarian Class and the Proletarian Party*’, *Collected Works*, FLPH, 1954, Vol-1, Page- 67

revolutionary must necessarily dissolve or unify individual interest with the party or social interest. It is a struggle of all times and every moment, i.e., a continuous struggle. Without this endless struggle no one can claim that he has been successful in merging individual interest with the party or social interest. Thus, individual interest would keep on merging with the party or social interest in this process of continuous struggle. It would be feasible to attain in real terms permanently and completely when at a certain developed stage of communism individual property as well as greed, inequality, which are products of individual property, would be abolished for ever; when abundant wealth will be created; when the whole human civilization will be involved to win over the struggle against nature on the basis of higher culture i.e., the class contradiction and class struggle will be terminated into a form of contradiction between human society against nature and a contradiction between advanced position with a regressed one. It does not mean that we have to wait for the days of communism to come, avoiding the present intense struggle of unifying individual interest with the party interest. Sense of individual right or individualistic mental attitude develops in the ideological sphere in a capitalist economy which is a society based on the sense of bourgeois individual right or individualistic mentality. Individual or community ownership of the property had not developed prior to division of society by class. In spite of that, the primitive wild mentality (survival of the fittest) of protecting one's own existence had been operative. After the division of society on the basis of class, different forms of 'sense of individual right' or 'sense of individual self' started to be differently patterned according to different societal structures based on slavery, feudalism and capitalism. The contradiction between social interest and individual interest had been attempted to be resolved to an extent during the initial phase of emergence of capitalism on the basis of bourgeois democratic ideology. It had been worked to an extent in evolving a psychic milieu that subordinated individual interest to social interest for the purpose of bringing individual, society and state within an order. But at a time when capitalism was at the door step of embryonic stage of monopoly<sup>5</sup>, Marx cited a Trade Union leader, T. J. Dunning as saying:

“With adequate profit, capital is very bold. A certain 10 per cent will ensure its employment anywhere; 20 per cent certain will produce eagerness; 50 per cent, positive audacity; 100 per cent will make it ready to trample on all human laws; 300 per cent, and there is not a crime at which it will scruple, nor a risk it will not run, even to the chance of its owner being hanged. If turbulence and strife will bring a

---

<sup>5</sup> “Thus, the principal stages in the history of monopolies are the following: (1) 1860-70, the highest stage, the apex of development of free competition; monopoly is in the barely discernible, embryonic stage. (2) After the crisis of 1873, a lengthy period of development of cartels; but they are still the exception. They are not yet durable. They are still a transitory phenomenon. (3) The boom at the end of the nineteenth century and the crisis of 1900-03. Cartels become one of the foundations of the whole of economic life. Capitalism has been transformed into imperialism.” (Lenin, ‘Imperialism is the Highest Stage of Capitalism’, Collected Works, Vol-22, Progress Publishers Moscow, p-202)

profit, it will freely encourage both. Smuggling and the slave-trade have amply proved all that is here stated.”<sup>6</sup>

That is, by saying this, he showed how capitalism, being reactionary at the decaying stage, occupied the mental and psychological sphere of bourgeois class. This impression is also available in the Communist Manifesto. Not only that, observing the influences of this over the people who are being ruled, that is oppressed classes, he said ‘to change the world, workers will have to change themselves first’.<sup>7</sup> Subsequently, while revealing that imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism Lenin exposed different facets of naked reactionary character of capitalism. He also showed that the bourgeois democratic revolution or national democratic revolution were no longer possible under the leadership of bourgeoisie in the way it had happened some time ago and he explained the logicality in favour of responsibility of leadership that should be borne by the working class. Moreover, if the working class has to complete the political revolution, he cited the necessity of the task of the Cultural Revolution prior to political revolution subject to the constraint of dialectical relationship with the prevalent material base, by saying that ‘Cultural Revolution precedes the technical revolution’<sup>8</sup>. Capitalist society being a society that strives for the continuance of individual ownership, sense of individual right and individualism, all of which sprang up every single moment, caused action- reaction in mental sphere. Marx divided the process of passing over from capitalism to communism into two phases: lower and higher phase. In the lower phase i.e., in socialism, though the process of abolition of individual ownership is initiated, it is not over. Even at the higher stage, during initial period of communism, it continues to linger for a long time before dying out completely. Thus, even in the process of abolition of individual ownership in socialism, ‘sense of individual right’ and

---

<sup>6</sup> Das Capital, Vol-1, Chapter-31, footnote-15

<sup>7</sup> Though in several occasions Shibdas Ghosh has said that this had been said by Marx, but actually Marx had never said anywhere this. Neither Marx used the word ‘first’, nor he believed that it could be done ‘first’. What Marx had explained is that it could be achieved along with the class struggle. We have discussed this in details in Polemic-5 and Polemic-6. Right now we just quote from German Ideology for the understanding:

“Communism is quite incomprehensible to our saint because the communists do not oppose egoism to selflessness or selflessness to egoism, nor do they express this contradiction theoretically either in its sentimental or in its highflown ideological form; they rather demonstrate its material source, with which it disappears of itself. The communists do not preach morality at all, as Stirner does so extensively. They do not put to people the moral demand: love one another, do not be egoists, etc.; on the contrary, they are very well aware that egoism, just as much as selflessness, is in definite circumstances a necessary form of the self-assertion of individuals.” Marx-Engels, CW, Vol-5, p-247)

<sup>8</sup> However, Lenin had never viewed that Cultural Revolution can precede the technical revolution without a material base as a correct Marxist view. He said that this theory is a theory of pedants. We have discussed this issue in Polemic-5 in details. Right now, we are citing the relevant quote of Lenin for the readers:

“Our opponents told us repeatedly that we were rash in undertaking to implant socialism in an insufficiently cultured country. But they were misled by our having started from the opposite end to that prescribed by theory (the theory of pedants of all kinds), because in our country the political and social revolution preceded the cultural revolution, that very cultural revolution which nevertheless now confronts us.”

“This cultural revolution would now suffice to make our country a completely socialist country; but it presents immense difficulties of a purely cultural (for we are illiterate) and material character (for to be cultured we must achieve a certain development of the material means of production, **we must have a certain material base**). (Lenin, ‘On Cooperation’, 2nd English Edition, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, Collected Works, Vol-33, p. 467-75)

‘individualism’ often appears in different forms centering round the small ownership of capital. Lenin expressed that its severity in socialist state is more intricate and intense than in capitalist state. In order to explain ‘where lays the power of overthrown bourgeoisie’, he said:

“in the force of habit, in the strength of small-scale production. Unfortunately, small-scale production is still widespread in the world, and small-scale production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale.”<sup>9</sup>

Stalin said on this issue that

“Have we in our Soviet country any of the conditions that would make the restoration of capitalism possible? Yes, we have. That, comrades, may appear strange, but it is a fact. We have overthrown capitalism, we have established the dictatorship of the proletariat, we are developing our socialist industry at a rapid pace and are linking peasant economy with it. But we have not yet torn out the roots of capitalism. Where are these roots imbedded? They are imbedded in commodity production, in small production in the towns and, especially, the countryside.”<sup>10</sup>

Thus, in the writings of Marx-Lenin, we get the idea as to what extent bourgeois humanism becomes reactionary in the period under monopoly capital and imperialism. We also find in the writings of Stalin that bourgeois individualism had not been exhausted in Socialism. For this reason, its elements exist both in base and in super-structure. Remnant of bourgeois individualism in socialist society has been termed as ‘socialist individualism’ by Shibdas Ghosh, which, in our opinion, could have been more proper to be termed as ‘bourgeois individualism in socialist society’.

Mobinul Haider Chowdhury expressed the opinion that whereas Lenin, on the question of party formation, intended to mean ‘revolutionary theory’, Shibdas Ghosh has enriched the teaching of Lenin by suggesting, with all his modesty, ‘covering all aspects of life – an epistemological category’. However, we find that while explaining all round knowledge of ‘art’ of practical programmes of movement Lenin had said,

“We must train our Social-Democratic practical workers to become political leaders, able to guide all the manifestations of this all-round struggle, able at the right time to “dictate a positive programme of action” for the aroused students, the discontented Zemstvo people, the incensed religious sects, the offended elementary school teachers, ... ”.<sup>11</sup>

In defining genuine class consciousness Lenin further said:

---

<sup>9</sup> Lenin, “‘Left-Wing’ Communism, An Infantile Disorder’, Collected Works, Vol-31, p-24

<sup>10</sup> Stalin, ‘The Right Danger in the C. P. S. B. (B)’, Collected Works, FLPH, 1954, Vol-11, p-235

<sup>11</sup> Lenin, ‘What is to be done’, Collected Works, Progress Publishers, Moscow, Vol-5, p-428



“The consciousness of the working masses cannot be genuine class-consciousness, unless the workers learn, from concrete, and above all from topical, political facts and events to observe every other social class in all the manifestations of its intellectual, ethical, and political life; **unless they learn to apply in practice the materialist analysis and the materialist estimate of all aspects of the life and activity of all classes, strata, and groups of the population.**”<sup>12</sup>

Does it not mean that the struggle covers all aspects of life? It is true that the language and the form of expression used by Shibdas Ghosh make it easier to understand but it does not express a distinctly fundamental idea. Lenin, in his book ‘What is to be done’, has said that the party can not be run without unity of ideas. It has been claimed that by saying ‘unity of thinking covering all aspects of life’ instead of ‘unity of ideas’, Shibdas Ghosh has enriched Leninist thought. It has also been said that it had not been required to understand or to say or to explain in this way by Lenin as humanist values had been relatively progressive at that time.

Could it be said that Lenin did not notice the extremely decaying character of bourgeois humanism after knowing the way Lenin had identified, explained and provided directions to the revolutionaries as to their duties and responsibilities in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution? Unity of thought of which class we would understand in a class divided society while referring to ‘unity of thinking’? Lenin, for example, had said that the class political consciousness of proletariat comes from outside to the oppressed class.<sup>13</sup> Implication of this saying is that the structure of ideology - that has been developed by Marx-Engels through the struggle, both practical and theoretical, identifying themselves with the proletarian class and on the basis of the advanced ideological consciousness - to be grasped and to be carried to that class through struggle. And no one can carry out this struggle alone. Instead of bourgeois ideas of ‘individual interest’ or ‘my interest’, ‘my demand’ they have to engage in collective struggle with the slogan of ‘our demand’ in the collective interest of the working class. The proletarian class consciousness is made effective being enriched by the experiences they gather from their struggle, specific to their own class. The concept of unity or collective thinking develops through this process. Thus, the acquired knowledge and experiences of this struggle synthesized dialectically gives birth to the singleness in purpose, in the same way, it creates uniformity of thinking when the unity of thinking is applied to practical struggle. It is neither created through addition or subtraction of thought, nor is it created through transformation.

While applying to practical struggle in his country, Shibdas Ghosh might have extended Leninist thought, might have sharpened the conceptualization and understanding to an extent under the objective condition specific to his own country and he actually did so. For this, we consider him a distinguished Marxist thinker and we have learnt from his experiences of struggle and thought

---

<sup>12</sup> Lenin, ‘What is to be done’, Collected Works, Progress Publishers, Moscow, Vol-5, p-412

<sup>13</sup> “Class political consciousness can be brought to the workers only from without, that is, only from outside the economic struggle, from outside the sphere of relations between workers and employers.” (Lenin, ‘What is to be done’, Collected Works, Vol-5, Progress Publishers, Moscow, p-422)

and are continuing to do that. But when Makbul Haider Chowdhury said “ in the present era, that particular Leninist theory is no longer operative – it is my opinion, it has not been said by Shibdas Ghosh. ... To-day, no one can move further in any country of the world without this theory of Shibdas Ghosh” - then it becomes a sweeping comment or puts it at the level of ‘wild claim’. It has been said that theoretical development and upliftment of Marxism has always been done on the basis of the necessity of the specific objective condition. If this is the case, then what does it mean if we say in this fashion that no further forward move is possible without the thoughts of Shibdas Ghosh in respect to any country of the world and period of time even after the lapse of 37 years of his death?

How much objective justification does the above have in comparison with the amount of emotion that has been expressed by this? It can be said that revolution in any country of the world necessitates concretization of Marxist-Leninist ideology with respect to the objective condition specific to the respective country. It is necessary to learn from the experiences of revolutionary struggles in different countries of the world, from the thoughts and experiences of Marxists thinkers and also from great men. It is necessary to learn from the experiences of struggle of

Shibdas Ghosh and his thought. It does not belittle the importance of the thoughts of Shibdas Ghosh, on the contrary, it places Shibdas Ghosh in a proper perspective.

In a socialist society, individual ownership gradually becomes extinct at the structural level but has not been abolished completely. Moreover, to whatever extent socialism develops in a socialist state, the existence of state implies the existence of class. There are existences of capitalist- imperialist states outside socialist world system. Within a socialist state, circulation of money and commodities are necessary. Socialist state requires exchange and trade of different dimensions with outside world. It, therefore, imparts cultural influences within the socialist state. It is erroneous to say in this way that Stalin and Mao failed to understand the fact that all these together give birth to a sense of individual right or individualism at every single moment. Moreover, to an extent it is easier to observe and say from a distance, in reality, elevating the standard of crores of people residing in socialist state to a uniform level and, on the basis of that, harmonizing people with communist culture is difficult to the same extent. Thus, not once or twice, even repeated failure does not always prove the lack of consciousness or initiatives. Different forms of individual ownership of tiny firms and consciousness related to individual ownership even within collective or state farming in the socialist state, instances of which were specified by Stalin, aspiration for the restoration of capitalism or the concept of bourgeois individual right or individualistic aspiration may crop up from either direction of base and super-structure. While admitting that the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Mao-Ze-Dong had been able to comprehend these problems Shibdas Ghosh in his discourse on ‘Cultural Revolution of China’ said:

“... the Chinese leaders do also find that with the relatively growing economic stability and advancement of the society as well as with the increasing material well-

being, individualism of a new variety is growing in the mental make-up of the individuals in the society. This new trend of individualism manifested itself in a socialist society..... But there is no denying the fact that they have been able to understand at least this much that such a trend of individualism is completely alien to class consciousness, class emotion and dedication of the proletariat.” (Cultural Revolution of China, Collected Works, Vol-I)

Now what sense it makes when Mobinul Chowdhury demands that we should accept the following proposition of him “...ideological questions that came up at International level and even within Soviet state had not been answered and answers were provided by Shibdas Ghosh. ... Thus the development of old Marxism only up to Mao-Ze-Dong would not work. ... **that is to say, after Lenin there lies Shibdas Ghosh – we have to say this emphatically.**”

Mobinul Hayder Chowdhury came to the conclusion and categorically said that Stalin and Mao-Ze-Dong were able to realize the problems only at the fag end of their lives but failed to show any way of resolving those and it is only Shibdas Ghosh who had provided Marxist interpretations of all those pending issues. It has also been claimed that the prevalent mechanical outlook that had been working within international communist movement was also shown with a caution in 1948 by Shibdas Ghosh.<sup>14</sup> But, there have been proper evaluations made by communist parties of China and Albania regarding the modern revisionism that had been practiced under the leadership of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. Shibdas Ghosh also may have made few correct observations. But then, how far it is rational to say that it has been explained only by Shibdas Ghosh? How do we understand the essence of the saying that high communist character can not be achieved without making ourselves free from ‘individualism’? What is the origin of ‘individualism’? It is a symptom germinated from capitalism. Thus, to the extent principled struggle is to be directed against capitalism as a whole and participation is ensured in that struggle, to that extent the change would keep on coming in necessity of ideological sphere commensurate with the desire of the development of struggle. It is not the process of countering an ideology by another ideology. Individualism’ as a tendency would wither away gradually through a process following the dialectical principle of evolving consciousness out of

---

<sup>14</sup> Like everyone we also believed that Shibdas Ghosh predicted the war between socialist states in an article published in 1948. But very recently we unearthed an unexpected and horrified truth. The revelation is beyond our all possible imaginations. While comparing the article of Shibdas Ghosh re-published in the selected work with the original article published in Ganadabi on 24th July 1948, we find that the claim is completely false, since that very paragraph is not there. Instead, with all probability, this paragraph was first appeared in a booklet published in 1973. However, by this time, the war between Soviet and China in 1967 was everybody’s knowledge. After further query, we find another interesting fact that corroborates this mischievous forgery of document. Actually Shibdas Ghosh had said just the opposite in the article ‘An Open Letter to Com. Khrushchov and other Comrades Abroad: On Steps Taken by CPSU Against Stalin’, published in March, 1962. He said “The differences, of course, will not be antagonistic in nature and **not lead to war between them** but they will, nonetheless, impede the march for the realization of the cherished ideal of World Communist Society”. However shocking and sad, this is the standard of morality, ethics, culture of SUCI(C) and Mobinul Hayder Chowdhury. Since, they can go to any extent to establish Shibdas Ghosh as a Marxist philosopher comparable only to Marx, Engels and Lenin, splitting BASAD on this question would have seemed a bagatelle by comparison.

the struggle and application of this evolved consciousness into the struggle. Because, the proletarian culture evolves, is expressed and is developed along with the laws, those exist as operative and effective, appropriate to the revolutionary objectivity within the society. Otherwise, it becomes behavioralism.

Individualistic trend spreads through several veiled or unveiled branches and leaves in the name of abolition of individualism. We have experienced the same in our internal ideological struggle within the party. Regarding collective leadership Lenin has said that the collective knowledge of all the members of the party is the collective leadership and when the ideological authority appears as the organizational authority, then it becomes effective as an authority. Where lies the difficulty towards actualization of this concept of concrete expression of collective leadership as the authority of the party? The above discussion explicitly makes it implicit that assertion of Comrade Haider is not correct. Thought and ideology of Marx- Engels- Lenin - not as a seedling - had been developed as a scientific philosophy for the emancipation of proletarian class because those were developed through their real life struggle. During a debate with Martov in 1903 regarding ideological struggle against the “bureaucratic” method of influencing by means of the Rules, Lenin, at that time, explained why organized party and its authority were necessary. He said that

“They have already forgotten that previously our Party was not a formally organized whole, but merely a sum of separate groups, and therefore no other relations except those of ideological influence were possible between these groups. Now we have become an organized Party, and this implies the establishment of authority, the transformation of the power of ideas into the power of authority, the subordination of lower Party bodies to higher ones. (‘One Step Forward, Two Steps Back’, CW, Vol-7, Moscow, 1961 Ed).

Besides, on the question of democratic centralism, the way it has been said by Haider Chowdhury– by saying that ‘Lenin had wanted to say, Comrade Ghosh has shown his modesty’ - what does it signify? Does it mean that Comrade Haider wants to make us understand that Comrade Ghosh has actually expressed the inadequacy of Comrade Lenin under a veil of modesty? In reality, after Lenin, with relation to democratic centralism Comrade Mao has spoken about ideological centralism and organizational centralism. Issues, on the basis of which ideological centralism develops, are something covering all aspects of consciousness (i.e., consciousness related to life & universe) and organization centralism covers all aspect of organization and movement. Thus, the essence of the idea, that the ideological centralism would be developed through struggle covering all aspects life as said by Shibdas Ghosh, is to be found even in the works of Mao.

We have already discussed elsewhere that why the attempt of providing justification to the effect of declaring Shibdas Ghosh as an International Marxist authority on the basis of the assertion of fundamental contributions made by Shibdas Ghosh in explaining theories, in the field of science

and other, like 'Big- Bang theory', 'expanding universe', 'uncertainty Principle', 'Law of determinism', 'Law of Probability', 'Fascism & Existentialism' etc. placed in the form of 40-points is not rational and those explanations are not fundamental contributions either. As a leader of a Marxist party, in order to enrich the party workers, he discussed several issues related to epistemology with them in the process of the formation of a genuine revolutionary party in India with the objective of directing the revolutionary struggle. It has not appeared to us that he has provided a general guideline to the international communist movement through this. Thus, remaining adamant in the demand for declaring Shibdas Ghosh an International authority in the midst of prevailing overall scenario of the country at the present moment and by constructing an issue of debate and by making the position of the party questionable by reneging themselves from the party instead of continuing the debate maintaining procedural obligations adhering to the party discipline, we understand, that these are neither supportive nor complementary to the cause of revolutionary struggle of the proletarian class. This is the result of extreme 'cult of Guru' and dogmatic approach. This is only a new edition of confusion propagated by all renegades of the past.

-----