- [FP)019/0112/3

309

## STALIN AND DICTATORSHIP

"We are in favour of the withering away of the state,

yet we are at the same time in favour of strengthening the

Amost powerful and mighty of all forms of state power that

have hitherto existed. The supreme development of the powerx

of the state, with the object of preparing the way for the

withering away of state power - such is the Marxist formula. Is that 'self-contradictory'? Yes it is 'self
contradictory'. But this contradiction is a living thing and

it is a complete reflection of Marxian dialectics, "-Stalin

wrote in 1930.

One of the biggest 'self-contradictions'/is the fact that intellectuals who are attracted towards the Communist Party not through direct participation in the working-class

6

struggle but through theoretical conviction, are often attracted precisely by the fact that the Communists are in the forefront of every campaign in defence of civil liberties and for the extension of freedom. Freedom - Liberte - Merdeka.

- Freiheit '- Inkululeko - in every language of the world Communists have rallied behind that banner.

And yet, paradoxically, there has been one chief characteristic distinguishing the Communists from the Labour Parties and Social Democrats, all of whom believe parties and Social Democrats, and that is the insistence by Communists that freedom, both political and economic can be won only if capitalism is crushed and replaced by socialism, and that owing to the certainty that the desperate forces of capitalism, ousted from power will resort to

every means including war and violence to prevent the march to socialism, it is necessary in the period immediately after the people seize power, for the state to be ruled by a form of dictatorship - the dictatorship of the proletariat.

True, Communists have stressed that this is a dictatorship different from any known in the pest; one based on the interests of the majority of the people and not on those of the oppressing minority, but the have

Communists never denied that this was dictatorship nevertheless, and dictatorship involved restrictions on freedom - freedom to organise opposition parties, freedom of the press, and of speech, and of travel.

of the press, and of speech, and of travel.

Dictatorship is an evil and Communists saw dictatorship

of the proletariat as a hateful stage which the Soviet Union

would be no world of slums and starvation, pass laws and jails a society where not only would dictatorship be a memory of the evil past, but even the whole machinery of state which limits man's liberty - the police forces and laws and parliaments, would wither away, and mankind would live as one family on a new level of existence.

when the Soviet Union would find herself so secure that she could begin to relax the dictatorship. While the fear-ridden capitalist countries retreated from the real freedoms of bourgeois democracy towards oppression and dictatorship, the socialist state would be able to advance from dictatorship to democracy on a new, higher, level.

The first signs of readiness for such relaxation have been apparent over the past two years or so, with the easing of restrictions on travel, the remlatively uninhibited flow of scientifict information, the raising of the tight security guard which surrounded the government leaders. Ent

But the real signal for a dramatic change, after the mild hints in the published reports to the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, was Kruschov's secret statement on the cult of the individual.

A trustworthy text of this statement is not available, but and communist Parties in several countries have expressed the the view that their Soviet friends have - not to mince words bungled their handling of the important announcement. It has been made possible for the capitalist press to indulge

6 -

in an orgy of specualation - and this time it wasn't a case of smoke without fire.

though the details are not yet certain, the overall picture is. Progressives who had seen the Soviet dictatorship of the proletariat as a hard necessity and had thought that the men at the summit of the dictatorship were of so great a calibre that the hardship of dictatorship were only on the knuckles of those whose aim was to destroy socialism now knew they were wrong

## BECHUREXCHONUNIETXPhildeophyzexpressedziteselfxasza

And that picture shows clearly that progressives outside the Soviet Union - and inside it - who had believed that the men at the summit of the dictatorship were of so superhuman a calibre that they were able to reduce the evils of dictatorship to a minimum were wrong. The very leaders - Stalin included - who had written and spoken so clearly to emphasise the dangers of individual decisions instead of democratic ones; who had emphasised that power must be firmly based on the aemocratic decision of the whole preparexxxxxxxx party and not an the caprice of individuals no matter how gifted; who had insisted on the need for utmost"socialist legality" in dealing with offenders - had all been living a huge lie for the past twenty years.

## Commanists

When people asked we to explain the adulation of Stalin has said that it was a necessity during a particular historic perbod, that the tributes paid were not to him as an individual but to him as a symbol of the whole party and the whole first socialist state, and that Stalin himself was a modest man who hated the excesses of but submitted to them because this was the will of the party. It seems that he were wrong and that, according to the Kruschov report, Stalin had come to love and believe in the tributes as being directly addressed to himself.

And it seems that while it was believed that it was a truth bardly zwarthzmentianingxthat that hardly needed ment - ioning that me all important decisions were the result of

the fullest possible democratic discussion within the party, and that none was ever taken arbitrarily by Stalin himself, this was also not so. A number of decisions, it seems, were made by Stalin alone, and the inevitable resulted, if decisions are taken by an individual alone - some of them were wrong.

And, perhaps worst shock of all, it seems that
a number of people - and possibly a large number of people who supported palicies in opposition to the party line were
treated
transed as traitors though there opposition was quite
legitimate, or if not legitimate, did not amount to treason.

The reaction to Kruschov's revelations had differed

In the colonial and broadly solonial condition there has been no burnoit.

extremely widely in different countries. The huge Communi st

Party of Indonesia and the very active one in India have done

11

Their leaders have welcomed the positive effects of the announcement and they appear even to be well-pleased with the situation. At the other end of the scale there has been an enormous impact on the very small hard-core Communist Party in the United States whose newspapers have played up their horror at the injustices revealed and have carried a number of articles in which communists write of the "heavy load of guilt" which they feel they bear; and results a substantial than the state of the "heavy load of guilt" which they feel they bear; and results a substantial than the state of the "heavy load of guilt" which they feel they bear; and results a substantial than the state of the "heavy load of guilt" which they feel they bear; and results a substantial than the state of the state of

much attention on the reassessment of Stalin while the workers were more concerned with the new opportunities for

In South Africa, for reasons much somewhat similar to those in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the harmful effects of the revelations have been limited and there is enormous scope for stressing the positive aspect s and their significance transfer for out progressive movement.

One gets the impression even that though the public is eager for discussion progressives have been slow to take the opportunity offered.

What are the positive aspects that need stressing and which can serve to assist the march to freedom?

Standing out most boldly is this. That by bringing the criticisms of the methods of the Soviet party leadership during the past twenty years mercilessly to light, Kruschov has taken the best means of ensuring that now a new era is

13

indeed beginning. With the immense burst of discussion that has taken place throughout the Soviet Union, with the progressive movement all over the world alerted, there is little doubt that the conditions which were created for dictatorial rule will not again be able to arise.

14

the decisions and must be obeyed?

There are two types of question asked about the Kruschov statement. One is "Why on earth did he make revelations like this which wants he knew would be seized upon by the enemies of the Soviet Union?" and the other is "How do we know that this can't whappen again?". The two questions asswer each other. The searing criticisms of the past which exposed the torn flesh of the Communist Party were necessary precisely to put people on their guard, to show what want had happened so that they would not let it happen again.

Progressives who felt it their duty to refrain from from joining in attacks on the Soviet Union under any circumstances in the past - and who, like myself, feel no "guilt" at all for doing so - will equally feel it their duty

constructive to voice/criticisms and misgivings in the future.

and to start off with I would say that there are aspects

of the very announcement of the errors of the past wexwe which
are not sompletely satisfactory A but that is of course the

subject of a separate discussion.

What stands out and cannot be sufficiently emphasised is
this - that the despotism of the tsars meant absolute misery,
was despoir and darkness for the people of Russia and her colonies;
that this misery, despair and darkness have been replaced in the
Soviet Union by a full life of hope, was relative plenty, security
and the confidence that a new life is opening where man will be
a full free individual as deeamt of before only in written
utopias; that the strength of the Soviet Union has made possible
the more rapid winning of freedom by the people of China and of

other countries which have suffered the yolk of imperialism - AND THAT THIS TRANSITION FROM TSARISM TO SOCIALISM WAS POSSIBLE ONLY BHROUGH THE DICEATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

That there were aspects of that dictatorship which led to injustice and bloodshed is clear. But just as all the mess, blood and agony are part of the birth of the the human baby, so/mess, blood and agony of the Soviet people have given rise to there ir socialist state.

Inasmuch as their sufferings, www experiences - and strength - now smooth the paths of other peoples to freedom by new routes, what an enormous debt we owe them!