

*Khrushchev—Mao Conflict*  
*and*  
*The Plebian Way*

—BISWANATH DUBEY

EIGHT ANNAS

11th May, '64

**P**RAVDA said on May 10, 1964 that Soviet Union regards her ideological battle with China as a top-priority and observers confirmed that the Kremlin had decided that the situation was irretrievable.

As days roll on, ideologues are more and more falsified in their prophecy to the effect that the Russo-Chinese dispute has proved not only to be as real as anything but also as deadly and as fatal as it can be. But out of evil, cometh good. And so we believe.

This dispute or conflict is not a local dispute or a border conflict. It is an international dispute affecting the lives and destiny of millions and millions of human beings aspiring for prosperity and happiness and groaning today under all types of exploitation, deprivations and destitution and denial of the rights to the earth and the water, the light and the sky.

It affects our lives also, the lives of 450 millions of Indians or more than that the lives of 600 millions of the Indo-Pakistani sub-continent.

Therefore the key to the dispute and the kernel have got to be analysed and dissected in an objective manner and properly understood. And our attitudes have got to be properly formulated, not only for the good of the Indian people and advancement of India's cause but also for the peoples of the world. No individual or groups of nations can stand isolated and behave in an ostrich-fashion in today's world. We live an interdependent life not only in the present but also in an all-embroiling, dynamically evolving future. In the present set up of circumstances, good nationalism and good internationalism

have been blended together into one solid, though complex, entity. Similarly, the bad and the bad comprise the opposite pole. It is therefore we have to take a stand, willy-nilly. Why then, not a properly deliberated and scientifically examined and evaluated, conscious attitude, instead of drifting like the straw in the wind. And the wind is going to develop into a whirlwind very soon. That makes the question important and vital for everybody.

## II

Marxists all over the world assert that they have a scientific approach to problems, social, economic, political and cultural. That Marxism is a social science is an incontrovertible fact.

The basic quality of a scientist is to be objective and to have a detached attitude in the study and examination of problems. It may be said that this is a difficult job. Can a worker groaning under increasing and continuous exploitation in its various forms or a leader of such workers, adopt a purely objective and detached attitude in the examination of excruciating social and political problems? If he can't, he is lost and along with him the future is lost. Anything done in anger and anguish is no solution to the complicated problems in which humanity is in today.

Before Marx, there were Utopians who worked from a spirit of anguish or anger, the bitterest of emotions and sentiments. But that was no solution. They worked and failed. Whether they were Robert Owen types or Blanquists.

Therefore the emergence of Marx heralded a new era. He it was who put on a scientific footing the struggle for the emancipation of the toiling millions. It was he who first of all introduced the scientific attitude in the lives of the fighters for the cause of the toilers.

The contributions of Lenin have been much more in the same direction. He developed not only the Marxist tenets of economics and philosophy but also an "Art of revolution". This was concretely expressed in the hard and persevering toils in building up the Party of the workers, the Party for revolution and the various strategies and tactics that were essential in the struggle for bringing about a total revolution in the lives of the toiling millions.

Since then, many, many developments have taken place enriching those who have eyes to see and ears to hear and intelligence to judge and grasp, and no vested interests to obstruct their vision. Humanity has learnt a concrete lesson—"There are various roads to socialism".

The Great October Revolution was the only classical one. The rest did not follow the pattern — howsoever strenuous efforts were made to take to the pattern, either financed and supported from the Comintern, or ploughing the lonely furrow.

Comrade Mao and his associates who are now shouting themselves hoarse for the classical pattern, forget that they themselves are living examples of the deviation from the classical October Pattern. The pattern was repeated in China but failed and led to massacre. Out of this failure emerged a new lesson, a new practice which led to a new result. Of course the result was good as it was a total revolution for socialism and not only for national integrity and sovereignty which of course it achieved.

The second big example of a practice away from the pattern was in Yugoslavia — the Tito-way.

And Albanians who shout and abuse so much now! Can they assert with justification and truth that they came to power in the classical way? Was it not the successful military advance of the victorious Red Army that saddled the present Albanian leaders to power. It was really Red Napoleonism that ushered in revolution throughout the

countries in East Europe, carrying the torch of revolution to the heart of the citadel of reaction — Berlin, Germany.

Much earlier than that was the success of the Spanish Popular Front, following on the limited successes of French Popular Front — a completely new lesson in the life of the struggling, working masses. There had been many more instances of smaller dimensions like Guatemala and the municipality of Capri. But ultimately these achievements could not last long as they were betrayed by internal enemies or ransacked by external aggression.

But what about Cuba? This was a completely new type of efforts, methods and ways and a glorious success where internal enemies are scotched in the bud by the ever-vigilant advance-guard of the revolution and where external aggression has been thwarted by the timely intervention of the might of the Soviet Union.

Now about the new Africa that is ever-emerging and ever-advancing to the sure goal of socialism in giant strides? Comrade Chou en Lai recently has moved among this resurgent Africa in search of friends and allies for his global strategy. I think at the time he, being a very practical man, did not preach his classical way of liberation but accepted the fact of liberation and sought allies, because while in Africa, we have not heard him talking about the classical October method.

Neither the emergence of the United Arab Republic followed the classical method, nor those of Ghana, Mali, Guinea, or Algeria.

And what is going on in Indonesia? Is it capitalism or socialism? Being in the closest wedlock, the Chinese comrades have never suggested that Indonesia is going the Capitalist way. And the Burmese way?

A new venture is going to take place in Ceylon by uniting all the Marxist elements in the seat of power.

The question of India need not be begged. Of course our country is in a very crucial phase of development

There is capitalism still ruling the lives of millions. But there is simultaneously a vigorous and conscious mass-effort towards socialism.

From these and many other varieties of experiences of the struggling peoples of the world, a Marxist who takes an objective view of the developing world will have to boldly assert that the classical way is not the only way, that there are various roads to socialism and if the charge of revisionism is to be levelled, it must be levelled on the course of history. History and historic needs, tasks and achievements have per force revised the basic limit of the classical way to socialism. And Comrade Mao charges Com. Khrushchev for revisionism! What a travesty of truth and fact and what a non-marxist way of approach towards the facts of historical progress!

### III

Some people try to simplify the matter and pose the question of the violent or the peaceful way.

Communists in their world declarations have never called themselves as votaries of violence like the fascists or the jingoist nationalists or the anarchists.

True communists have always demanded a total change, that is, a radical revolution in society, a radical revolution in the relations of production and distribution and with that purpose in view a change in the ownership of the means of production and distribution. This demand has never been at any time posed as something arbitrary but as a logical, necessary development of society. With the technological and organisational development of the day, individual ownership of the means of production and distribution has become arbitrary and is fulfilling no social purpose. It is based on injustice and is the root of many social ills like unemployment and mal-employment, hunger, destitution and prostitution amongst the millions on one side and more and more concentration of unmanage-

able wealth and debauchery in the hands of the few on the other. Moreover, the present society has brought out a patent antagonism between the social nature of large-scale, mass production and individual nature of appropriation of the fruits of production. *Millions produce but the few appropriate.* Further, the profit motive in the capitalist system of production has now objectively proved itself to become a break in the further development of production to serve the social needs. It has become anti-social by the creation of periodical crisis, by switching over production to the production of armaments for embroiling humanity to a mutual-killing business, while the basic human needs remain not-fulfilled for the absence of necessary quantity of consumer goods or due to the absence of the purchasing power of the masses being denied a means of livelihood under the sun.

Marxists try to argue out this patent case of a logical change in society. But that disturbs the status quo—those who are basking themselves on the fruits of others. It is these parasites who open war on the new philosophers as their prototypes had always done in the past on the then philosophers, Socrates and Christ to begin with. That is how the phase of violence opens and defensive counter-violence begins.

The question is, “Will they not open violence even today and tomorrow when their economic and political power are threatened? The answer is “yes, but”.

What is this “but”? The “but” means the following among many.

Anglo-French-Israeli forces opened violence on the resurgent Egypt, but failed. One threat from the President of the Soviet Union forced them to go back utterly humiliated. U.N. Forces under the U.S. adventurist command wanted to carry the Korean war beyond the Yalu river and unleash a nuclear war on the Chinese soil, but were thwarted by the incensed world opinion led by British Labour. Encouraged by the success in liquidating Guatemala, American imperialists launched various campaigns,

subversive as well as openly military, against Cuba, but have failed upto now because of the ever-vigilant Cuban people and the protection of the U.S.S.R.

What happened with Tito's Yugoslavia during Stalin's wrath on the small country? The rest of the world was there to thwart any military gamble from Stalin's side.

And coming to our own motherland, India. The aggressive and effectively advancing Chinese Army had to move back leaving much of its grabbing, afraid to meet the roused world forces. In this case, not only Soviet Union's moral support was switched to the Indian side, but also within a few days Anglo-U. S. Forces started pouring their military resources in the Indian soil for India.

These instances can be multiplied. But I stop not to become verbose. And these are the realities of the situation.

What do they mean? They mean only that the powers of those who want to open violence on others, are much curbed and much limited in the present-day world. In the past, in the case of overthrowing the people's regime in Spain in 1936-38, the reactionary imperialist powers could succeed. Even as late as fifties, they succeeded in the case of Guatemala. But those powers have been limited and curbed and outbalanced to a very great degree. That is why we are in a position to see the small oasis called Yemen or a small islet like Zanzibar coming up on its own without any imperialist counter-revolutionary military intervention worth the name. Mark it. *Imperialists are effectively counter-balanced by the growing might of the Soviet Union backed by the democratic and progressive world states including the newly roused peoples and their states of Asia and the erstwhile dark Africa.*

Thus with the danger of violence on behalf of reaction from outside being reduced to the minimum, the

threat of violence of reaction from within is very, very curbed. And two very important factors are further growing to totally negate this danger.

Number one is the ever-growing socialist and progressive movement drawing more and more people in the movement for socialism by the ever-increasing, relative pauperisation of the middle classes due to the inexorable growth of the concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands in the capitalist society.

Number two is the evergrowing total might of the socialist countries and their alliance with the liberated countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, coupled with the extension of public-sector economies in them.

These factors while growing, isolate and encircle reaction within. That is the kernel of the emphasis on the development of the peaceful aspect of the struggle for socialism.

#### IV

Anybody talking in terms of absolute would be wrong in facts as well as in theory.

Peaceful development towards socialism does not mean and cannot mean absolute non-violence which is beyond the range of practicability in this vegetarian-cum-nonvegetarian world of men and animals and animals in men.

There was interesting question the other day. "Was there violence in the emergence of socialist power in Czechoslovakia?" The reply given was that it was negligible because of the hibernation of the power of the reactionary classes due to the presence of the Red Army.

Similarly there was really no violence in Zanzibar because of the total collapse of the reactionary circles, their thorough demoralisation to intervene in the present set-up of relations of world forces.

What will happen in other countries will depend more and more on the unification of the labouring masses and their consciousness and organisational and hitting genius on one hand and the relative isolation, demoralisation and anarchy in the ruling cliques on the other. We think that would suffice for the prediction of the evolving future.

The crux of the matter is, "Which way lies the good of the people and what way would be less costly and effective in the present situation." The over-all position is the peaceful one. As the classical October pattern of Russia could not be repeated anywhere in the world in spite of all wishes and efforts, similarly the Chinese or the Castro method can no more be practised with success or any feasibility of realisation.

The past is dead with its glories. We may at best take some lessons from the dead past but cannot imitate the same as we have to act in the present to cause to emerge a new future. This is not idle philosophy but sound commonsense. One who lives in the past is dead as only the dead live in the past. Revolution is for the living and they have to live and to act in the present changed situation to bring a new future. The aim notwithstanding, methodology must change with the change in time which automatically carries a change in the situation. Not rigidity, neither dogmatism, nor wishful thinking, neither self-imposed role of messiahs would be of any service to the people and society. But a bit more realism, a bit more realisation of the grounds and the changed circumstances we are in, is of vital necessity for the cause of the people and the world. As negation of old idolatries and authoritarianism is the basis of Marxism, no Marxist true to the sense should allow any new authoritarianism to come into the field and be worshipped and its dictates be followed without any assessment of repercussions on the noble cause we cherish.

A type of fool-hardiness expressed in Chinese armed action on Indian borders has already resulted in the growth of reactionary ideas in our motherland, in the

disruption of the C. P. I., in the splitting activities of other left forces and in the necessary, limited swing of our Government to the west for the defence of our motherland, for military needs.

None of these has been good for the cause of the world. The Chinese dogmatists may gloat over these in an amused but barren self-satisfactory way for causing to emerge a party which would follow their dictates or they may laugh at their success in forcing India to take western aid for defence and to the extent compromise non-alignment or to spend more for arms instead of using every ounce of energy for developing the Indian economy on an industrial plane lifting it from the stage of oxen-carts. But for all these we Indian people suffer, our cause for amelioration of the impoverished conditions of the masses suffers, the cause of socialism suffers which has been the casualty number one in this Chinese onslaught.

What a price dogmatism causes others to pay !

And what it pays itself also is not very insignificant. By this action, Chinese have lost one of those allies who have been all along their ally under all circumstances and in spite of many of their misdeeds an ally which is still maintaining balance.

What have they got in return ?

They have a new friend now, an oppressor of the worst order in its own soil to its own people, a believer in religious apartheid, a member of SEATO and CENTO, the military regime of Pakistan.

In their over-enthusiasm to bring world revolution willy-nilly, the Chinese have opened a war of abuses on the citadel of socialism—U.S.S.R. Rejecting the Moscow-Peking alliance, they have entered into an alliance with Marshal De Gaule, the arch representative of French reaction. How wild the belief, they could not advance the cause of socialism with the support of Moscow, they would succeed now in doing the same in close collabora-

tion with De Gaule. They could not help Nehru in extending the Public Sector towards Socialism, they would do now with heart and soul with Marshal Ayub—votary of individual enterprise and feudal or rather tribal savagery !

V

*What is revisionism and how it is bad ?* Revision of the basic tenets of a science or a philosophy arbitrarily done with a view to confuse or weaken or jeopardise the interests of the suffering and exploited humanity is bad and to be condemned as such. But revision of method, technique or even strategy and tactics done on reasonable and scientific grounds to advance the cause of the suffering humanity in an ever-changing, everdeveloping world to meet the demands of the new conditions or relations of existence is sound common-sense, is necessary and justified and to be cherished and welcomed.

We condemn revision of Marxism but we all uphold the Great Lenin for the enrichment of Marxism by his own contributions to the theory and practice of Marxism. This addition to Marxism by way of new contributions to the theory and practice of Marxism, in the developing and changed situation, in the changed conditions of struggle and existence, naturally is revision of certain old ideas about older forms of existence and struggle which are obsolete, as dead and exist no more. Marxism being a living science and an applied philosophy must be in a position to enrich and develop itself with the developing needs of society. Anybody not ready for this but rigidly clinging to the old ideas of no value for any service in the changed situation may be satisfied to be designated as orthodox but would make himself obsolete like the idea that has gone obsolete with the change of time and conditions and is no more a revolutionary and therefore no more a Marxist.

Marxism is not a dogma or a religion to be adopted and declared. It is a revolutionary practice. It is a guide to action.

Thus if there have been certain revisions of ideas about things or facts of life and/or methods of struggle and development, necessitated by the needs of changed world conditions and relations of existence between states or among a number of states or between classes and peoples they cannot be wrong by themselves being revisions as such. If these revisions are unscientific or harm the interests of the toiling masses or humanity they of course would be bad. Now the onus lies on those who charge others for revisionism to prove which ones are bad. This must be proved with facts and cold logic and simply hurling abuses would be of no help. Abuses help in energising very low order of human beings to some fringe activity for some time but they become meaningless in large-scale social activity for a change in the world order. For that, clarity and conscious and intelligent activity of enlightened masses are a basic necessity. Therefore philosophers with their well-argued philosophies have always preceded and worked before any progressive social, political, cultural or moral change in human life could take place. They themselves never took to abuse; abuses were hurled on them by reactionaries, by the circles defending status quo. That is history—recorded history.

Now let us examine ourselves some of the revisions which Comrade Khrushchev and his associates have introduced in Soviet-life

The first one of them is the negation of the cult of the individual and the restoration of collective leadership in the party, more democracy in party and State apparatus, more freedom in social life and more scope of mass initiative in industry and agriculture.

These are being practised in Soviet-life since 1956 and the practice is being enlarged from day to day. Have they brought into light any ill that has injured the interests of the soviet workers and intellectuals? Comrade Mao

and his associates have not yet been able to produce even a single instance to say so. On the other hand, all of us who have visited or studied Soviet life comparatively, before the emergence of Khrushchevism and after, agree that the average or the overwhelming masses of Soviet citizens are happier now than before. And why? Because he can now propose, discuss or agree with or vote against, a new proposal or idea without any fear of losing his head or spending the rest of his life in exile, cutting woods or building roads. *Now Molotovs come and go without losing their heads.*

During the period of the implementation of this new policy, U.S.S.R. has not only made remarkable progress in science and technology revealed in sending a standard to the moon or aeronauts orbiting the earth, but also in the increased production of consumer goods making the life of the Soviet citizen much more happier, whilst emergence of rebellious poets like Yevtusenko earmark a new aura of cultural resurgence.

These are all good to Soviet life and very bad to the enemies of the Soviet Union as these give a new impetus to those who cherish socialism as a more advanced and better way of life and existence for humanity.

Secondly, the theory of real coexistence (and *not* a tactical or vanishing coexistence) of states with different or even opposite social systems. This theory is a brutal statement of facts and a theory expressing the grim reality of the world states of today. England, France and U.S.A. with their fullfledged capitalist systems are coexisting with full-fledged socialist systems in the bloc of socialist countries led by U.S.S.R. So countries with mixed economy like India, Ceylon or U.S.S.R. are coexisting with both.

*Coexistence does not mean an end of antagonism or conflict amongst them.*

But reality again is that there are friendship and cooperation also along with antagonism and conflict among these states.



There are extant trade relations not only amongst U.S.S.R. Great Britain and the different socialist, capitalist and mixed economy countries to the economic and cultural benefit of all, but also there are trade relations between Mao's China and Great Britain, and Canada, and Australia, and South Africa etc., etc. and to the benefit of both. Moreover every intelligent man knows that while the Anglo-American embargo on trade with Communist China was being trumpeted from the world forums it was being cleverly by-passed by both in practice through the trade windows of the British Hongkong and the portuguese Macao of China. That is why comrade Mao's Government never made an issue of the liberation of these Chinese territories still under imperialist occupation.

And now? General De Gaulle has openly taken the field in recognising the new China while maintaining its links with old, decrepit Chiang's Formosa and boosting trade and cultural relations between the two countries to revive the glory that was France. And men know that France even today is not as free from U.S.A. as Frenchmen want. Here is again America shaking hands with red China via France. These and many more are patent realities. By more I mean, solid relations of Chinese comrades with the Divine right of the king of Nepal or the theocratic, militarist Marshal dictator of Pakistan.

These are all admitted realities and accepted relations. The point at dispute or the question is "Whether with the development of these economic and cultural relations, a new era of a stable and lasting peace is being ushered into the world or inspite of all these the world is moving inexorably and inevitably to a global third world war, a thermonuclear war?" Com. Krushev and his associates believe in the first postulate, Com. Mao and his associates believe in the latter and assert that here is revisionism which is harmful to the cause of the world revolution and the world proletariat. They charge Com. Krushev for shirking the international responsibility of bringing about the world revolution and of cowardice as

according to them, he is afraid of nuclear arms of America which is nothing but a paper-tiger.

Now the question becomes a bit highly theoretical and should be so examined on a high, theoretical plane, keeping away all questions of personality and authority.

First of all, no Marxist should be afraid of a new idea as otherwise there would be no enrichment to Marxism, over and above making it dead like a classical language or a theocratic dogma. And that would be against dialectics also and dialectics is the life-breath of Marxism and believes in the continuous emergence of the new and the newer future out of the continuously inherent conflict and contradiction in the present. The present no sooner it is born than it is ridden with this inherent *conflict as if it is born with the conflict and as a result very soon it goes into the past oblivion causing a new future to emerge.*

## VI

Comrade Krushev advances a new idea:— What he says according to me is this "War is not fatalistically inevitable". It is true that Imperialism generates war. But this social law which was relatively absolute, or inevitably effective before has reached a stage where its blind inexorable powers have been limited to a great extent (1) by thermo nuclear might of the Soviet Union and the ever-increasing strength of the socialist camp, (2) the ever-increasing consciousness and organisation of the world public opinion and (3) by the emergence of a huge third force in the shape of the newly independent colonies of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Here is a question of assessment, proper and scientific. No sentimentalism or wishful thinking in the form of revolutionary overzealousness helps. Further, nobody should confuse a social law with a natural law. "Capitalism or Imperialism generates war"—is a social law. Once enforced, it has the impact of a natural law of course. But

enforcement is done by social forces. It is not only that capitalism generates war but also it can generate war when it has that power to generate war. This power of capitalism operates on the relative weakness of its class adversary—the proletariat with its allies. Thus this force can be curbed, limited or even eliminated by the towering strength of the working-class. Elimination is possible by revolutions. But curbing or limiting that power to the extent of making it impossible to be operative can occur before that. There is no difficulty in visualising a situation when by the timely and prompt mobilisation of the outbalancing strength of the revolutionary masses, this war-making or war-launching power of the imperialists can be successfully thwarted. That is how a struggle for peace develops and ultimately transforms itself into a struggle for the ushering of a new era of society, based on justice and humanism—only another name for socialism. This had been the aim of the world peace movement to which even the New China had been a party.

Whether the present and the evolving near future situation would be such is again a question of assessment and human mass action on a global scale.

One who would straight away hold the opposite view would make himself liable to be charged with (1) a no-confidence in the ever-growing consciousness and strength of the progressive forces of the world, (2) a non-understanding of the fissures due to the contradiction in the camp of capital, (3) the necessary weakness of the paper-tigers by the effective action of progressive forces in their own countries and (4) the ever-broadening conflict of mutually antagonistic interests in the Imperialist Camp.

Finally the question would then be, "Would it be judicious or tactically correct to unleash a revolutionary war against Imperialism by the Soviet Union and its allies? There is a suggestion implied in the question. It is this type of implied suggestion on behalf of Chinese communists that brings a charge of Trotskyism on their heads.

*Revolution can neither be imported nor exported. Neither can it be imposed from outside by sheer, aggressive military action.* What could be achieved by the Red Army March in a particular set of circumstances and under particular conditions cannot be achieved in the absence of those conditions and circumstances. People not in the know of things may feel flabbergasted or frustrated by the negation of the materialisation of their wishful thinking or dreams. But let it rest there. Let us be practical and realist. Let those who imagine that had Stalin or his associates been in the leadership things would have moved otherwise answer "Why was the post-war revolutionary action of the Greek working class allowed to be butchered by British Imperialist Sherman tanks, without any effective military aid from the Red Army during Stalin's life-time"? Only recently because of some other, very vital necessary conditions, Red Army technicians had to go back home from Cuba. No emotional obduracy, but cool calculation and intelligent steps are the need of the hour. Any Why? *Because the so-called paper-tigers are not paper-tigers.* They may be reduced to the position of paper-tigers only by the revolutionary action of the toiling millions of America. Anyhow these toiling millions of America have not yet gone nor are going in near future upto that extent. Under the circumstances, revolutionary patience is essential for the time that the American masses may take to reach the point. No help, this waiting is essential otherwise adventurism would bring about an abortion of the revolution in the national plane and would jeopardise the cause of socialism on a world-plane.

What happens in India as a result of the foolish die-hard Chinese policy and action? They might or might not have liberated some animals or trees of the jungle or some snow-covered barren mountain passes. But one thing is certain. They seriously damaged the cause of socialism on which path India under Nehru had been moving slowly. To accelerate the pace of socialism in India is the task which has got to be fulfilled by us—Indians, in a long-drawn, painstaking and persevering man-

ner building consciousness, organisation and struggle for socialism, brick by brick. Would it not have been better for socialism if the Chinese Communists had utilised every ounce of their energy in building up a happier society in China or concentrated their energy in liberating Taiwan from the stranglehold of the militarist junta that is ruling there and which had been their avowed enemy No. 1?

### VII

Marxists are materialists. Moreover, Marxism-Leninism declares from a detached, scientific study that human society on a world-scale is at different levels of development. Even there has been uneven development of capitalism in different parts of the world. Due to these variances in the conditions of existence and development, human beings and social groups are at different levels of development in different parts of the world. Similarly, their consciousness and organisation and abilities to move onward as well as the relative weakness or strength of different social groups and their relations in combat and conflict vary, are at different levels of existence and development. How can then there be the same, universal method, strategy and tactics for all to reach the goal of socialism. Naturally therefore there are different roads to socialism. Only a diehard dogmatist would deny the scientific truth upheld in the above. But the Chinese communists while themselves following a road different from the classical pattern of October revolution or construction of socialism in U. S. S. R. deny the same necessary right to others and dub other developments as revisionism and varieties of capitalism, without being very much concrete or specific in their wild allegations.

The Chinese slogans of "the Great Leap Forward" or "The Comumene" has instead of building up a happier economic and social life for the Chinese people have brought serious devastations. As a result, they themselves have introduced a material change in their theory and practice

by the new slogan "hasten slowly". For all that nobody is charging them as adventurous social gamblers as it is their own business to learn from their own experiences and take on to the path of socialism. But Tito's practice and method of construction of socialism in Yugoslavia have improved the conditions of life and existence, of work and progress, for the toiling masses of Yugoslavia, after liquidating capitalism and feudalism. He has introduced with success real workers' control in work and management. Moreover, by necessary decentralisation of economic and political power, Marshal Tito has introduced more democracy in worker's life. And still the Chinese dub these developments as capitalism—(though there are no capitalists in Yugoslavia)

\* \* \* \*

Dogmatists are apt to confuse unity with uniformity. There is and will be unity in the basic thought-current and interests in the world socialist-movement, but no uniformity of movement. It is neither possible nor necessary to have a uniform type of movement, struggles and organisations of struggles, for socialism. For example, trade-unions are an universal affair, as one of the organs of struggle and education for socialism. Thus far the unity of the world trade union movement for socialism, but no further. What will be the demands of the trade unions, how they will move, what forms of struggles they would adopt, what will be their strategy and tactics, when they will lie low, when and on what terms they would settle their disputes and again when they would sharpen and intensify their class-war, etc. etc. would vary from state to state, or region to region and continent to continent. Even the hardest dogmatists have to admit that the trade union movements in Portugal and Spain are to work underground whereas trade unions in France, Italy or UK function legally, openly and democratically. As a result their forms of struggle are to be wide apart.

Similarly trade-unions in U. A. R., Ghana and Indonesia have to work under the tutelage of a radicalised middle class dictatorship moving steadily to socialism. But there is no democracy in their life and activity like that of

India or Ceylon. These limitations or circumstances are bound to be reflected in the movement, its steps, its method of achieving the goal of socialism. In that case, how can there be any uniformity in the forms of struggles? Even in such classical democracies as of U.K. and U. S. A. there is no uniformity in the struggles and present-day aims of the trade unions. The British trade-union movement has given birth to a political party of its own wedded to socialism, wresting political power from the capitalists or giving in to them, democratically. But the American trade-unions, in general, even up-to-date, are so many appendages to Republicans or Democrats, both of which are capitalists. These are realities of life to which you cannot shut your eyes and not try to draw lessons from them and adjust your activities and even your ideas of struggle and organisation.

In that case what happens to the unity of world working class movement? There is and will be unity in diversity. There will be unity of the basic interest of fighting exploitation of all forms with a view to end exploitation of man by man once for all. But there will be diversity of movements and struggles to reach the objective. There will be unity in helping each other in their struggles, but there will be diversity in the forms of material and concrete aid. Only recently the miner's strike of France could be effectively helped by the Soviet workers and brought to success. But the same help could not be given by others, or to others. Instances need not be multiplied to tax the commonsense of readers or to embitter the already strained relations of those who have struggled and suffered and won their small or big victories unaided. One such series of glorious struggles are those of Japanese workers fighting against U.S. Imperialists and their agents in Japan.

But to cut the story short; aid, its quality and quantity, depends on the consciousness of the giver with his limitations and his relation with those to be aided. Brotherhood of the world working class is a social and economic reality but not yet a psychological, mental and

humanised reality. Like all human beings, workers are also rational animals. The process of more and more humanising and raising them to the quality of gods has been started thousands of years ago by eminent philosophers and saints in all lands and is being continued throughout these centuries by ever new generations of saints and philosophers. There has been improvement of course, real and tangible, compared with those virgin days of the laws of the jungle and desert but a good deal remains to be done. Achievements are expected to be available in the millenium of world communism. Workers of the world and their leaders who are an organic part of the same, remain human beings at various levels of development, economic, political, social, cultural and philosophical. To talk about or express allegiance to a highly scientific and humanist philosophy is one thing, but to come up to the tenets in actual practice in day-to-day life still remains another. This practice cannot be forced by a decree or a majority verdict or by the clash of armies. For that also, a long educative process is a necessity.

Till then, brotherhood of the world working class would also be limited by its own limitations of development. Till then, there will be more formality and less materiality in the concept. But the latter aspect would also grow, urged by necessities and cultivated from different sides. This is certain. One should be equally certain of more and more historical development of the content and the concept of equality in brotherhood. The past of this concept of brotherhood politicians has not been very glorious so much so that the big brother used to subordinate and boss over the small brother. What began as revolutionary brotherhood and aid metamorphosed under Stalin's regime into subordination of the small to the big and ex-communication, and if necessary and possible, annihilation of the small by the big. All glory to Com Khrushchev for ending this chapter. What Chinese communists are attempting to do in this sphere is restoration of that old, overthrown institution, dead and gone. In the Chinese military gamble on the Indian border,

people with sense, see an effort to brow-beat Pandit Nehru and make him a subordinate small brother to be away from Khrushchev and if possible, to act like Albania in the Chinese efforts of overlordship of the world socialist movement, elbowing out Khrushchev and his associates. But the neo-Macheavelians miscalculated.

Number one : India is not China.

Number two : Pandit Nehru was also a big brother with no less intelligence and resources and backing in his own country as well as the world outside. Frustrated in India, Chou En-Lai with his entourage embarked on the African scene. But he had to contend there with a combined force of Khrushchev, Nehru and African 'Nehrus'. It is true that nothing goes in vain. So Chinese have bagged some smaller entities. But they do not most probably see the other-side of the picture, more consolidation of others roused in competition by the Chinese bid. Left to themselves, the process would have been slow. But now it is accelerated, At least the Aswan-Dam and Khrushchev-Nasser public appearance in historic achievement acclaimed by popular upheaval would open the eyes.

Now the Chinese comrades are banking on the East-Wind or the coloured Afro-Asians in their campaign of revolutionary brotherhood against the white-skinned, Western Soviet leaders. But how can this apartheid win new adherents for a nobler cause ? If Verward's apartheid is destined to go down in the face of world progressive action, how can the opposite apartheid succeed ? The erelong victims of apartheid starting another apartheid would be like the Jews (of course for arguments' sake I presume) opening a pogrom against others in blind retaliation. But at best, that would divide the peoples more and more on non-sensical, anti-human lines. What happens then to the brotherhood of the toiling millions for socialism, for world revolution ?

Why not accept equality of nations in the concept of brotherhood of the toiling masses ? Why not accept the

realities of the varied development of the forces for socialism and respect and honour their various roads to Socialism ? Cannot attitudes be adjusted on such realisation ? And why force ones own will or a group's will or a nation's will and attitudes on others against their will and avowed interests ? A Marxist would realise, appreciate and adjust. A dogmatist cannot.