

KHRUSHCHEVISM

by

Theja Gunawardhana

SWADESHI PRINTERS,
COLOMBO,
CEYLON.

First Edition May 1963

Second Edition September 1963

Copyright Reserved

By the Same Author

White Heat For Green Carpet (Communes of China)

Congo Survives Operation Great Divide

'Never Again' Wills Japan

Venceremos—The Cuban Revolution

Whither India-China Relations?

Revolution can take any form—bloody or bloodless, violent or peaceful, military or economic, educational or administrative. It takes different forms under different historical and local conditions.

New revolutions take new forms in new crises but history teaches it never takes the form of capitulation and unprincipled compromise.

*

*

*

“We are marching in a compact group. Along a precipitous and difficult path firmly holding each other by the hand. We are surrounded on all sides by enemies.....We have combined voluntarily, precisely for the purpose of fighting the enemy and not to retreat into the adjacent marsh the inhabitants of which reproach us for having chosen the path of struggle instead of the path of conciliation. And now several among us begin to cry out—Let us go into this Marsh—and when we begin to shame them, they retort, how conservative you are! Oh yes gentlemen! We are also “free” to go where we please, free to fight not only against the marsh but also against those who are turning towards the marsh.

“Dogmatism doctrinairism, ossification of the party”—these are enemies against which the knightly champions riseThe high sounding phrases against the ossification of thought conceal unconcern for and impotence in the development of theoretical thought.....

The role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory.

—LENIN

(i)

Dedication

This book is dedicated to the struggle of the great Soviet people who are fighting bravely that their leadership will not turn the fruits of their revolution into dead sea fruit, by turning towards the marsh, to lead humanity out of which, they pioneered the first victory of socialism with sacrifice and heroism.

NOTE TO SECOND EDITION

A second edition of this book had to be brought out within four months of its publication. Since May, within these four months significant events have taken place proving several analyses in this book correct.

Firstly the Sino-Soviet talks which took place in spite of frantic and desperate efforts to prevent them by:—

1. The “expulsion” of Chinese Embassy officials in Moscow on the ground of having “distributed” the now celebrated June 14th Chinese C. P. reply letter to the CPSU letter which however was widely distributed (with no expulsions following) all over the world and particularly in China by the Soviet Embassy;

2. Getting Chinese Embassy windows smashed by catspaw sober students later described amorally and wickedly as drunkards by their own compatriots, proved the utter bankruptcy of Khrushchevism.

Secondly while the talks were in progress, Khrushchev the Trotskyist lashed out at the Chinese calling them Trotskiyst. This is part and parcel of Khrushchevism — to call others what he is. This diatribe met with only one reception wherever it was read — loud laughter. To make matters worse and the laughter more uproarious, side by side with Khrushchev’s diatribe, the world press published a Titoist lashing out at China. Since Tito is the spiritual heir of Trotsky and Tito was denigrating China, to find Khrushchev the Trotskyist labelling China as Trotskyist placed him as undoubtedly the greatest propagandist of peaceful co-existence of opposing systems! This is the greatest victory for the Great Debate.

While Suslov and Liu Ning - Yi were locked in mortal ideological struggle in the Moscow Palace of Receptions, the world was treated to comic opera by **Pravda**. It claimed on the eve of the abortive talks to have published NOW the celebrated, banned, June 14th Chinese C. P. letter. (Whether in expurgated or in unexpurgated form it failed to inform.) However the announcement was a cover to “reply” it. The reply was even more entertaining than the letter, since it meandered helplessly between truth and lies. This reply has in turn earned a more enlightening Chinese reply.

Thirdly the Moscow Congress for Women took place in conditions as were foretold in the last chapter of this book. But with one extra act we should not have failed to anticipate. That is the sight of Khrushchev’s female goon squads setting to work — “booing and

hissing" and mind you even catcalling. And when did they perform these sounds? At a prearranged signal from the Indian delegate who obligingly dragged the now celebrated, dead, red-herring from across that Border. Were the boos, hisses and catcalls for one who tried to bring in extraneous, irrelevant issues and spoil the atmosphere of friendship which the Congress claimed to foster? No they were for the Chinese delegate who asked for the right to reply.

TASS which now openly dishes out mendacious propaganda also failed to record that there were several countries which opposed the so-called "Declaration" of the Congress for Women. The world was made to believe that only China opposed it. Some opposed it and others abstained to vote for it since it was a pre-planned document whose findings did not arise out of Congress deliberations.

Fourthly, in July, Khrushchev came out with a statement that if Cuba is invaded rockets from USSR (not Soviet rockets from Soviet missile bases in Cuba!) will travel to USA. This confirms that there was indeed something very phoney about the installation of missile bases in Cuba in Oct. 1962. A similar statement then, as this July statement; would have sufficed, provided of course the promise and assurance were sincere.

Last but not least on Herr Walter Ulbricht's birthday the head of the USSR descended on the hapless GDR over which hangs the Damocles sword of the Berlin question. To this birthday party were also ordered to come Khrushchev's satellites to be ordered to queer the pitch for the Sino-Soviet talks. None obliged. Some European People's Democracies boycotted these proceedings which took place against a decor of merry-making and birthday festivities. Obviously the First Secretary of the CPSU was not having it all his own way any longer with his super monarchical authority and imperial decrees in the execution of the functions of a Hitler even though in Hitler's own country.

The absences were portentous and indicated that apparatus pressure was working no longer in the nature of a Big Club. Some of the fraternal parties were determined to help their Russian comrades struggling in the background against Khrushchevism and to help the Russian and world revolution by not contributing to its degeneracy.

The Partial Test Ban Treaty

Khrushchev in July 1963 was in selling mood. After years of rejection he accepted the imperialist terms for a partial test ban agreement to demonstrate to a shocked and betrayed world the feasibility of "peaceful co-existence". He lost no time in selling to some countries this so-called Treaty in real high-powered style. Strangely the signature of the German Democratic Republic was spurned but that of

Chiang Kai-shek's accepted. Cuba was among the countries that did not sign the Treaty since this government condemned the US-sponsored increasingly provocative acts against Cuba while "signing Test Ban Agreements elsewhere". The *ECONOMIST* commented that the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty between UK-USSR and USA renders the danger of war less among themselves but not for others. Based on the ideals of might, power and nuclear weapon monopoly, the Treaty stressed the Big Power chauvinistic attitude underlying it. One clause gives the three signatories veto power over any amendment proposed by other signatories. There is no guarantee of a real Test ban (even partial) for it allows the continuation of underground tests and an escape clause allows the unilateral resumption of tests with three months notice. Soviet embassies all over the world moved heaven and earth to get governments to praise the Treaty. Some praised it. Some condemned it. Some assessed it correctly. Some approved the Partial Test Ban Treaty for the respite from radioactive contamination for the stratosphere, seas and soils. It was indeed an insignificant but dangerous first step calculated to mislead the people, hypnotise the fighting vanguard and provide a camouflage for unprincipled compromise and indirect collusion with imperialism. This beauty mask on the ugly face of imperialism was meant to cover up further US violence against humanity. For it simultaneously stepped up committing greater moral violence on the people of S. Korea and S. Vietnam where napalm bombs and toxic chemicals were being used for mass extermination, of the freedom fighters. It stepped up aggressive acts against Cuba and border provocations in N. Korea. India which boosted the Treaty took the first steps to establish a naval base in the Andaman Islands, the future venue of the US Eighth Fleet in the Indian Ocean. Harriman announced US submarines would call at this base, belonging to the "non-aligned" world!

Great claims are made for the Treaty as a response to the demands of public opinion. Far from it. No public demand was ever for a partial Test Ban Treaty with provision for the continuance of underground tests whereby more dangerous nuclear weapons could be perfected. For so long Khrushchev himself had said a partial test ban would be very dangerous. Having bluffed some people, the forum of people's conferences were next sought for exploitation.

Khrushchevism in Hiroshima

The 9th World Conference against A and H bombs which was held in August in Hiroshima was the first venue for these tactics. The Soviet delegation came to Hiroshima to sell the Treaty in a big way believing the Japanese people who had suffered most from Tests would be gulled. Finding stiff opposition to it and enlightened opinion prevailing, the Soviet delegation resorted to the most bankrupt tactics. It sought to join hands with the notorious right-wing leaderships of SOHYO (Trade Union Movement) and the Japan Socialist Party.

Secret parleys with these elements, using of the World Peace Council delegates, bludgeoned to make proposals calculated to sabotage the conference, holding of press conferences where it declared that not the conference but only the Peace march was important, blatant interference in the affairs of Gensuikyo (Japan Council Against A and H bombs) in order to destroy this mighty mass movement—all exposed the real double-faced nature of Khrushchevism—embodied in the Soviet delegation at Hiroshima.

They came to sell the Treaty but departed downcast finding it was despised. Japan which has suffered and still suffers from nuclear bombs aftermath in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and where intensified nuclearization plans sponsored by USA were afloat was in no mood for tomfoolery. She is faced with US plans for sending nuclear submarines and jet bombers being posted in her occupied base. Hence to the applause of nearly 13,500 Japanese delegates, 82 foreign delegates from 20 countries and 8 international organizations, the Hiroshima Declaration found no mention of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. It stressed that "the recent world situation points out the most serious threat to world peace comes from the nuclear war policy of the US ruling group". So Japan correctly analysed and implied that tests, bases and nuclear weapons are all outcome of war policy. The tests are not an isolated phenomenon.

Today, behind the policy of nuclear blackmail stand not only the imperialist system and its military policy linked inextricably with a permanent war economy resting on military and giant monopolies, but also Khrushchevism which has capitulated shamelessly to imperialism.

Khrushchevism in Nicosia

In September in Cyprus, at the Executive meeting of the People's Afro-Asian Solidarity Association one saw that certain inter-governmental deals (among 4 governments) formed the background to isolate China on its principled stand on the Partial Test Ban Treaty in return for mutual support of other extraneous issues. Thus did unscrupulous governments try to exploit this people's forum to impose the foreign policy of Khrushchev on a mass movement. Together with the Soviet delegation there arrived a contingent of so-called "observers" from some European People's Democracies and a World Peace Council contingent who in the course of unsurpassed lobbying resorted to the most bankrupt tactics (pitiful to see) ordered by so-called representatives of a country which has known 46 years of socialist revolution. Backing these "peace forces" were Indian diplomats of the Middle East region who had also found their way to Nicosia, well ahead of the date the Executive Committee was scheduled to meet. Intimidation, threats, cajolery, bribes of free trips and other methods—all formed part of the lobbying tactics. And the Cypriots were blissfully unaware that the Greeks were further set off against the Turks and vice versa—all in the

process of winning approval for a miserable "Treaty" whose importance to Afro-Asian problems was nil, and one completely outside the Agenda. Modern Revisionists surpass today the imperialists in low tactics.

In passing I must not fail to mention that Khrushchevite emissaries and their paid agents all over the world are busy propagating breathtaking discoveries about my book. To write this book I received the cooperation of the true representatives of the people in all the socialist countries — those people whose voices are now silenced by revisionist tyranny. Why should a "liberalised regime" fear a book so much?

May the peoples of the world learn to discern the true significance of Khrushchevism. May the voice of the true revolutionary vanguard of the world ring out triumphant once more.

Theja Gunawardhana

CONTENTS

	DEDICATION	(i)
	NOTE TO THE SECOND EDITION	(ii)
Chapter			Page	
I.	DREAMS TAKE FORM	1
II.	MARXISM—LENINISM	28
III.	EARLY REVISIONISM	64
IV.	LENIN AND TROTSKY	86
V.	STALIN	119
VI.	TITO OF YUGOSLAVIA	163
VII.	KHRUSHCHEV	193
VIII.	THE TWENTIETH CONGRESS	216
IX.	POLAND AND HUNGARY	239
X.	THE STORM WITHIN	260
XI.	THE IDEOLOGICAL CHALLENGE	267
XII.	THE REPLY TO THE UNITY CALL	273
XIII.	SEE SAW	279
XIV.	THE 22ND CONGRESS	292
XV.	ALBANIA	303
XVI.	SINO-SOVIET POINTS OF VIEW	325
XVII.	THE GREAT DEBATE	334
XVIII.	REVISIONISM IN SOCIALIST ECONOMICS	365
XVX.	CUBA	386
XX.	PANORAMA	431
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	455

DREAMS TAKE FORM

PRIMITIVE society had been communistic. With the march of time and the dissolution of these primeval communities society had become differentiated into separate and finally antagonistic classes. Idealists dreamt of an ideal world, down the era of written history. Down the centuries man continued to cherish this vision. Man always knew where he wanted to go but did not know how to get there. Among the ancients Plato shared these dreams and among the medievals, Thomas More's *Utopia* (which means in Greek a place that does not exist) was a dream fantasy of an idealist of an ideal land! T. Campanella's *City of the Sun* (1623) was another utopian dream.

Centuries passed and More's fantasy dream started taking a form of reality. Man no longer dreamt of a Promised Land but is today building it with conscious effort. Today there are states well planned. There are states which *respect* the fundamental basis of equality, an ideal of which man dreamt for ages. There are states which control their future. This became possible when people inspired by revolutionary thinkers took their destiny into their own hands. People suffered in the era of feudalism. They suffer under the capitalist system with its social inequality, its undue waste of both natural and human resources its irrationality and its basic injustice. With the birth of socialism rose a new order based on a knowledge of the laws of social and economic development made possible by a scientific analysis of existing conditions of life.

In this planned new order, labour no longer remains a mere source of livelihood, but a genuinely creative process and a source of joy, happiness, pride and well-being. Labour is no more stultifying and exhausting. In the common ownership of the means of production, no longer does the tiller of the soil find life so exhausting, colourless and burdensome. Now he has both the time and the heart to enjoy the beauty around him because he breathes as a freeman. Before socialism a better life to the disinherited and the disenchanting was a mere utopia. Radical changes in the life

of society as a whole in a socialist state transform not only the lives of its members, but also its ethics and standards of values, when personal interest is subordinated to the common goal of the community. What religious teachers preached came to be practised in the socialist pattern of society in the daily life of the people.

Utopian socialists reacted strongly to the harshness of the capitalist system. They made deep studies, penetrating criticisms and formulated plans for a better world. *Icaria* (1842) was the Utopia of Etienne Cabet of France, a successor of Fourier. It was also the name of his American communist colony in Texas and later in Illinois. Their efforts bore fruit in a limited sense. Some rulers heeded the call and tried out experiments on a small scale believing that miniature social experiments were realistic. Some suppressed all such efforts since their security and well-being lay in maintaining the *status quo*, not in change. They repudiated all political and economic agitation.

But two men were destined to change utopia into a science.

They were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, life-long friends and collaborators in a great intellectual partnership. And they were the inheritors of three main ideological currents of the nineteenth century—classical German philosophy, classical English political economy and French Socialism saturated with French revolutionary doctrine. They were also able to draw conclusions from the lessons of the 1848 revolution in France, Germany, Austria and other European countries.

It was soon after 1825 in Great Britain and France that the word socialism came into use to describe the doctrine of writers who held that a complete transformation of the economic and moral basis of society could be realized only when individual control, and individualistic forces in the organization of life and work of the community were replaced by social control and collective forces.

British Socialism

Robert Owen (1771–1858) generally regarded as the founder of British Socialism was not only the leader of a great working class movement but a critic of the doctrines of orthodox political

economy. He denounced competition as leading to exploitation of labour and advocated a co-operative system *and held that the social character or behaviour of men is the product of environment and education. His **Report to the County of Lamark** (1821) anticipated Marx. Others who held similar views and developed them further were William Thompson (1785-1833) "**The Principles of the Distribution of Wealth most Conducive to human Happiness**"-1824) Thomas Hodgskin "**Labour Defended Against the Claims of Capital**" (1825) and Thomas Spence (1715-1814) the law-reformer who advocated collective ownership of land by local communes which would take over administration in a federated government.

French Socialism

Gabriel Bonnot de Malby and Morelly in the 1760's criticizing the French economic and social institutions prepared the way for the French Revolution. Francois Noel Babeuf's (1760-1797 leader of the *Societe des' égaux*) unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the government in 1793, heralded the modern socialist movement since his **Manifesto** embodied the first practical program calling for socialising of land and industry as imperative measures to complete the revolution begun in 1789. Comte de Saint Simon (1760-1825) and Charles Marie Fourier 1772-1837** keenly aware of the impending revolution in industrial technique and the role of science in human affairs stood for planned organization and control of the new social forces set afoot by political revolution and scientific advance. He held economic evolution to be the key factor in social adjustment. He anticipated Marx in advocating man's obligation to labour and holding that the property relations sustained by any social order conferred on it its special essential character. Louis Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881) imprisoned for over forty years for his revolutionary doctrines headed the extreme left in Paris and was imprisoned by Louis Thiers before the **Commune** (1871) in which his followers played an important role. He advocated the seizure of power by a revolutionary minority influencing the French syndicalist doctrine of *la minorité consciente* and was the leader of a small group of ardent socialist revolutionaries.

*Owen called his communist model societies "Home Colonies."

**Fourier advocated (*phalanstères*) cooperative settlements as the essential unit of social organisation.

P. J. Proudhon (1809–1865) calling himself a socialist and opponent of capitalism, laid stress on personal freedom and revolutionary association. He favoured personal property and inheritance under a moralized system of property right which eschewed exploitation. He advocated *mutuellisme*—classless non-governmental society. He ranks with Mikhail Bakunin as philosophers heralding anarchism.

German Socialism

Up to 1850 socialism developed as a French and British movement. Britain was industrially more evolved and France from the previous century had been the fountain head of revolutionary political ideas. Under the impact of French political and social ideas, German socialism begins with Ludwig Feuerbach (1804–1872) and the left Hegelians like Bruno Bauer (1809–1882), Moses Hess (1812–1875) and Karl Grun (1813–1887) who sought to draw atheistic and revolutionary conclusions from Hegel's philosophy. Karl Rodbertus (1805–1875), in his "**Illumination of the Social Question**" (1875) expounded the subsistence theory of wages and the labour theory of value and proposed state action to increase the worker's share in the product by preventing owners of capital from appropriating the profit accruing from rising productivity. He regarded society as evolving from the wage system to one in which the means of production would be publicly owned and wrote on the theory of economic crises and influenced Marx considerably.

Ferdinand Lassalle (1825–1864) founder of the Universal German Working Men's Association, laid great stress on the theory of the subsistence level of wages which could be changed only if the working class became the employer:—socialization was to be achieved by political agitation and democratic conquest of the state machinery. The state, he held, is the consolidated people. His historic service was to transform the working class from a tail of the bourgeoisie into an independent political party, though he believed the state could be an instrument of social progress based on universal suffrage. Wilhelm Liebknecht (1826–1900) and Auguste Bebel (1840–1913) leaders of the German Social Democratic Party were later Marx's leading supporters.

The 18th century is often described as the Age of Reason. The striking feature of its intellectual life was the way in which religious dogma gave way to a movement towards empiricism. Science had done much to explain the workings of nature.

The material framework of the world had been outlined by Isaac Newton (1642-1727). His ideas which had little effect in his lifetime became after Voltaire's essay on "**Newton's System**" (1737) the premises on which scientific determinism was built. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was influenced by ideas of both Newton and Leibniz (1646-1716) who in turn shared both Francis Bacon's (1561-1626) and Rene Descartes' fundamental tenet of the interdependence of all sciences. They refused the name of knowledge to whatever was doubted, but remained deeply spiritual at heart.

Kant (**Critique of Pure Reason 1781**) the exponent of transcendental idealism held that philosophical rationalism in its extreme form which he called dogmatism is mere uncontrolled play of mere thought. Thoughts without content are empty. Ideas are not independent agents. For genuine knowledge ideas must be correlated and synthesized with reality, substance and cause. Because he held that mind determines the form of reality to us, he called himself a formal or transcendental idealist.

Hegel

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) was opposed to the mechanical interpretation of nature favoured by the physicists and held that reason seeks to transcend fruitlessly the limitations of sense experience. The world as a whole is best conceived in terms of self-conscious mind and thought does not impose form on thought but relates the particular experience with the infinite whole of which it is an expression. Hegel held that a more adequate logic than that of tradition was needed to understand the world as it really is. Traditional logic applied only to the operations of the understanding, resulting only in abstractions, whereas **dialectical logic** did justice both to similarities and differences. The mind does not derive its laws *a priori* from nature but prescribes them to her. Hegel, like Plato, took all knowledge and all existence for his wide periphery. His fundamental thesis that the universe was undergoing a constant change and develop-

ment naturally and inevitably led to the corollary that the struggle against existing wrong and prevalent evil was rooted in the law of eternal development.

Here lies the importance of Hegelian thought at the crossroads of Utopian and scientific socialism—the greatest achievement of classical German philosophy. “The great basic thought”, Engels wrote, “that the world is not to be comprehended as a complex of ready made things, but as a **complex of processes** is now scarcely ever contradicted.” But to acknowledge this fundamental thought in words and to apply it in reality in detail to each domain of investigation are two different things. Dialectical philosophy itself is nothing more than the reflection of this process in the thinking brain. To Marx dialectics is the science of the general laws of motion, both of the external world and of human thought. This integral world conception is also irreconcilable with superstition, reaction or defence of bourgeois oppression.

Marx and Engels (born in 1818 and 1820 in Prussian Tiers and Barmen in Rhine province) both as students of philosophy were admirers of Hegel and acknowledged that in their intellectual development they were indebted to the German philosophers particularly to Hegel.

But Hegel's philosophy was idealistic. From the development of the mind and ideas it deduced the development of nature, man and of human relations. Retaining Hegel's idea of the eternal process of development, Marx and Engels rejected the idealistic view, because, turning to life they saw that explanation of mind must be derived from nature, from matter and not vice versa. Just as material causes underlie natural phenomena, **the development of human society is conditioned by the development of the material and productive forces.** On the development of the productive forces depend the relations into which men enter in production. In these relations lie the explanation of phenomena of social life, ideas, aspirations and laws. Marx grasped the objective laws governing the development of the system of social relations and sought to advocate determinism assuring the victory of the working class whose struggle to Marx was identical with the dialectical conflict of the organisational principles.