

Chinese Revisionists to Revise Verdict on Soviets?

"The Chinese Communist Party has circulated an important document to officials that concludes that the Soviet party should no longer be viewed as revisionist, according to knowledgeable Chinese sources."

Thus a November 10 article in the *New York Times*. If true, this development would mark another total reversal of and attack on Mao Tsetung. It would also mark a major preparatory step by the Chinese revisionists toward caving in to their Soviet revisionist counterparts. And this would be a major event

indeed in world strategic alignments for World War 3. The reason for these developments is clear. In an August 3 *RW* article "When Will China Play the China Card?" which predicted these changes, we quoted Mao speaking right to the heart of the matter: "Those who practice revisionism internally are bound to practice capitulation externally."

The likely truth behind the *Times* article is apparent from other, similar, recent developments in China. For some time, there has been little or no

criticism in the Chinese press of the *revisionism*, the total betrayal of revolutionary Marxism, of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The USSR is blasted only for its "hegemonism," its military designs and aggressiveness. One good reason for the new Chinese rulers' silence on Soviet revisionism is ironically pointed to in the *Times* article: "Peking's willingness to drop the revisionist label also helps the Government avoid the problem of explaining to the people that the Chinese party has not also become revi-

sionist...."

In the major speech last month at the ceremonies marking the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, in recounting the new rulers' revisionist view of the history of China since liberation, there is no mention at all of the historic battle waged by the Chinese Communist Party under Mao's leadership against Soviet revisionism. Instead, there is only the strangely polite reference to "...the scrapping of con-

Continued on page 16

Sino-Soviet

Continued from page 3

tracts and withdrawal of specialists (in the early 1960s—*RW*) by the Government of the Soviet Union" (only bad policy by "the Government," perhaps, with no blame attaching to the Soviet Communist Party?).

At almost the same time, a Chinese delegation arrived in Moscow to begin talks with the USSR on a broad range of differences between the two. This is the first attempt at such talks in 16 years, and the delegation head Wang announced upon arrival that "the Chinese and Soviet people have built and developed a profound friendship over long years of common revolutionary struggle." Of course the reference is carefully made to the two peoples and not to their governments or the two parties, but even so, how can there have been "common revolutionary struggle" when the people of the Soviet Union were under the heel of the revisionists, the new class of

capitalists, ruling through a fascist state apparatus, while at the same time the Chinese people (before Mao's death) really were broadly mobilized in revolutionary struggle *against* a new bourgeoisie? It is clear that the Soviets have been putting on the pressure in these talks—and one price they might demand of China is openly repudiating Mao Tsetung—the implacable foe of Soviet revisionism and capitalism.

There have been some other little things as well. When Hua made his recent tour of Europe (see article, page 11), he made a point of meeting with Berlinguer, head of the revisionist Communist Party of Italy. Of course, this Italian party makes a point of its independence from the Soviet Union, but it is still definitely part of the network of revisionist parties that has its headquarters in Moscow. And the recent arrests of dissidents in Peking have all the flavor of similar events in Moscow—the same combination of unleashing bourgeois liberalism on the one hand, while repressing those who go too far in ad-

vocating it on the other.

Then there has been the whole series of rehabilitations of Chinese former high officials who were toppled by the struggles of the masses during the Cultural Revolution and earlier. Besides their revisionism, what most of these had in common was a strong affinity for the Soviet Union. Primary among these is Liu Shao-chi, branded as "China's Khrushchev," during the Cultural Revolution, an epithet which cut two ways, for not only was he the highest-ranking leader of the bourgeois headquarters in China, he was also closely tied to the Soviet Union in many ways. Now, although Liu has not been formally rehabilitated, this is clearly in the works, and his policies and programs (as well as he himself) have been publicly praised by the new Chinese rulers.

If all this is indeed in the works, then it's only a few short Chinese revisionist hops to abandoning the label of "hegemonism" attached to the Soviets as well. After all, if the Soviet Union is

still socialist, then "hegemonism" must be the result of the bad policies of a few leaders. And, after all, Brezhnev is quite old and reportedly very sick. . . .

If all this is true, then the behavior of such loyal Chinese revisionist lackeys around the world (such as the CPML in this country) should be hilarious to follow. Not that we doubt for a minute that the leaders of such outfits will have any *principles* that keep them from tagging along after their Chinese mentors. They have clearly demonstrated that for years now. After all, if Yugoslavia has been labeled socialist, why not the Soviet Union?

But the real difficulty for these revisionist rubber men has nothing to do with changing their political positions. They've just staked their political careers on wrapping themselves in the patriotic flag of opposing the Soviet Union ahead of opposing the United States. And changing *that* should be an interesting flip to watch.

We'll have more to say as things unfold. ■