

dismantling of the Cultural Revolution. Even during that period, when the U.S. politically attacked China most vehemently, it was out of fear of the revolutionary repercussions of the Cultural Revolution that the U.S. directed its blows against China. Nevertheless, even during that entire period, the main enemy in the eyes of the imperialists was still the USSR precisely because of its formidable strength as a socialist country and, as we said, its tremendous potential for aid on a worldwide basis in the struggle against imperialism. This has not been the case with China.

It is not only due to the underdeveloped state of the economy in China. It is that China, for a variety of reasons, has never become the center for the worldwide revolutionary movement the way the Soviet Union became after the Bolshevik Revolution the central source for revolutionary energy, determination, political line, and of course, where possibly, material support.

During the trying days when the Chinese leadership met with the Soviet leaders in early 1950, the bourgeoisie, especially the U.S. media, were daily pouring out a barrage of propaganda calculated to show the so-called divergent interests between China and the USSR and the imminence of a split.

The negotiations between the USSR and China proved most difficult. But in a document in 1950 we addressed ourselves to that very point, to the question of whether temporary, ephemeral, and narrow interests would triumph over the broader class interests which united the workers and peasants of both countries.

BROAD CLASS INTERESTS SAME FOR BOTH CHINA AND USSR

We answered no. We based ourselves not on speculation born out of abstract theoretical premises but on the hard realities of the day, the urgent need in the struggle against the common enemy—imperialism—and that the current of history favors the triumph of these class interests over narrow interests championed in both China and the USSR.

For well-nigh two decades our thesis seemed to hold, at least insofar as open military hostilities were concerned. Today the current of history is running stronger than ever for the triumph of the broad class interests of the workers and peasants.

Everywhere there are giant leaps in technology, in science, in communication, in all the modern fields of scientific endeavor, the groundwork is laid more and more firmly for cooperation and solidarity of the international working class, of the toilers of all lands and of all nationalities. It is the weight of oppression, of exploitation, and the divisive policy of finance capital which holds down the solidarity of the working class and oppressed. The organic tendencies in contemporary society surge constantly and incessantly forward toward unification on the basis of socialist solidarity.

Everywhere the effort of the bourgeoisie to construct a bogus internationalism is proved to be a fraud because it represents the carnivorous tendencies of the transnational corporations and not the mass of the people. It exists on the back of the people like an incubus, a parasite, and does not permit the truly giant strides in industry, science, and technology to move forward for the benefit of humanity, but holds them back and seeks to shift them in the direction of imperialist war.

All of this happens independently of the will of the imperialists. And it is the fear of the imperialists which at bottom has caused in the socialist countries the dislocation, chaos, and sabotage of what can truly be fraternal, cooperative efforts to lay the foundations for a socialist commonwealth from the tip of the Korean peninsula to the edges of the Baltic Sea.

The bourgeoisie is only too mindful of the latent possibilities inherent in the social structures of China, the USSR, and other socialist countries, including those in Southeast Asia, Cuba in Latin America, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, and the progressive democratic regime in Afghanistan, for a peaceful socialist alliance based on an identity of fundamental interests to oppose the incursions, military threats, and interventionist policy of imperialism.

Most dangerous to the fortunes of imperialism is the revival of a genuine normalization of Sino-Soviet relations, which could proceed to a formalized socialist detente between the two giant socialist countries.

IMPERIALISTS FEAR LATENT POSSIBILITY OF SOCIALIST DETENTE

If it is possible to have a detente, a genuine detente, that is, between the USSR and imperialism, as the Soviet leadership has for so