

agreement or at least the initial stages of such an agreement, much broader than the joint communique on Taiwan, was the result of the trip.

One of the first moves of the new Soviet state in 1917 was to make public all the secret agreements made by the Czar. "Open diplomacy" was a principle of Leninism that received an immediate response from the masses all over the world, who have been the object of history for so many centuries. This principle was long ago abandoned by the revisionist Soviet leadership.

It is because any socialist country, and especially one with a great revolutionary tradition, carries such great moral authority with the progressive masses of the world that its every act must be judged first and foremost by these criteria: does it help raise the class consciousness of the masses; does it inspire them to struggle against the class enemy — in this case, the worst enemy of humanity, as the Chinese themselves have so often called U.S. imperialism? Judged from this viewpoint, it is only too clear that the abrupt turn in China's attitude toward the U.S. can do nothing but confuse the masses and sap the energies of the vanguard.

(There is, of course, a plus in the fact that people in this country are finally getting a glimpse at the stunning accomplishments of the Chinese Revolution. Many of the lies about China were demolished by the photographic evidence of healthy, energetic people living in a modern society.)

DIFFER WITH POLICY BUT CONTINUE TO SUPPORT SOCIALIST STATE

Workers World's analysis of the revisionist turn in China's foreign policy should not be confused with the hysterical accusations being heaped on the People's Republic by those parties that do not support her socialist economic foundations nor have any respect for the great revolutionary accomplishments of her leaders. We have been unswerving supporters of China since the establishment of this great socialist state. We welcomed China's revolutionary criticism of the Soviet Union's revisionist role, and the pages of this newspaper have reprinted many of the most significant Chinese statements attacking class conciliation and capitulation to imperialism in the international communist movement.

We exposed India's attempts at aggression (encouraged by U.S. imperialism) in the border dispute, at a time when the Indian Communist Party (pro-Moscow) entirely supported the Nehru government. Workers World saw in the Cultural Revolution a mighty attempt to disintegrate a movement that would restore class privilege, and eventually capitalist rule.

Furthermore, our support of the People's Republic of China as a socialist state, as a society where the privileged ruling classes have been expropriated and their mechanism of rule shattered, remains unshakeable despite our disagreement with the policies of the leadership.

But this new page in world relationships—brought about under the tremendous pressure of imperialism, still so vastly wealthy even though in social eclipse, combined with the hostility of the Soviet revisionists — demands more than ever that serious revolutionaries sharpen the tools of Marxism-Leninism, perceive the validity of the class struggle, and continue to prepare themselves and the masses for the social cataclysms that will inevitably accompany the break-up of this decaying system.

WWP LEADER FORESAW POSSIBLE SINO-U.S. AGREEMENT

At the 1966 Labor Day Conference of Workers World Party, Chairman Sam Marcy discussed the then-theoretical possibility that the Sino-Soviet split might drive China into an agreement with U.S. imperialism:

"If the ideological struggle between the Chinese party and the Soviet revisionists deepens and becomes a struggle between states, then it is possible that People's China may make a pact with the U.S. against the USSR. This would be a modern version of the Stalin-Hitler Pact."

Comrade Marcy explained that such a development would not change the attitude of the WWP toward People's China itself. Workers World would defend China against imperialism even though we disagreed with the policy, just as we defended the Soviet Union while attacking the way in which the Stalin-Hitler Pact was carried out.

"What we opposed in Stalin at that time," said Comrade Marcy, "was not the principle of his right to enter into an agreement with an imperialist nation. What we opposed was the way it was done — the secrecy, the shock to the proletarian forces, his painting up of the enforced agreement as a great thing and his softening of his previous position against Hitler as a result.

"Similarly, after Hitler broke the pact and turned his guns on the Soviet Union, we opposed Stalin's painting up the imperialist democracies. We opposed his demoralizing the world proletariat with the idea that the democratic imperialists were fundamentally superior to the fascist imperialists, although of course we defended the Soviet Union against the fascists. Stalin's position seriously weakened the conscious forces of world revolution and in the long run eroded the revolutionary role of the Soviet Union on the world arena."