

U.S., and most of all the key Italian CP, then under the leadership of Togliatti. It is to be noted that on July 6, when the Peking newspapers carried the CPSU resolution of June 30 on the 20th Congress, which amplified the Khrushchev report, they also carried a lengthy assessment of the 20th Congress and the Stalin question by Togliatti.

The Togliatti article (contained in a collection) is important because of the inferences which he drew from the 20th Congress. Togliatti's party, although long on the road of reformism, was now taking a head-long leap in that direction. Moreover, Togliatti drew the conclusion that it was not merely the mistakes of Stalin and his repressions that were involved, but the whole Soviet system. Implied in Togliatti's conclusions was that the class nature of the Soviet state itself was in doubt.

The evolution of the USSR under Stalin certainly could give one grounds for questioning the class character of the USSR, but such a step would have to be bolstered by Marxist analysis and factual data. What Togliatti did, however, was to draw the inference, which Khrushchev's report clearly lent itself to, that the Soviet state was undergoing a bourgeois degeneration. Hence—what ultimate conclusion by Togliatti? Since the Soviet Union was undergoing a bourgeois degeneration, and might in fact be a bourgeois state, an imperialist bourgeois democracy was preferable! The so-called "Italian road" to socialism began to take on a new momentum. Abandonment of class struggle and the renunciation along with it of the perspective of proletarian revolution was on the order of the day.

When the Chinese leadership finally decided to open the offensive against Khrushchev revisionism, the historical moment for a giant shift in a revolutionary direction, and away from Khrushchev revisionism, had in fact evaporated.

Thus, the brilliant revolutionary polemics of the Chinese CP leadership, such as "The Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us," etc., only influenced a small current in the communist movement.

Not only, however, did the Chinese leadership fail to grasp the historical moment during the period when Khrushchev's report was receiving worldwide attention and agitating the international communist movement.

Two very important events occurred which the CCP leadership

also failed to take advantage of or to raise to the level of a public polemic.

The "Anti-Party group"

The first was the expulsion of Molotov, Kaganovich, and Malenkov from the Central Committee of the Soviet CP, when they were indicted politically on such charges as "conspiring against the peaceful coexistence" theories of Khrushchev and on a whole series of other charges which, whatever their validity, certainly merited a public hearing, especially in the light of Khrushchev's ostentatious and hypocritical demagoguery concerning collective leadership and a renewal of inner-party democracy.

Also, two of the three leaders of the so-called "Anti-Party group" were the last of the Old Guard in the Bolshevik party. Aside from the fact that they may have degenerated along with the other leaders, arraigning them under an indictment in which they were supposed to have conspired against the theory of peaceful coexistence in and of itself made it an international question. The CCP leadership, however, evaded the issue. Instead the Chinese press merely reprinted Pravda's indictment, which was taken to mean complete approval.

Finally, Khrushchev had embarked in 1957 on a dangerous economic course with a vast and complicated scheme of economic decentralization, which had dangerous implications for the fate of the planned, socialized economy of the USSR, one of the fundamental pillars of a workers' state. Dangerous though Khrushchev's initial adventurous thrust into the reorganization of the Soviet economy was, it by no means became fatal, as the Maoist economists, using latter-day wisdom, are now saying. For a whole lot of political as well as economic reasons, Khrushchev had to back off to a considerable degree in *practice*. The significance attached to Khrushchev's decentralization plan by those who are now promoting the theory that a capitalist restoration has taken place in the Soviet Union is not at all warranted, as bourgeois economists soon realized to their chagrin.

Gave no hint of bourgeois restoration

The important point, however, about the decentralization plan