

After the termination of the war, the Bolsheviks began a whole series of agreements with imperialist powers and also resumed contacts and discussions with the leaders of the Second International, even though they continued a most resolute and irreconcilable struggle against counter-revolutionary Social Democracy.

More than anything, China needs to free itself from military encirclement and to avoid war on two fronts. What could be more helpful in that respect than a more or less definitive settlement of the border issue which would relieve both socialist countries of the necessity of concentrating huge military forces against each other, rather than having them in combat readiness against the imperialist powers? It is impossible for anyone but an incurable dogmatist to arrive at any other conclusion.

.....

Revisionism as an ideology and opportunism as practice has long been dominant in the Soviet Union. It antedates the split with the Chinese CP. But the conclusion that Soviet society has undergone a basic transformation in the sense that a new possessing class has taken firm hold of the reins of society and is running it on the basis of imperialist, that is, bourgeois private property interests in the epoch of imperialist decay is a falsification of history which will not long withstand the test of time.

REVISIONISM IS NOT IMPERIALISM

The Soviet bureaucracy has many traits in common with imperialist politicians. But it also is the representative of a developing social system, although it is burdened with many retrogressive features which are all too obvious. It needs peace for further development, whereas the real imperialists need war for sheer survival. The difference between the Soviet and imperialist systems is of fundamental concern to the world proletariat even if the political policies pursued by the current Soviet leadership are in the main erroneous and a departure from Marxism-Leninism.

There are many reasons why the talks in Peking may blow up. And the political character of the Soviet leadership is probably the most important obstacle to a mutually satisfactory agreement. But the art of conducting a revolutionary policy in the field of relations between states lies precisely in analyzing the social contradictions in each of the states with which a revolutionary government has to deal; in the case of the Soviet Union the contrast between the Soviet bureaucracy and the Socialist system of the U.S.S.R.

CHINA ASKS FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

The government of the People's Republic of China has stated that it

has taken the initiative in starting these talks. On Oct. 7, 1969, the People's Republic of China said, "The Chinese Government has never covered up the fact that there exist irreconcilable differences of principle between China and the Soviet Union and that the struggle of principle between them will continue for a long period of time." The phrase "irreconcilable differences of principle" is an oblique allusion to the existence of the ideological struggle on a party-to-party basis, which would be totally irrelevant in a diplomatic document if the Chinese CP somehow, in the back of its mind, did not still regard the Soviet Union as a socialist state rather than an imperialist power. Otherwise, why allude to the ideological question? These are carefully chosen words. They are an absolutely correct statement of the Marxist-Leninist approach regarding the ideological struggle between the leadership of the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union.

"But this," continues the document "should not prevent China and the Soviet Union from maintaining normal state relations on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. The Chinese Government has consistently held that the Sino-Soviet boundary question should be settled peacefully, and even if it cannot be settled for the time being, the status quo of the border should be maintained and there should definitely be no resort to the use of force. There is no reason whatsoever for China and the Soviet Union to fight a war over the boundary question," the statement concludes.

This statement completely coincides with the views expressed by Workers World Party at the outbreak of the hostilities between China and the Soviet Union and contained in the March 20, 1969 edition of **WORKERS WORLD**.