

is that the Chinese CP leadership did not attack it. In fact, if a transition from a planned and centralized economy to bourgeois restoration had taken place in the USSR, the focal point or so-called qualitative change should have been somewhere between 1956 and 1958. One of the exponents of the theory of capitalist restoration, Martin Nicolaus, places the time of the transition in that period. But the Chinese leadership certainly gave no hint of it then at all, nor did this presumed counter-revolution attract the attention of revolutionary Marxist-Leninists within the communist movement sufficiently to raise it as a political or theoretical problem. As a matter of fact, Mao Tse-tung, in a speech at the Sixth Plenum of the Eighth Central Committee, on Dec. 19, 1958, said, "The seven-year plan proposed by Khrushchev is a preparation to enter communism."

By in fact first supporting the Khrushchev report, then whitewashing the expulsion of the so-called anti-Party Group headed by Malenkov, Kaganovich, and Molotov, and closing their eyes to the decentralization danger inherent in Khrushchev's adventure in the field of economics, the Chinese leadership pursued a revisionist position and strengthened revisionism on an international scale.

It resumed a revolutionary polemical struggle against the USSR leadership later on, but this was halted with the deterioration of the polemic into a state-to-state struggle which increasingly assumed the character of nationalist rivalry.

How else can one explain the USSR's unqualified support for the capitalist regime in India (among others) and China's equally unqualified support for Pakistan? The support of the Gandhi regime or of Bhutto's regime by either of the two great socialist countries would be justified only if the support were directed to aid these regimes in the struggle against imperialism while helping the workers in these countries against the landlords and capitalists. Such aid would be calculated not to impede the struggle for proletarian revolution there.

Angola in light of earlier errors

The Chinese leaders' position on Angola and on the class definition of the USSR must be seen in the light of China's previous positions during the early days of Khrushchev's rise to power, which were not at all what they are now made out to be. If it can be seen that the Chinese leadership erred then, it is all the

easier to understand its errors in a period when it is involved in a state-to-state struggle with the USSR, a struggle which has completely deteriorated into utterly false polemics of which Angola is only one manifestation.

Class defense and political criticism

This does not, however, mean that either the Soviet Union or China has ceased to be a workers' state. On the contrary. In a certain sense both of these two great socialist countries have made enormous progress in socialist construction and in the betterment of the lot of the workers and the mass of the people in general. It is important to recognize that while it is most necessary to carry on a clear and unambiguous struggle against the revisionism of the Soviet bureaucracy as well as the revisionism of the Chinese leadership, it is equally important to affirm the progressive class character of both China and the USSR as workers' states.

Both the struggle against revisionism and the struggle for the defense of China and the USSR are two class truths that are not in contradiction to each other but flow organically from the dual and contradictory social character of both China and the USSR—both born in extremely hostile world environments, but both nevertheless progressive social systems infinitely superior to any capitalist country, no matter how "democratic" it may be.

The task of defending all the socialist countries as well as all oppressed people in the struggle against imperialism and particularly imperialist aggression is a paramount duty which no proletarian revolutionary organization can dare to forsake.