Two Superpowers: Equally Enemies of World’s People

In the last issue of Revolution, in the article “On the Three Worlds and the International Situation,” the rulers of the two superpowers, the U.S. and the USSR, are referred to as being “to the same degree and the same extent the main enemies of the world’s people.” Grasping this is essential for making sense of the struggles of the world today, for developing revolutionary strategy and tactics in different countries.

Why did the article use this expression, which is drawn from Enver Hoxha’s report last November to the Seventh Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania? The reasoning is simple—these statements epitomize the fact that the two superpowers are equally the enemies of the international proletariat and the people of the world and represent the main danger to the international unified front against imperialism in this period.

We know the U.S. and the USSR superpower status in the first place is the fact that “no other imperialist power is strong enough to contend as an equal with these two superpowers, especially the U.S. in forming blocks for the purpose of world domination.” (“World War. The Correct Stand Is a Class Division,” reprinted in Ril and Revolution, p. 13.) They are contesting for the throne of chief exploiter and oppressor of the world’s people, using their vast military, economic and political power to “export a whole new way of life” and enshrine them in dependence on finance capital.

Lenin, “A Caricature of Marxism,” CW, Vol. 23, p. 393) Even today, they are still subject to the laws of capitalism not only to seek hegemony over more and more of the world but to try and destroy its rival for that hegemony. For this reason, in the list of lesser imperialist powers, the alignment within the bloc of one of the two superpowers is the most favorable route to expanding their own empires, even though they may have also given rise to competition with the superpowers to an extent. As things continues to develop toward world war, especially war centered in Europe, the superpowers will be forced to line up in the bloc of one or another of the superpowers.

Soviet Union Overall On Offensive

The fact that the U.S. and USSR are equally the main enemies of the world’s people does not deny their rivalry being merely the one, with which the other is essentially indifferent. The rivalry is bilateral, the face-to-face confrontation over a world where every last inch of the world is contested between the imperialists and as such has to take the offensive to seize a larger sphere of influence. The U.S., long an imperialist power, has its feet in Europe and its world war 2 position as indispensable kingpin of the imperialist world and as such is seeking principally to defend what it already grabbed. And, of course, their “un-"en" path have given the superpowers certain different characteristics, which are important to analyze and understand—the U.S. has a stronger, more stable economy, the USSR a more centralized state apparatus, the U.S. has more developed and wealthier allies, the USSR a socialist cover and a better organized fifth column in its rival’s camp, and so on.

The fact that the Soviet Union is the up and coming expansive imperialist power, even the fact that it is more likely that an intercapitalist war will break out with a Soviet attack, does not make it a greater enemy on a world scale. Germany was the “younger and stronger robber” out to “rob the older and overgrown robbers,” but he fought strenuously against the line that there was a single main axis is driven by the enemy in this world struggle. The present situation, with the Soviet Union grown strong enough as an imperialist superpower to go on one on one with the U.S. in a similar fashion to the struggle between the first and second world wars, described by Stalin in his reply to the discussion at the Seventh Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Comintern. “Can it be said that the diminishing difference in the levels of development of the capitalist countries and these two countries is weakening the action of the law of uneven development under imperialism? I, it is not. Does the difference in the levels of development increase or diminish? It undoubtedly diminishes. Does the degree of levelling grow or decline? It certainly grows. Is there not a contradiction between

the growth of levelling and increasing unevenness of development under imperialism? No, there is not. On the contrary, levelling is the background and the basis which makes the increasing unevenness of development under imperialism possible. Only people who, like our opponents, do not consider the economic essence of imperialism can counteract levelling to the law of uneven development under imperialism. It is precisely the levelling that gives momentum to the development of the countries that struggle between countries to outstrip one another, becomes more acute. It is precisely this that creates the possibility for some countries to outstrip others and oust them from the market, thereby creating the preconditions for military conflicts, for the weakening of the capitalist world front and for the breaking of this front by the proletarians of different capitalist countries. He who does not understand this simple matter, understands nothing about the economic essence of monopoly capitalism.” (“On the Opposition, TP, 1934, p. 813-814)

The unevenness of development between the U.S. and the USSR has led to a situation where these two superpowers now are the main enemies of the world’s people. The slicing of the imperialist pie which followed World War 2 no longer reflects the actual situation in the world. The division between this division and the uneven development that has actually taken place since can only be resolved by a new war to reorder the world—unlcss the contradiction itself is resolved by the overthrow by the proletariat and its allies of the imperialist rulers of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Analyze Particularities

Related to the question of uneven development is the fact that the existence of two main enemies on a world scale has different particularities in different countries. As emphasized in the article in last month’s Revolution, “revolution is waged and won country by country,” and the proletariat’s party in every country must analyze what the target of its struggle is and how to strike at that target. And this analysis cannot be correct unless it is made taking into account the overall world situation. In one or the other of the superpowers, the target is obviously the ruling class of that country. In lesser imperialist states of Europe, Japan, Australia, and so on (also called the Second World), the situation 8 that the working class has to focus on the overthrowing of the “young” monopoly capitalist class and as one part of this task, while opposing both the U.S. and the Soviet Union, in particular emphasizing on opposing that superpower with which the ruling class is aligned.

In the numerous developing countries of the Third World, the struggle against the superpowers takes a different number of different forms, and foreign imperial powers often present themselves as the main and immediate enemy of the revolutionary struggle. For example, in Angola, the masses cannot win victory without

drawing out the New Czars and their Cuban triggerman while in south Korea, it is the U.S. which imposes the vicious Pak Jung Huh puppet regime on the country. Thus, while it is necessary to oppose and bewail both superpowers, the particularities frequently call for concentrating against one or the other.

This is the case even with the People’s Republic of China, which is a country of the third world but also a socialist state under the rule of the working class. While this means China is not represented by imperialism or enmeshed in dependence on finance capital, it also means that the rulers of both superpowers have no implemenable hatred for and deeply rooted fear of what New China represents and would like to see it destroyed. But in today’s world it is the Soviet Union which poses the greatest threat to China for a variety of reasons—geographical proximity, the defeats inflicted on U.S. imperialism in Asia, China’s exposure by propaganda and by example of the New Czars’ socialistoven, the USSR’s overall position of being on the offensive, etc. As the RCP has repeatedly emphasized, it is both correct and necessary for the Chinese government, the proletariat in power, to focus more of its attention on the greater menace— to China—of the Soviet Union while supporting and building the struggle of the world’s people against both superpowers.

CPI(M)’s Self-Exposing Tricks

To further clarify the importance of understanding why the superpowers are both tough together the heart of the target of the international unified front against imperialism, it is instructive to turn to the “Communist Party of India (Marxist)” as the October League has taken to billing itself. Happily, the mutation seems to have preserved intact the OLC’s valuable role as teacher by negative example.

Recent articles in the Calcutta weekly, Calcutta, have been the CPI(M)’s theoretical wizards directing a number of new spells and incantations at the correct analyticist and activists outlined above. The brute of their argument is attributing to the RCP a “theory of equilibrium” — the quotation marks presumably aimed at duping readers into believing this is some kind of quote from the RCP. They object strenuously to the “same extent and same degree" formulation and our analysis of this question because it exposes their familiar nonsense about
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Continued from Page 5 how the Soviet Union is much more dangerous than the United States. It is not primarily an American warning class "main blow internationally" etc. For people who consider themselves revolutionaries is one of the greatest topics of the world's people to take up this line is, as the RCP has pointed out in the past, a disgraceful exercise in conscious sabotage and counter-revolution. Now the CPML has tried to counterattack. They are out to prove that the RCP's position is "mechanical"... (illegible) and is not a clear position of the CPML as being "exactly the same" and in a state of "equi- librium," thus denying uneven development.

The "debate" (March 1977), au thored by E. Khrushchev, commences its case by taking an article in the April Revolution which describes how the "peaceful coexistence" in the Soviet Union appears to be equal to the two superpowers and is a clear sign of their increas ing drive toward war. The author never answers this article, other than to say that the USSR has armed at a faster rate than the U.S. in recent years—a point the piece in Revolution also makes.

What the Great Struggle article does is to extricate from the RCP's position on the arms race that the party believes "the two superpowers stand equal in the world today, but this is not even true of the staggering inequality in their strengths and weaknesses." Words like "exactly equal" and "perfectly counter-balanced" are used to explain the illusory metaphysics to the correct analysis of this question.

E. Khrushchev then goes on to assert that "the RCP fails to see the unity of imperialism's war against the uneven development among the imperialist powers." Who is this supposed to fool?

In the writing of the letter, the words "anti-war" and "anti-imperialist" are dropped—adding to the Revolutionairy Union before it—this point is made repeatedly. So pro-capitalist Capitalism Has Been "Replaced in the Soviet Union and What This" Meant for the World War, published in 1974, which "is the first of the capitalist state's insidious attempts to confuse the theory of equilibrium, or the Revolution articles from 1975 and 1976 reprinted in the War and Revolution pamphlet.

More serious than the CPML's dishonesty, however, is the blind stupidity and its own opportunism has produ ced. The author next quotes the following comments to the SCI during the great straddle article: Stalin's point as it happens, relates their position entirely. The picture however, "describes the current situation with the USSR forging ahead to challenge its declining rival on every front. It is the CPML who like the opposition socialists have a "myopic and headlong ideology towards an equal society, the CPML in fact opposes the building of a B-1 or favors it as a way to delay the onslaught of war."

The logic of the CPML to predict the development of a superpower, which they dare not admit, nonetheless leads inexorably to open collaboration with their own bourgeois ideology in the name of helping the international proletariat and its allies defeat their "most dangerous" enemy. It is poison enough in the U.S.S.R., but they have the nerve to preach that revolutions in other countries, in the same situation, is even more volatile and complex, should take up their stand against the parties of the capitalist dominated state, and deliver their "main blow internationally" to the "main danger" of the Soviet Union. This, from whom erosion, the creeping and the overthrow of the U.S.S.R. ruling class!

A final example of the importance of grasping that the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.S.R. is the only people to an equal extent is provided by recent events in Ethiopia. For years the dominant imperialist power in the industry was the Soviet Union with the small feudal emperor Haile Selassie and the devo, the "revo- lutionary" military junta which replaced him, seizing power a few years ago during the revolutionary struggle by the Ethiopian and Eritrean masses. To have portrayed the U.S. as the main enemy of the people's po pulation, the Ethiopian masses, it would have been impossible to predict or understand the devo's recent switching of superpower masters to the Soviet Union, which has replaced the U.S. as sponsor of the devo's desperate efforts to crush the Eritrean rebellion and the struggle of the Ethiopian people.

To conclude from this, however, that the Soviet Union is the main enemy of or main danger to the world's people would be an equally serious error. Laving of the U.S.A. attempts to use the Soviet Union's Ethiopian commitment as a lever to dissolve its other holds in the Horn of Africa and the Arabian Peninsula, the U.S. also intensifies its activities in the area. Together with a number of European powers, it is trying to test puppets in and seeking to influence the Ethiopian movement. The U.S. interests in Eritrea and Ethiopia's strategy and struggle of the Ethiopian masses to its advan tage, is bankrupting the phony Ethiopian Democratic Union and has succeeded in dividing the international sections of the Ethiopian countryside. With the devo increasingly shaky and revolutionary ferment growing, the United States is now trying to isolate the Tigrinya and whirpool past both of which the Eritrean and Ethiopia masses must navigate in order to win victory in their revolution.

Revolution is made and won country by country and it is the task of revolutionaries in every country to de velop a strategy of revolution and a program for the specific conditions of the world on which it is fought. A country for which there are no solutions while a world revolution is the only one which should first in a new war and so on. And of course there are those who will hold up the opposite policy, the same policy, equally sham Marxist-Leninists like the German Communist who will come up with a dozen reasons for letting the Soviets in, but the look the devo, is the dominant imperialist power in the world, it is the biggest backer of outlaw regimes like Israel and South Africa etc.

The fact remains that what the working class and its allies, in the U.S.S.R. and worldwide, is needed is a clear and concrete class analysis of conditions internation ally and in each country. That analysis tells us that on a world scale there are two main enemies of the masses and the only one that estimate either one in the slightest degree is a mistake of the greatest proportions.

Arms...

Continued from Page 11 fensive strategic posture; neutron warheads, if they are introduced, will only improve the ability of NATO to defend Western Europe from a Soviet attack, and even offer a greater possibility of a successful counterattack to Soviet forces. Each such improvement by the U.S. will be met by an attempt to counter it by the Soviet Union, each such improvement by the Soviet Union is matched by a corresponding improvement by the U.S., this is a necessary part of their rivalry for world domination.

The object of a war is to destroy the two superpowers and their blocs, besides victory, is the successful pro tection of their own means of production. If Western Europe and the U.S.A. want to be able to maintain a clear, clear exchange, any victory at the front lines would be very hollow, indeed, no matter how bad off the Soviet Union was. The two superpowers are not suited to this kind of protection. Neutron warheads over West Germany, or East Germany should NATO, must go "busting" destroying the city every other weapon, will keep the prize intact. Cruise missiles, with their increased first strike capability, offer them the hope of catching Soviet missiles in their silos, saving the U.S.S.R. capitalization factories, or, at least, more than previously could be hoped for.

The hue and cry about "defence" and "go ing slow in arms production" the neutron bomb and B-3 decisions are clear expulsions of the escalating imperial war preparations of both the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.S.R.