

UC Merced

TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World

Title

Doubts and Puzzles: Young Galeano Writing about New China during the Sino-Soviet Split

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4m47z5f7>

Journal

TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World, 9(3)

ISSN

2154-1353

Author

Teng, Wei

Publication Date

2020

DOI

10.5070/T493048195

Copyright Information

Copyright 2020 by the author(s). This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Doubts and Puzzles: Young Galeano Writing about New China during the Sino-Soviet Split

WEI TENG
SOUTH CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY

Abstract

As a journalist of Uruguay's *Marcha* weekly newspaper, Eduardo Galeano visited China in September 1963; he was warmly received by Chinese leaders including Premier Zhou Enlai. At first, Galeano published some experiences of his China visit in *Marcha*. In 1964, he published the complete journal of the trip, under the title of *China, 1964: crónica de un desafío* [*China 1964: Chronicle of a Challenge*]. Based on Chinese-language materials, this paper explores Galeano's trip to China at that time and includes a close reading of Galeano's travel notes. By analyzing his views on the New China, Socialism, and the Sino-Soviet Split, we will try to determine whether this China visit influenced his world view and cultural concepts.

Keywords: Galeano, The New China, Sino-Soviet Split

Resumen

Como periodista del semanario uruguayo *Marcha*, Eduardo Galeano visitó China en septiembre de 1963 donde fue calurosamente recibido por los líderes chinos, incluido el Primer Ministro Zhou Enlai. Al principio, Galeano publicó algunas experiencias de su visita a China en *Marcha*. En 1964, publicó el diario completo del viaje bajo el título *China, 1964: crónica de un desafío*. Basado en materiales en chino, este artículo explora el viaje de Galeano e incluye una lectura detallada de sus notas. Por medio de un análisis de sus puntos de vista sobre la Nueva China, el socialismo y la ruptura sinosoviética, se intenta determinar si esta visita a China influyó en su visión del mundo y en sus conceptos culturales.

Palabras clave: Galeano, Nueva China, ruptura sinosoviética

Arrival in China

In 1963, the People's Republic of China (PRC, henceforth China) celebrated its fourteenth anniversary since its inception. Eduardo Galeano, at the age of twenty-three, was invited to visit China and attend the National Day celebration as representative of the Uruguayan press and cultural circles. Back then, China had not yet established diplomatic relations with Uruguay because the latter maintained diplomatic relations with the Kuomintang regime in Taiwan. Not only

Uruguay, but most of Latin American maintained the same policy. Given Cold War politics, China was unable to gain recognition from almost all Latin American governments. But, sharing the hemisphere with the United States, Latin America occupied a unique and significant strategic position that almost demanded that China make an effort to secure official relations. At that time, Mao Zedong pointed out: “We welcome Brazil and any Latin American countries that are willing to establish diplomatic relations with China. Even if not for diplomacy, we also welcome business dealings; if not for business, common contact is also welcomed”¹ (Mao 372). During the first ten years of its establishment, China’s strategy on Latin America was “Small water runs long; steady steps move forward”² (Huang 52). Laid out by Zhou Enlai, the plan to establish diplomatic exchanges with Latin America was based on the notion that: “Actively carry out people-to-people diplomacy, forge a friendly relationship, develop cultural and economic exchanges towards diplomatic relations”³ (Huang 52). At that time, the leadership agreed that it would be significant if China could find a political “crack” in Latin America to break through the United States’ blockade. That is why the Chinese government valued civil diplomacy with Latin America; for example, Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai granted audiences to many non-governmental Latin Americans who were invited to visit China. Notable Latin American leftwing cultural figures such as Pablo Neruda, Nicolás Guillén, and Miguel Ángel Asturias visited China and contributed to broaden cultural communication between China and their countries.⁴

The two major forms of civil diplomacy between China and Latin America consisted of cultural exchanges and economic undertakings—this was the approach of China towards Uruguay—. According to the Chinese official record, Uruguayan writer Jesualdo Sosa, singer Virginia Castro, and tennis player Eduardo Argon visited China in the 1950s, as well as academics, journalists, and filmmakers. China also sent a group of its artists (1956) and an acrobatic troupe (1958) to visit Uruguay and both were greeted by the Chairman of the General Assembly of Uruguay. In 1959, the Chinese Cultural Association of Uruguay was founded in Montevideo to further promote cultural exchanges between the two nations. In 1959 and 1960, the Uruguayan Association for Friendship and Cultural Exchange with China sent representatives to attend the National Day celebrations (Sun and Lin, *Brief History of New China Cultural Exchange with Foreign Countries* 217). Inviting foreign guests through civil societies to attend National Day celebrations is

a common practice of civil diplomacy in China. In 1963, along with Galeano, another fifteen Latin American guests were invited, including Apparício Torelly (founder of the Brazilian newspaper *A Manhã*), Heloísa Leite de Medeiros (widow of Brazilian writer Graciliano Ramos), Chilean poet Fernando González Urizar, Mexican graphic artist Andrea Gómez, and the Uruguayan economist Guillermo Bernhard, et al. (“Our Friends All over the World: Foreign Guests from over Eighty Countries of Six Continents Join National Day Celebration”).

“It is the last days of September of 63; the plane, at the end of a long, long journey against the sun, arrives in Beijing”⁵ (Galeano, *China 1964* 9). This was Galeano’s first trip outside Latin America and he went far, all the way to the Far East. He stayed in China for over a month, then spent another month in the Soviet Union and, eventually, arrived in the former Czechoslovakia. In China, he attended the National Day celebration with 2000 people:

My hand was one of the two thousand and five hundred right hands that I reached out on the night of October 1 at the door of Tian Anmen, while the fireworks exploded in the sky. The revolutionary government had turned 14-year-old, and the people danced and sang in the streets of Beijing.⁶ (*China 1964* 153)

Besides Beijing, he visited various provinces such as Hebei, Hubei, Jiangsu, Zhejiang and Guangdong. He not only went sightseeing in major cities such as Shanghai, Wuhan, Nanjing and Hangzhou, but also visited the people’s communes. Participating in the usual events programmed for foreign visitors (Peking opera, acrobatics, Chinese cuisine and the Forbidden Palace), Galeano added to his trip a special objective—to discover the “real” China—. To that end, he seized every opportunity to interview common Chinese people as, for example, a Liberation Army soldier, a farmer, a worker, a student, a teacher and a *Ganbu* (cadre of the Chinese Civil Service). On 8 October 1963, Vice Premier Bo Yibo welcomed Galeano and Guillermo Bernhard (“Vice Premier Bo Yibo Met Uruguayan Guests”). On 4 November, Premier Zhou Enlai met with Galeano at the Beijing Hotel for an interview (“Premier Zhou Enlai Met Uruguayan *Marcha* Weekly’s Journalist”). The session lasted over an hour, which was unusual given that Galeano was simply a young Uruguayan journalist. That Zhou Enlai, occupied with matters of state, would allow for such a lengthy interview meant that he took this *Marcha* journalist seriously. Galeano, Andrea Gómez, and other Latin American guests would later attend a banquet hosted by Zhou (Rothwell 21).

Back in Uruguay, Galeano recorded his China experience in a book, *China 1964*, that was published in March 1964 by Jorge Álvarez’s publishing house in Buenos Aires. It was edited by his *Marsha* colleague and good friend Rogelio García Lupo. At the same time, it was also published in the United States by Monthly Review Press. On 30 May 1964, Galeano gave a lecture, “*China vista y oída*”, at the Instituto Cultural Uruguayo to promote the book (Kovacic 155).

A Unique Impression of China

Unlike Neruda’s China travelogue,⁷ Galeano’s text did not detail his interactions with Chinese people in a poetic language. He seemed not to care about banquets or scenery. *China 1964* is a book of field notes on Chinese society and politics and not a literary text. It was not because Galeano was unable to write in a literary (his first publication a month before his China visit was a collection of short stories. *Los días siguientes* (August 1963). His friend Hiber Conteris spoke highly of him as a writer: “se ubica, cronológicamente, en la más reciente generación literaria nacional. . . . *Los días siguientes*, novela corta, se vislumbra una segura vocación del escritor” (Conteis 1963).

Galeano did not travel to Beijing from Montevideo alone. The Uruguayan economist Guillermo Bernhard was also invited to China. He too wrote of his travels (*Crónicas chinas*) and, in serial form, his narrations appeared throughout November 1963 in *Época*, a Uruguayan newspaper that, founded in 1962, “was the first newspaper resulting from the will to unity of the left” (Kovacic 136).⁸ And later Bernhard’s book with the same title was also published by Carumbe in Montevideo in 1964. In these essays, Bernhard described his impression of China regarding its agriculture, industry, culture, education, social economy, etc. From an economist’s perspective, Bernhard believed that China had achieved extraordinary industrial achievements in just fourteen years—“Production has increased significantly in recent years despite all the natural calamities (floods and droughts) that they had to face; the standard of living has risen considerably; the culture has taken an acrobatic leap”⁹ (Bernhard 89)—. He emphasized that, although the Soviet Union had withdrawn its experts and assistance, China was not overwhelmed because the Soviets’ “gran ayuda” had not been free, nor was their equipment advanced (Bernhard 53, 89). In culture and education, China adopted several policies to erase its backwardness by emphasizing moral qualities, intellectual ability, physical fitness, and labor training. Bernhard spoke highly of the people’s

communes—“a totally new experience in the world”, and “the benefits for the country and for the farmer have been really extraordinary”¹⁰ (Bernhard 60)—. He thought that “this unique new organization of China enables peasants to improve living standard and points out a way of industrialization in rural areas”¹¹ (Bernhard 71); he concluded:

We confess that we have brought from China profound experiences and helpful and perfect teachings. We have seen a poor, economically backward country, in which a wonderful poor, but also suffered, silent, hardworking and kind people live, fight, and work, as we have not met another in the world ... it is a serious people that has full awareness of the fights in which he is glad and happy because he is no longer the slave as before, who has changed the humiliation imposed by feudalism and imperialism into the dignity of the patriot who is raising the new China by hand.¹² (Bernhard 86)

This “we” should include Galeano, but the latter’s impressions were far from these.

First, in *China 1964*, Galeano seldom used impassioned terms; he preferred a neutral but serious tone. Rather than heaping praise, like Bernhard, on the system, he raises perplexing questions and even doubts. For instance, the book starts with a series of questions: “What’s Mao’s plan? What makes China, the aggressive symbol of the poor’s rebellion, stand against the Soviet Union? Does China’s stance in this polemic reflect the whole nation’s attitude? Or is it just the hierarch’s temporary whims?”¹³ (Galeano 9) Another example is, not long after his trip to China in 1964, he went to Cuba. Upon his return, he wrote two articles about this trip: “A Cuba:” and “Cuba como vitrina o catapulta”. In the latter, he used “frases más vibrantes y emotivas para describir al Che” (Kovacic 164):

A deep and beautiful force was born, incessantly, from within; he was betrayed, like everyone else, by the eyes. He had, I remember, pure and clean eyes, like fresh dawn: that way of looking owned by the men who had belief. (. . .) He believed, yes, in the Latin American revolution, in its painful process, in its destiny, in that Socialism must breed the new human condition.¹⁴ (Galeano, *Entrevistas y artículos [1962-1987]* 80)

His style is quite different from that of *China 1964*. In Havana, Galeano interviewed Che Guevara for three hours while, in China, the duration of his meeting with Zhou Enlai was much shorter. His description of Zhou in *China 1964* was rather aloof. Compliments like “a good man and a man without trouble. . . a vibrant man of intelligence, extremely friendly and full of charm; in short, a great man”; “his most salient feature is to be completely relaxed and perfectly comfortable in all circumstances, he is certainly aware of his charm, and uses it” are all quotations¹⁵ (*China 1964* 154). He then proceeds to critically reexamine an observation: “Relaxed? Behind the good manners, this refined descendant of mandarins hides the twitching of the fight”¹⁶ (*China 1964* 154). After giving a general account of Zhou’s early army career, he concluded: “A life given, like that of other men of our time, to the new faith: victims and priests of the fever of the revolution”¹⁷ (*China 1964* 155). Perhaps he was not trying to be sarcastic, but it appears that he did not trust the Chinese leader as he did the Argentinean revolutionary, though Zhou, like Che, was considered to be a charismatic socialist leader.

Secondly, compared to Bernhard, Galeano was skeptical about what he saw and heard in China. To him, seeing was not believing. He was careful when interacting with Chinese newspapers, interpreters, tourist guides, and even interviewees: “When the guide pointed me to a worker, I chose another, because I knew in advance that the cadres, the Kan-pu, are delivered in the body and soul of the Party and its doctrine: they are the transmission belts of the will of the Beijing government, throughout China”¹⁸ (*China 1964* 13). Yet, Bernhard believed that “the Chinese Government has informed its people with total clarity and honesty about the controversy”, and Chinese people “know the Chinese and Soviet documents, which think about them with full knowledge of them”¹⁹ (Bernhard 58-59).

At last, Galeano’s views in *China 1964* were independently reached and resulted in objective writing, quite different from Bernhard’s who firmly defended China and its Communist Party. In “Últimas Palabras”, Galeano clearly stated that his book was “neither slander nor dithyramb,” but “a side of truth”²⁰ (*China 1964* 166). As a result, China’s official media 《参考消息》 (*Reference News*) compiled Bernhard’s chronicles²¹ and never even mentioned Galeano’s book.

China during 1963–1964

Galeano’s differences with Bernhard were symptomatic because it was no longer the 1950s when Neruda, Guillén, and Asturias visited China. At the beginning of the 1960s, China and the rest of world were on the threshold of a severe challenge with a storm brewing. Galeano added the subtitle “Crónica de un desafío” to *China 1964* and a title for its first chapter, “Viaje al centro de la tormenta”, both denoting his full awareness of the situation as an accomplished journalist and writer. In the international sphere, socialist China struggled to survive. In addition to the blockade from the capitalist block amid the Cold War, China’s divergence with the Soviet Union became public, thus igniting debate among international communist movements of the 1960s. After the Sino-Soviet split, China faced a threat from “two super-powers”, the United States and the Soviet Union. With enemies near and far, China had to adjust domestically and diplomatically. Domestically, the objective became ideological unification. In cities, “四清运动” (Socialist Education Movement) was carried out throughout the country, and the “decisions of the CPC Central Committee on Major Rural Problems (draft)” and the “Policies of Rural Socialist Education Movements (draft)” were implemented. The documents emphasized class struggle and revisionist threats; they included the motto “taking class struggle as the central task” and demanded active mass movements. Moreover, through written inscriptions, poems, and annotations, Mao Zedong encouraged “people’s learning and great criticism” (群众学习和大批判). For instance, in March 1963, he wrote an inscription: “向雷锋同志学习” [“Follow the Examples of Comrade Lei Feng”²²] and, on 1 August, he composed a poem “Ode to the Eighth Company” to praise “南京路上好八连” [“The Exemplary Eighth Company on Nanjing Road”].²³ Within a year, not only the People’s Liberation Army, but also the entire country was anxious to follow the Exemplary Eighth Company. Galeano recorded this Lei-Feng-Learning-Campaign in the second chapter of *All winds in one*.²⁴ Another significant event took place in May 1963: the Shanghai newspaper *Wenhui Daily* devoted a full page to criticizing the newly adapted Kun opera (昆曲) *Li Huiniang’s Revenge* through a review “Ghosts don’t hurt” by Liao Mosha; it caught Mao’s attention. On 12 December 1963, Mao gave special instructions to the Beijing Party Committee to criticize Beijing and exalt Shanghai. In the instructions, he said that “it is peculiar that many communists are keen on advocating feudalist and capitalist art instead of socialist art” (Mao 70). On 27 June

1964, Mao gave further instructions regarding the “Report on the Rectification Movement of National Federation of Literary and Art and Various Associations (draft)” by the Propaganda Department of the CPC Central Committee:

For fifteen years, most of these associations and their publications (a small number of which are said to be good) don’t fulfil the Party’s policies. They treat themselves as bosses and keep a distance from workers, farmers, and soldiers. Instead of representing the socialist revolution and industrialization, they have recently entertained revisionism. Without a thorough reform, some day they will turn into something like the Hungarian Petőfi Kör.²⁵ (Mao 70)

These are Mao’s “Two Instructions on Literary Criticism,” which are considered to be the battle cry for a rectification of literary and art circles and presage the Cultural Revolution. Galeano explained in his book how notable literary figures like Ding Ling and Ai Qing, who were also Neruda’s Chinese friends, carried out their self-education and self-reformation to “Wipe off the bad ideas from your mind”,²⁶ that is, bourgeois individualism and idealism (*China 1964* 148). In sum, 1963 was the year when the national political atmosphere heated up and took a turn.

Diplomatically, China embarked on a mission of seeking supporters. In December 1963, a delegation headed by Zhou Enlai visited fourteen Asian and African countries. The crusade for Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and Bandung Spirit that lasted seventy-two days and covered 108,000 miles, was an attempt to find living space between the two super-powers. The Sino-Soviet split did not happen overnight. During the Chinese revolution, the young Chinese Communist Party did not just follow the Soviet Union’s Communist Party in lockstep. Under the leadership of Mao Zedong, the CPC always adhered to a practical and realistic attitude in pursuit of a revolutionary path suitable for China’s national conditions; it succeeded in creating a new revolutionary model and philosophy that were different from those of the Soviet’s, such as 农村包围城市 [“rural strategy toward the urban”] and 游击战 [“guerilla tactics”]. The revolution was victorious and the CPC, having successfully established its own People’s Republic, also strenuously explored the way to socialist construction and state governance. On the international stage, unlike the Soviet Union, which had been in the center of Cold War, China has leaned toward nonalignment since the 1950s. In 1955, with no time to get over the pain and panic caused by the

Kashmir Princess aircraft explosion, Zhou Enlai and Chen Yi arrived at Bandung with the Chinese delegation, calmly dispelling doubts and speculations from twenty-nine Asian and African countries. “Based on consensus, seek common ground while setting aside differences” was the central idea followed by China.

Finally, a ten-point declaration on “peaceful coexistence and friendly cooperation” was unanimously adopted, despite differences in ideology or political structure. During the meeting, through a brief statement, Zhou Enlai expressed China’s desire to reach out and have a dialogue with the United States. In the Bandung Conference, China introduced itself as a friendly and open socialist country. The conference was also an expression of the Asian and African countries’ desire to find a new space in the bipolar Cold War. To some extent, the Chinese delegation’s active participation in the Bandung Conference became a signal of Sino-Soviet divergence. Later, a series of events accelerated the split.

On 4 April 1956, the *People’s Daily* published “On the Experience of Proletarian Dictatorship”, which was the first response from CPC to the report of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). On 29 April, while meeting with the delegations of six communist parties from Latin America, Mao Zedong reiterated the CPC’s opinion and criticized Khrushchev’s “Secret Speech” without naming him explicitly. In June 1959, before Khrushchev visited the United States, the CPSU notified the CPC that they would no longer assist China with nuclear technology, unilaterally revoking the agreement of October 1957. On 9 September 1959, Russian News Agency TASS stated that Sino-Indian border clashes “impeded the easing of international tensions” with a clear inclination towards India. This made public the Sino-Soviet divergence. In June 1960, the Congress of International Communist and Workers Parties was held in Moscow, where eighty-one parties were in attendance. Twenty-two Latin American communist parties sent representatives, among whom eighteen sided with the CPSU and criticized the CPC (Zhu, Mao and Li 196-200). On 16 July the CPSU sent a letter to the CPC demanding the withdrawal of all the Soviet experts from China. Ultimately, the ideological discrepancy between the two parties expanded to interstate relations. During the meeting of the two parties in July 1963, the CPSU published an open letter to all party members, openly criticizing the CPC and entirely publicizing completely the Sino-Soviet divergence. As a response, from September 1963 to July

1964, the CPC continuously issued articles criticizing Soviet revisionism, documents later known as the “Nine Commentaries”. It was at this tension-filled time when Galeano and Bernhard visited China. Galeano observed Chinese society in that atmosphere, pondering on socialist theories and practices; later, included his reflections, questions, observations, and doubts in *China 1964*.

China at the Center of the Storm in Galeano’s Writing

From the first sentence in his China journal, Galeano indicated his key point: the Sino-Soviet split:

I was interested, above all, trying to penetrate a very important truth: Is the Chinese people the real protagonist of the controversy that threatens to cause a schism, or is the government who is working behind them? Of course, I do not attribute myself, no one can be attributed, to the magical power of certainty. How can we avoid formulating any categorical judgment regarding the country of the Han, in so many ways inexplicable to a Westerner? To foreigners, we only have the right to make our impressions known.²⁷ (*China 1964* 12)

His first impression of Beijing was: “The War burns: wherever they go, visitors will find, in any corner of China, the hot atmosphere of the controversy with the USSR. Documents in all languages, printed in various formats; brochures, magazines, letters, statements”.²⁸ He used a metaphor to describe the flood of “attack and counterattacks”, such as “not all the water of the Volga can wash the infamies of contemporary revisionism”.²⁹ (*China 1964* 9). He wrote that, before 1960, foreigners had similar ideas on China,

The Soviet novels were the most read literary works after the Chinese ones in China; Soviet films were seen in cinemas and Soviet works in theaters, Soviet installations in the plants and Soviet machines and tools in the factories. Speaking Russian, one could understand Chinese intellectuals without the slightest difficulty. And wherever an outsider would meet with Chinese willing to highlight the vital importance of fraternal help from specialists who had come from the Soviet Union to teach the Chinese the ABC of the construction of socialism.³⁰ (*China 1964* 136)

Galeano claimed that he could not tell whether that was true because, when he arrived in China in 1963,

I found the reverse of the medal. In the conversations, the revisionists were inevitably talked about, the Moscow baton was attacked; Soviet films were labeled as bourgeois formalism and pacifism; Many Soviet machines are exhibited, today, to the visitor, as useless junk, and in each workplace, new figures are released, proudly indicating the increase in the proportion of Chinese machinery used. A bombardment of complaints and protests about the withdrawal of the aid and the conditions in which the aid was provided, falls on one as soon as it transposes the thresholds of any factory. And the Russian language is practically out of circulation.³¹ (*China 1964* 136–137)

Although Galeano’s description could be a bit exaggerated, as all Russians were not totally “out of circulation” in China, it does invoke the nervousness then within that society when it came to the topic of Soviet Union.

In 1963, in order to depict China comprehensively and realistically, Galeano decided to use “a survey method, and I put it into practice within my means”³² (*China 1964* 13). He interviewed “many people, chosen at random in corners of China very distant from each other”³³ (*China 1964* 13). Each time he went through the trouble to choose interviewees with the most distinct backgrounds and to find interpreters who understood the local dialect and could translate it to English, French, or Spanish; yet according to him, every interviewee would repeat the same lines. Each “will say exactly the same words about Stalin and Jruschov”³⁴ (*China 1964* 13); “Mao’s voice has an immense sound box of hundreds of millions of voices”³⁵ (*China 1964* 17).

Although disappointed at being unable to hear varied opinions among Chinese citizens, Galeano did not doubt the credibility of unanimous voices: “They can’t all have plotted to fool me”³⁶ (*China 1964* 13). After his close observation, investigation, and thorough analysis, he believed that this “ideological u”³⁷ could not be “explained based on fear”:³⁸

A police regime, riding a terror apparatus, can achieve obedience, impose the silence of its rebellion on the people. It can’t, that is, force euphoria. And Chinese workers burn with faith when they proclaim, as their own, the views of Mao’s government. It is not about chains dragged by the leaders’ fist, but of a complex circulatory system that irrigates, with the same blood, the vast body of China.³⁹ (*China 1964* 15)

Galeano understood their ideological unanimity from his own experience. First, China offered “a standard of living”⁴⁰ to everyone. Several interviewees enjoyed their new lives in their new China, such as Tang Yeng (142), born as a peasant in Tibet, but had become a staff member at the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing. In their narratives, people were grateful and passionate about the new China and the Communist Party, without hiding their discontentment with Soviet imperialism for trying to fault China. Secondly, since 1960, “with insignificant assistance from abroad”, China “is obliged to put all its forces to the maximum tension to conquer the objectives proposed in the economic order”⁴¹ (*China 1964* 18), and had achieved certain success: “such as the demand for oil; we used to mainly rely on its importation, but now we can meet our own needs” (“Press Release of the Fourth Session of the Second National People’s Congress”). Thirdly, Chinese society seemed to be more united than ever when confronting outside enemies such as “the hysterical kicks of Chiang (Kai-shek)”⁴² (*China 1964* 19), the Soviet Union and even some pro-Soviet factions in the socialist block. For instance, Palmiro Togliatti, head of Italy’s Communist Party, criticized the CPC; certain pro-Soviet Union socialist countries only addressed CPSU documents and ignored CPS’s “Nine Commentaries on CPSU”.

To be comprehensive and objective, Galeano also accepted the opinions of the Chinese leadership. When meeting with Bo Yibo, he was told that “the withdrawal of help was a help”⁴³ (*China 1964* 134), because otherwise the world would not believe that Chinese achievements were solely Chinese, made without any aid from the Soviet Union. When Zhou Enlai was interviewed, he specifically told Galeano: “We advocate unity and oppose division”⁴⁴ (*China 1964* 162). Zhou also condemned discourses such as “the ideological controversy between Beijing and Moscow will lead to the founding of the Fifth International”⁴⁵, considering them “the headlines of the bourgeois press, which present things in a sinister way”⁴⁶ (*China 1964* 162). Galeano even interviewed the last Chinese emperor Pu Yi, former war criminal who by then had completed his 思想改造 [“ideological reeducation”]. With great interest, he talked about the Sino-Soviet Split, but his opinions were not different from those that Galeano had heard from his interviewees throughout China (*China 1964* 144).

As seen, Galeano selected his interviewees from among different social ranks in hopes that they could present a complete picture, but ended up receiving the same response from everyone.

To the Chinese, the divergence was not only between the two parties, but also “a national issue”⁴⁷ (*China 1964* 20). Therefore, the entire society was motivated to oppose Soviet revisionism and its pernicious influence.

Chronicler at the Crossroad

Galeano’s trip to China did not provide him the facts to determine right from wrong in the dispute between China and the Soviet Union. His subsequent trip to the Soviet Union did not help either and, if anything, confused him even more. He received completely different answers to the same China questions from his interviewees, officers, and journalists whom he encountered in the Soviet Union:

The Soviets accuse the Chinese of ingratitude, meanwhile the Chinese accuse the Soviets of selfishness. There is, not all, but a reverse of the plot that remains hidden and can hardly be torn from the shadows: the versions of the facts do not coincide, but oppose each other, with each reconstructing the story according to their own point of view.⁴⁸ (*China 1964* 127)

Consequently, Galeano allowed the same number of pages to each side in *China 1964* for their “debate,” now in a textual space. Soviet interviewee Skachkov, a representative of Soviet Foreign Economic Relations, declared:

Only in 6 years (from 1954 to 1960) the Soviet Union supplied to China almost 1.5 million tons of steel laminates, more than 300,000 tons of pipes, 14 million tons of oil and its derivatives, more than 50,000 trucks, 7,200 tractors and 850 combine harvesters. The importation of these items and machinery played an extraordinarily important role in the realization of China’s industrialization plans. With the technical assistance of the Soviet Union, in the People’s Republic of China, almost 200 major and important industrial enterprises have been built, which have formed the framework of Chinese industry. This represents about 2/5 of the total industrial companies built in the socialist countries with the help of the USSR. They point out the nearly free delivery of 21,000 sets of scientific and technical documentation as a clear demonstration of proletarian internationalism.⁴⁹ (*China 1964* 129–130)

On the contrary, Vice Chairman of China Council for the Promotion of International Trade Yung Lung-kwei had a different opinion on the matter: “On the pretext that factories required complete systems of installations, it turned out that the total was worth much more than the sum of its parts: that is, if we could have bought the machines and parts separately, it would have been much cheaper”⁵⁰ (*China 1964* 134). And also, Galeano continues explaining, “most of the payments had been paid off by supplying cereals, vegetable oil, pork, eggs, fruits, cotton and wool fabrics, coal, tin, mercury, sodium, molybdenum and rare minerals”⁵¹ (*China 1964* 134). Skachov insisted that the Soviet equipment offered to China were “At the level of the latest advances in modern technique”; and that the equipment of the First Automobile Works that the Soviet Union lent assistance to build were “more modern than our own factories”⁵² (*China 1964* 131). On the other side, Chinese workers claimed that the Soviet equipment “is useless”, “they sold us many machines that are useless”, and also “after the withdrawal of the aid, they did not provide us with any spare parts of this machine, nor of this, nor of that; we have to produce them by our own means”⁵³ (*China 1964* 129).

Galeano was very confused with these two opposite arguments as one can tell from the heading he chose for the chapter—“Yes, no, yes, but no”⁵⁴ (*China 1964* 129)—. To dispel the clouds, he looked for help from a third party. For instance, he quoted the work of the Hungarian reporter Tibor Mende to show a proof that the loan from the Soviet Union to China was not of zero interest—“after 1956, in truth, all of the repayments and interest paid by China have exceeded the amount of credits it has obtained”⁵⁵ (*China 1964* 131)—. He continued to quote Tibor Mende’s words to clarify that China is not the country who receives the most economic aid from the Soviet Union:

India has been favored by loans of 700 million dollars of credit, while the 680 million Chinese people who are the allies of the USSR, have not obtained so far, more than 430 million dollars. After 1950, Indonesia itself, which does not have a population of more than 90 million inhabitants, has obtained 370 million dollars of Soviet loans. If the population figure is compared, it is seen that Russia's aid has been much more generous for neutrals in the Middle East and South Asia, than for its main ally.⁵⁶ (*China 1964* 132)

When visiting the Soviet Union, Galeano had access to mounds of Chinese declarations. Since 1955, Chinese Vice Premier Li Fuchun, Premier Zhou Enlai, Liu Shaoqi and Chairman Mao had all expressed their gratitude for Soviet technical and economic assistance. Galeano took Chairman a Liu Shaoqi’s statement as an example. On 7 December 1960, Liu said that Soviet assistance would not be forgotten (*China 1964* 137), while in 1963 Liu criticized that country severely:

Those who oppose us . . . only wrap themselves in an attractive layer to profit at the expense of others—a characteristic practice of relations among capitalist countries—in order to prevent economically underdeveloped socialist countries from constructing an independent national economy, and keep these countries economically depend on them and are under their political control. According to them, the other fraternal countries only have the duty to make sacrifices to serve their interests and have no right to develop an independent national economy. This practice disregards the principle of mutual respect for each other's independence and sovereignty, which must be observed in international relations in general. How can it talk about proletarian internationalism? Its position is, at the same time, chauvinism of big power and national selfishness⁵⁷. (*China 1964* 135)

As shown, Galeano tried his best to be impartial, introducing not only arguments by both sides, but also their inherent contradictions. He did not judge, but that did not mean he had no opinion. Indeed, because of the dispute between the CPC and the CPSU—“The communist world does not think, with only one head”⁵⁸ (*China 1964* 10)—that caused a rupture within the communist block: “The old myth of the mechanical harmony of the socialist countries among themselves, that smiling tourists have been in charge of spreading, has been pulverized by the facts”⁵⁹ (*China 1964* 10–11). Galeano then wonders whether “once the bridges are blown up, can we return to the old roads?”⁶⁰ (*China 1964* 139).

Conclusion

China was the first country that Galeano visited outside of Latin America and *China 1964* was his first non-fiction book. The trip and the book, undoubtedly, had a special impact on his life and

thought development. Twenty-three-year-old Galeano was invited to visit China because he had already excelled as a journalist in Uruguay and in Latin America as a whole. *Marcha*, under his leadership, became a prominent and influential newspaper among the Latin American left-wing media. Founded in 1939 by Carlos Quijano, *Marcha* not only published the most updated political news on Uruguay and Latin America, but also closely followed major international issues such as the reconstruction of post-war Europe, post-Stalin Soviet Union, the Chinese revolution and its socialist industrialization. Its culture section included the most renowned Latin American intellectuals like Ángel Rama, Emir Rodríguez Monegal, Gabriel García Márquez, Mario Vargas Llosa, Carlos Fuentes, Julio Cortázar, Mario Benedetti, Carlos Onetti, Ernesto Sabato, et al. In the words of Claudia Gilman, “with its appearance in the 1940s, *Marcha* precedes and propels issues of debate among Latin American intellectuals. In a certain way, it establishes the terms of those discussions for a long time until it is surpassed by more radicalized opinions in politics”⁶¹ (Gilman, as quoted in Kovacic 112). Quijano’s *Marcha* stood firm against imperialism and fascism. After the 1960s, the weekly became more defined about its leftist orientation. Obviously, it was the outcome of the Cuban Revolution’s support for the Uruguayan left-wing, as Eduardo Rey Tristán explains:

As of 1959, a new stage was opened in the evolution of the Uruguayan left, marked - as in the entire continent - by the success of the Cuban Revolution. The socialist, communist or anarchist renewal had already been fundamentally completed. The next four years until December 1962, were for the left the external projection of these renovations, in which these processes resulted in both a relative organic growth and a greater capacity to call.⁶² (Tristán, as quoted in Kovacic 95)

Galeano started to contribute to *Marcha* after the Cuban Revolution and became its editor-in-chief in 1961. Since then, the weekly journal has made its motto, “anti-imperialism, socialism and thirdism”⁶³ (Kovacic 130). The so-called “tercerismo” was a common stance in Uruguayan politics, which was aiming to find alternatives other than those offered by the United States and the Soviet Union (Kovacic 116). Under Quijano’s influence, Galeano developed strong socialist convictions,⁶⁴ but refused to blindly follow the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the reason perhaps why China took to the young Galeano and *Marcha*. After all, since the Bandung Conference, the Chinese Communist Party has been seeking an independent development path

and gradually came up with the idea of the Third World (see Teng, “Third World”). Indeed, although young, Galeano was considered “one of the most acute political journalists of this moment in Uruguay”⁶⁵ (Kovacic 137). With his articles often published in Yugoslavia’s *International Politics* and America’s *Monthly Review*, he was being increasingly noticed by the global left-wing press.

Before he set out for China, *Marcha* had shown interest in the Sino-Soviet divergences and serially published them in four 1963 issues. Galeano, therefore, probably went to China with unanswered questions. Then, the Sino-Soviet differences were not only about how to judge Stalin, but were concerned as well with several other major issues like the international communist movement, war and peace, capitalism and socialism’s coexistence, transition from violent revolution to peace, Marxism-Leninism’s relevance, etc. As Hui Wang pointed out: “the degradation of Sino-Soviet relations was the direct outcome of the latter’s hegemonic aspirations and China’s sovereignty; this conflict, however, could not be resolved easily because it reflected the political and theoretical contradictions between the two communist parties” (Wang 3). These major issues concerning the future of communism could not be resolved by Galeano in his short trips to China and the Soviet Union. When he returned to Latin America, the split between the two communist behemoths showed no signs of reconciliation; on the contrary, their differences increasingly worsened. After the publication of the CPC’s “Nine Commentaries,” Latin American communist parties intervened and tried to mediate the Sino-Soviet divergences in hopes of saving the existing solidarity of the communist movement. Between 23–28 November 1964, Cuba convened a meeting of twenty-two Latin American parties in Havana where the *International Communist Movement Solidarity Resolution* was passed and called for a cessation of all public debate and opposition activities (Zhu *et al* 197-198). These parties also decided to send a nine-party delegation of Latin American communist parties to meet separately with China and the Soviet Union in an attempt to restore unity. The delegation was headed by Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, Chairman of the Communist Party of Cuba, who had visited China previously. However, the attempt failed⁶⁶ and the delegation returned unaccomplished. The Sino-Soviet dispute implicated all communist parties in the world and resulted in serious differences and debates among them that lead, in certain occasions, to separation. With Brazil’s Communist Party being the first, more than half of the Latin American Communist Parties split into pro-Soviet and pro-China groups—

generally, the former was the original party and the latter the splinter group—. Almost all pro-Soviet parties broke their links to the CPC. As to national issues, pro-Soviet parties advocated peaceful transition and insisted on gaining power through peaceful and legal measures, while pro-China parties advocated for violent revolution and armed struggle.⁶⁷ Regarding political influence, compared with the parties supported by the Soviet Union, parties supported by China were weaker in Latin America.

This dispute lasted almost ten years and made a long-lasting impact on global left-wing and communist movements. This dispute, as Hui Wang points out, “is a challenge to the more and more rigid (‘depoliticized’) power structure inside the socialist camp through theoretic and political fights, and from this aspect, it can be deemed as a ‘politicization’ process inside the socialist system” (Wang 5). But the reality was that, before self-renovation in the communist movement through internal debate had a chance to succeed, it was strangled by splits and conflicts. Richard Gott wrote in *Guerrilla Movements in Latin America* that 1964 was “the year when the Sino-Soviet discrepancy got so serious that nothing could be done to fix it” and “it caused an incomparable destructive impact on the Cuban Revolution and in the whole continent” (Gott 424). Latin American left-wing and international communist movements, though having just been uplifted by the triumph of the Cuban Revolution, consumed much energy in debates and divisions that caused many irreparable losses.

Galeano was not interested in communist parties’ dogmatism or choosing sides between China and the Soviet Union. When he returned to Uruguay from Cuba in 1964, he seemed to believe that a socialist revolution could be achieved without the leadership of any communist party. In China, he raised this question to Zhou Enlai: “puede un país a su juicio desarrollar la revolución socialista sin la presencia de partido comunista en la dirección de proceso?”⁶⁸ Zhou replied without hesitation:

If a country wants to make the socialist revolution it must accept the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism, and Marxism-Leninism cannot be monopolized by the Communist Party. Any revolutionary can own this weapon. When Fidel Castro conquered the victory through armed struggle, he was not a member of the Communist Party yet.⁶⁹ (*China 1964* 161)

This might be the largest reward of Galeano’s trip to China. As Fabian Kovacic pointed out in his biography of Galeano: “Upon returning from that trip to Cuba, Galeano became more active and politically committed, although no longer at the levels of militancy but of support for the construction and the broadening collaboration of Latin American New Left”⁷⁰ (Kovacic 168). With Galeano and his *Marcha* alongside, the Uruguayan New Left was not only trying to change an imperialist and hegemonic society but was also calling for a profound cultural reformation. Their transnational ideals added to what Che Guevara, Galeano’s idol, fought for: worldwide revolution. Whence his noted *Open Veins of Latin America* that calls for Latin America to rebel against worldwide capitalist imperialism.

Notes

- ¹ “只要巴西和其他拉美国家愿意同中国建立外交关系，我们一律欢迎。不建立外交关系，做生意也好，不做生意，一般往来也好”。(All translations are mine.)
- ² “细水长流，稳步前进”。
- ³ “积极开展民间外交，争取建立友好联系和发展文化、经济往来，逐步走向建交”。
- ⁴ See Teng “Pablo Neruda”.
- ⁵ “Son los últimos días de septiembre del 63; el avión, al fin de un largo, largo viaje contra el sol, llega a Pekín”.
- ⁶ “Mi mano fue una de las dos mil quinientas manos derechas que entrechó la noche de primero de octubre en la puerta de Ti Anmen, mientras los fuegos artificiales estallaban en el cielo. El gobierno de la Revolución había cumplido 14 años, el pueblo bailaba y cantaba en las calles de Pekín”.
- ⁷ See Neruda 271-308.
- ⁸ “fue el primer diario resultado de la voluntad de unidad de la izquierda”.
- ⁹ “La producción se ha incrementado notablemente en los últimos años” a pesar de todas las calamidades naturales (inundaciones y sequías) que debieron afrontar; el nivel de vida se ha elevado considerablemente, la cultura ha dado un salto acrobático”.
- ¹⁰ “una experiencia totalmente nueva en el mundo”, and “los beneficios para el país y para el campesino han sido realmente extraordinarios”.
- ¹¹ “esta novel organización exclusivamente china, permite la elevación del nivel de vida de los campesinos y señala el camino para la progresiva industrialización de las zonas rurales”.
- ¹² “Confesamos que hemos traído de China experiencias profundas y enseñanzas provechosas y hermosas. Hemos visto un país pobre, atrasado económicamente, en el que vive, lucha, y trabajaba un pueblo maravilloso pobre también, sufrido, silencioso, trabajador y amable como no hemos conocido otro en el mundo . . . es un pueblo serio que tiene plena conciencia de la lucha en que está contento y feliz porque ya no es el esclavo de antes, que ha trocado la humillación impuesta por el feudalismo y el imperialismo por la dignidad del patriota que está levantando a mano la nueva China”.
- ¹³ “¿Qué se propone Mao? ¿Qué hondas razones mueven a China, símbolo agresivo de la rebelión de los pobres, a enfrentar a la Unión Soviética? La posición china en la polémica, ¿refleja una actitud nacional, o es apenas fruto de pasajeros caprichos de los jercas?”.
- ¹⁴ “Una fuerza profunda y hermosa le nacía, sin cesar, de adentro; se delataba, como todos, por los ojos. Tenía, recuerdo, una mirada pura, limpia, como recién amanecida: esa manera de mirar de los hombres que creen. Creía, sí, en la revolución de América Latina, en su doloroso proceso, en su destino tenía fe en la nueva condición humana que el socialismo debe engendrar”.
- ¹⁵ “un buen señor y un señor sin apuro . . . un hombre vibrante de inteligencia, extremadamente simpático y lleno de encanto; en definitiva, un gran señor”, “su rasgo más saliente es estar completamente distendido y perfectamente cómodo en todas las circunstancias, sin duda tiene conciencia de su encanto, y lo utiliza”.
- ¹⁶ “Distendido? Detrás de los buenos modales, este refinado descendiente de mandarines oculta la crispación de la pelea”.
- ¹⁷ “una vida entregada, como la de otros hombres de nuestro tiempo, a la nueva fe: víctimas y sacerdotes de la fiebre de la revolución”.
- ¹⁸ “Cuando el guía me señalaba un trabajador, yo elegía otro, porque sabía de antemano que los cuadros, los *kan-fu*, están entregados en cuerpo y alma de Partido y su doctrina: son las correas de transmisión de la voluntad del gobierno de Pekín, a lo largo y a lo ancho de China”.
- ¹⁹ “el Gobierno chino tiene informado a su pueblo con total claridad y honestidad sobre lo concerniente a la polémica”, and that the Chinese people “conocen los documentos chinos y soviéticos, que opinan sobre ellos con conocimiento pleno de los mismos”.
- ²⁰ “Ni la calumnia, ni el ditirambo,” but “un costado de la verdad”.
- ²¹ 《中国纪行》——乌拉圭 吉利尔莫·贝纳尔德，《参考消息》1964.1.3 头版。(Bernhard, “Crónicas chinas”).
- ²² Lei Feng (18 December 1940 – 15 August 1962) was a soldier in the People’s Liberation Army and is a communist legend in China. After his death, Lei was characterized as a selfless and modest person devoted to the Communist Party, Mao Zedong, and the people of China. In 1963, he became the subject of a nationwide posthumous propaganda campaign; Lei was portrayed as a model citizen, and the masses were encouraged to emulate his selflessness, modesty, and devotion to Mao. See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lei_Feng.
- ²³ The Exemplary Eighth Company on Nanjing Road was perhaps the most prominent model symbolizing the continuation of wartime spirit in peacetime of New China. Nanjing Road was the center of the commercial and entertainment district in downtown Shanghai before 1949, symbolizing all the vices of colonialism and capitalism in the Old China. After the Liberation, the Eighth Company was stationed in this district and was surrounded by all kinds

of dazzling lures. The company was praised and named by Mao and was held up by the Party to teach its members how to remain immune from all forms of influence from the old social environment. See Cheng 107.

24 "Todas las voluntades en una".

25 Petofi Club (Hungarian: Petőfi Kör) is an intellectual learning group formally approved by the Central Political Bureau of the Hungarian Communist Party on March 17, 1955. It belongs to the Hungarian Labor and Youth Union, and it provides a place for young intellectuals within the party to discuss freely the topics such as economy, philosophy, history, and news. Participants include well-known economists, writers, historians, educators, scientists, philosophers, and other scholars, socialites, intellectuals, and military officers. But later it became the fuse of the Hungarian Revolution in 1956.

26 "limpiarse la cabeza de malas ideas".

27 "Me interesaba, sobre todo, tratar de penetrar una verdad muy importante: ¿Es el pueblo chino el protagonista real de la polémica que amenaza provocar un cisma, o el gobierno está obrando a sus espaldas? Por supuesto, no me atribuyo, nadie puede atribuirse, el mágico poder de la certeza ¿Cómo formular ningún juicio categórico a propósito del país de los han, en tantos sentidos inexplicable para un occidental? A los extranjeros, sólo nos está reservado el derecho de dar a conocer nuestras impresiones".

28 "La Guerra arde: vayan adonde vayan, los visitantes encontrarán, en cualquier rincón de China, la atmósfera caliente de la polémica con la URSS. Documentos en todos los idiomas, impresos en diversos formatos; folletos, revistas, cartas, declaraciones".

29 "ataque y contraataques": "Ni toda el agua del Volga podrá lavar las infamias del revisionismo contemporáneo".

30 "las novelas soviéticas eran después de las chinas las más leídas; se veía films soviéticos en los cines y obras soviéticas en los teatros, instalaciones soviéticas en las usinas y máquinas y herramientas soviéticas en las fábricas. Hablando ruso, uno podía entenderse con los intelectuales chinos sin la menor dificultad. Y dondequiera que un afuera se encontraría con chinos dispuestos a destacar la vital importancia de la ayuda fraterna de los especialistas que habían llegado de la unión soviético para enseñar a los chinos el ABC de la construcción del socialismo".

31 "me encontré con el reverso de la medalla. en las conversaciones, inevitablemente se hablaba de los revisionistas, se atacaba al bastón de mando de Moscú; los films soviéticos eran tachados de formalismo y pacifismo burgués; muchas máquinas soviéticas son exhibidas, hoy, al visitante, como trastos inútiles, y en cada centro de trabajo se dan a conocer, con orgullo, las nuevas cifras que indican el aumento en la proporción de maquinaria china utilizada. Un bombardeo de quejas y protestas por el retiro de la ayuda y por las condiciones en que la ayuda era suministrada, cae sobre uno no bien traspone los umbrales de una fábrica cualquiera. Y el idioma ruso está, prácticamente, fuera de circulación".

32 "un método de encuesta, y lo puse en práctica dentro de mis posibilidades".

33 "muchas personas, elegidas al azar en rincones de China muy distantes entre sí".

34 "dirá exactamente las mismas palabras sobre Stalin y Jruschov".

35 "La voz de Mao cuenta con una inmensa caja de resonancias de centenares de millones de voces".

36 "no pueden haberse complotado todos para engañarme".

37 "unanimidad ideológica".

38 "explicar en función del miedo".

39 "Un régimen policial, montando un aparato de terror, puede lograr la obediencia, imponer al pueblo el silencio de sus rebeldías. No puede, eso sí, obligar a la euforia. Y los trabajadores chinos arden de fe cuando proclaman, como propios, los puntos de vista del gobierno de Mao. No se trata de cadenas arrastrando a los dirigidos del puño de los dirigentes, sino de un complejo sistema circulatorio que riega, con una misma sangre, el vasto cuerpo de China".

40 "un nivel de vida".

41 "está obligada a poner al máximo de tensión todas sus fuerzas para conquistar los objetivos que se propone en el orden económico".

42 "los histéricos pataleos de Chiang (Kai-shek)".

43 "el retiro de la ayuda fue una ayuda".

44 "abogamos por unidad, nos oponemos a la división".

45 "la polémica ideológica entre Pekín y Moscú desembocará en la fundación de una quinta internacional".

46 "los titulares de la prensa burguesa, que presenta las cosas de una manera siniestra".

47 "una cuestión nacional".

48 "Los soviéticos acusan a los chinos de ingratitud; los chinos acusan a los soviéticos de egoísmo. Hay, sin toda, un revés de la trama que permanece oculto y que difícilmente podrá ser arrancado de las sombras: las versiones sobre los hechos no coinciden, se oponen entre sí, cada cual reconstruye la historia según su propio punto de vista".

49 "Solamente en 6 años (de 1954 a 1960) la Unión Soviética suministró a China casi millón y medio de toneladas de laminados siderúrgicos, más de 300000 toneladas de tubos, 14 millones de toneladas de petróleo y sus derivados, más de 50000 camiones, 7200 tractores y 850 cosechadoras combinadas. la importación de estos artículos y maquinarias desempeñó un papel extraordinariamente grande en la realización de los planes de industrialización de China. Con la ayuda técnica de la Unión Soviética, en la República Popular China se han construido cerca de 200 empresas industriales importantes y de primerísimo orden, que han formado el armazón de la industria china. Esto supone casi los 2/5 del total de empresas industriales construidas en los países socialistas con la ayuda de la URSS. Señalan como una clara demostración de internacionalismo proletario, la entrega de 21000 juegos de documentación científica y técnica, casi gratis".

50 “con el pretexto de que las fábricas requerían sistemas completos de instalaciones, resultaba que el total valía mucho más que la suma de sus partes: es decir, si hubiéramos podido comprar las máquinas y las piezas por separado, nos hubiera salido mucho más barato”.

51 “la mayor parte de los pagos había sido efectuada mediante el suministro de cereales, aceites vegetales, carne de cerdo, huevos, frutas, tejidos de algodón y lana, carbón, estaño, mercurio, sodio, molibdeno y minerales raros”.

52 “al nivel de los últimos adelantos de la técnica moderna”, “más modernas que nuestras propias fábricas”.

53 “no sirve para nada”, “nos vendieron muchas máquinas que no sirven para nada”, and also “después del retiro de la ayuda, no nos suministraron más piezas para los repuestos de esta máquina, ni de está, ni de esta otra; los tenemos que producir por nuestros propios medios”.

54 “Sí, No, Sí, Pero No”.

55 “después de 1956, en verdad, la totalidad de los reembolsos y de los intereses pagados por China ha superado el monto de los créditos que ha obtenido”.

56 “la India se ha visto favorecida por préstamos de 700 millones de dólares de crédito, mientras que los 680 millones de chinos que son sus aliados de la URSS, no han obtenido hasta el presente, más que 430 millones de dólares. Después de 1950, la Indonesia misma, que no tiene una población de más de 90 millones de habitantes, ha obtenido 370 millones de dólares de préstamos soviéticos. Si se compara la cifra de la población, se ve que la ayuda de Rusia ha sido mucho más generosa para los neutrales de Medio Oriente y Sudasia, que para con su aliado principal”.

57 “los que se oponen a nosotros... solo se envuelven en una atractiva capa para sacar provecho a expensas de otros— una práctica característica de las relaciones entre países capitalistas—, a fin de impedir que los países socialistas económicamente subdesarrollados creen una economía nacional independiente, y hacer que estos países dependan económicamente de ellos y estén bajo su control político. según ellos, los otros países hermanos solo tienen el deber de hacer sacrificios para servir sus intereses y no tienen derecho a desarrollar una economía nacional independiente. Esta práctica desatiende hasta el principio de respeto mutuo a la independencia y la soberanía de cada uno, que debe observarse en las relaciones internacionales en general. ¿Cómo puedo hablar de internacionalismo proletario? su posición es, a la vez, de chovinismo de gran nación y de egoísmo nacional”.

58 “El mundo comunista no piensa, ya, con una sola cabeza”.

59 “El viejo mito de la armonía mecánica de los países socialistas entre sí, que sonrientes turistas se han encargado de difundir, ha sido pulverizado por los hechos”.

60 “ya volados los puentes, ¿se podrá retornar a los viejos caminos?”.

61 “con su aparición en la década de 1940, *Marcha* precede y propulsa los temas de debate entre los intelectuales latinoamericanos. En cierto modo, establece los términos de esas discusiones durante un buen tiempo hasta que es rebasada por opiniones más radicalizadas en lo político”.

62 “A partir de 1959 se abrió una nueva etapa en la evolución de la izquierda Uruguay, marcada —al igual que en todo el continente— por el éxito de la Revolución Cubana. La renovación socialista, comunista o anarquista ya se había completado en lo fundamental. Los siguientes cuatro años hasta diciembre de 1962, fueron para la izquierda los de proyección externa de esas renovaciones, en los que esos procesos se tradujeron tanto en un relativo crecimiento orgánico como en una mayor capacidad de convocatoria”.

63 “anti-imperialismo, socialismo y tercerismo”.

64 “Eduardo Galeano: ‘Tengo fe en el oficio de escribir, la certeza de que es posible hacerlo sin venderse ni alquilarse’.” Interview by César Di Candia, *Búsqueda* weekly, 22 October 1987.

65 “uno de los más agudos periodistas políticos de este momento en el Uruguay”.

66 The delegation arrived first in Moscow. The meeting went well and CPSU agreed to put an end to the dispute and restore the communist movement solidarity. But in Beijing no progress was achieved, because it was Khrushchev who suggested put an end to the dispute while CPSU accused CPC of causing split. What's more, the fact that the delegation went to the Soviet Union before China gave CPC a reason to believe that the delegation served for the Soviet Union's interest and thus hold against it. China claimed that it was not fair to stop the discussion before over sixty parties including the Soviet Union openly admit their mistakes. When receiving the delegation, Mao Zedong insisted on “fighting against” the revisionism “for ten thousand years” 争论一万年, and this “actually dispelled any possibility of continuing the discussion and reaching an agreement” (Zhu et al. 199).

67 This is just a relative and rough distinction. Many changed their standpoints over time: some pro-Soviet Union parties reflected on their anti-CPC attitude and several pro-China parties, later, had conflicts with CPC when they started to follow the Albanian Party of Labour (Zhu et al. 208–209).

68 “In your opinion, can a country develop the socialist revolution without the presence of a communist party in the process direction?”.

69 “Si un país quiere hacer la revolución socialista debe aceptar los principios revolucionarios del marxismo-leninismo, y el marxismo leninismo no puede ser monopolizado por el Partido Comunista. Cualquier revolucionario puede disponer de esta arma. Cuando Fidel Castro conquistó la victoria por medio de la lucha armada, no era miembro del Partido Comunista”.

70 “Al regreso de ese viaje a Cuba, Galeano volvió más activo y comprometido políticamente, aunque ya no en los niveles de militancia sino de apoyo a las causas de la amplia Nueva Izquierda latinoamericana en cuya construcción él mismo colaboró”.

Works Cited

- Bernhard, Guillermo. “Crónicas chinas”. *Reference News*, 3 January 1964.
- Cheng Yinghong. *Creating the New Man: From Enlightenment Ideals to Socialist Realities*. University of Hawaii Press, 2009.
- Conteris, Hiber. “La absurda persecución de la muerte”. *Marcha*, no. 1171, 30 August 1963.
- Galeano, Eduardo. *Entrevistas y Artículos (1962-1987)*. 3rd ed., Ediciones del Chanchito, 1996.
- . *China 1964: crónica de un desafío*. Jorge Álvarez, 1963.
- Gilman, Claudia. “Política y cultura en los sesenta—El Semanario Marcha”. Informe Final de Beca de Iniciación del CONICET, 1990.
- Gott, Richard. *Guerrilla Movements in Latin America*. Quoted in its Chinese version 《拉丁美洲游击战运动》, Shanghai People’s Publishing House, 1975.
- Huang, Zhiliang. *Re-discover New Continent: Zhou Enlai and Latin America*. World Affairs Press, 2004.
- Kovacic, Fabián. *Galeano*. Javier Vergara, 2015.
- Mao, Zedong. “An Instruction on Literature and Art”. *Anthology of Modern Chinese Literature 1949-1976*, Vol. 1, Literary Criticism. Pt.1. Ed. Mu Feng. Shanghai Literature and Art Publishing House, 1997, p. 70.
- . “Talk to Brazilian journalist”, September 2, 1958; in “Mao Zedong’s Manuscripts since the founding of the People’s Republic of China” Vol.7 (1958.1-1958.12), Central Document Publishing House, 1992, p. 372.
- Neruda, Pablo. *Confieso que he vivido. Memorias*. Seix Barral, 1974.
- Rothwell, Matthew D. *Transpacific Revolutionaries: The Chinese Revolution in Latin America*. Routledge, 2013.
- Sun, Weixue and Lin Di (eds.). *Brief History of New China Cultural Exchange with Foreign Countries*. China Friendship Publishing Company, 1999.
- Teng, Wei. “Pablo Neruda in Contemporary China: Translation between national and international politics”. *Remapping World Literature Writing. Book Markets and Epistemologies between Latin America and the Global South*. Eds. Gesine Müller, Jorge J. Locane, and Benjamin Loy. De Gruyter, 2018, pp. 175–87.
- . “Third World”. *Afterlives of Chinese Communism: Political Concepts from Mao to XI*. Eds. Christian Sorace et al. ANU Press and Verso Books, 2019, pp. 281–86.
- Tristán, Eduardo Rey. *A la vuelta de la esquina. La izquierda revolucionaria uruguaya 1955-1973*. Editorial Fin de Siglo, 2005.
- Wang, Hui. *Depoliticized Politics*. SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2008.
- Zhu, Wenchi, Mao Xianglin, and Li Keming. *Communist Movement in Latin America*. Contemporary World Press, 2002.
- “Our Friends Are All Over the World: Foreign Guests from over Eighty Countries of Six Continents Join National Day Celebration”. *People’s Daily*, 1 October 1963.
- “Premier Zhou Enlai Met Uruguayan *Marcha* Weekly’s Journalist”. *People’s Daily*, 5 November 1963.
- “Press Release of the Fourth Session of the Second National People’s Congress”. *People’s Daily*, 4 December 1963.
- “Vice Premier Bo Yibo Met Uruguayan Guests”. *People’s Daily*, 9 October 1963.