

The tempo is picking up in the arena of international wheeling and dealing. And the Chinese revisionists, who established their rule just 3-1/2 years ago with a coup against Mao Tsetung's revolutionary line, are frantically trying to keep up with the beat. In particular, the Chinese—not socialist, but capitalist—are more and more openly flirting with the Soviet social-imperialists denounced by Mao and all. For now they are doing it both for bargaining power—to shake loose even more American aid—and at the same time to actually prepare conditions for vaulting over the fence and nestling in among the other Soviet allies.

Geng Biao, Chinese vice premier in charge of military affairs, arrived in Washington this week, full of grins and hugs, to cement the agreements to ship "non-lethal" military goods like computers and radar to China. At the same time, to put an edge on the bargaining, Teng Hsiao-ping appropriately uses Liu Shao-chi's posthumous rehabilitation ceremony to continue a long drawn out game of footsie with the Soviets. Along with his other "merits," Liu is honored by Teng for his contributions to "the expansion of the international communist movement" (three guesses what that means, since Liu was well known for his support for the Soviets). And in the background simmers a not too concealed debate in China over whether, after all, the Soviet Union is "socialist" or not and whether that makes them a fraternal country or not—all of which takes place in a framework totally devoid of any political principle other than naked capitalist self-interest and the disgusting neo-colonial belly crawling of these revisionists, bending over to now one, now another of the imperialist big powers.

Turning the Screws

Since the invasion of Afghanistan, the Soviet social-imperialists have stepped up their pressure on China—beefing up half their divisions along China's northern border to full fighting strength and moving new hardware into place. The vise of global confrontation is tightening and you can see the beads of sweat popping off the brows of China's rulers.

An article in the pro-China revisionist U.S. weekly *The Call* (May 19) by "free-lance" mouthpiece David Kline sharply condenses the present Chinese views. It's a big event for *The Call* which up until now has voiced nothing but pro-U.S. "everything against the Soviets" views week after week. First the article lists a long string of frustrations the Chinese feel with U.S. policy, summed up by the headline "U.S. Actions Undermine Anti-Soviet

Pro Soviet Wind Blows In Peking AC/DC In Capitulation

Unity." Apparently they feel the U.S. is not resolute enough in fighting the Soviets—bullying allies on the one hand, and not single-mindedly confronting the Soviets in Asia, on the other. Kline's message: The Chinese don't need "symbolic" aid, they need the *real* thing, and fast. Using Pakistan as a transparent analogy, Kline writes: "China was disappointed with President Carter's \$400 million aid offer to Pakistan, a border country that China does not wish to see succumb to Soviet pressure." Finding words for the Chinese leaders, Kline quotes Pakistani leader Zia ul-Haq:

"What do I buy with this but the hostility of the Soviet Union?", Zia asked."

Obviously the Chinese are demanding major increases in aid before they will consider continuing to "buy Soviet hostility" worthwhile. At that point, Kline drops his bombshell in the open:

"Should the U.S. persist in trying to enforce its will on the third world, however—and should Beijing feel Washington is reversing its previous commitments to China—the result could be disastrous. Against its will, Beijing might be forced into a rapprochement with Moscow in order to buy precious time to modernize its defenses and prepare for war."

In other words, either you (U.S. imperialists) "modernize" our defenses, or we will be forced to come to terms with the Soviets. Kline himself is obviously horrified at this thought—not out of any Marxist principle, of course, but because it would create terrible problems for him and the CPML in continuing their efforts to buy a safe and "influential" spot kneeling at the feet of the U.S. imperialists in the coming war. Kline writes "The world should hope that China never feels it necessary to make that kind of choice." Read: "I should hope."

There is more than a bluff here coming from China. Major forces within the Chinese leadership are more and more being associated with a line calling for a major realignment of Chinese ties. The unofficial, but pro-China, Hong Kong magazine *Wide Angle* (April 16) carried a report of a speech of the chief delegate to the Sino-Soviet talks, Wang Yu-ping. This revisionist (who is also deputy foreign minister) waxes eloquent

about the Soviet Union before a gathering of Chinese foreign diplomats. Really, you see, there is not a fascist dictatorship there, the conditions of people are improving, politically people are relaxed and the rulers don't really suppress dissidents or oppress minority nationalities all that much. Some outlook—not to mention a publicized statement—for a "tough" negotiator with a "ferocious enemy"! Actually this is quite in keeping with the current Chinese practice of the most utter and public slavishness to imperialists, both present and potential overlords. Apparently they feel an extra "burden" from China's revolutionary past—and that they have to "prove" themselves through contortions that would even embarrass such practiced master lackeys as the Philippines' Marcos, or old Chiang Kai-shek himself.

On the particular question of whether the Soviet Union is socialist or capitalist, Wang is "modestly," and transparently, reserving his personal opinions, saying only that more investigation is needed and there is no need for hasty conclusions. Others have not been nearly so reserved. In fact over the last six months, the debate on the Soviet social system and the implications that has for China's foreign alignments has repeatedly broken out into the open. Under the guise of airing diverse opinions, trial balloons are teasingly run out to test Chinese readiness for new turnabouts, and to "subtly" signal international observers about debates going on—and to jack up the U.S. And then, just as teasingly, the controversies are hushed up again.

Last fall, a major stir was sparked when the national cultural magazine "Hundred Schools of Art and Literature" published the conclusion of a majority of the participants at the "Second National Conference on Contemporary Russian Literature" that the Soviet Union is, in fact, socialist despite the fact that it is externally hegemonistic. Under Brezhnev, the article reported, the political situation is stable and the economy is developing at a good pace. Then after the article had whipped up national interest and debate, the government officially criticized the editors for jumping the gun and called for a self-criticism. But from all indications, the criticism was not specifically

aimed at the very notion that the Soviet Union might not be "socialist." In fact, at the same time, Zhao Ziyang (who has since been appointed Deputy Prime Minister) is reported by the *New York Times* (April 25) to have said that the two basic criteria of a socialist economy are state ownership of the means of production and paying people according to their work—criteria which the Soviet Union has used for years as its "socialist" cover. Completely gone from this line is any Marxist analysis of the truly decisive criterion: *who* controls the state, which *class*, and *in whose interest* society is being transformed. All that is left is the line which the Chinese must uphold together with the Soviet rulers (and all other state capitalists) that simple *state* ownership of industry and land is enough to guarantee working-class rule. "Paying people according to their work" is a phrase which has been used to mean anything. And this has been a slogan of revisionists in both the Soviet Union and China for resurrecting wage slavery, institutionalizing piecework and greatly expanding differences in income between mental and manual laborers. This is capitalism straight up.

It is exactly because the Soviet economy is organized along lines that are similar to the capitalism being restored in China that the debate over the Soviet social system becomes so sticky for the Chinese revisionists. It is not surprising that they are forced to postpone final verdicts. To continue to call the Soviet Union "capitalist" when they themselves are following the same basic internal policies strains their own domestic "socialist" cover. At the same time, the attempts to redefine the Soviet Union as "socialist" immediately bring the entire international analysis of the Chinese government into question—how can the Soviets be such ferocious "hegemonists" when their social system is "socialist"? Perhaps it is only a "bad policy" which could "change" later on.

And obviously, powerful forces in the Chinese leadership are encouraging asking exactly that question because the answer bolsters their growing intention to realign and join the Soviet imperialist war bloc. A deceitful and intensifying debate among utter scoundrels, protective of their demagogic "socialist" masquerade, fighting among themselves over which superpower to bow to.

Continued on page 16

BATTLE OF THE FLAGS

Did May Day have an effect? "Not

Continued from page 13

At this point, the debate is being kept simmering in the background, while the leading forces work out their international tactics, following the characteristic patterns of utter pragmatism and complete lack of any consistency or principle. Current Chinese leader Teng Hsiao-ping has led the pack in this little game of peek-a-boo. In a speech on January 16, Teng openly announced that "The Soviet Union has been building socialism for 63 years since the 1917 October Revolution"—and thereby unleashed powerful forces to re-examine previous verdicts on Russia. Months later the debate was reeled in after a university official gave a speech to Chinese youth leaders calling the United States a greedy imperialist country that had colonies abroad and was so beset by internal troubles that a mother must pay to eat in her son's home. This "discovery" of U.S. imperialism was clearly nothing but a signal that the current slavish love campaign for U.S. imperialism might soon end. The debate had again gone far enough, for now, and so Teng spoke up with a personal "clarification" that contradicted his previous remarks. Peking Review No. 20 (May 19) reports Teng saying: "Facts over the past years show that the Soviet Union is not a socialist country, but a social-imperialist country." Then he adds teasingly, "At present it is the Soviet Union which really threatens world peace. The Soviet Union is the source of war. We should keep a close watch on what will happen in the 1980s." In other words, the accent is on the "at present." A feeble reassurance for the U.S.—in reality, a barely veiled ultimatum.

Reversing the 1960s Polemics

In the famous *Polemic on the*

Hired Killer Magazine

Continued from page 10

be utilized for further counterrevolutionary activity.

It's no wonder that the advertisements, articles, etc. in *Soldier of Fortune* are shot through with the apocalyptic vision of a ruling class that sees itself outnumbered and outmanned, battered on all sides, and definitely in danger of losing it all unless some professional "survivors" can come to the rescue. Until recently, the out-front recruiting activities have centered in on mercenary adventures overseas, particularly in Africa, but lately including Central America as well. Articles and advertisements that deal with assassinations, combat, etc. within the U.S. have been clearly secondary, mostly limited to police defense against "criminals,"

General Line, nine political essays written under Mao's direct leadership, the Chinese party exhaustively exposed the revisionism of the Soviet Union under Khrushchev, showed how the rise of revisionism to power must inevitably lead to capitalism, and systematically defended Marxism-Leninism and its revolutionary essence. For years these precious polemics were nothing less than the very definition of what revolutionary communism meant; they were a life raft for serious revolutionaries disoriented by betrayal and years of crusty reformism. And now, the treatment of these polemics is another indication of how far the Chinese revisionists are moving both in blotting out Marxism and also in making moves toward the Soviets. *In practice* the polemics were repudiated step by step over the past three years: revolution is no longer supported by the Chinese revisionists; the verdict on Yugoslav social-capitalism was reversed for a pragmatic revisionist alliance; Berlinguer's recent visit to China went straight up against the fiery polemic against the betrayals of the Italian Communist Party and its leader Togliatti. Very significantly, the Chinese have moved from just disregarding these polemics to *publicly* repudiating them in general—as was recently done, for example, by Li Yi Mang, Deputy Minister of the Foreign Ministry, in a speech cited in *Wide Angle* that blanketly referred to the polemics as erroneous.

Liu Shao-chi

The ultimate indication of the degree to which the legacy of Mao Tsetung is being eradicated is, of course, the resurrection of Liu Shao-chi, arch-revisionist, infamous as "China's Khrushchev," the man who led the revisionist opposition to Mao and the man famous as a major pro-Soviet imperialist figure

often with racial overtones and stories about border patrolmen attacking "ill-gals."

The recent issue represents the first time that *Soldier of Fortune* has issued the call to go after revolutionaries in the U.S.—a clear sign that the ruling class is seeing things becoming pretty apocalyptic at home as well. And it's not surprising that they would zero in on the flying of the red flag over the Alamo as the incarnation of that vision. For to those like *Soldier of Fortune* and the class it serves, who worship the jackboot of imperialist oppression, that action symbolized their fears of the future and their desperation in trying to stomp it out. □

in the Chinese party of the 1960s. Since the *RW* reported on his restoration in issue No. 44, the flood gates have opened to flatter his memory. May 17 was set aside as a national day of memorial homage to this toad, an open announcement that nothing Mao stood for is sacred, even the antagonism with the Soviet Union. Driving the point home, Teng Hsiao-ping pointedly gave the major memorial speech to Liu without a single mention of "revisionism" or even a *token* denunciation of the social-imperialists.

In short, even while the Chinese revisionists are shamelessly continuing their alliance with the U.S. and unleashing pitiful lobbyists like David Kline to demand even more lucrative relations, the decks are being cleared for rapprochement with the Soviets. As we have already written, in the short run it is an attempt to drive a harder bargain with the American imperialists and pry more goodies out of them—and in the long run it brings the restoration of Sino-Soviet alliance even closer.

Almost a year ago, the *RW* printed an article entitled "When Will China Play the 'China Card'?", which pointed out that the very strength of the Soviet threat to China might very well make them the power that ultimately wins the allegiance of a new capitalist China. Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought teaches that a poor and backward country like China simply cannot maintain independence from the major imperialist powers without breaking capitalist relations of production, and carrying out a revolutionary line of self-reliance and the mobilization of the masses. The laws of imperialism brought into play by the capitalist restoration in China mean that despite the fancy dreams the Chinese capitalists have about rapid "modernization," about "using" the imperialists to build up independent strength and playing off the superpowers, the subordination of China to one superpower or the other is a foregone conclusion. As we wrote last August, "The same thinking guiding their current capitalist 'modernization' will guide them right toward the arms of the Soviets. The pressures that will mount on China as world war draws closer make an about-face in Sino-Soviet relations not just an abstract possibility but a strong likelihood. Their logic: If the Soviets threaten to stomp on your sand castles, why not strike a bargain?"

Munich Analogy

Recent developments have confirmed all our earlier predictions with a vengeance. We pointed out then that

the "Munich analogy" that they were using so freely then to denounce the "Hitler-like" Soviet danger and to call on the Western imperialists to stop what they called "appeasement policies" was a double-edged analogy. The (then) unwritten conclusion to the "Munich analogy" was the possibility of a Chinese flip over to the Soviet side, using the cover of comparison to the then-socialist Soviet Union's temporary pact with Germany to foil the British-U.S. attempts to send Hitler east, unmolested, to attack the Soviet Union. The then unwritten conclusion has now been written explicitly by Dave Kline in the *Call* article, as a flimsy cover to try to sell this grotesque act of capitulation as "socialism" to some *Call* readers.

The bourgeois diplomatic rumor mill is feverishly cranking out advance warnings of major events. Soviet diplomats are reportedly giggling about a "bombshell" the world can expect within months. These could be the first direct indications of a major open thaw between the revisionists in Moscow and Peking.

Whether the Chinese ultimately justify their final crawl to Moscow as a "tactical" necessity forced on them by a supposedly "flabby" West, or whether they simply announce that they have discovered the Russians to be long-lost cousins estranged by Mao Tsetung, is completely irrelevant. Reality doesn't change every time the Chinese opportunists dream up some new historical analogy to justify their prostitution. China is neither a "modernizing" superpower-in-the-making buying time through deft maneuvers, nor is it a "socialist" country hunting long lost comrades. It is a major chunk of the world being bitterly contested by two colliding imperialist superpowers. The shifting alignment of one quarter of humanity into the Soviet camp would be a tremendous change in the international balance of forces. All of Asia would be overshadowed by the Soviet war bloc, and the pressure on Japan to leap over, too, would quickly mount. Without a doubt, the U.S. imperialists would be forced to take rapid and decisive action to hold their empire together and wrench the balance into their favor. The events surrounding this contention promise to be among the decisive events that trigger the approaching third world war. □

A cumulative index of the *Revolutionary Worker*, Vol. 1, Nos. 1-52 will be published in our next issue.

REVOLUTIONARY WORKER
Voice of the Revolutionary Communist Party, U.S.A.