

Modern China Series No.10

China's World view

Anglo-Chinese Educational Institute

Anglo-Chinese Educational Institute

The objects of the Institute are to encourage and promote the study and dissemination of information about all aspects of China and the Chinese people. The Institute is a charitable trust supporting the educational aims of the Society for Anglo-Chinese Understanding (SACU). The Institute Library consists of over 1,400 books and a collection of pamphlets, periodicals, press cuttings and conference reports.

Trustees: Joseph Needham FRS ScD
Joan Robinson FBA
Mary Adams OBE
Derek Bryan OBE
Patrick Daly

Secretary: Alan Paterson
Anglo-Chinese Educational Institute
152 Camden High Street London NW1 ONE

* * *

Available from the Institute

Modern China Series

- No. 3 China's Social Policy by Isaac Ascher, revised edition
 - No. 4 Economic Management in China by Joan Robinson
 - No. 5 Education in China by Peter Mauger and others
 - No. 6 The Women's Movement in China — a Selection of Readings 1949-1973
 - No. 7 Introduction to China by Innes Herdan
 - No. 8 Health Care in China — 1. The Mass Line by Joshua Horn. 2. Annotated Bibliography
- Nos. 1 and 2 in the Series are out of print.

Also available:

Reports from China 1953-1976 by Joan Robinson
Mao Tse-Tung, Marxist by David Fernbach

© Anglo-Chinese Educational Institute, January 1979.

ISBN 0 903193 14 0

CHINA'S WORLD VIEW

The Society for Anglo-Chinese Understanding (SACU) 152 Camden High Street, London, NW1 0NE, was founded in 1965 to promote understanding and friendship between the British and Chinese peoples. It publishes a magazine, *China Now*, six times a year, covering all aspects of modern China, including book reviews. It organises public meetings and discussion groups; provides speakers, films, slides and poster exhibitions. Since 1965 it has been sending to China specialised and general tours and delegations, members of which have access to all the resources of the Society in preparation for their visits.

SACU also publishes a booklet:

Chinese – phrasebook for visitors

which provides in English, *pinyin* and characters (together with a guide to pronunciation) a selection of basic phrases on everyday life and needs. This helps visitors to get closer to the ordinary people than is possible through an interpreter.

China's world view

by

A SACU working group

Contents

Foreword	(vii)
1 The making of the Chinese Revolution	1
2 How the Communist Party of China approaches world politics	7
3 The analysis of imperialism	10
4 War, peace and revolution	17
5 Proletarian internationalism, the united front and peaceful co-existence	23
6 Principle and compromise	28
7 The Third World — basis of China's foreign policy	37
8 The First World	48
9 The USSR's world role today	52
10 How China exposes Soviet revisionism	60
11 Contention between the superpowers	70
12 The Second World	74
13 Europe and the focal point of contention	78
14 The relation between China's world view and development within China	93
Appendices	98
Bibliographical Note	105

Foreword

Since this study was completed much has happened in China. Chairman Hua Guofeng and other government and Party leaders are acting with boundless energy to modernise China's agriculture, industry, science and technology, and defence. China's world view must now take into account the passage of Vietnam into the camp of imperialism. Signs of it had been discernible for some time, but the Soviet-Vietnam treaty and the Soviet military assistance which preceded it and made possible the invasion of Kampuchea, highlighted the change. It disappointed many, showing that however heroic one's past it is still possible to become an aggressor seeking to dominate others.

Then there has been the rift between China and Albania, who stood side by side during the bitterest days of the Sino-Soviet polemic. The present differences seem to stem from the refusal of the Albanian Party of Labour (after much inner-party struggle) to accept the Chinese thesis of the three worlds.

More important in global significance, however, are the China-Japan Treaty of August 1978 and the establishment of full diplomatic relations between China and the USA on 1st January 1979. The treaty with Japan had for years been bitterly opposed by the Soviet government which, acting as imperialism always has, disregarded Japan's sovereignty and refused to discuss the return of the four northern islands annexed after World War II. This gradually alienated Japanese public opinion, while China's care for Japanese susceptibilities, support for her claim for the restoration of her territory and reliability as a trading partner were in striking contrast.

The Sino-US agreement marked the final defeat of the US policy of containing China which dated from 1949. Nixon's visit in 1972 had shown that continued American recognition of the Taiwan government was the only substantial obstacle to the establishment of diplomatic relations. Once again the People's Republic refused to make concessions of principle and this stand, because it was based on solid political realities, proved fully justified. The USA has broken off official relations with Taiwan, as Japan did, and it now remains only for the people of the island to take their place within the People's Republic of China.

It has become increasingly clear, ever since 1969, that the defeated US policy of encircling China is being taken over by the Soviet Union. Her troops and atomic weapons on China's border, her domination of the People's Republic of Mongolia, her stubborn hold on the Japanese islands, her recent treaties with Afghanistan and Vietnam (both containing 'military' clauses),

all attest this. To meet the threat China continues to encourage a broad front of Third and Second World countries to oppose superpower domination. Part of her effort has been an unprecedented series of visits all over the world by high-ranking Chinese delegations, often led by important Party or government officials. The policy they have been implementing is the policy we describe in this book.

Note

From the beginning of 1979 the Chinese State Council decided to go over wholly to the pinyin method of 'romanising' Chinese characters. Much of the Western press has followed suit and we may therefore expect that old spellings to which we have become accustomed will gradually fade from memory. Below is a table showing the pinyin equivalents of the names of Chinese people and places referred to in our text. The State Council's decision came too late for alterations to be made.

February 1979

Table of pinyin equivalents

Mao Tse-tung: Mao Zedong	Liu Shao-chi: Liu Shaoqi
Chou En-lai: Zhou Enlai	Chang Chun-chiao: Zhang Chunqiao
Chiang Kai-shek: Jiang Jieshi	Chiang Ching: Jiang Qing
Hua Kuo-feng: Hua Guofeng	Wang Hung-wen: Wang Hongwen
Teng Hsiao-ping: Deng Xiaoping	Kuomintang: Guomindang
Chiao Kuan-hua: Jiao Guanhua	Chungking: Chongqing
Lin Piao: Lin Biao	Peking: Beijing
Kao Kang: Gao Gang	Hsinhua: Xinhua

Chapter 1

The making of the Chinese Revolution

Since the last World War, and especially in recent years, great changes have taken place. Former colonial countries have won political independence and begun to use it; the oil-producing countries have realised their strength in relation to the industrial powers; the Soviet Union has reverted from socialism to capitalism; and the people of China, the world's most populous land, have freed themselves from exploitation.

Many more people are becoming interested in China, because its policies, both external and internal, seem to have broken out of the usual rut. Some are perhaps suspicious because China is a communist country, yet its internal policies are often both original and successful, while its initiatives in world politics seem reasonable and worthy of support. Is this so in spite of China's Marxist principles, or because of them? It is our aim in this booklet to explain how the Chinese look at the world and so to provide a guide to understanding the reasons for their policies, particularly their foreign policy.

Many of the ideas China has put forward about world politics are very striking, for example the warning that a new world war, centred on Europe, is likely. This has horrified some, others have dismissed it as absurd. To be too horrified to think about world war will not prevent it, and before a line of reasoning can be called absurd an effort must be made to understand it. The Chinese believe their world view is reasonable and coherent, that it does not lead to inconsistencies, that their foreign and home policies are based on the same reality and that the goals they seek are in the direction that world history is inevitably going.

In order to understand present Chinese policies it is well to take a brief look at China's past — an important influence in bringing about the people's desire to change the old society for a new one. This look at the past is particularly desirable for us in Britain and other Western countries because the development of our modern industrial society has for a long time been closely linked with China. An important part of our wealth was obtained at the expense of China.

The first British aggression took place some 140 years ago, when China was still being ruled by old-style Emperors. That vast country with its big population was ceasing to be what it had once been — a great civilisation with a stable economy, more advanced than Europe in science and technology and with its own brilliant artistic traditions. Under venal and degenerate rule it had fallen behind Europe and poverty and misery were on the increase.

China's ancient civilisation could not save it from becoming part of the

colonial sector of the world economy that capitalism had brought into existence. All over the world the vigorous forces of capitalism originating in Europe were like a torrent which swept away one by one the barriers to the creation of a world economy. The countries of Europe competed with each other, and with the USA and Japan, to exploit what they saw as a vast market for their manufactures, a storehouse of wealth to be looted with impunity, a highly profitable field for investment, a pool of expendable labour and an area of great strategic importance in the struggle for world domination which was beginning. The ruined and oppressed Chinese peasants, handicraftsmen, traders and labourers wanted to resist, but got little sympathy from their traditional rulers, the Imperial Court and the feudal gentry, who were concerned to ensure their own survival.

These rulers often received assistance from the foreign powers which eventually occupied and administered parts of China. On more than one occasion workers and students demonstrating against foreign rule and exploitation were shot and killed by the police or troops of imperialist powers.

This imperialist occupation of China was against the interests of the majority of the Chinese people. As the colony of several powers, China was in danger of being partitioned like Africa.

Chinese who were deeply concerned about restoring the livelihood of the people and ensuring China's survival as an independent nation came more and more to see that their country had entered a new era; world history had left old China behind. Some reformers tried to reverse what was happening, but their efforts came to nothing. Others decided that they must look to and learn from the West. Under Sun Yat-sen's leadership the Emperor was overthrown in the democratic revolution of 1911 but the young Chinese Republic was even more at the mercy of imperialist forces than its predecessor. During and after the First World War China's territory was disposed of by her 'allies' without her knowledge.

Just when Chinese patriots were coming to see clearly that the 'democracy' and expertise of the West were no solution for China's poverty and subjection, came news of the overthrow of one of the most rapacious of the imperialist regimes, that of Tsarist Russia, by workers and peasants led by their own revolutionary party. The Bolshevik Revolution had a powerful impact on semi-colonial China and the following passage well summarises this period of history.

From the time of China's defeat in the Opium War of 1840, Chinese progressives went through untold hardships in their quest for truth from the Western countries . . . Chinese who then sought progress would read any book containing new knowledge from the West. The number of students sent to Japan, Britain, the United States, France and Germany was amazing. At home, the imperial examinations were abolished and modern schools sprang up like bamboo shoots after spring rain; every effort was made to learn from the West. In my youth, I too engaged in such studies. They represented the culture of Western bourgeois democracy,

including the social theories and natural sciences of that period, and they were called 'the new learning' in contrast to Chinese feudal culture, which was called 'the old learning'. For quite a long time, those who had acquired the new learning felt confident that it would save China, and very few of them had any doubts on this score, as the adherents of the old learning had. Only modernisation could save China, only learning from foreign countries could modernise China. Among the foreign countries, only the Western capitalist countries were then progressive, as they had successfully built modern bourgeois states . . .

Imperialist aggression shattered the fond dreams of the Chinese about learning from the West. It was very odd – why were the teachers always committing aggression against their pupil? The Chinese learned a good deal from the West, but they could not make it work and were never able to realise their ideals. Their repeated struggles, including such a country-wide movement as the Revolution of 1911, all ended in failure. Day by day, conditions in the country got worse, and life was made impossible. Doubts arose, increased and deepened. World War I shook the whole globe. The Russians made the October Revolution and created the world's first socialist state . . . Then, and only then, did the Chinese enter an entirely new era in their thinking and their life. They found Marxism-Leninism, the universally applicable truth, and the face of China began to change.

(Mao Tse-tung: *On the People's Democratic Dictatorship*, Selected Works Vol.IV)

It thus became possible for the more advanced Chinese revolutionaries to form a definite idea of how to attain the goal of an independent, democratic and prosperous China, and the first steps were taken with the foundation of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921. Out of the struggles of the working class (which at that time included seamen, stevedores, miners, textile workers and others) and of the youth and intellectuals, there emerged a new leadership with readily understood aims which commanded wide support. Large sections of the peasantry began to be won over to the view that the old relations of exploitation and domination in China's vast countryside were part of a *system*: all over the world the labouring masses were being similarly exploited in the interests of a tiny minority.

Initially only a few adopted the outlook of the politically conscious working class and followed it; but the revolutionary tide grew stronger. Led by the CPC the Chinese began and sustained the long struggle to liberate China and carry out the socialist revolution.

The October Revolution helped progressives in China, as throughout the world, to adopt the proletarian world outlook as the instrument for studying a nation's destiny and considering anew their own problems. Follow the path of the Russians – that was their conclusion.

(*ibid.*)

Imperialism had led to the development in China of a small but disciplined and politically advanced proletariat; Chinese patriots who viewed their struggle for liberation as part of a world revolution that would end only with

the final overthrow of capitalism; a deeply oppressed people who became pupils and successors of all those in many lands who had fought against oppression; and an armed and organised force to unite the vast majority against capitalism. In other words, capitalism had produced the very forces which would destroy it.

At first, the ruling classes of Britain, the USA, France, Japan and other imperialist countries, together with Chinese collaborators, seemed invincible. Two years after Sun Yat-sen's death in 1925, Chiang Kai-shek (military leader of the Kuomintang) seized power and claimed to be Sun's successor. In fact he allied himself with the very interests and classes against which Sun had fought. Chiang suppressed the political activity which the revolutionary Kuomintang had encouraged, imprisoned and tortured revolutionaries and carried out several large massacres. The imperialists, who had been on the defensive, found an ally in the now counter-revolutionary Kuomintang of Chiang Kai-shek.

Gradually, however, relying on the masses of the working people and their own Party, the patriots and revolutionaries were able to turn the tide. Everything they won they had to fight for. They were sustained by the strong belief that social development is subject to laws which can be understood, that history is on the side of those seeking to build a world where there are no oppressor classes or nations. They were ready to show the seemingly superhuman courage, discipline and capacity for suffering demanded of those who were creating a new China. In order to win power and defend it a Workers' and Peasants' Red Army was formed.

The revolutionaries went among the different sections of people, especially in the villages, to listen to the masses, understand their problems and explain the political situation. In this way they formed a political movement which had wide support from the people of China. When in 1937 the Japanese moved to extend the colonial regime they had established in northeast China in 1931, the CPC took the initiative in forming an anti-Japanese united front, following the principle of uniting all possible forces against the main enemy.

During the war of resistance against fascist Japan and the Second World War, China's international alignments underwent a change. For the Chiang regime it was an opportunity to enhance its status and enrich itself. For the Communist-led patriotic forces it was a time of new-found solidarity with all those oppressed by fascism and colonialism and also a time of learning how to form an alliance even with reactionaries and imperialists who had quite different reasons for opposing the Japanese. The invaders were defeated by a people's war waged on a scale never approached before.

After World War II ended in 1945 the USA strongly supported Chiang Kai-shek in turning once more against the Communists and attempting to seize the whole of China. Although, to begin with, the Communists had much smaller forces and far weaker armaments than the Kuomintang, they successfully developed their policy of relying on the masses, brought all the people's ingenuity and courage into play and completely defeated the Kuomintang in only four years. As Mao Tse-tung said:

When Chiang Kai-shek started his offensive against us in 1946, many of our comrades and the people of the country were much concerned about whether we could win the war. I myself was concerned. But we were confident of one thing . . . I said all allegedly powerful reactionaries are merely paper tigers. The reason is that they are divorced from the people . . . We have developed a concept over a long period from the struggle against the enemy, namely, strategically we should despise all our enemies, but tactically we should take them all seriously.

(Mao Tse-tung: *All Reactionaries are Paper Tigers*, Selected Works, Vol.V).

Speaking on 30 June 1949, when the victory of the revolution over the Kuomintang was assured, Mao Tse-tung was able to say that the Chinese had taken a step on the 'ten-thousand-li journey' towards the final 'extinction of classes, state power and parties', that is, towards Communism.

The foundation of the People's Republic of China was the first action of its kind in the colonial world and it marked a profound historical change. The Chinese proletariat, after protracted struggles, had achieved success in spite of the apparent domination of powers with advanced material resources, modern technology, tested skills in government and diplomacy. The new workers' and peasants' state refused to be intimidated by any bullying, aggression, subversion or other nonsense from those who considered themselves 'lords of the earth'. Speaking for New China in 1949, Mao Tse-tung made it clear that China expected to make a bigger contribution to mankind than ever before; he also firmly laid down the only terms on which other countries would be able to engage in relations with the People's Republic:

We are willing to discuss with any foreign government the establishment of diplomatic relations on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual benefit and mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty . . . The Chinese people wish to have friendly co-operation with the people of all countries and to resume and expand international trade in order to develop production and promote economic prosperity.

(Mao Tse-tung: *Address to the Preparatory Committee of the New Political Consultative Conference*, Selected Works, Vol.IV)

The People's Democratic Dictatorship, as it was called, led by the working class, was a serious challenge to all ideas about world politics propagated by Western capitalism. For this reason the legitimacy, even the existence, of the PRC was denied for years and every effort was made to bring it down. But the advance of the Chinese revolution could not be held back. Under the leadership of Mao and the CPC the Chinese people overcame their desperate poverty, backwardness, illiteracy, chronic malnutrition and disease in an incredibly short time. Relying primarily on their own efforts and ingenuity the workers and poor peasants, with revolutionary and patriotic intellectuals who had fought and suffered with them, have in less than 30 years laid the foundations of a socialist China well on its way to satisfying the people's growing needs for food, clothing, housing, medical care and industrial raw

material and equipment, and creating a strong and stable industrial base and an economy free from inflation and debt. In the early years the Soviet Union gave valuable material and technical assistance, but the main emphasis had always been on self-reliance. China's remarkable economic progress has not been attained at the expense of any other people — even China's enemies have had to admit that. To an increasing extent the ordinary workers and peasants enjoy the concrete reality of political power. In the next chapter we shall show something of how they use it.

Chapter 2

How the Communist Party of China approaches world politics

The Chinese emphasise that their state is under the leadership of the working class; in fact, the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' over the bourgeoisie prevails. It was one of the most important concerns of Mao Tse-tung and his closest colleagues that the working class should retain the power progressively to restrict and eliminate any tendencies toward resurgence of capitalism during the transitional period until communism is realised. Since Mao's death the new Chairman, Hua Kuo-feng, and other leaders have reiterated the need to 'continue the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat'.

In China it is the CPC's Central Committee (elected at periodic National Congresses of the Party) which has ultimate responsibility for deciding on questions of fundamental political importance and for approving statements of principle which represent what China stands for. There is also the National People's Congress (composed of deputies elected on a territorial basis), which elects a Standing Committee as a permanent body in control of state affairs; and this Standing Committee in turn appoints and, if necessary, dismisses the Prime Minister and other Ministers (including the Foreign Minister) who form the State Council. The Foreign Ministry and the International Department of the CPC's Central Committee conduct formal relations with their counterparts in other countries. The current (1977) Constitution of the PRC lays down. The Communist Party of China . . . is the core of leadership of the whole Chinese people.

Participation in international diplomacy demands specialised work even for a country in which the working class is the ruling class. Time and attention and labour have to be allocated to study and devise policies that accurately reflect world conditions. This business of foreign policy, complex as it is, is increasingly being discussed and understood by the 'ordinary' people of China, especially the younger workers and peasants. In the light of the Marxist belief that the people, and the people alone, are the motive force of world history such understanding is clearly essential.

China's world view is formed by a process which can be divided into three stages. Firstly, there is the immediate perception of facts and events, such as a good reporter or historian seizes on. Since the foundation of the People's Republic the Chinese have been observing the same facts and events as people of other countries — changes of government, wars and invasions, negotiations and agreements between states, economic crises, increasing or diminishing control of other countries by imperialism, etc. But they have been observing them from their own historical, geographical and ideological position as a

country once oppressed by imperialism, as part of the Third World, and as a country guided by the theory of scientific socialism.

To get information about what is happening in the world the Chinese depend on their own investigation and research, reports by reliable observers on the spot, discussions with visitors and so on. They have in recent years vastly increased their knowledge of the social history and culture of peoples with whom, in the long history of China before the Revolution, there had been only marginal contact, or with whom contact had been broken under the influence of colonialism. Ordinary working people — the men and women in the factories, mines, oilfields, construction sites, shops, army units, colleges and farms — appear to do much more serious study of what goes on elsewhere in the world than do the people of any other country. In addition to the world news, which is reported and analysed from a Marxist viewpoint in newspapers and broadcasts, there is a daily paper of information material on world affairs.* In some factories every shift reads and discusses the day's news, including this information material. In some there are special workers' commentary groups.

Secondly, to understand the present world order and the conflicts to which it gives rise, to see how one situation at a particular time develops into another, a scientific understanding of the age in which we are living is necessary — in other words, a sound grasp of theory. Such phenomena as strikes, coups d'état, currency revaluations and production statistics do not, in themselves, reveal the essential character of the situation in a country or the world. For example, they do not show how such events as the setting up or closing down of US military bases, the Algerian victory in the war of liberation against the French, the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the Pinochet coup in Chile in 1973, or the economic crisis in Britain came about, where they are leading or how they connect up with what is happening elsewhere. The Chinese train themselves to take into consideration all the relevant factors and contradictions in a situation, its history, the social movements, economic trends, conflicts of interest among different classes and social strata, the extent of political awareness and prejudice, the strength of reaction as well as of revolutionary currents at any given moment. Marxism (or Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought) is their microscope and telescope. This theory, like any other with a claim to be scientific, did not 'fall from the skies', and the Chinese do not use it as a dogma. It was developed over a long period of observation of and participation in the struggle of workers and peasants all over the world. The experience of the Chinese Revolution, as summed up especially in Mao Tse-tung's works, is a component part of the theory of Marxism-Leninism as it stands today, though this

* The Chinese-language publication *Reference News* is a daily with a circulation of about seven million and 35-40 million readers. It is made up entirely of translations of foreign news agency reports and newspaper articles, published without comment. Every factory, commune, army unit and middle school receives one or more copies.

experience is not fully appreciated by all who claim to follow the ideas of Marx and Lenin.

There is a third level of relationship to the world. The Chinese would say that they study and analyse the world situation *in order to change it*. Information and theoretical analysis are not ends in themselves. Through knowledge of how society develops in the present epoch the Chinese have been working for a change in the world order, and are themselves changing that part of it which is within their own country. The making of revolution in any country is the responsibility of its people; revolution cannot be exported. But what the Chinese are doing is of long-term assistance to the revolutionary proletariat, which, according to Mao Tse-tung, also represents the interests of more than 90 per cent of the people of the world. Given the nature of the historical period in which we live, leadership in the task of changing the world cannot be exercised by those who now rule it and benefit by the present system.

In the present epoch of the development of society, the responsibility of correctly knowing and changing the world has been placed by history upon the shoulders of the proletariat and its party.

(Mao Tse-tung: *On Practice*, Selected Works, Vol.I)

Much that goes on in the world, such as the impoverishment of the already impoverished countries, the widespread and systematic imprisonment and torture of men and women engaged in democratic activity, the arrogant demands of the powers, angers and revolts the Chinese as it does many people in other lands. In response to such situations the Chinese think of action on three levels of relations between China and the rest of the world: between people and people, between revolutionary party and revolutionary party, and between state and state. These are the three categories of policy relations, as the Chinese see it. In working out a socialist approach to international politics the Chinese can learn to some extent from the past experience of revolutionary Russia, but in dealing with the complexities of development since the Second World War, they have been breaking completely new ground.

To grasp the Chinese world view, as manifested in theory and in practice, may demand quite an effort. The Chinese policy-makers see each situation as part of a whole, historically and geographically. Their study of history shows that the world is developing in such a way that oppression and exploitation of class by class, nation by nation, will eventually be abolished. This is an objective law independent of people's will. But revolutionaries can and must take action in conformity with and as a stimulus to this historical trend. At present, one thing that stands in the way of the peoples of the world is, according to this view, imperialism. That is the major problem today.

In order to explain satisfactorily the way the Chinese look at the world one must outline the Marxist-Leninist analysis of imperialism, which we shall do in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

The analysis of imperialism

Chairman Mao has often taught us: We are still in the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution . . . Stalin said: 'Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution'. This is entirely correct. Since Lenin's death, the world situation has undergone great changes. But the era has not changed. The fundamental principles of Leninism are not outdated: they remain the theoretical basis guiding our thinking today.

(Chou En-lai at the 10th National Congress of the CPC)

Imperialism, in Lenin's definition, is the 'highest stage of capitalism'. Marx saw modern capitalism as a society divided between the many who work and the few who own and control the productive process and society in general while living off the labour of others. By tremendously developing the productive forces and organising production on a much wider and more comprehensive basis than had ever existed before, capitalism produces within itself essential elements of a new classless, communist, society, in which production is consciously controlled by the producers themselves on behalf of the whole people — at first nationally, then eventually on a world scale. But while capitalism has thus prepared the basis for the future progressive development of society, it is itself the main obstacle preventing the change from coming about.

The exploitation and oppression of capitalism force the working class to struggle against this system, seize state power and initiate the transformation of society. For society to develop into communism it must pass through a stage (socialism) in which the working class becomes the ruling class.

From its very beginnings capitalism has involved the exploitation and oppression, not just of one class by another, but of some nations by others. In this sense, 20th century imperialism is simply the culmination of earlier colonialism. Marx and Lenin were very clear on this point and so was Mao Tse-tung:

The evil system of colonialism and imperialism began with the enslavement of Negroes and the trade in Negroes.

(Mao Tse-tung: *People of the World Unite and Defeat the U.S. Aggressors and all their Lackeys*)

However, imperialism in the sense used by Lenin, and since then developed by all Marxist-Leninists, refers to something that began to develop only

towards the end of the 19th century. Lenin summarises thus the characteristics of this historical period:

1. the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a stage that it has created monopolies that play a decisive role in economic life;
2. the merging of bank capital with industrial capital and the creation, on the basis of this 'finance capital', of a financial oligarchy;
3. the export of capital, as distinguished from the export of commodities, acquires exceptional significance;
4. the formation of international monopoly capitalist associations which share the world among themselves;
5. the territorial division of the world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed.

(V.I. Lenin: *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Chapter 7).

When the biggest capitalist powers have divided the world among themselves it is clear that an up-and-coming imperialist power can secure a place only by challenging one of the established powers — hence the age of imperialism is one of world wars for the redivision of the globe. Capitalism was once progressive but in its 'highest' stage it has stopped advancing and has become completely moribund and parasitic.

Imperialism thus intensifies the contradictions of capitalism. As well as the struggle between working class and employers, we now have the struggle between oppressed and oppressor nations and acute conflicts (political, military and economic) between rival imperialist powers. It is in these conditions that the transformation of capitalism into socialism and then communism begins, with the outbreak of proletarian revolution against the imperialist system. As Lenin said (quoted by Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism*): 'Imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution'.

There were many instances in Lenin's time of people who made quite a fuss about being anti-imperialist yet in practice really served imperialism. The most important question, as Lenin saw it, was: should the contradictions of imperialism be used to destroy the system, or should they be alleviated? Some leaders in the workers' movement capitulated to imperialism (usually their 'own' imperialism) at the outbreak of the First World War. They went on producing arguments which in spite of their Marxist phraseology served to prettify imperialism, apologise for it, make things easier for it.

Lenin called such people 'social-imperialists' — socialists in words, imperialists in deeds. A prominent representative of this trend was Karl Kautsky and the Chinese often refer to Lenin's criticism of him when making their own criticism of the present leaders of the USSR.

The building of a new workers' movement was given a great impetus by Lenin's analysis of the general characteristics of imperialism. One of the new parties which came into existence was the Communist Party of China, which upheld Lenin's view that imperialism is the *highest* stage of capitalism and that its basic characteristics will endure throughout the period before the

victory of the socialist revolution throughout the world. The CPC still holds to this analysis, though many other 'communist' parties now have a completely different political line.

Lenin considered that in the present era the Marxist slogan 'Workers of all countries, unite!' should be extended to become 'Workers of all countries, and all oppressed peoples, unite!' in recognition of the common interest uniting the proletariat with the national liberation movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries in struggling against imperialism. According to Lenin, a workers' state like Russia naturally had to form part of this united front and do 'the utmost possible in one country for the development, support and awakening of the revolution in all countries' (quoted by J.V. Stalin: *Foundations of Leninism*).

From the 1920s onwards the new international communist movement struggled against the imperialist powers as a whole and especially against those major powers which were the standard-bearers of oppression. Immediately after World War I the major enemy was the Entente powers grouped in the League of Nations, then it was the fascist Axis powers of the 1930s. At the conclusion of World War II the major enemy was the USA, representing imperialism in a concentrated, aggressive form in the succeeding period.

At the same time a powerful socialist camp had emerged to become a major force standing in the way of US aggression. Later, when signs began to appear that Lenin's policy was being abandoned, the CPC conducted a serious inter-Party debate with the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It became an open polemic when the CPSU attacked the CPC publicly and began to repudiate the essentials of what should have been their common heritage: Marxism-Leninism. We shall refer extensively to the documents of this polemic, since together they are a systematic statement of all the major aspects of the Chinese world view at that time.

The central document from the Chinese is *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, published in June 1963. Before this, however, the Chinese had replied extensively to criticisms levelled against them by several 'Communist' Parties in capitalist countries. The most comprehensive of these articles is *More on the Differences between Comrade Togliatti and Ourselves*. After the CPSU had openly attacked the CPC and the Chinese *Proposal* had been published, the Chinese set out their point of view in more detail in a number of other publications, the most important being a set of nine 'Comments' on an 'Open Letter' from the Central Committee of the CPSU.

The first of them, *The Origin and Development of the Differences between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves*, sets out how the Chinese saw the crisis developing. The last, *On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism* (July 1964) is a summing up. The Comments also give the full text of important documents from the Soviet side.

The Soviet leaders had departed from Leninism in various ways, but the most striking and dangerous was their tendency, from the late '50s to the beginning of the '70s, to be especially friendly towards the people's main

enemy, the Number One imperialist power of that time, the government of the USA.

In their *Proposal* the CPC ask, what are the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world? They reply:

Marxist-Leninists consistently hold that they are:

the contradiction between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp;
the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries;
the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism; and
the contradictions among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

This categorisation is not an exercise in logic; its point of reference is the real world and it is a guide to action, showing whom to unite with and whom to oppose. At an early stage of the Chinese Revolution Mao Tse-tung said:

'Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? This is a question of the first importance for the revolution' (*Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society*, 1926). Internationally also it was and is a question of first importance.

To defeat the reactionary rule of imperialism . . . it is necessary to form a broad united front with all forces, excluding the enemy, that can be united with and continue to wage arduous struggles.

(Chairman Mao's Important Talks with Guests from Asia, Africa and Latin America)

The four contradictions mentioned above are all referred to in the writings of Lenin, who was particularly farsighted in perceiving the enormous importance of the struggle of oppressed nations and peoples. He too made his analysis a guide to action, showing whom to unite with and whom to oppose. The *Proposal* quotes him as follows:

Alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed countries against any and all the imperialists — such is the external policy of the proletariat.

And the Chinese themselves add:

Whoever fails to understand this point and considers that the support and aid given by the socialist countries to the oppressed peoples and nations are a burden or a charity is going counter to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

(*Proposal*, op.cit.)

These Leninist theories should have served as an accepted analytical tool to apply to the complex facts of the world situation in order to understand its underlying trends. The Chinese opposed any domination of the international movement by a single party, but if all parties shared these perspec-

tives the movement would surely constitute a united force, and a very powerful one. The 'camp' of the socialist states was a particularly important progressive force; both the Russians and Chinese felt it was important but not for the same reasons. To the Chinese the socialist camp had a heavy responsibility; its progressive status was not something for all time, automatic, infallible. Nor did they feel, as the Russians tended to, that the relation between this force and imperialism determined everything in world politics.

The socialist countries should certainly oppose imperialism in a consistent and unwavering way, but the masses of the world's people, who were the targets of aggression, must be the main strength in overthrowing it. The socialist camp should encourage and support popular struggles; it should certainly not be indifferent, still less should it try to prevent the action of the masses. If it did it would become a hindrance to progress.

According to Marxism, a phenomenon is mainly characterised by its contradictions, and the Chinese formulated four basic contradictions to show that this is still the period of imperialism and proletarian revolution. The principal (i.e. dominant) aspect of the world's contradictions is the people, and they grow stronger while the group of oppressors grows weaker.

While emphasising the continuity of the era the Chinese also show how the relation of world forces has changed. Basing themselves on historical experience since Lenin's time, they show how imperialism is being tied down and fiercely attacked by the people of the developing countries:

The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America . . . The national-democratic revolution in these areas is an important component of the contemporary proletarian world revolution . . . In a sense, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population.

(*Proposal, op.cit.*)

In making this point the Chinese referred to the liberation struggles of the peoples of Vietnam, Algeria and other countries, as well as to the struggle waged by many developing countries which had already attained independence, to safeguard their sovereignty against neo-colonialist plunder of their economies and imperialist subversion and intervention in their internal affairs.

The Soviet leaders, on the other hand, implied that the socialist camp exercised decisive influence on the whole of world politics, the most important aspect being the relations of the USSR with US imperialism. This reflected the Soviet leaders' capitalist outlook, trying to conclude an agreement with a competitor and thinking the world's people beneath contempt. Khrushchev said:

Understanding between these powers (*USSR and USA* — Ed.) and their willingness to co-operate with each other in the settlement of outstanding international issues on the basis of the UN Charter and the principles of

peaceful co-existence, today largely determine the general state of affairs in international relations.

(Interview in *Izvestia*, 31 December 1962)

While the Soviet leaders put forward the theory that the internal progress of a socialist country is assured by a growth in production, they argued also that the economic growth of the USSR was inevitably and necessarily a factor for progress in world politics as well, never mind what policy the USSR pursued. They could thus say:

The socialist system is exerting an ever-growing influence on the course of world development. The entire world revolutionary process is today developing under the direct influence of the great example provided by the new life in the countries of socialism . . . It is therefore clear that he who wants to bring closer the victory of socialism throughout the entire world should, in the first place, show concern for strengthening the great socialist community and its economic might . . . consolidate its unity and solidarity and the growth of its international authority.

(Letter of the CC of the CPSU to the CC of the CPC, 30 March 1963.

Printed as Appendix to *Proposal, op.cit.*)

In the same document the Soviet side argued:

The faster the productive forces of the socialist countries develop, the higher their economic potential will rise, and the stronger the influence of the socialist community will become on the rate and trend of the whole of historical development in the interest of peace and of the complete triumph of socialism.

This is an extension into the international sphere of the 'theory of productive forces', which denies Marx's and Lenin's view that the working people are the major creative force and class struggle is the motive force of development. This theory took root in the Soviet Union after Lenin's death and became especially marked after Khrushchev came to power. It puts a one-sided emphasis on the development of the productive forces as the main factor in the progress of a socialist country towards communism. The Chinese view, on the other hand, following Mao Tse-tung, is that in socialist society class struggle is the most important progressive factor. The Soviet position was fundamentally unacceptable to the CPC.

While rejecting over-emphasis of the contradiction between socialist and imperialist states, the Chinese also reject the Trotskyite view, which over-emphasises the contradiction between proletariat and bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, believing or purporting to believe that this is the only important conflict in world politics. The Chinese see all the contradictions as important and all as inter-related. It is impossible to understand one (e.g. the struggle between capitalism and its 'own' working class) without seeing it in relation to the others (e.g. capitalism in relation to the colonies

or semi-colonies). Every contradiction influences the development of the other contradictions.

The struggle between the oppressed nations and imperialism was the focus of world contradiction at the time of the Sino-Soviet polemic in 1963 and today it still is. This does not mean that the other contradictions are unimportant, but they tend to revolve around this one. The CPC recognised that this situation was developing and changing:

The centre of world contradictions, of world political struggles, is not fixed but shifts with changes in the international struggles and the revolutionary situation. We believe that, with the development of the contradiction and struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in Western Europe and North America, the momentous day of battle will arrive in these homes of capitalism and heartlands of imperialism. When that day comes Western Europe and North America will undoubtedly become the centre of world political struggles, of world contradictions.

(*Apologists of Neo-Colonialism*, 1963)

It may indeed happen that the present position, with Europe the focus of contention between the superpowers, marks the beginning of this change.

Chapter 4

War, peace and revolution

Historically, all reactionary forces on the verge of extinction conduct a last desperate struggle against the revolutionary forces, and some revolutionaries are apt to be deluded for a time by this phenomenon of outward strength but inner weakness, failing to grasp the essential fact that the enemy is nearing extinction while they themselves are approaching victory. (Mao Tse-tung: *The Turning Point in World War II*, Selected Works, Vol.III)

Some of the differences between the CPC and the CPSU have been set out in the previous chapter. Another question on which the Chinese felt they had to uphold principle and defend the Marxist method of seeking truth from facts is that of the relation between peace and war. The Soviet leadership under Khrushchev had proposed a set of ideas referred to as the 'three peacefuls': peaceful transition to socialism, peaceful coexistence, and the possibility of preventing war. This reflects the Soviet leaders' exaggerated opinion of what they could achieve by their own efforts, in the absence of support from the world's people, or even in the face of opposition from them. This was the first stage in the USSR's great-power chauvinism, the belief that their own interests as a nation are supreme.

All analysis in international politics centres, explicitly or implicitly, on the question of war. Marxism-Leninism looks at the problem in an all-round way: war is indeed an evil and must be eliminated, but this will come about only with the final overthrow of imperialism. It is a step towards this when oppressed people engage in just, revolutionary, class or national armed struggle in order to overthrow an oppressor class or oppressor nation. The Chinese Communists have added a lot to Marxist theory through their experience of a quarter-century of revolutionary wars on an unprecedented scale.

In the era of imperialism, which produces the phenomenon of *world war*, the attitude to war becomes a central issue in all politics. In the context of an imperialist world war the Marxist-Leninist view is that the working class of imperialist aggressor states should work for national defeat (turn the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war), whereas the people of oppressed countries and nations should fight for national independence. The imperialist economic system is characterised by competition and plunder; imperialist politics reflects this economic system, and war in turn is regarded by Marxists as an extension of politics. Hence it is not surprising that imperialist war should be aggressive. Stalin said, 'In order to abolish the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism' (*Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*).

Unjust imperialist wars (all imperialist wars are unjust) take different forms: firstly, conflicts between rival imperialist blocs or states aimed at a redivision of spheres of influence; secondly, attacks by one or more imperialist powers on the peoples of weaker countries; thirdly, aggression against socialist states. In discussing which were the just or unjust struggles in world politics Lenin put forward very definite criteria: for example, on the national and colonial question he argued that policy should be based

firstly, on an exact estimate of the specific historical situation and, primarily, of the economic conditions; secondly, on a clear distinction between the interests of the oppressed classes, of the toilers and exploited, and the general concept of national interests as a whole, which implies the interests of the ruling class; thirdly, on an equally clear distinction between the oppressed, dependent and subject nations and the oppressing, exploiting and sovereign nations, in order to counter the bourgeois-democratic lies which obscure the colonial and financial enslavement — characteristics of the era of finance capital and imperialism — of the vast majority of the world's population by an insignificant minority of the richest and most advanced capitalist countries.

(V.I. Lenin: *Preliminary Draft of Theses on the National and Colonial Questions*)

As we shall see later, these are precisely the criteria the CPC applies in analysing the contemporary era, characterised by superpower domination, bullying and oppression on the one hand and resistance by the peoples on the other. They are used also to analyse the significance of the conflicts which have broken out in various parts of the world recently: in Eastern Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, Southern Africa, etc. The abandonment of this method of analysis by the Soviet leaders during the Khrushchev period obscured the fundamental antagonism between the ruling class of the USA and the peoples of other countries (including the working class and minorities in the US). By persisting in denial of these principles the Soviet leaders now also attempt to cover up the increasing antagonism between the ruling class of the Soviet Union and the world's people.

One part of the debate between the Chinese and Soviet parties in the early 60s centred on the question of whether war was still inevitable under imperialism, and whether people were justified in taking up arms to oppose imperialist violence. Specifically, the question was whether the advent of a new *form* of warfare (nuclear weapons) had altered the fundamental character of war in this era.

The basic argument of Khrushchev and his allies started from nuclear weapons: the unprecedented destructive power of these weapons, they urged, made nuclear war a suicidal venture; yet every armed conflict in a world divided between socialism and imperialism threatened to escalate into a war between the two camps, and such war involved the danger of nuclear weapons being used. 'Any small "local war" might spark off the conflagration of a world (nuclear) war' (quoted in *Two Different Lines on the Question of*

War and Peace). The Russians therefore proposed 'general and complete disarmament' to the US leaders as a practicable goal, holding that all 'local' conflicts could be settled by negotiation between the two superpowers.

We (*the USA and the USSR* — Ed.) are the strongest countries in the world and if we unite for peace there can be no war.

(*ibid*)

This argument also has a bearing on the idea of peaceful evolution to socialism. The Chinese say that at the meeting of representatives of 12 Communist Parties in Moscow in November 1957, 'the chief subject of controversy between us and the delegation of the CPSU was the transition from capitalism to socialism' (*The Origin and Development of the Differences between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves*). According to the Soviet perspective, the peoples were to be dissuaded from carrying out revolution, since this would involve the danger of war. In those circumstances, therefore, the road of the October Revolution was no longer universally valid and could be replaced by the 'parliamentary road'. But the CPSU did not say how the contradictions of capitalism were to be resolved without war.

Khrushchev did in fact advance the unconvincing prospect of a period of peaceful competition between capitalism and socialism in the economic and technical fields, as a result of which capitalism, having been shown to be inferior, would withdraw gracefully from the world stage, with best wishes to its peaceful conqueror, socialism. Events soon exposed this as very un-Leninist fantasy.

In criticising the Soviet position on war, peace and revolution the Chinese emphasised first of all that it bore no relation to reality. The Soviet leaders spoke as though this was already an era of peace, whereas in fact the world was torn by local wars in which imperialism was attacking the people and the people were bravely fighting back. Khrushchev talked a lot about peace, but was his line likely to lead to it? The Chinese Party has always held that peace can best be safeguarded by taking seriously the danger of war, standing firm against local imperialist aggression and resolutely avoiding 'appeasement'. The Soviet notion of disarmament had no concrete meaning. Instead of working to ban nuclear weapons the US-Soviet negotiations were really aimed at preserving a monopoly of them. So the big talk about peace only persuaded people to drop their guard and made the situation even more dangerous.

The Chinese certainly did not take the threat of war lightly, as Khrushchev and his supporters alleged. They said that 'no Marxist-Leninist has ever held or ever will hold that revolution must be made through world war'. It was even 'possible to prevent a new world war' and 'the possibility of banning nuclear weapons does indeed exist' (*Proposal, op.cit.*). As the Chinese said in 1963, while the system of imperialism and exploitation is still in existence it would be 'sheer illusion' to think that a 'world without weapons' could be brought about (*Proposal, op.cit.*). This is why they often now say that only revolution can prevent a world war. Imperialism produces on the one hand

the danger of war, and on the other popular anti-imperialist struggles which are the only path to the eventual abolition of imperialism, hence also to the abolition of war. One cannot 'guarantee' against wars, but by refusing to give in to imperialism on specific issues, one can reduce the risk of world war.

During the early 1960s the Soviet leaders were claiming that there was an important distinction between such 'reasonable' representatives of US imperialism as Eisenhower and Kennedy, who were allegedly 'for peace', and 'madmen' such as Goldwater. The CPC argued that this line of the CPSU, which 'denies the united front against US imperialism and its lackeys', in fact 'serves the global strategy of US imperialism' and 'is the road leading to the greater danger of war and to war itself' (*Two Different Lines, op.cit.*). The Chinese summarised their position in the following way:

World peace can only be won through struggle by the people of all countries and not by begging the imperialists for it.

(*ibid*)

The CPC has never shrunk from discussing the significance of nuclear warfare. On the contrary, they meet the challenge head on, taking up the question in order to show that nuclear war does not fundamentally alter the laws of world politics. Immediately after the US nuclear attack on Japan in 1945, Mao Tse-tung used the opportunity to criticise bourgeois thinking:

The theory that 'weapons decide everything', the purely military viewpoint, a bureaucratic style of work divorced from the masses, individualist thinking, and the like — all these are bourgeois influences in our ranks.

(Mao Tse-tung: *The Situation and our Policy after the Victory in the War of Resistance against Japan*, Selected Works, Vol.IV)

Again, Mao's famous thesis that imperialism and reactionaries are paper tigers was first put forward in connection with nuclear weapons. Mao's talk with the American journalist Anna Louise Strong, in 1946, is a particularly important source for the study of Chinese foreign policy. It treats of the nuclear issue in the overall context of the world situation at that time. US imperialism was already planning to use the immense strength it had accumulated as a result of the Second World War to 'roll back communism'. Many believed at this time that the atom bomb had completely transformed the role of warfare as an extension of politics. Linked with this was the idea that US atomic weapons presented an immediate threat to the Soviet Union. According to this view, the main contradiction was that between the imperialist camp and the socialist camp. Mao Tse-tung put forward a very different conception. He accepted that 'US imperialism is indeed preparing a war against the Soviet Union', but saw also a further aspect which put it into a different perspective. Firstly, before they could attack the Soviet Union the US rulers would have to attack their own people, politically and economically, and impose fascism. Secondly,

The United States and the Soviet Union are separated by a vast zone which includes many capitalist, colonial and semi-colonial countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. Before the US reactionaries have subjugated these countries, an attack on the Soviet Union is out of the question . . . At present . . . it is not the Soviet Union but the countries in which these (US) military bases are located that are the first to suffer US aggression.

(Mao Tse-tung: *Talk with the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong*, Selected Works, Vol.IV)

The immediate purpose of the US war propaganda against the Soviet Union was thus to cover up a different idea.

It turns out that under cover of anti-Soviet slogans, they are frantically attacking the workers and democratic circles in the United States and turning all the countries which are the targets of US external expansion into US dependencies . . . Moreover, if the American people united with these countries oppressed by US imperialism, then a new world war could be averted.

(*ibid*)

Mao argued that 'the outcome of a war is decided by the people, not by one or two types of weapon'.

The spirit which pervades this text is Mao's view that 'the people and the people alone are the motive force in the making of world history' (*On Coalition Government*). This point was also fundamental to Marx and Lenin, who fought hard against the notion that a handful of heroes could decide the fate of humanity.

Many people who claim to be Marxists have replaced this view in all fields by a kind of technological determinism. But the view defended by China has found confirmation in practice, especially in the remarkable victories of the liberation movements in Indochina.

In the same interview with Anna Louise Strong, Mao Tse-tung put forward his conception of the 'intermediate zone', the zone between imperialist USA and socialist USSR. Imperialism aims first and foremost at the annexation of economic territory; the first target of the US at this time, therefore, was not the Soviet Union, a tough piece of meat to bite on, but rather the much more readily available territory that lay between itself and the Soviet Union. This territory, however, was not just a passive object, but consisted of scores of countries in which people lived and worked. In its efforts to subjugate the intermediate zone US imperialism was bound to meet with popular resistance, and far from successfully subjugating the intermediate zone and going on to attack the Soviet Union, it has itself been steadily 'rolled back' from its 1945 positions.

The concept of the intermediate zone has been applied and reapplied by the Chinese, as the world situation has developed. In the 1950s, they saw a 'first intermediate zone' (the countries that were later called the Third World) and a 'second intermediate zone' of developed capitalist countries more or

less subordinate to the US. In the 1970s, with the Soviet Union having changed its colour and emerged as a rival imperialism to the US, they speak of the Second and Third Worlds, over which the two superpowers contend for hegemony. The Second World consists of the developed capitalist countries, threatened by the superpowers but also exploiting the Third World. Meanwhile China, now the socialist 'tough piece of meat', warns that the immediate thrust of Soviet expansionism is not directed against herself, despite the utterances of Soviet propaganda, but rather against the West European nations that the Soviet Union woos with 'detente'.

The Chinese view the world *dialectically*. They consider that it is constantly changing, sometimes undergoing major changes, when things are transformed into their opposites. The *motive force* in these changes is the people. During the later 1940s, the '50s and the '60s the CPC argued consistently and forcefully on the one hand that the USA was an aggressive imperialist power (of which not everyone was aware at the time), and on the other hand that the USA was in fact weaker than it seemed and could be opposed and defeated (of which even fewer people were aware). But with the maturing of these changes a new situation has come into being: the 'socialist camp' no longer exists and the USSR is now the main enemy of the people. The CPC is once again breaking new ground in its analysis and once again its arguments may at first appear surprising.

Some observers are not accustomed to understanding the part played by the people. When confronted with such a mighty change as the decline of the USA, they can only assume that this was the work of another superpower, the USSR. This is more or less the viewpoint propagated by the present Soviet leaders, who ascribe every popular victory over colonialism or US imperialism to its own decisive assistance or influence, trying hard to persuade people, especially those most oppressed, that they need the Soviet Union as a powerful saviour and protector.

China's view is the contrary of this. Oppressed peoples must, and will, free themselves by their own efforts and in their own way. It is the duty of socialist countries to give them all the help they can, but such aid can never be other than supplementary to the main effort, that of the people themselves.

Chapter 5

Proletarian internationalism, the united front and peaceful coexistence

The principle of proletarian internationalism means that a genuine socialist country must work actively, in its foreign relations, to promote the revolutionary cause. In practice, the CPC has always stressed that this does not mean 'exporting' revolution. Just as 'no saviours from on high deliver', in the words of the Internationale, so no saviours from outside can deliver either. The liberation of a nation from imperialism, and of an oppressed people from its ruling class, can be the work only of the oppressed nation and people themselves. From its own experience the Chinese Communist Party has learnt the importance of self-reliance.

The example of World War II is instructive in this context. The working people of many countries made great efforts and sacrifices to defeat fascism. In those areas which were liberated with the aid of the Soviet Red Army (such as Eastern Europe) it was possible to prevent the US from realising its general ambition of putting into office right-wing regimes subservient to American capital. This was, from the point of view of the proletarian cause, a favourable thing. The negative side was that the Eastern European socialist countries lacked, to a greater or lesser extent, an independent, self-reliant, socialist movement. Thus the building of socialism rested on a weak foundation.

The Hungarian uprising of October 1956 was not supported by China, which regarded it as an anti-socialist movement.* On the other hand the Chinese did not oppose Poland's moves to assert independence from the USSR while still following a socialist path, and China's attitude probably played a part in preventing the Russians from invading Poland in 1956. Later the Chinese came to regard all aspects of the Soviet Union's relations with its 'community' (Eastern Europe and the Mongolian People's Republic) as relations between oppressor and oppressed nations. Hence they support all moves towards independence, even if not of a socialist kind. They did not look on the Dubcek regime in Czechoslovakia as being genuinely socialist, but they very strongly condemned the Soviet invasion of that country in 1968.

The Third International (Comintern), which existed from 1919 to 1945, sometimes laid down a global strategy for the guidance of individual Communist Parties. An example is the policy of the united front against fascism put forward at its 7th World Congress in 1935, a policy with which the CPC strongly concurred. While the socialist camp was in existence, after World

* In the wake of the uprising the CPC wrote, 'It is doubtful whether a dictatorship of the proletariat was ever really established in Hungary'.

War II, the CPC believed in the need to co-ordinate the main lines of international policy, through discussions carried on between parties on a basis of equality. But they strongly opposed any tendency to impose a line on a Party from outside. The application of the general principles of Marxism to the situation in a particular country could be the work only of the communists of that country. The CPC criticised other parties only if they appeared obviously to have departed from Marxist principles. The point is made very clearly here:

If it is not a party that can use its brains to think for itself . . . and knows how to apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism and integrate it with the concrete practice of its own country, but instead is a party that parrots the words of others, copies foreign experience without analysis, runs hither and thither in response to the baton of certain persons abroad . . . then such a party is absolutely incapable of leading the proletariat and the masses in revolutionary struggle.

(Proposal, op.cit.)

While the people of each country have the main responsibility for their own liberation, the anti-capitalist struggle was already viewed by Marx and Engels as an international one and this international character becomes even more evident in the period of imperialism. Lenin was quite clear that the proletariat should unite with the national liberation movement in colonial countries. The imperialist system oppresses the working people of all countries, both of the imperialist countries themselves and also of the exploited nations. In a developing country, if any government takes progressive economic and social measures it is bound to come into opposition with imperialist interests.

Thus the great task that a single socialist country, or a small number of socialist countries, can perform in a world still dominated by imperialism, is to encourage all those countries (the great majority) that are oppressed by imperialism, to form an international united front directed in particular against the dominant imperialist great powers. Lenin expressed this concept in the following terms:

We now set as the main task for ourselves: to defeat the exploiters and win the waverers to our side — this task is a world-wide one. The waverers include a whole series of bourgeois states, which as bourgeois states hate us, but on the other hand as oppressed states, prefer peace with us.

For Lenin at that time, as for the Chinese today, this front is a vital necessity.

The content of this united front has changed from time to time in different historical circumstances and as the nature of the main enemy has changed. In Lenin's time the dominant imperialist grouping was the Entente of Britain, France, the USA and Japan, which had won the First World War. From the mid-1930s the most dangerous imperialist powers were Germany, Italy and Japan, which had evolved an aggressive policy of unprecedented brutality in a bid to wrest world hegemony from the 'satisfied' world leaders of the

previous generation. After the victory of the Allies over the Axis powers in 1945, it was the US that set out 'to erect a huge world empire such as has never been known before' (*Proposal, op.cit.*). Today, with the relative decline of the US and the rise of the USSR as a rival imperialist superpower, the balance is shifting again. The embryo anti-imperialist united front brings together socialist countries and bourgeois states whose governments, in the particular circumstances, support peace, particularly those states most directly exploited by imperialism. Such a front weakens the power of the most dangerous imperialist enemy in many ways and thereby greatly helps the oppressed to achieve both political and economic liberation.

The concept of 'peaceful coexistence', which plays such an important role in China's foreign relations, must now be introduced. In principle, a socialist country has no ambitions to annex or dominate any other country. As there is no future in trying to export revolution, as the Chinese have said repeatedly, such a country can desire only peaceful relations with all other states, regardless of their social system. With those non-socialist states which are themselves the victims of imperialist exploitation, there is a real basis for lasting relations of friendship and mutual support within the anti-imperialist united front. But even towards imperialist states a socialist country's policy is based on genuine desire for peace as long as it is possible, and a people like the Chinese, who liberated themselves only by long and bitter armed struggle against foreign imperialism, know only too well the suffering that war means to the peoples involved in it. As early as June 1949, before the official foundation of the PRC, Mao Tse-tung wrote:

We are willing to discuss with any foreign government the establishment of diplomatic relations on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual benefit and mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, provided it is willing to sever relations with the Chinese reactionaries, stops conspiring with them or helping them and adopts an attitude of genuine, and not hypocritical, friendship towards People's China.

(Mao Tse-tung: *Address to the Preparatory Committee of the New Political Consultative Conference*, Selected Works, Vol.IV)

In 1954 China and India formulated the well-known five principles that should govern relations between states with different social systems:

- mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty,
- mutual non-aggression,
- non-interference in each other's internal affairs,
- equality and mutual benefit,
- peaceful coexistence.

From the time of the Bandung Congress of Asian and African countries (1955), these principles have been taken up collectively by the developing countries as a weapon in their struggle for the democratisation of international relations. Even the USA was eventually obliged to accept the principles as a

basis for relations with China, in the Shanghai Communique signed by the governments of China and the US during President Nixon's visit in 1972. As a consistent and active protagonist of these principles from the 1950s until the present, China helps combat propaganda about the aggressiveness of socialist countries, while also exposing the politics of the two superpowers, which run counter to these principles in every way.

As regards China's relations with oppressed countries, even with those whose governments do not support China's social system, there is no reason for antagonism to develop as long as both sides hold to these principles. On the other hand, it would be utopian to believe that relations between socialist countries and the big imperialist powers can remain untroubled over a long period. While Lenin referred to the possibility of peaceful relations with 'a whole series of bourgeois states', he also insisted that 'we are always at a hair's breadth from all kinds of invasions'. A socialist country that has prised itself free from the imperialist system is a living signal and inspiration to the oppressed of the world, and it is no wonder that the most aggressive of the great powers have often threatened People's China with attack, just as they did the Soviet Union when it was a socialist country.

Therefore the CPC saw it as a fundamental error that Khrushchev should have considered permanent peace possible between the socialist camp (as it then existed) and the camp of imperialism. Andrei Gromyko, still Soviet Foreign Minister today (1979), went so far in 1962 as to claim,

if there is agreement between Nikita Khrushchev, the head of the Soviet Government, and John Kennedy, the President of the United States, there will be a solution of international problems on which the destinies of mankind depend.

(Speech to Supreme Soviet, 13 December 1962)

He also said:

It is a historical established fact that without understanding between the USSR and the United States, not a single international conflict can be settled and no agreement can be reached on a single important international problem.

(Statement of Andrei Gromyko, 13 December 1963)

The Soviet leaders, therefore, following on from their view of the threat of nuclear war, departed from Leninism by making peaceful coexistence the general line of their foreign policy. They saw peaceful coexistence as having actually been accepted by the more 'reasonable' representatives of US imperialism such as Kennedy, rather than as a condition that could only be attained and maintained by constant struggle against imperialism. They attempted to get this accepted as the general line of the international communist movement, and Khrushchev asserted that 'the inevitable struggle between the two systems (of socialism and capitalism) must be made to take the form exclusively of a struggle of ideas'.

Most important of all the errors which, in the opinion of the CPC, were made by the Soviet leaders in this connection, was the idea that relations between the two camps (in fact, relations between the leaders of the USA and the USSR), however peaceful, could affect and render non-antagonistic the three other basic contradictions in the world (see page 13). Khrushchev extended his argument about peaceful relations between the two camps by saying that socialism could be won in the capitalist countries through a process of peaceful evolution, and also that the nations need not or should not wage violent struggles to free themselves.

For all these reasons, the Chinese leadership insisted, in their polemic concerning the general line of the international communist movement, that peaceful coexistence should be viewed as one aspect of a revolutionary anti-imperialist policy. The *fundamental* principle guiding the foreign policy of a socialist country must be proletarian internationalism.

Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence is very clear and readily comprehensible by ordinary people. Peaceful coexistence designates a relationship between countries with different social systems, and must not be interpreted as one pleases. It should never be extended to apply to the relations between oppressed and oppressor nations, between oppressed and oppressor classes, and never be described as the main content of the transition from capitalism to socialism, still less should it be asserted that peaceful coexistence is mankind's road to socialism. The reason is that it is one thing to practise peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. It is absolutely impermissible and impossible for countries practising peaceful coexistence to touch even a hair of each other's social system. The class struggle, the struggle for national liberation and the transition from capitalism to socialism in various countries are quite another thing. They are all bitter, life-and-death revolutionary struggles which aim at changing the social system. Peaceful coexistence cannot replace the revolutionary struggle of the people. The transition from capitalism to socialism in any country can only be brought about through the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country.

Putting peaceful coexistence into this wider context, the CPC went on:

In our view the following should therefore be the content of the general line of foreign policy for socialist countries: to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation among the countries of the socialist camp, in accordance with the principle of proletarian internationalism; to strive for peaceful coexistence on the basis of the Five Principles with countries having different social systems and oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war; and to support and assist the revolutionary struggle of all the oppressed peoples and nations. These three aspects are inter-related and not a single one can be omitted.

(*Proposal, op.cit.*)

Principle and compromise

In their foreign policy the Chinese seek to support the revolutionary struggles of all countries, to give assistance to other socialist countries, to weaken and defeat imperialism through the anti-imperialist united front, and to stave off imperialist intervention against their own revolution. Inevitably there are times when these different aims come into partial conflict with each other and difficult choices — compromises — have to be made.

As early as April 1946 Mao Tse-tung was arguing that agreement between the socialist Soviet Union and the imperialist countries was bound to come about sooner or later, after peaceful negotiations. Such agreement might involve 'compromise on some issues, including certain important ones', but it would not mean 'compromise on all international issues'. Moreover, Mao said:

such compromise does not require the people in the countries of the capitalist world to follow suit and make compromises at home. The people in these countries will continue to wage different struggles in accordance with their different conditions.

(*Some Points in Appraisal of the Present International Situation*, Selected Works, Vol. IV)

A very important example of compromise, which served as a point of reference in Lenin's thinking, occurred in 1918, when Germany invaded revolutionary Russia, obliging the Bolsheviks to sign the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and to make substantial concessions. Of this Lenin said:

One must be able to analyse the situation and the concrete conditions of each compromise, or of each variety of compromise. One must learn to distinguish between a man who gives the bandits money and firearms in order to lessen the damage they can do and facilitate their capture and execution, and a man who gives bandits money and firearms in order to share in the loot.

(V.I. Lenin: *'Left-Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder*)

This passage was referred to by Chou En-lai in his report to the 10th Congress of the CPC in 1973. He reminded the delegates that:

necessary compromises between revolutionary countries and imperialist countries must be distinguished from collusion and compromise between Soviet revisionists and US imperialism.

The context of these remarks was that in the previous year, at a time when

the Vietnam war was still going on, China had received a visit from President Nixon of the USA. In fact, the Chinese did not yield anything of material importance in their negotiations with Nixon, so it can hardly be said that there was any compromise. Nevertheless, these principles must be kept firmly in mind, especially when thinking about a possible improvement in relations between the Chinese and Soviet states. Like Sino-US relations, Sino-Soviet relations are an instance of peaceful coexistence between a socialist state and an imperialist one; there is nothing to prevent their being normalised if both sides accept the Five Principles.

So far the Soviet leaders have resisted this, particularly by their refusal to consider any give-and-take on the boundary dispute. In the 19th century large areas of northern China were forcibly annexed by the Russian empire and treaties recognising these annexations were imposed on the Chinese. The government of the PRC have always described these treaties as 'unequal' (and, therefore, according to Marxists, not binding), but they also say that they are willing to accept them as a basis for discussion. The Russians have so far refused to budge an inch.

If there should be an improvement in Sino-Soviet relations the CPC would certainly continue their criticism of Soviet internal and foreign policies, as they do those of the USA.

After the deaths of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai in 1976 the Chinese people and leaders said they would learn from them, always maintaining principle when solving problems. It would be very dangerous for the world's people if China's foreign policy came to be conducted dogmatically, instead of in the tradition of very flexible tactics guided by firm political principle. It is of great benefit to all those who favour democracy, progress and national independence, that Chinese foreign policy should continue to be conducted on the same lines as it was by Mao and Chou.

'Countries want independence, nations want liberation, and the people want revolution'. These three demands are the main force in world politics today and are opposed by imperialism and especially by the two superpowers. As a socialist country China supports each of these three 'wants', but what if a contradiction should arise between them? For example, a Third World government which is struggling against imperialism for economic independence may at the same time persecute minority nationalities and suppress the people's demands for a decent standard of living. There are such instances today.

In 1960 Mao Tse-tung wrote:

Those backed by imperialism are precisely those discarded by the broad masses of the people. Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, Kishi, Batista, Said, Menderes and their ilk have either been overthrown or will be overthrown by the people. The risings of the people in these countries against the lackeys of US imperialism and other imperialisms are also a fight against the reactionary rule of imperialism itself.

(*Chairman Mao Tse-tung's Important Talks with Guests from Asia, Africa and Latin America*)

In parenthesis, it is instructive to look at what has happened to the tyrants Mao mentioned. Syngman Rhee, US-backed dictator of South Korea, was overthrown after popular rioting in 1960; Kishi, war criminal and militarist prime minister of Japan, was forced to resign in the same year; Batista, Cuban dictator, had been overthrown in the 1959 revolution; Nuri es-Said, pro-Western prime minister of Iraq, had been killed after an anti-imperialist army coup in 1958; Menderes, dictatorial prime minister of Turkey and supporter of US-dominated military pacts, was executed in 1961. Chiang Kai-shek died with all his ambitions unfulfilled.

In the above quotation Mao was referring to the comparatively straightforward situation, typical at that time, in which all three struggles (for independence, for national liberation and for revolution), were directed against the same target. But today things are rather different. The US, which used to make quite a habit of helping anti-popular regimes to suppress the people, is getting weaker and can no longer be relied on. Some governments, which used to be subservient to the US (for instance the Philippines and Zaire), are taking national independence as a basis of their foreign policy, even though they still oppose revolution. Even very strongly anti-democratic governments may to a limited extent oppose both superpowers.

It is not only possible, but mandatory for China to enter into diplomatic relations with such governments in the interest of the united front against the superpowers. The Third World at the present time is a good example of a united front, including very many widely differing political forces. Its effect is positive because it is directed against the old world economic order upheld by the superpowers and against the hegemonism and bullying they practise. To support the building of an international united front China must help even those governments whose resistance to the superpowers is weak and inconsistent. This in no way implies that the people within such countries should cease struggling against national and class oppression; China tries at the same time to help their struggles. If some governments of the Third World should try to apply power politics, China would condemn it, as she condemned Indonesian aggression against East Timor and Indian aggression against Sikkim.

History does not go in a straight line, but in spirals. This was so in the past (as the complex course of the Chinese Revolution demonstrates) and it is also true of the present era, the main content of which is the protracted struggle for the emancipation of working people in all parts of the world. Those who want progress must grasp the main contradiction of their society at each stage. In the struggle against the imperialist system, and particularly against the two superpowers, popular forces often have to fight against the government if it attempts to suppress them, and at the same time to support that government in so far as its foreign policy is truly anti-imperialist. This is rather like the anti-fascist struggle of the 1930s, when the Chinese communists were faced with Chiang Kai-shek, who was as counter-revolutionary as could be yet who could, in certain circumstances, be forced to take a stand against Japanese imperialism. Since this was the main threat facing China, an alliance between

Chiang and the communists to fight the menace was possible. Mao Tse-tung firmly rejected both 'all alliance, no struggle', which was a Rightist error, and 'all struggle, no alliance', which was a 'left' one. The CPC argued correctly that the broadest democracy and mobilisation of the masses were necessary for effective national defence.

China's view is that for bourgeois rulers of either Second or Third World countries there are two possibilities only: either they yield to the mounting indignation of the masses and move towards an anti-imperialist policy, or they persist in selling out the country to imperialism, in which case they will be overthrown. Revolutionaries should be ready for either possibility. As Mao Tse-tung put it:

... the diehards may be hard, but they are not hard unto death, and in the end they change — into something filthy and contemptible, like dog's dung. Some change for the better and that is also the result of our repeated struggles against them ...

(Mao Tse-tung: *New Democratic Constitutional Government*, Selected Works, Vol.II.)

Naturally, revolutionaries care about the people's welfare. Nothing could be further from the Chinese view than the idea of allowing conditions to become as bad as possible in the expectation that this will turn the people to revolution. The Cuban leader Guevara apparently had a policy of trying to create 'Vietnam-type' situations in various places. This could only alienate the people and, in fact, the Vietnamese communists themselves strove to avoid a 'Vietnam-type' situation in their own country. Of course if such a situation comes about in spite of all efforts to prevent it, if the reactionary diehards capitulate to foreign imperialism, then revolutionaries must be ready to struggle to overthrow their own government and then defeat imperialism itself.

The CPC's policy in the '30s and '40s was to struggle against Chiang in such a way as to force him to adopt correct policies, to oppose Japan and to permit some degree of democratic freedom. Eventually, in 1937, he had to agree; this made it clear to the Chinese people that the CPC was the political force which upheld the people's interests. In the Chungking negotiations of 1945 Chiang persisted in the diehard policy of allying with Japanese imperialism to suppress the people and was overthrown four years later.

When governments can be obliged to adopt some genuine anti-imperialist and democratic reforms this is all to the good. It does not make the struggle for national liberation more difficult, on the contrary, the struggle proceeds on a higher level in the new conditions.

Some examples of the complex considerations which may arise in implementing the policy of the international united front may profitably be considered in some detail. In the past they caused some people to criticise China's actions; now it is easier to see those actions in perspective.

Sri Lanka

A number of people were surprised and upset when the Chinese criticised

the April 1971 insurrection in Sri Lanka and maintained friendly relations with the apparently counter-revolutionary government of Mrs Bandaranaike. Did China abandon revolutionary workers and peasants to the cruelties of bourgeois repression just because good state relations with Sri Lanka were advantageous to China? Was there truth in the allegation that China gave aid to put down the uprising?

Sri Lanka (or Ceylon as it was then called) had become independent of British rule in 1948. In January 1950 its government recognised the PRC as the only China. And in 1952, despite US opposition, this anti-Communist government agreed to barter rubber for Chinese rice, thus solving two of their most serious economic problems. China paid more than the market price for the rubber but the arrangement was of mutual benefit and it continued. In spite of US retaliation closer relations developed on the basis of the Five Principles. When the imperialist powers created the Southeast Asian Treaty Organisation (SEATO), for their own ends, and when India's prime minister Nehru launched a military attack on China, Sri Lanka moved not only towards more cordial relations with China but also away from dependence on either of the two big-power blocs. The majority of the people were friendly towards China and admired and trusted Mao and Chou En-lai. It got through even to the neo-colonial and semi-feudal elements among Sri Lanka's rulers that socialist China, however large and strong, could be relied on never to exploit, bully or interfere in their country.

In the 1970 election Mrs Bandaranaike's Sri Lanka Freedom Party, in a coalition with the revisionist Communist Party and the Trotskyist LSSP, and with a strong radical and anti-imperialist platform, was elected with an overwhelming majority. As might have been expected, they dragged their feet over the promised measures to introduce socialism, but some of the things they did were, in the international situation then existing, a blow to US imperialism. They entered into diplomatic relations with North Korea, recognised the South Vietnam National Liberation Front, and came out in open support of the Palestine liberation struggle.

These steps did not, however, affect very much the oppressive and outdated class relations which prevailed internally. A young people's radical movement called the People's Liberation Front (Janatha Vinukthi Peramuna, or JVP) began to campaign against the government. It organised itself in a semi-clandestine manner, was implacably opposed to the 'old left', denounced the anti-revisionist Ceylon Communist Party and, apparently, rejected the Marxist-Leninist line of a revolutionary party relying on the working class to lead a worker-peasant alliance in a new-democratic revolution. It had a vague philosophy and programme made up of ideas from Mao, the Vietnamese and the Cubans.

Hundreds of discontented and angry young people, deeply moved by the people's sufferings at the hands of those in power and their police, joined the JVP. Among them were courageous young men and women who wanted to achieve for Sri Lanka what the liberation struggles in China, Vietnam and Cuba had achieved. But there were other elements in the JVP, among them

some highly reactionary ones. The leaders did not engage in serious study or analyse conditions in Sri Lanka and the world, or do mass work; nor did they practise democratic centralism.

The JVP launched an uprising in April 1971, but things did not work out according to plan. No base could be established in any town or village and there was no support from workers or peasants, even though they may not have been sorry to see the much-hated police attacked. The courage and heroism of some JVP units and the viciousness of the repression that followed aroused sympathy in many countries and anger against the government. The same happened within Sri Lanka too, though no public expression of criticism was allowed. The government appealed for help to a number of countries and got it.

It was in this context that China came under attack from various groups. First there had to be explained the presence in Colombo harbour of a Chinese ship carrying arms. In fact its presence was accidental; it was refuelling on the way to Dar-es-Salaam with weapons for liberation fighters in Africa. Right-wing politicians in Sri Lanka (and, no doubt, those expressing imperialist and Indian government viewpoints) said that the ship was there to supply the insurgents, and they proposed seizing the cargo. 'Left' opponents of China in other countries have seen the ship as proof that China supplied Mrs Bandaranaike with arms to crush the revolution. What happened was that when the right-wing elements proposed that the Chinese be forced to give up the arms for the government's use, the ship's captain quietly, and without permission, took the ship out of port and into international waters. Chinese arms were never supplied to either side.

The second criticism is more serious. The Marxist-Leninist Ceylon Communist Party had fraternal relations with the CPC. The government arrested its General Secretary and detained him without trial, though he was known to have strongly criticised the JVP for its political and ideological errors. The police took the opportunity to seize and destroy 'pro-Chinese' publications and Marxist works. Various interested groups pressed Mrs Bandaranaike to expel the Chinese, on the grounds that they had instigated the uprising.

Acting on instructions from Colombo, the Sri Lanka embassy in Peking conveyed to the Chinese Prime Minister the allegations being made. Chou En-lai sent a frank and forceful message. He indignantly pointed out that it was never China's policy to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, and that the overthrow of imperialism and reaction could be achieved only if the working class was supported by the vast majority of the people, and not from outside. He also pointed out that the Chinese were opposed to the JVP ideologically (e.g. for its Guevarist theories). And in view of the charge that the Chinese had instigated the JVP to get rid of Mrs Bandaranaike, he expressed pleasure that someone whom he knew and appreciated as a friend of China was safe and well.

Chou's message was transmitted to Colombo and then either a part or the whole of it was taken from the official files and read out in the Senate. A sinister meaning was immediately given to it in anti-China journals. Whether

the message was taken down by a Chinese or a Sri Lankan official, whether it was a summary of the interview or a transcript, whether what was read out publicly by politically-motivated people was accurate or not — such questions are legitimate ones for future study. For our purpose it is the substance that is important; Chou En-lai's reply to the accusations was principled and correct.

Thirdly, there was the announcement in May 1971 of Chinese development aid for Sri Lanka. The Colombo government announced it just when the repression by the army and police, including the torture and killing of political prisoners, was at its height. The government may have sought to give the impression that the aid was a gesture of political support from China. But the point is, were the Chinese being callous in not suspending negotiations or demanding that the announcement be postponed? The question itself implies that China's *development aid* might really have been intended by the donor for other than the stated purpose. But those seriously engaged in the struggle against imperialism, social imperialism and local reaction know that Chinese aid according to the Eight Principles (see Appendix) can never be an obstacle to them or a help to their enemies. The horrors of tyranny in Third World countries cannot be ended until the vast mass of the people grasp the truth that they alone must do it, and can do it.

The thousands who were detained have now been released and the leaders who were sentenced to terms of imprisonment have been released too. Because of the uprisings considerable numbers of courageous young people were killed; the state apparatus of police, army and prisons has been extended. Such anti-Marxist and anti-Chinese views as there were in the JVP have developed and become more explicit. The whole episode was a setback to the interests of the Sri Lankan people; but it was part of their internal struggle, which could not have been fought for them. It would not have been in their interest for China's policy to have been different.

Malaysia

The example of Malaysia shows it is possible to handle satisfactorily the contradictions between support for revolutionary movements and support for the anti-imperialist policies of the government of the day, particularly where the Left has achieved a certain degree of political maturity and is led by a Marxist-Leninist party.

There is a long history of mutual support between China's revolution and the various popular revolutionary movements of Southeast Asia. All had to face Japanese invasion during World War II and US imperialism afterwards. In Malaya itself and in North Kalimantan, where there is a separate Communist Party, the armed struggle against the British gradually developed, as the British withdrew, into a struggle against US imperialism. The CPC has supported the Malaysian revolutionaries with weapons, training and, important propaganda facilities, particularly the Voice of the Malaysian People radio station, which broadcasts from southern China.

After the American collapse in Indochina, the Razak government in Malaysia, like their counterparts elsewhere in the region, could no longer rely on US strength to defend them against their own people. They moved towards non-alignment, and diplomatic relations were established between Kuala Lumpur and Peking. How did this affect Chinese support for the Communist Parties of Malaya and North Kalimantan?

The institution of diplomatic ties with Malaysia, on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, has in no way hindered the CPC's fraternal support for the CPM and CPNK. It seems that Razak was told in Peking that the insurgent movements in Malaysia were the product of his own government's repressive policies. The support that the Chinese gave to these Communist Parties was entirely support for policies formulated within Malaysia by Malaysians, and this support was non-negotiable. Nevertheless, the Malaysian government still found it in their interest to establish diplomatic relations with China.

Thailand

In Thailand China has long supported the local Communist Party. The people waged a protracted struggle against the Thai government's policy of allowing the US to use the country as the nerve centre of its military and subversive activity in Asia. The contest resulted in the fall of the repressive dictatorship of Thanom and Praphas. The democratic regime which took its place expelled the US troops, which was a very good thing and a big advance for the Thai people. The revolutionary movement developed to a higher stage, with students and workers demanding full democratic rights.

During this period the Prime Minister, Kukrit Pramoj, visited China, where Mao Tse-tung is reported to have told him that it was not in his own interest to attack the Thai communists. If he sent troops they would be won over to the revolutionary cause; if he killed any communists they would be popular martyrs and heroes. China continued to give support to the Communist Party of Thailand while also supporting the progressive moves of the government. The Thai communists, for their part, resisted the temptation to relax their vigilance or lay down their arms. In the autumn of 1976 a right-wing coup took place, but it did not wipe out all the gains of the period of democracy, for the mass movement had reached a superior level of struggle and most of the US troops had left. A large number of workers and intellectuals joined the revolutionary forces, which retained their organisation intact, and so the movement entered a new stage in its protracted history.

At a press conference in Bangkok on 8 November 1978 during his visit to Thailand, Vice-premier Teng Hsiao-ping reiterated that the relationship between Parties should be separated from that between states. A Thai newsman mentioned that Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong had declared that Viet Nam did not support Thai Communists. Vice-premier Teng said:

I hope you will not ask me to be like Pham Van Dong. If China acts like

Pham Van Dong, that will first bring disaster to the Asian-Pacific region.

In our relations with the Southeast Asian countries, not only with Thailand, there is the issue of the relations with the Communist Party. Since the problem arose in history, it cannot be solved overnight. We first of all reached mutual understanding with ASEAN (Association of SE Asian Nations) countries that such a problem should not hinder the establishment and development of our mutual relations, and on this basis we realised normalisation of our relations and developed them.

To China, this problem not only concerns her relations with Thailand. It is an international problem for her. We always hold that the relationship between Parties should be separated from that between states so that it does not hinder the development of our friendly relations with other countries.

In fact, we and Thailand reached such mutual understanding and established diplomatic relations . . . This is gratifying. On the basis of such mutual understanding, we will continue to deepen our relations and accelerate the development of our political, economic, scientific, cultural and other links.

(*Peking Review*, 17 November 1978)

The main lesson to be drawn from these examples is that no outside force can ever take the place of action by the masses of the people in their own country. And in historical development there can never be any short cuts.

Chapter 7

The Third World – basis of China's foreign policy

The present is a time when all the fragments of the old social order have gone into the melting pot. This is a good thing, for it means a new world is in the making. As Teng Hsiao-ping said at the Special Session of the UN General Assembly in April 1974:

In this situation of 'great disorder under heaven', all the political forces in the world have undergone drastic division and realignment through prolonged trials of strength and struggle.

The basic contradictions we mentioned in Chapter 3 will remain throughout the imperialist era but their relative importance has changed and will change again, as will the balance between the contradictory aspects.

In the struggle between the world's people and imperialism it is, more and more clearly, the people who are what Mao Tse-tung called the *principal aspect* of the contradiction. Immediately after World War II the 'socialist camp' was the main progressive force. The contradiction between imperialist powers was much less in evidence than it had been during the previous part of the century, because no other imperialism was strong enough to challenge the USA. At present, however, this contradiction is once again to be seen very clearly in the rivalry between the two superpowers (see Chapter 8). Although with the restoration of capitalism in the USSR another major imperialist power came into being and the socialist camp ceased to exist, even so the strength of the exploited and oppressed peoples has been increasing relative to the imperialist system.

China's relations with the USA have continued to be relations between a socialist and an imperialist country, as well as those between a country of the Third World and a superpower, but here too there has been an important change – when the USA took some steps, however limited, towards conducting those relations according to the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence (see p.25) governing relations between states with different social systems. During some parts of the post-war period the class struggle within the capitalist countries has been less sharp than the class contradictions between imperialism and the oppressed countries of the Third World; but now there are signs of contradictions in Europe. The four basic contradictions remain but express themselves differently at different times.

At the International Communist and Workers' Parties meeting in Moscow in 1957 the Chinese put forward the thesis that 'the east wind is prevailing

over the west wind'. They meant that the overall balance had definitely begun to favour the people. Since then the anti-imperialist forces have become ever more conscious and radical in their activity, so that in 1970 Mao Tse-tung was able to predict the US defeat in Indochina, putting forward the thesis that a small country can defeat a big one, and also the proposition that 'the danger of a world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today' (*Peking Review*, 23 May 1970).

In 1968 Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia marked the appearance of social-imperialism. The USSR had by then become a major expansionist power. This was something new but at the same time it was a continuation, a logical sequel to the restoration of capitalism in a large, developed socialist country. At a crucial point like this the CPC had to take account of the changed situation, since to continue to oppose the US alone would play into the hands of the other superpower. There was change, but there was also continuity. China's opposition to Soviet hegemonism (the domination of others) is a continuation of its resistance to Japanese and US imperialism over several decades. It also continues the line of Marx's, Lenin's and Stalin's implacable struggle against imperialism and imperialist war.

In the future, too, reassessments of world forces will certainly be necessary to maintain this consistent anti-imperialist line. In 1962 Mao Tse-tung said:

The next 50 to 100 years or so, beginning from now, will be a great era of radical change in the social system throughout the world, an earth-shaking era without equal in any previous historical period. Living in such an era, we must be prepared to engage in great struggles which will have many features different in form from those of the past.

(Important Documents of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China)

The substance of these struggles will always be opposition to imperialism, but in order to be consistently anti-imperialist it will be necessary to make a fundamental analysis of each new situation. The many profound changes over the past 15 years have shown that Mao was quite right — and we are only at the beginning of the period he mentioned.

China's policies have been developed and clarified in speeches at the UN and in China and in Chou En-lai's reports to the 10th Congress of the CPC in 1973 and the 4th National People's Congress in 1975. Teng Hsiao-ping's UN speech of April 1974, referred to at the beginning of this chapter, first made public Mao Tse-tung's view that an understanding of international politics required the recognition of the division of the countries of the world into three groupings — the First, Second and Third Worlds. This analysis quickly gained wide currency, though it was not without its critics.

It was because of attacks on it that on 1 November 1977 the *People's Daily* published a long article by its Editorial Department, under the title *Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major*

Contribution to Marxism-Leninism. The briefest possible summary of its arguments is contained in the titles of its five sections:

1. The differentiation of the three worlds is a scientific Marxist assessment of present-day world realities.
2. The two hegemonist powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, are the common enemies of the people of the world; the Soviet Union is the most dangerous source of world war.
3. The countries and peoples of the Third World constitute the main force combating imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism.
4. The Second World is a force that can be united with in the struggle against hegemonism.
5. Build the broadest international united front and smash superpower hegemonism and war policies!

This article, of over 20,000 words in English, and with copiously annotated sources, is essential reading for a thorough understanding of China's foreign policy.

When considering the Third World's fight against imperialism we must begin by reminding ourselves of the earlier history of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples and how their struggle became so important.

By the beginning of the present century Britain, France, Russia, Holland, the USA, Japan and other imperialist countries had taken possession of, or controlled, nearly all the rest of the world, where they kept the people in subjection, exploited them and their natural resources, and prevented independent agricultural and industrial development which might threaten imperialist interests. As conditions grew more intolerable the people became conscious of what imperialist 'development' and 'modernisation' were doing to them; their resistance grew stronger.

As early as 1921 the revolutionary significance of events in the colonies had been appreciated by Lenin. Speaking at the 3rd Congress of the Communist International, he pointed out that

millions and hundreds of millions, in fact the overwhelming majority of the people of the globe, are now coming forward as independent, active and revolutionary factors. It is perfectly clear that in the impending decisive battles in the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, initially directed towards national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism and will, perhaps, play a much more revolutionary part than we expect.

(V.I. Lenin: *Collected Works*, Vol.32, pp.481-2)

While movements for independence and national liberation were building up, the latecomers among the imperialist powers, Germany and Japan, attacked the established powers in a bid to re-divide the colonial territories and carve out new spheres of influence. World War II began.

To a certain extent it was a struggle between rival imperialist groups for

control of the world, but this was not its main aspect: more important was the struggle by the peoples of different countries to defeat fascism, an unprecedentedly reactionary phenomenon, both in terms of its home policy and its piratical conduct in international relations. This was a truly popular struggle. Marx himself had argued that the working class should mobilise

to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations. The fight for such a foreign policy forms a part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes.

(K. Marx: *Inaugural Address to the International Working Men's Association*, 1864)

During the war several important imperialist powers played a positive role, while at the same time manoeuvring to secure their own great-power interests. Britain tried to enlarge its sphere of influence at the expense of the Axis powers, while the USA aimed to replace Britain in many areas. The Soviet Union played a decisive part in victory but was gravely ravaged by the war, as were many other countries. This left the USA in a very strong position.

Taking advantage of the situation after World War II, the US imperialists stepped into the shoes of the German, Italian and Japanese fascists, and have been trying to create a huge world empire such as has never been known before.

(*Proposal*, op.cit.)

Though the great powers did not intend that the colonial peoples should determine their own future after the war, their ability to prevent it was another question. Movements for independence and armed struggles for national liberation developed very rapidly, especially in Asia, where the contrast with pre-war conditions was very marked. In North China there was a vast area under communist control, which became the base for a people's struggle to overthrow completely the power of US imperialism and its Kuomintang allies in the rest of the country. In 1945 the Vietnamese began their August Revolution under Ho Chi Minh's leadership and proclaimed their independence; British and French efforts to crush them failed. At the same time the Indonesians, who had been under Dutch rule, declared their independence, regardless of British attempts to prevent it. In Korea the patriotic forces, who had fought the Japanese fascists longer than anyone else, began to form their own government.

The end of the war among the big powers thus merged into a period of bitter and bloody confrontations between the victorious imperialist powers and their previous colonial subjects, making it impossible for the former to determine the post-war world order and reimpose foreign rule or gunboat diplomacy as the norms of international politics. Imperialism found itself fighting desperately for the 'rights' and powers essential for its survival. In a number of places, the Philippines, Malaya, Thailand and elsewhere, the

people's forces had begun to take the initiative, relying mainly on their own strength and the justice of their cause. Anti-imperialist resistance was on the rise all over Asia. Africa and Latin-America: in Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Guatemala, Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, South Africa, West Africa, Palestine . . . As the Chinese had expected, US imperialism suffered disastrous defeats, first in China itself and then in Korea. Chou En-lai said, at the 10th Congress of the CPC in 1973, 'US imperialism started to go downhill after its defeat in the war of aggression against Korea'. Then followed the historic defeat in 1954 of the US-backed French forces trying to reconquer Indochina. These events influenced not only the basic world contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism, but the other main ones as well.

To consolidate their victories, it was indispensable for the developing countries to cooperate, to unite and to advance on the diplomatic plane. In 1955 the heads of state and governments of many African and Asian countries met at Bandung in Indonesia. There they helped to 'vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice' in international relations, embodying them in the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence (see Chapter 5) in opposition to the gangster politics of imperialism. Representing China, Chou En-lai played a very important part.

During the '50s and early '60s the Chinese considered that the basic orientation of the socialist camp in international politics was correct. However, they sensed a serious tendency to overestimate the strength of imperialism and a failure to perceive the strength of the struggle for liberation and independence on the part of the developing countries. The CPC expressed their view thus:

We hold that whether one treats imperialism and all reactionaries as the paper tigers they really are is a major question of how the forces of revolution and the forces of reaction are to be appraised, a major question which determines whether the revolutionary people will dare to wage struggle, dare to make revolution, dare to seize victory, and which affects the outcome of the world-wide struggles of the people and the future course of history. Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries should never be afraid of imperialism and the reactionaries. The days are now gone forever when imperialism could ride roughshod over the world, and it is imperialism and the reactionaries who should be afraid of the forces of revolution and not the other way round. Every oppressed nation and every oppressed people should above all have the revolutionary confidence to defeat imperialism and the reactionaries, otherwise there will be no hope for any revolution. The only way to win victory in revolution is for the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries resolutely to combat every trace of weakness and capitulation, and to educate the masses of the people in the concept that 'imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers' . . .

(*People's Daily*, 31 December 1962: *The Differences between Comrade Togliatti and Us*)

The imperialists, headed by US imperialism, were indeed hard-pressed in

the 1950s, and looked for new tactics to maintain the old world order. They tried to win back the initiative by easing the path to 'constitutional' independence in the remaining colonies, setting up puppet regimes, forming 'regional' military alliances in the Third World, stirring up civil wars, subverting radical forces by bribery, blackmail and murder, publicising bogus 'aid' programmes, promoting pre-emptive economic reforms, training mercenaries for counter-insurgency programmes, and attempting even outright invasion and occupation of coveted territory. The USA at times made extensive use of international institutions —

It makes use of them when it needs them, and kicks them away when it does not. But it may still pick them up later if they happen to be useful again. Whether it uses them or kicks them away depends on which is more convenient for its aggressive purpose.

(Mao Tse-tung: *People of the World, Unite and Defeat the US Aggressors and all their Lackeys*)

China consistently opposed US-dominated military pacts like SEATO and MEDO (Middle East Defence Organisation), as well as such imperialist groupings as the Alliance for Progress. China also opposed American manipulation of the United Nations, though continuing to believe that organisation could be transformed into something worthwhile. The decisive factor in foiling the US attempt to dominate international relations was the enormous strength of the masses all over the world. As Mao said in 1957:

Of all the classes in the world the proletariat is the one which is most eager to change its position, and next comes the semiproletariat, for the former possesses nothing at all while the latter is hardly better off. The present situation in which the United States controls a majority in the United Nations and dominates many parts of the world is a temporary one, which will eventually be changed.

(Mao Tse-tung: *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People*, Selected Works, Vol. V)

This analysis has been confirmed by events, for most of the US military pacts and spheres of influence have collapsed or been seriously shaken. Even in NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) US influence is less than it was and one can see a possibly useful role for the organisation, in defending the national sovereignty of West European countries against a Soviet threat. As for the UN, it has become, especially since China took her seat there, more and more a forum at which the countries of the Third World formulate, concert and press their demands on the great powers, especially the superpowers, and build their own unity.

The growth of modern revisionism, headed by the new Russian ruling class, has certainly made the situation more complicated for the developing countries. Not only is the USSR a dangerous superpower, but it uses its extensive ties both with so-called Communist Parties and with genuine liberation movements in the Third World to sow confusion and division.

The main feature of the contemporary era is that 'countries want independence, nations want liberation, and the people want revolution'. In all countries threatened by superpower attempts to establish hegemony, whether by military means, subterfuge or the theories of 'limited sovereignty' and 'interdependence', there is a widespread understanding of the need to defend state sovereignty and make the state a tool for opposing imperialism. The state boundaries of some Third World countries may be irrational and a legacy of colonialism; nevertheless, they must be maintained by the people as part of the struggle against imperialism, to achieve real independence.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America

extremely broad sections of the population refuse to be slaves of imperialism. They include not only the workers, peasants, intellectuals and petty bourgeoisie, but also the patriotic national bourgeoisie and even certain kings, princes and aristocrats, who are patriotic.

(*Proposal, op.cit.*)

The people are the decisive factor not only in achieving independence from colonial rule, but also in building a new order. The Chinese have spoken with admiration of the way the African peoples have been able, in spite of the odds against them, to fight and work for a new Africa. Chou En-lai, who toured Africa in 1963-4, was greatly impressed by the 'dauntless fighting spirit' of the people he met. The Africa coming into being as a result of the people's struggle would be superior to that of the colonialists:

The awakened and fighting African people will certainly win complete victory in their struggle for national liberation so long as they heighten their vigilance, close their ranks, persist in struggle and dare to seize victory. No matter how tortuous the road of struggle and how long the struggle, an independent new Africa free from imperialism and old and new colonialism will certainly emerge. In the cause of creating a new human civilisation the African peoples who have created a glorious ancient civilisation will certainly leave far behind the Western civilisation which was based on colonial rule over the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

(Chou En-lai: Speech at Rally in Mogadishu, 3 February 1964)

It is not expected, of course, that the peoples of all oppressed nations will be roused at the same time to the same pitch of resistance; or that the vanguard of the liberation movement or the proletariat will find the people all ready to join them. The Chinese view is not romantic idealisation of the masses but sober assessment: *only* by relying on the people as the makers of history can independence, national liberation and socialist revolution be achieved. Political work is therefore part of the task of leading the struggle. At a critical juncture in their own revolution, just after the victory over Japan in 1945, Party workers and fighters were given an appraisal of the situation by Mao Tse-tung. He pointed out that 'when the people are not yet politically conscious it is entirely possible that their revolutionary gains may be handed

over to others', and that there were many illusions about the Kuomintang and the USA.

The fact that a section of the Chinese people is not yet politically conscious shows that much remains to be done in our propaganda and organisational work. The political awakening of the people is not easy. It requires much earnest effort on our part to rid their minds of wrong ideas. We should always sweep backward ideas from the minds of the Chinese people, just as we sweep our rooms. Dust never vanishes of itself without sweeping. We must carry on extensive propaganda and education among the masses, so that they will understand the real situation and trend in China and have confidence in their own strength.

(Mao Tse-tung: *The Situation and our Policy after the Victory in the War of Resistance against Japan*, Selected Works, Vol.IV)

The CPC carried out this task. That was the main reason why the people were involved as never before in the revolution and won such remarkable victories in all fields.

As Mao said of China, a Third World country, the people are the main asset, their poverty and apparent 'blankness' are in fact positive things, because this means there is an immense demand for change. Men and women, especially in the developing world, have become more and more daring as a result of the example of the Vietnamese people's struggle, a major turning point in world history, as well as the negative example of the aggression, treachery and greed of the superpowers.

China's analysis and policy has therefore been opposed to that of the Western powers and the Soviet Union. Characteristic of China's opinion is the following, on the Middle East, written at the time of the 1967 Israeli aggression:

The Arab people's struggle against imperialist aggression will be a protracted one. Looked at in essence and from a long-term point of view, it is the Arab people who are really powerful. US imperialism, British imperialism, Soviet revisionism, Israel — all are paper tigers . . . Chairman Mao has said: 'The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history'. The Arab people are the makers of Arab history. No encroachment on or violation of Arab land by imperialism will be tolerated. So long as the 100 million Arab people raise their political consciousness, adopt correct policies and persevere in struggle, they will certainly be able to drive away the old and new colonialists, headed by the United States, and to wipe out all aggressor bandits . . .

(*People's Daily*: 11 June 1967)

Once the people of the Third World have control over their own natural resources and other economic wealth, they continue the struggle against imperialism by consolidating their democratic rule, increasing production and advancing their knowledge of the material world. Diversification — developing both agriculture and industry, the production of food as well as

industrial crops — reduces dependence on the capitalist-dominated world economy and on earnings of foreign exchange on the imperialist markets.

Both superpowers fear the growing anti-imperialist role of the Third World, seeing it, correctly, as a mortal threat. The Soviet leaders have countered by offering themselves to the Third World leaders as 'natural allies'. But far from attacking the international division of labour which gives rise to 'under-development', with its single-crop, export-orientated economies, food shortages and a host of other evils, they offer a refurbished version of it. They never advocate reliance on the people and refer disparagingly to the Third World and its peoples. In this respect the Soviet rulers have increasingly come to adopt the same positions as the American leaders, and both superpowers have found themselves defending the old world order, based on inequality and exploitation, which the rising forces of the Third World are attacking.

The imperialist big powers, and more recently the superpowers, have thought it their exclusive right to make decisions on world and economic affairs which are binding on other countries. The resistance has, however, been too strong for them, partly because of China's example and influence. In 1974, on Third World initiatives, the 6th Special Session of the UN General Assembly adopted a 'Declaration on the Establishment of a New Economic Order and the Programme of Action'. The vast majority of the developing countries joined in this united struggle against the superpower-dominated order and drew up programmes of demands on the USA, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and other capitalist countries. At the UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) Conference in Nairobi in 1976, the demands went far beyond what the big powers were prepared to concede and the conference became a fierce confrontation between the First and Third Worlds. More recently, the Third World countries, as 'debtor' countries, have united to resist the 'creditor' imperialist powers. The growing unity and strength of the Third World springs essentially from the massive desire of the peoples of these countries for fundamental change in the imperialist world order.

The Chinese have based their analysis on facts, pointing to numerous instances of the weakening of imperialism. The recent period, since the October 1973 war in the Middle East, has shown a tremendous development. A *Peking Review* editorial on 10 January 1975, entitled 'Rise of the Third World and Decline of Hegemonism', argued as follows:

The course of the struggle last year showed that the people of the Third World are the main force combating imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism, the motive force of revolution propelling history forward.

The imperialist powers previously divided the world among themselves, and world affairs were once forcibly decided by a few colonial empires. Today, the two hegemonic powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, are locked in a fierce battle to redivide the world. But the days when power politics held complete sway are gone for ever . . . The Third World has now entered the international arena and is playing an increasingly important role.

As the countries of the Third World win and consolidate their national independence, so they are able to begin to challenge the fundamental characteristic of imperialism — its extortion of surplus value from their workers and peasants. This extortion has historically been effected in several ways, in which the export of capital (emphasised by Lenin as the dominant feature distinguishing the monopoly stage of capitalism from its earlier, competitive phase), has played an important but not an exclusive role.

As we all know, in the last few centuries colonialism and imperialism unscrupulously enslaved and plundered the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Exploiting the cheap labour power of the local people and their rich natural resources, and imposing a lop-sided and single-product economy, they extracted super-profits by grabbing low priced farm and mineral products, dumping their industrial goods, strangling national industries and carrying on an exchange of unequal values. The richness of the developed countries and the poverty of the developing countries are the result of the colonialist and imperialist policy of plunder.

(Teng Hsiao-ping: Speech at the Special Session of the UN General Assembly, 10 April 1974, quoted in *Supplement to Peking Review*, 12 April 1974.)

The changing world situation has helped some countries whose resources were being brutally plundered to look for ways of dealing effectively with powerful imperialist interests. Regional groupings have been formed excluding, for the first time, imperialist countries. Worldwide solidarity and cooperation has also begun to take shape, of which a magnificent example is the 'Group of 77'. This group was formed by the 77 developing countries present at the first UNCTAD conference, in 1964. It meets regularly (there are now over 100 members) in order to work out a common policy for Third World countries before each annual session of the UN General Assembly and before other important international conferences. The imperialist governments, especially the two superpowers, are finding it much harder than before to assert their interests by pressure on Third World countries individually. Bodies like OPEC (Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries) are not easy to deal with. The action of OPEC countries in increasing the price of oil is seen by the Chinese as marking a turning point.

It broke through the international economic monopoly long maintained by imperialism and fully demonstrated the might of a united struggle waged by developing countries. If imperialist monopolies can gang up to manipulate the markets at will to the great detriment of the vital interests of the developing countries, why can't developing countries unite to break imperialist monopoly, and defend their own economic rights and interests? The oil battle has broadened people's vision. What was done in the oil battle can and should be done in the case of other raw materials.

(Teng Hsiao-ping, *op.cit.*)

The Chinese have contributed to this broadening of vision. They have

widely reported and explained their own and other people's continuing struggle against imperialism and have shown that the threats and bluster of the superpowers should not be feared. More important, they have supported various Third World organisations and governments which assert their own interests against those of the superpowers and thus further undermine the very basis of imperialism. This is a policy that goes back to the earliest days of the People's Republic when, just after liberation, it was the first country to recognise independent Vietnam and to give it aid, and then when it sent volunteers and material to help the North Koreans resist the US-led attack. In 1952, when Ceylon was in serious economic difficulties because of its considerable dependence on the unstable export market for rubber, China offered the government a way out of its difficulties, as we explained in Chapter 6. In 1957 China gave economic aid to Ceylon to help its development programme. In the same period China helped Cambodia. This began a process of cooperation with other Third World countries which implemented the policy enunciated by Mao Tse-tung in 1949 (see p.5).

The principles on which China cooperates economically with other countries and gives (or would accept) development aid were elaborated by Chou En-lai at a rally in Mogadishu in 1964. They are reproduced in the Appendix. Economic cooperation on the basis of these principles was itself a step towards a new economic order to replace the old. In recent years the Chinese have shared a considerable proportion of their precious resources with other Third World countries. In making up for the holding back of agriculture, industry and science and technology in the colonial period, people must rely mainly on their own efforts. The danger of imperialism returning, or a new imperialism gaining a foothold by exploiting the isolation and technical backwardness of newly independent countries, can be reduced if developing countries cooperate among themselves.

The Chinese carry on a constant struggle against chauvinism and hold to the principle that 'all countries, big and small, rich or poor, should be equal' and that international economic affairs should be jointly managed by all countries instead of being monopolised by one or two superpowers. Since China resumed her rightful seat in the United Nations, the UN General Assembly, the specialised Agencies and UN Conferences have become arenas for serious struggle by the oppressed nations against the oppressors. Many developing countries have put forward demands for a change in the UN Charter to make it more democratic and restrict the ability of the handful of richest countries to stand in the way of positive action. China has strongly supported these demands, for instance at the 1974 Session, while they have been opposed by the two superpowers.

The First World - the Superpowers

When we refer to the USA and the USSR as the two superpowers the expression is taken from everyday journalism but can nevertheless have a precise meaning. At the Special Session of the UN General Assembly in 1974, Teng Hsiao-ping, in a speech we have quoted before, said, 'What is a superpower? A superpower is an imperialist country which everywhere subjects other countries to its aggression, interference, control, subversion or plunder and strives for world hegemony'. In the context of the Leninist theory of imperialism this is very close to Lenin's own definition of the term 'great power', taken from the everyday language of his day. 'Superpower' emphasises that the process of monopoly has reached a limit which very few states can attain. In fact today there are only two such powers; they have the strength to dominate other imperialisms and the industrial and military capacity to start another world war. Together they make up the First World.

We do not need to say much about the role of the USA as a power with ambitions of global hegemony, which has intervened in the affairs of countries all over the world. What the CPC argued after the conclusion of World War II is now commonly recognised to have been true. From 1946 to the late 1960s the Chinese saw US imperialism as the main enemy of the world's people, and most of the content of their polemic with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union hinged on the CPSU leaders' 'denial of the united front against US imperialism' and their overt and covert attempts in the late 1950s to do a deal with the USA at the expense of the rest of the world (not a 'necessary' compromise).

In its post-war bid for world hegemony, US imperialism bit off more than it could chew and is now suffering the consequences. As Stalin had predicted in 1952:

Outwardly, everything would seem to be 'going well': the USA has put Western Europe, Japan and other capitalist countries on rations; Germany (Western), Britain, France, Italy and Japan have fallen into the clutches of the USA and are meekly obeying its commands. But it would be mistaken to think that things can continue to 'go well' for 'all eternity', that these countries will tolerate the domination and oppression of the United States endlessly.

(J.V. Stalin: *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*)

Stalin here argues that a situation of overall domination by one imperialist power is essentially unstable. The specific example he refers to has indeed

confirmed his judgment: the West European countries and Japan have greatly increased their economic strength relative to the USA. More important, Stalin's general proposition has also been proved true, in that a rival imperialist power has emerged to challenge the USA for global hegemony. But this challenger has not emerged from the ranks of the once-great imperialist powers in Europe; it is the Soviet Union, as a result of the change in the class character of state power there, which has come to fulfill this role.

From the early 1960s onwards the new Soviet rulers, while deceitfully taking up the same theme as the American leaders about the permanent banishment of instability and war from the international system, prepared to challenge the USA for world hegemony.

We shall devote special attention here to the way the Chinese view the role of the USSR, partly because US imperialism is already thoroughly exposed, while Soviet imperialism continues to deceive many. In the Chinese view, it is important to continue the struggle against US imperialism; but one-sided concentration on the USA would be extremely dangerous, since this would risk 'letting the tiger in through the back door, whilst driving out the wolf from the front gate'. Chinese criticism of the USSR is also important for what it tells us about Chinese policy. Mao Tse-tung said: 'In international relations, the Chinese people should rid themselves of great-nation chauvinism resolutely, thoroughly, wholly and completely' (Selected Works, Vol.V, *In Commemoration of Dr Sun Yat-sen*). In defining her foreign policy China bears in mind the negative example of Soviet policy, which shows what happens if capitalism is restored in a large socialist country.

Her criticism of Soviet revisionism and social-imperialism thus provides a yardstick whereby one can judge China's actions.

China is not a superpower, nor will she ever seek to be one . . . If one day China should change her colour and turn into a superpower, if she too should play the tyrant in the world, and everywhere subject others to her bullying, aggression and exploitation, the people of the world should identify her as social-imperialism, expose it, oppose it, and work together with the Chinese people to overthrow it.

(Teng Hsiao-ping, *op.cit.*)

The Marxist method of class analysis can explain why particular countries behave as they do in international politics, and this is how China has studied the Soviet Union. According to this view, production is the material basis of human society. People enter into certain 'relations of production' which comprise forms of ownership, organisation of the process of production and distribution of the product. These together make up the 'mode of production'.

Capitalism is a mode of production with its own specific set of production relations. Based on these relations, people in society are divided into classes, each class having a role in the mode of production. The activity of social classes is the key link in understanding the functioning, development and change of any given form of society. The realm of ideology and political institutions (known as the 'superstructure') reflects the characteristics and

requirements of the mode of production which is in force. At certain periods of history the existing relations of production in a particular society restrict the further development of the productive forces. For example, the feudal system was compatible with a certain level of production, but eventually, if production were to develop, it had to be replaced. Such a change in the mode of production can be brought about only through a political revolution, in which the old ruling class is overthrown and dispossessed of that control over state power which served to preserve the old social relationships.

Marxists consider that the capitalist system of production relations has become a barrier to the further development of society; in the Western industrial countries capitalism moves through a succession of crises which give rise to sharpening class struggle. The Chinese analyse the international behaviour of capitalist states against this background, and believe that sooner or later socialist revolutions will take place in all of them. Gradually, in studying the state of affairs in the Soviet Union, the Chinese have come to see the USSR as being in the same position. According to an analysis made by Mao at the beginning of the 1960s, a counter-revolution had taken place in the USSR, culminating in the middle '50s, whereby state power had reverted into the hands of a kind of bourgeois (capitalist) class composed essentially of the state bureaucracy, and a capitalist mode of production of a special form had come into being there. Thus all the crises and social conflicts witnessed in the USSR today (and they are many) reflect the sharp contradiction between the re-established capitalist relations of production and the development of the social productive forces.

Concerning the present class nature of the Soviet Union, the following points must be made. State ownership of the major means of production (nationalisation) does not in itself mean that a system is socialist, as Engels pointed out long ago in *Anti-Dühring* (Part III, ch.ii). On the contrary, in the absence of effective control by the people, state ownership may be only a screen, concealing ownership by a new privileged class, a bureaucratic state bourgeoisie, who fill the places left vacant by the old private capitalists and direct the productive forces in the interests of their own power and wealth.

Nor are the relations of production simply a matter of ownership. There is also the vital matter of the relations between people in the productive process, particularly the relations between mental and manual labour, which in practice means between those who give orders and those who execute them, and the relations of distribution, i.e. the way of distributing what has been produced. In the Soviet Union and other states which have followed its path, these two aspects of production relations also have markedly capitalist characteristics. Taken together with the lack of real popular control of the productive forces, this provides the basis for all-round domination by a new bureaucrat-bourgeois class, whose economic purpose is to perpetuate and extend its own privileged position by extracting surplus value from those who really do the work. The Soviet proletariat is today an exploited and oppressed class, at least as much as in any Western capitalist country.

The question of political power in the state is likewise vitally important.

Even in the Stalin period, when state policy, for all the mistakes that were made, was still basically directed towards advancing the interest of the working class, the organs of proletarian dictatorship and the Party leadership itself failed to practise the *mass line*, the principle that leadership must be 'from the masses, to the masses', and not just handing down directives from above. The political representatives of the new bourgeoisie, from Khrushchev onwards, were able to take over a political apparatus that had already excluded genuine popular participation and employ it for their own anti-working-class purposes.

This means that the position of the Soviet working class today is even worse than in a bourgeois democracy, where the workers have, for the moment at least, some power to organise legally to resist the grosser forms of exploitation and oppression. It is this that led Mao Tse-tung to put forward the contention, as early as 1964, that 'the Soviet Union today is under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the German fascist type, a dictatorship of the Hitler type (see *Peking Review*, 24 April 1970, *Leninism or Social-Imperialism?*).

Chapter 9

The USSR's world role today

a. Export of capital

At the heart of Lenin's theory of imperialism is the export of capital. In applying his analysis to the contemporary Soviet Union, we see the export of capital taking two main forms: 'aid' (economic and military), and the formation of joint-stock enterprises.

Lenin considered foreign loans to be a typical form of capital export. Soviet loans to Third World countries are certainly not given on the basis of mutual benefit (see Appendix for the Eight Points characterising Chinese aid), but rather as a means of exploitation and, furthermore, of securing spheres of influence in which the relationship of exploitation can be continued.

In their capital export today, the Soviet revisionists carry out fourfold exploitation with one single loan. First, they get interest on the loan. For example, the amount of interest on outstanding loans and the compound interest which the Soviet revisionists receive from India annually is one-fourth more than what it borrows from them in the same year. Second, as the recipient country is obliged to buy with the loan outmoded Soviet equipment and goods from dead stock at high prices, Soviet revisionists rake in fabulous profits from commodity export which follows capital export. Third, it is specified that when the 'aid project' is completed the recipient country must repay the loan with products the enterprise turns out or with cheap raw materials. Thus the Soviet revisionists extort profits from price differentials by pressing down the purchasing price. Fourth, high salaries and allowances and inappropriate privileges are exacted for the large numbers of Soviet revisionists' 'specialists' and 'advisors' in the recipient country.

(Nan Ching: *Social-Imperialism, Rapacious International Exploiter*, Peking Review, 8 November 1974)

Military aid too can serve as a means of economic exploitation:

Any country which receives 'military aid' from the Soviet revisionists must accept the following: First it must buy Soviet arms at jacked-up prices in hard cash or foreign exchange. These harsh conditions drive the recipient country to European money markets to borrow Soviet-needed US dollars. Second, Soviet revisionism makes the most of the arms sales by grabbing the recipient country's important raw materials and having them resold on the market to reap fabulous profits. For instance, the Soviet revisionists

sold arms in the Middle East in exchange for its oil, which in turn was put on the European market for manifold superprofits.

(*ibid*)

By forming joint-stock enterprises the Soviet Union is moving directly into buying the wage-labour of foreign workers to extract a profit. The Soviet journal *Kommunist* admits that this is the 'new form of cooperation' which 'more and more resolutely' has been given priority in 'perfecting even more the international division of labour' and has now been extended from the older East European satellites and 'opened' to the developing countries. As Chai Chang said in an article called 'Soviet Revisionists' Sinister Programme of Neocolonialism':

To put it bluntly, the so-called 'joint-stock enterprises' mean in reality a change from disguised 'assistance' to crude capital exports, and from enjoying the privilege of exchanging armaments and machinery for raw materials at cheap prices to gaining control and monopoly over the economic lifelines of Asian, African and Latin American countries. Isn't this out-and-out imperialist theory and practice?

(*Peking Review*, 19 April 1974)

b. Economic Annexation

By rendering the economies of under-developed countries dependent in a one-sided manner on those of developed countries and thus annexing territory economically, imperialism seeks to perpetuate the exploitation of territory and find new forms for it.

In the name of 'international division of labour', they (the Soviet revisionists) try their utmost to incorporate important economic departments of other countries into Soviet economic 'planning' so that their economy will suffer from a lop-sided development and depend more and more on Soviet revisionism till they become Soviet revisionists' raw material supply bases and processing plants.

(*ibid*)

As Kosygin baldly stated back in 1966:

This cooperation enables the Soviet Union to make better use of the international division of labour. We shall be able to purchase in these countries increasing quantities of their traditional export commodities – cotton, wool, skins and hides, dressed non-ferrous ores, vegetable oil, fruit, coffee, cocoa beans, tea and other raw materials and a variety of manufactured goods.

(Report to the 23rd Congress of the CPSU, quoted in *Leninism or Social Imperialism?*)

They also use 'assistance' and 'economic cooperation' as a means to control the industrial sectors of Asia, African and Latin American countries.

In India, which has close 'cooperation' with the Soviet revisionists and more thorough 'specialisation' in production, they have set up steel, machine-building, power and some other major industries through 'assistance'. These industries must be operated in accordance with standard, variety and quantity stipulated by the Soviet revisionists and must sell the products to them at dictated prices. As a result, 30 per cent of India's steel, 60 per cent of its oil, 60 per cent of its power equipment and 85 per cent of its heavy machine tools have fallen under Soviet revisionist control. (Chai Chang, *op.cit.*)

Besides simple extraction of surplus value, an important factor involved in economic annexation is the drive to corner supplies of scarce raw materials. As Lenin said in *Imperialism* (Chapter 6), 'the more capitalism is developed, the more strongly the shortage of raw materials is felt, the more intense the competition and the hunt for sources of raw materials throughout the world, the more desperate is the struggle for the acquisition of colonies'. This also provides opportunities for speculating in commodity prices, which the Soviet Union engages in, as for example by buying up supplies of natural gas from Iran and re-selling to Western Europe.

The forms of economic cooperation that have so far been mentioned are all achieved by virtue of the Soviet Union's superior economic power vis-a-vis the developing countries. However, no more than any other imperialist great power does the Soviet Union rely simply on such 'peaceful' means to achieve the economic annexation of a territory. Most notable in the countries of the 'Council for Mutual Economic Assistance' (CMEA, usually known in the West as 'Comecon'), it is the direct military-political presence of the USSR that enables it to extract surplus value from the workers and peasants, even though some of these countries, such as the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, are at a higher level of development than their Soviet overlord.

From the foundation of CMEA in 1949 until the middle 1950s each member state pursued its own independent economic development plan. From 1955, however, the members had to coordinate their plans with the five-year plan of the USSR, and from the late '50s special stress was laid on planning the use of raw materials on a CMEA-wide scale.

Around 1965 the Soviet Union began to insist ever more strongly that its CMEA 'partners' should coordinate their economic plans with its own, and in 1971 the CMEA was made to adopt a 'comprehensive programme for economic integration', applying to production, science and technology, foreign trade and monetary affairs. In no way can this be compared with the economic integration of the EEC countries, since in Eastern Europe the economies of all members are harnessed to the needs of the Soviet Union. The USSR, besides being able to bring economic pressure to bear on any CMEA member individually, is also in absolute political command. Increasingly, the Soviet Union has forced the CMEA to follow an 'international division of labour' which develops the economies of the East European countries in

a distorted way and renders them increasingly dependent on the Soviet Union for raw materials and fuel.

Here too transnational corporations are being established on the American model. This was how, for example, the once world-famous optical and chemical industries of the GDR were brought under the control of a joint Soviet-German 'Optico-Chemical Industrial Combine', with headquarters naturally in Moscow.

It can also be pointed out that the economic integration of foreign countries into Soviet planning is in some respects the continuation of a policy already in operation within the Soviet Union itself. Quite apart from the specifically national oppression of the non-Great-Russian nationalities, who amount to nearly half the total Soviet population, the supposedly 'autonomous' republics of the national minorities are not allowed all-round economic development, but must also specialise as suppliers of raw materials or processing plants for the Great-Russian economy.

c. Terms of Trade

Although Lenin did not directly discuss the question of terms of trade, or 'unequal exchange', it is clear enough that at the prices set by the world market, the developing countries which export primary and low-technology products receive in exchange less value in the form of high-technology goods. This is clearly related to the one-sided dependence of the economies of the exploited countries on the imperialist countries.

It is known to all that the present price relationships between primary products and finished goods on the international market come into existence as imperialism occupies a monopoly position. This relationship in itself represents an exchange of unequal values . . .

The Soviet revisionists go one better than the capital-imperialists in buying cheap and selling dear . . . Prices of Soviet exports to the Third World countries are generally 15-25 per cent higher than world market prices while the prices of Soviet imports from Third World countries are 10-15 per cent lower. This means an additional exchange of unequal values . . . a case of double exploitation.

(Nan Ching, *op.cit.*)

To quote from another source:

It uses its overlord position to press its 'international division of labour', 'specialisation in production' and 'economic integration', to force these countries to adapt their national economies to the Soviet revisionist needs and turn them into its market, subsidiary processing workshops, orchards, vegetable gardens and ranches, all so that outrageous super-economic exploitation can be carried on.

It has adopted the most despotic and vicious methods to keep those countries under strict control and stationed massive numbers of troops there, and it has even openly dispatched hundreds of thousands of troops

to trample Czechoslovakia underfoot and install a puppet regime at bayonet point.

(Leninism or Social-Imperialism? op.cit.)

All this, of course, is justified by the 'Brezhnev doctrine', which the Chinese have analysed as consisting of five elements: the theory of 'limited sovereignty', the theory of the 'international dictatorship of the proletariat', the theory of the 'socialist community', the theory of the 'international division of labour' and the theory that 'our interests are involved'. While the first three of these elements serve particularly to maintain Soviet hegemony over its traditional satellites, the theory of the 'international division of labour' legitimises the economic annexation of Third World countries. Under the theory that 'our interests are involved' the Soviet rulers are able to claim *carte blanche* for expanding their sphere of influence in any direction.

The major instrument of Soviet foreign policy, as of all imperialism, is the ability to deploy massive armed force outside its own territory. Since the early 1960s the Soviet Union has engaged in unprecedented arms expansion. It can scarcely be claimed that this build-up is necessary for defence; in the immediate post-war period the country was well able to defend itself against the USA, even though in terms of armament the USA was vastly superior. Over the last decade the USSR has sought to catch up and surpass the USA in military terms. Its total military spending in 1975-6 was some 20 per cent more than that of the USA.

Khrushchev tended to argue that one had to choose between conventional and nuclear weapons; in his view conventional warfare was of secondary importance in the nuclear age. But in the Brezhnev period, from late 1964, the USSR not only maintained the earlier pace in building up its nuclear arsenal but also undertook an extraordinary increase in conventional arms. The most striking aspect is the growth of the navy which from 1967-8 began to show itself in all corners of the globe. Defence Minister Grechko could boast, in May 1975, that Soviet warships now 'sailed beyond the coastal waters and inland seas into the vast oceans of the world'. As a support for its global strategy the Soviet Union has naturally sought military and naval bases and staging posts, obtaining them at various times in Mongolia, Cuba, Syria, Guinea, India, Angola and other places.

The Russians have been having the same experience as the Americans did: the people of countries where their bases are implanted do not welcome the imperialist presence and the USSR has a tough time hanging on to its positions.

Among subsidiary instruments of foreign policy there is the sale of armaments. Apart from being a big money-maker this can serve to tie the recipients to the Soviet Union, as spare parts, further supplies and training in their use can always be withheld as a form of blackmail. The Soviet Union is today the world's biggest 'merchant of death'; the blackmail it practises in this connection has recently been very well exposed by President Sadat of Egypt, from his country's experience.

The Soviet Union also possesses the world's biggest apparatus of espionage

and subversion in the form of the KGB (even bigger and certainly more insidious than the American CIA), often using its grotesquely swollen embassies in various countries as a cover for these operations. And while the established 'communist' parties of different countries (not including those which follow a line similar to that of the CPC) vary greatly in the degree of independence from Moscow's control, in all of them the Soviet Union has its loyal agents.

In many instances these parties have no real mass base and function only as tools of Soviet policy, as was shown, for instance, in the attempted coup in Sudan in July 1971. In some parts of the world, especially in Europe, certain of these parties have a social base in a section of the middle class which, under the traditional capitalist parliamentary system, has no part in state power, leading some people to imagine these parties to be potentially anti-Soviet forces. But it should be noted that all of them have supported (for example, at the Berlin conference of European 'communist' parties in 1976) the key point of Soviet foreign policy, namely the suggestion that 'detente' is a panacea for all problems of international relations.

In the early stages of the polemic, when the CPC did not attack the CPSU by name, they concentrated mainly on attacking the revisionism of those West European parties which had been outstanding in their public attacks on the CPC. Today it is almost exclusively the CPSU which is attacked, and China views these 'communist' parties as essentially bourgeois parties.

Among particular examples of Soviet 'control, subversion, interference and aggression' are those listed by Chou En-lai in his speech to the 10th Congress of the CPC in August 1973:

It has invaded and occupied Czechoslovakia, massed its troops along the Chinese border, sent troops into the People's Republic of Mongolia, supported the traitorous Lon Nol* clique, suppressed the Polish workers' rebellion, intervened in Egypt, causing the expulsion of the Soviet experts, dismembered Pakistan and carried out subversive activities in many Asian and African countries.

Since 1973 China would add a number of new items to the list of Soviet crimes, notably the interventions in Angola (see next chapter) and in other parts of Africa.

The very great military apparatus built up by the USSR, and the foreign policies followed, cannot be explained in terms of defence against the USA. The Soviet Union's forcible maintenance of oppressive regimes in Eastern Europe, its massive naval expansion and foreign bases, its instigation of India's war against Pakistan, its subordination of some 'communist' parties to the needs of Soviet policy — none of these are needed to advance socialism — in fact socialism cannot be advanced by such means. What such means do

* Lon Nol was the pro-American leader who carried out a coup d'état in Cambodia in 1970.

advance is the Soviet strategy of domination and exploitation of other countries.

The contention between the Soviet Union and the USA is for the redivision of the world. The USA is on the strategic defensive, seeking above all to hang on to the neo-colonialist empire it has built up, while the Soviet Union is on the strategic offensive, seeking to wrest territory from the economic grip of the USA and to move into regions they have been forced to evacuate under the pressure of the national liberation movements.

This explains two special features of social-imperialism. Firstly, the Chinese argue that the Soviet Union constitutes the most dangerous source of war today. Like German and Japanese imperialism before it, Soviet imperialism is a latecomer on the world scene, at a time when imperialism in general has begun to decline.

As it lags behind its opponent, US imperialism, in economic and financial strength, it is bound to desperately increase its military strength in a bid for world domination. The state apparatus of fascist dictatorship in the Soviet Union, combined with highly concentrated state monopoly capital, facilitates militarisation at an accelerated tempo.

Already 'the entire Soviet economy has taken on a peculiar form of war economy', with the percentage of national income going to military purposes now around 20 per cent, higher than Hitlerite Germany in 1939 (19 per cent), let alone the USA at the time of its wars against Korea (15 per cent) or Vietnam (10 per cent). While talking all the time about 'permanent peace' and 'irreversible detente', the Soviet Union in fact is building up armaments, in the same way as Hitler and other imperialist aggressors did in the past. At present it is seeking to split and disintegrate Western Europe and drive the USA out by political and diplomatic means, but is nevertheless fully prepared, in the right circumstances, to use the same naked military force against Western Europe as was used to subjugate Czechoslovakia in 1968.

The second special feature of Soviet imperialism is the support it has lent to certain liberation movements, for instance Vietnam (but not Cambodia), Palestine and Southern Africa (with strings attached), as well as to certain apparently progressive struggles in the developed countries.

This support for liberation movements is often cited as convincing proof that the Soviet Union is not imperialist in the same sense as other imperialist powers and, in particular, that it differs fundamentally from the USA. Yet it was precisely under the flag of anti-imperialism that the USA constructed its own world empire, first stepping into the place vacated by Spain — most notably in the Philippines and Cuba — and later into the shoes of Britain, France, Holland, Belgium and Japan whenever the opportunity arose. Naturally, the USA, like any imperialist power, had to obtain at least some local support, however slender, in the country in question. The bourgeois leaders of many independence movements in Asia and Africa after World War II provided the USA with just this. Neo-colonialism (a way of dominating

countries economically, politically and militarily while still allowing them nominal independence) is a new form, adopted by imperialism at a time when Third World peoples were already trying to take their destiny into their own hands. Social-imperialism, in its drive to expand its sphere of influence in the Third World, has arrived on the scene when the national liberation movement has reached a still higher stage of development. Soviet imperialism thus has to disguise itself more subtly. But Russia's practice of imperialism under the banner of anti-imperialism is not essentially different from what the USA did earlier. Within the oppressed countries the Soviet Union seeks to rely, in general, on a bureaucratic state bourgeoisie similar to its own, particularly one connected with the state-owned sector of the economy, fostering it under the guise of a 'peaceful transition to socialism'. Thus Soviet propaganda describes nationalisation as a form of 'transition to socialism'. In practice any political, social or economic forces which seem to serve the ends of the Soviet Union are described as 'progressive'.

The restoration of capitalism in a country as rich and powerful as the USSR inevitably led it on to an imperialist path. It exploits its own people, but in the search for maximum profits it has to join in the struggle to redivide the world.

How China exposes Soviet revisionism

China has consistently given full support to wars of national liberation — for example, the struggles of the peoples of Indochina, Palestine, southern Africa. Wars of this kind push history forward and benefit the majority of people in all countries, including the imperialist ones. The people of the Third World also have to struggle against the old international economic order; this struggle too is aided by wars of national liberation — for example the victories of the Palestinians and the other Arabs in the 1973 October War in the Middle East.

To be politically equal to their task, the working class and the oppressed nations must know who are the main enemies of independence, national liberation and socialist revolution, and what they are up to. For a long time the USA was the main force opposing all armed national-liberation struggles and also opposing the struggle by the world's poorer countries for economic independence. As seen by the Chinese, this was probably true right up to the victory of the Indochinese liberation wars. The liberation struggle still continues in its different forms but more and more it is directed against both superpowers.

For quite some time, and especially since the Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia in 1968 and Russia's rapid expansion as a naval power at about the same time, Chinese policy has clearly reflected the view that to make sense of any event in international politics it is absolutely essential to understand the role not only of the USA but also of the USSR.

The Soviet Union always confuses the issues as much as possible, trying to convince the USA that it is a rival imperialist power strong enough to merit concessions, while at the same time trying to impress public opinion with its 'anti-imperialist' image. The USSR joins the USA in upholding the old economic order (for example, on the law of the sea), and sometimes openly suppresses national independence movements, in Eastern Europe especially, while on other occasions it pretends to support independence movements, its true purpose being to expand its sphere of influence.

China's exposure of the aggressive nature of US imperialism as the world's No.1 enemy and its vulnerability has been immensely valuable. But of all contributions China has made, the greatest has probably been the exposure of social-imperialism and the unravelling of the confusions deliberately created by the Soviet leaders, thus righting their reversal of the truth.

We will give some examples showing how China has consistently opposed aggression, whether perpetrated by the USA, the Soviet Union or other

powers. The situations to which we refer are varied but have in common the fact that China was able to arrive at a correct (all-sided and not one-sided) understanding because she understood the Soviet Union's role.

1. *The break-up of Pakistan in 1971*

The Pakistan government had long been something of an exception among Third World countries. Obsessed by the military threat from India, its rulers joined in the formation of two US-dominated military pacts (CENTO and SEATO) in the 1950s. Such pacts had often been criticised by China in the strongest possible terms. However, the anti-communism of Pakistan's leaders did not prevent growing friendship with China, especially after the Bandung Conference, which Pakistan helped to convene. Under Yahya Khan's government, at the end of the 1960s, there seemed at least a sign of a positive development away from Pakistan's former position as an American satellite. This was encouraged by China.

If Pakistan was a former imperialist satellite becoming slightly less so, India was moving in the opposite direction. From being a protagonist of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence in the middle '50s, the Indian government went so far as to undertake military adventures against China in 1962 and Pakistan in 1965. Abandoning its earlier commitment to non-alignment, the Indian government aligned itself with the Soviet Union and in 1971 signed a military pact with the USSR.

Indian military intervention to dismember Pakistan later in the same year was viewed by the Chinese as an example of a highly reactionary trend in international politics, i.e. a return to the jungle law of the strong attacking the weak, but also as an instance of Soviet expansionism, using India as a tool.

Meanwhile, in Bengal, at the same time as the people were genuinely struggling for national liberation, there was a wing of the bourgeoisie that wanted to secede from Pakistan and place their country under Indian tutelage. In reply to questions, Chinese Foreign Ministry representatives explained:

It was just for the people of East Pakistan to wage revolution, as it is just for people everywhere to rebel against oppression, but it was wrong for foreign troops to invade to create a bourgeois government, which was India's intention all along. Until the Indian invasion, the situation in Pakistan was an internal affair. We opposed Yahya Khan's suppression policy and told him so. Premier Chou En-lai urged Pakistan to pay attention to Indian-Soviet plans for aggression and to make a distinction between this and the problem in East Pakistan. Regarding East Pakistan, we urged the Pakistani government to distinguish between the secessionists, who sought to place Pakistan under Indian domination, and the legitimate demands of the people. We criticised the Pakistan government privately, which we thought proper at the time, considering the world situation and India's obvious plans for aggression. If we had denounced Yahya Khan publicly, this would only have given support to Indian and Soviet plans

to intervene and the people of East Pakistan would not have profited in the least.

(quoted from *Unite the Many, Defeat the Few*)

It is clear from this statement that the Chinese saw themselves as faced with a complex situation in which several different contradictions were operative, and sought to cast their own weight in the way that would be most beneficial and would have the fewest negative side-effects.

Action in a real situation, in foreign affairs just as in any other field, is very different from simply striking moral postures of approval or disapproval. It should also be noted that in the light of their long and rich experience of applying a Marxist-Leninist line in foreign affairs, the Chinese always try to take the long view and refuse to be carried away by the temptation to make a one-sided, emotional response. In the case of Bangladesh this has again been proved correct. The Chinese refusal to denounce Yahya Khan publicly in 1971 may for a time have lost them some friends in Bangladesh; but developments there under Mujibur Rahman soon showed the illusory character of an independence that was actually dependent on Indian troops and their Soviet sponsors.

The Chinese government specifically stated that they had no prejudice against Sheik Mujibur. But in a very short time he changed from a popular figure into someone completely isolated and distrusted. The regime was corrupt and oppressive, leaving Bangladesh in thrall to Indian and Soviet capital. During this period a movement of popular opposition developed, increasingly influenced by the same Marxist-Leninist ideas that China follows. In August 1975 a series of changes occurred: first a coup d'état which was to a certain extent fostered by the USA as a function of its contention with Soviet imperialism; then pro-Soviet elements attempted to stage a come-back, which was unsuccessful, and a relatively more authentic national-independence regime came to power under Zaiur Rahman. Bangladesh now has friendly relations with both Pakistan and China.

Every important issue in international politics today involves a propaganda battle. For the USSR, the important objectives are to build up its own image as a selfless saviour, to propagandise the notion of 'detente', and to discredit Chinese foreign policy.

The Chinese, on the contrary, are not very interested in prestige. They seek no credit which they have not earned, or which is based on merely temporary factors. They believe that policy based on serious, Marxist analysis, which proves in the long run to be of benefit to the oppressed, will bring adequate recompense. They believe that successful aid is its own reward, in that it helps forward the whole world movement.

2. Chile

After the Popular Unity government under Salvador Allende came to power in 1970, the Chinese press enthusiastically reported all its actions in

safeguarding national economic independence. China also offered practical help, including a large interest-free credit, while warning against illusions about peaceful transition to socialism and against the dangers from reactionary elements in the armed forces.

The pro-Soviet Communist Party of Chile used its influence to try and convince public opinion that only the Soviet Union was a friend of Chile, with the result that at the time of the rightist coup in September 1973 the Chinese credit had not yet been ratified, though later the Pinochet regime tried to draw on it. Pro-Soviet propaganda organs in various parts of the world have tried hard to give currency to the idea that China refused to aid Popular Unity and did on the other hand aid the rightist Junta, which in fact obtained nothing from the Chinese. Various other devices were used for the same purpose, for example a scenario was arranged under the direction of the Soviet Embassy in Peking to give the impression that, a short time after the coup, the Chinese had expelled the Popular Unity ambassador as *persona non grata*. This was completely untrue; he was told that if he so wished he could go on living and doing political work in China.

Because the existence of diplomatic relations was an encouragement to the progressive forces in Chile, and because they held out the possibility of a future development of people-to-people links, Chou En-lai did not sever them. Besides, the Chilean government had not denounced the Bandung principles on which diplomatic relations had been based and as long as they did not do so, China would not break them off. The evolution of events in Chile suggests that a Chinese boycott would have brought no advantage to those fighting for democracy there.

At the time of the coup the Chinese paid tribute to the way Allende died a martyr at his post and firmly rebutted the notion spread in some circles that he had committed suicide. They condemned the role of the USA in instigating the coup, but at the same time found it necessary to condemn the poisonous theory of peaceful transition to socialism spread by the Soviet leadership and their followers in Chile, which had the effect of rendering the Allende regime defenceless.

The events in Chile are only one in a series of disasters caused by this theory, the most serious being the coup in Indonesia in 1965, which led to the massacre of several hundred thousand people. Chile proves once again the view consistently upheld by the CPC that those who work for peace, democracy and national independence must be fully prepared to meet the violence which the enemies of these ideals will use.

In Chile, before the coup, the USSR was working in an indirect, behind-the-scenes way, trying to infiltrate any authentic struggle for national independence and use it as an instrument of Soviet policy. Chilean independence was indeed overthrown, but from the point of view of expanding the Soviet sphere of influence this episode was a relative failure. Soviet propaganda has made some effort to turn it to advantage by hypocritical disapproval of the reactionary policies of the Chilean Junta. More important, though, has been a development of Soviet policy which gives the impression that the

CPSU is now abandoning the theory of peaceful transition. Soviet leader B. Ponomarev writes:

The Chilean events have served to re-emphasise the importance of safeguarding and defending socialism and revolutionary gains by all necessary means.

(*World Marxist Review*, June 1974)

Far from supporting the national-independence movement, what this really means is that pro-Soviet elements, when they fail to rally mass support, should be prepared to use violence and to call for outside (Soviet or Cuban) intervention.

This exposes the present policy of 'detente' as the purest hypocrisy. When they felt too weak to challenge the US, the Soviet leaders preached peaceful coexistence and peaceful transition to socialism. When they were stronger they began to talk about 'defending socialism . . . by all necessary means' and the Cuban and Soviet interventions in Africa followed. Those who are impressed by the current propaganda for 'detente' should ponder this.

The Russians partially encouraged the pro-Soviet Communist Party of Portugal in its attempt to grab power in 1975. This was meant as a demonstration of Russia's ability to influence events in Western Europe, for the purpose of extracting concessions in their horse-trading with the USA about spheres of influence. Similarly the so-called 'Chilean experience' was used to provide propaganda backing for the state of emergency in India in 1975, which was directed against the liberal-democratic forces there and also against the Marxist-Leninist communists. Only the pro-Soviet Communist Party of India went along with Indira Gandhi and attempted (unsuccessfully, as it turned out) to turn the state of emergency to its own advantage.

3. *The War in Angola*

It is not new for a great power to make use of national-liberation movements to serve its own interests. British imperialism exploited the Arab movement against Turkey during World War I in order to draw the Middle East into its sphere of influence. US imperialism for a long time made a fuss about being opposed to colonialism so as to disintegrate the spheres of influence of rival imperialist powers. The Angolan struggle took place at a time when the US was already thoroughly exposed and odious to the people of the whole world. Soviet social-imperialism pits its strength essentially against two enemies: firstly, rival imperialist powers, especially the USA; secondly, the *people* of all countries. Against the first enemy it is in a reasonably strong position because today the USA is vulnerable. Against the second enemy it is the Soviet Union that is weak but seeks to appear strong by the use of propaganda and strikingly effective military action.

Certainly there is no reason why people who have suffered aggression and exploitation by the US should now show it any mercy. But facts show clearly

that we are entering a period in which one-sided opposition to the USA inevitably has the effect of aiding its rival the USSR. That is why the Chinese talk of the danger of letting the tiger in through the back door while repelling the wolf at the front gate. It is a most important aspect of the Chinese approach to world politics that they do not attach too much importance to whether parties, groups or individuals call themselves right, left or centre. What counts is the role they really fulfill. The criterion of 'leftness' is whether one promotes historical progress, and in international politics the Left forces are those which work steadfastly to increase the unity of 'all forces, excluding the enemy, that can be united with' (as Mao put it), i.e. the united front against the superpowers.

The Soviet rulers, to serve their own interest, continually try to divide the nations of the Third World, describing some regimes as 'progressive' and others as 'reactionary'. The white regime in South Africa failed miserably to divide the African states by its so-called 'detente' policy; the Soviet Union attempted something more subtle by splitting the members of the Organisation of African Unity over their attitude to events in Angola.

There was a history of African resistance during the centuries of Portuguese rule in Angola. In the 1950s Angolans in different parts of the vast colony began to organise for struggle, and formed liberation movements. By the time Portugal's colonial problems began to be widely reported there were three such movements: MPLA, FNLA and UNITA. Various social-democratic and revisionist organisations in Europe gave massive publicity and support to MPLA, which thus came to be the best known in left circles in the West. FNLA, known to be led by a man with conservative, even reactionary views, was regarded with hostility by the left in Europe. UNITA relied entirely, according to reports by the few visitors to its liberated areas, on the peasants in East and South Angola. None of the movements was Marxist-Leninist or under working class leadership, but all had Marxist factions or members at one time or another. There were reactionary elements too in each of them. The fact was that the emergence and development of the national liberation movements in Angola reflected the concrete realities of Angolan society. Each separate movement had a history of successes and failures, weaknesses and problems, in meeting the needs of the local people, organising them in armed struggle against the Portuguese forces, educating cadres, setting up bases, getting weapons and winning recognition. They all wanted independence from Portuguese rule, but their conceptions of what independence and liberation were going to mean clearly differed. Whatever foreigners might have wanted — and to Western eyes MPLA was the most liberal and most attractive — it was inevitable that once the Angolan people started managing their affairs independently and democratically *they* would decide which elements, or combination of elements, they wanted most and trusted and supported most, which would safeguard national independence, unite the people and develop the economy, and which would try to sell the country to imperialism.

In January 1975 delegates of the three movements met in Mombasa, got

over many of the obstacles which had prevented cooperation and agreed to negotiate jointly with the Lisbon government for complete independence. They also agreed on a common political platform and administrative arrangements for the formation of a transitional government in which all would take an equal part, and the merging of the troops into a common Angolan army. They pledged themselves jointly to build a 'just and democratic society', to eliminate 'ethnic, racial and religious discrimination' and to 'safeguard the territorial integrity of Angola'. Later that month their negotiations with the Portuguese government resulted in agreement on independence by 11 November, to be preceded by elections for a constituent assembly. Given the bitterness between the leaders of MPLA and FNLA, hostile US intrigues, Soviet influence at the time in Lisbon, and the political backwardness of colonial Angola, it was a remarkable Angolan achievement. Armed clashes between MPLA and FNLA, and other, foreign-instigated provocations like the circulation of forged documents, did not destroy the coalition. In June the three leaders met again, in Nakuru in Kenya, and reached further agreement on some questions, though many problems remained unresolved.

In early 1975 US imperialism was having a very difficult time. It had been shown to be vulnerable to determined resistance by a small nation. Its ruling class was deeply divided over foreign interventions. The CIA was under attack by Congress. It was clear that the Angolans, once independent, could with OAU and worldwide support, have dealt effectively with US imperialism if Kissinger had tried to intervene. South Africa, too, was on the defensive, having been pressurised and isolated over many years. Its 'detente', as bogus as the Soviet detente, was nevertheless a recognition that the regime would have to be conciliatory. In fact, with the consolidation of Angolan independence, UNITA-SWAPO cooperation would inevitably have been stepped up. And the most important future development in Africa, the revolutionary overthrow of the rotten capitalist regime in South Africa, by proletarian forces over whom Moscow had no control, would then have become a realistic prospect.

For the USSR, which has tried through the revisionist South African Communist Party to keep control of the resistance in South Africa, it was the time to act, because of the dangers to be parried and the opportunities to be seized. The crude tactics of the Americans were avoided, Soviet troops were not involved. Though the Angolan leaders were manoeuvred into making serious tactical blunders, 'Angolisation' of the new imperialist offensive was not possible. 'Cubanisation' had to be tried.

Without doubt, it was not the wish of the politically conscious people in Angola that after the Portuguese withdrawal there should be civil war or any new form of foreign domination. African opinion in the continent was for the peaceful resolution of differences within Angola. Those who allowed their personal ambitions or their loyalty to imperialist interests to stand in the way of implementing the Mombasa agreement would have condemned themselves in the eyes of the people. But the massive foreign interventions, triggered off by Moscow's interference, took matters out of the hands of the Angolan

people, at least for a time.

China had followed the OAU in recognising all three liberation movements, rejecting the idea that some were progressive and some reactionary. Had the three movements remained united South Africa would never have dared to intervene. Already in 1973 Chiao Kuan-hua, in his speech to the 28th UN General Assembly, had emphasised that

while the old-line colonialists are on the decline, neo-colonialists of different shades are trying to take their place by means of cunning and deceptive manoeuvres. The superpowers are sowing dissension among the African countries so as to fish in troubled waters. The African people are still faced with the task of a protracted, complicated and tortuous struggle. Africa belongs to the great African people.

China has always emphasised the need to rely mainly on armed struggle. In his speech at the 29th General Assembly, next year, Chiao Kuan-hua said:

According to our experience in China, all reactionaries habitually use counter-revolutionary dual tactics, and we must use revolutionary dual tactics to deal with them. Armed struggle is fundamental, but negotiations are not excluded.

While they were fighting colonialism China gave all possible support, including military material, to all three movements, the greater part going to MPLA. After the agreement between the three movements and Portugal, which provided for independence and a coalition government, China ceased her military support for all three because it should no longer have been needed. It was then that the Soviet Union, after giving very half-hearted aid in the struggle, stepped in and supplied only one of the movements (MPLA) with a vast amount of military equipment in order to capitalise on the possibility of a civil war.

China holds that it was the African people who were mainly responsible for the overthrow of colonialism in Angola, thus also playing a big part in the downfall of fascism in Portugal. This stress on the role of the people is in complete contrast to the Russian analysis, which holds that all favourable developments in world politics are decisively influenced by two factors: the relative strength of the USSR vis-a-vis the USA at a global level, and the aid given by the Russians to 'progressive' forces.

While America and Russia are rivals, they also act in a parallel way to uphold the imperialist system in general. The USA made a big effort in Vietnam to convince the world's people that military might and modern weapons decide everything; America's defeat very thoroughly exposed the inner weakness of imperialism. Now in Angola the Russians have been trying to do the same thing: their technicians and Cuban troops took complete control of the MPLA forces, trying hard to prove that self-reliant people's war carried out by liberation movements over the years is historically obsolete and ineffective in the face of modern high-technology warfare.

China's line during the civil war was *not* to support the other two movements against the MPLA; she consistently stressed the need for unity among the three. The leaders of FNLA and UNITA were themselves linked to foreign imperialist powers and could not lead a genuine independence movement against Russian domination at that stage. The point was not, 'which of the movements ought to defeat the others', and China completely rejected this way of posing the question. The point is rather the struggle of the Angolan *people* against foreign intervention, and in this sense the civil war was a bad thing for the Angolans, just as the anti-colonialist liberation war had been a good thing. The next stage of the Angolan liberation movement will certainly be directed against Soviet-Cuban domination, but it has yet to find its form. There is considerable popular resistance to Soviet control, which is at present expressed to some extent in continued action by UNITA and FNLA, despite the weaknesses of the leadership of these movements. Nevertheless, MPLA is also a serious and genuine liberation movement, which contains many good fighters who struggled for years against Portugal and are certainly not prepared to hand over the fruits of victory to another imperialist power. There is evidence recently of several instances where MPLA cadres who favour independence have been persecuted and imprisoned. They will certainly fight back.

China believes that the Soviet Union is out to expand its sphere of influence relative to the USA. The way to prevent this is not to rely on the American government (though naturally its actions and responses should be carefully studied and taken into account), but rather to rely on the people of the area over which the superpowers are contending — in this case Africa. Apart from aiming to control territory and use Angola as a testing-ground for its weapons, the Russians have also used the Angola war to orchestrate a very big effort to influence world public opinion and to refine their methods of propaganda. To combat this the Chinese have tried very hard to explain the true situation. During the early 1960s the USSR under Khrushchev took a 'soft' line, permitting the Americans to have things all their own way, but today, as the events in Angola show, the Soviet leaders are much more aggressive and assertive. In fact they are only asserting their right to a larger slice of the world cake, but the anti-US stand which they take on some occasions enables them to build up a favourable image in the eyes of certain political movements for whom the USA is the main enemy.

As Chiao Kuan-hua said at the 28th session of the UN General Assembly, it took the Chinese a certain amount of time to realise

that what the Soviet Union practised was not internationalism, but great-power chauvinism, national egoism and territorial expansionism. Therefore, we will not blame those friends who have so far failed to see this for lack of experience.

And he went on to quote Lenin: 'We judge a person not by what he says or thinks of himself but by his actions'. Experience of the aggressive practice of the contemporary Soviet Union is helping to dispel illusions.

People in Europe should sum up the experience of Soviet expansionism in places like Angola, because in Europe too the USSR is playing a complicated game, trying to use its 'socialist' image to impress some and its military strength to overawe others. Of course some sections of the conservative wing of European politics are warning about the Russian threat in Africa and elsewhere, but they present this as a 'Marxist' or 'communist' threat, thus confusing the issues even further. China has pointed out correctly that the Soviet Union is aggressive and predatory just because it is *not* Marxist or communist.

Contention between the superpowers

In viewing the world situation the Chinese start from an analysis of the major trends in the world today, in order to define the character of the era in which we live.

Taking the objective facts, and eschewing a sentimental or wishful-thinking approach, they conclude that, while much has changed since Lenin's time, the current era remains one of imperialism and proletarian revolution. The tendency is for the imperialist powers to compete for world dominance, which follows inevitably from the very nature of imperialism. However, the economic, political and military strengths of the different imperialist powers — their weight in the international arena — vary considerably; only the most powerful few, as we have already said, can conceivably enter the lists for world hegemony. In practice only the two superpowers can do so. The other and lesser imperialists are subjected to exploitation or attempted exploitation by the giants while also confronted with the rise of the Third World which they, together with the giants, have been exploiting and continue still to exploit in varying degrees. The ruling class of every one of the imperialist countries is also involved in a struggle with its own working class which sooner or later will rise to rid itself of capitalist exploitation and eventually end the era of imperialism altogether.

The question of who are the principal contenders in the competition between the powers is essentially determined by their relative strength:

... there can be no other conceivable basis under capitalism for partition of spheres of influence, of interests, of colonies, etc., than a calculation of the *strength* of the participants, their economic, financial, military and other strengths.

(V.I. Lenin: *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*)

With this perspective, one is forced to the conclusion that today it is mainly the ruling classes of the USA and the Soviet Union who are struggling with each other for mastery of the world. The contention of these two superpowers for direct control of other people's territories, for spheres of influence, sources of raw materials and financial investment, knows no bounds. Equally important is the desire to prevent the rival superpower from dominating a particular territory.

Whether in the Middle East, the Indian sub-continent or Africa, the meddling of one or both superpowers is the major source of tension. It is

reflected in many of the coups and putsches and creates a 'neither war nor peace' situation while sometimes also causing actual wars. The aim is to obtain economic, military or political advantage. It is not, and never can be, genuine and unconditional support for a people's struggle for liberation or a nation's for independence.

This contention has been summarised by the Chinese in the following terms:

The two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are vainly seeking world hegemony. Each in its own way attempts to bring the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America under its control and, at the same time, to bully the developed countries that are not their match in strength.

The two superpowers are the biggest international exploiters and oppressors of today. They are the source of a new world war. They both possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. They carry on a keenly contested arms race, station massive forces abroad and set up military bases everywhere, threatening the independence and security of all nations. They both keep subjecting other countries to their control, subversion, interference or aggression.

(Teng Hsiao-ping: Speech at the Special Session of UN General Assembly, quoted in Supplement to *Peking Review*, 12 April 1974)

In analysing any regional or local war or conflict, one should look first at the global situation within which it is taking place, at the way in which it reflects the contention between the superpowers. Only when it is seen thus in an all-round context can any specific local conflict be understood. But this fact is often neglected, or sometimes deliberately distorted, by certain commentators when they try to interpret Chinese foreign policy.

Given this inevitable thrust of the two superpowers towards world mastery, it is necessary to identify the major point of contention around which other areas of conflict hinge. As the Chinese see it, in the present period the focus of contention is Europe.

In the past two or three years the Chinese have repeatedly warned West European visitors of the danger Soviet expansionism presents to them. In view of the Sino-Soviet border conflict that erupted in 1969, the massing of Soviet troops on China's border and the consistent anti-China campaign conducted by the Soviet Union, some people have asked whether these warnings from the Chinese are not part of an attempt to draw Soviet pressure away from themselves. The Chinese, however, say that because of the revolutionary experience of the Chinese people, particularly in the War of Resistance against Japan, and because of their high political awareness and determination to defend their country, it would be impossible for the USSR to occupy and hold down China successfully. The only way the Russians might succeed against China is by subverting the Chinese leadership from within. In 1969 Soviet military pressure on China was at its fiercest and many people in the West considered a war to be imminent. But it now appears that this Russian

effort was coordinated with backing for an attempted seizure of power by the Chinese Defence Minister, Lin Biao, who was killed in 1971 while attempting to flee to the Soviet Union. Over the last few years the Chinese have carried out a movement to criticise Lin Biao and analyse his actions.

Such campaigns to increase popular understanding greatly reduce the possibility of a successful attack against China. If the Soviet leaders continue to keep Sino-Soviet relations on the boil, their behaviour is, in part, an attempt to bully China, but in the main they are trying to lull the West into a false feeling of security. In 1973, at the 10th Congress of the CPC, Chou En-lai put it this way:

China is an attractive piece of meat coveted by all. But this piece of meat is very tough, and for years no one has been able to bite into it. It is even more difficult now that Lin Biao the 'superspy' has fallen.

Western Europe, by contrast, is less tough, and not at present prepared to defend itself by its own efforts. Further, though large Soviet forces are deployed on the Chinese border, forces three times as great are held ready on the European front. It is thus quite justifiable for the Chinese to maintain that the Soviets are 'making a feint to the East while attacking in the West'.

The two superpowers, and the Soviet Union in particular, talk a great deal about detente, and in certain instances they may indeed collude together against other countries. However, the Chinese believe that, as Mao Tse-tung said:

Since the two superpowers are contending for world hegemony, the contradiction between them is irreconcilable; one either overpowers the other, or is overpowered. Their compromise and collusion can only be partial, temporary and relative, while their contention is all-embracing, permanent and absolute . . . They may reach certain agreements, but their agreements are only a facade and a deception. At bottom, they are aiming at greater and fiercer contention. The contention between the two superpowers extends over the entire globe.

(Statement of 20 May 1970)

As has happened twice already in the imperialist epoch, the struggle between the two major imperialists for redivision of the globe lurches inevitably towards world war, and the only force that prevents or delays it is the struggle of the peoples of different countries to deny their territory to imperialism, and the struggle of the peoples in the countries of the superpowers to restrain their rulers' aggression. This is the sense of Mao's words:

The danger of a new world war still exists and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today.

(*ibid*)

To put it another way, either their contention will result in their fighting each

other, or the people of the world will rise in revolution and put an end to imperialism.

Western Europe is particularly important to the Soviet Union for many reasons. Firstly, its geographical position as an intermediate zone between the USA and the USSR renders it a natural prey for Soviet expansionism to try to wrest from US influence. Secondly, Western Europe possesses the greatest concentration (apart from the superpowers themselves) of skilled labour and advanced production techniques, to which the Soviet Union must get access if it is to succeed in its ambitions for world hegemony.

While the present focus of contention is localised in Europe the superpowers, in their manoeuvres to control Europe, may in the immediate future compete more acutely in other areas, particularly on Europe's flanks, such as the Middle East and Mediterranean, where there has been an enormous Soviet naval build-up. The USSR also seeks control over areas of the Third World rich in raw materials.

Some people still believe that a war between the two superpowers is ruled out in advance by the suicidally destructive character of nuclear weapons. The Chinese response to this is very clear and simple: the goal of both superpowers, underneath all their rhetoric about the 'free world' or the 'socialist community', is to subject as much territory as possible to their economic exploitation. For this reason, the aggression of each superpower is in the first instance directed, not against the other's heartland, which is most difficult to occupy, but against the 'intermediate zone'. The object of their contention over Europe is to make use of its industry, manpower and technology for their own ends and to deprive the other superpower of their use. To obliterate Europe by nuclear means would be to defeat this purpose. Since the Second World War, Western Europe has on the whole fallen within the economic sphere of the USA. The Soviet leaders hope to extend their influence either gradually by political means or suddenly by conventional military means. Their calculations assume that the USA will not take the initiative in using nuclear weapons.

Chapter 12

The Second World

We have now arrived at the last of the three main sectors into which the Chinese see the world as divided — the Second World of developed capitalist countries other than the two superpowers.

The definition of the First, Second and Third Worlds is not intended as an abstract exercise in logic. It is intended to serve as a guide to action, to help in distinguishing the basic class characteristics and the political orientations of each of the three main forces in international life today: that is, who must be opposed and who, in certain circumstances and under certain conditions, can be united with to defeat the main enemy. From their own experience in forming a united front with Chiang Kai-shek to defeat Japanese imperialist attacks, the Chinese know full well the problem of working with unstable and vacillating allies. However, their prime concern is the victory of the people of every country over oppression, exploitation and subjection. They understand that to achieve this objective temporary alliances are necessary if the main enemy is to be overcome. In mobilising the world's people to defeat the plans of the superpowers, whilst the main thrust must come from the Third World and eventually from the workers of the capitalist countries, there is at present a possibility of using the contradictions between the two superpowers on the one hand and the Second World on the other to maximise the opposition to superpower bullying. Of course the ruling classes of the Second World may well be hesitant and unreliable and their own proletariat will have to maintain pressure on them.

The following passage expresses the position well:

The situation in the Second World countries, in between the superpowers and the developing countries, is complicated. Some of them to this day still maintain various forms of colonialist relations with the Third World countries, which should be ended. But at the same time, they all suffer to varying degrees superpower control, bullying, exploitation and plunder and are trying to rid themselves of superpower control and interference and safeguard their independence and state sovereignty. With the growth and development of the Third World, more and more Second World countries, motivated by their own economic interests and their need to counter the two hegemonic powers, are for dialogue with Third World countries and are actually developing relations with them.

(*Peking Review*, 19 December 1975)

Western Europe and Japan clearly fall within this definition but so, too, do

the countries of Eastern Europe, although they vary significantly in their degree of economic development.

Some of them (*the developed countries*) have in fact been reduced by a superpower to the position of dependencies under the signboard of its so-called 'family'. In varying degrees all these countries have the desire of shaking off superpower enslavement or control and safeguarding their national independence and the integrity of their sovereignty.

Hegemonism is doomed to failure; it does not work in face of the people, nor will it work for long within the bloc controlled by force.

(*Hsinhua News*, 7 June 1976)

This description of the role of the Second World accords with the everyday experience of many. But it is among some sections of the 'left' in Britain and Europe that there is the greatest difficulty in understanding what the Chinese mean. This difficulty results from a failure to see that the realities of our times are substantially different from those immediately after World War II and, indeed, from those which preceded the US defeat in Indochina and the build-up of Soviet armaments. Some people have objected to China's foreign policy, particularly the notion of the Second World, on the ground that it is out of keeping with Lenin's view of imperialism. But in fact these objectors fail to understand what Lenin meant.

According to him, imperialism is not just a *policy* adopted by certain powerful states, it is a specific stage in the development of capitalism, monopoly capitalism, that impels the developed capitalist countries to foreign expansion and mutual contention for division of the globe. This fact the Chinese accept. But it would be very wrong to interpret Lenin as having held that all capitalist states without exception become imperialist great powers. In Lenin's own day, the smaller capitalist countries such as Sweden and Switzerland could not possibly participate in the division of the world. These smaller capitalist countries, even at the time of World War I, were themselves the object of imperialist expansionism. Lenin argued (in opposition to Kautsky) that

the characteristic feature of imperialism is precisely that it strives to annex *not only* agrarian territories but even most highly industrialised regions (German appetite for Belgium; French appetite for Lorraine).

(V.I. Lenin: *Imperialism*, *op.cit.*)

In the imperialist world system, developed capitalist countries without exception all receive surplus value from the peoples of the less developed countries — in this respect both Luxemburg and Monaco are imperialist. But it is only the large capitalist countries, the 'great powers', that are in a position to build up spheres of influence and struggle for world hegemony, and they do so even though they may derive no *direct* economic advantage from it.

As essential feature of imperialism is the rivalry between several Great Powers in the striving for hegemony, i.e. for the conquest of territory, not so much directly for themselves as to weaken the adversary and undermine *his* hegemony.

(*ibid.*)

In the world of today there are only two large capitalist countries that can function as great powers and strive for hegemony — the USA and the USSR. Even countries as important as Britain, France and Western Germany are outside this superpower struggle, indeed they are among the prizes it offers. In Japan the tendency towards a recurrence of militarism, which was observed with great attention by China up to the beginning of the 1970s, is now much less significant.

Faced with the upsurge of the Third World, the capitalist countries of the Second World have to make a choice, precisely because their superior economic position in relation to the Third World is not backed up by the political and military strength necessary for them to dominate the Third World on their own account. Either they fall into complete subordination to the USA or USSR, and allow one or the other to function as a gendarme for them, or they react favourably to the demands of the Third World countries for a change in the international economic order by 'dialogue' instead of by 'confrontation'.

The Lome Convention of 1975 was an instance of the EEC countries choosing dialogue instead of confrontation with the Third World and reaching agreement through consultation. The Convention, between the EEC and 46 African, Pacific and Caribbean countries, has modified the neo-colonialist economic relations which existed between the European powers and their former colonies. Other countries, for example the former Portuguese colonies, have now joined, so that almost the whole of Africa is now represented. The developing countries maintained a united position during a decade of hard bargaining and succeeded in winning reasonable terms. An Export Stabilisation Fund exists to indemnify the developing countries against fluctuations in the price of raw materials; they are allowed tariff-free access to European markets for nearly all their products, while they themselves can use tariffs for protection.

The Second World countries are in need of materials for their industry but they cannot hope to control the sources, as in the days of colonialism, by enslaving the developing countries. On the other hand, if the superpowers manage to dominate these sources of raw materials then the Second World countries will become completely dependent on the superpowers. Hence it is in the interest of the Second World to support the independence movement of the developing countries against the superpowers. The foreign policy of all the Second World states is full of contradictions and they always try to keep as many options open as possible and avoid taking a clear stand. But the *tendency* is towards cooperation between the Second and Third Worlds.

Some people ask whether the unified capitalist EEC will not itself become a 'third superpower'. This is hardly a significant danger. The European

capitalists are no more moral or altruistic than their counterparts in the USA or the Soviet Union, but the fact is that the EEC is in no position to throw its weight around the world. Its member states are still in the last stages of retreat from their former empires. Their ruling classes are capitalist and engaged in competition with one another, but it is dubious whether many of them could even protect their homelands militarily. Even if a tendency does exist among certain European reactionaries to build Europe up into a third superpower, it would take at least a generation to accomplish, and by that time the opportunities for hegemonism will have been yet more drastically reduced by the progress of the Third World peoples. The EEC as it exists here and now can be won as an ally against the common enemy. Within such an international united front only the Third World can take the lead; the Third World unites with Second World countries and at the same time struggles to make them abandon any tendency to impose a neo-colonialist relationship.

At the 4th UNCTAD Conference in Nairobi in June 1976, whilst the West European countries were divided on a number of issues, on some they gave their support to the Third World in opposition to the superpowers.

There is a growing struggle on the part of the Second World countries in between the superpowers and the Third World to free themselves from the control, threats, bullying, exploitation and the shifting of economic crisis by one or the other superpower. More and more Second World countries favour dialogue with the Third World countries and are making efforts to establish cooperation with them. As is pointed out by many developing countries, such dialogue and cooperation, if they are to proceed successfully, must be based on the principles of mutual respect for independence and sovereignty and of equality and mutual benefit. Contacts and exchanges of this nature are beneficial to both sides and have favourable prospects. The struggle of the Second World countries against superpower control and exploitation and their tendency to establish ties with Third World countries are also exerting an important influence on the development of the international situation.

(*Peking Review*, 12 September 1975)

It is because they understand the Soviet threat to Western Europe that the Chinese adopt this attitude. This is not out of self-interest, to create difficulties for the Soviet Union on its western flank, but because they see the *general* interest of the world's people, themselves included, as being served by a united front against the two superpowers, the most dangerous enemies of peace and progress in the present period. The choice before the West European nations is between uniting, eventually taking over from the USA full responsibility for their own defence and being able to determine their own destiny, or remaining divided and being swallowed up one by one by the Soviet Union as it seeks to extend its sphere of influence at the expense of the USA, a situation which would certainly lead to a world war.

Europe as the focal point of contention

In the current era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, which will change only with the final defeat of imperialism, the contradictions at all levels are in a process of continuous change. A world view based on an analysis made immediately after World War II, and one made today following the defeats of the USA in Indochina and the internal changes in the Soviet Union, must be radically, if not totally, different.

At the end of World War II, with an impoverished Europe facing the USA grown enormously richer as a result of the war, the relationship was so unequal that it could hardly be described as a confrontation. Over the years the balance of economic power changed, with Europe — particularly West Germany and, at a somewhat slower pace, France — growing in strength and with the American economy showing signs of increasing strain. The change in the relative position of America and Europe (and Japan) reached a nodal point in August 1971, when the supremacy of the dollar in the capitalist world currency system came to an end. America still remained economically the stronger, but Europe had by this time put on enough economic muscle to be able to resist the more objectionable forms of pressure and domineering from the States and to steer a more independent course.

As the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union became more pronounced, Western Europe's relationship with the Soviet Union underwent a change; from one between the ruling classes of European capitalist countries and a socialist state, it became an inter-capitalist, inter-imperialist rivalry.

The events in the Soviet Union which resulted in the qualitative change into a capitalist state were a process of erosion of and departure from socialist policies and practices extending over a period of years. Parallel with these changes was the systematic build-up of an aggressive military apparatus from the time of the Cuban missile crisis (1962), when the Soviet Union was obviously not in a position to challenge the USA militarily, to the situation today when, most experts would agree, a rough parity of military power exists between them.

This process of change may be divided into three main phases: (i) the period of the one international gendarme, US imperialism; (ii) the emergence of the two superpowers and the need to oppose them; (iii) the continuation of the hegemonic aspirations of the superpowers, but with Soviet social-imperialism as the greater danger for reasons already explained (see Chapter 9).

Despite the problems of European unity which surface from time to time, the logic of events in a period when the two superpowers are seeking world

domination, is driving the ruling classes of Europe into a common front by consolidating the economic community, establishing more effective forms of political union and, looking ahead, adopting a unified European currency and, eventually, a unified and standardised defence. Reviewing the problems of Western Europe in 1974, the Institute of Strategic Studies observed:

Keeping the Common Market together under the impact of economic crisis became, therefore, a primary act of security policy . . . If West Germany refused to be moved by the American temptations of American-German bilateralism, this was because Bonn saw the European community not merely as an economic but as a strategic necessity.

(Strategic Survey, 1974)

This is not to say that inter-capitalist rivalries do not exist between the various countries of Western Europe; they clearly do. Between the working people of the European continent, however, there are no such antagonistic contradictions and here, in the long run, lies the basis for a common front of a more solid kind — of the people — which will be realised in proportion to their political awareness and determination to act (possibly in the earlier period in terms of demands on their own bourgeoisie) in rejecting both American and Soviet imperialist aggression. Forms of unity of the European people to put pressure on their ruling classes for genuine European independence and eventually a Europe based on people's power, with whatever forms of international cooperation they decide to be appropriate, are the surest and only final safeguard against superpower encroachments and for peace in the continent. This concept is certainly in the perspective of the world view of the Chinese, who see people, not weapons or technology, as decisive.

Contention is the constant feature of superpower relations, with co-operation and collusion a temporary phenomenon. Whilst the character of this contention is global, there are clearly areas of major and of lesser conflict and, to be of any value, an analysis of the world situation must define them in order to pinpoint the crucial one.

As we said in Chapter 11, the Soviet leaders, in their policy towards Europe, will use the confrontation on the borders with China as a feint. However, the Chinese cannot allow their understanding of this to lull them into minimising the threat which the Soviet Union poses to themselves. 'Soviet revisionism is bent on subjugating China', stated an article in *Peking Review* (11 August 1978), and 'has stepped up its preparation for launching a war of aggression against China'. But despite the current recession, Europe is still the juiciest and most tempting plum for either superpower to grab. She is the world's most important economic area after the superpowers themselves and, as such, is seen by both as a rich prize, more important than the Middle East, with all its oil, or Japan. Whichever of the superpowers could, by force or stealth, acquire effective control over Europe's industrial and technical resources and make use of her strategic position, could thereby swing the balance decisively against its rival.

America's attitude was described by President Carter at a summit meeting in London in May, 1977:

We will continue to make the Alliance the heart of our foreign policy. We will join with you to strengthen the Alliance politically, economically and militarily.

For both superpowers Europe is strategically a vital factor. Conflicts around its periphery are part of the attempt to dominate this area. America's attitude is described in *Strategic Survey, 1974*, mentioned above:

The Administration seemed to attach as great an importance to the American presence in Europe as before, not least because this presence would allow American military operations on Europe's periphery if necessary.

This is an added reason for the USSR to challenge America's position in Europe. Its strategy was described in China's statement on the 'Three Worlds' (*Peking Review*, 4 November 1977):

The Soviet Union has massed its military and naval forces in Eastern Europe and on the northern and southern European waters, which are deployed to encircle Western Europe. At the same time it has stepped up its seizure of strategic areas along the line running from the Red Sea through the Indian Ocean via the Cape of Good Hope to the eastern shores of the South Atlantic, endeavouring to outflank and encircle Europe and seriously menacing the main lines of communication vital to Western Europe.

Along the eastern borders of Europe lie countries which are, to a greater or lesser degree, subject to Soviet oppression, whose people are restive and will sooner or later throw off the regimes which are only kept in power by Soviet support. A major Soviet presence in Western Europe would help contain such breakaway elements.

In Southeast Europe there is open resistance to the arm-twisting of the Soviet leaders. The pressure on Yugoslavia and Romania to allow the passage of Soviet troops, the building of military roads through their territories and the holding of manoeuvres on their soil are but some aspects of this situation. Basically, Soviet policy is a denial of national independence in the name of proletarian internationalism. A Romanian journal explains:

The national interests and international interests of the working class are indivisible and an integral whole. If the nation is denied its existence, its rights curtailed and a set of coercive criteria laid down as the principles for the working class to follow in achieving unity in the struggle for its basic goal, then internationalism will not and cannot exist.

(*Lunea*, No.14, 1976)

The journal quotes Engels' preface of 1893 to the Italian edition of *The Communist Manifesto*:

Without restoring autonomy and unity to each nation, it will be impossible to achieve the international union of the proletariat, or the peaceful and intelligent co-operation of those nations towards common aims.

It is in the spirit of the principle expressed here by Engels that the Chinese give support to Romania to help her maintain her independence and withstand Soviet coercion.

In Yugoslavia, in addition to economic and military pressures, the Soviet leaders have gone so far as to organise pro-Soviet subversive groups directed from Kiev to oppose President Tito and, it is widely assumed, to stage a coup after his death. In a speech at Sisak (20 September 1975) Tito explained:

Being strategically situated Yugoslavia has watered the mouth of many people who are furtively hoping for the breaking out of some internal strife so that they can interfere in our domestic affairs.

And at the Conference of European Communist Parties in June 1976 he warned:

It is precisely interference in the internal affairs of others that has jeopardised peace and always provoked conflicts between countries in Europe and elsewhere in the world.

The fact that the Soviet press is constantly lauding the advantages accruing from the normalisation of relations with West Germany in 1970 has in no way diminished the spying operations of the KGB and its puppets which have been uncovered, one after the other, in West Germany in recent years, nor has it brought any nearer the possibility of the German people living together again as one nation. Indeed, the Soviet leaders have clamped their hold more firmly on East Germany, where 345,000 Soviet troops are the physical manifestation of the oppressor. In contradistinction to the earlier agreement, which provided for the possibility of reunification, the latest accord prescribes that Germany shall remain divided, denying to the people of East Germany the right of self-determination — to decide for themselves whether or not Germany should return to its status as one nation.

In general, the Soviet leaders are using the screen of detente to give international sanction to their grip on the East European countries. In his report to the Central Committee of the CPSU on 24 February 1976 Brezhnev observed:

The most important results of the liberation struggle of the European peoples during and after the Second World War have been formalised.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia, the political, economic and military

pressures, particularly on Yugoslavia and Romania, the attempt to perpetuate the division of Germany, the woeful state of the Polish economy, make the true character of this 'formalisation' all too clear: the last thing to concern the Soviet leaders is the aspiration for national autonomy and economic independence of the peoples of East Europe.

True to their imperialist character both superpowers must seek ways to influence and control Europe's economy. Both have critical problems, especially the slowing down of economic growth, the burden of which they would like to shift to the shoulders of others whilst denying any benefit to the rival. Both have an army of non-producers and bureaucrats who have to be sustained by the labour of the working people of other countries as well as their own. The acquisition of additional economic (particularly industrial and technological) strength is important to both. The USA has already penetrated Europe's industry through massive investment and other forms of financial control. Direct US investment in Europe today stands at \$44 billion, exceeding the direct investment in Canada.

The pressures which the one superpower tries to exert through investment, the other has so far attempted by penetration of a different kind — through trade, technology and credits which have the effect of binding at least certain European industrial and financial circles into long-term relationships with the Soviet Union. The East European countries, primarily the Soviet Union and Poland, are heavily indebted to many Western European countries which have granted long-term, 15-20 years, loans to finance trade deals. These countries' hard currency debts in 1977 reached \$51.7 billion according to a Chase Manhattan report of May 1978. Such arrangements have helped partially to cushion the effects of excessive arms expenditure by the Soviet leaders, but the repayments are becoming due and the economic hens are coming home to roost.

'Economic cooperation' has served the Soviet armaments drive in the field of naval power. Most of the rapidly growing Soviet merchant fleet has been built in other Comecon countries and in the West, Russian shipbuilding yards being reserved for naval vessels, mainly submarines.

Pursuing their endeavours to get a grip on the European economy, the Soviet leaders are now thinking of a more extensive form of economic relationship which, given the nature of Soviet economic policy, could only be a further encroachment of social-imperialism into Western Europe — a process which has been described as 'finlandisation'. In February 1976 CMEA (or Comecon) forwarded a draft agreement to the EEC with a view to establishing official relations, a proposal which the Soviet *Economic Gazette* of March 1976 observed would 'open the course for active participation in the international division of labour', the reality of which, as we saw earlier, is to use other people's economies in the service of Soviet social-imperialism.

It seems that the Soviet leaders even now do not scruple to interfere in Europe's affairs. Before the Spring Assembly of the Western European Union in June, 1978, a report which called for closer cooperation between Europe and China was leaked to the Soviet leaders in advance of the debate, who

then through the ambassadors in London, Bonn and Rome put pressure on these governments to withdraw the report. An attempt by the French Socialists and Italian Communists to suppress the report was overridden. The report as adopted included reference to the fact that the WEU Assembly considers that 'total resistance to all external aggression is one of the fundamental elements of the policy-thinking of China and Western Europe'. It is surely revealing that the Soviets protested that this was 'a demonstration of collective hostility to the Soviet Union'.

The build-up of their military resources is one of the features that most clearly support the view that the superpowers themselves regard West Europe as the critical area of their confrontation. A preponderance of the Soviet Union's arms and men is positioned along its western perimeter. Thus three-fifths of her ground forces, three-quarters of her long-range air force, half her tactical air force and three-quarters of her medium-range missiles are in position for an attack on West Europe. Three-quarters of the major sea-borne vessels of the Soviet navy and half its attack and nuclear-missile submarines are deployed around Europe. Whereas earlier these cruised off the northern coasts of the Soviet Union and in the Baltic, they are now free-ranging in the North Sea and the Atlantic. In the Mediterranean the number of Soviet ships in 1974 was five times what it had been seven years earlier.

The Helsinki and Belgrade conferences may come and go, talk of detente may wax and wane, but the Soviet aggressive build-up goes right on. The International Institute of Strategic Studies reported on the latest situation in *Strategic Survey*, 1977:

The Soviet Union approached her aims in Europe along the traditional paths of protective political and military control over the Eastern bloc and attempts to advance Soviet influence in Western Europe. The armed forces of the Warsaw Pact continued to be improved by the addition of new weapons and equipment — such as the T-22 battle tank, the Su-17 and Su-19 aircraft — and plans for the deployment of the SS-20 IRBM in Western Russia were further advanced.

(p.61)

Referring to Brezhnev's claim that the Soviet Union had not increased its military forces in Europe as a 'clumsy beautification of reality' the military journalist A. Weinstein writing in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on 3 May 1978 quoted figures of the Soviet build-up:

Russian tank regiments stationed between the Weichsel river and the Elbe have been systematically strengthened in the past decade . . . the number of tanks has been increased to 46,500 with about 7,000 added under Brezhnev's rule . . . the number of armoured vehicles has been increased from 45,000 to 53,000 . . . Under Brezhnev's rule the number of fighter planes of the third generation has grown from zero to 1,000 and that of modernised fighter bombers from 500 to 1,200 . . . the number of fighter helicopters has been increased from 1,900 to 5,000.

Herr Weinstein concludes that when their structure is taken into account the soviet ground and air forces must be considered weapons for offence.

It is perhaps in the field of naval power that the aggressive intentions of the Soviet leaders are most fully revealed and their imperialist ambitions exposed, adept though they are at two-faced tactics: on one side showing the flag of peace and detente and on the other giving a display of power adequate to intimidate weaker nations and impress the rival superpower. In a recent book (*The Maritime Power of the State*, Moscow 1976) Admiral Sergei Gorshkov, Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy, has expounded the Soviet Union's gun-boat diplomacy, modern style. Thus, the navy

is a powerful means of attaining the political aim of armed struggle in time of war,

but it also

plays an important role as a political instrument of the state in time of peace.

In the latter role it can both 'demonstrate the country's economic and military might abroad' and 'protect the interests of the state abroad to the maximum degree'. What these foreign interests of a socialist country are, is not explained, though the reader gets an inkling of the intimidatory purpose Gorshkov has in mind from his observation that demonstrations by the navy can in many cases provide the possibility of achieving its political purpose without resorting to armed force, merely by applying pressures with its own potential power and the threat of military actions to be taken.

Military control over the sea area around northern Europe has been 'a crucial element in global power policies for several centuries' comments Barry Buzan in a paper published by the Institute of Strategic Studies in early 1978 (*A Sea of Troubles?* Adelphi Papers, No. 143):

These waters not only provide the principal access to the open ocean for the most important of the Soviet fleets, but also contain the vital shipping lanes linking the members of NATO.

(p.20)

A potentially ominous precedent . . . was the holding of Soviet naval exercises in the North Sea for the first time in June 1976.

(p.23)

Norway is particularly concerned at the extent of Soviet pressure, especially over its boundary in the Barents Sea, described by Barry Buzan as 'part of that virtually sacrosanct set of boundaries on which East-West stability is built' (p.24).

Norway's apprehensions are not without foundation for

Not only is the bulk of Soviet naval strength concentrated in the northern bases (which, despite their limitations, offer the best access to the high

seas) but, more particularly, three-quarters of modern Soviet strategic missile submarines (Y- and D-class) are stationed there. The most modern of these (D-11-class, equipped with SS-N-8) can strike at most North American targets from the Barents sea . . .

(p.24)

The Islands of Spitzbergen (Svalberg) are in a particularly vulnerable position. Established as an integral part of Norway by a treaty of 1920, but with certain rights permitted to other powers, the Soviet Union has constantly disregarded Norway's sovereignty and on more than one occasion has used bullying tactics to gain her ends. The correspondent of *Le Monde*, Frank Bjerkholt, writing on 14 August 1975, described the situation:

The Soviet presence in Spitzbergen, the exploitation of the coal mines at Barentsburg and oil exploration in Colesubtka present real problems for the Norwegians, particularly the Russian villages which tend to constitute enclaves on the fringe of the laws and regulations of Norway. The Russians are inclined to ignore the obligations, applicable to all foreign activity, to submit to Norwegian authority. But the Norwegians have no means of imposing their will.

Neither of the two superpowers is prepared to accept Norway's offshore rights, which derive from the fact that the Islands form part of the Norwegian continental shelf. With the discovery of offshore oil in the region, and having regard to Spitzbergen's strategic situation, the area could at any time become a flashpoint in the contention of the superpowers.

The Danes are similarly apprehensive about Soviet operations around their coast but the USSR brushes their fears aside as

a ballyhoo about the 'systematic' appearance of mysterious aircraft and landing ships off Danish coasts, which, to be sure, had the markings of the Soviet Union.

(*Izvestia*, 11 May 1976)

On 5 March 1978 the Danish paper *Jyllands-Posten*, quoting the remarks of Poul Soegaard, Minister of Defence, commented:

like those of the old tsars, Moscow's motives are always covered up with fine but contradictory statements and actions. In fact, the Soviet Union has set up nuclear floating bases in the Baltic . . . When the Soviet submarines entered into the Baltic in the autumn of 1976, we strengthened our defence and we will further heighten our vigilance in the future. The 'sea of peace' is nothing but an illusion.

In the Mediterranean too, the superpowers contend for strategic advantage, they 'shake hands across Central Europe and bare their ugly teeth in the blue Mediterranean Sea' — Dom Mintoff, Maltese Prime Minister, July 1973. With

the rise of Soviet naval power, Western hegemony is well on the way to becoming an even balance, states Barry Buzan (*op.cit.*) adding that

The existence of naval rivalry in the Mediterranean reflects not only the central confrontation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact but also the interests of the two superpowers in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union has built up in recent years the largest merchant fleet in the world and plans further expansion and further technological improvements. This is seen not merely as a commercial venture but as having political and strategic implications of the kind already demonstrated in Cuba, Angola and the Horn of Africa. It has been pointed out that many of the Soviet merchant ships are built with equipment of such an advanced type as to make them virtually interchangeable with military vessels.

The Soviet navy, suggests John Moore (*The Soviet Navy Today*, Macdonald and Jane's), is acquiring a string of naval bases just as the British navy collected coaling stations in the heyday of the Empire.

Although the Soviet leaders claim that their military expenditure is being reduced (*Pravda*, 12 May 1976), all the evidence points in the other direction. An article in *Survival* published by the Institute of Strategic Studies (Nov-Dec 1977) suggests that 'the present upward momentum of Soviet defence programmes is likely to continue . . . future Soviet military budgets will continue to be strongly influenced by programmes already in motion'. Soviet defence expenditures have absorbed 11 to 12 per cent of GNP over the past 15 years in comparison with the figure for the United States of slightly over 6 per cent. Despite the slowdown in the Soviet economy, including a planned reduction in the rate of industrial growth, there is no sign that defence expenditures will be cut in order to raise living standards.

Summing up the changes over time, the latest report of the International Institute of Strategic Studies (*The Military Balance, 1978-1979*) observes:

In 1962 the American land, sea and air forces in Europe totalled 434,000; now the figure is around 300,000. There were 26 Soviet divisions in Eastern Europe in 1967; now there are 31, and they are larger in size (despite the increase of some 25 divisions on the Chinese front over the same period). The numerical pattern over the years so far has been a gradual shift in favour of the East, with NATO relying on offsetting this by a qualitative superiority in its weapons that is now being eroded as new Soviet equipment is introduced. While NATO has been modernizing its forces, the Warsaw Pact has been modernizing faster and expanding as well . . . in general the pattern is one of a military balance moving steadily against the West.

The American imperialists do not propose to remove their forces from Europe, even though in time Europe may become more independent and the American presence may be reduced. In fact James Schlesinger said in 1975, when he was Secretary of Defence:

With the end of our involvement in Vietnam, the emphasis of our planning has shifted towards Europe . . . most of our forces already are or soon will be oriented towards a war in Europe.

(*Annual Report to Congress*, 5 February 1975)

How can the military build-up by the two sides be reconciled with all the talk of detente, and what are the realities which lie behind Vladivostok, Helsinki and Belgrade? At root this is a matter of power and it would be the grossest self-deception on the part of those who seek peace and treasure independence to look only at the words and ignore the deeds. As Lenin explained (see page 70), the basis for the division of the spoils can only be a calculation of the strength of the participants, their economic, financial, military and other strengths.

The facts are that (a) as imperialist powers the USA and the USSR *must* contend for spheres of influence and a redivision of the world and (b) this contention will be played out in accordance with the relative strength of the two sides and the extent of the opposition to superpower hegemony from the Third and Second Worlds.

The Vladivostok Agreement between the USA and the Soviet Union, of November 1974, does not in the opinion of *Strategic Survey, 1974*

restrict the freedom of both sides to continue their current strategic programmes. In effect it codifies the next generation of strategic weapons of the two superpowers.

While the Helsinki accord was used extensively to persuade the Russian people that their leaders are following a 'Leninist policy of peace and friendship' and to lull the peace forces in the rest of the world into accepting at their face value the principles included in the Final Act of the Conference (the inviolability of frontiers and territorial integrity of states, non-interference in the internal affairs of others and the peaceful settlement of disputes), it has not had, and will not have any effect on the determination of each of the superpowers to build up its military capability and obtain economic and political advantages over its rival. All this despite Brezhnev's assertion that 'the aggregate results of the Conference consist in the fact that international relaxation is being increasingly invested with concrete material content'.

There is all the difference in the world between illusions of detente spread by the Soviet leaders and repeated by the European 'communist' parties, and the possibility, indeed the necessity, of using the contradictions between the superpowers and the rest of the capitalist world to defeat the main enemy. When the Chinese receive right-wing European leaders such as Strauss, Schmidt, Heath, Thatcher, Tindemans and others in Peking or when Chairman Hua visits Romania and Yugoslavia, it is in the hope of strengthening the opposition to superpower imperialism — a course which the Chinese believe will be in the interests of the people of Europe.

Militarism is a particular form taken by the economies of imperialist great

powers at certain stages. The economy of the USSR is relatively far more concentrated around military purposes than is that of the USA, let alone any other imperialist country. This is undoubtedly a crushing burden on society but it fits into imperialist logic, being a short-term solution to economic crisis, but leading to greater crisis. Both superpowers are developing new and more costly advances in weapons technology, while at the same time using the smokescreen of detente to delude the people into thinking that their country's arms expenditure could be cut and their standard of living raised, *if only the other side* would follow a truly peaceful course.

Accords, alliances and agreements, as the Chinese have stated, are among the forms in which the collusion and contention of the superpowers finds expression. Basically, they reflect the balance of power between the two at any given time.

Peaceful alliances prepare the ground for wars and in their turn grow out of wars; the one conditions the other, producing alternative forms of peaceful and non-peaceful struggle on *one and the same basis* of imperialist connections and relations within world economics and politics.

(Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol.22, p.295)

Gradually the true character of the Soviet Union's aggressive policy is becoming exposed and understood by an increasing number of people, even if the majority of the people in Europe are unaware as yet of the focus of the superpowers' contention on their continent. This is, however, not true of Europe's ruling groups. For the present, with their economic position relatively stronger vis-a-vis the USA, but unable to stand on their own feet militarily against the threat of the other superpower, their relations with the USA are likely to remain ambivalent.

This part dependence, part independence of Europe induces an uneasy relationship, which will swing from an emphasis on dependence to one on independence, according to changes in the situation. In the long run the European ruling classes are likely to be forced by events to seek political unity and cohesion of their military forces as a means of defence against the menace of the superpowers.

As the Chinese see the situation:

The monopoly capitalists of the West European countries, Japan, etc., have a thousand and one ties with the United States and, in face of the menace posed by Soviet social-imperialism, these countries still have to rely on the US 'protective umbrella'. But so long as the United States continues its policy of control, they will not cease in their struggle against such control and for equal partnership.

(*Peking Review*, No.45, 1977)

All this, of course, is looking at the problem in terms of the relative economic and military strength of the three elements in the triangle: USA, USSR and Europe. In the short term, and in the absence of a popular move-

ment for European independence and resistance to the superpowers, the Chinese see as positive any forms of opposition by the bourgeoisie of the European countries to Soviet or American encroachment. This implies the building up of an adequate defence apparatus, even though, for an interim period, it may be necessary to retain US forces in Europe as a counterbalance to the Soviet Union. Several European leaders are looking to a diminishing role for the US forces.

The long-term view of the Chinese is clear from numerous statements. It is based on their own experience and draws on the lessons for the world's people of the Indochina war: that arms and technology are secondary, people are decisive and, once correctly orientated and mobilised, can defeat any aggressor.

Innumerable facts prove that a just cause enjoys abundant support while an unjust cause finds little support. A weak nation can defeat a strong, a small nation can defeat a big. The people of a small country can defeat aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, dare to take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country. This is a law of history.

(Mao Tse-tung: Statement of 20 May 1970, after the US-engineered coup in Cambodia)

While reliance on the strength of the people as expressed in Mao Tse-tung's words is basic to the Chinese world view, the present period is one in which the leaders of the European powers are beginning to grapple with the implications of a relatively new alignment of forces and with the hard fact of superpower contention over their continent. The Chinese statements at the United Nations and in meetings with European statesmen have helped considerably to elucidate the main factors in a phase of world history that is nothing if not complicated.

Increasingly reality is breaking through the rhetoric. As long ago as 1973 Michel Jobert, French Foreign Minister at that time, expressed the opinion that 'experience has shown us that superpower *tete-a-tete* can just as easily lead to confrontation as to detente'. He told the National Assembly:

We must be realistic and lucid... If we want to stay free, have any influence in the world, participate in the determination of our destiny, then we must tirelessly pursue both European construction and our defence effort.

In 'staying free', the more far-sighted of Europe's politicians are becoming aware of China's attitude towards the superpowers, her understanding of the more immediate menace of Soviet social-imperialism and of the positive stance taken by China towards European security. The 24th session of the Assembly of the West European Union, held in June 1978, adopted a recommendation calling on the WEU countries

to examine attentively the role which China may play with regard to the

security of Europe and the world and study carefully the views expressed by the Chinese government on questions concerning the threats to international peace, and to encourage the member governments to develop their trade relations with China on a bilateral basis and continue to take concerted action, particularly within the framework of the European Economic Community, with a view to developing trade between Europe and China.

When considering the character of NATO as it is today and as it may become with a more developed European unity, it is necessary to reflect on the nature of the conflict should the contention of the superpowers become open war. In such an event, and given the character of the superpowers as already described, it would seem that for the people of Europe the war would be one of national defence and would have certain similarities with World War II against Hitler fascism. In *Socialism and War*, written in 1915, Lenin explained that

We Marxists differ from both pacifists and anarchists in that we deem it necessary to study each war historically (from the standpoint of Marx's dialectical materialism) and separately.

He then went on to consider the difference between wars of aggression and defensive wars and explained:

socialists stressed the legitimacy of 'defensive' wars . . . It is only in this sense that socialists have always regarded wars 'for the defence of the fatherland', or 'defensive' wars as legitimate.

If China's thesis of the world role of the superpowers and their contention over Europe is accepted, it follows that Europe's armed resistance to attack from either would have the character of a defensive war and that, in so far as it is an instrument to be used in such an event, NATO must be seen as having defensive aspects. With growing European cohesion the trend is likely to be towards a force in which the American element is seen as a temporary necessity, eventually to be phased out. The present developments will make Europe less, not more, dependent economically and, it follows in the longer run, militarily on the USA. We have said that the USA might well find it expedient to bow to the inevitable and accept a Europe independent of either of the superpowers rather than see it come within the sphere of interest of the rival imperialism. The USA, for reasons already explained, is on the defensive, whereas Soviet social-imperialism, in terms of economic penetration, military build-up and political 'softening-up', is on the offensive and is therefore the greater danger. Whatever the rhetoric coming from Moscow, the Soviet leaders want to get the USA out of Europe in order to step into their shoes.

It is obvious that neither of the two superpowers dares express its true designs openly and frankly. Each has to dress up its policy to try to make it

acceptable at home and abroad. Each employs phraseology about freedom, peace and internationalism, while in practice undermining these very things. For historical reasons the Soviet Union has in this respect some advantages over its rival. The unmistakably imperialist features of American policy have been amply exposed in Korea, Latin America and Indochina. When America talks peace most people look for the napalm, the defoliants, the My Lais. When she mentions freedom their minds turn to CIA-paid gunmen operating in other countries against progressive movements.

The Soviet Union can trade on the image created in the past when she was pursuing an anti-imperialist policy and, at least in the short run, she can appeal to progressives and seekers after peace by directing attention to the imperialist character of her rival, masking an aggressive imperialist policy under the guise of socialism and using the prestige of Lenin to cloak actions which he would have been the first to repudiate.

In January 1975 *Pravda* reproduced a Joint Statement of West European Communist and Workers' Parties issued in Paris under the title, 'No, to Claims of American Imperialism to Hegemony'. The statement included the following, which would find widespread acceptance:

Western Europe must not become one of the 'provinces' of the American Empire.

We call upon the working people and nations to take resolutely into their own hands the matter of defending their independence, their freedom and security, and the cause of peace.

What was not, of course, mentioned was the equally important need to build up resistance to Europe becoming 'finlandised', a satellite of the Soviet Union, and to expose the even greater dangers to Europe's independence from that direction. History does not stand still. Through the clouds of propaganda reality begins to show as, following their imperialist policies, the two superpowers expose their true colours. In the Chinese view the situation in Europe is anything but one of peace and detente. As Vice-Premier Teng Hsiao-ping said at a banquet given in Peking for Chancellor Schmidt:

Thirty years have passed since the end of World War II, yet Europe is still in a state of aggravating armed confrontation . . . It is now evident that the superpower most zealously preaching detente and disarmament is precisely the one which is stepping up arms expansion and war preparations, maintaining an offensive posture far exceeding its defensive needs and posing a threat to the people of Europe and the whole world. With the superpowers contending so fiercely and expanding their armaments so frenziedly, they are bound to go to war against each other some day.

Chinese statements such as this, though addressed to European statesmen, also help to increase the awareness and the vigilance of the people in response to the dangers inherent in the European situation and to uncover the essential unreality of detente and disarmament.

The Soviet social-imperialists, in propagating illusions of detente, have the support in Europe of the Italian, French and other 'communist' parties which, at their meeting in June 1976, whatever their differences with the Soviet leaders on other issues, totally accepted the focus on detente and disarmament, as the document of the Conference makes clear. In putting this document into effect, the 'communist' parties of Europe, however proudly they may be detaching themselves from, and even repudiating, some aspects of Soviet policy are, in this most important respect, using the people's desire for peace to soften resistance to Soviet penetration into Europe.

The implications of the Chinese analysis of the European situation in the overall world context are not easy to face. There is, inevitably, a tendency to wishful thinking, to say 'it can't happen here'. In the statement quoted above Teng added:

It is fully understandable that the people in Europe who went through two world wars desire peace and security. Likewise, the Chinese people, who suffered untold hardships, wish to have a relatively favourable environment in which to carry on their country's socialist revolution and socialist construction. However, the trees may prefer calm but the winds will not subside.

(*Peking Review*, 7 November 1975)

The Chinese make it quite clear that, while being opposed to war, they prepare for it and so reduce its likelihood and, if it comes, the dangers and suffering. Such preparation involves questions going beyond the purely military aspects of defence. Based on their own experience in fighting for national liberation and independence, the Chinese would consider it vital that the people should first understand and appreciate the danger and then find ways of popular participation in and influence over their own defence. In a wider context, the Chinese would expect the forces of an independent Europe to find powerful allies in the Third World, where countries are, more and more, taking up positions of resistance to superpower bullying and interference in their internal affairs.

Chapter 14

The relation between China's world view and development within China

What we have written so far, presenting and explaining the Chinese world view, may seem naive to some readers. It has become an accepted idea in the West that all states alike seek to acquire power, wealth and territory at the expense of others, in so far as it is possible to do so and get away with it. Where, it may be asked, is the national self-interest of the Chinese in all this? China may still be a poor country but it can be more formidable militarily and politically than countries which are far more developed economically. Does it not try to subordinate the interests of other peoples to its own security, even if not to its economic development? Are its people and leaders not being made out to be unbelievably 'saintly' in renouncing the opportunities offered by China's vast population and its extensive natural resources?

It is a good thing to ask this kind of question. If nevertheless it turns out that on the whole the practice of Chinese foreign policy is in accordance with the ideals which are expressed, this would have tremendous implications for the people of all countries. Though China's world view as we have presented it may seem very 'ideological' and austere, it does at least challenge head on the accepted ideas of 'my country right or wrong', and so on. If it is true that China has committed no aggression at all against other states, does not have bases abroad or station its troops in other countries, or exploit other countries economically, is it really because she has never wanted to do these things? That question gives us an opportunity of moving on to some points of clarification.

To begin with we have dealt in rather broad terms with China's outlook and her dealings with groups of countries: the Third World, the superpowers, the Second World. But there are also day-to-day dealings with particular countries. There are over a hundred countries with which China has relations of one kind or another. As we have already mentioned, a multitude of state leaders, party leaders, delegations of people's organisations and other groups has been visiting China in recent years. On the occasions when foreign visitors are formally welcomed the speeches of the leaders who are assigned to speak for China are never confined to the courtesies of hospitality; they always have a political point, indicating precisely the relations between China and the other country concerned. For example, when in 1975 the Foreign Minister of Singapore, a state which was extremely hostile to China and the people's liberation struggles, paid an official visit, what the Chinese said publicly carried great significance; the importance given in Chinese statements to the people of Singapore, to the Chinese people's friendship for them, was different from what was said about China's relations with the government of Singapore.

Scores of speeches for such occasions are composed every year and great care goes into them. During the 1972 visit of Nixon for talks with the Chinese leaders, every public gesture and speech had the greatest significance. When Mr Heath was accorded the courtesies normally reserved for a head of state or government, it was done with a definite purpose. In addition to these clear manifestations of where China stands and what her strategy and tactics are, there are the less public day-to-day communications and actions of the Chinese Foreign Ministry and diplomatic missions abroad.

It would be surprising if on the many occasions when China's representatives have to make up their minds on a particular situation or crisis or controversy in relation to other countries, they have never acted on inadequate knowledge or analysis, or erred in the application of policy. If such errors do occur, their importance may loom large in that country or at that particular moment. Chou En-lai admitted to making such a miscalculation, which had serious consequences: in 1954 he played a leading part in getting his Vietnamese comrades to accept the Geneva Accords which set the terms for the withdrawal of the French forces. He overestimated the honesty of the Western powers. The Chinese have learnt from mistakes like this and have been prompt to make amends and to criticise themselves. But the occasions when less than ideal decisions have been made do not add up to a wrong policy. The important thing is to look at the numerous examples we have of normal Chinese foreign policy decisions and statements, and thus to grasp the general political lines.

Next, it should be remembered that what has been presented and explained in this publication is what Chou En-lai used to refer to as 'Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in foreign policy'. That is, the world view it expresses comes out of the thinking, viewpoint, politics and struggle of revolutionary Marxists in China who, following Mao, have used dialectical materialist analysis and the methods of Marx and Lenin in the changing conditions of the world during the last 25 years. This has permitted the friendship which the Chinese people feel for the people of other countries to find a creative and effective political expression in the actions of the Chinese government, with the result that most of China's working people understand and follow the leadership's consistent line and regard it as their own.

However, this line has not been the only line proposed. Even among the leaders of the CPC and in the government there have been people who have succeeded for longer or shorter periods in imposing other principles and policies. There is a 'struggle between the two lines', the bourgeois or imperialist line and the proletarian line, in foreign policy. Any departure from the general line of the Chinese revolution would be much more serious than the technical mistakes and errors of judgment we mentioned earlier. If the line that ran counter to Mao's had been firmly established — in the CPC Central Committee, in the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress and the Foreign Ministry — we should certainly have been presenting a different picture of China's world view. We should have had to describe a foreign policy which ran counter to the interests of the people of China and the people of other

countries. In practice, Mao Tse-tung's line *has* prevailed.

How China views the world as a whole and acts in it is determined by what kind of country and state China is, what 'colour' it is, which class is in power. The internal and the external are related. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie are *in every respect* different things. In the course of the polemic between the CPC and the CPSU, in the CPC's article of 14 July 1964, *On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism and its Historical Lessons for the World*, the Chinese explain some Marxist fundamentals:

Only by emancipating all mankind can the proletariat ultimately emancipate itself. The historical task of the dictatorship of the proletariat has two aspects, one internal and the other international. The internal task consists mainly of completely abolishing all the exploiting classes, developing socialist economy to the maximum, enhancing the communist consciousness of the masses, abolishing the differences between ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, between workers and peasants, between town and country and between mental and manual labourers, eliminating any possibility of the reemergence of classes and the restoration of capitalism and providing conditions for the realisation of a communist society with its principle, 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs'. The international task consists mainly of preventing attacks by international imperialism (including armed intervention and disintegration by peaceful means) and of giving support to the world revolution until the people of all countries finally abolish imperialism, capitalism and the system of exploitation. Before the fulfilment of both tasks and before the advent of a full communist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat is absolutely necessary.

In 1964 the danger of China becoming revisionist and therefore turning into a country like the USSR, was great enough to cause serious concern to Marxist-Leninists in the CPC. There were 'top party persons' who were 'taking the capitalist road', 'persons like Khrushchev'. With the Cultural Revolution, which began in 1966 and continued until 1977, the masses, particularly the working class, rose up under Mao's leadership and seized back the power in the Party, state, factories and other units which revisionists had to some extent usurped. The struggle between the two lines, which went on in the 1950s and 1960s, has not, however, come to an end. A bourgeoisie still exists in China, opposing the line of reliance on the working class as the main force in building a powerful socialist country. Representatives of the anti-working-class line have at times existed at very high levels in the CPC and government.

There have been a number of mass campaigns to expose them and to learn lessons from their conduct. In 1970 a campaign began to popularise the serious study of Marxist theory, and this precipitated a counter-attack by anti-Marxist elements of the Party headed by Lin Biao. After the failure of Lin's attempted coup, the movement was developed into one to 'criticise Lin Biao and rectify the style of work', and then into the movement to criticise Lin Biao and Confucius. In late 1974 Mao Tse-tung asked: 'Why did Lenin

speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? It is essential to get this question clear. Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation'. This obviously referred back to the internal and external tasks of proletarian rule mentioned in the quotation from *On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism*, and showed that the work of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution still needed to be carried through to the end.

It is not difficult to see how the struggle against revisionist ideas and influences affects both internal and external developments. If a bourgeois dictatorship is restored in China, the workers will lose the power they have; they will again be suppressed, coerced and exploited; they will be bullied and urged to respect the power and authority of the minority who lord it over them and rob them. It would not be the people but, to use the Chinese phrase, 'the mandate of Heaven' that would hold sway. A class which oppresses and exploits the vast majority of the working people within the country will, as its own power and means allow, bring people of other countries into subjection, and could thus make China into a superpower. Following the law by which it lives, such a ruling class might, on the other hand, capitulate to the bullying of other more powerful states. Even before they attempt to seize power by subterfuge and treachery, as Lin Piao tried to do, the reactionary elements against whom the working class is struggling have this philosophy of capitulation. They are frightened by the risks taken by a poor country like China in uncompromisingly opposing both superpowers, who have shown themselves to be vicious and cruel. They have no confidence in the people; in 'dig tunnels deep, store grain everywhere, and never seek hegemony'; in the armed workers' militias; in the support of the world's people in the event of imperialist aggression. They would be opposed to the principles embodied in

A weak nation can defeat a strong; a small nation can defeat a big. The people of a small country can certainly defeat aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, dare to take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country.

(Mao Tse-tung: *People of the World, Unite . . . op.cit.*)

The struggle against the bourgeoisie and against imperialism, against the slavish comprador philosophy and against capitulationism are also struggles against the wrong line in world affairs. All the struggles within the CPC and in China since Liberation have involved a struggle over whether or not to hold to the proletarian world view outlined in this book. If people like Kao Kang, Liu Shao-chi or Lin Piao had prevailed, China would not only have been in danger of changing course internally but of doing so externally too. It is partly because an outstanding leader of the revolutionary left, Chou En-lai, was so firmly in command of foreign policy matters that the occasions when a different line was followed were so few and so brief.

There is always a connection between a country's internal and external

policies. In the Soviet Union Khrushchev put forward his theory of peaceful transition, which was a form of capitulation to the exploiting classes internally, and at the same time put forward his distorted conception of peaceful coexistence externally, which is a form of capitulation to international imperialism headed by the USA. Subsequently, as the USSR grew stronger, imperialist contention against the USA became the main feature.

After Chairman Mao's death in September 1976, four leading members of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee, Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao, Chiang Ching and Yao Wen-yuan, the so-called 'gang of four', were removed from office, accused of forming a faction for the purpose of seizing power. In view of what we have said it should be no surprise that they were also accused of capitulationism. There is ample evidence to show that the four would have subverted the internal line of the Chinese revolution, so naturally external consequences would have followed. Internally, the line which they pushed, for purely opportunist motives, was one of 'all struggle, no alliance', and if this line had been projected into international affairs it could only have meant the abandonment of the anti-imperialist united front. Moreover, the evidence shows that the gang consistently attacked certain people who were closely identified with China's revolutionary line in international affairs, such as Chen Yi and particularly Premier Chou En-lai.

Chou made an outstanding contribution by guiding China's foreign policy. He was modest on China's behalf and good at learning from other revolutionaries; unshakeable in his opposition to imperialism and superpower hegemonism, and very good at uniting with all possible forces against these evils; flexible and undogmatic so that he could easily find the best ways to realise the objective of opposing imperialism in a concrete way, and could adjust to changes in the situation such as the emergence of social-imperialism. After Mao Tse-tung's death the Central Committee of the CPC emphasised that in applying Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought it would follow Chou En-lai's example. This is a good sign for the future of China's foreign policy.

Since the fall of the 'gang of four' and the appointment of Hua Kuo-feng as Chairman of the Central Committee, Chinese foreign policy has very consistently kept to the line which we have described here, Mao Tse-tung's revolutionary line. This shows that the world view of the proletariat continues to guide. People all over the world, whether they are communists or democrats opposed to fascism and imperialist aggression, have benefited from China's foreign policy in the past and have good reason to be happy about the most recent developments of China's domestic policies.

Appendix I

China's Eight Principles of Economic and Technical Aid to Other Countries as announced by Premier Chou En-lai at a speech in Mogadishu, 3rd February, 1964.

In providing economic aid to other countries, the Chinese Government has always strictly abided by the following eight principles:

- 1 The Chinese Government always bases itself on the principle of equality and mutual benefit in providing aid to other countries. It never regards such aid as a kind of unilateral alms but as something mutual and helpful to economic co-operation.
- 2 In providing aid to other countries, the Chinese Government strictly respects the sovereignty and independence of the recipient countries and never attaches any conditions or asks for any privileges.
- 3 China provides economic aid in the form of interest-free or low-interest loans and extends the time limit for the repayment when necessary so as to lighten, as far as possible, the burden of the recipient countries.
- 4 In providing aid to other countries, the purpose of the Chinese Government is not to make the recipient countries dependent on China but to help them embark step by step on the road of self-reliance and independent economic development.
- 5 The Chinese Government tries its best to help recipient countries build projects which require less investment while yielding quicker results so that the recipient countries may increase their income and accumulate capital.
- 6 The Chinese Government provides the best quality material and equipment of its own manufacture at international market prices. If the equipment and material provided by the Chinese Government are not up to the agreed specifications and quality, the Chinese Government undertakes to replace them.
- 7 In giving any particular technical assistance, the Chinese Government will see to it that the personnel of the recipient country fully master such technique.
- 8 The experts and technical personnel dispatched by China to help in construction in the recipient countries will have the same standard of living as the experts and technical personnel of the recipient country. The Chinese experts and technical personnel are not allowed to make any special demands or enjoy any special amenities.

Appendix II

Extract from Hua Kuo-feng's report on the Work of the Government delivered at the First Session of the Fifth National People's Congress on 26 February, 1978.

The international situation has been developing in a direction favourable to the people of the world in the last three years. The factors for revolution are growing all the time. Countries want independence, nations want liberation and the people want revolution. This tide of history rolls on and no force on earth can hold it back. All the basic contradictions in the world are sharpening daily and the rivalry between the two hegemonist powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, and their contradictions with the people of all lands have become particularly acute, constituting the central problem in international relations today. The people's struggle against them, and in particular against Soviet social-imperialism, is on a higher upsurge than ever, and the international anti-hegemonist united front with the third world as its main force is broadening. This is an outstanding feature of the fine international situation. More and more countries and people have come to see the aggressive features and paper-tiger essence of the superpowers clearly, waged tit-for-tat struggles against them and won victory after victory. The people of Kampuchea, Viet Nam and Laos defeated the US aggressors after long years of war and bloodshed. Egypt, the Sudan and Somalia categorically abrogated their treaties with the Soviet Union and expelled the Soviet specialists from their countries. Zaire heroically routed the mercenary troops engaged in the invasion masterminded by the Soviet Union. The people of Africa will no longer tolerate the superpowers' riding roughshod over them, and have angrily shouted such slogans as "Hands off African affairs!" and "Russia, get out of Africa!" Faced with the superpowers' threats, the second world countries of Western Europe and other regions are making greater efforts towards unity against hegemonism. The unswerving struggles waged by the people of the world have struck crushing blows to the superpowers which, beset with difficulties at home and abroad and threatened by growing crises, find the going tougher than ever. The course of world events has further borne out the correctness of Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds.

Unreconciled to their reverses, the two hegemonist powers are intensifying their contention for world domination and frantically pushing their policies of aggression and war. At the same time the factors for revolution are growing, so obviously are the factors for war. The danger of a world war is a growing menace to the people of the world. So long as social-imperialism and imperialism exist, war is inevitable. The contention between the two hegemonist powers reaches every corner of the globe, but the cockpit is Europe. They work

overtime to preach "detente" and "disarmament", with no other purpose than to fool people and hide their arms expansion and war preparations. A latecomer among imperialist powers, the Soviet Union relies mainly on its military power to carry out expansion; yet it goes about flaunting banners of "socialism" and "support for revolution" to dupe people and sell its wares. It is the most dangerous source of a new world war. Since things differ from one country to another, the people of each country must determine their own fighting tasks in the light of its specific conditions. But so far as the overall world situation is concerned, there is a strategic task common to the people the world over, and that is to consolidate and expand the international united front against hegemonism, oppose the policies of aggression and war pursued by the superpowers, and in particular by Soviet social-imperialism, and strive to put off the outbreak of a new world war. At present, some people in the West follow a policy of appeasement towards the Soviet Union with the fond hope of saving themselves at the expense of others. This can only whet the ambitions of the aggressors and hasten the outbreak of war. Our attitude towards a new world war is: "First, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it". We believe that the outbreak of war can be put off, but then the people of all countries must close ranks, sharpen their vigilance, prepare against all eventualities, oppose appeasement, resolutely struggle against the war machinations of the superpowers and foil their strategic dispositions. In this way, even if the superpowers gamble with war, the people of the world will not be caught in a vulnerable state of unpreparedness. We are revolutionary optimists. The future of the world is bright, though the struggle of the people of the world may be arduous and protracted and the road tortuous. Victory is sure to go to the people of the whole world.

The Chinese Government and people uphold proletarian internationalism and are determined to carry out Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in foreign affairs. Following Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds, we should strengthen our unity with the proletariat, oppressed people and oppressed nations of the world, with the socialist countries and with the third world countries, unite with all countries subjected to aggression, subversion, interference, control and bullying by the superpowers and form the broadest united front against superpower hegemonism. We are ready to establish and develop relations with all countries on the basis of the Five Principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. We support all the oppressed people and nations in their revolutionary struggles.

We have always maintained that all countries, whether big or small, are equal and that the big should not bully the small, the strong not domineer over the weak, the rich not oppress the poor. We oppose the superpowers' interference in the internal affairs of other countries and their attempts to monopolize international affairs. No country should seek hegemony in any region or impose its will on others. Whether a country treats others on an equal footing or seeks hegemony is a major criterion by which to tell whether or not it follows the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and whether it is a genuine or sham socialist country. A socialist country should set an example in treating others as equals. We firmly stand on the side of the people of the world and will never seek hegemony or strive to be a superpower, neither

today nor in the future when we have become a modern, powerful socialist country. We shall always follow Chairman Mao's teaching that we should get rid of great-nation chauvinism resolutely, thoroughly, wholly and completely.

The people of the world support each other in their just struggles. We are only fulfilling our bounden internationalist duty when we render assistance to other countries. We will continue to apply the Eight Principles on providing aid to other countries as proclaimed by Premier Chou En-lai in 1964. We strictly respect the sovereignty of recipient countries and never attach any political strings, ask for any privileges or interfere in the internal affairs of these countries. In rendering assistance, we aim at helping the recipient countries to be self-reliant and not at making them dependent on the aid-giving country. As a developing country, China can provide only a limited amount of aid. Nevertheless, we will try our best to do this job well . . .

China is a socialist country. It belongs to the third world and has experience and tasks in common with the other third world countries. We resolutely support the developing countries and people of Asia, Africa, Latin America, Oceania and other regions in their struggles against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism and in their struggles to win and preserve national independence, defend state sovereignty, develop the national economy, protect national resources and establish a new international economic order. We highly appraise the non-aligned movement, which plays a positive role in the struggles against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism, and give it firm support.

We have consistently worked for greater unity with the other socialist countries and the development of relations of friendship, mutual assistance and co-operation with them on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. We steadfastly support them in their efforts to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete conditions in their own countries and to carry on their revolution and construction independently, and we steadfastly support them in their struggle to oppose foreign aggression and subversion and to safeguard their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. We hold that the socialist countries should likewise adhere strictly to the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence in their relations with one another. Should differences arise, they should seek a solution through friendly consultation. We pledge our firm support to the Korean people's just struggle for the independent and peaceful reunification of their fatherland.

The Chinese people maintain traditional ties of friendship with the people of Southeast Asian countries. In the last few years China has established diplomatic relations with Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand, and there has been a new growth in friendly contacts and economic and cultural interchange. It is our desire to restore or establish diplomatic relations with all the other countries in this region. We support the countries of Southeast Asia in their efforts to strengthen regional economic co-operation and bring about the neutralization of Southeast Asia.

The good neighbourly relations we have with Burma, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iran are steadily getting better and better. We support the proposals put forward by the countries concerned to make the Indian Ocean a peace zone, South Asia a nuclear-free zone and Nepal a zone of peace. The Chinese people have always cherished feelings of

friendship for the Indian people. The people of both countries wish to see an increase in friendly contacts and an improvement in their relations. There are questions pending between China and India; nevertheless, relations can be further improved provided serious efforts are made on both sides.

The Middle East question has long remained unsettled and the trouble is due to superpower support for Israeli aggression and superpower contention for hegemony in the region. The situation in the Middle East is still in a state of flux. We stand four-square behind the people of the Arab countries and the Palestinian people in their just struggle to recover lost territories and regain national rights. We are against Israeli aggression and against the contention between the Soviet Union and the United States in this part of the world. The Middle East question cannot be solved unless Israel withdraws from the occupied Arab territories and the national rights of the Palestinian people are restored. We are convinced that ultimate victory will go to the people of the Arab countries and the Palestinian people provided they set store by the general interests of their fight against the common enemy, uphold unity and persevere in struggle. China maintains good relations with most of the Arab countries and hopes to establish and develop relations with the remaining ones.

In recent years, there has been great progress in the friendly and co-operative relations between China and the African countries. The people of Africa are waging a hard struggle to win the complete emancipation of the continent. We firmly support the people of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Azania in their just struggle against colonialism and racism and for national independence and liberation. In accordance with their strategic need to compete for global hegemony, the superpowers are stepping up their contention in Africa. We resolutely support the African countries in their struggle against aggression, subversion and intervention by the superpowers, and by Soviet social-imperialism in particular. Africa belongs to the people of Africa. The African people can settle their own problems by themselves so long as they strengthen unity and exclude outside interference.

In recent years there has been a gradual extension of the relations between China and Latin American countries. We are ready to establish and develop relations with more Latin American countries and enhance mutual understanding and friendship. We support the Latin American countries in their struggle to safeguard their independence and sovereignty, to defend their maritime rights, to promote regional economic co-operation and to establish a Latin American nuclear-free zone. We also support the people of Panama in their unrelenting struggle to recover the Panama Canal.

There have been satisfactory developments in the relations between China and the second world countries, with a steady increase in friendly contacts and economic and cultural interchange. We are ready to develop our relations with them in diverse fields. We support them in their struggle against threats, interference, subversion and control by the superpowers, and particularly by Soviet social-imperialism. We support the West European countries in their efforts to unite against hegemonism, and we hope to see a united and powerful Europe. We also hope to see closer contacts between the second and third world countries on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.

China and Japan are close neighbours separated only by a strip of water, and the friendship between their two peoples goes back to ancient times.

Since the normalization of relations, contacts and exchanges have been growing in many fields and a long-term trade agreement was recently signed. It is in the fundamental interests of the people of China and Japan to conclude at an early date a treaty of peace and friendship based on the joint statement of the two governments. We firmly support the Japanese people in their just struggle to recover their four northern islands. The people of China and Japan should live in friendship for countless generations.

China and the United States differ in social system and ideology, and there are fundamental differences between them. Yet the two countries have quite a few points in common on some issues in the present international situation. The Sino-US Shanghai Communiqué issued in 1972 has brought a new turn in the relations between the two countries. These relations will continue to improve provided the principles laid down in the Communiqué are seriously carried out. At present, the attitude of the US Government towards the question of Taiwan is the obstacle to the normalization of Sino-US relations. The Chinese people are determined to liberate Taiwan. When and how is entirely China's internal affair, an internal affair which brooks no foreign interference whatsoever. If the relations between the two countries are to be normalized, the United States must sever its so-called diplomatic relations with the Chiang clique, withdraw all its armed forces and military installations from Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits area and abrogate its so-called "mutual defence treaty" with the Chiang clique. This is the unswerving stand of the Chinese Government. The people of China and the United States have always been friendly to each other. We are willing to increase contacts between the people of our two countries and promote mutual understanding and friendship.

China and the Soviet Union were once friendly neighbours. The people of the two countries forged a profound friendship in their long revolutionary struggles. The Sino-Soviet debates on matters of principle were provoked by the Soviet leading clique through its betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. The fact that the relations between the two countries have sunk to such a low point today must be traced to the social-imperialist policy pursued by this clique. The debates on matters of principle must go on. At the same time, we have always held that such debates should not impede the maintenance of normal state relations on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. The Soviet leading clique has expressed its desire to improve Sino-Soviet state relations in words, but in actuality it stubbornly clings to its policy of hostility towards China. It has gone to the length of arrogantly demanding that we change Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. This is nothing but a pipe dream. If the Soviet leading clique really desires to improve the state relations between the two countries, it should prove its sincerity by deeds. First of all, in accordance with the understanding reached between the Premiers of the two countries in 1969, it should sign an agreement on maintaining the status quo on the borders, averting armed clashes and disengaging the armed forces of both sides in the disputed border areas, and then enter into negotiations on resolving the boundary question. It should also withdraw its armed forces from the People's Republic of Mongolia and the Sino-Soviet borders, so that the situation there will revert to what it was in the early 1960s. How Sino-Soviet relations will develop is entirely up to the Soviet side.

Chairman Mao taught us: "Dig tunnels deep, store grain everywhere, and never seek hegemony", and "Be prepared against war, be prepared against

natural disasters, and do everything for the people". We must maintain a high level of vigilance and be prepared against a war of aggression launched by the superpowers. We will not attack unless we are attacked; if we are attacked, we will certainly counterattack. The heroic People's Liberation Army and the millions of militia, together with the people of the whole country, must go all out to strengthen preparedness against war and be ready at all times to wipe out any enemy that dares to invade us.

Fellow Deputies!

Reviewing the past and looking forward into the future, we are fortified by our boundless confidence that we will win new and still greater victories in our socialist revolution and socialist construction.

The socialist modernization of our agriculture, industry, national defence and science and technology is a great and unprecedented undertaking and a profound revolution, too. There will be momentous change in town and country, in the productive forces and the relations of production, in the economic base and the superstructure, and in the political, economic, military, cultural and other spheres. In this great struggle, many new situations and new things will emerge and challenge our understanding, and many new contradictions and new problems will arise and challenge us to resolve them. Our thinking and our style and methods of work must be improved and raised to a new level. We must study hard and well, try to grasp new things as they come along, and tackle new problems as they crop up. In this way we shall be able to adapt ourselves to the new situation and tasks.

Our tasks are glorious as well as arduous. Our future is bright. We must free ourselves from superstitions, emancipate our minds, be dauntless and revolutionary in the task of "transforming China in the spirit of the Foolish Old Man who removed the mountains", be firm and unyielding, and work hard to reach our great goal through indomitable struggle.

The great banner of Chairman Mao is the invincible banner of unity in struggle and of continued revolution for the people of all nationalities in our country. For over half a century, this glorious banner has guided us out of darkness to a world of light, taken us past innumerable hidden reefs and enabled us to overcome countless difficulties and win triumph after triumph. On our road of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the banner of Chairman Mao will guide us in continuing to vanquish all internal and external class enemies, surmount all kinds of difficulties and hardships, achieve miracles and make a greater contribution to humanity.

Chairman Mao's behest that we should make China a modern, powerful socialist country must be fulfilled. It can certainly be fulfilled. This is the inexorable trend of history and no reactionary forces can hold it back.

Bibliographical Note

This bibliography aims to include some of the material which is most readily available regarding the Chinese view of the world situation.

The Chinese publish and study works of Marxist-Leninist theory as a guide in analysing and acting in the context of contemporary international affairs. The following four booklets, all published in English by Foreign Languages Press Peking, are particularly important:

V.I. Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism
Lenin's Predictions in the Revolutionary Storms in the East
Lenin on War and Peace (Three Articles)
Lenin on the National and Colonial Questions (Three Articles).

Mao Tse-tung's *Selected Works* in five volumes are also important. Many of his works (for instance his analysis of classes in *Volume I* or his works about the united front) seem to be about internal affairs, but are actually of value in understanding international questions, because they show the method of analysis which the Chinese employ. Here, however, we have just selected a few titles which directly concern international questions. Many are also available as separate pamphlets:

- Volume I:* 'On tactics against Japanese Imperialism', section 4.
 'Problems of strategy in China's revolutionary war', Ch.I.
 'On contradiction', Ch.I.
- Volume II:* 'On protracted war', sections entitled "Refutation of theory of national subjugation" and "Fighting for perpetual peace".
 'Role of the CCP in the National War', section entitled "patriotism and internationalism".
 'The identity of interests between the Soviet Union and all mankind'.
 'The Chinese revolution and the CCP', Ch.I, section 3.
 'On new democracy', Ch.IV.
- Volume III:* 'On coalition government', Ch.II.
- Volume IV:* 'Some points in appraisal of the current international situation'.
 'Talk with the American correspondent A.L. Strong'.
 'The present situation and our tasks', Ch.VIII.
 'Revolutionary forces of the world unite, fight against imperialist aggression!'
 'Report to the 2nd session of the 7th Central Committee', Chs.VIII, X.
 'On the people's democratic dictatorship'.
 'Cast away illusions, prepare for struggle'.

Volume V: 'The bankruptcy of the idealist conception of history'.
 'The Chinese people's volunteers should cherish every hill . . .'
 'Our great victory in the war to resist US aggression'.
 'The Chinese people cannot be cowed by the atom bomb'.
 'On the Ten Major Relationships', sections III, X.
 'US imperialism is a paper tiger'.
 'Talks at a conference of secretaries . . .', talk 2.
 'All reactionaries are paper tigers'.

Some other important pamphlets containing Mao's writings include:

Comrade Mao Tse-tung on "Imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers" (1st pub. 1958, 3rd ed 1966)
Chairman Mao Tse-tung's important talks with guests from Asia, Africa and Latin America (1st pub. 1960, 4th ed 1966)
Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, sections 5, 6 and 18.

The most systematic exposure of China's world view was made in the course of the polemic against the Soviet leadership, though this was during the period when the Chinese saw United States imperialism as the main enemy and before Soviet social-imperialism had come to constitute the main source of war.

During the first period of the polemic (Dec. 1962-March 1963) the Chinese did not criticise the Soviet leadership by name. The most important document of this period was the 200-page booklet, *More on the Differences between Comrade Togliatti and Ourselves*; the Chinese also criticised several other communist parties which put forward a revisionist point of view. The articles of this period, all published as pamphlets, are collected in a book entitled *Whence the Differences?* published in Britain by New Era (no date).

In June 1963 the Chinese published *A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement* (the most important single document of the polemic), followed by a set of eight Comments on the CPSU's Open Letter replying to the Chinese proposal. These and some other texts are included in *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement* first published by Foreign Languages Press Peking in 1965 and reprinted by Red Star Press, London, 1976. The 4th, 5th and 6th Comments are the most important for our purposes.

Major programmatic statements have from time to time been made at Party Congresses etc. The *Report to the Ninth Party Congress* (1969)* contains a statement of the CPC's view after the USSR came to be viewed as an imperialist power, and includes references to Mao Tse-tung's thinking on international questions as it developed in the period subsequent to the polemic. The text is published in *Important Documents of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China* (Peking, 1970).

The booklet *Tenth Party Congress of the CPC* (Documents) published

in 1973 contains the text of Chou En-lai's Report which is an extremely important statement of China's world view. This was followed in 1975 by another report by Chou En-lai to the Fourth National People's Congress, included in the booklet of conference documents.

The Eleventh National Congress of the CPC (Documents) published in 1977 includes the Political Report delivered by Hua Kuo-feng, which deals with international questions particularly in the section entitled "The Situation and our Tasks".

Three specially important statements of China's analysis of world politics have been published since the polemic. These are:

Leninism or Social-Imperialism? (Peking, FLP, 1970)
Teng Hsiao-ping's speech at the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly (Peking, FLP, 1974)
Chairman Mao's Theory of the Three Worlds is a Great Contribution to Marxism-Leninism (Peking, FLP, 1978)

Since China's recovery of her seat in the United Nations there have been annual statements in the form of speeches by the main Chinese representative. (He was Ch'iao Kuan-hua up to 1976, and Huang Hua during 1977 and 1978). These have all been published in pamphlet form, and the latest one can be considered as the most topical and current statement of Chinese policy.

It is also important to study statements made at receptions for visiting foreign statesmen in China, occasional official statements from government spokesmen and Hsinhua News Agency etc. These can be found in the weekly paper *Peking Review*. A subscription to *Peking Review* is the best way of keeping in touch with the developments in China's world view.

* This report was delivered by Lin Piao who was later criticised as an enemy of the Chinese revolution. However the contents of the Report (which was in fact collectively written) were subsequently reaffirmed.