

# Normalization: China Joins U.S. War Bloc

Capitulation Goes Better with Coke

The normalization of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and China on January 1 put the official seal on the capitulation of China's revisionist rulers to U.S. imperialism. It marked the formal hitching of China to the U.S. war chariot.

The bending and scraping before the U.S. imperialists by China's New Mandarins was strikingly revealed in the terms of the agreement over Taiwan. These terms represent a major concession to the U.S. when compared to the terms China had insisted on for many years. This is obviously true in spite of the fact that most of the formal language of China's position in the Joint Communiqué issued by the U.S. and China at the end of Nixon's visit in 1972 was kept in the normalization agreement—U.S. recognition that Taiwan is a province of China, that the Taiwan question is "entirely China's internal affair," and U.S. agreement to sever diplomatic and military ties (after one year!) with the Chiang regime.

China had in the past demanded that the U.S. cancel all of the 59 treaties which it has with Taiwan. But now this position has been "moderated," allowing Carter to make it very clear in his announcement that "special attention had been paid" to insuring that normalization "will not jeopardize the people of Taiwan" and that the U.S. will continue to "maintain current commercial, cultural and other relations with Taiwan through non-governmental means."

In particular, Carter asserted that the U.S. would continue selling arms to Taiwan. And while Hua Kuo-feng stated that China "absolutely could not agree with this," the Chinese also made it plain that they will in fact tolerate such sales. Indeed, part of the deal was that China promised to demonstrate its "peaceful intentions" toward Taiwan—which it soon did, halting the bombardment of Taiwan-held offshore islands, and assuring a U.S. congressional delegation that China intends to reunify peaceably. In fact "reunification" has now replaced the words "liberate Taiwan" in official Chinese documents. Teng Hsiao-ping then announced that as far as the new Chinese leadership was concerned, Taiwan would retain its own capitalist economic and social system after reunification with the mainland—including its own armed forces!

There is nothing wrong with a socialist state establishing diplomatic and economic relations with capitalist or imperialist countries. The question is, on what basis are such relations to be established? Mao himself said that "As for the imperialist countries, we should unite with their people and strive to coexist peacefully with these countries, do business with them and prevent any possible

war, but under no circumstances should we harbor any unrealistic notions about them." (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People.*) And as Lenin pointed out, "World hegemony is the content of imperialist policy."

In the early '70s Mao and other revolutionaries in China obviously made an assessment of the overall international situation and in particular the growing Soviet threat to China's security. Based on these assessments, they agreed to certain initiatives toward developing ties with the U.S. and other Western imperialist countries as a counterweight to the Soviets. At the same time, these analyses and decisions intensified the sharp struggle within the Chinese Communist Party leadership, since there were those who wanted to take advantage of this "opening to the West" to drive through a truck of capitulation to the U.S. imperialists.

If diplomatic ties had been established in Mao's time it would have meant continued struggle against all imperialism and it would have been something that should have been supported by the international proletariat. But there is no way that the normalization engineered by Carter and the Hua-Teng clique can be seen as a continuation or a culmination of the policies initiated under Mao's leadership. The conditions and terms of normalization now reflect the fact that counter-revolutionaries hell-bent on capitalist restoration won out in the class struggle in China and have seized power. These are the same people who have argued all along that China's only military security and only possible source of economic development lay in aid from one or another "great power."

Under these new conditions, the establishment of diplomatic ties can only be for the mutual benefit of the U.S. imperialists and the traitors now ruling China. And despite all their great-nation ambitions and posturing swagger, the relation between the U.S. imperialists and the new Chinese bourgeoisie will by no means be one of equality, but of dependency and subservience, the relationship between an imperialist master and a comprador bourgeoisie.

## Comprador Bourgeoisie

An article in *Peking Review* in 1976, written when the "Gang of Four" was still in leadership and battling against Teng and his scheme to prostitute China to the highest bidder, hit the nail on the head:

Chairman Mao has pointed out that under China's historical conditions, those who stubbornly choose to take the capitalist road are in fact 'ready to capitulate to imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-

capitalism.' This was the case with Teng Hsiao-ping. In his eyes, the Chinese people were no good at carrying out economic construction or bringing about the modernizations of agriculture, industry, national defense and science and technology, nor, for that matter, was the socialist system of any help. The only feasible way to 'speed up the technical transformation of industry and raise labor productivity' is to 'import foreign techniques and equipment.'

Teng himself, after he and his renegades took over, put it in his own manner, characteristically contemptuous of the masses: "If you have an ugly face," he said, speaking of China, "there is no use pretending you are handsome. You cannot hide it so you might just as well admit it."

This capitulationist line also has strong implications for military affairs. It holds that the only possible defense against Soviet attack, and the only way to "buy time" for modernization, is the "defense" offered by enlistment in the Western war bloc and by getting modern weaponry from the imperialists. Relying on the Chinese masses and people's war be damned! This same logic, of course, could also lead to capitulating to the Soviets.

What were the historical conditions of China which, Mao pointed out, promoted capitulation? The fact that China still carried the scars of colonial and imperialist ravaging of the country: underdevelopment and backwardness. The peasantry composed 80% of the population, and industrial development was at a very low level relative to the imperialist nations. In these circumstances, the choice was not between staying socialist or becoming an imperialist superpower. The question was whether China would keep to the socialist road, and on that basis transform its society, or whether it would once again become a dependent country, under the sway of imperialism. *This* is what it meant for China to be dragged down the capitalist road.

Self-reliance was not just some sort of "pull yourself up by your bootstraps" nostrum or idealistic moralism devised by Mao. Nor was it an isolationist xenophobia, as the Western bourgeois commentators are so fond of saying. It reflected the concrete realities of China's conditions and the goals of the revolution.

Self-reliance was *essential* to China's socialist construction as well as her defense. The question was never *whether* to develop the economy, as Teng & Co. pretend, but whether to develop it on the basis of socialist or capitalist relations of production. Technology and production processes are not



neutral, and to think that they can simply be imported and will automatically serve socialism is fundamentally incorrect and revisionist. In an article in 1976, the revolutionaries in China pointed out, "Foreign technology must be divided into two. Technical designs of capitalist countries serve the pursuit of the highest profit by the monopoly bourgeoisie and bear a clear-cut class coat of arms. How can we use them without distinguishing the 'white cat and black cat'?"

The doctrine of the neutrality of techniques and production processes, which is explicitly affirmed by the new rulers of China, reaches its logical conclusion in their holding up of the "science of management" (that is, the management of workers) as one of these "neutral" bodies of knowledge that they are going to import from the capitalists and put to use!

### Leads to Dependency

Furthermore—and the "Gang of Four" struggled to expose this—the massive imports of foreign technology upon which China is now basing its modernization do not come free, either economically or, in the final analysis, politically. "Modernizing" in this way can only place China in a position of dependency.

The two-line struggle on modernization and self-reliance in the Chinese Communist Party goes back many years. One part of this struggle has been over where "modernization" fits in as a task. The so-called "four modernizations" have now, according to Hua and Teng, become the highest goal and the "historic mission" of the Chinese people—thus replacing communism. This in itself is a revisionist line.

It was in opposition to this that Mao emphatically pointed out, "Class struggle is the key link." This did not mean Mao lost sight of the fact that the ultimate goal of communist revolution is to liberate the productive forces, but that he recognized that it was the line of the bourgeoisie to constantly place immediate results in production above the class struggle. Such a line is, in fact, a weapon in the arsenal of the bourgeoisie in waging class struggle against the proletariat. Only by waging struggle against the bourgeoisie is it possible to continue on the socialist road and, ultimately, to really unleash production.

In the 1950s Liu Shao-chi, Teng, Peng Teh-huai and other bourgeois democrats and capitalist roaders in the Party argued that "mechanization must precede collectivization." China, they said, could only move forward if agriculture were developed, but agriculture could only be developed through massive mechanization, and the prerequisite for this was the development of China's heavy industry. This, they argued, had to be imported, either from the Soviet Union or the Western imperialists.

Mao trashed this as revisionist rot. China should learn from both the positive and negative aspects of the industrialized capitalist countries. But fundamentally, China could only be developed by politically mobilizing and relying on the masses. "Only socialism,"



he said, "can save China." Mao's line took expression in the Great Leap Forward, a massive campaign to mobilize the Chinese people in their millions to shatter convention, take matters into their own hands, develop the socialist economy, and wage political and ideological struggle against those who said China had to prostrate itself before foreign imperialists.

It was in this political context that Mao put forward that agriculture was the foundation of China's economic development and industry was the key link. Heavy industry was to be the priority, he had said, but this depended on the development of agriculture and light industry.

Similarly, Mao and the revolutionaries in the Party fought for self-reliance in national defense, in opposition to Liu Shao-chi and Peng Teh-huai, who pushed for dependence on the Soviet military, or those like Chou En-lai who leaned more towards reliance on Western imperialism.

It is interesting to note that Peng Teh-huai, a bitter opponent of the Great Leap Forward who was exposed and knocked from his post as Minister of Defense in 1959 for, among other things, arguing for capitulation to the Soviet revisionists, has now been posthumously rehabilitated to a position of "honor" by that traitors' conclave of the Chinese Central Committee—at a time when Teng & Co. are making opposition to Soviet social imperialism the cornerstone of their capitulation to U.S. imperialism.

Unquestionably this rehabilitation represents, at least in part, the fact that the essence of the matter for the Chinese revisionists is not which imperialist power they bow before, but that the only road to "development" and "defense" is a line that leads to capitulation to one or another imperialist power. (It probably also represents a certain hedging of their bets among the "pragmatists" running China, and an indication that they could and may well, given the right conditions, switch alliances to the social imperialists in the Soviet Union.)

### Distortion and Stagnation

Once their counter-revolutionary coup placed them in the saddle in October of 1976, these capitalist roaders wasted no time in reversing the revolutionary policy of self-reliance and began pinning China to the U.S

imperialists. Despite all their great and pompous claims and promises that China will, as a result of their policies, become an advanced industrialized country by the year 2000, the course they have charted can only lead to economic distortion and stagnation, and political as well as economic dependence.

The so-called "four modernizations" will require a tremendous expenditure for foreign technology and equipment. Where is the capital for such expenditures going to come from? Foreign banks, credits from suppliers, and, they hope, from China's new "magic weapon": export of domestically produced oil (and possibly from a few other potential "big exports" like cotton textiles).

It does not take a crystal ball to see where the massive borrowing China's New Mandarins are planning will leave the country. It will leave it in hock for generations to come to foreign capitalists. The fruits of the productive labor of China's people, like the sugar of Cuba and Egypt's cotton, will be mortgaged to creditors. Economic priorities will be determined not by the needs of the masses, but by the demands of capital accumulation to pay off interest and principal on foreign loans and credits.

Similarly, the foreign exchange China hopes to gain from its oil production means that increasing resources and transport will have to be allocated to the development of oil production—at the expense of the needs of the people and the development of other sectors of the economy, specifically agriculture and light industry. The RCP gave an example of this in its polemics on China last year. "One account that appeared in the *Economic and Political Weekly* told of how in 1976 transport systems were being used to move oil for export at the expense of the movement of grains and foodstuffs to the cities and machinery and fertilizers to the countryside. The Four called for a reduction in oil export and are now hounded for their interference." (*Revolution and Counter-revolution*, pp. 309-10.) Hua and Teng's buddy, the Shah of Iran, also had grand schemes for "modernizing and mechanizing agriculture" by relying on oil exports to import industry. These revisionists will bring similar misery and chaos to the agricultural areas.

The crash program to develop oil production itself means massive borrowing to build the necessary drilling and refining capabilities, and the reallocation of scarce resources. And it means that less profitable enterprises or undertakings that require investment from the state but do not make an immediate return will tend to get short shrift or be eliminated altogether. For example, it is reported that in the far west region of Sinkiang, enormous efforts were made in the past to reclaim the Gobi Desert, to import settlers and establish industry. This has required significant subsidies, quite in line with the policy of socialist China to put resources to the development of some of the more underdeveloped regions of the country, including in regions of China's national minorities. But Hua, stopping off in Sinkiang after scraping before Yugoslavia's Tito, announced that the subsidies to the local state farms should be phased out. He also call-

Continued on page 26



# Normalization

(Continued from page 6)

ed on the local people to learn from Yugoslavia's agriculture.

Another potential source of foreign exchange that is being highly touted these days is cotton textiles. Again, there are already indications that decisions on the allocation of acreage for growing certain crops are being made not on the basis of the overall needs of the economy and the people, but to grow cotton for textile export.

## Exploitation

In addition to the effects of such distortions of the economy on the masses, there is also the direct exploitation they will suffer at the hands of their own bourgeoisie and the foreign capitalists who are being invited to set up shop in China. At this point this includes various types of "joint ventures" although direct investment by foreign capitalists cannot be ruled out. Recently a group of Hong Kong capitalists contracted with China for the construction materials and raw materials for a number of factories, and whatever machinery and technical know-how is necessary. Although the government will supply and pay the workers, the Hong Kong entrepreneurs can specify the number, age, sex and skills of the workers as well as choose the location of the plants.

And what is the effect of the import of large amounts of sophisticated foreign technology? Good-bye not only to the principle of self-reliance but also the development of the economy on the basis of independence. Such technology can only increase dependency on the supplying countries for parts and repairs.

Furthermore, such sophisticated technology is not being developed out of the base of the Chinese economy, but is being imposed on it. This technology cannot be introduced widely throughout the country and it will, of necessity, require reliance on experts and specially trained technicians for operation. This will accelerate the creation of a new privileged class, the social base for the top revisionists, and rob the masses of initiative in developing the economy, just as the new regime seeks to rob them of any political initiative.

Finally, in addition to economic distortion and dependency, the comprador bourgeoisie in China will inevitably drive the economy into stagnation. Not surprisingly, with all the talk of "modernization" and the touting of the great potentials of mortgaging China's resources and future to the imperialists, there is no talk of the fact that these schemes are dragging China into the shaky network of international credit and the fluctuations of the increasingly crisis-ridden international capitalist economy. What will happen when there is a relative glut in oil on the international market because of a contraction of the economies of the industrialized capitalist states, or for other reasons?

This "modernization" of China's revisionist rulers is a charade. China's economy was developing just fine before they began their wrecking. But it wasn't fine for them. Like any comprador bourgeoisie their dreams were not of the overall development of the country and the revolutionary struggle to liberate mankind—they were for feathering their own nests, feeling big and powerful by lording it over the masses while sniveling and scraping at the feet of foreign imperialists.

## Strategic Interests of Imperialism

The economic dependency on imperialism that Teng & Co. are engineering is only part of the overall political and military capitulation. And it would be wrong to think that the U.S. imperialists are licking their chops with such anticipation merely or mainly because of an economic bonanza they expect to score from entry into China. For the overriding value they expect to reap is from China's political capitulation to and enlistment in the U.S. war bloc.

In many ways China's deal with Coke to set up distribution and bottling in China has to be seen as more of a political statement than an economic move—unless you want to believe, with the CPML (see *The Call*, Jan. 8, 1979), that the backward nature of the Chinese soda pop industry posed a big problem for China that can be resolved by the unquestioned superiority of Coca Cola. Coke comes right behind the American flag and the dollar bill as a symbol of U.S. imperialist domination throughout the world. The Teng-Hua capitulationists could hardly find a more telling gesture of where they stand.

The substance of Chinese capitulation to the U.S. imperialists, however, is much more despicable and disgusting than flashing Coca Cola signs in Peking. China has, for all intents and purposes, become the newest member of NATO. China's "military experts" are perusing the catalogues of Western arms manufacturers with undisguised delight, laying plans to outfit China's army with millions of dollars worth of imported military equipment—everything from fighter planes to military uniforms.

For a quarter century the U.S. imperialists have dug their claws ever deeper into the flesh of the Iranian people, supplying their puppet the Shah with all his weapons of oppression and terror. As the anger of the Iranian people exploded into a fury of resistance and revolutionary struggle, ripping the Shah and his U.S.-built regime to shreds, Hua Kuo-feng tripped to Tehran to toast his great accomplishments. And as the U.S. imperialists gear up for armed intervention if necessary to salvage their stake in Iran, *Peking Review* reported on December 22 that "it is of strategic significance for the United States and the West as a whole to maintain friendly relations with a strong and independent (!) Iran, a major oil producer in the Persian Gulf area." The U.S. State Department couldn't have put it better.

By "independent" the Chinese revisionists mean independent from the Soviet Union. Opposition to the social-imperialists is the basis on which these traitors try to justify their capitulation to U.S. imperialism and

slandrously claim that they are following Mao's policies. But Mao never argued that China should—or could—fight the Soviets, or the U.S. imperialists, on their own terms. In fact, on the question of relying on advanced military technology imported from the imperialists, Mao made just the opposite point: "We will adopt advanced technology, but this cannot gainsay the necessity and the inevitability of backward technology for a period of time. Since history began, revolutionary wars have always been won by those whose weapons were deficient, lost by those with the advantage in weapons. . . . If one cannot fight unless one has the most modern weapons, that is the same as disarming oneself." (*A Critique of Soviet Economics*)

While Mao advocated diplomatic relations with the West and using these against the Soviets, he never meant this should be done at the price of selling out and surrendering to U.S. imperialism. Yet supporting the interests of U.S. imperialism and bucking up the so-called "appeasers" in the U.S. ruling class is now defined by these renegades as "proletarian internationalism."

## War—Not "Peace and Stability"

After all, as the CPML parrots the Chinese revisionists' line, "it represents a roadblock to the steamrolling military machine of the Soviet Union, which is the most aggressive superpower and the main source of a new world war. . . . All this in turn means a delay in the war preparations of the superpowers and more time for the people of the world to get prepared." Prepared for what? More treachery? More capitulation to U.S. imperialism? More time for the Chinese and their supporters in the industrialized countries of the West to try to convince the proletariat that they should unite with their own bourgeoisie to oppose the "main danger" coming from the Soviet imperialists?

To claim, as the Chinese revisionists do, that their capitulation to U.S. imperialism will advance "peace and stability" in the world is the rankest kind of chicanery.

The laws of capitalism and imperialist contention between the U.S. and the USSR are leading straight in the direction of an inter-imperialist war. As part of this movement, the two superpowers are tightening up the groups of countries linked with them into full-fledged war blocs. The U.S. imperialists are only too happy to add China to their rolls. And whether the New Mandarins stay tied to the U.S. bloc or see a better deal for themselves by trying to flip over and sell out to Soviet social imperialism, their capitulationism—the inevitable result of their revisionist line and headlong rush to restore capitalism—only shows that China has become a reactionary force in the world and that its rulers can only pursue reactionary interests in the preparation for and carrying out of a world war. ■