

Chinese Meet Nixon - Why?

The U.S. imperialists' head of state, President Nixon, has made his dramatic voyage to the People's Republic of China. The whole world is wondering what took place, what was lost, and by whom? The Communist League certainly doesn't have any "inside dope" on what took place during the visit. Very little has been said by either side. However, there are a number of other questions being raised such as, why did the Chinese meet with the Nixon government and vice versa. These questions can be answered by an analysis of the changes and events taking place throughout the world presently.

The main contradiction in the world today remains be-

tween the colonized countries and the imperialist countries as manifested by the revolutionary National Liberation struggles throughout the colonial world centered on South-East Asia on the one hand, and by the counter-revolutionary, fascist wars being waged by the imperialists against the National Liberation struggles on the other. As a consequence, the primary aspect of relationships between the imperialists since W.W.II has been collusion and counter-revolutionary unity. However, the contradiction between the imperialist countries are intensifying.

As Lenin pointed out, "It is quite likely, of course, and
(cont. on p. 4)

China Visit-

(cont. from p. 1)

we must not forget that no matter how solid the imperialist groupings may appear to be, they can be broken up in a few days if the interests of sacred private property, the sacred rights of concessions, etc. demand it." (1)

Within the capitalist world from Western Europe to Japan to the U.S., conditions are fundamentally the same; deteriorating. For example, unemployment in Italy has topped the one million mark with an additional 800,000 workers on temporary jobs or else listed as just "temporarily resting". In addition prices in 1971 were 7% higher than 1970. In West Germany, the annual industrial growth rate which was 6.1% in 1970 fell to only 2.2% in the first eight months of 1971. Unemployment in October 1971 was 53.5% higher than in the same period of 1970. Prices rose 6% in 1971 due to increasing inflation. In France unemployment rose 25% while prices were 6% higher than in 1970. In Britain steel output dropped about 10% in the first nine-months of 1971, unemployment figures showed nearly one million and the cost of living rose 10.3% from June 1970 to June 1971. (All statistics in this paragraph were taken from Peking Review 7-8, Feb. 25, 1972, p.29)

Japan is presently faced with a number of serious contradictions. There is the growing class struggle inside Japan. Only last November 2 million Japanese workers staged a nation wide general strike protesting the reversion of Okinawa and the reviving of militarism by the Japanese imperialists. Japan urgently needs expanded markets greater sources of raw materials and exploitable labor. The Japanese economy was hit hard by the Nixon governments' devaluation and the resulting forced revaluation upward of the Japanese yen. The tariff tax on imports has also slowed down the Japanese economy. For some time Japanese big business has been trying to establish trade relations with China. Chou En Lai has made it clear that China will not trade with any Japanese firm that does not comply with the following four points: 1) Has investments in Taiwan or South Korea; 2) has aid agreements with the "governments" of either South Korea or Taiwan; 3) has any joint ventures with U.S. companies; or 4) makes or sells any materials for the war in Vietnam. In addition, there is the necessity of containing and crushing the ever-spreading revolutionary struggles of the peoples of Indochina. The U.S. imperialists have been pushing Japan for some time to become increasingly involved in the war in Indochina, thus taking responsibility off the U.S. and shifting it onto Japan. Both the U.S. and Japanese imperialism need to crush the revolution in Indochina but neither is capable of doing so. All of this has highlighted the splits be-

tween the national bourgeoisie and comprador bourgeoisie within Japan and between Japanese imperialism and U.S. imperialism.

In this time of economic crisis and political warfare among the capitalist countries the U.S. imperialists are having an extremely difficult time remaining number 1. Despite the weaknesses of the Common Market countries, the Common Market today accounts for 40% of world trade and its exports amount to 55 billion dollars yearly as compared to the 43 billion dollar export volume of the U.S.. During the first 8 months of 1971 the U.S. government lost 20 billion dollars to foreign reserves, more than it lost in the entire decade, 1960-1970. Couple all of this with swelling inflation, unemployment, a huge trade deficit, etc. and it becomes much clearer why. The situation between friend and foe is in the process of changing. Old alliances are being cast aside and new ones are forming as the capitalist countries scramble for new markets and allies to arrive once again at a position of strength. Witness the entry of England into the Common Market; growing relations between Japan and the Soviet Union (Gromyko's visit to Japan); and England along with many other countries recognizing the People's Republic of China as the only and legitimate government of China and establishing diplomatic and trade relations with China.

In the interests of strengthening U.S. imperialism, the Nixon government has been temporarily forced to swallow its "anti-communist pride" and embark on the journey to China. The U.S. imperialists simply cannot wage a military war against China at this time and so they must turn to peaceful measures to opening negotiations

"No better proof of the Russian Soviet Republic's material and moral victory over the capitalists of the whole world can be found than the fact that the powers that took up arms against us...and our entire system have been compelled, against their will, to enter into trade relations with us in the knowledge that by doing so they are strengthening us." (2)

"The current international situation is such that some sort of a temporary, unstable equilibrium, but equilibrium for all that, has been established; it is the kind of equilibrium under which the imperialist powers have been compelled to abandon their desire to hurl themselves at Soviet Russia, despite their hatred for her, because the disintegration of the capitalist world is steadily progressing, unity is steadily diminishing, while the onslaught of the forces of the oppressed colonies, which have a population of over a thousand million, is increasing from year to year,

Lynching - (cont. from p. 1)

slavery and subjugation of the native Indian and Mexican people, along with the cruel and barbarous treatment of the Negro people at the hands of the sainted "forefathers". As the Indian people stood in the way of the expansionist plans of the early colonizers, these pious Christian settlers had a "solution" which Karl Marx clearly pointed out: "Those sober virtuosi of Protestantism, the Puritans of New England, in 1703, by decrees of their assembly set a premium of 40 pounds on every Indian scalp and every captured red-skin: in 1720 a premium of 100 pounds on every scalp; in 1744, after Massachusetts-Bay had proclaimed a certain tribe as rebels, the following prices: for a male scalp of 12 years and upwards 100 pounds (new currency), for a male prisoner 105 pounds, for women and children prisoners 50 pounds, for scalps of women and children 50 pounds." (Karl Marx, Capital, Progress Pub., Moscow, 1965, Vol. I p.753)

This policy was carried out again and again along with the expansion of the capitalist state until the Indian people, whose mighty tribes once thrived on the huge expanses of their land, have been reduced to small handfulls and forced to live in concentration camps, or reservations, as they are called. Some Indians do find work in the cities, the worst possible work and the lowest of wages. The Indian people are denied their culture, and "democratic" freedoms and are subjected to the most vile kinds of white chauvinism.

The question of the fate of the Indian people is tied to the national question, to the question of land - territory. Although the Communist League has not been able to publish a clear-cut position paper on this important question as yet, we hope to do the proper investigation, study, and analysis to make this possible before too long. As a part of the national question, its resolution is extremely important to the unity and revolutionary potential of the Anglo-American working class. We will say that within the U.S. there are numerous autonomous regions that belong to the Indian people whose economic, territorial, and political rights have yet to be restored.

FULL EQUALITY AND DEMOCRACY for the INDIAN PEOPLES!!

month to month, and even week to week." (3)

At the same time however, we must be crystal clear that this does not mean a change in the nature of the imperialists, they have not become benevolent. Quite the contrary, they have temporarily been forced to don a peaceful disguise, they are waging a different kind of war-

(cont. on p. 6)

China Visit: (cont. from p. 4)

fare-but one no different in nature only in form.

What is the Nixon government seeking in China? They of course see in China the potential for trade, for new markets and the possibility of forming a bloc to offset the new alliances being formed, mainly that between the Soviet Union and Japan which carries with it a dangerous potential, dangerous for U.S. imperialism.

In direct opposition to the imperialist camp stand the socialist countries, China, Albania, North Korea, and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. While Vietnam is embroiled in war with the U.S. aggressors and their allies and North Korea is being provoked by the U.S. and Japanese imperialism (with Japan preparing to take over more and more in these attacks), China and Albania remain the stabilizing forces in the revolutionary socialist camp. China, since its liberation in 1949, has made tremendous advances in stabilizing its economy, building its industry, bettering the working and living conditions of the Chinese workers and peasants and strengthening its military. Today China has a stable economy, no inflation or unemployment, a stable currency and no national debt. Numerous non-socialist nations have sought to establish diplomatic and trade relations with China. China's position is clear.

"(4) In the struggle against the anti-Communist diehards, our policy is to make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few and crush our enemies one by one, and to wage struggles on just grounds, to our advantage, and with restraint." (4)

Contradictions and splits weaken the strength of the imperialist camp and prevent them from ganging up on China or other members of the socialist world or the colonized nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America. "As for the imperialist countries, we should unite with their peoples and strive to coexist peacefully with those countries, do business with them and prevent any possible war, but under no circumstances should we harbour any unrealistic notions about them." (5)

China's policy towards non-Socialist countries is to develop relations based on the Five Principles of 1) Mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty; 2) Mutual non-aggression; 3) Non-interference in each other's internal affairs; 4) Equality and mutual benefit (in trade etc) and, 5) Peaceful co-existence.

"It is obvious that it is the Socialist sector--not the imperialist sector that benefits from peace, and only the most backward phrasemonger would suggest that at this time

and under these conditions that that war between China and the U.S. would benefit the world revolution.

"The Chinese Party knows full well that time is on the side of the revolution. It has been obvious since W.W.II that it will be the struggle for peace that will develop the class war." (6)

Historically, the policy of peaceful co-existence has been used to strengthen the socialist forces a number of times.

In 1919 Lenin made clear the position of the Bolshevik party on peaceful co-existence. "I am often asked, whether those American opponents of the war against Russia--not only workers, but mainly bourgeois--are right, who expect from us, after peace is concluded, not only resumption of trade relations, but also the possibility of receiving concessions in Russia. I repeat once more that

they are right. A durable peace would be such a relief to the working people of Russia that they would undoubtedly agree to certain concessions being granted. The granting of concessions under reasonable terms is desirable also for us, as one of the means of attracting into Russia, during the period of the co-existence side by side of socialist and capitalist states, the technical help of the countries which are more advanced in this respect." (7)

And again on Aug. 23, 1939, the Non-Aggression Pact, signed by Germany and the U.S.S.R. strengthened the U.S.S.R. and laid the basis for the defeat of the German Fascists.

"It may be asked how could the Soviet Government have consented to conclude a Non-Aggression Pact with such treacherous fiends as Hitler and Ribbentrop? Was this not an error on the part of the Soviet Government? Of course not. Non-aggression pacts are pacts of peace between states. It was such a pact that Germany proposed to us in 1939.

Could the Soviet Government have declined such a proposal? I think that not a single peace-loving state could decline a peace treaty with a neighboring state, even though the latter was headed by such fiends and cannibals as Hitler and Ribbentrop. Of course only on one indispensable condition, namely, that this peace treaty does not infringe either directly or indirectly on the territorial integrity, independence and honor of the peace-loving state. As is well known, the Non-Aggression Pact between Germany and the U.S.S.R. is precisely such a pact.

What did we gain by concluding the Non-Aggression Pact with Germany? We secured our country peace for a year and a half, and the opportunity of preparing its forces to repulse fascist Germany should she risk

an attack on our country despite the pact. This was a definite advantage for us and a disadvantage for fascist Germany

What has fascist Germany gained and what has she lost by treacherously tearing up the pact and attacking the U.S.S.R.?

She has gained a certain advantageous position for her troops for a short period, but she has lost politically by exposing herself in the eyes of the entire world as a blood-thirsty aggressor." (8)

Stalin's words were born out in Oct.-Nov. 1942 at the battle of Stalingrad when the victorious Red Army broke the back of the German army and spelled the doom of fascist Germany.

Just as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was correct in utilizing the policy of peaceful co-existence, the Communist Party of China is also absolutely correct in seeking to force a policy of peaceful co-existence, the Communist Party of China is also absolutely correct in seeking to force a policy of peaceful co-existence on the U.S. imperialists at this time.

There is one final point we wish to expose to all honest revolutionaries. Since Nixon's visit to China, opportunists and "ultra-lefts" of various colors, along with the revisionist Communist Party U.S.A. and especially the Soviet social-imperialist traitors, have been spewing vicious rumors about a split between the D.R.V.N. and China. They have come out and implied that the Chinese made some kind of deal with the U.S. imperialists, disadvantageous to the Vietnamese. We can only say that this kind of split, counter-revolutionary rumor mongering does nothing but strengthen the imperialist forces and hurt the revolutionary struggles of the masses of exploited and oppressed peoples throughout the world. For those who have any doubts whatsoever on this question we wish only to refer you to Peking Reviews #4 (Jan. 28, 1971, p. 4) and #7-8 (Feb. 25, 1972, p. 5) where it is stated:

"A protocol between the government of the People's Republic of China and the government of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam on supplementary gratuitous supply of military equipment and economic materials by China to Viet Nam for 1972 was signed in Peking on Jan. 22nd." And, "An agreement was signed in Peking on Feb. 11 between the government of the People's Republic of China and the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia on China's economic aid and military supplies to Cambodia for 1972."

And also, in Peking Review #6, Feb. 11, 1972, p. 13 there is a full length article once again reiterating the complete and absolute support of

China Visit (cont. from p. 6)

the Chinese government and Chinese people of the struggle for National liberation of the Indo-Chinese peoples against U.S. imperialism. Are these the actions of an enemy? Certainly not. The unity of the Vietnamese and Chinese peoples in the anti-imperialist struggle, particularly against the genocidal war being waged by U.S. imperialism, is made of steel.

From observing China's foreign policy we can see 3 inter-related principles they have held firm to. First, mutual friendship, assistance and co-operation between all the countries in the socialist camp; second, developing relations of peaceful co-existence on the basis of the Five Principles with non-socialist countries; and third, consistently opposing all imperialist war and aggression and supporting

and aiding all revolutionary struggles of oppressed and colonized nations.

The Communist League ardently supports the Communist Party of China in utilizing the policy of peaceful co-existence between the People's Republic of China and the U.S. imperialists at this time. We know the Chinese will use this period of peaceful co-existence to strengthen in every possible way the socialist countries and their allies. We, inside the imperialist countries must also use this period to strengthen and consolidate our forces to prepare for the inevitable turning of peace into war and bourgeois democracy into fascism.

Footnotes:

- (1) Report on Foreign Policy, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 37
- (2) Lenin, Our Foreign and

Domestic Position and the Tasks of the Party, Nov. 21, 1920

(3) Lenin, V.I., Speech In Closing the Conference, May 28, (Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (B)), Collected Works, Vol. 32, Progress Pub., Moscow, 1965, p. 436

(4) Mao Tse-Tung, On Policy, Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung, Vol. II, Foreign Languages Press Peking, 1965, p. 442

(5) Mao Tse-Tung, On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People, Selected Readings From the Works of Mao Tse-Tung, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1967, p. 386

(6) People's Tribune, Vol. 3 #7, August 1971, p.2

(7) Report on Foreign Policy, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 70

(8) Stalin, J.V., Victory Will Be Ours!, a speech made on July 3, 1941, Workers Library Publishers, Inc., N.Y. City, July 1941, pp. 8-9