Vice-Premier Geng Biao advances friendship

Who’s upset by China visitor?

By Charles Elias

The visit to the U.S. by China’s Deputy Prime Minister Geng Biao has caused quite a stir.

The visit by this senior official marks a new step forward in relations between China and the U.S. A whole range of exchanges—economic, technical and cultural—have been mapped out. When completed, these exchanges will put relations between the two countries where they would have been had not the recognition of the People’s Republic of China by U.S. authorities been delayed for 30 years. According to Richard C. Holbrooke, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs: “The fears and doubts that were expressed by opponents at the time of normalization have proven ill-founded. The high hopes that we had been realized or surpassed.”

The advance in the level of relations between these two countries of opposite social systems will surely benefit China in its life-or-death struggle to modernize the country and place itself on a firm economic foundation. For its part, the U.S. has its own interests in gaining a new market for its recession-bound goods as well as in gaining political stability in its relations with this Asian power.

Most significantly, both countries have come to recognize some common concerns. In particular the Soviet drive in southwest Asia has pushed the need for mutual understanding between the two to its highest plane.

Both countries, however, make it clear that this new period of friendly relations is a “friendship,” not an “alliance,” against the Soviet expansionists. For one thing, Vice-Premier Geng’s visit didn’t result in any arm sales to China nor in any joint military planning arrangements. The Chinese have not requested any such sales or arrangements, and the U.S. has apparently not offered any.

The Chinese did purchase carefully selected items of “dual use” technology and defensive military support equipment. But, since China is not an aggressive superpower like the Soviet Union and the U.S., this should pose a threat to no one—unless they have aggressive designs of their own.

Yet Geng Biao’s visit has thrown the pro-Moscow Communist Party USA into a frenzy. Even before any agreements were drawn up, the CP’s paper, the Daily World, was already screaming “dire warnings” about a U.S.-Japan-China “axis” against the Soviets.

Daily World commentator Conrad Komorowski, showing no shame whatsoever, blamed the “alliance” on “the phony pretext of a non-existent ‘Soviet aggression in Afghanistan.’” Komorowski argues that there is no cause for any such anti-Moscow unity since Moscow only “gave the Afghan democratic revolution military assistance in maintaining itself against subversive efforts. . . .”

Like the Mittleites 40 years ago, the Soviet leaders talk like priests and nuns while marching into one country after another. Their “assistance to democracy” is being perceived throughout the region for exactly what it is—naked aggression.

The very thing the USSR fears most is the collective efforts of countries (even countries with different social systems) to respond to its war preparations. Nothing worries Brezhnev and company more than a strong and prepared socialist China, especially because it is in Asia where Moscow is making its main assault on the sovereignty of countries like Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Laos.

The steps made by the U.S. and China are not very large in the direction of collective security. But the fact that they have already evoked such fears from the ranks of Moscow’s backers in the U.S. shows that they are meaningful.

The recognition of “parallel interests” between the U.S. and China should in no way be interpreted as an abandonment on China’s part of socialist principles. In times when big powers threaten to unleash a world war, it has long been shown that collective strength is certainly in accord with the interests of socialism. This was the lesson learned by the people of various countries in WWII when such joint efforts helped save the world from fascism.

The only ones who should be troubled by Geng Biao’s trip to the U.S. are those who now face a new road block in their march to war.

Carter wavers on prosecute Rams

The Carter administration appears to have backed away from its threats to prosecute a group of ten U.S. citizens who attended the “Crimes of America” hearings in Iran.

Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark who attended the Tehran meeting, said in a Paris interview that if prosecuted for violation of Carter’s travel ban, he would defend himself by asserting his constitutional right to travel, to assemble and to speak. Probably not wanting to risk a courtroom defeat for the Emergency Powers Act, which allows the president to restrict foreign travel, Sec. of State Edmund Muskie announced that the administration would probably take a lenient stand towards the ten.

Last November, Clark was sent by Carter to negotiate the release of the U.S. hostages, but was turned back when Ayatollah Khomeini refused to meet with him.

Appearing on ABC’s news program “Issues