

Chinese Revisionism in Decay

The second session of the 5th National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China came to a close on July 1. This session further revealed for all to see that the revisionist ruling clique in power in Beijing (Peking) is rushing China headlong down the road of capitalism and social-imperialism — "socialism" in words and savage warmongering imperialism in deeds. The NPC enacted a number of further measures for the complete restoration of the most reactionary capitalist and revisionist elements in China, guaranteeing them all manner of rights to wealth and power. Also an important law on "joint ventures" was adopted, legalizing the unrestrained influx of foreign imperialist capital, guaranteed by law the U.S., Japanese, European and other imperialist corporations their "due profits" plundered from the sweat and blood of the Chinese working people, just as in the days of the emperors and Chiang Kai-shek. Anything and everything that serves the "four modernizations" — China's plan to become a powerful, warmongering social-imperialist state — is being made the law in Beijing.

This session of the NPC also clearly demonstrated that the Hua Guofeng/Deng Xiaoping (Teng Hsiao-ping) clique is going still further in throwing overboard even its "Marxist-Leninist" and "anti-revisionist" pretenses. To reassure the imperialist sharks of the "security" of their investments in China and to facilitate China's all-round alliance with imperialism, the Chinese leaders are pulling off what little is left of their "revolutionary" mask. Chinese revisionism is merging completely with the other main currents of modern revisionism, openly adopting the blatantly revisionist theses of the Khrushchovites, Titoites, "Eurocommunists", etc. Chinese revisionism is on the road of all-round rapid decay.

Among other things, the National People's Congress adopted an openly Khrushchovite thesis denying the fundamental role of the class struggle under the conditions of socialism. Premier Hua Guofeng, in his "Report on the Work of the Government" which was adopted by the session, declared that: "There is no longer any need for large-scale and turbulent class struggle waged by the masses, and therefore we should not try to wage such a struggle in the future," and that at all costs the class struggle should not be "magnified" but should be toned down and mitigated. While for the sake of demagoguery he did not deny the existence of class struggle in China altogether, the position of this premier of Chinese revisionism was as clear as crystal. Hua spelled out his line in no uncertain terms: "The realization of the four modernizations by the end of the century" is the "principal contradiction to be resolved, the central task to be performed," and therefore "class struggle is no longer the principal contradiction in our society."

Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping are not the first to repudiate the Marxist-Leninist theory that it is the class struggle which is the principal motive force for the development of class society, not only in capitalist society but also after the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. The revisionist renegades from Bukharin to Tito to Khrushchov to Brezhnev have all held that the class struggle dies out and loses its significance with the establishment of socialism.

On this question, modern revisionism clashes sharply with Marxism-Leninism. As Comrade Enver Hoxha reaffirmed at the 7th Congress of the Party of Labor of Albania: "the construction of socialism is a process of stern class struggle between two roads, the socialist road and the capitalist road." This class struggle must be waged relentlessly and in a revolutionary manner on all fronts, in the political, ideological and economic fields. This class struggle is a fierce struggle against both the old and new capitalist and revisionist elements, forces and influences and against the capitalist-imperialist encirclement of the socialist country which is linked with the internal enemies of socialism. Furthermore, this fundamental contradiction between socialism and capitalism remains in force even after the suppression and elimination of the exploiting classes, throughout the entire period of transition to classless, communist society.

The formulations recently adopted by the Chinese National People's Congress on the class struggle are significant in that they mark yet another zigzag in the opportunist line of Chinese revisionism, a turn towards its further degeneration. But this is not to say that the Chinese party hasn't in the past also maintained class collaborationist and opportunist stands on the waging of the class struggle.

In 1956, the Chinese leaders agreed with Khrushchov's attack on Stalin and on Stalin's line of waging a stern class struggle under conditions of socialism. After Stalin's death, at the notorious 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Khrushchov renounced the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat, declaring that these were no longer necessary and were harmful after socialism has been built and the exploiting classes eliminated. It is well known that under this banner the ultra-renegade Khrushchov overthrew the dictatorship of the proletariat and restored capitalism in the Soviet Union and carried out the most criminal treachery against socialism and the revolution.

And in 1956 the Chinese leadership applauded Khrushchov's stand. They wrote into one of their important documents that: "After the elimination of classes the class struggle should not continue to be stressed as though it was being intensified, as was done by Stalin with the result that the healthy development of socialist democracy was hampered. The Communist Party of the Soviet

Union is completely right in firmly correcting Stalin's mistakes in this respect." ("More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", p. 49).

That same year the Chinese Communist Party held the first session of its 8th Congress elaborating the Chinese leaders' own opportunist and class collaborationist position on the class struggle. The 8th Congress of the CPC elaborated at length on the opportunist thesis that the Chinese capitalists of the so-called "national bourgeoisie" were an ally of the working class under socialism and a class which could and should be merged with the socialist system. The Congress polemicized against the "left" position of expropriating and eliminating the capitalists as a class and chastised those who wanted to "squeeze out and bankrupt capitalist industry and commerce." The Congress acclaimed the policy of "taking into account both public (state-owned — ed.) and private (capitalist — ed.) interests and benefiting both labor and capital." The Chinese capitalists were allotted important positions in the state apparatus and economic enterprises, and the policy was adopted of "long-term co-existence and mutual supervision" between the capitalist parties and the communist party. The 8th Congress also declared that "the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in our country has basically been resolved" and that "who will win in the struggle between socialism and capitalism... has now been decided."

In short, the extremely erroneous and opportunist line of the 8th Congress of the CPC was that the capitalist exploiting class does not have to be suppressed and expropriated in order to construct socialism, but that these exploiters also "favor socialism" and can "remold themselves into working people". The working class was to build socialism in China harmoniously linked arm-in-arm with the bourgeoisie.

A new demagogical twist was given to this same anti-Marxist-Leninist, class collaborationist line by the second session of the 8th Congress of the CPC which was held in 1958. Paying lip-service to the necessity of the class struggle, the second session concocted the formulation that: "There are two exploiting classes and two laboring classes in China today." The exploiters who "opposed socialism" comprised "one of the exploiting classes" and "the other exploiting class comprises the national bourgeoisie... who are accepting socialist transformation step by step." According to this peculiar "theory", the so-called "national bourgeoisie" has a "dual character in relation to the socialist revolution." But by "national bourgeoisie" is meant literally every and all exploiters, capitalists, landlords and reactionaries who "see the need" to "remold themselves", "correct their many wrong views" and "give their hearts to the Communist Party"! Even the big industrialists, bloodsoaked Kuomintang generals and the puppet emperor of Manchuria are declared "patriotic personages", part of the "national bourgeoisie" and hence "comrades" of the working class with a place in the sun in an allegedly socialist China.

This sickening benevolence towards the exploiting classes was the attitude of Mao Zedong (Mao Tsetung) himself. Mao held that the contradiction between the working class and the Chinese capitalists was a "non-antagonistic one" to be resolved by encouraging the capitalists to "study and remold themselves" (see "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People"). And it was Mao Zedong who advocated there should be "long-term mutual supervision and coexistence" between these two classes — even under socialism! Obviously nothing could be further from the revolutionary class line of the proletariat and the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of scientific socialism.

Later on Mao Zedong and the CPC pursued their opportunist approach to the class struggle through the gross distortion and mutilation of the thesis that "classes and class struggle remain throughout the entire period of socialism." The Chinese leaders demagogically adopted this thesis in the early 1960's under the signboard of a struggle against Khrushchovite modern revisionism, only then to strip this correct thesis of its Marxist-Leninist revolutionary conclusions. When the CPC and Mao Zedong issued this and similar slogans, this did not mean that they had repudiated their previous opportunist position and were now in favor of an irreconcilable and relentless class struggle against the capitalist and revisionist enemies of socialism. No, they had not changed their line in the least but were still in favor of a liberal-bourgeois resolution of this class conflict.

For example, the Chinese leaders clung to the Khrushchovite premise that the existence of class struggle under socialism hinges on the condition of the existence of the exploiting classes. In other words, while declaring that the class struggle remains and cannot be eliminated, the CPC maintained that therefore the exploiting classes also must remain and cannot be eliminated under socialism. And pursuing this idiotic logic, this pseudo-"dialectical approach", the CPC has gone out of its way to preserve much of the property and rights of not only the old capitalist exploiters but also has taken an extremely benevolent and opportunist stand towards the known revisionist renegades in power, leaving them in important positions in the party and state under the hoax of the "inevitability" of the existence of the bourgeois and exploiting classes under socialism. The restoration to power of the self-confessed arch-revisionist Deng Xiaoping, not once but two times, was not an isolated mistake but a general practice in the Chinese party. The existence of one or more "bourgeois headquarters" right inside the

communist party itself, from the central committee on down, was not only allowed but even welcomed by the Chinese leadership as a sign of the "maturity" and "fearless materialism" of their party!

With such opportunist distortions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism it is any wonder that another zigzag has taken place, that overnight the exploiting classes and with them the class struggle have evaporated? Now Hua Guofeng declares that "as classes the landlords and rich peasants have ceased to exist" and that "the capitalists no longer exist as a class" (this despite the fact that Hua repeated in his report the opportunist thesis that "the capitalists of our country constitute a part of the people" after 30 years of supposedly socialist construction!). And voilà, "the class struggle is no longer the principal contradiction in our society." No, this can come of no surprise at all to anyone who has studied the opportunist, anti-Marxist-Leninist and wavering positions of the Chinese leaders on the waging of the class struggle.

The conciliatory and liberal attitude which Mao Zedong and the other leaders of the CPC always held towards the exploiting classes is among the reasons why genuine socialism was not and could not be established in China. The Chinese people carried out an immense revolution, liberating the Chinese people from the cruel tyranny of foreign imperialism and the big landlords which had brought devastation and misery to China. But the transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution never took place. With the bourgeoisie sharing power with the proletariat, with the bourgeoisie so-called "democratic" parties to this day maintaining their positions in the Chinese state, how could there be a genuine dictatorship of the proletariat without which there can not be even any serious talk of genuine socialism? Without the resolute expropriation and elimination of the exploiting classes, which to this day maintain much of their wealth and privileges in China, what kind of socialism can there be?

Pursuing the opportunist and eclectic ideological line of "Mao Zedong Thought", the Communist Party of China attempted to steer a middle road between socialism and capitalism. Of course this road proved impossible to traverse. And today China is rushing with lightning speed to become fully integrated into the world imperialist camp as a big social-imperialist state. That the Chinese leaders are more and more discarding their "revolutionary", "Marxist-Leninist" and "anti-revisionist" disguise is not in the least surprising but is a consequence of the inevitable collapse of Mao Zedong's opportunist road of conciliation with imperialism, revisionism and all the class enemies of socialism.

Nevertheless, the latest twist on the Chinese revisionists' trail of betrayal has left their sycophants here in the U.S. a little out of step and with their nose somewhat out of joint. The "CP (M-L)" bootlickers of the Chinese revisionist warlords and the U.S. imperialist bourgeoisie have completely renounced the revolutionary class

BRITAIN

Continued from page 7

"Britain has the only sufficient milk production system in Europe"; "the Congress of the TUC... is the best example in the world of democratic centralism"; "we begin the new year in the company of the oldest and best organized working class in the world"; the British working class "have an unmatched record of persistence in struggle and of maneuver without surrender"; "we were the first modern proletariat, once again we must lead", etc., etc.

This outright "British" chauvinism of the "CPB (M-L)" was further enshrined in its line, program and policy at its recently held Fifth Congress. At this Congress, the "CPB(M-L)" put forward the "theory" that it is the British working class which is going to liberate the world. It writes: "But in the perspective of the firm and lasting establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat it may well prove to be the case that the oldest capitalist country will also be the birthplace of socialism as a permanent alternative to exploitative systems. From a revolutionized Britain, a proletarian way of life, thought and action could spread to the rest of the world." ("The Worker", March 8, 1979, our emphasis). What is this theory that "the oldest capitalist country will also be the birthplace of socialism," that "from a revolutionized Britain, a proletarian way of life, thought and action could spread to the rest of the world"? Besides the many other anti-Marxist, anti-Albanian, anti-Bolshevik positions contained in it, the statement reveals that the "CPB(M-L)"'s slogan and program of "saving Britain" is not being misunderstood as a result perhaps of some "clumsy" formulation, but represents precisely the mantle of the British bourgeoisie in the working class, the mantle of national and social-chauvinism. As the class struggle intensifies in Britain and throughout the world, as the struggle in the international communist movement grows ever stronger in defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, this social-chauvinism of the "CPB(M-L)" will become, and can only become, even more open, crude and blatant.

THE PROLETARIAT AND ITS MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY MUST TAKE THE FIRMEST OF STANDS AGAINST NATIONAL AND SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM

The proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist Party must take a most decisive and militant stand a-

gainst the national and social chauvinism of the British bourgeoisie and against its propagators in the working class movement. National and social chauvinism are the ideology of the bourgeoisie, the ideology of reaction, imperialism, racism and colonialism. It is a crucial question for the proletariat to oppose this ideology, whatever form it should take, and to decisively and actively uphold and strengthen the unity of the British proletariat with the working and oppressed people of the whole world. National and social-chauvinism stand directly against the interests of the British proletariat, the world's proletariat and people and socialism and the revolution. As Comrade Lenin writes: "The social-chauvinists are our class enemies, bourgeois within the working class movement. They represent a stratum, or groups, or sections of the working class which objectively have been bribed by the bourgeoisie (by better wages, positions of honor, etc.), and which help their bourgeoisie to plunder and oppress small and weak peoples and to fight over division of the capitalist spoils." Further, Lenin writes: "Unity with the social-chauvinists is betrayal of the revolution, betrayal of the proletariat, betrayal of socialism, desertion to the bourgeoisie because it is 'unity' with the national bourgeoisie of 'one's own' country against the unity of the international revolutionary proletariat, is unity with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat" (Lenin's emphasis).

But now their "wise leader" has declared from his rostrum in Beijing that the class struggle must be thrown overboard. The master's baton is waved, the disguise is being shed and Chinese revisionism is becoming more naked; and therefore the spineless social-chauvinists of the "CP(M-L)", who are already completely compromised, find themselves in an embarrassing spot. Thus, like a little mouse, the "CP(M-L)" could not help itself but let out a timid squeak: "How can 'large-scale, turbulent class struggle' be ruled out in the future?"; "How can such changes take place except through class struggle?"; "Shouldn't socialist modernization be considered a form of class struggle?"; "It appears that there are still some questions stemming from this important meeting that have not yet fully been resolved, some compromises made for the sake of unity." (see *The Call*, July 16, 1979). Of course, Hua's report, which spelled out the plans of his counter-revolutionary clique to build capitalism in China in alliance with the U.S. and other imperialists in order to turn China into a warmongering superpower, was also hailed by the "CP(M-L)" as a great triumph of "socialism and the revolution".

Clearly these are hard and difficult times for the entire camp of Chinese revisionism. The U.S. and other imperialists are making China pay dearly for its alliance with themselves. And the proletariat and revolutionary forces the world over are disgusted with and are condemning the Chinese revisionist traitors. In particular, it is the open and relentless struggle of the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces, of the glorious Party of Labor of Albania and the other genuine Marxist-Leninist parties against Chinese revisionism which poses insurmountable obstacles for the new emperors in Beijing and the opportunist sects of their followers in various countries. The ugly features of the Chinese revisionist betrayal, the Chinese leaders' long history of vacillation towards imperialism, capitalism and modern revisionism, a vacillation with its ideological roots in "Mao Zedong Thought", are all being laid bare by the merciless exposure by the genuine Marxist-Leninists. It is this active factor too which is bringing about the rapid decay of this revisionism along with the all-sided capitalist and social-imperialist degeneration of China itself. □

gainst the national and social chauvinism of the British bourgeoisie and against its propagators in the working class movement. National and social chauvinism are the ideology of the bourgeoisie, the ideology of reaction, imperialism, racism and colonialism. It is a crucial question for the proletariat to oppose this ideology, whatever form it should take, and to decisively and actively uphold and strengthen the unity of the British proletariat with the working and oppressed people of the whole world. National and social-chauvinism stand directly against the interests of the British proletariat, the world's proletariat and people and socialism and the revolution. As Comrade Lenin writes: "The social-chauvinists are our class enemies, bourgeois within the working class movement. They represent a stratum, or groups, or sections of the working class which objectively have been bribed by the bourgeoisie (by better wages, positions of honor, etc.), and which help their bourgeoisie to plunder and oppress small and weak peoples and to fight over division of the capitalist spoils." Further, Lenin writes: "Unity with the social-chauvinists is betrayal of the revolution, betrayal of the proletariat, betrayal of socialism, desertion to the bourgeoisie because it is 'unity' with the national bourgeoisie of 'one's own' country against the unity of the international revolutionary proletariat, is unity with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat" (Lenin's emphasis). □

Marxist-Leninist Books and Periodicals



NEW YORK
256 West 15th St.
New York, NY 10011
(Just east of 8th Avenue)

CHICAGO
2107 S. California
Chicago, IL
(near California "L" stop)

BOSTON
595 Mass. Ave Central Sq.
Cambridge, MA 02139
Phone: (617) 547-7160

OAKLAND
3232 Grove St.
Oakland, CA 94609
Phone: (415) 653-4840