

Leaders' Policy Statement Keeps China In Mao's Footsteps

The leadership of the People's Republic of China, despite the passing of Mao and the purging of "the Gang of Four," has not altered by one degree the course of foreign and domestic policy pursued by Mao. This is the clear message of a mammoth policy statement which appeared in the official publication of the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Daily, on Nov. 1. In particular, the document is clear that the leadership of China is firmly fixed to a policy against the Soviet Union so fanatically pursued by their predecessor.

Despite the fact that the 35,000 word document has received little attention in the western press, the Chinese policy effects U.S. perspectives because it lays to rest any prospect of significant Sino-Soviet rapprochement for a long time to come. The flickering attempts of certain U.S. academics and politicians to hold aloft the bogey-man of a new Sino-Soviet alliance if the U.S. does not fork over Taiwan on Peking's terms no longer hold. Despite an appearance of attacking both the U.S. and the Soviet Union, the document, as the following quotes reveal, makes the Soviet Union its chief target. The only operable portion of the entire piece is the call to end "appeasement" of the Soviets by ceasing every current and prospective economic or military measure of détente. Lest the repetition of Peking's doctrine of the "inevitability of war" be brushed aside, the reiteration of Mao's well-known pooh-poohing of the dangers nuclear war would bring to China — and China's crash bomb shelter program — should be borne in mind.

CHINA

Chairman Mao's theory of the three worlds scientifically epitomizes the objective realities of class struggle on the world arena today. In this theory he inherited, defended and developed basic Marxist-Leninist principles.

In his talk with the leader of a Third World country in February 1974, Chairman Mao said, "In my view, the United States and the Soviet Union form the first world. Japan, Europe and Canada, the middle section, belong to the second world. We are the Third World..."

After 1958, with the Khrushchev-Brezhnev clique's complete betrayal of the cause of communism, capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union, and it degenerated and became a social-imperialist country. True, there are China and the other socialist countries, **but what was once the socialist camp no longer exists, nor do historical conditions necessitate its formation for a second time.** Meanwhile, many countries in the im-

perialist camp no longer took their cue from the United States and even openly stood up to it... In the 1960s, the ruling clique in the Soviet Union were already very far gone in their betrayal of socialism, but for a time U.S. imperialism remained the arch enemy of the people of the world. Then, **after a succession of grave events**, the Soviet Union not only turned into an imperialist superpower that threatened the world as the United States did, but also became **the most dangerous source of another world war....**

As the United States got bogged down in wars and its strength began to decline, Soviet social-imperialism came up from behind. The Khrushchev-Brezhnev renegade clique, which had snatched the fruits of the socialist construction carried out by the Soviet people for over 30 years, gradually transformed what had been a socialist power into an imperialist power.... It has caught up with the United States in nuclear armament and surpassed it in conventional weaponry. As its military and economic power increases, Soviet social-imperialism becomes more and more flagrant in its attempts to expand and penetrate all parts of the world. It makes great play with its ground, naval and air forces everywhere and engages the United States in a fierce struggle for supremacy on a global scale, thus betraying its aggressive ambitions which are unparalleled in world history...

The conduct of the Soviet Union in international affairs is quintessential imperialism and hegemonism, without a trace of a socialist proletarian spirit. Nor is that all. Of the two imperialist superpowers, the Soviet Union is the more ferocious, the more reckless, the more treacherous, and the most dangerous source of world war.

Why must we say so?...

First, Soviet social-imperialism is an imperialist power following on the heels of the United States and is therefore more aggressive and adventurous...

Second, because comparatively speaking Soviet social-imperialism is inferior in economic strength, it must rely chiefly on its military power and recourse to threats of war in order to expand...

But if, despite what has been said above, we should still indiscriminately put the two superpowers on a par and fail to single out the Soviet Union as the more dangerous instigator of world war, we would only be blunting the revolutionary vigilance of the people of the world and blurring the primary target in the struggle against hegemonism...

How is it that the second world countries constitute a force which can be united with in the struggle against hegemonism?...

Today Soviet social-imperialism obviously represents the gravest danger to the West European countries, for Europe is the focal point in the Soviet strategy for seeking world hegemony...

Today, the European countries are faced with the grave threat of invasion and annexation from the Soviet social-imperialists....

What are our tasks then? First, we must warn the people of the danger of war...Since the rivalry between the two hegemonist powers is intensifying and especially since Soviet social-imperialism is on the offensive, the conflict between them cannot possibly be settled by peaceful means...In the present historical circumstances, there is no possibility for a lasting peace, and a new world war is inevitable...Second, we should make every effort to step up the struggle against hegemonism...

Third, we must redouble our efforts to oppose the policy of appeasement because it can only bring war nearer. There are people in the West today who in fact adopt a policy of appeasement towards the Soviet Union. In striving to work out an "ideal" formula for compromise and concessions in the face of Soviet expansion and threats, some people have dished up such proposals as the "Sonnenfeldt Doctrine" in the fond hope of assuaging the aggressor's appetite or at least gaining some respite for themselves. Others intend to build a so-called "material basis" for peaceful cooperation and the prevention of war by means of big loans, extensive trade, joint exploitation of resources and exchange of technology. Still others hope they can divert the Soviet Union to the East so as to free themselves from this Soviet peril at the expense of the security of other countries...