

BOURGEOISIE DELIGHTED BUT CAUTIOUS

The world bourgeoisie, which hailed the suppression and could scarcely conceal its delight, as always, finds such steps helpful and valuable but inadequate for their purposes. The triumph of a reactionary grouping within the framework of a workers' state is at best for them only a half-way measure. Only a full-scale counter-revolution would suit their purposes.

At the moment imperialist diplomacy, particularly the diplomacy of the Carter-Vance administration, is to take a cautious view of the situation in China.

The rightward trend of the new leadership in China has also raised the hopes of the leaders of the Soviet Union. They sense a social identity and a common, revisionist outlook regarding their internal situations. This has not stopped the violent stream of invective and abusive epithets by the Peking press directed at the Soviet Union nor has there been any appreciable tapering off of the statements made again and again claiming that the "great danger" between the two so-called superpowers lies with the Soviet Union. All sorts of appeals directly and indirectly for U.S. imperialism to break the so-called detente (does it really exist?) with the USSR have continued unabated.

Nevertheless, the imperialists remain wary and suspicious that all the abusive language emanating from the new Chinese CP leadership may yet prove to be mere diplomatic sleight of hand for purposes of a new but limited rapprochement between the USSR and China.

Of course, the evidence from the point of view of diplomatic exchanges is overwhelming that the Chinese leadership is unyieldingly bent on a rapprochement with the U.S. imperialists against the USSR, and not the other way around.

Nevertheless, the suspicion and wariness of the imperialists is not based on external diplomatic manifestations of China's diplomacy but rather on the historical and sociological fact of life: that both China and the USSR, notwithstanding the triumph of rightist groupings, are basically committed to the same social system, to a similar mode of social production which no assault by internal reaction, either in the Soviet Union or in China, has been able to overturn. Nor are there any substantial grounds for believing that counter-revolution is a prospect for the immediate future.

Both socialist states have undergone considerable evolution to the right. But as even bourgeois publicists and sociologists are forced to

admit, the centrally planned character of their economies and the public ownership of the basic means of production stubbornly persist and have not appreciably yielded to consecutive assaults by internal reactionary forces.

It is not true that a reactionary, bureaucratic, and privileged grouping, such as holds the reins of authority in both the USSR and in China, can at will dismantle the socialist foundations in industry, or even in agriculture, where it is much easier, without an open struggle.

This of necessity imposes the obligation on revolutionary working class friends and observers of social and political evolution in China and the USSR to pay the most meticulous attention, within the framework of what is possible, to developments in both these socialist countries.

For instance, the Jan. 31, 1977 issue of the New York Times reports that "at a series of high-level meetings in Peking last spring, according to an article distributed by the Chinese press agency Hsinhua, Chang Chun-chiao, who was then a member of the Politburo and a senior Deputy Prime Minister, charged that by exporting oil 'China is going for a colonial economy.'" He was alluding, says the dispatch, to the Chinese who once worked as agents for foreign businessmen. Chang charged, "There is a comprador bourgeois right in the Politburo."

Of course it is well known that there was a serious dispute last spring concerning Chou En-lai's policy of expanding oil exports (to what extent no one knows here) in order to pay for foreign technology and purchase whole plants to speed economic development. What is verifiable is that from 1970 until 1975 oil constituted the main item of export from which China obtained foreign exchange to purchase whatever commodities, industrial or otherwise, were needed.

Chang Chun-chiao's alleged charge, which seems to be wholly in accord with the theme of his essay "On Exercising All-Round Dictatorship over the Bourgeoisie," that "China is going for a colonial economy," may be vastly overdrawn or deliberately fabricated by his victorious factional opponents. It is nevertheless worth examining, for what is at issue in such a dispute is not really the sale of this or that commodity for export, nor the need to obtain sophisticated technology or entire plants.