

Revolution—the revolution which was aimed at curbing bureaucratic excesses, at prohibiting enormous privileges and emoluments to the upper crust in Chinese society. The Cultural Revolution had combatted those enormous material incentives which tend to cultivate a class differentiation in the peasantry, the working class, and especially in the so-called managerial class, that stratum in Chinese society which holds such a central role in planning, management, administration, and the various fields of science, technology, and industrial know-how.

Undoubtedly much will be attributed to the personal traits of Teng, especially his cunning and his ability to survive during periods of revolutionary storms, to once again be reinstated after having been cast into purgatory twice during Mao's lifetime. But personal traits, important though they are in the political struggle, are not what is really decisive.

The basic point which accounts for his reemergence is that the counter-current, the current against the Cultural Revolution, proved in the final analysis to be predominant and overwhelmed the left opposition.

Neither Chiang Ching nor Yao Wen-yuan, certainly not Wang Hung-wen, the sole strong revolutionary leader who emerged from the Shanghai working class, and not even Chang Chun-chiao held any great sway in the planning and management sector of the economy—which of course is very important in a socialist country. Nor did they enjoy much loyalty or adherence from this sector to the Maoist doctrine. Contrary to what Mao's detractors are now hinting, his doctrine did not seek to belittle the significance of technology in the construction of socialism, but to make the masses the ultimate historical instrument in shaping their own socialist destiny.

Teng's relation to Mao is best summed up in Mao's own commentary on Teng. "Teng Hsiao-ping is deaf [hard of hearing] but at meetings he would sit far away from me. In the six years since 1959 he has not reported to me about his work. He relies only on Peng Chen [former mayor of Peking and ally of the Liu-Teng faction] for the work of the secretariat." (Quoted by Edgar Snow in *The Long Revolution*, p. 83.)

According to Snow, the only one of the many writers friendly to the Chinese Revolution who had long and extensive interviews with Mao over a period of years, among the important items that Teng failed to report to Mao was the policy of "the extension of plots for private use and of free markets, the increase of small enterprises

with sole responsibility for their own profits and losses, and the fixing of output quotas [in communes] based on the household [individual enterprise]." This line of political divergence from Mao clearly puts Teng in the role of the early "liberalizers" who were then in the ascendant in the Soviet Union.

It did not, in the Teng world outlook, mean any particular subservience to the Soviet Union or agreement to be a subordinate partner in a Sino-Soviet alliance, but a sharing of views on the evolution of the economy, its management and direction, and the role of the state in the distribution of the national income vis-a-vis the different strata of the population.

TENG AND THE "EUROCOMMUNISTS"

It was only a bare two years ago that Teng in his capacity as Deputy Prime Minister visited Paris to launch a virtual crusade to unify and strengthen NATO against the "greatest danger," Soviet social-imperialism." He was then rudely rebuffed by George Marchais, the leader of the French CP.

The incident is illustrative of how superficial appearances convey the impression of deep-seated differences in world outlook, which speedy developments soon tear to shreds. For the truth of the matter is that since 1975 the trends of social development make abundantly clear that the world outlook of Teng Hsiao-ping does not fundamentally differ from that of Marchais, Berlinguer, or Carrillo.

These leaders of so-called Eurocommunism are actually leaders of social reformism, promoting the cause of the preservation of the capitalist system in their respective imperialist countries which are in irreconcilable conflict with the Soviet Union as a workers' state and a new, progressive social order.

Teng represents the current Chinese version of what the Carrillos, Berlinguers, and Marchais' stand for in the way of renouncing and abandoning the revolutionary struggle for socialism. They are bound together, at last, by their lynch-pin of anti-Sovietism.

They differ in this fundamental respect: whereas Teng is anchored to a workers' state in a period of profound political reaction, the Marchais-Berlinguer-Carrillo grouping are reformists tied to the working class movement in a period of deep capitalist decline and resurgent aggressive political reaction and imperialist pressure at home and abroad from the U.S. Teng's social reformism is reformism on the foundation of a workers' state. The social reformism of