

# China Policy Study Group BROADSHEET

Sponsors: Dr Joseph Needham FRS, Prof Cyril Offord FRS, Prof Joan Robinson, Prof George Thomson

## SUPERPOWER CONTENTION IN ANGOLA

November 11th, when after 500 years of colonial rule the Portuguese withdrew from Angola, should have been a great day for the mass of the peoples of Africa, and in fact for all but imperialists and reactionaries. The Angolan people should have begun independently and without outside interference to construct a new Angola. That was not allowed to happen.

The Angolans, after fighting separately in three liberation movements to get rid of colonial rule, had to learn to work together. The Organisation of African Unity recognised all three of them and China gave assistance to them all. Their leaders agreed earlier this year to unite to take over from the already departing Portuguese administration. If that agreement had stood there would have been no excuse for foreign powers either to intervene or be invited in to fight an invasion. But respect for independent Angola's territorial integrity and non-intervention in the internal affairs and political struggles of the Angolans was not what either of the superpowers had in mind. It would have been inconsistent with their competition to dominate the world. Whatever 'help' they gave in the past was not, it is now clear, to help the Angolan people, but to acquire a client state and bases in strategic and resource-rich Southern Africa.

Angola is nearly half-a-million square miles in extent. After Europe's 'civilising' mission only about 7 million Angolans are left. What independent Angola would have inherited was not merely the legacy of imperialism and the col-

onial regime but, more important, the experience, discipline and gains of armed struggle and political and economic work. However, material conditions being what they were on 11 November, none of the liberation movements could on its own have taken over and administered all of Angola, least of all while trying to outlaw and annihilate other liberation fighters—patriotic men, women and children who for years, and in difficult conditions, had fought and worked to liberate Angola. People who self-reliantly established, defended and extended liberated bases in Angola's countryside, in the face of imperialist 'pacification' campaigns and blandishments, will not accept being told by social imperialists, social democrats and armchair revolutionaries that they should surrender the fruits of victory and submit to a new domination.

Brezhnev, the modern Tsar, shrewdly calculated that if the Soviet Union provocatively declared its own interests in Angola before the Angolans could take over, advertised its intervention, and got those in MPLA and UNITA to fight each other, South Africa would get the cue to invade and overrun Southern Angola, including the bases of the Namibian liberation forces. Thus the Angolans would not be able to secure their borders (including the Cabinda enclave).

As soon as one liberation movement had been persuaded to fight to eliminate the others and monopolise political power, there began a carefully orchestrated campaign of propaganda and

intrigues, particularly intended to confuse African anti-imperialist forces. The Angolans are now being injured and killed with modern weapons no one gave them when they were fighting NATO-backed Portugal. They are being encouraged, with the help of foreigners, to fight and destroy one another. This is not a revolutionary, people's war. South Africa, the most dangerous, reactionary power within Africa, has been allowed to exploit the situation to its advantage and that of US imperialism.

If the people of Angola do not awake to their grave danger the liberation movement in Africa will be set back for years and it will be Ford, Brezhnev, Vorster and Smith who will celebrate the end of Portuguese rule. The OAU is trying to put pressure on the superpowers to leave Angola alone and China, in order not to aggravate matters, has stopped all her assistance. More than ever it is urgently necessary for genuine Marxists in Africa to help the masses to study and grasp the truth about the world situation. To see how fraudulent superpower detente is, and what the laws and mechanisms are which drive the imperialist superpowers—both the one they know well and the one that many are deceived by—is to be better armed ideologically for the new phase of the struggle against imperialism. This struggle will not soon be over; imperialism will not yield to moral appeals. But if truly progressive forces are united over Angola and succeed in driving imperialism and its agents out of the country, it will be an historic victory.

## TOWARDS A SOCIALIST COUNTRYSIDE

The National Conference on Agriculture, from 15th September to 19th October, was one of the most important held in China since liberation. The majority of the most responsible men and women in the Party and government took part. There were 3,700 delegates—from the Centre, the provinces and autonomous regions, the prefectures and counties. They began their discussions in Tachai and Hsiyang County and then moved to Peking. From the reports and articles,

and the talks that were given, especially those by Hua Kuo-feng and Chen Yung-kuei (both members of the CPC Political Bureau and vice-premiers), it is clear that the conference had been carefully organised and got through a lot of work. The Marxist standpoint was firmly maintained; the principles and policies already in practice, and actual experiences and problems in various parts of China, were studied by a total of 7,000 participants; and policy for further

development of the countryside during the rest of the decade was agreed on. Hua Kuo-feng, speaking at the conclusion of the conference, spelt out the main implications of the call to build Tachai-type counties throughout China and to complete basic mechanisation of farming by 1980.

To people who believe anti-communist and Soviet experts' reports on China it must seem either crazy or just bogus for the representatives of the 600 million

rural Chinese to set themselves such a task. If half of the 50,000 or so communes were to become Tachais (including those which have already done so) and to complete mechanisation by 1980 it would be a tremendous leap forward ideologically and economically. There are over 2,100 counties in China, a number with a population around half a million, a few with nearly a million. If only one-third of them, plus a large number of communes in other counties, could be called Tachais by 1980, the character of the world economy could, as we shall see, be changed decisively. That is why we cannot think of the results of the conference without excitement.

### **Agriculture the crucial problem**

To know whether or not this Party directive is based on scientific knowledge, precise information and correct assessment of the ideological level of the masses and their local leaders we must see the conference in its context. The problem of chronic and massive food shortage used to be more acute in China than almost anywhere else in the world. It was not, said Western experts, one that the Chinese could solve by themselves. For on the one hand there were very large and growing numbers of people needing work, food, shelter, clothing and education which they could not produce; on the other there were irredeemably backward peasants and impractical Communist ideologies! Techniques, know-how, leadership and capital were needed; only experts and benefactors from capitalist countries could provide them and show the way. To make it worth their while, foreign and local capitalists had to have incentives; otherwise famine-stricken China would be worse off than ever before. But for Marxists like Mao Tse-tung the main problems after liberation were essentially political rather than technical: socialist transformation, the persistent struggle of workers and peasants against bourgeois rule and exploitation, workers, peasants and cadres mastering Marxist philosophy and political economy in order to develop agriculture, industry and science self-reliantly—that would be the solution. The experts said that this was wrong. But they were not allowed into China and kept on 'reporting' that the Chinese economy was in a mess. Liu Shao-chi, who opposed the 'three red banners', followed bourgeois models, relied on bourgeois expertise and the motive of self-enrichment, was regarded abroad as a more 'practical' man. The failure of his policies, however, showed how hopeless capitalist remedies were.

Liu, like many China experts, regarded the demands of workers and poor peasants with a socialist outlook and enterprise as a serious threat to his plans to develop 'backward' China. A former agricultural labourer, Chen Yung-kuei of Tachai, did not at first seem a likely Communist to challenge Chairman Liu on an issue which was crucial for the socialist revolution. But that is what happened in this village in the inhospitable Taihang mountains. When Chen and his poor peasant neighbours persisted in the collectivising and putting socialist politics in command of agriculture they were repeatedly 'investigated' by Liu's men, reprimanded, and even dismissed from the brigade Party Committee. They stood their ground. The Tachai peasants turned their co-op into a brigade; they did not work blindly; collectively they studied, planned, solved problem after problem, transformed nature, and raised their grain yields to heights unheard of in that part of the country. Capitalist-inclined persons in positions of power, determined to discredit the brigade in any way possible, ended up by confirming the political integrity of its members and the genuineness of their achievements. It was while these Communists were defying Liu that Mao Tse-tung, in 1964, issued his call: 'In agriculture, learn from Tachai.'

### **Where do correct ideas come from?**

Mao, following Marx and Lenin, had taught that in revolutions the masses are the heroes and that it is in the course of their revolutionary struggle that the wheel of history moves forward.

It was only gradually that many Chinese Party comrades understood what it meant to 'practise Marxism, not revisionism' and to 'become a pupil of the masses'. When the peasants of Chiling in Honan took the initiative, under the impetus of the cooperativisation movement, and formed a People's Commune in 1958, Mao went there to learn what new thing they had done. After investigation he saw that it was a good thing and declared people's communes to be 'fine'. The Party decision on the formation of communes followed. To declare in 1964: 'learn from Tachai', was a bold step. Would Tachai pass the test? It was a real brigade, not an experimental group, but would its progress continue, in the terrifying struggle against nature, conservative ideas and powerful opposition? Would the much-admired Chen Yung-kuei and his colleagues become complacent? And could this heroic and resourceful brigade of only about 400 people in the Taihang mountains be an appropriate model of modern development for the whole of China?

Tachai continued to develop politically, mastering complex technical and economic problems and avoiding complacency, arrogance and adventurism. Its grain yield eventually reached over 8 tons per hectare, ten times its pre-liberation peak. Its members successfully began mechanisation by self-reliance, maintaining their impressive grain contribution to the state while diversifying production to such an extent that less than half their income is now from agriculture. They set up a school system which itself became a model, and produced two scientific studies, based on their experience, which were published in Peking. Above all, they helped to make the proletarian dictatorship more effectual.

After the overthrow, in the Cultural Revolution, of the bourgeois elements which had usurped leadership in the county of Hsiyang (where Tachai is), Chen Yung-kuei became one of the county CPC Secretaries. He led his colleagues out of their offices to where the problems were being tackled in practice. Working alongside the former poor peasants, and consulting them, the cadres began to change. They studied. Hsiyang started to learn from Tachai and to leave its backwardness behind. A better grasp of Marxist theory and method made comrades more scientific. In 1970 the county's grain yield was double that of 1967 and in 1972 treble. For a county of 200,000 people and a work force of 75,000 it was a notable achievement. Under good leadership, repudiating capitalist solutions and learning from Tachai, the Hsiyang communes and brigades turned Hsiyang County into a national model. The area is hit by natural disasters nine years out of ten but between 1967 and 1974 Hsiyang's people completed 7,452 construction projects and multiplied the irrigated area 37 times. The landscape changed radically. Basic mechanisation (83 per cent of the cost of which was borne by the county) has been achieved. Over 3,000 workers are operating, maintaining or managing farm machinery and equipment, and others are working in county industries or as blasting experts, masons and so on in capital construction.

As in Tachai, it was the primacy of proletarian politics which was the deciding factor. The relation between 'practising Marxism' and solving China's problems was being demonstrated. The reason for the backwardness of communes and counties with 'insoluble' problems was coming to be clearly understood by the peasants and workers. Other Tachais began to be created, and other Hsiyangs, as the masses under Communist leadership restricted and fought capitalism. These too became national models. A variety of problems—of financial management, scientific research, availability of electricity, pumps, tractors, construction of dams and channels, of underground water, better seeds, relations with workers in nearby cities, manufacturing, etc.—were being solved by the enterprise of peasants all over China who were reading and studying Marxist works and criticising bourgeois economics. Large communes, counties, even entire prefectures were reaching the most advanced levels. Provinces (e.g. Hopei, Kiangsu, Shanghai, Hunan) are doing the same. Given the variety of terrain,

climate, soil, water level, varying access to industrial centres, differences in experiences of revolutionary struggle and in political consciousness, this kind of development, based on original solutions, was essentially what Mao Tse-tung must have had in mind in launching the 'Learn from Tachai' campaign. The labouring masses have been the heroes of a great agricultural revolution.

The National Conference on Agriculture was therefore one in which experts did in fact participate, analysing the successes of the Tachai-type counties as well as the shortcomings of those which had failed to learn from Tachai. It is the solid achievement behind them that makes the plans of the leaders of counties, provinces and the country to do still better so impressive. They have made China self-sufficient in food and vastly increased yields and output of industrial crops. They have been mechanising. In Wuhsi County in Kiangsu there were only six tractors in 1965. Relying mainly on their own efforts after Liu's overthrow the people of the county built up county, commune and brigade industry. By 1974 there were 1,600 factories with a total industrial output, *Red Flag* reports, valued at 270 million yuan. There were also 994 power-operated irrigation stations, 1,446 km of underground tunnels constructed in the last nine years, and full or partial mechanisation of cultivation, threshing, irrigation and drainage, and processing grain and fodder. There are now 2,900 tractors. We can see what 'learning from Tachai', the Cultural Revolution, the Criticise Lin, Criticise Confucius campaign and the emphasis on the dictatorship of the proletariat have done for production.

#### The foundations of a socialist economy

Highly industrialised, populous Kiangsu may be called a Tachai-type province. Every one of its 64 counties has at least one fertiliser plant. Its 1974 grain output was 2.62 times that of

1949, its cotton output 15 times the 1954 total. Advanced as it is, it can be expected to advance further, as Tachai is doing. Vast areas of the Chinese countryside (the most extensive in the Third World) should thus be leaving behind the small production basis of agriculture as mechanisation and rural industrialisation speed up and make large scale planning and co-ordination a necessity for all. In China already over 20 million men and women have become workers just because of mechanisation in the countryside. Together with those engaged full-time or part-time in industry, mining, construction and scientific research in the rural areas and with the workers in the cities they form a considerable proportion of the Chinese population. This process is accelerating. By the end of the new campaign, in 1980, there will begin a new stage in the development of the workers' and peasants' immense power to serve human need. The world economy could then be, *in essence*, different from what it has been.

The movement to build Tachai-type counties throughout China is being led by the CPC Committees. It is part of the life-and-death struggle led by the working class against capitalism—at the very heart of it, in fact. What Huo Kuo-feng and Chen Yung-kuei said at the conference and what the Chinese people are doing has the greatest importance for the world, and not only for China. Under proletarian dictatorship capitalism's insoluble problems can be solved.

\* \* \*

The wealth of society is created by the workers, peasants and working intellectuals. If they take their destiny into their own hands, follow a Marxist-Leninist line and take an active attitude in solving problems instead of evading them, there will be no difficulty in the world which they cannot overcome.

Mao Tse-tung

## WOMEN'S WAR OF LIBERATION

International Women's Year is nearly over. In some ways it has been useful. It has shown that the worldwide and self-reliant fight of women against the old order has become too great a danger for the establishment to ignore. In one sense the 'Year' may be a concession to make women feel they are receiving some recognition, but it does fall at an important historical stage in the women's movement. In its middle-class form this movement has done valuable work in continuing the process whereby some of the inequalities inherited from earlier forms of class society are eliminated, thus carrying forward the bourgeois revolution which proposed the slogan of 'equality' to further the struggle against the appalling maze of feudal restrictions and privileges. This equality is really a qualified and relative concept, and the growing conservatism of the bourgeoisie makes this ever more apparent. To take the ruling class at its word and demand the actual content of equal rights is never a bad thing, so long as one does not spread illusions that such action can bring a fundamental change. As a result of women's agitation, job opportunities, wage rates, legal rights and education are less unequal than they used to be; some of the grosser, crueller forms of discrimination against women are being restricted.

Capitalism breaks down the old feudal oppression of women, the patriarchal family, yet it never achieves the substance of liberation; the hypocritical, pseudo-monogamous bourgeois family only makes the contradiction between form and substance still more glaring. Genuine realisation of equality between the sexes can only develop in the process of struggle against capital, against imperialism (capitalism's highest expression), against the bullying superpowers and their stooges. Antagonism is thereby concentrated against the real enemy; only thus can it disappear from other contradictions which remain, and will remain for a long time, among the working

people. The struggle to abolish sexism, along with racism, chauvinism, the outlook of a worker-aristocracy and other divisive influences, is a protracted and crucially important one; whatever the historical origin of such divisions, they have one main aspect today—they are pressed into the service of reaction and exploitation.

The advances of the women's movement in the west are major signs of the growing unity of working people around scientific revolutionary principle. The watchfulness and persistence of millions of working women is one sign that the proletariat is assuming its historic destiny. Meanwhile the people of the Third World face imperialist oppression in its most acute form; their mobilisation on a large scale is the most important development of recent history. 'Backwardness', as we know, can be a basis of revolution, because it gives rise to the desire for change, and the change in status of women in many third world countries, who have become front-rank freedom fighters, is a mighty refutation of imperialism and provides a forceful example to women as well as men elsewhere in the world.

In reaction to this mounting tide, the decaying forms of society are adopting some defensive measures. The placing of a handful of women in top positions in the state bureaucracy in many countries is only a manoeuvre designed to strengthen the existing system, just like the few concessions made to militant blacks or the encouragement of that odious upper stratum of the working class which serves the interest of capital. The old ruling classes in their decline always tend to promote individuals from oppressed classes who can bolster their legitimacy and ability to rule. This is true also in third-world countries, where individual women are placed at the head of certain reactionary regimes which oppress the masses of the people, and especially the women.

The content of bourgeois equality is the 'free' transaction in

which the capitalist hires the labourer, the crucial point being the capitalist's monopoly of the means of production. Within the day-to-day existence of capitalist society working people struggle to get the value of their labour-power, i.e. the cost of their subsistence as labourers and the reproduction of their class. Thus the value of a man's labour includes the cost of maintaining his family, at however miserable a standard. The unpaid labour he performs over and above the value of his labour-power is a source of profit to the capitalist. Capitalism's achievement in bringing other members of the family into production means that with the wife working (initially also the children) the man need only be paid his own keep. So his wages can be reduced (or prevented from keeping pace with a rise in prices), his unpaid labour becoming correspondingly greater as his paid labour becomes less. More important, women's work now becomes a source of surplus-value. Every struggle for the right to work, under capitalism, is a struggle for the right to be exploited, and that of women is no exception. But in this struggle, this resistance against capitalism, the working class finds its historical orientation towards the long-range goal of the abolition of the wages system. Having won certain rights, women are becoming and will become the most militant revolutionaries; they realise from excellent personal experience that there is no point in going back to the old state of affairs or remaining in the present condition. In essence the movement for women's liberation is a war of liberation; as Lenin puts it:

The business of the bourgeoisie is to promote trusts, to drive women and children into the factories, to torture them there, to corrupt them, to condemn them to extreme

poverty. We do not 'demand' such a development. We do not 'support' it; we fight it. But *how* do we fight? We know that trusts and the employment of women in industry are progressive. We do not want to go back to the handicraft system, to premonopolistic capitalism, to domestic drudgery for women. Forward through the trusts, etc., and beyond them to Socialism! (*The War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution*)

The struggle for socialism needs to bring all groups in which ordinary people exist and organise their lives into contact with scientific socialist theory, whose key is the Marxist theory of the state. The founders of this theory grasped the fundamental connection between the development of the family (the development of woman's exploitation by men), class exploitation, and the function of the state. This makes it easy to see why women are playing and must play such an important role in promoting change. 'This socialism is the *declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally.* . . .' (Marx). At present a new relationship of comradeship and equality among women and men proletarians is developing in the flames of struggle against imperialism, but this change will be by no means one of short duration. Division of labour between men and women preceded other forms, and the subjection of women lies at the very origins of class society, the slave-owning state. The dictatorship of the proletariat is needed precisely in order to raise political struggle to a higher level; this applies also, and especially, to the liberation of women, a major motive force in the long-term struggle to abolish class society.

## STRENGTHENING UNITY

The Western press has recently featured reports of troubles in China, this time in Chekiang Province and its capital, Hangchow. Western visitors, it was said, had been unable to visit the city and there were rumours of dissension and strikes.

Even if these reports are true, what is so terrible about strikes? As long ago as 1957 Mao Tse-tung referred to small numbers of people who had been involved in such events. Analysing the situation briefly he had no word of blame for the strikers but criticised mainly 'bureaucracy on the part of the leadership and lack of educational work among the masses.' (*On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People.*)

Though the Cultural Revolution concentrated much of its fire on bureaucracy, and did so very effectively, it still exists in China. Though the masses are far better educated politically than they were in 1957, education will never be completed. So no one should be surprised that the new Constitution of the PRC contains specific provision for the right to strike.

The fact is that struggle is a sign of life and without struggle there can be no progress; no one should expect that it will cease. Bourgeois habits of working and thinking exist everywhere and it is through fighting them that advances are made and new objectives fixed. If there was no struggle in China the outlook would indeed be black.

It is interesting to review some of the broadcasts from the area in question during the period August-October this year. They show that struggle increased labour enthusiasm and benefited output. Many of them speak of a 'new situation' in places of work, *as a result of struggle* for clarification and understanding of the political line. At a meeting organised by the Provincial Committee of the CPC, a speaker on behalf of the Committee said:

Many leading cadres, with high spirits and soaring fighting will, are leading the broad masses to struggle against the class enemy, capitalist tendencies, bourgeois factionalism and various erroneous ideas. As a result, a new situation has emerged, characterised by stability and unity and efforts to build socialism in a big way.

The Hangchow Steam Turbine Works, reporting on their study programme, said that production had gone up; output was more than double that of a year before. In the Hangchow Silk Combine 'revolution develops vigorously and production goes up every day'. At the Hangchow Electrothermal Workshop 'a seething, militant atmosphere prevails . . . the workers have overcome one difficulty after another'.

Out of struggle unity emerges.

## CHRISTMAS GIFTS

We remind readers that a subscription to BROADSHEET will give pleasure and, better still, enlightenment, for a whole year. In the same way any of the Thomson paperbacks will provide intellectual food for a long time to come. The new edition of *From Marx to Mao Tse-tung* is 75p but *Capitalism and After* and *The Human Essence* are still 70p each. Postage is included, but cash with order, please, to this office.

The other day we had a very generous donation which was an expression of gratitude for George Thomson's qualities as a teacher at Birmingham University a good many years ago. We do not always know when we sow a seed, but it is never lost.

### ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES from January 1976

SURFACE MAIL U.K.:	SEALED £2.00	OPEN
U.S., Canada, Europe, China, Hong Kong, Japan, Aus., N.Z.:	£2.85 (\$8.60)	£1.80 (\$6.00)
All other countries:	£2.00	£1.25
AIR MAIL		
U.S., Canada, Hong Kong:	£3.85 (\$11.20)	£2.50 (\$7.85)
China, Japan, Aus., N.Z.:	£4.40	£2.85
All other countries:	£2.70	£1.75

No air mail rates to Europe.  
U.K. ISSN 0067-2052.