

**July, 1972**  
**Information from Consultative Meeting about China July 3-5, 1972 on International Policy and Internal Situation of the People's Republic of China (PRC) under Current Conditions**

**Citation:**

"Information from Consultative Meeting about China July 3-5, 1972 on International Policy and Internal Situation of the People's Republic of China (PRC) under Current Conditions," July, 1972, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, National Archive, Prague, CPCz CC presidium 1971-1976, box 49, arch. sign. 49

<http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/110272>

**Summary:**

A lengthy document that addresses several issues related to Communism and China. It covers such topics as Chinese foreign policy, Chinese and American relations, Maoism, Chinese policy regarding developing countries, capitalist countries and other socialist countries.

**Original Language:**

Czech

**Contents:**

- English Translation

2690

IV/b

Confidential

On international policy and internal situation of the People's Republic of China (PRC) under current conditions

Introductory theses

The period of time which has elapsed from the last meeting of the representatives of international departments (February 1971) has been influenced by important events of international importance: 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and congresses of a number of fraternal parties of socialist countries, a meeting of the leading representatives of our countries held in Crimea, a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact (January 1972), adoption of a complete program for further cooperation and development of the socialist economic integration of the countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), which resulted in further reinforcement of the unity and solidarity of fraternal parties and countries, and mainly those parties and countries which are participating in this meeting.

The success of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist community in their policy of improving the international climate in Europe and the whole world is indisputable. The Soviet Union, Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany have entered into agreements, which our party regards as a historical milestone. Another event of international importance were the constructive talks with President of the USA which took place in Moscow and Warsaw in May 1972. All the aforesaid indicates that the Lenin's idea of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems is being brought into life through concrete contractual and legal forms, and thus gathers strength.

The recent period of time clearly showed that through mutual effort of socialist countries and Marxist-Leninist parties it is possible to weaken and divert the negative impacts of the activities of Chinese leaders within the world political arena. Imperialism and anti-communism, despite their continuous efforts to use Beijing's policy for their own benefit, did not manage to change the distribution of power to the disadvantage of peace, democracy and socialism. The world socialist community now hold an active, offensive position in the fight against imperialism and reactionary forces. And Beijing must keep this in mind.

Everyday life has proved the correctness of conclusions made at the Moscow Meeting of communist and workers' parties held in 1969 as well as at various congresses of the CP of the Soviet Union and other fraternal parties, that the anti-Leninism ideas of Mao Zedong are empty and hollow. Unscientific concepts

of Maoism which still form the basic factor in the development of Chinese reality prevent any solution of basic social and economic problems, give rise to crisis situations in the country, distort the socialist features of the base and well as the superstructure, cause harm to the socialist conveniences of Chinese working people. Chinese leaders repeatedly declare their loyalty to the ideas of Mao Zedong, but in order to cope with everyday problems, they make changes to their internal policy despite the fact that these changes are contrary to Maoist principles.

The years which elapsed since our first meeting in Moscow in December 1967 have proved that carrying out mutual analyzes of Chinese problems is very useful. The analysis of the foreign policy and internal situation of China plays a very positive role in the preparation of political assessment and specification of the direction our parties should take in their ideological, propagandistic and scientific and research activities. Such analyzes are particularly necessary and important in the context of the changes in the international position of the PRC and foreign activities of Chinese leaders, and new factors in the internal development of China. The processes which take place in both areas are not only related to China. They also concern the international authority of scientific socialism, interests of the socialistic community, communist movement and national liberation movement. Marxist-Leninist parties and socialist countries are, like many times before, forced to fight on two fronts: against imperialism and against "left" and "right" opportunists headed by Maoists. This multilateral fight requires new aspects to be taken into consideration under current conditions.

## I. On foreign political activities of Chinese leaders

### 1. Changes in the international position of PRC, and Beijing's objectives

The two last years witnessed significant changes in the international position of China and large activation of Chinese foreign policy. During the last one and half years, PRC has been recognized by 27 countries. The total number of countries maintaining diplomatic relations with Beijing reached 77. 26th General Assembly of the United Nations restored the rights of PRC in this organization. There are serious changes in the relations between China and the USA, between China and Western European countries including the UK and a number of countries in Asia and Africa. Beijing is also penetrating Latin America. PRC has been developing their economic and business relations; the volume of economic support China provides to other countries is growing. This largely increases China's importance in international affairs. The possibilities for Chinese leaders to fulfil their hegemonic ambitions are growing. All the aforesaid can be explained by many different factors:

The first one is closely associated with the long-term straggle of Chinese working people against imperialism, consistent and determined support of this

fight provided by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as well as by international anti-imperialist forces. A certain role was also played by the fact that the most far-sighted representatives of imperialist circles found it necessary to become closer to Maoists as their allies in their fight against the world revolutionary movement. The crisis of foreign political situation in the period of “cultural revolution” forced Maoists to modify and change their tactics to achieve their strategic objectives which remains the same. Chinese leaders want to gain time to reinforce their internal as well as international position and then use it to realize their long-term global tasks.

Activation in the area of Beijing's foreign policy is accompanied by flexible methods and high level of adaptability to the current political realities. Beijing uses every possible way to demonstrate their “peacefulness”, desire to develop their relations with various countries. They stand out against interference in the matters of other countries, for peaceful coexistence, for peaceful solution of disputes and problems.

Simultaneously, Chinese leaders are making every effort to achieve their recognition as a super-power and to take a position of spokesman of the national liberation movement and developing countries. They are trying to weaken the international position of countries regarded as opponents by Beijing. In relation to this, Beijing gives first priority to the fight against the Soviet Union and its allies, while their hostility towards the USA has fallen into the shade.

Primary tasks of the current foreign policy activation of Beijing:

- Use the concept of fighting against the “hegemony of two super-powers” to become a spokesman of “the third world”, to ally with as many developing and other small and middle-sized countries as possible (including capitalist and some socialist countries), and to reinforce China's position as a world political center. Maoist propaganda (see for example Journal “Chug-Chi”, issue 4 – 6, 1972) has been promoting a geopolitical theory which claims that the Soviet Union and the USA “are heading towards their end” and their position must be, naturally, taken over by China.
- Through development of relations with Western European countries to reinforce the international position of the PRC, to speed up the growth of military-industrial and, in particular, rocket and nuclear potential. Official Chinese representatives expressly declare that they are determined to draw on the scientific-technical and technological experience of the USA, Japan and Western European countries.
- They use more subtle methods when intensifying their disruptive activities aimed at countries of the socialist community, communist and national liberation movement. Through a differentiated approach they are trying to weaken the

relationship of socialist countries and to set them against each other.

- To suppress the foreign policy activities of their potential opponents and to enable China to operate with a free hand in the international arena with an aim to intensify the tension in international relations, in particular between the Soviet Union and the USA, Soviet Union and Japan and between any of these countries and other countries and thus remove the increasing danger of war from their own borders.

The main tendencies of foreign policy activities of Chinese leaders were clearly revealed as early as at the meeting of communist and workers' parties in June 1969. It was pointed out at the meeting that the foreign policy of China diverged significantly from proletarian internationalism and lost its class and socialist content and that Chinese leaders only speak about their fight against imperialism but do nothing. In this way, they support imperialism both directly and indirectly. Imperialists use the current foreign orientation of Beijing as a trump card in their political fight against world socialist and liberation movements.

## 2. Chinese-American rapprochement

Nixon's visit to China – it is not an isolated event. It needs to be analyzed in relation to general strategic and tactical objectives of both parties. If it just involved normalization of relations between two countries, there would be no reason for worries. But the USA shifted their focus towards China only after Chinese military provocations on the borders with the Soviet Union and gets stronger hand in hand with intensification of Beijing's anti-socialist activities. This finally persuaded Washington that Beijing does not intend to create a united front with socialist countries against imperialism. The fact that Chinese leaders refused to act jointly with the socialist countries in Indochina has just confirmed the validity of previous conclusions. The present rapprochement of Maoists with American ruling circles were preceded by long-term secret contacts arranged through diplomatic way or with the help of various agents or mediators. Some information concerning this issue has already been provided earlier. The authorship of e.g. Edgar Snow has been openly confirmed by the Deputy Chairwoman of the PRC, Mrs Sung Ching-Lin in an article in the journal "China Reconstructs" issue 5, 1972. Recently, the government of the USA published a two-volume collection of documents dealing with the American-Chinese relations in 1946. Besides others, this collection contains cipher telegrams and reports from General Marshall, who was at that time a special representative of American President in China, on his discussions with Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai. These documents repeatedly express the idea that the Chinese leaders are prepared to enter into an agreement with the Americans. On 31st January 1946, Zhou Enlai confirmed to Marshall that the leaders of the Communist Party of China are determined "to cooperate with the USA in matters of local as well

as national significance". In his telegram to Trumann, Marshall reports: "Chinese communists, whose final aim is to achieve socialism, do not believe it is possible to achieve this in the nearest future..." They are trying to "implement a political similar to the one in the USA". Zhou Enlai referred to Mao Zedong and assured Marshall that if Mao ever travels abroad "he will first travel to the USA (not to Moscow) because the USA, according to his opinions, can provide knowledge about many things China can benefit from". The documents to the State Department contain numerous comments suggesting that Chinese leaders "have already developed their own version of Marxism and their own tradition", that "Chinese communists have nationalistic tendencies and many of their achievements have been made on the basis of nationalism". The documents especially emphasize that leaders like Zhou Enlai and Mao Zedong "will definitely not firmly adhere to the communist platform."

It is without doubt that if the USA and PRC are not heading towards mutual dealings and rapprochement, each of them is following their own global policy.

The United States of America naturally take into account a large number of factors – in the first place, the growth of China's influence on the international situation in Asia and the whole world as well as China's chances to become a super-power in the nearest future, equipped with modern rocket and nuclear weapons. Washington counts on using the Maoist leaders and their anti-communism to undermine the increasing authority of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist community, in their fight against the international communist movement and against various national liberation forces. White House is also aware of Beijing's fear of the potential growth of the military and political power of Japan, they monitor China's attempts to gain political influence in the developing countries (they explain Nixon's visit in China as their "victory" over imperialism), and through the rapprochement with the USA to become a member of the players in the widest international arena. The Americans are obviously trying to use the improved relations with China to withdraw from the war in Vietnam under favorable conditions, to create a relatively stable and advantageous balance of power in Asia, to stop the increasing influence of the Soviet Union and world socialist in this area and to restrict the economic and political activity of Japan. Another important long-term aspect is the interest of American monopolies in the potentials of Chinese market connected with their aim to acquire positions which will allow them to influence the internal and international policy of PRC.

For Chinese leaders Nixon's visit was a step toward their goal they set for China – to reach a position of a super-power as soon as possible. Chinese leaders expected that Nixon's visit will help them reduce the conflicts between PRC and the USA, mainly in Asia – the main arena for conflict of interests of the two countries. Obviously, the aim of the Chinese-American rapprochement was not only to exert pressure on Japan enabling China to get a better position within

Chinese-Japanese relations, but also to prevent Japan from reinforcing and extending their positions in South-East and South Asia, which largely concern the Chinese leaders. China wanted to achieve a gradual departure of the USA from their policy of support to Chiang Kai-shek as well as an acceptable solution of Taiwan issue. Beijing also relies on gradual development of conditions for economic cooperation with the USA, which could largely increase their financial and military potential.

To achieve all the aforesaid, Chinese leaders make open concessions to Washington (which is mainly evidenced by another invitation of Kissinger in June 1972) and they have intensified their pressure on Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV).

A preliminary analysis of the results of Chinese-American talks suggests a conclusion that the Chinese-American rapprochement is far beyond the scope of establishment and development of normal relations between two world powers. It is directed against the interests of all socialist countries and particularly against the Soviet Union.

It is interesting that the description of Chinese position in the Chinese-American communiqué lacks any reference to socialist countries, their importance and role in the fight for peace and international security. It, naturally, was an intentional move, just like the format of the communiqué, in which the USA and PRC separately described their opinions and standpoints. This enabled Chinese leaders to show their fundamental class policy, but they did not do it.

We do not want to exaggerate the level of rapprochement between Washington and Beijing and we do not think that Nixon's visit to PRC led to any direct cahoots between PRC and the USA. The meeting in Beijing did not remove the basic contradictions between the USA and Maoist China. We will judge the results of it from the activity carried out by the governments of both countries.

The American doctrine of "containment without isolation" is still valid presuming that the development and extension of contacts with the People's Republic of China will not in any way limit the severe and resolute measures against Chinese people in South-East Asia. There is still fierce competition between China and the USA in the area of the whole Asia and the Pacific region. Nixon's administration is aware that the Soviet Union with its allies is not only the main opponent but also the main partner of the United States in the international arena, which can not be excluded from the solution of any serious problem. In our opinion it would be unwise to underestimate the importance of the results of the talks between the USA and PRC and their agreement in the long-term interests of both parties which have been incorporated into the mutual part of the communiqué. In fact, this whole action can be summarized as a beginning of the coordination of activities in important international issues, which was first

demonstrated in the recent events on the Indian subcontinent.

Experts on China agree almost unanimously that Nixon and Chinese leaders have entered into a special non-aggression pact. Under different conditions, this measure would definitely contribute to the easing of international tensions. However, under current conditions, where Chinese leaders continue with their murderous policy against the Soviet Union and the USA wage a dirty war in Indochina, this situation can be described as a free hand given by the USA to China concerning their operations "in the North" i.e. against the Soviet Union, and a guarantee given by China not to interfere in American operations in Vietnam and other countries of Indochina.

The meeting of Chinese leaders with Nixon clearly demonstrated that neither of them intends to contribute to the security of peace and international safety. The Chinese-American communiqué tiptoes around the most important suggestions of the United Nations directed against the arms race, calling for an international conference on disarmament, for political settlement of the situation in the Near East etc. Nixon's visit to China has laid foundations for the development of relations between the USA and PRC. It constitutes a serious move towards the coordination of efforts of Maoists and American ruling circles with an aim to change the distribution of power in the world and to cause harm to the socialist community and the Anti-Imperialist Front of Nations.

From the intensity of political contacts between the USA and PRC and the new round of talks during Kissinger's recent visit to Beijing, the regular secret talks between the ambassadors in Paris we can conclude that the tendencies of Chinese-American rapprochement are becoming stable. At the same time it is necessary to keep in mind that Nixon's visit to the PRC did not remove the existing contradictions between the USA and Maoist China. Both parties will undoubtedly continue to struggle for the reinforcement of their positions in Asia and their interests in this area will inevitably come into conflict.

### 3. Activation of Chinese policy in relation to developing countries

After Nixon's visit to China, Chinese propaganda have focused their political activity on the representatives of developing countries, trying to show the results of the Chinese-American talks in the most suitable way to serve their purposes. The way Chinese representatives present the whole matter is that by inviting Nixon Beijing was trying to prevent the possibility of "Soviet-American conspiracy" and during the talks Beijing promoted the interests of "third-world" countries. At present, Beijing is using another strategy. They declare their membership of the group of developing countries trying to achieve a hegemonic position from the inside. However, China's claims for the status of a developing country are unacceptable, because China belongs among super-powers and is a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council. It is a nuclear super-



power with the most numerous land army in the world spending more than 1/3 of their budget for military purposes. Under the cover of their fight against “super-powers” the current Chinese leaders demand China to be recognized as a super-power and is already trying to dictate to developing countries how to behave and who to keep in touch with and to what extent.

Behind a façade of friendship with African and Asian countries, Maoist leaders do not intend to pay the smallest attention to the interests of these countries. The current China ended up on the part of the military-terrorist regime of Yahya Khan and Sudanese reactionaries, because it was required by China's interests on Indian subcontinent and in the Eastern parts of Africa.

The unwillingness of Chinese leaders to identify with the needs of the nations of Asia, Africa, Latin America was clearly demonstrated when China entered the United Nations. Despite expectations of developing countries, Chinese delegation uses their rights to oppose solutions to important international problems (disarmament, Near East crisis, conflict in Hindustan) being hand in glove with the imperialist super-powers, in particular with the USA.

Following their super-power hegemonic ambitions, Beijing uses the support they provide to developing countries as a means of political pressure. For example, when political relations with Burma got worse, the government of PRC immediately stopped any financial support to this country and withdrew Chinese experts. As a result of this, the construction of various buildings and objects in this country remained unfinished for a very long time. Despite promises from Chinese representatives, many countries could only use 20% - 25% of the promised help, because Beijing was consistently avoiding the fulfillment of their obligations. This way, in the 60s, China failed to grant promised loans to Ceylon, Guinea, Burma, Cambodia. In the course of 11 years (1958-1969) China only met 20% of their financial obligations intended for the construction of production plants in various African countries.

At present, the largest activity of Beijing is directed towards Pakistan, Ceylon, Zambia, Mali, Somalia and Congo (Brazzaville). These countries represent 2/3 of all Chinese support provided to developing countries. Thanks to a special liking to these countries, China provides them with long-term interest-free loans. However, like before, the process of granting the loans is relatively slow: at the end of 1971 only about 30% of the promised loans was actually provided.

By encouraging “third-world” countries to focus on the development of light industry and agriculture, Chinese support does not help the countries establish their own industrial basis thus does not solve the basic problems of their economic development. Thus they doom these countries to dependence on developed capitalist countries and – under the conditions of scientific-technical revolution – to even greater and greater backwardness. This is why we find

extremely dangerous the repeated efforts of Maoists to damage the mutual relations between developing countries and the Soviet Union together with other socialist countries, and to force the “third world” to establish closed economic groups with China as the founder.

The biggest problem in the “third world” in the previous period was the situation in the Near East and the escalated situation on Indian peninsula.

Chinese leaders are in favor of solving the issue of the Near East by force of arms. They declare the necessity for all Arabian countries and nations to act in concord and in unity, relying on the increase of extremist spirits in Arabian countries, while interpreting the complicated situation in such a way which can result in isolation of Arabian countries and deepening of contradictions between them. Beijing is trying to base their policy on the fact that neither the Resolution of the Security Council date 22 November 1967 nor the liquidation of damages caused by Israel aggression in 1967 – if it is ever carried out – will solve all the problems related to the establishment of the State of Israel in 1947.

As demonstrated by the visit of Mahmud Riad, special adviser of the President of Egypt for foreign affairs, to China in March this year, Beijing leaders have not given up their attempts to prevent political a political solution to the conflict and keeps encouraging Arabian nations to use their military forces and “strike”.

The events that shook the Indian subcontinent are very well known. Also the results of these events are very well known. The righteous standpoint of India and the legitimate right of Bangladesh people to decide on their own future has won. The military pressure-group of Pakistan, which was pursuing its goal to keep the colony in East Bengal under their control and which was providing support to Pakistan reactionary forces together with the USA and China, has suffered a crushing defeat. It is necessary to point out that multilateral and determines measures of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries played an important role by preventing the USA and PRC from interfering into the Indian-Pakistan war and thus enabled in a relatively short period of time the elimination the danger of a military conflict and recognition of the sovereign rights of the East Bengal people. We can not ignore the fact that at a certain moment the USA together with China managed to gain support from the majority of votes in the United Nations (104 votes) counting on a presumption that not all the countries of the “third world” will be well informed about who is in the right and who is guilty in the conflict. The existing evidence – including the Chinese-American communiqué – suggest that China and the imperialist powers have not abandoned their plans and goals in this area and tried to manoeuvre the situation in such a way to make the young Bangladesh state fall under their sphere of influence. Recently, after suffering the defeat of their policy on the Indian peninsula, Chinese leaders has started to change their strategy. They abandoned their Indian campaign and started to prepare the grounds for the

recognition of Bangladesh.

Beijing still regards the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America as their main potential allies. The existence of nationalist and sometimes even extremist spirits in these countries makes it easier for China to exercise their influence. Besides, Beijing learned from the experience in the last years that the extremes in their foreign policy during “cultural revolution” caused that many countries diverged from China. This is why Chinese leaders now abandoned their strategy of forcing “the ideas of Mao Zedong” upon “the third world” in an open way. Beijing is trying to normalize relations which were seriously damaged or broken off during the period of “cultural revolution”. They have re-established their diplomatic relations with Tunisia and Ghana, and have commenced a process of normalization of relations with Burma, Mali, Kenya and a number of other countries. China has focused on the development of cooperation with the representatives of the ruling circles and ruling parties of Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippines. Chinese leaders have changed their previous negative attitude towards the “Non-Aligned Movement”. They are now supporting this movement with an obvious objective to increase their influence on non-aligned countries and to win a reputation of a determined warrior fainting against any power blocs and to get associated with the movement of “non-Aligned” countries.

The Beijing's foreign policy has a new feature – growing interest in the area of Indian Ocean. Chinese leaders have probably started to perform their task to develop China into a maritime power and they are already trying to gain a strong position in countries of that area, to force the USA out of these countries, to counteract the penetration efforts of Japan, and to weaken the positions of socialist countries, and particularly of the Soviet Union. To carry out their plans, China would like to obtain a guarantee from Pakistan, Ceylon, Tanzania and some other countries of East Africa and Arabian Peninsula. Here, the Chinese leaders sometimes proceed hand in glove with the UK.

Strong evidence that Chinese leaders do not desire to strengthen peace in Asia lies with the fact that they are against the establishment of a collective security system in this area.

#### 4. Some features of Chinese relations with developed capitalist countries

We have been talking about relations between China and capitalist countries and the main goal of these relations – Chinese-American rapprochement. It should be pointed out that the basis of the Chinese policy in this area is their effort to use developed capitalist countries as an active force in Chinese fight against “one of the two super-powers”, in particular against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

An important role in Beijing's global strategy is played by Japan. China is trying

to establish strong relations with Japan and gain a political ally in their fight against the Soviet Union and the USA. Simultaneously, Beijing is trying to prevent the advancement of the position of Japan as a competitor of China.

Chinese representatives promote relations with the leaders of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, which is evidenced e.g. by talks arranged between Zhou Enlai and Miki in spring 1972, with a leader of the opposition in the Liberal Democratic Party, Sato, and with one of the candidates for Prime Minister. During these talks Zhou Enlai repeatedly pointed out the necessity to prepare grounds for the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between China and Japan after Sato leaves.

Recently, the development of Chinese-Japanese relations has become more complicated due to large deposits of oil in the area Tiao-ii-iao (Senkaku) islands, claimed by both China and Japan.

Beijing leaders are trying to hamper the stabilization process in Europe. They are trying to present the whole matter as if it is detrimental to the interests of China. Chinese leaders have focused on the development of their relations with large capitalist European countries and are flirting with the European Economic Community, the opponent of Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA).

Simultaneously, Beijing continues to activate their external economic policy. Even though limited financial capacity of the country restricts the scope of individual operations, preliminary analyzes suggest that foreign trade of the PRC in 1971 increased by 9% compared to 1970 and amounted to Ruble 4.3 billion.

The structure of China export has not changed much. There is a certain effort to increase the import of machinery and technologies. Capitalist countries have remained to be the main business partners of Japan with approx. 76% share in the total foreign trade of China.

## 5. On China's relations with socialist countries

Maoists continue with their effort to gradually weaken and disintegrate the socialist community, to knock down individual countries to isolate one from the other. Beijing regards those countries which act jointly and uniformly with the Soviet Union as "revisionist" and tries to bring the rest under their direct influence. The policy of differentiated approach largely depends on the nature of relations between China and the particular country and on the current requirements, and ranges from exerting severe pressure to offering loans and free help and support, giving promises to develop trade, financial, scientific-technical and cultural cooperation etc.

Chinese leaders even deny the existence of socialist community as such.

“Socialist community – it is a nonsense” – declared the current Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the PRC, Ju Chang. As a counterweight, Beijing promotes an idea of loosely connected regional groups with Beijing playing the main part. For example, the Chinese suggested creating a bloc of “six countries” in Asia (China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV), democratic forces from the South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia), which, however, was not supported by majority of the potential members. In Europe, Beijing is promoting the idea of establishing a closed group of Balkan states.

In Maoist propaganda, only Albania, DPRK, DRV and Romania are regarded as socialist countries. Chinese maintain relations with these countries at all levels, including inter-party contacts and exchanges of delegations at the highest level. Despite this, there are disputes emerging periodically between China and its partners.

Relations between China and Albania are presented by Beijing as “an example of ideal relations between socialist countries”. Regardless of this, Albania has responded very coldly to the Chinese-American rapprochement.

Relations between China and DRV seem to be very friendly a close from the outside and they became very complicated in relation to Nixon's visit to Beijing and Chinese-American rapprochement.

Relations between China and Korea, which underwent a certain development in 1971, are limited by different attitudes of the two parties to a large number of internal political as well as international problems.

Relations between China and Romania have been promoted on the basis of mutual recognitions of a special position within the socialist system and within the international communist movements, but Beijing is not in a hurry with the development of the bilateral relations of these two countries.

Relations between China and the Soviet Union have not undergone any significant changes in the last period. Like in the past, Chinese leaders stuck to their anti-soviet positions and did not show willingness to continue with the process normalization of relations with our country. The Soviet-Chinese talks on border issues did not make any progress due to artificial obstacles created by the Chinese delegation. Also Soviet proposals for further improvements in the international relations in other areas have met with resistance from Chinese leaders. Beijing tries to use their presence at the international forum, mainly in the United Nations, to attack socialist countries and mainly the Soviet Union. Our party puts up necessary resistance to their manifestation of open and violent Anti-Sovietism. Simultaneously, without abandoning our Marxist-Leninist positions and renouncing the state interests of the Soviet Union and other

fraternal countries, our country believes that improvement and development of relations between the Soviet Union and PRC is in the interest of their nations, the whole socialist system, peace and social progress.

## 6. Maoists' disruptive activity in communist movement

It is a well-known fact, that the efforts of Chinese leaders to achieve a hegemonic position in the international communist movement have suffered a defeat: only communist parties of Albania, New Zealand, Burma, Malaysia and Thailand have fallen under the influence of Maoists. Also Beijing's attempts to create a counterweight to the communist movement by establishing their own political movement of international scope based on "Marxist-Leninist" disruptive groups have failed. These Beijing's groups have very few members, they do not have any authority over working masses and they keep breaking up.

After the "Cultural Revolution", leaders of the Communist Party of China have resorted to a more flexible strategy. Without abandoning support provided by Pro-Maoist groups in various countries, Beijing keeps trying to win the favor of those parties which hold a special position in relation to Beijing's disintegrating activities. Typical moves in this perspective lies with the effort to promote and develop relations with the Vietnam Workers' Party, Korean Workers' Party, Communist Party of Romania, Communist Party of Spain, efforts directed towards the Communist Party of Italy (Jakovjello's and Pavolini's visits to China in 1970 – 1971).

At the same time, Beijing leaders publish their intention to persevere in their fight against the international communist movement, to support pro-Beijing groups. In an anniversary article "On the Fiftieth Birthday of the Communist Party of China" dated 1st July 1971, the focus of the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China was specified as a "fundamental fight between two lines of the international working-class movement" and a "disputation on the principal line of the international communist movement". The authors of the article praise the activities of the foreign disintegrators and say: "Our victory is inseparable from their support. We will be grateful forever, we will never forget." The article declares that "tireless revealing a criticism of the current revisionism, whose center is the Soviet revisionism and bringing the fight to an end" is "the international obligation" of the Communist Party of China. Just as Zhou Enlai expressed in the discussions with the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Party of Chile in spring 1972, the Communist Party of China does not intend to join the international communist and working-class movement.

On the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Communist Party of China, Beijing received greetings from the disintegrating groups. Texts of these greetings were published under large headlines in Chinese press, headed by

letters sent by the disintegrators from Australia, New Zealand, Indonesia, Burma and Poland. The letters contained verbal attacks against the Soviet Union and praised Mao Zedong, who was said “to made an unrivaled and genial contribution to Marxism-Leninism and to the international revolutionary movement”, declared China to be “the leader of the international working-class movement”, “the basis of the world revolution”, “the holder of priceless spiritual nuclear weapon – Mao Zedong's ideas” etc. All the press within the PRC published greetings from 35 disintegrating groups.

During the second half of 1971, Beijing hosted 48 delegations from various Pro-Maoist foreign organizations. On 30th September 1971, the department for international relations of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China arranged the first banquet for disintegrators and invited more than 200 representatives of “fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations”.

Chinese leaders instruct foreign Maoists to follow the objectives set by Beijing in the area of foreign policy, mainly to promote and facilitate the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and various counties. To achieve this, Beijing recommends their followers in Western Europe to refrain from any severe forms of fight. Simultaneously, pro-Beijing organizations continue to fan hatred against socialist countries. So at the beginning of 1972 the leaders of “the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Italy” sent a circular letter to their local departments, containing angry verbal attacks against the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland and other socialist countries.

The relations between China and the USA which were activated at the beginning of 1971, and particularly the visit of President Nixon to the PRC caused a certain concern among the foreign Maoists and increased the dissension between members of the small group of Beijing's “parties”.

The subversive activity of the Maoist leaders has recently undergone some changes. Beijing is taking various measures with the aim to dissipate the mistrust of communist and workers' parties towards them. Maoist leaders are trying to hide (or even maybe remove) extremist aspects in their policy; they have stopped their attacks against many communist parties, they are removing such thesis from their propaganda which cause objections and are trying to give it an acceptable shape – Maoism under a mask of Marxism.

At the present time, Chinese leaders avoid lecturing communist parties through their propaganda, as they did before. They present their ideas and opinions as if they do not want to impose their opinion and experience to anybody. They describe Mao Zedong as a true Marxist and provide evidence suggesting that he was trying to apply Marxism-Leninism to the special conditions of China and Chinese revolution and thus “promoted, protected and developed Marxism-Leninism”. Maoist declare their intention to “stick firmly to proletarian

internationalism”, and never accept “the arrogant superpower and megalomaniac chauvinism “, declare that their “contribution to world revolution is still totally negligible”, and express their preparedness to “learn from the revolutionary nations of other countries”.

The same purpose – to create a more likable image of the current Chinese leaders – is served by changes in the foreign policy strategy declaring the return to the principles of peaceful coexistence and activation of foreign political activities of more reserved nature.

As they are promoting their new strategy towards the communist movement, Maoists more and more count on making use of various separatist and nationalist tendencies. We need to admit, that there are suitable conditions for this strategy.

It is absolutely typical for this period of time, that in autumn 1971 leaders of Romanian, Spanish, Italian, Japanese and some other parties arranged bilateral meetings which confirmed and reinforced nationalist principle and separatism, which were previously expressed individually. In their public speeches during the meetings and in joint communiqués they repeatedly referred to “independence” and “autonomy” etc. which in the context of these declarations expressed their effort to liberate from internationalist obligations in relation to other fraternal parties and the whole communist movement.

Besides, they indirectly suggest that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union itself belong among the forces against which it is necessary to protect the “autonomy” and “independence” of their parties and countries.

Beijing shows a high level of flexibility in this matter. They do not require the leaders of the aforesaid communist parties to openly express their anti-Sovietism and they are quite happy about their “neutral” attitude to Maoism. However, the leaders of the Communist Party of China use every opportunity to provoke manifestations of nationalism, encourage leaders of the parties to establish “national fronts” of communism under the pretense of applying Marxism in consideration of the concrete situation. Especially here, on the way of revision of the general principles of socialist revolution and socialistic construction, there is evident blending of various opportunist movements with Maoism.

The reestablishment and development of relations between individual parties with Maoist leaders is largely supported by changes in the internal situation of China. We can learn about this from apologetic declarations by some Italian and Spanish communists in relation to their visits to China (a series of articles by Jakovjello and a declaration by Santiago Carrillo). The completion of “cultural



revolution”, an obvious stabilization of internal political and economic situation, formal reestablishment of party organizations in provinces and mainly promotion of slogans about the leading role of the party during the period after the “September crisis” in 1971, promotion of slogans about the “line of masses” and their control over the party and state bodies as a means of the fight against bureaucracy – these are a few basic features whose shallow interpretations form a basis for the picture of the current China “painted” by Carrillo and Jakovjello. Simultaneously, they indirectly blame Marxist-Leninist parties for providing incorrect information about the current situation in China.

The embellished perception of Maoism is, to the large extent caused by the fact, that the many real successes achieved by China has been passed off as results of Maoist “application of Marxism-Leninism to the specific Chinese conditions”, even though in reality they were achieved only thanks to diversion from the directives issued by Mao Zedong. The current process of Mao Zedong's transformation into a Marxist-Leninist, which is now keeping busy Chinese propaganda, representatives of some parties, bourgeoisie (in particular, American bourgeoisie) and press, inevitably influence the thinking of those who do not catch up with the changes in Chinese reality.

Another specialty of the current Maoist activity lies with the fact that Maoists, interested in getting communist parties on their side, do not make visible steps to achieve this. They act as if “from a position of strength” encouraging communist parties to promote and develop relations with Beijing on their own initiative, i.e. to come and “bow down”. So the leaders of the Italian Communist Party have been waiting long for an invitation from Beijing. The leaders of the Communist Party of Japan have repeatedly declared that they are prepared to normalize relations with China provided that China cuts off the support provided to disintegrating groups. However, Maoists do not intend to comply with these wishes and expects the parties to make additional concessions. In relation to this it is necessary to take into account tendencies arising in some communist parties, which are in favor of establishing relations with disintegrating groups. For example, at the joint assembly of the Central Committee of URK IKS in November 1971 were presented suggestions to establish relations with “activists of groups” repudiated by the “official party”.

It is also possible to conclude that this new strategy of Maoists as well as effort of some communist parties to normalize and develop relations with Chinese leaders based on the concept of “unity under the conditions of diversity” can negatively influence the situation of the international communist movement, creating an atmosphere of pressure exerted on the Marxist-Leninist parties to re-establish relations with the Communist Party of China on the basis of compromises.

X X X X

This is the way the current activities of Chinese leaders in the international arena became more flexible and pragmatic. This increases the danger that individual communist and workers' parties, many countries, in particular countries of the "third world, progressive forces and international representatives could become disorientated, get lost and fall under Chinese influence. This situation requires us to improve our fight against the anti-Leninist activity of Maoists in the international arena.