

DISCUSSION 8

DR. GAETANE PAYEUR-MINOT: First of all, I want to stress the point that I did not—nor do—question the substance of Chinese ideology.

My paper is purely a case study, not just on Bangladesh but on liberation movements in general, in relation to China.

MR. RAMON ZAMORA: Prof. Minot, we would like to make a comment on your paper regarding China's sort of leaving behind her revolutionary ideology in international field. I think we have to put China in the context of international politics. In the present international power struggle, China is concerned not only with political and military struggle against "imperialism"; she is also engaged in an ideological struggle with what she calls "Russian socialist revisionism".

Now, it is within this context, plus her claim to a clear Marxist-Leninist ideology, that I think we can understand her different actuations in world revolution.

You gave the example of Bangladesh. I think that was a reflection of political struggle with ideological content. We should realize that, then, Bangladesh was actually a sort of basketball court between Russia and China. Pakistan was sympathetic to China. And China needed international support for her policies—revolutionary, or otherwise.

Thus, China supported Pakistan against the separation of Bangladesh. And Bangladesh was supported by India and Russia.

Now, in international affairs, China claims she does not interfere in the internal conditions of a country. The country should be left—whether it wants a revolution or not—alone. Thus, with regards to Bangladesh, I think China still made the proper stand.

China may support a revolutionary movement, overtly or covertly. She is doing this in Malaysia—establishing relationship with the state of Malaya while supporting the revolutionary movement of that same country. And although you may say this is Chinese opportunism, I think China is doing it so she may gain

international support for her policies, while considering it, at the same time, part of the Marxist struggle towards an international proletarian revolution.

So, again, before we can really concretize China in international affairs, we should see China from a purely Chinese point of view—not American or even Asian.

DR. MINOT: You have raised many points.

When you say that in the international environment—especially, in the USSR-China conflict—China's concern was her struggle with the USSR, I agree with you. But that ideological struggle is first for China, I think I don't agree anymore.

The ideological struggle is there inasmuch as it is important in the conduct of Chinese foreign policy.

DR. FRANCISCO NEMENZO, JR.: Well, Mr. Zamora said that the behavior of both China and the Bangladesh should be put in the context of Marxist ideology. And I agree with him.

However, when he began concretizing his points—seemingly agreeing with the presentation of Dr. Minot—I think I have different views. Apparently, he is trying to justify Dr. Minot's interpretation of Chinese policy which pictures China as giving secondary importance to ideology, and primary importance to her national interest.

However, I think that a Marxist should view it from the standpoint of Marxism, not from the standpoint of a Chinese or a Russian. For even the view that the Soviet Union is the primary enemy and US imperialism, second, is already a deviation! And I think this is reprehensible for the Chinese. Just as I think it is reprehensible for the Russians to celebrate the destruction of the Communist Party of Indonesia because it was pro-Chinese!

I think this kind of behavior among the two major socialist powers is reprehensible from the Marxist point of view.

MR. ZAMORA: I want to pursue the viewpoint of China.

Realizing the implications of Russian socialist revisionism, I think this is where China bases her action and attitudes towards liberation movements the world over.

In Maoist facts and tactics, they use this concept of "hedging"—that is, keeping off where the enemy is. Thus, they don't support a revolutionary movement in a certain country if they think it will only redound to their downfall later on, politically as well as ideologically.

It would be against their interest to be ideologically and nationally supportive of movements which would only, in turn, support Russia in claiming to be a revolutionary. And I think what China did was proper and practical in the concrete international situation.

DR. NEMENZO: It was proper nationally, rather than internationally.

MR. ZAMORA: Well, still the primary consideration of China, or so she claims, is ideology—purity of ideology.

And Russia's triumph is not that of a Marxist-Leninist revolution but rather that of a capitalist! And even if you say that there are benefits that redound to the Russian people, still China does not see things only from their particular manifestation. She sees things as a whole. That's why, she claims, Russian ideology is a revisionist ideology.

DR. MINOT: I would like to react first to Dr. Nemenzo.

I did not say that ideology is secondary and national interest is primary for China. It is not a question of first or second. Rather, What I tried to show is the role of ideology within national hegemony.

I tried to show how it works in China.

In terms of national liberations elsewhere, China is flexible. When she decides to support or not to support a particular movement, she first looks at the inherent conditions of the group. Then she checks the purity of its ideology. And finally, she determines the quality of the organization that purportedly wants to carry the liberation.

DR. NEMENZO: Probably I was wrong in my formulation. It is not the ideology which is subordinated but rather it is the internationalist component of Marxism. This internationalism is subordinated to the Chinese perception of her national interest.

DR. MINOT: I would like to say something about internationalism.

In China, Mao was quite embarrassed by this question of internationalism. The truth is that, although there has been a myth of China's being internationalist, they are quite busy as nationalist.

DR. WILFRIDO VILLACORTA: I wonder if I can agree with Dr. Nemenzo on the reprehensibility of the Chinese approach to supporting national liberation.

When you asked the question, Who is the enemy?, I am not sure whether you are referring to the enemy of China or to the

enemy of the world. It seems you are putting both the US and the USSR on the scale.

Now, the Soviet Union is the more lethal of the two, in terms of its spread of armed forces overseas, in terms of the spread of its political apparatus. And it can make any military and strategic decision anywhere. That's why, in this sense, it has an edge over the US.

And China sees the US as a lesser threat because, as I subscribe to the Marxist ideology, US seeing it from a Marxist framework, whether we agree or not.

With regards to China, I think she is still true to her policy statements—especially on self-reliance. So I do not think China, after all, is reprehensible from the Marxist point of view.

DR. NEMENZO: Dr. Villacorta premised his statement on a Marxist reference to show that he is wrong!

He is saying that between the US and the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union is the more lethal because the US contains the seeds of its own destruction—the implication is that the Soviet Union does not contain its seeds of destruction. But I think the seeds of destruction are universal.

In the Soviet Union today, there is the bureaucracy. But there are forces against this bureaucracy which are international in orientation and are already going against the Soviet Union!

This same contradiction also prevails in China. But since I am not the speaker and I cannot speak at length, I just want to point out, however, that this contradiction in China cannot really be observed right away by people who just pay short visits to that same country.

DR. VILLACORTA: That is too sarcastic a remark to go without rebuttal!

I am not claiming that I am an expert of China because of my short visits there! In the same manner, you cannot defend Soviet Union's interest without really examining the policies of China, especially in foreign relations!

Thank you.

DR. MINOT: I would just like to bring the status of ideology in the Chinese reader's minds. As far as I understand the problems, it is not really a question of pure Marxist ideology in China.

For China, ideology is "not a doctrine; it is a way of solving problems." Thus, the question of ideology should not be seen in pure Marxist light. In the tradition of China, the role of ideology is

not that of a doctrine but rather, that of a way of action. And, therefore, it is quite pragmatic.

DR. GONZALO JURADO: Well, ideological purity is an abstraction. A socialist society at a certain period of development may no longer be the same in another period of development. And I agree that there is a fundamental difference in Chinese policies on the one hand and in Soviet policies on the other hand.

However, on the basis of a sketchy understanding of Marxist theory, I am optimistic. Right now, I am hoping that these two potential leaders in international liberation movements will get together. I am quite—wort of—sick at seeing them fight each other!