

Open Letter to China

The following statement was released May 15, 1977 by U.S. Labor Party National Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.:

To The Central Committee Of The
Communist Party Of China!

The immediate danger of general thermonuclear war, which your leadership has recognized publicly, obliges me to break my recent standing policy of avoiding direct intervention into internal Chinese affairs.

Up to this point it has been my policy, insofar as possible, to work to create for China that global environment of economic development which would be most favorable to China's urgent internal interests. I have been correctly assured that under such global circumstances, the leading social forces of China, the industrial workers, the dedicated officer and non-commissioned officer corps of the Chinese army, and the scientifically oriented professionals, would be successful in winning a majority of forces within China to an improved domestic and foreign policy.

Now the interests of China, as well as those of the world, oblige me to openly and directly criticize your strategic orientation.

First, there is, as you fear, a high probability of a general thermonuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union before the end of August 1977 — as I warned a nationwide U.S. television audience during a half-hour address on November 1, 1976. David Rockefeller's puppet, the Carter administration, its running-dog, the French Giscard government, and their accomplice, Israeli intelligence, are following an operational policy which will indeed lead to the ABC (atomic-biological-chemical) warfare extinction of the USA and major parts of Western Europe before August 1977. David Rockefeller and his financier allies are hopelessly bankrupt, and therefore their puppets have turned wildly insane — as the presence of Jimmy Carter in the White House exemplifies.

Second, you are not entirely unjustified in seeing the war as inevitable during 1977. Although certain forces inside the U.S. and Western Europe are determined to prevent the war from occurring, they have so far exhibited vacillation, have limited themselves to cautious half-measures which — because they are half-measures — are well-meaning impotence. Only I and my associates represent a qualified rallying-point for stopping the war danger; if other forces lack the perception and courage to rally openly around my forces, they are all going to die mewling in their own vacillation and cowardice.

Third, despite your approximate correctness on the basis of those two points, your stated policies and postures are not only politically, strategically wrong, but suicidal in implications. *It is morally inconceivable and monstrous that a nation of over 800 million people should not be a major positive factor in moving to prevent general thermonuclear war from occurring.*

Under such circumstances, I have not only the right but also the obligation to be as impolite and even cruel toward your nation's political leadership as necessary, to point to the visible causes of your present strategic follies.

Chinese "Oblomovism"

Leading circles of your Central Committee, especially of the older generations, are generally informed of V.I. Lenin's ruthless denunciation of the phenomenon of "Oblomovism" within Bolshevik circles. No doubt, during times of embittered relationships between the Chinese Communist Party (CPC) and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, private jokes concerning Soviet-leadership "Oblomovism" have been widespread among such leading CPC circles. However, I must insist that the worst Soviet Oblomovism is a miracle of Promethean cosmopolitanism by comparison with the more profound expressions of backward-peasant Great Han Chauvinism which have frequently dominated your nation's policies.

Do not console yourselves that I might represent a variation on the notorious Hong Kong School of political studies of modern China. I know the character of those imbeciles even better than you do.

They pile up great dung-heaps of petty gossip concerning intimate relationships within China, from their spies proximate to China's leading circles down to the spies who are friends of William Hinton and similar types at the village level. Such Hong Kong scholars shape these dung-heaps of gossip into various shapes, as a young child with clumsy fingers sculpts in mud or clay. Having made such shapes, these Hong Kong gossip-consumers then announce: "See what a wonderful conclusion I have been able to fashion from my accumulated China intelligence!"

I do not subscribe to such practices.

My analysis of China is a class analysis. I see the continuing struggle between the interests of China's industrial workers and the continuing forces of the "idiocy of rural life." I see how strata of the CPC and professionals take sides in guiding this class struggle within China in a positive or backward direction. I am also one of the world's leading experts in economics and industrial technology, and am able to judge the relative competence or incompetence of various policies announced by the CPC, both on broad issues of China's domestic policy and its foreign policy. I look at China "inside-outside" in this way, and judge China's policies accordingly.

In this way — I tell you most frankly — I understand China better than a majority of the members of your Central Committee.

My method is best broadly identified as the method of crucial scientific investigation — the method of "unique experiment" as this was identified by the great Bernhard Riemann. For this reason, I am able to reach correct conclusions with absolute certainty even from what might appear to some as little things.

For example, the campaign against the birds. Birds eat grain. That is true, but birds also consume insects. Kill the birds and you will have more insects, which are a greater danger to the food supply than the birds over which you have foolishly triumphed. That folly affords me crucial insight into foolish thinking within a majority of the CPC and other responsible strata. It reveals the influence of the peasant mentality — the “idiocy of rural life” — on your leading bodies.

“Go to the people, learn from the people.” That is not Marxism, that is populism. One deals with the backwardness of the peasantry by bringing the peasant up to the level of culture of the industrial worker, not by dulling the minds of industrial and professional cadres with village ideology. “Understand the peasantry, know the psychological and political effects of the ‘idiocy of rural life’ on the masses of the peasantry — ‘develop insight into the peasant’s mind.’ Absolutely! The question is: Which *class* is the teacher and which class is the student?”

To emphasize my sympathy for such problems of China and its CPC leadership, I add the following observations.

The army of China is an important political weapon against the backwardness of peasant life. An army commanded by representatives of the highest levels of industrial classes and culture, based on industrial-worker officer and noncommissioned officer cadres, and an industrial-worker militia system, is not only the most effective military force possible for defense of China, but is an instrument for assimilating the backward peasantry into modern industrial culture. It is indispensable, of course, that the commanders and leading military cadres understand the mentality of the peasantry — *in order to overcome this mentality* — and use the peasant elements of the militia system to raise the cultural level of the peasantry as a whole.

It is unfortunately true that China has been obliged to emphasize what the Nazis praised as “*primitive Bauweise*” in major rural and other engineering undertakings. However, it is a different thing to say, “Comrades, since we lack modern technology, we are obliged to resort to such primitive methods of engineering since the work cannot wait,” than to praise such primitivism as in some way desirable.

I also have possession of another crucial piece of information, upon which I can rightly construct the most rigorous and meaningful conclusions by methods of “unique experiment.”

One of my associates, presently a leading member of our organization’s executive, some recent years past spent months in China as a visiting journalist. She has reported on that experience with a deep sympathy for the Chinese people and the deepest appreciation of the hospitality she enjoyed there. Among the questions she asked of all responsible sources of the government and CPC was why China’s commitment to the Vietnamese struggle was so limited. The uniform answer she received was that the securing of Taiwan was the primary issue in China’s struggle against imperialism.

Is it possible that at this date you do not see how monstrous that attitude, that policy is? Unfortunately, I find it all too possible that you would still defend such a monstrously immoral policy. It is a *nationalist, racist*

outlook on foreign policy matters, not a Marxist outlook, not a sane outlook.

I also have extensive (although by no means complete) knowledge of the way in which the internal affairs and policies of China and its Communist Party have been manipulated over decades by Anglo-American intelligence networks penetrating your political organizations down to the village level. Just as Rockefeller and allied intelligence networks — working through Canadian and other intermediaries — lead 800 million Chinese around by the Taiwan Mandarin’s queue, so every capitulation to national and racial chauvinism, to the “idiocy of (Chinese) rural life,” is a feature of the psychological profile of Chinese leadership which the psychological-warfare technology of Rockefeller and allied specialist agencies can exploit to manipulate China almost as an animal trainer controls a performing circus animal. The fact that some of you for so long imagined that William Hinton was a friend of China is an example of the way you are so easily duped and manipulated by these Rockefeller and allied agencies.

It is exemplary of the same principle that your government has stressed the military policy of hordes of an ill-armed Chinese militia — with well-maintained weapons 20 years old and more — as compensation for a lack of the technology of modern warfare. Against the present “all-volunteer U.S. Army,” the Chinese Army would undoubtedly be more than a match on the ground, and also against such politically rotten armies as that of France. Against the Soviet forces, such a “Chinese armed peasant horde” would be a tragic military obscenity — as every qualified Chinese military commander knows! Apparently, according to evident Chinese strategic posture, your CPC leadership has forgotten the *political* ABCs of the distinctions and connections between partisan and regular warfare. You should restudy Clausewitz, the associates of Tukachevsky, Tito, and Giap more carefully once again.

The gist of the argument of those who praise China’s strategic policy from the outside is relevant to this problem

It is argued by these incompetents that the primitiveness of much of Chinese rural life, its adaptation to a low level of labor-intensive technology, is in effect a civil-defense survival potentiality under conditions of modern ABC warfare. The cretins who praise Chinese strategic policies on this account are, not accidentally, those same circles which governed the U.S. Pentagon in the 1961-1968 period, under Schlesinger, and under the present Administration. It is those ignorant, neo-Malthusian accountants, typified by McGeorge Bundy and genocidalist Robert S. McNamara, who indirectly aided the Warsaw Pact in developing a marginal thermonuclear war-winning advantage over the U.S.-NATO forces. If one’s military policy is praised in such circles of manifest gross strategic incompetence, one already has strong reason to reexamine the competence of one’s strategic posture.

Contrary to cretinous strategists of the neo-Malthusian, Bundy-McNamara tradition, backwardness is the greatest vulnerability under conditions of ABC warfare. I develop this point here as it bears most directly on the

problem of Great Han Chauvinism — Han “Oblomovism.”

If you had studied European history during the 14th century or during the 16th and 17th centuries, and had also studied American and European military history from 1776 through 1871, your leadership could not have tolerated the tragic blunders which are China’s strategic posture to date. The 14th and 16th to 17th centuries’ developments, especially the Black Death and the experience of the Thirty Years War, directly discredit the present Chinese strategic posture as incompetent.

The existence of the human species depends on the ratio of free energy represented by applied, encultured levels of productive technology. This is both the objective meaning of *labor-power* and the objective reflection of the subjective side of labor-power, culture. It is the power to rapidly reproduce the highest levels of technology in agriculture and industry, on the basis of the assimilation of such modern culture subjectively by the population, which is the basis for the power of a society to progress and to survive — most emphatically including survival under conditions of thermonuclear war.

If the stresses of thermonuclear war, and its included broader range of ABC measures, were to strike China, the very backwardness of Chinese agriculture would transform the masses of the population of China into biological forcing-cultures for the most massively genocidal pandemics in all human history — this precisely because of the backwardness of Chinese rural life.

Therefore, if China were to either ally itself with the Rockefellers in a war against the Warsaw Pact, or if China were to foolishly contemplate emerging, as a neutral, from such a war with a strategic advantage, then such a policy would represent in either case criminal strategic incompetence by the leadership of the CPC.

As you and I know — but as certain Rockefeller circles hysterically refuse to believe — it is the second sort of folly, “neutrality,” which coincides with the present profile of the CPC leadership. Great Han Chauvinism, and all Oblomovist political tendencies adapted to such chauvinism, prescribe that the entire non-Chinese-speaking world is a world of “strangers,” an “outside world,” outside the great national family of China. “Let the foreign devils destroy one another” is the natural policy of Great Han Chauvinism in all its guises, including the professed socialist guises.

It doesn’t function. China, as you ought to know most clearly, is moving toward a deadly internal economic crisis and social byproducts of such crisis, precisely because of inadequate technological progress during recent decades.

The various grand gestures of desperate folly, beginning with the so-called “Great Leap Forward,” did not succeed because they could not succeed. They were conceived in folly and produced consequences agreeable to that quality of conception. The “Great Cultural Revolution” not only failed to deal with the real problem, but did grave internal psychological and political damage to China’s previously existing potentialities for overcoming the problem of technological backwardness.

The impetus for both self-destructive gestures is well

known. The “Great Leap Forward” was a chauvinist act of autarkical desperation, directly correlated to deterioration of China’s relationships to and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. (I do not discount Soviet errors in that connection, but the China response was worse than any Soviet contributing mistakes involved. One does not behave like such a backward peasant as to allow subjective reactions to fluctuations in foreign policy relations to undermine an essentially sound long-term foreign policy.) The “Great Cultural Revolution” was aggravated into an internally self-destructive obscenity in a turning-inward flight from the “Berkeley Mafia” coup in Indonesia and related developments. In both cases, it was a flight from global realities to hiding inside the bedroom of the Great Han family. “We do not need the outside world! The outside world has rejected us. Very well, we reject all foreign devils and their affairs!”

Although China is, in part, one of the world’s greatest industrial powers, the cost of food — in respect of the proportion of the population required for agricultural production — makes China one of the major backward economies of the world. With this great lump of rural backwardness on the back of the Chinese industrial workers, it is most difficult to develop sufficient industrial surplus within China to meet, simultaneously, the needs of industry, the army, and agriculture.

From my study of your government’s publications, and of the wretched dogmatic propaganda of the “Great Cultural Revolution,” I know that much of the creative mental potential of the young adult generation of China today was systematically destroyed by the “Great Cultural Revolution.” You openly degraded the achievements of China’s creative professionals and industrial workers in favor of the idiocy characteristic of rural life, calling forth from the ranks of China’s youth the most hideous, nihilistic potentialities of the petit-bourgeois social stratum.

As a result both of the objective strategic economic conditions and the monstrous aggravation of those problems through the nihilistic insanity of the “Great Cultural Revolution” and its aftermath, you have monstrously aggravated the problems of technological progress, and are on the verge of a crisis of the type erupting under the Bukharinist policies during the middle 1920s in the Soviet Union — but a far vaster and more deadly crisis.

If we get the world through the present crisis without a general war, and establish a new world economic order of the type I have proposed, we shall enable China to solve these economic problems. Unless that occurs, the accumulated mistakes of past Chinese policy will confront you with the most savage crisis imaginable.

I have the most profound concern for China and its people, but my present powers are limited to ideas and the political influence I and my associates are able to exert with correct ideas. To aid China at this moment, I can therefore only aid you by giving you those ideas which you desperately require to assist yourselves in escaping from the looming horrors before us.

You must immediately cease to defend the influence of rural, chauvinistic idiocy in your past policies on grounds that the critics are “foreigners.” (Karl Marx, I

remind you, was not of Chinese descent, nor did he ever master the Chinese language.) China was a monstrously backward culture until it was confronted by European civilization and ideas. It was a decaying, degenerating culture, of great sweeps of "yin-yang" ebb and flow under the rule of Oriental despotism and the degenerate Mandarin system. The Chinese peasant — as I personally knew him casually as a soldier during World War II — was degraded to an animal-like existence, with fewer rights than prized cattle. *The ruling ideas of old China were the Mandarin ideology, which rationalized the perpetuation of the animal-like existence imposed upon the people of China.*

It was the touch of European ideas, largely mediated through Chinese intellectuals of the strata typified by Sun Yat Sen, who assimilated that European culture and European humanism. On the basis of European humanism, *they rejected the traditional bestialist ideologies of Mandarin China, and led a struggle to bring European culture to China*, so that the Chinese coolie and peasant might at last realize his potential to rise above his Mandarin-ideology status of a "talking animal."

To go back to Chinese traditions, to Mandarin ideology, is to reject those European influences through which heroic Chinese leaders led China as a nation out of the mud and human dung-carrying bestiality of its degenerated Mandarin past. To turn inward, to the past, the Han Chauvinism, to the rural "roots," is to repudiate the only hope of the people of China, to escape at last, fully, from the bestial traditions of the Mandarin past.

European culture is not some "foreign thing" for China. European culture is the precious, highest advancement of the rise of the human race from the Pleistocene millions of years ago.

European culture is still the apex of man's upward advance from the baboon-like existence of our pre-Paleolithic ancestors.

It is not merely "European." The great rise of European-Mediterranean culture began in Ionian Greece over 2,500 years ago with Thales, on the basis of the Mesopotamian and Egyptian (and Indus River valley) foundations accumulated since the rise of neolithic cultures in those regions. With the fall of Greece, and the decay of degenerate Rome, the further progress of humanity was perpetuated by the great Arab Renaissance. On the basis of the Arab Renaissance, through Ibn Rashid, the transmitted influence of Ibn Sina, and the great Egyptian Fatimids, the European Renaissance was built.

What was brought to China from Europe during the 19th century — apart from British and New England opium peddlers — was the return to China of part of its rightful share of the accumulated achievements of the entire human race over preceding millions of years.

To repudiate that European culture is to repudiate humanity. To repudiate European cultural achievements is to repudiate Sun Yat Sen and every other greater leader of modern China's struggles to assimilate *the power of European culture* for its own. The Mandarin past is a bestialist past, from which China must escape to survive. To repudiate European culture as a "foreign thing" now is to repudiate China's potential for even mere physical survival.

Proper Policy of China

To sit back and prepare for the war in which "the foreign devils destroy one another" is immoral and monstrous, Mandarin-like fatalist bestiality. Your duty — to China and to the human race — is to put what power and influence China has openly in the balance against this war, against David Rockefeller and his war-making allies. In return for that service to humanity, China has the right to demand of the world a new world economic order, in which the massive technological-development potentialities of China can finally be realized.