

IN THE WORLD

CHINA

The making of a superpower

By David Milton

OLD FASHIONED NATIONALISM appears to be replacing the revolutionary ideology of Mao Tse-tung as the motive force behind the drive to make China one of the leading industrial world powers by the year 2000. Communist party chairman Hua Kuo-feng unveiled a ten-year economic plan to achieve this goal in a long speech delivered to the National People's Congress held in Peking in late February. "By the end of the century," he said, "the output per unit of major agricultural products is expected to reach or surpass advanced world levels and the output of major industrial products to approach, equal or outstrip that of most developed capitalist countries." Western press comments on Hua's speech noted that his remarks were reminiscent of former Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's promise to bury the West.

Since China now shows signs of returning to a path of modernization that the West regards as more "sensible" and "practical" than the visionary goals mapped out by the century's great rebel, the American press has reported recent events in China in a more or less straightforward fashion. Not a few editorials in the U.S. have expressed smug satisfaction over the fact that the Chinese have finally come to realize that human beings are by nature motivated through self-interest rather than by altruism and that the road to progress is paved with material incentives. The capitalist world had been frightened by Mao's success in stirring up millions behind the slogan "Rebellion is Justified." Now China might be less interesting, but more understandable. Americans do not have much difficulty in coming to terms with goals that are measured quantitatively.

"Rational rules and regulations."

There is no question that the most significant historical action taken by the 1978 People's Congress was the decision to abolish the revolutionary committees formed during the Cultural Revolution in factories, schools and farm brigades. These representative management committees are to be replaced by one-person management exercised by factory directors, school principals and production brigade heads under the leadership of the Communist party. China is returning to the management system set up by the Russians in China during the 1930s. It is ironic that just as Sweden, West Germany and Great Britain are experimenting with worker-management schemes, no matter how unrepresentative of real workers' power these structures may be, the Chinese are abandoning the concept altogether.

In any case, Chairman Hua and Peking central planners have laid out a no-nonsense program for economic growth. A single executive will be in charge of each factory, while stricter accounting practices will be introduced to tighten state control over industry and emphasize profit-making for individual enterprises.

Plans call for the "institution of rational rules and regulations" in factories and the right of enterprises to create their own capital reserves.

During the years I spent in China "rational rules and regulations" were condemned as methods inspired by Russian revisionism. A new emphasis on cost, profits, expenses, size of the work force, and output value will be put into effect to measure the efficiency of capital investment. Also, a determined effort will be made as part of the general tightening up procedure to cut down on misappropriation (theft) of plant materials by employees. Administrative staffs and levels of bureaucracy will grow in proportion to the rationalization of production.

Decisions have apparently been made to allow Chinese workers more freedom of travel, thus creating a new mobile labor force that will be able to seek jobs wherever they may exist. China has been divided into six great administrative regions to coordinate the overall ten-year plan for the whole country, and the People's Congress set up a number of new national ministries covering different sectors of the economy. A 20 percent wage increase has already been granted to 60 percent of the lowest paid categories of workers, cadres and teachers; production bonuses will soon be introduced to spur higher levels of output throughout the nation.

Among the goals set by Peking are the creation of 14 new industrial centers, ten steel complexes, eight additional large coal mines, ten new oil and gas fields, 30 major power stations, six trunk railroads and five new harbors. China hopes to triple its steel production by 1985. However, the first priority, according to Chairman Hua, is to achieve the mechanization of agriculture "so that labor and capital can be rechanneled into industry." Since there are 600 million or more peasants working in the countryside there would seem to be an infinite amount of labor to rechannel. How much of this labor can actually be absorbed by Chinese industry is a question of intense interest to many economists.

China has set itself very ambitious goals that many Western economists believe will be very difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. But China has a good technical and economic base on which to build. The Russians laid the foundations for China's machine tool and heavy industries in the '50s, the Chinese have since created the infra-structure for a modern economy, and recent discoveries of vast oil and mineral deposits provide the means for another great leap forward.

China-Japan trade.

Senior Chinese officials are now attending seminars in Japan to learn how the

Japanese achieved their unsurpassed post-World War II industrialization. China, with a population seven to eight times that of Japan and perhaps 20 times the natural resources, now hopes to duplicate the Japanese race to industrial power. If such a hope can be realized, then despite Hua's pledge that "China will never seek hegemony or strive to be a superpower," China will have become the greatest *de facto* superpower on earth. In recent months Peking has openly encouraged Japanese rearmament. A Tokyo-Peking military alliance in the future is a possibility.

Moreover, the recent \$20 billion China-Japan trade deal is a good start on the road to accelerated economic growth. Japan will double its annual import of Chinese crude oil with a target of 15 million tons set for 1982, and import 5.3 million tons of Chinese coking coal plus 3.9 million tons of other coals. In exchange, Japan has agreed to sell the Chinese \$7.8 billion worth of complete plants and technology plus another \$2.3 billion of construction materials and equipment. The Japanese have also contracted to build a large integrated steel plant in Shanghai, and another two plants in Fujian and Shaanxi provinces are being negotiated.

The recent People's Congress, like all previous Congresses, rewrote the constitution, which is more of a political platform than a constitution. It expresses the ideas of whoever is in power at any one particular moment in history. Among the many changes of emphasis, the key change is the emphasis on production as the State's basic goal, in contrast to the stress on revolution in the last constitution. The reference in the 1975 document to workers, peasants and soldiers has been deleted and replaced by the phrase "all power in China belongs to the people."

Freedom of speech, correspondence,

The ripple effect of this major deal, meaning the peripheral trade related to the main pact, will probably reach another \$4.2 billion by 1982 according to authoritative sources in the West. None of this includes the normal trade already being carried on between the two countries. As western protectionist pressures drive Japan towards Chinese markets, a new great center of world power is rapidly arising.

Western experts believe that the Chinese did well in winning favorable terms for themselves from the Japanese and will actually get the best of this long-term deal. The fact that the Japanese have agreed to accept five-year deferred payments (China's euphemism for credit) from its trading partner seems to bear out the opinion that China achieved a bargain. Japan, on the other hand, has won a favorable edge over Western Europe and the U.S. in the growing Chinese market for advanced technology.

Kings and bandits.

Continued on page 20.



The first session of the National People's Congress at Peking's Great Hall of the People, March 1.

At their Congress, the Chinese adopted a no-nonsense program for economic growth. With Japan's help, this program could make them a world power.

MIDEAST

Presidential choice splits government

By Gidion Eshet

JERUSALEM

THE READERS OF IN THESE TIMES probably have not heard the names of Dr. Yitzhak Shawe and Eliezer Rimalt. One of the two is likely to be the next president of Israel. Good news. But who is presently the president of that remote and troublesome country? one may ask. And what difference does it make?

Whoever the next president will be, he is unlikely to influence the policies of this country. But if it is to be Dr. Rimalt, the coalition headed by Menachem Begin will no longer be as before. Within the Likud, which is the largest coalition party, only two factions, Herut and La'am, are hot-headed Greater Israel enthusiasts. The third faction—the Liberals—are more moderate and are closer in their political views to the Labour party. All of the Democratic Movement for Change and about half of the National Religious party—the other partners in the coalition—hold the same views as Labour. In the context of present events, the difference is this: Labour, DMC, NRP *et al.* agree to both demands made by President Carter. Herut and La'am say nay.

During Begin's visit to the U.S., it became clear that Begin is rejecting Carter's demand that Israel declare that UN Resolution 242 means Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza and that it promise no new settlements during negotiations. Carter is not asking Israel to withdraw from all the territories or in fact even parts of them. He is only asking for the principle. Carter needs that in order to help President Sadat in his negotiating with Israel. If Sadat's peace efforts are hit by Israeli obstinacy, his pro-American regime could be endangered,

Fear of the U.S. has split Begin's coalition between moderates and Greater Israel enthusiasts. This is behind the debate over a new president.

and that could be a blow to American interests in this region.

Sadat, so it seems, is willing to reach a separate agreement with Israel. But in order to be able to negotiate such a deal, he needs some understanding that Israel is willing to withdraw from the Palestinian land—the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

But Israel is unwilling to grant him that. At least that is the policy of Begin who heads the Herut faction and his friends in La'am. The other partners to the coalition think differently.

The liberals who are part of the Likud bloc have until now supported Begin. They supported him because he was successful. But now things seem to change. Strained relations with the U.S. has frightened the Liberals, who are a party of businessmen and well-to-do merchants.

The main interest of these people has traditionally been economics. The Liberals (who are no liberals by any standard) are very worried when Carter threatens Israel. Not being extremists, one way or the other, they do not have the same feelings Begin and his people have about Greater Israel. Under these circumstances the fight over the presidency suddenly became important.



When President Katzir announced over a month ago that he will not run for a second term no one thought much of it. The president of this country is powerless. His only power is to pardon criminals. The liberals suggested that Dr. Rimalt, the veteran leader of their party, be elected. Rimalt, who quit politics last year and became headmaster of a Tel Aviv school was the first Liberal to have come out publicly for Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza. No surprise, then, that his relations with Begin were not that good. If Begin had chosen some "notable" as his candidate to the presidency, even the Liberals would not make a fuss. But out of the blue Begin announced that his candi-

date is Dr. Shawe. "Dr. who?" asked most Israelis. No one has ever heard of him, not even one member of Knesset, which elects the president.

The opposition and the DMC opposed Begin's candidate, but he could be elected if all the Likud and NRP would have said yes. But the Liberals said no and are fighting for Rimalt. Rimalt now has the support of all the opposition and part of the coalition—he has the majority. As things stand, Begin's candidate is going to lose.

For an authoritarian prime minister like Begin this is a blow. It seems that the Liberals are preparing the ground for a possible change in the future.

A Palestinian boy beaten for slogans

Nassir Abdul Jawad had to answer not only for slogans he is accused of writing against the Israeli occupation, but also for the activities of his deported father.

By Livia Rokach

NASSIR ABDUL JAWAD IS A 14-year-old Arab Palestinian boy from Al Birah, a town ten miles north of Jerusalem in the West Bank, occupied by Israel since 1967. Nassir, who is a slim, curly-haired boy with smiling dark eyes and one of the best pupils in his class at the local school, is now facing trial in front of an Israeli military court on charges of having written slogans against the foreign occupation of his country in October 1977.

Nassir was arrested on Nov. 1 during a vast police action that took place that same day throughout the West Bank and was officially motivated by the desire of the occupation authorities to prevent hostile demonstrations on the 30th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration Nov. 2. He was taken to the police station of Al Birah together with nine other boys from his school, aged 14 to 17, and charged with having thrown stones during some previous occasions at the Military Governor's car, while the latter was driving to his office. All the boys denied the accusations, claiming they had always been punctually at school between 8 and 9

a.m., the time indicated by the interrogating officer as that of the governor's transition on that road.

The boys were thereupon beaten with Coca Cola bottles on their stomach, on their backs and at the back of their necks while the charges were repeated at short intervals during the whole day, but the boys continued to deny the charges. Towards evening they were sent home but requested to report back to the police station the next morning.

The next day, the same charges were repeated and the interrogation, this time separately, started all over again. Nassir was beaten again with Coca Cola bottles in the same manner. This time, the interrogators—there were two of them—started questioning him about his father.

Deported father.

Nassir's father, Abdul Jawad Salih, had been the mayor of Al Birah until December 10, 1973, at midnight, when he was forcibly deported by the Israeli military authorities to Jordan. He had never been officially charged or brought to trial before then. Following his deportation the Israeli military government of the West Bank charged him with "having tried to organize support for the Palestine organizations" and, with "opposition and resis-

tance to the Israeli authorities." Explaining the charge, the Israeli press cited his having reportedly protested to the military governor the arbitrary arrests of citizens during demonstrations against the occupation.

The interrogators talked to Nassir about his father's deportation and wanted to know why the family had stayed behind in Al Birah. "You should not stay here, you should go and join him," they said repeatedly. Then the beatings started all over again. Nassir knew that such pressure had already been exercised on his mother, who some time before had been called to the Russian Compound Interrogation Center in Jerusalem and told the family should go away. As the beatings continued, one of the interrogators shouted, "Your father wanted to kill me..." And also, "Your father is too clever at making communiques."

When Nassir was finally sent home that evening, he was shocked and fearful. Not only had his father been deported four years before in the middle of the night by a military company who brutally invaded the house—a scene that would leave indelible marks on any ten-year-old child—but also his brother, Omar, who is one year older than himself, had been arrested in February that year with 28 other school boys from Al Birah, and badly tortured before being thrown into jail for five months on the unproved charge that he had "stolen bombs in order to throw them at Israeli settlers" near Al Birah. During the day's session, one of the interrogators also asked him the age of his younger brother, Alaa. Nassir told him Alaa was almost five years old. "When he has passed his fifth year we'll take him too and torture him," the interrogator said laughing. That evening the boys, who were to report again the next day, decided to "admit" that they had thrown stones at the military governor's car.

But when the next day the boys "con-

fessed" to the charges against them, they were told that their school had confirmed that they were attending classes on the days and hours in question. Thus the charges were changed to "having written anti-occupation slogans on the walls in town." Again the interrogations, accompanied by beatings, started and continued through the whole day. This time Nassir was told that the men were revenging themselves upon him for his father's "crimes." Again he was told he and his family should not stay on in the West Bank.

When he came out of the police station he saw his mother waiting for him in the street. As he ran to her, he was shaking and trembling with fear and pain. She raised his shirt and saw his back and his neck all blue and black from the three consecutive days' beatings. An officer who saw the gesture called Nassir back and told him to keep silent about the beatings. "You and your mother should keep your mouths shut"—and he covered his own mouth with his hand—"or else you'll go to prison. Tell your mother that."

On the fourth day the boys were blindfolded and put up against the wall. As the hours passed, two of them fainted, but the others were told not to move. That night they were not sent home but kept at the interrogation center. At night the questioning began again. This time Nassir was accused of having organized at school a group presumably called "The Young People of Palestine." He denied this. Again he was beaten.

At a certain point one interrogator asked him, "How old are you?" Nassir repeated that he was 14 years old. The man who asked the question seemed to be filled with compassion for him, but the second interrogator became furious and shouted at the former one, "Yes, yes, he's 14, but his father is with the PLO in Beirut." Then he started questioning the boy

Continued on page 11.