

THIRD DRAFT OF CRITICISM OF THE RCP

(MIM)'s formation represents a challenge to the RCP USA. MIM is setting out to build a vanguard party based on Mao Zedong Thought. Eventually, everyone who supports the RCP will come into contact with MIM.

In the past, the RCP, the Black Panthers, the Progressive Labor Party and other groupings have served the role of the most advanced party in the US at one time or another. It is disappointing to see the RCP tend to follow other groupings in dropping the banners of the Gang of Four, Mao and Stalin.

Problems in the RCP go beyond the ebb in the International Communist Movement (ICM). The RCP has adopted some incorrect tendencies in its view of party-building. Pictures of Bob Avakian, the chairman, are plastered all over much in the way Mao's profile was deified by Lin Biao. The entire political content of such posters, which may have as little as the slogan "Revolution in the 80s, Go For It!" on them, is that heroes are THE ANSWER, especially for the vacillating petty-bourgeoisie which finds itself in need of an anchor. For Marx's and Mao's criticism of personality cults, see "On Personality Cults."

Of course, the RCP doggedly defends its pretty photographs with the line that the RCP is merely recognizing the role of leadership, the conscious element and the vanguard party. In reality this amounts to Liu Shaoqi's formalistic line that anyone who attacked him or his allies was "anti-party." The photograph game is a mockery of Mao's line on personality cults and his view of political line as opposed to party organization for its own sake as decisive. The reduction of politics to mass adulation for a fetish is an insult to both politically backwards and advanced people.

However, if the mindless cult around Avakian were the only problem with the RCP, then all advanced people would have to struggle within the RCP to erase a minor blemish on a party that is obviously deeply involved in making revolution. The real problem is that the cult is a symptom of a division of labor within the RCP which is ultimately rooted in a "left" economist line.

The RCP does not hold state power; therefore, it is not generating a "new" bourgeoisie within itself. Nor does the personal prestige of leaders within the RCP serve as more than a partial basis for the problem of the RCP's line.

Overall, it still must be stressed that the RCP is not the main enemy. Not even the CPUSA is the main target of revolution in the US. The bourgeoisie does not primarily reside in any party in the US except for the Democratic and Republican parties. Even if the RCP were dishonestly claiming the banner of Marx, Lenin and Mao, it would be incorrect to unleash our major blows against the RCP. MIM targets the US Government above the Ku Klux Klan and other disgusting organizations. The best way to knock the wind out of the sails of the RCP is to do just this.

The purpose of this essay is to spell out some differences between the MIM and RCP line, especially for those people interested in Marxism-Leninism Mao Zedong Thought (MLMZT). There are many honest people in the RCP struggling to grasp MLMZT.

DEFINING THE BASIC PROBLEM OF THE RCP'S LINE-- "LEFT" ECONOMISM

Economism is an incorrect view and practice relating the vanguard party to the broad masses and their daily struggles. It is rooted in the doctrine of economic determinism and was especially strong in the Second International, which spawned today's reformist Socialist International and groups like the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA). Basically, economists expect economic conditions to serve up political change on a silver platter.

Rightist economists cheerlead for wage struggles as tantamount to revolution. Cheerleading for various struggles while keeping one's revolutionary opinions to oneself, saying what people want to hear and otherwise losing militance is more generally known as

opportunism or tailing spontaneous (politically unconscious) struggles. This "right opportunism" is the main danger in the party-building process in the world.

Although the RCP defends its line in Liu Shaoqi fashion, MIM is currently of the opinion that the RCP's deviation from communism is a "leftist" confusion of the relationship among the international conjuncture (and the basis of revolutionary opportunity), class, the base of the vanguard party and political line.

Quite typically, in its very document intended to make a break with economism, the RCP states that "the poorer they are, the more people want revolution." Fine, but then the RCP says its "firmest base" is among people "who feel it most." Already this is a bourgeois liberal-guilt sort of line. Furthermore, it is an empiricist line especially given the decisiveness of the superstructure at this time. (See "On the Crisis of Marxology and Economism.")

The RCP does not mean to say that India and Bangladesh are automatically in a revolutionary situation. The RCP stands head and shoulders above other parties in understanding that at this time it is the contention between the rival imperialist blocs and the self-destruction which this implies that provides a chance at making revolution against weakened states.

Still, the RCP has not made the link between the desire for revolution and the ability or freedom to make that revolution. The question is why if the poorest want revolution most they do not make it. Clearly the answer is that they do not have the opportunity or freedom to do so. The state is the most obvious reason why: The police, army, prisons, family and other repressive institutions oppress the poorest most of all.

To this the RCP says that we must work "from the revolution back." This is a profoundly un-Marxist notion, exactly the same as Trotsky's idea of waiting for pure proletarian insurrection. The vanguard party will have to have support among the workers who will control the most strategic parts of the US. However, the way to obtain this support is not to tail after workers or wait for them. The only waiting that has to be done is for the bourgeoisie to get further involved in the current WWII. As the bourgeoisie destroys itself, the proletariat and the vanguard party need only collect bids for the rope contract for the hanging.

God, Avakian and the Moonies do not offer real world solutions. The revolution will be made with what's at hand, not a miraculous international conjuncture brought about by obscurantist leadership.

"Left" economism is manifested in a constant oscillation between viewing the masses as asses and believing that the masses would step forward automatically if there were a heroic example. "Left" economism is different than right economism only in that its result is more aggressive organizing.

Of course, the RCP's own "left" economist line is that the masses are asses. In an article in the Revolutionary Worker, the RCP compares the masses of the US to the inhabitants of one giant insane asylum because of their lack of understanding of the situation in Central America. It is true that the American public does not know what side the US is on in El Salvador and Nicaragua, but that is a result of the bourgeoisie's domination of the means of communication and information, not the inherent stupidity or insanity of the masses. Mao saw clearly that it does no good to attack the masses, but it does give the bourgeoisie the chance to rule in place of the masses. That is why the ultraleft attack on the masses is "left" in form but ultraright in essence.

The "masses are asses" line results in commandism and attacks on the masses. Since according to this line there is an incredible gap between the politically conscious leaders and mere followers in the party and amongst the masses, leaders order their followers around to make sure the "correct" thing is done. What is missing is any attempt to mobilize the masses through Mao's mass line. Pushed to extremes, the "masses are asses" line results in treating the masses as the enemy. Indeed, the RCP would do well to take a look at "On Handling Contradictions Among the People." To attack the masses as anti-party is to support a non-Marxist line.

The spontaneous generation of revolutionaries line results in the push for a party of heroes to spark the masses. This point of view also justifies commandism within the party since superheroes do not want lower-ranking party members to mess up any chance to spark the masses. If macho, superhero leaders order around lower level party members in the short run, this is justified by imminent mass rebellion seeking divine leadership according to this line.

In any case, the "left" economist line justifies the personality cult, a stifling division of labor, commandism and in extreme cases, attacks on the masses.

The ways economism and workerism are expressed by the RCP to youth are many. One is that "youth can not lead the revolution." This is not correct. Precisely because youth do not form a class but a strata, they can lead revolution. Contrary to some RCP circles, not all youth are "crazy" (ready to step forward, but in need of heroic leadership) and unable to make revolution in the long run. Any strata can lead the revolution. There are female, Black and youth leaders of revolution. There is no formula for saying which strata will contribute the most proletarian revolutionaries.

Another ally of economism is the theory of productive forces--another determinist view. This is used to defend tailing after workers. In this view, those people that do not have the correct relationship to the means of production can not lead the revolution, since ultimately, development in the productive forces spurs revolution.

In another variant of the theory of productive forces offered by Liu Shaoqi in his ultraleft form, the masses are so culturally backward, that they are in sore need of rectification by correct party leaders, who see to the growth of the productive forces themselves since the masses are so incompetent. Of course, this sort of elitism is not much different than the ideology of leave-it-to-the-market (i.e. ruling class) found in the U.S.

In contrast, MIM believes that class struggle, mainly over the state at this time constitutes the most important part of relations among people and classes in general. Furthermore, at this time, ideological and political line largely determine one's relationship to the very means of production.

Mao said that "ideological and political line are decisive in everything." Experience and expertise are not the requisites for fighting and upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat; otherwise, how could anyone in the United States be a socialist? The empiricist explanation of youth's inability to lead revolution must be thoroughly exposed and rooted out. Line not experience is decisive. Also, empiricism must be linked to the pragmatist line of expertise in command or that "politics must serve economics," which is the line in Beijing right now.

ACCELERATING ATTACKS ON MAO

Since the RCP has a lot of trouble being the banner-holder for Mao in the US, it is not surprising that RCP leaders have taken to attacking Mao in between the lines. In a chapter right out of recent Chinese history, Avakian started an attack on Lin Biao in the closing pages of his *Harvest of Dragons*. Now, people who have studied recent China know that since 1972 the revisionists have attacked Mao and the Four by targetting Lin Biao alone and not as part of a general succession of revisionists in the Chinese CP led by Liu Shaoqi. Today, Deng and Co. always mention the Four and Lin Biao in the same breath while omitting references to Liu Shaoqi, who the revisionists have rehabilitated.

Avakian appears to be attacking Lin for overestimating the revolutionary potential of the Third World. (*Harvest of Dragons*, 150) This is not just a typical Trotskyist refrain on Avakian's part. Something about Lin Biao has been worth singling out in Avakian's first article in *Revolution* and in his *Conquer the World*. In the closing pages of *Harvest of Dragons* Avakian criticizes people who are always talking about the "masses, the masses, the masses." (p. 147)

Who are these mysterious people? They are none other than followers of Mao and the Cultural Revolution. Mao himself often used the phrase "the masses, the masses, the masses" in calling for daring leadership of the masses, self-education and the steeling of

youth in revolutionary struggles which necessitated contact with the masses and the carrying out of the mass line:

The ultimate line of demarcation between the revolutionary intellectuals on the one hand and non-revolutionary and counter-revolutionary intellectuals on the other lies in whether they are willing to, and actually do, become one with the masses of workers and peasants. (Mao in 1939 in "The Orientation of the Youth Movement," Peking, 1960, p. 9)

Moreover,

What should be taken as the criterion of judging whether a youth is a revolutionary? How shall we make him out? There is only one criterion, namely, to see whether he is willing to, and in practice does, unite and become one with the broad masses of workers and peasants. (Ibid., 9, 10)

In the creation of his bourgeois-style political machine, Avakian has found it necessary to piss on Mao's profound contributions relating the masses to the vanguard party.

The RCP is also no longer excited by Mao's contribution to the proletariat's understanding of imperialism. The RCP calls Raymond Lotta's book *America in Decline* "The First Significant Deepening of Lenin's Theory of Imperialism." (Revolution, Spring 1984, 52) Apparently the united front against Japanese imperialism is not applicable in the world as a whole. (Revolution, Spring '84, 20) The two stage revolution of the semi-feudal and semi-colonial country just seems like no fun for Avakian anymore. Indeed, it seems there were several anti-imperialist revolutions (unnamed of course) that Mao was screwing up for not coordinating in an International. This of course was again a result of Mao's national chauvinism according to the RCP. "Maoism without Leninism is nationalism (and also, in certain contexts, social-chauvinism) and bourgeois democracy." (Conquer the World, 38)

Moreover, "Imagine, for example, what it would have been like if the revolutionary line in China had been more clearly and firmly an internationalist one." (Ibid., 44) In addition, The "Declaration of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement" cosigned by the RCP is in general better than any of the RCP's literature in regard to criticizing Trotsky at least as much as Stalin, the role of the masses and anti-imperialist struggle and the relationship of economism in both "left" and right forms to the international situation. However, even in this document there is an attack on the Chinese CP under Mao for its "exaggerated understanding of the negative aspects of the Comintern." What were the Chinese supposed to do in 1963? Ally with the Soviets? Who were the genuine organizational units that needed an international body? Why should the CPC open up parties to attacks from the Soviets (and US) just for the sake of visible unity? By 1972, the bourgeoisie had control of China's foreign policy through Zhou Enlai. Why should Mao push for an International led by Zhou and Deng? Weren't millions of copies of the works of Mao distributed internationally? To say that the Chinese did not support revolution internationally is just pure slander. The Chinese shed their blood in Korea and sent arms and other aid to the Vietnamese. These were the most significant revolutions to actually occur. Does the RCP want to play the Trotskyist game of blaming Mao/Stalin for the failure of world revolution?

Most grievous of all the attacks on the most important aspects of Mao's Thought and all of Marxism-Leninism is the RCP's between the lines dismissal of the Cultural Revolution in China. Besides widespread ignorance of Liu Shaoqi within the RCP coupled with Avakian's attacks on Lin Biao and disdain for Mao's views of the masses, the RCP downplays the most advanced and pathbreaking experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Avakian is fond of saying that it is easier to establish the dictatorship of the

proletariat in the backward countries but that it will be easier to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat in the formerly imperialist countries. What a massive illusion! What Eurocentrism! In fact it will be harder for many reasons. One is that the masses of the imperialist countries have long been bribed with superprofits and depoliticized. Another is that they will not get the chance to engage in protracted guerrilla warfare. Insurrection will be brief (compared with that in China) and necessarily focussed in the army, navy and airforce. The armed forces will be more thoroughly hardened and professionalized than in any Third World country. Avakian says there will have to be a professional army after the revolution in the US to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat. He pisses away the lesson learned in China--that the professionals in any part of the state--army, navy and airforce and bureaucracy--form a real material basis for the generation of a bourgeoisie in the party. The armed forces in the US will be a thousand times worse than the Red Army of the Long March as a basis for the generation of a new bourgeoisie in the party.

The RCP is also soft on Chinese revisionism. There is rarely any concrete exposure of the Chinese "reforms" since Mao in the Revolutionary Worker. Nor has the RCP done any major in-depth or theoretical work detailing those changes. As of 1987, the RCP has yet to concretely show what it is that is concretely happening in China in our own lifetimes. Avakian's theoretical treatments of the coup in China are nothing but camouflage for his unwillingness to really expose the internal workings of Chinese state capitalism.

The RCP's line is that China could not help becoming revisionist because external forces are decisive and China was alone with Albania against the world capitalist system. The RCP correctly initiated discussions within the party about the coup in 1976, but it never really stressed that China is state capitalist. *Revolution and Counterrevolution* leaves the question at the stage that China is on the capitalist-road and should be described as socialist in public practices of RCP activists. With the publication of *The Capitalist-Roaders Are Still on the Capitalist-Road* in 1977 by a non-party study group, one wonders why the supposed vanguard RCP took so long to come to its position in favor of the Cultural Revolution and the Gang of Four in China. Was there really a process that needed two or three years of struggle in the RCP or was the RCP leadership waiting to see what its competitors in the October League/CPML would do and who would get the China franchise?

More recently, in *America in Decline*, Raymond Lotta downplays the significance of the coup in China. As discussed elsewhere, Lotta is trying to imply that World Wars alleviate the crisis of imperialism and restructure the world for another round of accumulation. This is fallacious to begin with, but Lotta adds that China's entrance into the Western bloc "has had no leavening effect on crisis," as if anything but the dictatorship of the proletariat could. However, even though war is aimed at the redivision of the world, Lotta does not see that the coup in China is the equivalent of a war fought by US imperialism for the allegiance of a large country with influence in many liberation struggles to boot.

The RCP also attacks the Chinese experience with the party and the conscious element. Even in his defense of the Gang of Four, Avakian delivers pretty faint praise: "Perhaps they were not as good as Stalin." (RCP, *Revolution and Counterrevolution*, 22) (Of course, Mao's grade for Stalin was 70.) And the context this comes up in is "the sphere of correctly distinguishing and handling contradictions between the enemy and the people and contradictions among the people." (Ibid.) Clearly Avakian is implying that the Cultural Revolution was characterized by attacks on the masses similar to Stalin's purges and that the Four are to blame. Mr. Avakian, who was it that developed the theory of continuous revolution? Who was it that saw that attacks on impurities among the masses were useless? Who saw that class struggle continued under socialism? Avakian seems to have done the necessary work to claim the banner of the Four, but little statements between the lines reveal his own analysis. Jiang Qing "I believe, was capable of more than a little subjectivism." (Ibid., 104) This of course is with no evidence or even an anecdote. It also plays into stereotyped thinking about women. Finally, Avakian gets a kick out of an

RCP CC member's statement "well, war is approaching and we don't have a socialist country to defend, thank god." (Revolution, Spring '84, 15) With that flippant an attitude to the most important experience with socialism to date and that much disdain for the development of the conscious element, it is no wonder that the RCP finds itself "thanking god" and Avakian every day.

Mao made it clear that the liberation of 1949 and the Cultural Revolution were the two most important accomplishments of his life. The RCP leaders seem to be quietly dropping the lessons of the GPCR and relegating the Chinese's theoretical contributions to the struggle against imperialism to irrelevance.

ATTACKS ON STALIN, SOFT WORDS FOR TROTSKY

As one would expect, the RCP's counterfactual and baseless speculations reach new heights in discussions of Stalin. Basically, the RCP rejects the united front. Again it is interesting to consider that maybe the alliances of WWII made by Stalin were not in the interests of the proletariat. One suspects that this idea of fighting on one imperialist side against another might be a bad thing, but once again the RCP proves itself master of innuendo and unproven assertions.

The Trotskyists and other bourgeois critics of Stalin like to point to the 1939 Non-Aggression Pact that Stalin made with Hitler. None of these critics like to point out that in the next few years it was Stalin's army, not the British, French or American army that turned the tide against Hitler and won the war.

Raymond Lotta finally acknowledges this in *America in Decline*. (p. 212) Still, the RCP argues that overall the balance of WWII was not good for the socialist countries or even progressives. (Avakian, Revolution, Spring '84, 12) Gentlemen, we are not dogmatists, but what would you have done? Better yet, since you benefit from hindsight, who would you have supported at the time instead of Stalin?

Off hand, Stalin is right that the bourgeois democracies if left to themselves do not have any overriding interest in preventing fascism. It is also well known that Hitler wanted Britain by virtue of its racial heritage to be a partner in imperialist plunder. Hitler also did not expect to fight the US for top dog status right away. He saw a role for Americans too. So why couldn't the bourgeoisie have divied up the world including the Soviet Union? Churchill is known to have considered it very seriously. When Britain was losing in 1941, what was there to lose? In no case would Hitler or Stalin have had the illusion that they could be in harmony in the long run. Before Hitler sent the Jews off to concentration camps it is known that he had all the communists killed. Nor did Stalin ever have any illusions about the West. He did not exactly pack in his game in Eastern Europe or in the Cold War that ensued WWII.

The scorecard for WWII, as it probably will be for any World War, was favorable for socialism. China broke through thanks to Japanese imperialism's battering of China and war with the US. Britain's international desperation made it lose its grip on the colonies in a way that at least allowed for upsurges often in the guise of fighting fascism. Albania broke through. It is true that communism fared poorly in Western Europe. The RCP has detailed this fact in their journal the *Communist*. Still, the contention of the imperialist blocs could easily have become the division of the Soviet Union, China and the rest of the world. The RCP denies this as part of its elevation of interimperialist rivalry to theoretical heights above the other three contradictions Mao cited as most important in the world today.

THE RCP'S REINTERPRETATION OF LENIN

The RCP's favorite hiding place is Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?*, where Lenin discusses the necessity of having a vanguard party. A tired RCP refrain in defending its metaphysical disdain for the concrete and the particular is that "you must not understand the need for leadership and a party." This party for its own sake line reaches its highest

heights in the defense of Avakian's photographs. Essentially, the RCP accepts the popular bourgeois interpretation of Lenin's struggle for a vanguard party as a struggle for a bourgeois disciplinary body to check the democratic tendencies of the masses.

The RCP's "left" economist line leads it to its view of the party as merely a bourgeois disciplinary body. This is the root of commandism and their line of experts in command. The experts line is shown in the RCP emphasis on a division of labor within the party and in the deification of party leadership. One RCP representative has been so thoroughly mystified as to say that Raymond Lotta (an RCP leader) is just not available for forum discussions. He is just so high up that the masses could hardly hope to see him in the flesh. However, when it comes to selling Lotta's book *America in Decline*, Lotta is, as it turns out, a national lecturer.

The RCP's one-sided emphasis on discipline in the party is shown in its one-sided attacks on Charles Bettelheim. In the *Communist*, the RCP attacks Bettelheim as non-Marxist based on all Bettelheim's works prior to his third volume of *Class Struggles in the USSR* in which Bettelheim does finally call the Russian Revolution a capitalist revolution.

The recurring theme of the article in the *Communist* is that Bettelheim is a bourgeois democrat who does not uphold party discipline and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Indeed, the RCP comes right out and says that oppression of sections of the masses is necessary to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat. (*The Communist*, no. 5, May 1979, 203) In contrast, Lenin stressed that the dictatorship of the proletariat was an "alliance" of the proletariat with other classes between itself and the bourgeoisie. It is an unequal alliance led by the proletariat, (Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 29, p. 381) but no Marxist has ever called for the "dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie and a section of the masses." Indeed, the RCP is directly contradicting one of Mao's five most important essays on philosophy: "Dictatorship does not apply within the ranks of the people. The people cannot exercise dictatorship over themselves, nor must one section of the people oppress another." (Mao, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," *Selected Readings from the Works of Mao Tsetung*, 436)

The RCP's critique of Bettelheim has other examples of in-between-the-lines attacks on Mao. The RCP objects to this quote from Bettelheim. "In brief, a ruling party can be a proletarian party only if it refrains from imposing orders on the masses and remains the instrument of their initiatives. This is possible only if it submits fully to criticism on the part of the masses, if it does not try to impose "necessary" tasks upon the masses, if it proceeds from what the masses are prepared to do toward the development of socialist relationships." (Ibid., 220) The RCP must want to impose socialism on what it views as the ignorant masses. The RCP even disagrees with this almost exact paraphrase from Mao: "The only 'guarantee' of progress along the road to socialism is the real capacity of the ruling party not to become separated from the masses." (Ibid., 221)

The real reason for the RCP's 63 page attack on a professor who does not even hold state power is that the RCP wants to distance itself from the Cultural Revolution's lessons in fighting revisionism. Bettelheim was one of the most important first-hand observers of the Cultural Revolution. In 1968 at a time when the revolutionary movement in the US thought of Mao as "heavy" but was too weakly developed to build a party, Bettelheim struggled in the forefront of the academic community to debunk criticisms of the Cultural Revolution and to explain the theory of socialist transition. Later he described the actual particulars of the *Cultural Revolution and Industrial Organization in China*. This book described the masses in their actions to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the end of the book Bettelheim wrote a postscript which distinguishes him as clearly as possible from bourgeois democrats and ultraleft/anarcho-syndicalists. It starts out "the Cultural Revolution did not result from 'spontaneous' mass action inspired by the illusory views of the 'ideology of spontaneity,' but from mass action aided by the political guidelines of Mao Tse-tung's revolutionary line, and from the activities of the workers, peasants, cadres, etc., who adhered to this line. These guidelines and activities alone made it possible to concentrate the correct initiatives of the workers, and enabled the Chinese masses to unify

their struggles and to define the objectives they had to attain before they could hope to overcome a bourgeois line and social relationships that obstruct China's progress along the road to socialism." Bettelheim wrote this before the RCP even existed and yet the RCP concludes that Bettelheim has not even provided a flashlight in the struggle to light up the road upholding Mao Zedong Thought. (Ibid., 234) This is just the RCP's way of saying that studying Bettelheim's books on the Cultural Revolution is a waste of time.

Unfortunately, the "Declaration of the RIM," which the RCP is a party to states that "The Marxist-Leninists in the advanced capitalist countries face the task of continuing to combat the pernicious influence of revisionism and reformism in their ranks. The key to doing this remains the fight for principles developed by Lenin in the course of preparing and leading the October Revolution." (p. 45) This sounds good until one realizes that this poses Lenin against Mao in the fight against revisionism. However, one quickly realizes that Lenin never "developed" the restoration of capitalism thesis. How can we claim that the bourgeoisie right inside the Communist Party took power in the Soviet Union and China if the principles that Lenin developed are still the key? It took the experience of the ICM and the Chinese CP in particular to develop the theory of continuous revolution. There is no way to demarcate against Hoxhaism, the CPSU or the CCP without that theory. There is no way to demarcate on the Soviet Union and China without principles developed by Mao.

Basically the RCP and its allies are saying that Mao Zedong Thought does not apply to advanced capitalist countries. Mao's advances in "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People" and "Where Do Correct Ideas Come From" are again knocked down from the realm of philosophy or revolutionary theory to the realm of China's national revolution. MIM is a "Maoist" group and upholds the lessons of these essays of Mao's in fighting revisionism and recognizes the Cultural Revolution in China as containing the most advanced, concentrated and universal lessons in fighting revisionism to date. Again this is not a dogmatic defense of Mao. Such a defense is a contradiction in terms. This is to point up the differences between the MIM line and the RCP line. While the RCP pretends to go back to Lenin, MIM holds that it is impossible to uphold Lenin without upholding Mao. Marxism-Leninism is doomed to failure and death if it ignores the lessons of MZT.

FORMALISM: AN EXPRESSION OF "LEFT" ECONOMISM

Those who are active in politics will be struck by the RCP's formalism. One RCP spokesperson literally regards the RCP's most inactive member as more of a threat to the bourgeoisie than the entire Communist Workers Party (CWP, five of whom were killed in Greensboro by the KKK/Nazis/US Government) and Dennis Brutus, who is rated as one of the top twenty opponents of apartheid by apartheid. MIM's experience has been that the decisive question for the RCP in its recruitment of new members is whether or not candidates consider the RCP as THE VANGUARD outside of any discussions of political line.

Thus it is not surprising that the RCP has trouble recruiting youth, who Lenin stressed above all else in *On Youth*, are rightfully too impatient to give organizations steeped in formalism a second thought. The personality cult, the marketing hype and loftiness of the RCP cadres, and the endless attacks on the masses as something of a practice of dictatorship over people are all rooted in a "left" economist line and theoretical confusion.

MIM can only hope to live up to the spirit of Lenin in his writings in *On Youth*. In spirit, he favored summary executions of cadres who said there were no advanced youth to be had in the party. He advocated that people who were too formalistic and purist to get involved in mass struggles, meet people and recruit them vigorously with or without the proper seasonings, experience etc. that these people be kicked out of the party. In these times when the forces who uphold Mao are having trouble keeping up with the

spontaneous upsurges of the masses, this attitude should be applied to all strata and classes as part of a general organizational line.

ON THE RCP'S STANCE ON SOCIAL BASE

MIM does not suffer from bourgeois liberal guilt trips. MIM will not wait for any strata or the proletariat itself to mount the political stage.

Instead of tailing after one social base or another, MIM starts from the international proletariat's scientific view of the international situation. In this time of imperialism and world war, the international proletariat has already established that it's had enough and that it will make revolution given the opportunity during imperialist war. If one disagrees with this point, it would be correct to conduct an investigation of the demands of the oppressed peoples now and in the recent past. It is not that MIM abandons the mass line on this point, but that MIM sees the mass line as already established on the basic questions of imperialism and war in this time period. On organizational questions and burning issues of the day it is still necessary to conduct relentless investigation and uphold the mass line.

Of four contradictions at this time--between the imperialist countries and the oppressed countries, between blocs of imperialist countries, between the socialist countries and the imperialist countries, and between the imperialist countries and their own proletariat--MIM focusses only on the first two. MIM has a duty to intervene first and foremost in these two contradictions. There are no socialist countries at the moment, so the third contradiction has little impact on MIM line. As for the fourth contradiction, it is a factor, but the analysis of class struggle within the United States for instance does not have a principal influence in MIM's formulation of revolutionary strategy at this time. (See upcoming issues of MIM Theory on the labor aristocracy of the U.S. as a majority of the population.) Consequently, MIM does not derive its social base from this fourth contradiction. Frankly, the masses of the United States do not dictate MIM's line. Rather, MIM's line on imperialism and war dictate MIM's social base. It is possible, however, for Maoists to disagree on this issue.

MIM's social base is that group of people who see the necessity of destroying and transcending imperialism and its symptom of militarism. It is the analysis of the current situation as one of World War III and MIM's line of working to stop it and go beyond it that separates MIM's social base from the RCP's.

In response, the RCP has said that it is mostly the petty-bourgeoisie that is in motion as a result of war and imperialism at this time. However, if "petty-bourgeois intellectuals" and students are receptive to MLMZT, then MIM will dare to recruit amongst those strata and any others willing to listen. MIM will boldly organize united fronts among everybody opposed to imperialism and militarism. The RCP claims that MIM is writing off the proletariat. Fine, Trotskyists can wait for pure proletarian insurrection. If Mao had not organized the masses of "petty-bourgeois" peasants and if Lenin had not made all the peasants "middle peasants" by giving in to their demand for private plots, neither the Chinese nor the Russian Revolution would have happened. Both Lenin and Mao were excellent in assessing principal contradictions and adjusting their expectations of social base accordingly.

Concretely, the advanced today are concerned about the Mid-East, Central America, Southern Africa, the nuclear arms race and many other issues including punk rock, racism and sexism. Ironically, the harder the RCP tries to project what the proletariat will look like when THE CONJUNCTURE comes, the farther off the road to the proletariat the RCP gets.

CONCLUSION

MIM will not share the RCP's disdain for the particular and concrete and hence the masses and their struggles. Nor will MIM join the RCP in Trotsky's netherworld of external causation, abstraction and deterministic fallacies.

MIM works for revolution out of what exists at hand. If the people who show an interest in fighting imperialism and defeating the American state have many leaps to make, we can not wring our hands or promise revolution when the material conditions ripen. World War III is already here.

It is to be stressed that there are no guarantees in the business of making revolution. The world may be vaporized despite the best efforts to end WWII. There may even be a revolution that fails or goes down to defeat in the long run. The class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is not over until classless society is reached and even then new and comparable contradictions may arise. People who are looking for bourgeois discipline, comforting prophecies, cult leadership or a chance to administer such should join the RCP. People who see that there are no guarantees but that it is nonetheless "right to rebel" should struggle with or in MIM.

Other literature relating to the RCP:

"On Personality Cults"—free.

MIM Theory, "Positive Trends in the RCP?"—a smattering of views on the recent work of the RCP and the RIM that it is part of. .30.

"The Decline of the RCP," essay critique of the RCP by the Organization for Revolutionary Unity, a now defunct group that upheld the Cultural Revolution and viewed the USSR as state capitalist. \$1.50.

Don't be a geographical opportunist!

Know the various lines of groups to the "left" of social democracy in the United States, even if you don't live near any of their chapters!! Send for list of names, addresses, subscription policies, ideologies and comments by a MIM comrade, all in easy to read chart form. Comes with special chart for prisoners seeking free literature. .40 or free for prisoners or those who subscribe to MIM Theory or MIM Notes for \$1 or more.