

Against Mao Zedong Thought!

— PART FOUR —

ON THE QUESTION OF "TWO-LINE STRUGGLE"

Introduction to Part Four

This series of articles is devoted to carrying the struggle against Chinese revisionism through to the end. The struggle against Mao Zedong Thought has won great victories. But, as happens in the course of any profound struggle that affects many political forces, varying views have been expressed as to what Mao Zedong Thought is. This series of articles upholds and fights for the Marxist-Leninist critique of Mao Zedong Thought. It is essential to uphold revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in the fight against Mao Zedong Thought and to expose and combat the treacherous attempts of the Khrushchovite revisionists and others to rehabilitate their own bankrupt doctrines and rabid opposition to revolution under the guise of their sham criticism of the allegedly "ultra-left" Mao Zedong. Hence it is essential not just to condemn the phrase "Mao Zedong Thought," but to clarify what are and what are not the actual revisionist theses of Mao Zedong Thought.

The Introduction and Part One of this series denounced the anti-Marxist-Leninist stand of opposing the ideological struggle. Maoism is not the exaggeration of the ideological struggle, as the crusaders against ideological struggle pretend. On the contrary, Maoism negates the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the necessity of ideological struggle and of the stern struggle against revisionism. Part One of this series examined the treacherous stand of the Chinese leadership in the struggle against Soviet revisionism. It showed that, far from exaggerating the struggle against Soviet revisionism, or waging too much ideological struggle, or issuing too many polemics, instead, right from the start, Mao Zedong and the Chinese leadership wavered and vacillated, sought to strip the struggle against Soviet revisionism of its deep Marxist-Leninist ideological content, and to extinguish this struggle altogether.

In this article we return to the question of the struggle against opportunism, but from another angle. We examine the Maoist theories of "two (or more) headquarters in the party." With such theories, Mao denied the monolithic unity of the party, mocked at the Leninist party concept and denied the basic Leninist principle that the proletarian party must be built without and against the revisionists and opportunists. Instead Mao held that revisionist and bourgeois headquarters and lines were inevitable inside any party. Thus Mao stood for coexistence with opportunism and the bourgeoisie. To hide his utter negation of Marxism-Leninism, Mao tried to dress up his complacent, liberal, social-democratic theories of coexistence with opportunism as allegedly theories of "two-line struggle." But in fact Mao replaced the struggle against opportunism with liberal coexistence combined with unprincipled factionalist maneuvering designed to preserve the balance among the contending factions or headquarters. Not the struggle against opportunism, but opposition to this struggle — that is a hallmark of the Maoist theories.

The question of the Maoist theories of many lines or headquarters in the party has been intentionally confused by the crusaders against ideological struggle. The Marxist-Leninists denounce the Maoist sabotage of the struggle against opportunism. But the crusaders against ideological struggle denounce the struggle against opportunism itself as allegedly being "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'" These gentlemen dance and leap and shout and try to drown out the clear voice of Marxism-Leninism with emotionalism. Struggle against opportunism? Horrors, they scream. Maoism! Any fight of one theory or line or doctrine against another? Ideological struggle? Oh no! Yet more Maoist two-lineism! A stern Leninist stand to build the Marxist-Leninist Party without and against the revisionists and opportunists? That is the last straw, they sputter. Why, according to them, the Leninist "without and against" slogan is the most fully worked out example of "the Maoist theory of 'two-line struggle.'"

Trying to lend profundity to these hysterical shrieks, they solemnly assure us that they have found the basic and fundamental error of Maoism, the root of Chinese revisionism, in philosophy — in particular, in taking "the basis of change, development and motion (to be)...the contradiction between correct and incorrect." This is supposed to be the common Maoist thread linking the ideological struggle, the struggle against opportunism and the two-line struggle. The key to opposing Maoism is thus supposed to be understanding that "the Marxist-Leninist tactics, the Marxist-Leninist tradition, the Marxist-Leninist style of work — all show that it is not necessary to have correct analysis all the time...." Putting this ridicule of the energizing and mobilizing role of Marxist-Leninist theory into practice, these gentlemen have reduced the struggle against Mao Zedong Thought to the idiotic level of denouncing one or two-word phrases torn out of any context whatsoever, including not only "two-line struggle," but also "movements," "campaigns," and "getting organized."

What a travesty! Mao Zedong stood for coexistence with

Continued on page 5

IN THIS ISSUE

From Enver Hoxha's Historic Speech at the 1960 Moscow Meeting	3
Vitality of the Leninist Norms Among the Marxist-Leninist Parties	4
Enver Hoxha's New Book The Khrushchevites — Memoirs	7
New Browderite Strategy of the MLOC/ 'CPUSA (M-L)'	8
'United Labor Front' of the 'CPUSA (M-L) Means Unity with the Khrushchovite 'CPUSA and All the Social-Democrats	9
Scientific Session in Albania on the Struggle Against Soviet Revisionism	10

Against Mao Zedong Thought!

Continued from front page

opportunism in a single party. That is the meaning of his theory on the inevitable existence of opposing lines in the party. Yet these crusading charlatans denounce the struggle against opportunism as Maoism! Maoism vents special hatred on the Leninist teachings on the monolithic unity of the party such as the Leninist "without and against" slogan. Yet these self-righteous fakers denounce the Leninist "without and against" slogan as Maoism! Maoism put forward a whole barrage of theses against fighting opportunism. Maoism denounced this struggle as a sectarian attitude to "middle forces." Maoism cursed Stalin for his Leninist struggle against social-democracy. And so forth. Maoism preferred to play a pragmatic game of footsy with the Khrushchovites, social-democrats, "Eurocommunists," Titoites and all the opportunist scum. But now the crusaders against ideological struggle are resurrecting the very theories of the Chinese revisionists against the anti-opportunist struggle and are serving this up as an alleged repudiation of Maoism. What a mockery! What a disgusting farce! The very same Maoist blunders that these gentlemen have been putting forth for years, today they are presenting to the world as allegedly the last word in denouncing Maoism.

Furthermore, these gentlemen have been savagely attacking our Party under the yellow banner of these Maoist blunders. They are straining themselves to the utmost to strangle our Party, but Leninism is our bastion from which we will never be dislodged. The immediate issues behind their war on the Marxist-Leninist Party of the USA are: (1) that our Party has given vigorous leadership to the movement against social-chauvinism, has insisted on carrying the struggle against Chinese revisionism through to the end, remains irreconcilable towards social-democracy and refuses to join the dance of pragmatic and unprincipled alliances with the opportunist chieftains; and (2) that our Party insists that only the norms of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and not any sort of "special relationship," govern the relations between Marxist-Leninist parties. They are violating the norms of relations between Marxist-Leninist parties in order to impose on our Party their anti-Leninist Maoist blunders.

The crusaders against ideological struggle not only oppose carrying the struggle against Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought through to the end, but their Maoist blunders also serve to blunt the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism and social-democracy as well. For example, the Soviet revisionists are extremely interested in presenting the Chinese revisionists as exaggerators of the struggle against opportunism, for they wish to label the whole struggle against Soviet revisionism as a Maoist concoction. And on the level of theory, it is precisely Khrushchovite revisionism that claims that the iron unity of the party rules out inner-party class struggle, ideological struggle, etc. Furthermore, the Khrushchovites and the social-democrats in close unity condemn the struggle against opportunism as a violation of the "unity of the left" (sometimes "left-center") forces. Of course, there can be no unity on the unprincipled, anti-Leninist basis. Thus, despite their unity-mongering, the pro-Khrushchovite and social-democratic parties and coalitions are just as notorious as the Maoists for being faction-ridden, disunited and consumed by the self-serving struggle of cliques.

Thus when the crusaders denounce the ideological struggle as "Maoism," they are in effect taking up the Khrushchovite criticism of Maoism. They are to that extent replacing the Marxist-Leninist critique of Mao Zedong Thought with the stand of Khrushchovism. The irony of history is that to preserve their Maoist blunders in a time of the all-round exposure of Maoism, they have taken up Khrushchovite phrasemongering on certain questions. This is only

possible because Maoism and Khrushchovism are both variants of a common reactionary ideology. Whatever the differences in form and tactics between the various revisionisms, they are all branches of the same tree.

In opposition to Maoism, Khrushchovite revisionism and social-democracy, revolutionary Marxism-Leninism upholds the struggle against opportunism. The question of fighting opportunism is of immense importance to the revolution. It is a programmatic question, a fundamental question of strategy and tactics. There can be no talk of a revolutionary movement in the U.S. unless it fights opportunism. The bourgeoisie seeks to strangle the revolution by surrounding the proletariat and the activists with a stifling and corrupting atmosphere of liberal-labor politics. To this end, the bourgeoisie utilizes a variety of means: the dead weight of decades of liberal-labor corruption of the mass movements; the giant labor bureaucracy; the legions of poverty pimps and petty officials; the modern revisionists and social-democrats who form a "left" wing of the Democratic Party; etc. These can be counteracted by even stronger forces, the forces of revolution, the forces of the class conscious proletariat and its allies. Marxism-Leninism puts forward the orientation for these healthy, growing forces, and revolutionary Marxism-Leninism grows and thrives among them. But to give up the struggle against opportunism means to lose faith in the powerful forces of the revolution and to instead slide into the marsh of accommodation with the liberal-labor bog. Therefore the denunciation of the Maoist and Khrushchovite theories opposed to the ideological struggle and the struggle against opportunism is one of the burning questions of the revolution.

The Marxist-Leninist Critique of Mao's Theory on the Existence of Opposing Lines and Headquarters Inside the Party

Now let us set forward the Marxist-Leninist critique of Mao's theories in favor of the existence of opposing lines and factions in the party.

Our Party unanimously denounced these Maoist theories at an internal conference in March 1979. We stressed that these theories negated the militant monolithic unity of the party, disorganized the party, promoted coexistence with opportunism and were wildly factionalist. It was stated that:

"Mao Tsetung's factionalism was especially revealed in his theory of the existence of two headquarters in the party, with representatives of these headquarters existing in every body from the central committee and political bureau, right down to every organization at the base. This is a theory of unbridled factionalism and of destroying the party's monolithic unity. It presents itself as a theory to fight revisionism, but actually it is a theory to coexist with revisionism." (*Mao Tsetung and Mao Zedong Thought Are Revisionist and Anti-Marxist-Leninist*, Part IV, "The Leading Role and the Organization of the Party," pp. 7-8)

Thus the Maoist theory has the following characteristics: I. It is in the first place directed against the unity of the party. The Maoists ridicule the Leninist principles of unity as "undialectical" and even revisionist. Instead the Maoist theories turn the party into an arena for the clash of forces with contradictory principles and platforms. Indeed the Maoist theory turns the party into an arena where many classes clash, with both a "bourgeois" and a "proletarian" headquarters. Furthermore, Mao's talk of two headquarters was even prettification, for in fact many different "headquarters" and factions existed and clashed in the Chinese leadership.

II. It is directly related to Mao's utter negation of party concept and party spirit. The Maoists negate the leading role of the party and instead glorify the various headquar-

ters and factions or, to be more precise, the personal rule of the various chiefs. In fact, Mao treated the party with contempt. The Maoist theory denounces the party methods of work as allegedly formalism and bureaucracy and a damper on the initiative of the masses. A rampant individualism was fostered. The party committees and collective leadership were tossed away. Instead there is the formation of networks of agents and of "leading groups" formed arbitrarily according to the power of this or that faction. The Maoists respected no Marxist-Leninist norms of organization whatsoever, but simply played off one force against another in whatever way expediency demanded. The result of their negation of the party under the pretext of avoiding bureaucracy was their reliance on military discipline and the army in order to bring order into the Party and Chinese society.

III. By talking of two-line struggle or struggle against the bourgeois headquarters, Mao tried to give an anti-revisionist coloring to his theories. Naturally, one would at first assume that recognition of the existence of a bourgeois headquarters would imply the sternest struggle to eliminate this headquarters. But Mao's theory was not that the bourgeois headquarters should be eliminated, but that its existence was inevitable. The struggle between the opposing headquarters, lines or factions was viewed by Mao as simply a struggle to preserve the balance between the factions, to somewhat elevate one or lower the other. Indeed, in general Mao's idea of the struggle between opposites was of an eternal series of changes of place, of first one side, then the other, gaining temporary dominance. That was also his idea of the struggle between opposing lines in the party. When he talked of struggle against the bourgeoisie or the revisionists, he actually meant recognition of the legitimate right to existence in the party of the bourgeoisie or the revisionists. Hence Mao's theories were not theories of struggle against opportunism, whether inside or outside the party, but of coexistence between opportunist factions.

IV. The Maoist theory promotes anarchist and factionalist methods of waging the inner-party struggle. The Maoist anarchism and factionalism is based on the negation of the party concept and on the liberal, social-democratic theories of the coexistence of factions in the party. Naturally the coexistence between factions inevitably breaks out into squabbles between factions, and this unprincipled chaos was prettified as "two-line struggle." These anarchist and factionalist methods were particularly widely propagated during the "cultural revolution." Revolutionary Marxism-Leninism strips the anti-revisionist mask from the anarchist and factionalist methods. It does not criticize the "cultural revolution" for fighting too hard against opportunism, but for the opposite, for adopting a liberal and complacent attitude both towards the criticism of the ideological basis of the Chinese ultra-revisionists and for leaving them in power. Indeed, the truth is that the Chinese leaders never intended the "cultural revolution" to be anything but a mild readjustment of factions, to be over and done with within a year. Caught by surprise by the unexpected severity of the struggle, the Chinese leadership was utterly unable to deal with the situation, and the "cultural revolution" eventually ended in utter fiasco, with the power firmly in the hands of the ultra-revisionists.

These are the basic features of the Maoist theories which our Party has stigmatized with the vivid characterization of "two (or more) headquarters in the party."

In line with its anti-party theories, Maoism has defined the class struggle in the party as equivalent with two-line struggle or the struggle between opposing lines and factions. Revolutionary Marxism-Leninism does not accept this definition of the inner-party class struggle. Such a formula implies that opposing lines and factions always exist in the party. But the inner-party struggle goes on all the

time in a monolithic party, free from factions or opposing lines and united in thought and action. Indeed, among the main aims of the inner-party class struggle is barring the way to the crystallization of hostile lines in the party, ensuring the vigorous implementation of the single line of the party and maintaining the militant fighting unity of the party.

However, should the dangerous situation arise that opposing lines or factions do crystallize inside the party, then no self-respecting proletarian party accepts this fact. Instead the party strives hard to restore unity on the basis of the revolutionary program and line that expresses the class interests of the proletariat. In such a serious situation, when opposing lines do exist, then the class struggle may center on or take the form of a struggle between opposing lines.

As well, the struggle of the proletarian party against opportunists outside the party may also assume the form of a struggle between opposing lines. This is especially obvious today when a fierce struggle is proceeding between Marxism-Leninism and the various revisionist and opportunist currents. For example, this month marks the 20th anniversary of the famous Moscow meeting of 1960 of 81 communist and workers' parties. At this meeting, as the *History of the Party of Labor of Albania* points out:

"...the crystallization of the two opposing lines in the international communist movement — the Marxist-Leninist line and the revisionist line — became still more apparent.

"The struggle between these two lines had become unavoidable..." (Ch. V, Sec. 4, p. 468)

The struggle against modern revisionism does not contradict the Leninist unity of the communists, but is a prerequisite for it. To close one's eyes to this struggle is to jeopardize the revolution and harm the cause of genuine unity. As Lenin stressed:

"Unity is a great thing and a great slogan. But what the workers' cause needs is the unity of Marxists, not unity between Marxists and opponents and distorters of Marxism." ("Unity," *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 232, emphasis as in the original)

The monolithic unity both of the international Marxist-Leninist movement and of the individual parties can only be built up on the Leninist basis, without opportunists and in resolute struggle against them. This is what Leninism teaches. And this is what Maoism denies, with its ridiculing of the very possibility of unity among the Marxists and its advocacy of coexistence with the opportunists.

Hence the Marxist-Leninist critique of the Maoist theories on opposing lines and headquarters in the party is profound and concrete. It is precisely in order to obscure this powerful Marxist-Leninist critique that the crusaders against ideological struggle have reduced everything to emotionalism about "two-line struggle." This is putting the cart before the horse. Marxism-Leninism does not condemn the Maoist theories on the basis of picking out random phrases out of context, but, on the contrary, judges various theses and formulations on whether or not they express the Marxist-Leninist truth or the opportunist falsehood. We shall see that the crusaders against ideological struggle are striving with might and main to obscure the Marxist-Leninist critique of the Maoist theories because these crusaders want to negate the Marxist-Leninist critique and substitute their Maoist blunders. Hence they posit that everything has allegedly been solved, and Maoism vanquished, by simply avoiding any mention of the phrase "opposing lines" and by marching straightaway into the Khrushchovite heaven of class peace and the extinction of the ideological struggle.

To be continued