

# CLASS

10¢

SPRING 1974  
ISSUE 4

FOR THE  
WORLD  
PROLETARIAN  
REVOLUTION

# WAR

## THE SECOND CULTURAL REVOLUTION

The first Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China emerged and developed as an integral part of the world-wide revolutionary upheavals of the 1960's, mass strikes, armed insurrections, and all-out class war—in the colonial zones, in the imperialist heartlands, and in the workers' states themselves. The first Cultural Revolution gave birth to new mass-strike forms of struggle and revolutionary political lines which are an integral part of the world-wide polemics of the last decade, out of which has come the new international proletarian revolutionary movement which today has entered battle with the most vicious enemies of all of humanity.

There is today a second Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in the People's Republic of China. As this article will demonstrate, this second great revolutionary upheaval is the object of a world-wide "cover-up" which is trying, as also happened during the period of 1966-1969, to conceal the genuine class struggle at hand by portraying the events in China over the past six months in terms of "mandarin mysteries". Unfortunately, the political habits of even the left faction in the Chinese Communist Party do not aid in dispelling that image of contemporary Chinese politics—unfathomable intrigue. The second Cultural Revolution, which has begun in China in the past few weeks, is emerging, and developing under the conditions of the emergency assembly of the world-wide united front against the Rockefeller-CIA and allied forces and their moves for fascist military takeover, i.e., under conditions of international crisis unparalleled in history.

As pointed out in Class War no. 3, published in September, 1973, in the present struggle, what was left unresolved in the first Cultural Revolution must now be directly confronted by the left and ultra-left proletarian forces. The 10th Party Congress, as we pointed out, actually expressed an extremely shaky situation. Mao Tsetung's own silence at that congress (he has always addressed Party Congresses) according to the Chinese C.P. "etiquette", indicated his disapproval of the situation in the congress, the predominance of Chou En Lai and his "rehabilitated" bureaucrats like Teng Hsiao-Ping, the removal of both Chiang Ching and Yao Wen-Yuan from the top nine officials in the political bureau, etc. This silence was the signal for the struggle to begin again, in the party, in the state apparatus of workers' rule, and throughout the society. As in 1965, the left began its struggle, not in Peking—dominated by Chou En Lai's apparatchniks in the State Council, but in Shanghai, main industrial center in China and traditional base of the revolutionary workingclass movement.

One month after the August 1973 10th Party Congress, the left launched a new publication in Shanghai's Fu Tan University entitled "Study and Criticism". Although most of the articles have been written under pseudonyms, it is widely believed that Yao Wen-Yuan and Chiang Ching herself are closely connected with "Study and Criticism"—this makes all the more ominous the news, in late March, that the publication has been banned, an unprecedentedly repressive move by Chou En Lai and his faction, indicating the seriousness of the situation.

The factional situation is essentially the following—

In the center, but leaning far to the right, in his classical role of conciliator since the early days of the Chinese Revolution, stands Chou En Lai.  
(please turn to page two...)

Chou En Lai rests on his personal domain, the State Council, which unlike the municipal and regional political and military apparatuses, did not suffer extensive purges and internal struggle during the first Cultural Revolution. It is from his position of power in the State Council that Chou En Lai launched his counter-attack on the foreign affairs bureaus of the state, and the international relations section of the Party, which were seized by the left and ultra-left during 1966 and 1967. However, with such a power base in Peking alone, Chou could not hold power very long. To maintain the State Council against the left, Chou has brought back into power many of the most rightist and restorationist bureaucrats who were major targets of the Red Guards campaigns. Chou has deployed these elements in the diplomatic corps and at the regional and municipal party leadership levels. To the left stand the Shanghai rebel forces identified with Chiang Ching, many of these leaders of the Workers Revolutionary Rebel General Headquarters which, numbering 2 to 3 million members at its height, was the main constituent of the 1967 January Revolution, the Shanghai Commune. This faction, which can count on wide support in Wuhan, Taiyuan, and other major industrial centers, is itself flanked by the self-declared Ultra-Left, typified most clearly by the Sheng Wu-Lien in Hunan and their allies in various areas, who organized the "August Gun-Seizing Campaign" in 1967, and who first identified Chou En Lai as "China's Number Two Khrushchov". The army is in the midst of a complex and fluid situation. Lin Piao and his faction in the Political Department of the People's Liberation Army, far from representing the military "old guard", as has been suggested in the capitalist press, actually led a struggle beginning in 1965, against the entrenched regional military commanders in the P.L.A. who had established "independent kingdoms" in various areas which were linked with various municipal and regional party leaderships. Lin Piao's famous 1965 essay "Long Live the Victory of People's War!", while polemicizing against the U.S.S.R.'s peaceful coexistence line, was actually primarily a polemic against Lo Jui Ching's "Commemorate the Victory over German Fascism", also written in 1965, which argued in favor of reliance on nuclear weapons and a "traditional" type of army. In 1965, Lo Jui-Ching was both Vice-Premier of the State Council, tied with the Chou En Lai faction, and Chief of the General Staff of the P.L.A. He was the commander of the P.L.A. not by virtue of any centralizing influence in the P.L.A. but as the figure most acceptable to the various regional military commanders. Lo Jui-Ching and his group bitterly opposed Lin Piao's campaigns to both democratize and centralize the P.L.A., abolishing saluting and insignia of rank and developing egalitarian relations between officers and soldiers at the same time as he activated the largely dormant Political Department of the P.L.A. and used it as a left-wing political center from which to attack the "old guard". With Lin Piao's death and the subsequent purging of his forces from the P.L.A., as Class War no. 3 pointed out, a veritable Chinese Watergate, the "old guard" began making a gradual comeback. However, beginning in early January of this year, apparently Chou En Lai moved against these elements, breaking up a number of regional commands, transferring commanders far from their regular home bases, protecting himself for the time being against attack from this quarter, as he prepares to take on the left, but leaving a dangerous situation of a vacuum of leadership in the military as a whole.

The immediate question we must deal with is the disposition of these factions, representing their respective class interests, in terms of the present international situation. Although it is obvious that Lin Piao was never a "Soviet agent", as the Chou En Lai forces have implied, it is probable that we represented a faction in both the army and the party as a whole which favored a "detente" oriented towards the Soviet Union rather than towards the United States. Chen Pota, representing this line in the party, like Lin Piao, was bitterly opposed to Soviet modern revisionism but by early 1971, saw that the developing crisis in the capitalist countries, especially in the United States, would throw the imperialist bourgeoisie, particularly its most desperate and ruthless factions, into the most violent posture. With the advent of the 100th anniversary of the Paris Commune, the left took the occasion to press for a return to the militant foreign posture of the late 1960's. Under this pressure, the Chou En Lai faction, borrowing a page from CIA "dirty tricks", set up in Piao and Chen Pota both, but mainly Lin Piao, for reasons we shall point out below, as alleged "conspirators" working on behalf of the Soviet Union, while at the same time Chou pressed for the most unprincipled "detente" policies vis-a-vis the United States. It is not clear whether the left forces led by Chiang Ching, Yao Wen-Yuan, etc. would necessarily favor a China-U.S.S.R. detente at this time, but it is clear that they oppose the extent of the China-U.S. detente, which, with Teng Hsiao-Ping's recent disgusting support expressed for the Rockefeller-CIA "raw materials shortages" hoax, shows the most dangerous threat to the world revolution as a whole. The pro-U.S. elements in the Chinese bureaucracy, akin to the Dubcek elements in Czechoslovakia, are undoubtedly using the threat of an attack by the Soviet Union to further drive Chou into the arms of the U.S. Any "scandals" like the recent "helicopter incident" on the China-U.S.S.R. border, must be

(please turn to page 3....)

strongly considered to be "dirty tricks" operations by either pro-U.S. elements in the Chinese leadership, or even possibly the work of U.S. C.I.A. operatives, taking their orders directly from the Rockefellers, as part of world-wide Operation Chaos and Confusion, a preliminary phase of the Rockefeller-CIA game plan for military takeover. Rockefeller-CIA forces have already used the "threat" of possible war between China and the U.S.S.R. as the pretext for NATO maneuvers in Europe. The continued ability of traitorous pro-U.S. elements to stage provocations on up to even attempting, in conjunction with C.I.A. forces, to incite full-scale war, will not be eliminated by any China-U.S.S.R. military non-aggression pact alone, although that would certainly be an immensely important positive step at that time, but rather by the mass mobilization and political consciousness of the working class in both China and the Soviet Union, in the face of the bureaucracy which is a class enemy in both countries, against the immediate threat of the Rockefeller-CIA moves as well as the no-less-immediate threat posed by the bureaucracies, and for the world proletarian revolution and world socialist reconstruction in this decade. What then is the situation in the political struggles in China and the development of these struggles over the past couple of months especially, where both Chinese and international press alike have been speaking of a "new cultural revolution" ?

Following the launching of "Study and Criticism" in September of last year, the next immediate indication of continued instability in the leadership, and another strong signal for heightened "struggle between the two lines" in the party and elsewhere was Mao Tsetung's unprecedented absence from the October 1st rallies, which like his silence at the 10th party congress, can in no way be attributed to illness. In November, newspapers note the absence of Wang Hung-wen, a "young Turk" from Shanghai, from various official meetings, indicating further unclear rifts. In December come rumors of clashes between workers and public security forces in Wuhan, a major industrial city with a traditionally strong left proletariat. All of these events take place against the background of a cryptic campaign, at first waged by the right, but then, as we shall show, picked up by the left also, a campaign which initially emerges with the rather absurd theme of trying to draw a parallel between Lin Piao and Confucius. It must be pointed out that the rightists never cite from actual speeches or writings by Lin Piao, but rather ascribe all sorts of alleged Confucian utterances to Lin Piao without ever citing source of the quotation, which can only lead one to believe that such alleged quotations are simply dreamed up by Chou En Lai's lackeys in the propaganda department of the State Council ! The references to Confucius, however, have a more important aspect, which has been virtually ignored by western observers, namely the connection between the anti-Confucius campaign and that other key figure set up by the Chou En Lai faction in the Chinese Watergate, namely Chen Pota.

Personal secretary to Chairman Mao, vice-president of the Academia Sinica, a leading party scholar noted for his enthusiasm for the Paris Commune, during the first cultural revolution the head of the key Cultural Revolution Group in the Central Committee, virtual central headquarters of the left, Chen Pota is today virtually unmentioned by either side in the current polemics. His personal fate is still unknown. However, the use of Confucius as a negative example to link with Lin Piao can only refer, indirectly perhaps, to Chen Pota, like Confucius, known as a "scribe", and identified by the Chou En Lai faction as an evil old patriarch plotting against the forces of good and rooted in the "old ways", in this case, not the feudal values of ancient China, but actually, the revolutionary traditions of the Chinese Revolution in the 20th century ! By being vague in this way, the Chou En Lai faction has left itself open to attack as well, since Confucius can also be identified with Chou En Lai, and this seems, in fact, to have been the case more recently. Why is it not possible to come out in the open and attack Chen Pota in the same way that Lin Piao has been attacked? Simply because Chen Pota is too closely associated with Mao Tsetung himself, and, as they are in the process of "rehabilitating" various rightists who, during the cultural revolution were openly anti-Mao, the Chou En Lai forces, at least during the last three months of 1973, felt too vulnerable to attack from the left to risk a campaign which might be interpreted as anti-Mao. The left itself, including Mao, have made a bad mistake by their silence on the "Lin Piao affair". Either they were duped, or, more likely, still felt too threatened by external threats, both from the U.S. and Soviet Union, to risk beginning an open struggle against Chou En Lai. Evidently, such considerations are being increasingly dropped, and open, even violent struggle increasing, since the beginning of this year.

In early 1974, the left begins its new offensive. An article appears in an issue of "Study and Criticism" which is the most obvious direct attack against Chou En Lai and his policies. The article discusses the French Revolution, the division in the revolutionary republican forces between left and right wings, and the balance

(please turn to page four . . .)

held by Robespierre who, according to the article "raised his left hand to strike down the right and then his right hand to strike down the left." Robespierre ended up on the guillotine himself, the article says, because he was unable to carry the revolution through to the end. "Study and Criticism" ends the article with the observation that those who accuse a revolution of going too far are probably preparing to betray it.

The Chou En Lai forces respond to this attack with warnings about "excessive factionalism", and then, in what will prove to be a bad blunder, with a campaign aimed directly at the leading left figure, Chiang Ching herself. This campaign is the stupid chauvinist "anti-Beethoven" campaign, followed by attacks against Shakespeare, Schubert, etc. As is well known throughout China, Chiang Ching is a devotee of Beethoven. She personally asked the recent visiting American philharmonic orchestra to play Beethoven's Sixth Symphony, the Pastorale, during their performances in various Chinese cities. She has also led the revolutionary campaign to fuse the best of western music, including increased use of the piano, western-style orchestration and symphony, etc. into today's Peking Opera, a campaign which reached its peak during the world-shaking events of 1966-1969, and, despite all the "third world" racist sycophancy of Guardian-type "Maoists", is a rejection of the "native" Chinese music. Chiang Ching has led a struggle against the hideously banalizing tinkle-tinkle and high-pitched screeching of much of "traditional" Chinese opera and music. By attacking the left through an attack on Chiang Ching's known enthusiasm for Beethoven, the rightist and centrist forces show they are at heart anti-internationalist which is perfectly consistent with their anti-workingclass perspective. However, rather than pressing their advantage on this question, namely the wide internationalist sentiment in the Chinese workingclass, the left forces apparently do not respond with any direct counter-attack, but rather cave in to this vile nationalistic sentiment by declaring that, if decadence is coming into China, it must be the fault of Chou En Lai whose detente policies have opened the way for increased cultural exchanges! The response by the left to the anti-Beethoven nonsense expresses a basic weakness of the left, which found expression during the first cultural revolution as well, the failure of Mao Tsetung, at the height of the anti-revisionist polemics of the sixties, to begin the building of a new revolutionary international.

By January 19, reports from various provinces in China indicate that the "class struggle is comparatively acute and complicated", and increased warnings from the bureaucracy in Peking against the "dangers of factionalism" as well as the news that large numbers of Red Guard units are being revived indicate that the struggle is passing beyond the limits prescribed for it by the bureaucracy, beyond a simple mass propaganda campaign and into the mass-strike ferment of the class war.

On February 2nd, the various campaigns underway are officially declared to be a "second cultural revolution". The bureaucracy, by admitting the re-emergence of the class struggle process which broke out in 1966, hopes to contain that process within its own limits, especially by breaking up the left's main attack against the Chou En Lai forces into a series of local struggles against local, regional, and municipal figures, largely expandable figureheads who are slated for retirement soon anyways. In Sheng Wu-Lien's "Whither China?" (Class War no. 3) they point out how in the first cultural revolution, the bureaucracy tried to break up the revolutionary mass struggles which aimed at creating an entirely new Paris Commune-type state structure into a series of local campaigns to remove individual "capitalist-roaders". Apparently, however, this tactic has not worked out as well the second time—reports in newspapers, both Chinese and internationally, point out increasing violence in various cities in China. On February 16, the New York Times, Chou En Lai's factionally ally in this country, reports that all cities in China, except Peking, are closed to foreigners. A week later this report is contradicted by a story that a group of U.S. travellers in China did get access to several other cities besides Peking, but that their sight-seeing was more restricted than usual, they were discouraged from taking photographs of wall-posters, and that the city of Wuhan, at any rate, was still off bounds.

In early March, the left forces open up a new campaign against the Chou En Lai group, obviously modelled after the 1965 campaign against the play "Hai Jui Dismissed from Office", a campaign which led directly to the cultural revolution the following year. This new campaign is waged against a play entitled "Three Visits to Tsofeng", produced by the cultural group of Chou En Lai's State Council, and bitterly attacked in the Shanghai left journal "Study and Criticism" by Chu Lan, whom many believe to be Yao Wen-Yuan. In an unprecedented concession to the left, Chu Lan's articles attacking the play, which link it, and thus Chou En Lai, directly to attempts to restore capitalism in China, is reprinted in Hongqi (Red Flag) the Party's official theoretical journal published in Peking.

(continued on page five . . .)

On March 19th, the Rockefeller-CIA's main organ, the New York Times, expresses its concern with the developments in China, particularly the evident turn to violent mass struggles. Rocky and the CIA need a stable Chou-led bureaucracy in China, especially to help push the "third world boycott of raw materials" hoax in the United Nations, not to speak of the Rocky-CIA plans for further penetration of the Chinese economy itself. The NY Times editorial that day places its hopes on Chou En Lai, hoping Chou can "collaborate with the Chairman, but also play a moderating role." In other words, they hope that Chou can nag on to some shread of "revolutionary" identity, even if only by an occasional diplomatic public appearance with Mao, while at the same time he crushes the left and polices the working class and peasantry.

The last half of March witnesses increased news of open violence and class war in China. Left publications in Hunan issue an article commemorating the 103rd anniversary of the Paris Commune, a favorite topic of the left and ultra-left, which calls for revolutionary violence, for a revival of the spirit of revolutionary rebellion, and for increased involvement of the army in the new cultural revolution. Apparently, by the end of March, the bureaucracy in Peking has taken the unprecedented repressive step of banning "Study and Criticism" itself. Whether this means that the left has been halted, for the time being, in its campaign against Chou En Lai, is not clear. April has witnessed increasing evidence of repressive moves. The April 18 New York Times reports that public notices in the city of Canton list the names and ages of about 30 people recently executed for alleged "espionage"—on behalf of the Soviet Union, not the United States—and also for opposition to the anti-Lin Piao campaign.

The predicament of the bureaucracy has some analogy with the situation that faces the Rockefeller-CIA forces in the advanced sector. By provoking chaos and confusion, rebellion and mass political activity, these reactionary elements may very well be opening a Pandora's Box, unleashing forces which they will not be able to control—the key is the role of the revolutionary movement, whether in China or in the capitalist countries, and our ability to intervene into this situation and out-organize the class enemy, whether it be the bureaucracy of the workers' state in China or the CIA-LEAA fascists in this country, and to turn the thrust of the mass struggles and mass-strike energy against the most outstanding and immediate foe. In both cases the tactics of the enemy center around their attempts to divide, localize, and dissipate the political ferment—our tactics, indeed the essence of our overall strategy and general program, is to forge class-wide united fronts, organs of struggle for power—in China, this means a return to the praxis of the Shanghai Commune and the 1967 January Revolution, here in North America, this means the rapid building of N.U.W.R.O. (North American Unemployed and Welfare Rights Organization) as the political union of the entire workingclass, eventually developing Political Central Labor Councils throughout the continent, councils which will move from mass-strike agitation to dual power confrontation with the organs of capitalist rule, and from dual power to full power, as the component sections of the workers' government.

The role of the Chinese in terms of the overall international situation is marked by inconsistencies, but, in the past couple of months, by an increasing rightward motion, peaking in Teng Hsiao-Ping's recent United Nations endorsement of the Rockefeller-directed raw materials hoax. The March 15, 1974 issue of the Peking Review contained two almost completely contradictory articles about the "energy crisis". On the front page of the publication, the heading says "Behind the So-called Energy Crisis". The first article follows the pro-Rockefeller line, supporting the "Arab unity" for the oil embargo, etc. and calling upon other "third world" countries to do likewise vis-a-vis other raw materials. The second article, however, ascribes the "energy crisis" directly to the oil companies, not the Arabs, and entitled "Fabulous Profits for U.S. Oil Monopoly Capital", goes on to name Exxon and others, attacking the conspiratorial character of the "shortages", and declaring that "such perverse action by oil monopoly capital has aroused stronger and stronger resentment on the part of the U.S. public." This article may be the expression of the desire of the bureaucracy to keep their options open, or it may express deep divisions over foreign policy. It is important to note that the Chinese have not referred to the Watergate "scandals" once, and unlike the police-riddled "Maoists" in the United States, have not jumped on the "Impeach Nixon" bandwagon in any way.

The Chinese are known to have been increasing their own production of oil in recent years. It is estimated that Chinese oil production has increased by 150% in the three years between 1970 and 1973, reaching about 50million tons per year in 1973. China is presently self-sufficient in oil production, getting most of its oil from the Taching area in Manchuria, with some further drilling planned in southern areas using equipment purchased from Denmark (offshore supply vessels) and Japan (drilling rigs). But this cannot possibly meet the needs of an expanding and developing modern

(continued on page six . . .)

socialist economy, which is what China must become as the only alternative to the kind of austerity and zero-growth decay which is the Rockefeller program for all of Asia. This means that the Chinese must join with the French, with whom they already have a record of good relations, as well as the U.S.S.R. and Japan, to develop nuclear fusion power as the basis for stopping the Rockefeller energy and raw materials blackmails, and laying the foundations for world-wide socialist economic reconstruction. (See New Solidarity, April 15, 1974 for further material on nuclear fusion power, also the historic Draft Program for World Reconstruction, adopted at the second international convention of N.U.W.R.O.).

The Rockefeller forces are already moving to threaten the Chinese bureaucracy against any moves which might threaten their game plans. This threat takes the form of the Jackson amendment to Nixon's proposed bill for increased trade with the Soviet Union and China. The Jackson amendment would oppose lowering trade tariffs for countries which restrict emigration. On April 2nd, Senator Mike Mansfield, citing the 750 million dollars worth of trade with China in 1973, proposed that the Nixon increased trade bill explicitly include China. Jackson, a Rockefeller stooge, has mainly used his amendment to threaten the Soviet bureaucracy, citing the "Soviet Jewry" controversy as a basis for possible maintenance of trade restrictions, but the Rocky-CIA forces could at any time revive their periodic propaganda campaigns about the "Bamboo Curtain", refugees braving barbed-wire and border-guards to reach the supposed "free world" in Hong Kong or Taiwan, etc. and thereby use the Jackson amendment against the Chinese also.

Although, in the final analysis, we must place our hopes on the left, proletarian revolutionary forces in China to carry the second cultural revolution through to the end and completely overthrow the Chou En Lai clique, we must point out that, simply to save their own skins, even the most rotten revisionist bureaucrats must break now from their suicidal domestic and foreign policies which are playing right into the hands of the Rockefeller-CIA forces, the most vicious enemies of all of humanity.

The Chinese, together with the Albanians and all those Maoist and pro-Chinese forces which have not fallen, like so much of the left, into the hands of the CIA, must immediately join in the International Workers' United Front proposed by the National Caucus of Labor Committees in their January 23rd, 1974 Emergency Joint-Action proposal. Furthermore, through their representatives in the United Nations, they must renounce the "third world" line which gives a "left" cover to Rockefeller's blackmails, and instead urge united action to break the energy and raw materials strangleholds. Also, they must support the petition filed at the United Nations Human Rights Division in late January of this year by the N.C.L.C. charging the CIA, British MI-5, and allied agencies with Nuremberg crimes, mentecidal brainwashing and behaviour modification. Radio Peking and Radio Tirana in Albania must join the international briefing network and help blow the cover off Rocky's moves at the same time as they help mobilize the world-wide forces needed to help bring the working class to power in North America and Europe in the next two to three years. Anything less than this is insane suicide and criminal treachery to the cause of the world revolution. By reversing the rightward turn, even if only for their own selfish reasons, the Chinese leadership can help to ensure the continued existence of the human race in this century.

In the light of the Rockefeller-CIA moves for military takeover this year, CLASS WAR does not uphold the position of Election Boycott for the upcoming elections in November, 1974. Although we believe that we have been absolutely correct in calling for Election Boycott up to this point, especially during the Great Elections Hoax of 1972, the necessity for defending even the limited "democratic rights" against CIA-LEAA fascist military takeover requires that, as a tactic at this time, CLASS WAR support the electoral campaigns of the U.S. LABOR PARTY, political arm of N.U.W.R.O. here in New York City and throughout the United States.

CLASS WAR will continue to appear, as a mimeographed publication, and will continue the programmatic analysis and polemics begun in the first three newspaper issues, including the series on the Struggle Between Two Lines in the Communist Movement, the planned history of the first Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, the study of Left-Wing Communism, and other questions of vital importance to the theoretical and practical development of the workingclass.