INTRO NOTE:

WHY IS THE HISTORICAL QUESTION OF THE 4-GANG IN CHINA MORE THAN 20 YEARS AGO OF IMPORTANCE TODAY?

Readers may wonder perhaps: Why do I hold this to be such a relatively important question today?

This has to do with the massive subversive activities by the main reactionaries in the world against the international Marxist-Leninist movement, activities which it's absolutely necessary to expose and to beat. Both of the CIA-manipulated phony "Internationals", the "RIMitz" and the "MIMitz", are strenuously making propaganda for the ultra-rightist 4-gang as the "real revolutionaries in China" in the mid-70s etc, as an important part of their whole ideological setup.

A QUESTION LONG-SINCE SETTLED BUT A CASE "REOPENED" AGAIN BY CIA AND TODAY LARGELY TURNED UPSIDE-DOWN

The question of the character of the 4-gang was really settled long ago, in late 1976, when that counter-revolutionary clique was completely exposed to and condemned and beaten by the Chinese people in October 1976, supported in this by the international Marxist-Leninist movement at that time too.

Only later was that question so to speak "reopened" again.

This was after, firstly, the group in China led by Hua Guofeng, whom Mao Zedong had proposed and made propaganda for as his successor as CPC chairman - thereby dealing a blow both at the hopes of the openly-rightist Deng Xiaoping clique and also at those of the phony "left" 4-gang - had started openly to commit acts of revisionist treason themselves as early as in the very next month, November 1976, and then step by step combined with the Deng clique in to overthrow socialism in China, a restoration of capitalism that was completed in late 1978.

And secondly, the question in a way was reopened by them from 1978 on, from the CIA puppet the "RCP" in the USA, above all, starting to unfold a complete falsification of the then recent history of the class struggle in China, a falsification proclaiming the - to all
who knew the most basic facts — completely exposed and refuted 4-gang as "the real revolutionaries" in China.

Because of the already weak and in fact doubtful nature of many Marxist-Leninist (with or without quotes) organizations of the mid-70s in several parts of the world and also the big blow to the entire international Marxist-Leninist movement in the world that was effected by the overthrow of socialism in China, knowledge of such basic facts as mentioned above was scant to begin with and later in many places obviously vanished completely.

This plus the fact that there in the ideology of the PCP in Peru, whose people's war from 1980 on earned it a considerable and not unjustified prestige internationally, were (and still are) certain grave weaknesses which enabled the CIA to "sell" its 4-gang "heroes" and its entire reactionary anti-Mao 1984 "RIM Declaration" to it, has caused the present situation in which obviously rather many sincere people in various parts of the world believe that this falsification is the truth.

THE TRUE HISTORY OF EVENTS IN CHINA IN 1976 ETC

With several earlier postings, not least with the abovementioned Info #22en, I've refuted this Goebbels/Orwellian "truth". Of great importance concerning it are also the 1976-79 articles by the then Marxist-Leninist party in Germany, the "NE", which I reproduced in Infos #12en, of 08.07.96, and #40en, of 13.07.97.

In the present Info is reproduced a debate on the role of the 4-gang, between me and a present-day adherent of that gang, Jay Miles, of the Detroit Peru Support Committee, which took place on the Marxism-General mailing list (M-G) managed by the Spoon Collective, in the time between December 1996 and last February (when I on my part had to postpone its continuation).

Its main interest today, I believe, lies in that history of the events in China of that most crucial year, 1976, which I wrote down, with polemical comments, dealing with all the most important events in chronological order, as part of that debate. It's reproduced in parts 4/12 to 7/12 of this Info.

From the likewise 12 parts of that earlier Info, #22en, which contain all the most crucial documents, readers could already puzzle together that history. For overwhelming proof of what I'm maintaining, I refer you to that posting. But the sequence of events should be easier to see below here.

Also I in that debate brought a collection of criticisms of the 4-gang by Mao Zedong, at CPC party meetings, in the years 1974-976. They are in part 8/12 here. So is a list of things on the Net with information on China in the mid-70s.

Reading the last four parts, 9-12/12, is *very* "optional". They contain a 4-part debate posting by Jay Miles (with a few comments by me now) which is liable to bore you to death since it's as good as
empty of relevant facts, and which is included only in order to demonstrate (further) his "debate methods".

DEBATING THE 4-GANG WITH A PRESENT-DAY (AVAKIANIST) CONTINUER OF ITS LINE

The rest of this Info mainly contains other debate postings by me as well as some quite long, and not badly-informed but *completely and callously mendacious* ones, really painstaking attempts at fooling those not so familiar with the facts – and possibly, at fooling himself, even – despite his by then already since several months back knowing the true story, by Jay Miles, who thereby rather instructively demonstrates some of the conning methods of such forces as were the 4-gang in China more than 20 years ago. In part 8/12, I'm commenting on them, before reproducing Jay's February batch of postings.

Since early 1996, I've had Net contact with the Detcom and with Jay Miles, a contact that has been rewarding too in many ways. I've earlier gotten some important information from Jay. And in two political struggles at least, the one against the *leaders* of the "RCP" and of "RIM" for their stabbing the people's war in Peru in the back and the April-June 1996 successful fight against and exposure of the "Quispe" US imperialist agent crowd, he and the Detcom he's leading – eventually – came out on the side of the proletariat.

But otherwise, Jay very systematically has been "jumping up on a fence and staying there" in all more important political struggles, in particular, that concerning the character of the *"RIM" as a whole*, its reactionary 1984 basic "Declaration" in particular, which he's seen exposed (by me) since early 1996.

And now quite recently, in that struggle which did not start with, but was considerably sharpened by, my ex-comrades', the now bourgeois "NE" in Germany, publishing on 30.06 a quite good criticism of the founder of the PCP, J.C. Mati-Eltegui, and in the course of which the phony "PCP ambassador" Adolfo Olaechea, UK, exposed himself so completely as a bourgeois swindler, he engaged in some sniping activities of a nasty and for him obviously characteristic kind, in favour of ultra-reaction.

Therefore, when judging the character of that today not unimportant Net writer, Jay Miles (respectively the Detcom as a whole), one must consider his actually taking a certain stand, last March, *against* the imperialists' ultra-reactionary anti-nuclear-energy campaign – an important part of their entire "green" warfare against the masses and one that's supported or covered up by *practically all* the phony "Marxists" internationally –unfortunately to have been in the main nothing further than another camouflage attempt on his part.

I had hoped, despite for instance that character of his 4-gang debate postings which the readers of this can see for themselves, that the basic standpoint of Jay Miles might turn out to be, or might change into, one of some genuine support for the international
proletariat anyway. But I now have to realize that this has not been the case. It's necessary to warn the readers, those who haven't already drawn the same conclusion themselves, about the character of that writer, which I hereby am doing for the first time:

He actually is a die-hard representative of the arch-reactionary line of the 1970s 4-gang in China, respectively of *Avakianism*, that very nasty ideology of the "RCP", USA, for which his own Detcom in early 1996 coined that apt term in the first place.

This of course doesn't mean that it would be wrong on principle for people perhaps to ally themselves with Jay Miles or the Det-com on some point or other. The same thing applies concerning all basically bourgeois forces. It just means that basically, you shouldn't trust them an inch.

Those who really want to represent Marxism today, to help show the way forward for the revolution, for the international proletariat, cannot get around the of course quite complicated and laborious business of basically getting to understand and be able themselves to see through and expose how the adversaries of that revolution, both "pro" such adversaries and also "amateur" ones, work in order to deflect and to smother its sincere conscious adherents. A study of that debate which this Info posting reproduces may be of some help in such a respect, I hope.

JAY MILES' DEBATE POSTING 1, 14.12.1996

Rolf, I have been thinking hard and doing a lot of study around the issue of the "gang of four" and the restoration of capitalism in China of late since your suggestion of a debate around these things was posted to the list. Of late I have been reading later issues of Peking Review (after 1976) and studying the political lines of Hua Kuo-feng and Deng Hsiao ping presented as interviews in these publications. I think I can demonstrate from the facts that you are holding a number of erroneous ideas concerning the events, persons, and political lines involved in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

I agree with you that a debate or discussion of these things would be of importance, more so than a lot of the stuff that I read on the Marxism lists. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was the greatest mass campaign to raise the revolutionary consciousness of the masses of people, not only in China but all over the world, and its effects are not over yet but is still having an impact on the political thinking of people internationally.

Here in the Detroit area, we have been fortunate that we have been able to talk and struggle with a great many people from China who come to our city and nearby to attend college. China sends many students here, mostly to study engineering it seems. We have talked with persons both young and old, people too young to remember much of the Cultural Revolution and others who were
actually Red Guards and participated fully in the political struggles of that period. We have spoken with both peasants and city folk, and people of all classes and current members of the revisionist Communist Party of China. It is very interesting and educational to speak with these persons and get a many view-points of what happened in China. I should like to relate some of what we have learned over the years from these discussions in our debate on the "gang of four" and China.

I would also to put forward an argument that the struggle against the Right deviationist trend (1975-1976) was not an attack on the four but against the capitalist roaders, Teng Hsiao-ping and his gang. The four were attacked by the capitalist roaders for "ultra-left" errors not for capitalist road tendencies. More on this to come, too.

I want also to touch upon some other things you have brought up in many of your articles on China, such as your statements that the masses were overjoyed with the arrests of Chiang Ching and the others; that they were against industrialization and modernization, that the line of upholding the four was a development by Avakian and co (This is especially wrong, they said nothing publically for two years (!) after their arrest, they did the same thing as they did with the peace accords in Peru, they waited it out and let others struggle out the correct line.)

I know that many others will get something from this debate and I invite others to also participate in it. I hope it will spark further study of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and in Mao Tse-tung's writings.

Jay Miles / Detroit

From: rolf.martens-AT-mailbox.swipnet.se (Rolf Martens)

Jay (Detcom, Detroit) wrote, on 14.12 (and this I think is an important debate):

> Rolf, I have been thinking hard and doing a lot of study around the issue of the "gang of four" and.......[Part of quote snipped]

> I think I can demonstrate from the facts that you are holding a number of erroneous ideas concerning the events, persons, and political lines involved in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

I'm anxious to read your arguments for that! Other readers I refer to my "UNITE! Info #22en: The 4-Gang in China", in 12 parts, posted to this list on 03.11.96.

> I agree with you that a debate or discussion of these things would be of importance, more so than a lot of the stuff that I read on the Marxism lists. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was the greatest
>mass campaign to raise the revolutionary consciousness of
>the masses of people, not only in China but all over the world,
>and its effects are not over yet but is still having
>an impact on the political thinking of people internationally.

Yes, precisely.

>Here in the Detroit area, we have been fortunate that we
>have been able to talk and struggle with a great many people
>from China who come to our city and nearby to attend college.

..........[Part of quote snipped]..........

Very good! I on my part have spoken to no Chinese at all on these
questions, but I followed the struggles at the time, in 1974-1976
and later too, through the Peking Review and also the Hsinhua (New
China) news bulletins which were sent me free of charge from the
Stockholm office, and not least read the statements by the
KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT), the *only* party I know of which after the
overthrow of socialism in China continued Mao Zedong's line
*completely*, and discussed the matters with the comrades of that
party at the time. (It much later, towards the end of the 1980s,
degenerated.)

>I would also to put forward an argument that the struggle
>against the Right deviationist trend (1975-1976) was not
>an attack on the four but against the capitalist roaders,
>Teng Hsiao-ping and his gang.

Yes of course. I on my part have never pretended that *this*
campaign was against the 4-Gang. Only, Mao Zedong from 1974 at CPC
party meetings was *also* criticizing that Gang. It was he who gave
it that name. (See the Peking Review article, October 1976, in one
of the parts of my Info #22en.)

>The four were attacked
>by the capitalist roaders for "ultra-left" errors not for
>capitalist road tendencies. More on this to come, too.

Yes, there was conflict between the "traditional" capitalist-roaders
of Deng Xiaoping and the phoney "left" capitalist-roaders the 4-
Gang. Both were against Mao's line. And Mao criticized them both. As
for "ultra-left", it's known since long of course that certain
bourgeois deviations have appeared in an "ultra-left" guise, such as
Trotskyism, an ideology quite close to that of Avakian and the 4-
Gang.

Do you have the 1977 book by Roxane Witke, "Comrade Chiang Ching",
in which she recounts her 1972 interviews with Jiang Qing? It's most
illuminating, I think, concerning the line of the latter.

>I want also to touch upon some other things you have brought
>up in many of your articles on China, such as your statements
>that the masses were overjoyed with the arrests of Chiang
Ching and the others;

Precisely; they were overjoyed, as shown by some of the documents I brought and as is shown by many others too.

that they [the 4-Gang, you mean] were against industrialization and modernization, that the line of upholding the four was a development by Avakian and co (This is especially wrong, they said nothing publically for two years (!) after their arrest, they did the same thing as they did with the peace accords in Peru, they waited it out and let others struggle out the cor-

Well, in the first place, that CIA instrument the so-called "RCP" of the USA, did NOT congratulate Hua Guofeng at becoming Chairman of the CPC in October 1976, as did practically all of those over 40 organizations all over the world with which the CPC had contact, many of them also explicitly congratulating him and the Chinese people to the recent victory over the 4-Gang. This included the PCP in Peru. (See the two parts "Intl.verdict" in my Info #22en) Two other parties (in addition to the "RCP") likewise were ominously SILENT: Hodxa's Albanian Party of Labour...

[Note, July 1997: No, that was an *error* by me which I've later corrected: Hodxa's party at that time did congratulate Hua Guo-feng. It was only later that it started attacking Mao's line -at a time when the Deng/Hua group in China was doing so too,only "from another side". -RM]

...and the Roter Morgen group in Germany (Ernst Aust's party, relatively important at that time). Those two last-mentioned started vilifying Mao Zedong quite openly two years later, in 1978. In that same year, Avakian and Lotta of the "RCP" published two books with massive disinformation on events in China, in favour of the 4-Gang: "Mo Tsetung's Immortal Contributions" by Avakian and "And Mao Makes Five" by Lotta. Are you saying that the propaganda for the 4-Gang was *not* started by those creeps? Or by their CIA masters? Then who started it?

It's not so strange that they said nothing for two years. *Everyone* (that counted) was condemning the 4-Gang at that time, and the Roter Morgen's open support, in Germany, of those reactionaries meant its *political suicide*. At that time, the masses in many countries *knew* very well that the 4-Gang were a bunch of reactionaries. Later, the "RCP", the "RIM" and others have conducted their disinformation campaign, at a time when many of the formerly existing organizations were disappearing and people had no longer that knowledge which existed in 1976 etc.

But I'm prepared to listen to your arguments on why I "got it all wrong" of course! And why practically all the M-L organizations at the time got it all wrong too. (Well, many of those didn't count for all that much anyway. Those in Europe at least, except for the NE in Germany, were pretty doubtful.)
I know that many others will get something from this debate and I invite others to also participate in it. I hope it will spark further study of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and in Mao Tse-tung's writings.

Jay Miles / Detroit

Yes!

Rolf M.

Rolf, I have been thinking hard and doing a lot of study around the issue of the "gang of four" and I think I can demonstrate from the facts that you are holding a number of erroneous ideas.

As I wrote in my first reply today, it will interest me much to see your arguments for that. This *is* a very important debate, I hold!

..........

I want also to touch upon some other things you have brought up in many of your articles on China, such as your statements that the masses were overjoyed with the arrests of Chiang...
"Wang [Wang Hongwen, one of the 4-Gang - RM] had long cultivated his connections with the militia in different parts of China and in particular in Shanghai. He is said to have once said: 'with a hundred thousand workers and a million of militia men, Shanghai can dominate the whole country'. If he really had made such a statement, it would have shown unusually bad judgement. When the news of the arrest of the four reached Shanghai, there - according to the testimony of a visiting American - arose an atmosphere of veritable celebration."

(That "visiting American" is most probably, I think, the same professor from the USA whose account was quoted in Klaus Mehnert's book and reproduced by me in part 6/12 of my posting on the 4-Gang, Info #22en. So, I have no other foreign witnesses so far on this. Here comes what was new to me, in Hagglof's book)

"However, it can be seen from reports by local radio stations that disturbances had occurred in many places. From Hunan and Shansi there was reported "open revolt" and from Szechuan "civil war". It is generally known that long-lasting and serious strife had occurred in Hangchow. Of this I heard during my visit to Shanghai, which of course is rather close to Hangchow."

"It apparently on a few occasions was the case that the regional units of the Chinese army had to call in troops from neighbouring provinces, but any really critical situation does not seem to have arisen anywhere. It was simply a question of time when the army could restore calm and order everywhere."

"Hua had behind himself the regular army and all security and police forces. The 'Gang of Four' had only scattered militia troops and groups of other adherents, who, it is true, seem to have been numerous at some places but who were largely unarmed."

So it appears that the 4-Gang did have some adherents among the masses in some places. This doesn't change my overall assessment though: The Chinese people and those activists who really wanted to uphold Mao Zedong's line were *ground between the two millstones of two reactionary groupings* which were opposing each other too and which were pretending, both of them, to be the representative of the correct line but which in fact were both opposing Mao Zedong's line. It's not unreasonable to suppose that a certain number of people were fooled by the phoney "radical" propaganda of the 4-Gang, or/and that in some places, the striking down of that Gang was being presented as a "victory for Deng's line", which it in fact was *not*, in the country as a whole.

And it remains a fact, I hold - and it's supported by many accounts - that, in their great majority, the Chinese people did enthusiastically welcome the striking down of the 4-Gang. The accounts I've reproduced so far - except for the official one, which I've given my reasons for judging to be veracious -are the one from Shanghai and the one from Tsingtao (as it was spelled then). There are others too.
Later, from early 1977 on, there were reports in the (openly) bourgeois newspapers of "disturbances caused by 4-Gang adherents". But at that point in time, the situation had "changed", in that the Hua Guofeng group had started its (open) treason (from November 1976 on, signs of this were visible) and so the so-called "4-Gang adherents" protesting or fighting at *that* time may well have been adherents of Mao Zedong's line, *genuine* opponents of revisionism.

It will be interesting to hear what the Chinese you've been talking to are saying on this and on the whole question.

At any rate, it would take some pretty heavy stuff, fact wise, to convince me that the main conclusions - very massively documented and proven, I hold - of my Info #22en are false!

(Btw, one other posting of mine is of relevance too concerning the 4-Gang: "UNITE! Info #12en: China - NE (Germany), '75-'77", in 6 parts, posted 08.07.96. This deals with another aspect of the question, that of the Gang's connection with and participation in the subversion against the international M-L movement at the time. It doesn't give any information on what the Chinese really thought of that group in China but shows, among other things, why my then comrades, who lived in exile here in Malmoe, Sweden, were deeply suspicious of it even back in early 1975.)

The ball is yours, Jay!

Rolf M.

MY DEBATE POSTING 3, 14.12.1996

Jay, here's a third reply to your posting today - upon some more reflection I've seen that you made one erroneous statement of fact, probably because you haven't yet understood the Marxist position on what is Left and what is Right. On that question, more later. Here I shall show you where and how you reported incorrectly.

>Rolf, I have been thinking hard and doing a lot of
>study around the issue of the "gang of four" and
>[....rest of quote deleted, July '97 - RM]

>The four were attacked by the capitalist roaders for
>"ultra-left" errors not for capitalist road tendencies.

Now the 4-Gang, as I've pointed out before, were not only or even in the main attacked by the (other) capitalist roaders but precisely by Mao Zedong, as was pointed out (for the first time publicly) in the article I'm about to quote and which, as the circumstances show, is likely to have been telling the truth on this. But leaving out, for the moment, the question of who it was that attacked the 4-Gang, all who read the Peking Review of that time, October 1976 etc, can clearly see:
1) There was *no* mention of any "errors" of a so-called "ultra-left" type. (At least not in Oct '76 etc - possibly much later, in 1978 or so perhaps, when the Peking Review had become more and more an openly-bourgeois paper. I haven't checked the later issues on this, but in the first and crucial article, the term "ultra-left" did *not* occur a single time; I don't think it was used in any of the later 1976 issues either, though I haven't checked this out.)

[Note, July 1997: In Peking Review No. 15/1978, there does appear, for the very first time the term "ultra-left", but this as a quoted one, and not even then do the now rather openly revisionist forces who're writing themselves use this confusing, bourgeois and anti-Marxist term. - RM]

(The very concept "ultra-left" is a bourgeois one and is also used by the Avakianists, but it's not a good one at all since it disguises the class content of things. It's better to speak of *genuine* contra *phoney* left, in the latter case putting the word within quotes, and of a bourgeois line contra a proletarian one - more on this later.)

2) In the important leading article in the three Chinese papers on 25.10.1976, proclaiming the victory over the 4-Gang, those people precisely *were* accused of being capitalist-roaders.

So how can it be that you got the idea that it was the other way around, Jay, when you do have those issues of the Peking Review? I venture the guess that it has been some bourgeois-Avakianist prejudices which you haven't gotten rid of yet that made you "see" things which weren't there (spooky, what?) and not see those that were.

You may or may not take comfort in the fact that comrade Adolfo made precisely the same mistake, not distinguishing between false and genuine left ("left"), in our debate on the same subject in June-July. Some more discussion on this will be needed! And it's so much better when people are willing to debate the issues, as you are, instead of just clamming up. We need "yap yap-yap" and certainly not silence, that's one thing I hold is very important.

Anyway, here are some quotes from that article I mentioned. It was posted by me (once again) as part 7/12 of "UNITE! #22en" on 03.11.96 and was originally published in the Peking Review, of course, in No. 44 / 1976, 29.10.96, pp. 14-16, title:

'G R E A T   H I S T O R I C   V I C T O R Y - Editorial
by "Renmin Ribao", "Hongqui" and "Jiefangjun Bao"'.

'Thus the proletariat won a decisive victory in counter-attacking the onslaught of the bourgeoisie.'

'The "gang of four", a bane to the country and the people, committed heinous crimes. They completely betrayed the basic principles of "three do's and three don'ts" that Chairman Mao had earnestly taught, wantonly tampered with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought,
tampered with Chairman Mao's directives, opposed Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line on a whole series of domestic and international questions, and practiced revisionism under the signboard of Marxism.'

'Resorting to various manoeuvres, they pursued a counter-revolutionary revisionist line, an ultra-Right line.'

'Chairman Mao pointed out: "You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party – those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist-roads are still on the capitalist road."* Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-Chiao, Chiang Ching and Yao Wen-yuan are typical representatives of the bourgeoisie inside the Party, unrepentant capitalist-roads are still travelling on the capitalist road and a gang of bourgeois conspirators and careerists.'

(So far the quotes from PR 44/76.)

Nothing at all on "ultra-left" in this article (please check your own PR copy, Jay) but, as you can see, precisely an accusation against the 4-Gang as being unrepentant *capitalist-roads*.

This of course concerns only one of the points in our debate. But it may be that it's an important one – I don't mean your mistake here in itself but what I think may lie behind it, a certain error in your thinking. (Which I would find quite understandable, if I'm right on this. After all, you didn't get the opportunity, as I did, of associating with a party like that German NE for more than a decade, did you? As far as I can tell, nobody else in the USA, for instance, did either.)

Rolf M.

PEKING REVIEW AND "GANG OF FOUR"

The four most important leaders who were arrested in the purge of the Chinese Communist Party that was carried out in October, 1976, were:

Chiang Ching, wife of Chairman Mao for over 40 years until his death, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, and Director of Literature and Art for the Central Committee,

Chang Chun-chiao, Senior Vice Premier of the State Council, First Secretary of the Shanghai Party Committee, Director of the General Political Department of the People's Liberation Army, and member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, the leading body of China,
Wang Hung-wen, Senior Vice Chairman of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the Party Central Committee, Third Secretary of the Shanghai Party Committee, and director of the people's militias, and Yao Wen-yuan, Director of Propaganda for the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, Second Secretary of the Shanghai Party Committee, and member of the Political Bureau of the Party Central Committee.

At the time of the purge, these leaders, now called the "gang of four," were among the ten most important leaders in the Chinese Communist Party. The post-purge criticism was directed at them. However, hundreds or perhaps thousands of other leading cadre were also removed, arrested, or purged, including many of the ministers of the State Council, members of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, and local Party committee members around the country. There was an all-round "rectification" and reorganization of the CCP and the popular organizations in China by the capitalist roaders in the CCP who directed this purge.

The purge was not directed only at the "gang of four" but at a definite political line. Because of the importance of the four in the CCP, and because the criticisms brought forward by the capitalist roaders center on them, focus is often centered on the "gang of four". But it is clear that the events that took place in China show the differences of TWO POLITICAL LINES at conflict in the struggle.

The key to understanding the essence of the two-line struggle in China is the question of the campaign launched by Chairman Mao in late 1975 to criticize Teng Hsaio-ping and "beat back the Right deviationist wind to reverse the correct verdicts of the Cultural Revolution."

Rolf Martens has emphasized the study of articles in the PEKING REVIEW for a correct understanding of the events in China, which is a very good suggestion and I will be quoting from Peking Review issues printed during 1975 to 1978 during this discussion of China and the "gang of four".

It seems that the editorship of Peking Review changed with the 42nd issue of 1976 (the second week of October). With that issue the "principles laid down" phrase associated with the "gang of four" line disappears; two issues later the campaign against the four begins. On the second day of the purge, the head of Hsinhua News Agency, a main source of information about China, was removed. (NY Times, Oct.17, 1976) Most of the named authors who contributed to the Peking Review during the two years before the 42nd issue of 1976, including several who appeared regularly, have not written a single article since then. Most of the named authors after this issue, had not written articles before that issue. The other two Chinese magazines published in English, CHINA PICTORIAL and CHINA RECONSTRUCTS, did not appear in November and December, due to "various reasons", according to an apology in the Peking Review.
Yao Wen-yuan, one of the "gang of four", as Director of Propaganda for the Central Committee of the Party, was responsible for the national news media. The Editor of RENMIN RIBAO (People’s Daily, the official organ of the Central Committee of the CCP) was removed during the purge, as were the editors of HONGQI (Red Flag, the theoretical journal of the CCP) and HSUSHSHI YU PIPAN (Study and Criticism, theoretical journal of Shanghai). (NY Times, Jan 10, 1977; Washington Post, March 6, 1977) I think it would be safe to assume the same kind of change occurred in all the other national magazines and newspapers that provided material for the Peking Review.

The capitalist roaders that seized control of the Chinese government then began attacking the political line put forward by the Chinese Communist Party in its official press (Red Flag, People's Daily, Liberation Army Daily, Peking Review, etc.) for several years before the purge as "revisionist fallacies" promoted by the "gang of four" to "usurp power": "The gang, who had long controlled the mass media, tampered with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought and spread revisionist fallacies to confuse peoples' thinking in order to shape counter-revolutionary opinion for their usurpation of Party and state power."

The line put forward by the Chinese Communist Party and the Peking Review before the purge and that put forward by the CCP and the Peking Review after the purge are completely different and opposite lines.

A most important and obvious difference in the line of Peking Review was a complete reversal in attitude towards the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist attempt. Throughout 1976 until the death of Chairman Mao in September, the central emphasis of the Chinese press was the campaign to beat back the Right deviationist attempt and deepen the criticism of Teng Hsiao-ping. The struggle was characterized like this in China Reconstructs #10, 1976:

"The victory of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has not been easy. Intense struggle is equally inevitable in consolidating and developing its results. History proves that every great revolution is bound to be followed by a struggle between those who are for it and those who are against it. The same is true of the Cultural Revolution. Toward the end of summer last year, Teng Hsiao-ping, the arch unrepentant capitalist-roader in power in the Party, led a Right deviationist attempt to reverse the correct appraisal of the Cultural Revolution and settle accounts with it. This was a concentrated expression, under new circumstances, of the struggle between two classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and between two lines, Marxism and revisionism. The Party and the people have thrown themselves into a struggle to criticize Teng Hsiao-ping and counter-attack this Right deviationist attempt. The struggle was initiated and is being led by Chairman Mao himself. It is a continuing and deepening
of the Cultural Revolution." (pp. 7-8)

On April 7th, 1976, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, led by Chairman Mao, agreed unanimously to remove Teng Hsiao-ping from all his posts both inside and outside the Party (including that of Senior Vice Premier, Chief of Staff of the People's Liberation Army, and member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau) and declared that:

"Having discussed the counter-revolutionary incident that took place at Tien An Men Square (on April 5th, 1976) and Teng Hsiao-ping's latest behavior, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China holds that the nature of the Teng Hsiao-ping problem has turned into one of antagonistic contradiction." (PR #15, 1976)

This resolution determined that the anti-revisionist struggle of 1975-76 was one between the people and the enemy, one between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, an antagonistic contradiction. Hundreds of millions of Chinese workers and peasants became involved in the struggle in agricultural communes, factories, and schools across the country. All work in China, the relief and reconstruction after the earthquakes, the scientific advances, industrial and agricultural production, and the continuing revolution in education, was linked up to the deepening of the criticism of the chief unrepentant capitalist-roader in the Party and of the Right deviationist wind to reverse the correct verdicts of the Cultural Revolution.

"We must continue to advance in the midst of victories already won and bring about a new upsurge in the criticism of Teng Hsiao-ping by further repudiating his counter-revolutionary revisionist line ideologically and politically. We must be clear that the collapse of Teng Hsiao-ping does not mean the end of the struggle. Criticism of his revisionist line and eradication of its pernicious influence are of cardinal importance to the future and the destiny of our Party and state and are a great militant task in combating and preventing revisionism and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat. Much remains to be done in this respect and we must never slacken our fighting will." (PR #35, August 1976, p.5)

In the first issues of Peking Review after the purge, the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist attempt and criticize Teng Hsiao-ping was mentioned but was not elaborated on or deepened, the emphasis being, rather, on the criticism of the "gang of four." Within two months, all mention of the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist attempt was dropped and Teng Hsiao-ping was only mentioned in criticizing the "gang of four" or, more exactly, the "gang of four" were criticized for "twisting and overemphasizing" the criticism of Teng. Before the purge, Lui Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping were constantly referred to together in criticizing the capitalist road line.
Then Teng Hsiao-ping's name was dropped and the "gang of four" added in his place. The emphasis of the Peking Review became to ridicule the anti-right campaign of 1976, making Teng Hsiao-ping appear to be a victim of the "gang of four", and label the struggle an attempt by the "gang of four" to "seize power."

The Rightists in power now, not only dramatically ended Mao's campaign to beat back the Right deviationist trend and deepen the criticism of Teng, but they made the main point of criticism of the "gang of four" their role in the campaign. They not only attacked its manifestations and the way it was handled; they attacked its very essence, its general orientation. By defending Teng and by instituting his policies, they said that the entire anti-Right campaign was wrong, that the Cultural Revolution was wrong, that Mao's line was wrong.

The campaign to beat back the Right deviationist trend and remove capitalist-roaders like Teng Hsiao-ping from power was not an attempt by individuals to seize power, it was not an attempt to split the Party, it was not an intrigue or conspiracy. It was an OPEN AND ABOVEBOARD mass movement LED BY MAO TSE-TUNG to rectify the Party, strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and continue on the socialist road.

Hua Kuo-feng and the other capitalist roaders in the Party set themselves against the line of Mao Tse-tung and the other revolutionaries in the Party. They were intriguers of the most despicable sort. When two days after the incident in Tien An Men Square, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee met and declared that "the problem of Teng Hsiao-ping has become one of antagonistic contradiction", dismissing him from all his posts within and outside the Party, it was an unanimous decision.

The decision was not the result of splitting, intriguing and conspiring by the "gang of four." It was the result of Chairman Mao uniting the many to defeat the few. Obviously, however, there were present at that Political Bureau meeting in April 1976, who did not consider that they were in antagonistic contradiction with Teng Hsiao-ping, or that he should be removed. But did they raise their voices in dissent? No, they voted unanimously along with the entire Political Bureau.

Hua Kuo-feng said nothing. Neither did Li Hsien-nien nor Yeh Chien-ying, nor any of the others who were so free and loud after Mao's death in criticizing the 1976 struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind. Until Chairman Mao had died, and they had succeeded in arresting the "gang of four" and the rest of the important leaders of the struggle to beat back the Rights, Hua and the other SCUMS OF THE EARTH kept up a pretence of supporting Mao and the struggle.

Peking Review #31, July 29, 1977 announced that Teng Hsiao-ping was being restored to all his posts without being required to engage in any sort of self-criticism. A "Resolution on the Anti-party Clique of Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao, Chiang Ching, and Yao Wen-yuan
was also adopted, ratifying the measures taken against the Four by Hua Kuo-feng. The new leaders had totally reversed that decision of April 1976, placing Teng in a position of tremendous authority and showing their total opposition to the proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman Mao.

Was the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist trend "fabricated" or wrong in general orientation? Wasn't Teng an arch unrepentant capitalist-roader who intended to restore capitalism or was he a responsible communist comrade who was victimized by the "gang of four"? Who in fact was following the proletarian revolutionary line of Mao Tse-tung and had to be arrested so the capitalist roaders could continue on down the capitalist road?

[TO BE CONTINUED: JAY MILES' DEBATE POSTING 3, 17.12.1996]

PEKING REVIEW READING LIST

Rolf Martens of Sweden has suggested the articles in the Chinese periodical PEKING REVIEW (PR) as a resource for study regarding the debate on the "gang of four". This is a fine suggestion, but please note that the editorship of Peking Review changed in October 1976. PR #42, 1976 and China Reconstructs of November-December, 1976 were the first issues which represented the line of the capitalist roaders.

I recommend the following articles from PEKING REVIEW for special study:

"Marx, Engels and Lenin on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Questions and Answers" 12 parts, PR #40-51, 1975

"Constitution of the People's Republic of China; Speeches to the Second Plenary Session of the 10th Central Committee, by Chang Chun-chiao and Chou En-lai, PR #4, 1975

"Speeches by Chou En-lai and Wang Hung-wen to the 10th Party Congress" PR #35-36, 1973


"Advance Victoriously Along Chairman Mao's Line in Army Building", PR #5, 1975


"Small and Medium Sized Industries Play Big Role," PR #45, 1975

"Between Cadres and Peasants" and "Socialist New Peasants", PR # 40, 41, 1975

"Fundamental Differences between the Two Lines in Education,"
"Criticizing the Program for Capitalist Restoration," PR #13, 1976

"An Endless Flow of Successors to the Cause of Proletarian Revolution" and "A Dynamic County Party Committee," PR #26, 27, 1976

"Inner-Party Struggle and Party Development," PR 34, 1976

"Comments on Teng Hsiao-ping's Economic Ideas of the Comprador Bourgeoisie," PR #35, 1976

"Working Class Occupying and Transforming the Superstructure," PR #37, 1976

The following articles contain the major attacks against the "gang of four":

[Note, July 1997: For the *really* *most* major one, the joint editorial of the three leading Chinese papers on 25.10.1976, see my "UNITE! Info #22en" (part 7/12), 03.11.96. - RM]

"The 'Gang of Four': A Scourge of the Nation" PR #48, 1976

"Speech by Chairman Hua," PR #1, 1977

"Premier Chou in the Great Cultural Revolution," PR #4, 1977

"A Component Part of the 'Gang of Four's' Plot to Usurp the Party and State Power: What was their aim in calling for 'creating literary works on the struggle against capitalist-roaders?'

PR #5, 1977

"How the 'Gang of Four' Used Shanghai as a Base," and "Exposing Wang Hung-wen's Scheme to Throw China into Disorder"

PR #6, 1977

"Study Documents Well and Grasp Key Link" PR #8, 1977

"Chang Chun-chiao Tampers with Chairman Mao's Educational Policy" PR #8, 1977

"Mechanization: Fundamental Way Out for Agriculture"

PR #9, 1977

"Foreign Trade: Why the 'Gang of Four' Created Confusion"

PR #9, 1977

"Ferreting Out 'the Bourgeoisie in the Army' - Another 'Gang of Four' Scheme" PR #10, 1977

"Vice Premier Yu Chiu-li's Report" PR #22, 1977

"A Serious Struggle in Scientific and Technical Circles"
PR #18, 1977

"Grasp the Key Link in Running the Country Well." PR #16, 1977

Jay,

Your postings 2 and 3 (both on 17.12) in our debate, on events in China in 1976-78 and what they show about the true role of the 4-Gang in the overthrow of socialism there, were shocking reading, because they so obviously, in part, were insincere.

In four postings, my 4th to 7th in this debate which together will make up an article in 4 parts, I shall above all tell the main story of the class struggle in China in 1976, the crucial year, once more and in another way, presenting events in the order they took place. From the many (12) parts of my earlier "UNITE! Info #22en: The 4-Gang in China" (03.11.96), readers could pick together the same story. For some details, I shall refer to #22en.

(There are many details of course which I, for instance, still don't know or cannot be certain of. But the main course of events is quite clear and well-documented.) Under way, I shall comment on your presentation of things. At the same time as this one, I shall make one other posting, my 8th in this debate, with quotes (reported by the Peking Review) showing how Mao Zedong criticized the 4-Gang. Some of these I've brought before. My posting 9 will list Peking Review articles already on the Internet.

Why is the question of the role of the 4-Gang important? As I wrote e.g. in my Info #22en, it has vital ramifications for the whole question of the imperialists' massive subversion against the entire international Marxist-Leninist movement, today just as much as 20 years ago.

The Avakianists' vile falsification of history in this respect, which no doubt originates, in the last instance, from the CIA, is an important part of that large-scale and long-time "Operation Subversion" of that agency's which is embodied in the so-called "RIM", whose phoney "Marxist" "Declaration" of 1984 they even succeeded in making the PCP in Peru sign, an enormous error on the part of that party which it still has *not* corrected. This whole operation the Marxists ABSOLUTELY NEED to KILL. Certainly it's a *crime* consciously to defend it.

You, Jay, have read(?!?) this 3400+ line 12-part posting of mine which I mentioned above, which contains a large number of documents from many different sources and which completely refutes the Avakianists' falsification of that part of Chinese history. You also have the Peking Review issues from that time, which by themselves also tell the main parts of the true story.

Yet in your posting 2, which contains your "argumentation" so far, you're pretending that this massive and complete refutation of the Avakianist fairy tale "doesn't exist". You simply *repeat, once
more*, that fairy tale. You also completely disregard, as if they weren't there, those parts of the Peking Review issues which by themselves, as I had pointed out earlier, refute it.

In your posting 3, where you're making a recommendation to others on which Peking Review articles to read on this subject (a recommendation which in itself doesn't matter much, since those who have access to the issues of course can seek out all the articles there are for themselves), you're also - rather ridiculously, but significantly - avoiding to mention a number of articles which you absolutely do know are very relevant indeed.

This including some articles which are already on the Net, as brought by me earlier, and even including one that you yourself posted last May as an argument against what I was saying, but which I then commented on as likewise revealing a part of the true story, since really everyone can see it was *lying*, if they just look at it a little closer. Now, you don't want people to read it any more.

That "recommended"-list of yours was really a *"don't-read"* list. It indirectly showed that you would like people *not* to read certain PR articles - which you *know* are important - from that time. I shall comment more on that "please delete" list below.

Even in your posting 1 (on 14.12) in this debate, you wrote something that was seemingly strangely upside-down, in view of your having all those relevant PR issues:

> The four were attacked by the capitalist roaders for "ultra->left" errors not for capitalist road tendencies.

In the first of my 3 replies that same day, I didn't even notice what you in fact were saying, and only said approximately that yes, they were criticized, NB above all by Mao, for their phoney "left" line, but in my third reply I pointed out the "spooky" fact of your "seeing" things that absolutely were not there and not seeing those that were.

In all the PR issues in question the 4-Gang of course were *never once* attacked for "ultra-leftism" (an Avakianist/openly-bourgeois, confusing concept) but *always* as ultra-Rightists and as, precisely, capitalist-roaders. (This was done quite correctly in the beginning, in October '76; only later did it become more and more hypocritical since the "critics" of the 4-Gang themselves turned traitors and embarked on a revisionist, capitalist road.)

Probably nobody - except yourself - could have been fooled by that ridiculous upside-down statement of yours, Jay. But I didn't take that to be a *conscious* attempt to mislead people - on a matter which wouldn't be all that crucial anyway. I thought that this single "war-is-peace" statement might be "only" a reflection of some massive Avakianist prejudices still existing in your thinking. I know of own experience how difficult it can be to rid oneself of certain erroneous ideas once they've been implanted in one's brain for a long time and for instance are being supported by "everybody" - whom you trust, at least, too.
But in your postings 2 and 3, you obviously *are* trying deliberately to fool people. Such evident dishonesty I haven't seen in any of your previous postings. With them, you're taking a big step backwards, in the direction of that same quagmire which already contains people like (the earlier Detcom member) Gina, her political boss the agent of US imperialism W. Palomino ("Quisper"), those ridiculous "Mao Doctors" ("mao_docs") and others.

Do you really want to continue in that direction? I of course can really do nothing about such a thing. But unless I've misunderstood some things grossly, you *should* make an about-turn.

1976 EVENTS IN CHINA

These events can in the main be followed quite well if you read the issues of that year (#1 - #52) of the weekly Peking Review (PR). On those main points where the PR actually is lying or is omitting some relevant facts - and in a couple of instances, it does do that - the truth and those facts can rather easily be ascertained by a comparison with other sources. (And those details which still are unknown to those who have only access to those sources which both you and I know, Jay, will not change the general picture of events; this is clear enough.)

EARLY 1976: PUBLIC CRITICISM OF DENG XIAOPING'S "RIGHTIST WIND" GOES ON. ALSO, MAO ZEDONG SINCE YEARS BACK HAS BEEN CRITICIZING THAT OTHER DEVIATION, THAT OF THE 4-GANG, AT PARTY MEETINGS

You wrote in your posting 2, Jay, that

>`The key to understanding the essence of the two-line struggle
>`in China is the question of the campaign launched by Chairman
>`Mao in late 1975 to criticize Teng Hsiao-ping and "beat back
>`the Right deviationist wind to reverse the correct verdicts of
>`the Cultural Revolution."

No, it isn't. The key to understanding the essence of this is the question of Mao's and the other genuine Marxists' criticism of *both* those revisionist deviations which there were at that time, the (openly-)Right deviationist wind of Deng Xiaoping *and* the phoney "left" deviation and splittist machinations of the 4-Gang.

On principle and in general terms, you can find one important guide to the understanding of such struggles, in something that Zhou Enlai said in his report to the 10th Congress of the CPC, in August 1973. You did mention that report too, Jay, in your "recommended-reading" list. I posted the report in full as "UNITE! Info #13en" on 10.07.96, and in my Info #3en also quoted the following, theoretically extremely important lines:

>`It is imperative to note that one tendency covers another.
>`The opposition to Chen Tu-Hsiu's Right opportunism which
>`advocated 'all alliance, no struggle' covered Wang Ming's
>'Left' opportunism which advocated 'all struggle, no alliance'.

In early 1976, a public campaign against Deng's revisionism had been going on for some months already, as you write. To us following events from afar, it didn't become clearly visible until the issue #6/76 of the PR (06.02.1976), where it was first reported and supported, later issues eventually naming the target, Deng Xiaoping, by name too.

In PR #1/76 were published the two poems written by Mao Zedong in 1965 i.a. against Khrushchev's revisionism in the Soviet Union. This was no doubt a move in part against Deng's similar deviation but also against revisionism in general. (I posted those IMO very good poems in four languages on 01.05.96 as Info #10, four separate versions.)

*And* Mao Zedong at that time had already been criticizing, at CPC party meetings, the *other* deviation too, that of the 4-Gang, since a much longer time back, since (at least) July, 1974, in fact. (The very designation under which the members of that group later became known, the "gang of four", was one that Mao himself had called them by, in 1975.) This wasn't known to people in general in China and of course not to us in other countries either, until after the October 1976 big blow against that Gang, when it was disclosed internationally (and, as the circumstances most definitely point to, veraciously) in the article in PR issue #44/76, "Great Historic Victory".

This article of course, as all know including yourself, Jay, is *the* most important publication from "official" China on the question of the 4-Gang, not *only* because its disclosure of the fact that Mao Zedong had long been criticizing the Gang severely, but that disclosure *was* one vital part of it too. I posted that article last May as part of my "4-Gang" series then, and again (as part 7/12) in Info #22en, which brought the whole series once more.

**DISCUSSING WHAT LATER BECAME KNOWN ABOUT SOME EVENTS BEFORE 1976**

In your posting 2, you continued:

> Rolf Martens has emphasized the study of articles in the PEKING REVIEW for a correct understanding of the events in China, which is a very good suggestion and I will be quoting from Peking Review issues printed during 1975 to 1978 during this discussion of China and the "gang of four".

So we *seem to* agree: Others can get the vital relevant facts from the PR issues of that time. But you made *no* mention whatever of those facts which were first disclosed in that crucial PR #44/76 article, the facts of Mao's repeated criticism of the 4-Gang too and not only of Deng Xiaoping, in your posting 2.
And in your 3, the list of PR articles you recommended as important on the whole matter under debate, that article wasn't even included - although it's even one of those which today are available on the Net. Why this, one must ask. And what conclusion can other people draw from the fact of your failing to put this, and also a number of obviously likewise important late 1976 PR articles attacking the 4-Gang, on your list?

Comparing your "recommended"-list to those PR articles that there actually were, I find (as will all others who check this out) that you, in the first place, systematically have *avoided* listing those which quote or otherwise mention *Mao Zedong's long-time criticism* of the 4-Gang. This left you with only one article from all the 9 issues (#44-#52) of late 1976, which otherwise of course contained a great number of articles against the Gang.

What conclusion can other people draw from this? The obvious fact, I think, that *you agree* with me on judging that those quotes or other mentions of criticism by Mao against the "gang of four" which these PR issues contain, most likely are *true*. (Or that at least those in the first one, #44/76, are - I've already pointed out earlier that, as time passes, in late 1976 and in 1977 etc, the PR gets less and less reliable.)

You're *not* advancing any argument why these quotes, in your opinion, might be forgeries. This indicates, doesn't it, that you too think that there aren't any valid arguments in that direction. You simply are trying to sweep the whole question of what Mao said (or didn't say) on the 4-Gang under the carpet. A pretty futile move, but in your postings 2 and 3, you're making it, for all to see.

In the second place, since you listed, as the articles "containing the major attacks" (according to your heading) against the 4-Gang, only one from late 1976 and 11 from 1977, those who don't have access to the PR issues might think that the 1977 criticism (with or without quotes) was somehow more important than the 1976 one. This is not the case. It was the *early* criticism that was the most important one, that of October 1976, when Mao Zedong's correct line was still being followed by Hua Guofeng and the other Chinese leaders (at least in words; what were their real intentions at that point is most difficult to tell).

SOME MORE ON EVENTS BEFORE 1976

In the summer of 1972, Jiang Qing, who later also misused her position as Mao Zedong's wife so far as to form the factional phoney "left" 4-Gang grouping within the CC of the CPC, had given a series of interviews to a historian from the USA, Roxane Witke. These were much later reported on in a very illuminating book (which I shall not comment on more here) by that historian, published in 1977: "Comrade Chiang Ching". Jiang Qing had not asked the CC of the CPC for authorisation to make these interviews, and the visit to China by Roxane Witke or her having met with such a relatively important
CPC leading cadre was not even reported on by the PR at the time, a quite abnormal thing.

Thus one must ask, what was the purpose of these interviews. I wrote in my 1994 article later posted as Info #3en on 01.01.96:

> The "gang" was named so by Mao Zedong, who in 1974 repeatedly urged them to stop functioning as such. Their leader, Jiang Qing, in 1972 already, through a series of secret unauthorized interviews with historian Roxane Witke, had started seeking U.S. support for herself as "Dowager Empress" after Mao Zedong's death. Even better suited their line social-imperialism.

One later report on a brewing conflict within the CPC involving Jiang Qing, even before 1976, was made in a 1985 book by Clare Hollingworth, who in the 1970's had been correspondent in Beijing to the British Conservative newspaper the Daily Telegraph. In parts 4/12 and 5/12 of my Info #22en, I quoted from her reporting above all on the events on Tiananmen Square on 05.04.1976 (to which I shall refer below too) but also (although more difficult to ascertain the truth of) e.g. this:

> "It is now suggested that Chen Boda, under the direction of 'the traitor Lin Biao', opened the campaign to criticise Premier Zhou as early as October 1966 when he gave orders that 'Everyone can be criticised except Chairman Mao, Lin Biao and Jiang Qing', which meant, 'Criticise Premier Zhou'. A poster criticising the Premier was put up in the university in January 1967 but was taken down within two days on the express orders of the Chairman. From that time onwards, despite the great respect and popularity the Premier enjoyed with the 'broad masses', it is now known that there were constant open and under-cover attacks led by Jiang Qing against him. Although the healthy leaders were frequently photographed laughing and joking together, perceptive friends such as Prince Norodom Shianouk and even the late Edgar Snow were deeply worried."

The last sentence here must refer to a period of time beginning in 1973 or earlier, since Edgar Snow died in October of that year. [Note, July '97: Actually, in 1972; the remains of that long-time friend of China were later taken to that country. RM]

In my posting 8, I shall reproduce how Mao Zedong, according to various late '76 and early '77 PR issues, criticized the 4-Gang - most but not all of it already quoted in my Infos #3en and #22en.

On all these reports of criticism, and very sharp criticism too, by Mao against the 4-Gang in 1974-75, you said absolutely nothing in your posting 2, Jay. Were you hoping that "people may not see them" or that "if you close your eyes, they'll go away"?

Indirectly, one may perhaps infer that you discount these reports as "lies", since you wrote about a "purge" in October 1976. But in fact (almost) nobody was purged *then* other than the 4-Gang and a rather small number of adherents of theirs. (See below.)
EARLY 1976 (CTD.): ZHOU ENLAI DIES. THE 4-GANG TRIES TO PREVENT THE PEOPLE FROM MOURNING HIM. HUA GUOFENG, AND NEITHER DENG NOR ANY MEMBER OF THE 4-GANG, IS APPOINTED ACTING PREMIER.

On 08.01.1976, China's Premier, Zhou Enlai, passed away after a long illness. He had been, together also with the old military man Zhu De (who was to die some months later, in July 1976), Mao Zedong's most important comrade-in-arms and ally, and was indeed held in very high esteem by the masses. The three of them, Mao, Zhou and Zhu, had taken part in the political and military struggles together since the 1920s.

In the media, which to a large extent were controlled by the 4-Gang, Zhou Enlai's passing away did not get the attention which would have been normal for a leader of his standing, and it's clear that the Gang in fact tried to prevent the people from expressing their great mourning for him. This angered many and was eventually to cause what in fact were massive protest demonstrations against the 4-Gang in late March / early April.

On 03.02.1976, Hua Guofeng was appointed Acting Premier and was also put in charge of the work of the Political Bureau (PB) of the CC of the CPC. This came as a surprise to many "observers". Hua was not as well-known as, for instance, Deng Xiaoping or the four persons whom Mao had already been referring to, within the CPC, as "siren bang", a "four-persons-gang". (I know no other Chinese words than these and "Da dai /Down with/ Deng Xiaoping"). Hua Guofeng's appointment, on the proposal of Mao Zedong, was very significant.

Deng Xiaoping, who had earlier been fulfilling many of the functions of a Premier during Zhou Enlai's illness and who in January, 1975, had been appointed as one of several Vice-Premiers and also elected member of the CPC PB and of its Standing Committee, of course was now, quite justly, being massively criticized in public for his "Right deviationist wind to reverse correct verdicts", a criticism initiated by Mao. So it was logical that he was not appointed.

But it should be noted that neither was any member of the 4-Gang appointed to this post. This makes it very clear that Mao didn't trust any of those either. In fact, "4-Gang member" Zhang Chun-qiao "held higher rank" than Hua, and he, who had long coveted the premiership, was furious at the decision, later PR articles say. He wrote down the same day his "Thoughts on February 3,1976" - "viciously attacking Chairman Mao's wise decision and slandering Comrade Hua Kuo-feng", according (e.g.) to PR #2/77.

WHAT DID HUA'S APPOINTMENT IN FEBRUARY 1976 MEAN?

Openly-bourgeois and also Avakianist commentators have tried to make people believe that Hua Guofeng's appointment in this situation was "a compromise" "between the Right and the Left wings within the CPC". That's a bloody lie - at least on the part of those people who've pretended they are Marxists".
This decision was directed *both* against the (openly-)Right *and* against the phoney "Left" group. It was a *victory* for the *genuine* Left, for Mao Zedong's all-sided correct line.

I pointed this out in my Info #22en, as well as the fact that the battle in reality was a *triangular* one, with Mao's proletarian revolutionary line in one of the corners, so to speak, of the triangle and the respective, *both* in fact bourgeois, revisionist deviations in the two others. This was no "compromise" at all. When the Avakianists are talking of a "Right-Left compromise" here, this also implies, and must be seen together with, one of those other dastardly lies and vilifications of Mao Zedong's correct line with which they since 1984 have been attacking the international proletariat through their "Declaration", today translated into more than 20 languages:

The lie that in China in the early 1970s "the revisionists"(!) "to a large degree controlled"(!) foreign policy - so that, according to them, Mao's brilliantly correct line, which the facts show was so massively supported by the people of other countries as well and was so extremely successful, from the standpoint of the proletariat, wasn't the dominating one at all in China at that time.

You, Jay, in your posting 2 are passing over completely the fact of this appointment of Hua Guofeng, on Mao's proposal, in early 1976, and the significance of it. You mysteriously are referring to

> The capitalist roaders that seized control of the Chinese government

without stating *when* this supposed "seizing of control" would have taken place. By "capitalist-roaders" you mean, among others and clearly above all, Hua Guofeng. But you must(?) know quite well that Hua did *not* "seize control" as a capitalist-roader.

Hua Guofeng *did become* a capitalist-roader, yes. But this (as far as can be seen from the political line that was actually followed), only much later, in the course of a development starting approximately in *November* of 1976 - and *not*, as far as the essence of things are concerned, in October either. This last-mentioned point in time, I suppose, is the one which you're *implying* that the "capitalist-roaders!' "seizing of control" took place, though you're not saying so directly.

This is precisely in accordance with the fairy tale of the (open) Avakianists, who since 1978 (indeed even since 1976) have been trying to make people believe that a "revisionist coup d'état" - consisting of the big blow against the 4-Gang then - took place in China in October 1976.

But the facts (well-known to many at the time, unknown to those younger people who never got to read the "communist" Peking Review but were only fed the lies of the "RCP" and "RIM" gangsters, pointed out again [only] by me, on the Net since a year ago) make this falsification look as silly as it is.
When did Hua (and "his" group) "seize control"? Hua Guofeng *already had* a big part of the power after his being appointed Acting Premier and put in charge of the work of the CPC BP, in February '76. And he and that group were to be *even more* in control after his appointment to the posts of Premier and CPC First Vice-Chairman in April '76 (see below). In October 1976, they already *were* the ones in control.

Everybody who checks out these things even quite superficially can see this. That's probably why you didn't repeat quite directly the Avakianists' lie that Hua Guofeng etc "seized control" "in October '76", Jay, but were so impossibly vague on *what* point in time you meant.

Hua did *not* "seize control" under the circumstances of his already being a capitalist-roader. He was *appointed* to crucial posts, first in February and then in April, 1976, as a *representative of Mao's correct, proletarian line*. And he acted as one in striking down the 4-Gang in October too, then getting the people's massive support (whatever his real intentions at that time may have been). Only later, from November on, etc did he (or his group, openly) start to follow the capitalist road. Hua's case is one of treason (combining with Deng's clique) while in power, *not* one of "effecting a coup".

Hua Guofeng, instead of some other leading cadre, *was* Mao's choice. All sources (except those ridiculous "compromise" bull-shitters) confirm this. An article in PR #2/77 (admittedly of the somewhat later and more unreliable "vintage") reports Mao Zedong's having issued an instruction (not clear whether in February or in April '76): **"It is necessary to do propaganda and give publicity to Comrade Hua Kuo-feng to make him known to the people of the whole country step by step."**

But people only reading your posting 2, Jay, have no chance of telling what posts Hua might have had in February or even in April '76. He in your version of events only "leaps into existence" as someone "suddenly in control" in October. That's dishonest.

LATE MARCH / EARLY APRIL 1976: MASSIVE DEMONSTRATIONS BY THE PEOPLE AGAINST THE 4-GANG, CULMINATING ON TIANANMEN ON 05.04.76. BUT THEY ARE SUPPRESSED AND LATER VILIFIED.

Since the people had been prevented from expressing their mourning for Zhou Enlai in January, they used the opportunity of the Quing Ming (Dead Heroes) Festival in early April to do so.

A detailed report on events in Beijing, by foreign correspondent Clare Hollingworth who witnessed them, was quoted in parts 4/12 and 5/12 of my Info #22en. There are also reports in some much later PR issues, #46-48/78, which obviously are more truthful than the completely falsified story in PR #15/76 etc but not quite true either, since the action was then described as "completely
revolutionary", although there *were* a few Rightist elements also trying to take advantage of the situation.

On 05.04.76, the people gathered at Tiananmen, at least 100,000 and perhaps many more, and angrily denounced the removal of the great many wreaths commemorating Zhou Enlai that during the preceding days had been placed on the Martyrs' Memorial - 200 trucks were needed for their removal, says PR #48/78. Eventually, some cars were overturned and set on fire, as was a small security unit building. The people stayed on the square all day despite radio broadcasts from the Mayor, Wu De, to leave. Then militia were set in to disperse them, and many were arrested.

On this occasion, the otherwise proletarian government of China had acted *against* the people, for the first time. Obviously, this was something achieved, in the main, by the 4-Gang, who managed to take advantage of the fact that Mao Zedong at that time was quite ill and also utilized the ongoing correct campaign against Deng Xiaoping's Rightist wind for their own reactionary purposes, putting out the false story that those demonstrations had been (mainly) a manifestation in favour of that wind and had been engineered by Deng.

Here comes in that obviously *mendacious* article in PR #15/76, Jay, which you posted to the earlier Marxism list on 08.05.96, as an argument against my earlier saying that those actions had been in the main revolutionary: "Counter-revolutionary Political Incident at Tien An Men Square".

I commented on it in a posting on 13.05, brought again as part 2/12 of my Info #22en, and pointed out that anyone could see it was *lying*, since not only was it silent about the whole real background of events, the mourning for Zhou Enlai and the removal of the wreaths, but it e.g. ridiculously tried to make people believe that

>Except for a handful of bad elements who were bent on creating >disturbances, the majority of the people were passers-by who >came over to see what was happening. [!!!]

And those "passers-by" (at least 100,000, the article admits) supposedly did nothing whatever to stop these "disturbances by a handful of bad elements" either!

Now in your recent posting 2, Jay, you simply are "running away" from all discussion of the character of those events and even from that article which you yourself originally had brought. You're just repeating what the later PB meeting on 07.04, as part of one resolution, stated on them - which however can be *seen* to have been *wrong* - and "have now completely forgotten" that article. It isn't even included in the "recommended reading" list in your 3.

Such a method is precisely the same as those later used, in Nov-Dec 1976, by the group in China led by Hua Guofeng, whom you call "SCUMS OF THE EARTH", and in later years for instance by the (open) Avakianists too: The suppression of earlier documents, the pretence
that they "just aren't there". In this case, it was even one of your own. This is acting exactly opposite to that principle of Mao Zedong's which you yourself stressed during the "Quispe" fight earlier this year: *"Be open and above-board"*.  


In your posting 2, Jay, you once more reproduce, *only*, one of the *two* crucial resolutions of that meeting of the Political Bureau. You did the same in you posting, arguing against my presentation of things, on 05.08. But at that earlier time, you might perhaps be excused for excluding the other, since it's at least equally great importance hadn't then yet repeatedly been pointed out (by me).  

*Now*, however, when you're *still* pretending it "just isn't there", that's one more instance of the obvious dishonesty in your recent postings. In PR #15/76, where both resolutions were published, the one you're deleting was even the one that was presented first, in red print, on the front page. It reads (cf Info #22en part 5/12):  

"On the proposal of our great leader Chairman Mao, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China unanimously agrees to appoint Comrade Hua Kuo-feng First Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China."

You in your posting 2 only repeated part of the other, which reads:  

"Having discussed the counter-revolutionary incident which took place at Tien An Men Square and Teng Hsiao-ping's latest behaviour, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China holds that the nature of the Teng Hsiao-ping problem has turned into one of antagonistic contradiction. On the proposal of our great leader Chairman Mao, the Political Bureau unanimously agrees to dismiss Teng Hsiao-ping from all posts both inside and outside the Party while allowing him to keep his Party membership so as to see how he will behave in the future."

Those two resolutions must be viewed together, if you're to get the correct picture. By the first, Hua - and again, no "4-Gang member", for instance - was appointed First Vice-Chairman, a post that had not existed before but which (according to PR #2/77) Mao Zedong suggested be instituted. Mao himself, Clare Hollingworth writes, was too ill to attend that meeting. The two decisions proposed by him however were quite correct, the facts show: Appointment of Hua (a continuation of the February decision *against* the 4-Gang) and dismissal of Deng on account of his Rightist wind.
*But* that direct reason for this dismissal which was at least implied in that second resolution, there having been a so-called "counter-revolutionary incident", was a *false* characterization of the recent events. So Deng in part was "hung" for a "crime" which he had *not* committed. This, as I already have pointed out, could not but in fact *help support* his (openly-) Rightist deviation, make the people less eager to oppose it. Not only this; the PB had now called an essentially quite just action by the people "unjust".

Clearly, this must have made many among the masses worried, and wondering what was going on, in the following months. This (although subordinate) part of the second resolution obviously was a result of the 4-Gangs's having managed to sway the PB on this point. The people in Beijing must have felt a great hatred for those - whoever they were - who had caused the suppression and also the vilification of their just demonstration in April. There had also been similar demonstrations in other cities (later PRs).

Another thing that was not correctly done by that PB meeting was its taking upon itself to appoint Hua and dismiss Deng to/from *governmental* posts as well. This, as pointed out by a Swedish embassy employee in a book (quoted in my Info #2en part 5/12), was really, according to China's constitution, the business of the National People's Congress. My guess concerning this irregularity is that it was done behind Mao Zedong's back. As in the case of the other and more important error, the 4-Gang may have been to blame in part. But the other PB members present did concur, so they carried responsibility for it too.

The comment you made, Jay, on that important Politbureau meeting, may show how you're still at heart thinking, only it's obvious, isn't it, how wrong and contradictory that is. You wrote, on the resolution dismissing Deng, "your *only* one" of the two:

>it was an unanimous decision. The decision was not the result of splitting, intriguing and conspiring by the "gang of four."
>It was the result of Chairman Mao uniting the many to defeat the few. Obviously, however, there were present at that Politbiuro meeting in April 1976, who did not consider that they were in antagonistic contradiction with Teng Hsiao-ping, or that he should be removed. But did they raise their voices in dissent? No, they voted unanimously along with the entire Politbureau.

>Hua Kuo-feng said nothing. Neither did Li Hsien-nien nor Yeh Chien-ying, nor any of the others who were so free and loud after Mao's death in criticizing the 1976 struggle to beat back the Right deviationist wind.

So you're thinking that Hua Guofeng was *already* a capitalist-roader in *April 1976*, and that some of the others present were too? You said this directly too in another comment directly above these lines, likewise referring to the situation in April:
>Hua Kuo-feng and the other capitalist roaders in the Party set themselves against the line of Mao Tse-tung and the other revolutionaries in the Party. They were intriguers of the most despicable sort.

But Hua was precisely the leader that Mao at that time had the greatest confidence in, a fact on which you're silent. The one you're calling "intriguer" had been suggested by Mao Zedong in February for the most responsible posts and was now, again on Mao's proposal, confirmed even more in this, by the PB. You're arguing then, firstly (and genuinely believing?) that Hua Guo-feng managed to fool Mao, who was now old and ailing? But that doesn't fit with what you're saying about Mao's role in connection with the *other* PB resolution, the only one you admit there was:

>It was the result of Chairman Mao uniting the many to defeat the few.

So here, when (rightly) repudiating Deng, Mao *wasn't* that ailing, in your judgement. Your thinking doesn't fit together. Secondly, you're arguing that Hua in Feb-April etc, 1976, fooled not only Mao but also the other genuine Marxists. In other words, that there, in the main, only *were* fools and/or revisionists in the PB of the CC of the CPC at that time. But that too absolutely doesn't hold water.

This is again the (open) Avakianists' fairytale that China at that time "to a large extent" was under the influence of revisionism, and this, the facts show, precisely is a big lie. Above all, people in other countries too could, and still today can, see that China precisely was following Mao Zedong's brilliantly correct and successful line in foreign policy, based on his all-sidedly correct analysis of the situation in the world.

Hua Guofeng later *did* become a crook. So most definitely did Li Hsien-nien. When judging what they were aiming at in April '76, one must go by such reasoning as I've done above. Your ideas on it, Jay, absolutely don't fit. They are, perhaps, caused by such prejudices as you've "inherited" from the "RCP" etc, who since decades have had Hua down as "always a crook", the 4-Gang as "always heroes". It's a CIA story actually, refuted by the facts.

>From foreign M-L (with or without quotes) parties, there were a few messages after that PB meeting, congratulating Hua on his appointment and supporting the CPC on its two decisions. (Some were reproduced in PR #16/76 etc.) It may be noted that the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany, a party which I was in close contact with in 1974-1990 and which, as I've pointed out, during a long time, also after the overthrow of socialism in China, really represented Mao Zedong's correct proletarian revolutionary line, in its message (not published in PR) which correctly supported the two resolutions, did *not* see through the CPC PBs error on there having been "a counter-revolutionary incident" but mistakenly concurred in that judgement too. A rare mistake by the NE, showing how complicated things then were.
I on my part didn't understand the April '76 events in China until a couple of years ago. But I think it's not difficult for others to do so today, as soon as certain vital facts become known to them.

**LATE APRIL - AUGUST 1976: UNCLEAR SITUATION. THREE POINTS OF ADVICE BY MAO TO HUA ON 30.04.**

In May-August 1976, the unclear situation that had arisen after the April events continued to exist. Hua Guofeng, the leader whom Mao Zedong had proposed for the top posts, continued to be in charge. At the same time, the partial success of the 4-Gang, indirectly favouring Deng too was causing disquiet among the masses.

Mao on 30.04. (according e.g. to PR #52/76) had written down for Hua Guofeng the advice, concerning how to handle the concrete situation then: *"Take your time, don't be anxious."*, *"Act in line with past principles"* (a line that the 4-Gang were later massively to publicize a "slightly" distorted version of, to discredit Hua and as part of their attempt to usurp Party and state power), and *"With you in charge, I'm at ease"*.

That last line (whose set of Chinese characters, I've read somewhere, could more literally be rendered as "You run business, my heart rest") was later much publicized in China as showing Mao's confidence in Hua. Such obviously he had.

**09.09.1976: MAO ZEDONG DIES**

The passing away of Mao Zedong on 9 September 1976 of course was a tragic event which had a great impact in China and even internationally, because of this Marxist leader's historical role, which he had continued to fulfil even in his last months when he in part had been incapacitated by illness. People in many countries paid him their last respects. In the PR issues following his decease, a great number of messages of condolence, from heads of state and from foreign parties, were published.

**OCTOBER 1976 (06.10.76): THE BIG BLOW AGAINST THE REACTIONARY PHONEY "LEFT" 4-GANG**

This is the event whose character the Avakianists above all have concentrated their lies on. Suppressing all information that was available internationally at the time, they from 1978 on have been concocting the upside-down story that this was *not* essentially an important victory for the proletariat against one of the reactionary cliques but was "a counter-revolutionary coup d'état", supposedly by pro-Deng Xiaoping forces.

I've already massively refuted that falsification of history, by my Internet series "'The Four' & events in China 1976" in May-August of this year, posted again on 03.11.96 as "UNITE! Info #22en", in 12 parts. I refer to those postings once more.
Again, you, Jay, in your posting 2 in our present debate, are pretending that all those things I pointed out in them, all those documents I reproduced to show their veracity, simply "aren't there".

You do point out something that I didn't touch on: The fact that, from issue #42 on of the PR (i.e. from 15.10.76 on), its editorship had changed, and you give a number of details showing that from that same time on, important changes took place in the editorships of several main publishing media in China.

That's certainly quite true, and wasn't a bad thing either but, in the main, undoubtedly a good one. The 4-Gang had had a comparatively great influence precisely over the media. Now on 06.10 the whole Gang had been arrested for trying to usurp Party and state power. It was logical that their (rather few) followers were weeded out.

It's necessary above all to see: Under which line was the 4-Gang dealt that blow? And that - in the first and crucial phase, Oct '76, - *was* the all-sidedly correct line of Mao Zedong, the documents show. The criticism against the other deviation, that of Deng Xiaoping, was being continued too, then, during this phase.

**OCTOBER 1976 (CTD.): YOUR 2-3 ARGUMENTS, JAY, FOR "CAPITALIST-ROADERS' HAVING TAKEN CONTROL" AT *THIS* POINT, DON'T HOLD WATER.**

- **YOUR ARGUMENT 1: "LINE CHANGED"**

In your posting 2 you advanced three arguments for the Avakianist's fairy tale's in fact being true, that the big blow against the 4-Gang was a "counter-revolutionary" event:

Firstly, you wrote that that blow was a "purge" - well, one may call it that; in this case in the main absolutely a just one, although there was at least one murky point even as early as in October; I'll come to that - and you argued:

> The line put forward by the Chinese Communist Party and the Peking Review before the purge and that put forward by the CCP and the Peking Review after the purge are completely different and opposite lines.

No, that's *not* true. The general line, including Mao Zedong's genuinely internationalist proletarian revolutionary line in foreign policy, which is the part of the general line that could, and still can, be checked on most easily from afar, was *still* being upheld, in October '76. The contents of the foreign-policy line can be seen in the UN speech by Foreign Minister Qiao Guanhua on 05.10.76, i.e. immediately before the big blow. I reproduced it as "UNITE! Info #18en" (in 3 parts), on 05.10.96. PR articles show that this line was continued after the blow too.

Only later did the foreign-policy line gradually change and shift colour, so that towards the end of 1978, for instance, Soviet social-imperialism was not called by that scientifically correct term any more, and more than ten years later again, the now ruling
revisionist Deng Xiaoping clique in China was actually calling the Soviet Union a "socialist"(!) country, as if that clique had "effected another October revolution" in the Soviet Union!

But in October the line was *not* changed. As the only "difference in line" to "point at", you brought forward what you called "a complete reversal in attitude" on one matter:

>A most important and obvious difference in the line of Peking Review was a complete reversal in attitude towards the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist attempt. Throughout 1976 until the death of Chairman Mao in September, the central emphasis of the Chinese press was the campaign to beat back the Right deviationist attempt and deepen the criticism of Teng Hsiao-ping.

So you're saying there was a "shift of emphasis". You admit that the criticism of Deng Xiaoping was (still, at that time) being continued. That's one important fact.

But such a shift of emphasis, which there in fact was, too, *under the changed circumstances*, does *not* mean that the correct line has been changed. During the preceding months, since April, the emphasis in the PR (for instance) had indeed still been on criticizing Deng Xiaoping, *despite* the fact that, by the *unjust* suppression of the people's demonstrations, for instance, *the 4-Gang*, who were the main movers behind this, had started to become at least as great a danger as Deng's clique. And with their (obviously real) attempt, in September-October, at seizing power in the state and the Party, they did become the greatest danger to the proletariat at that time.

Quite correctly did the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in its message of congratulations to Hua Guofeng - the message that, because of its quite particular insight, was very important, among all those sent from foreign parties, but which precisely was *suppressed* in China - say, on the October blow, (Info #22en part 8/12):

>With it, the most dangerous grouping at the present time has been hit.

In general, of course the emphasis of struggle *must* be changed according to what enemy or what deviation at the time is presenting the greatest danger to the proletariat. During the Cultural Revolution, there first was emphasis on the struggle against the revisionism of Liu Shaoqi, which appeared in an openly-Rightist form. Later, after the 1971 coup attempt by Lin Biao, whose
revisionism had appeared in a phoney "Left" guise, emphasis of course shifted towards combating *that*.

And as was pointed out by Zhou Enlai at the CPCs 10th Congress in 1973, which I've quoted above and many other times already:

**"It is imperative to note that one tendency covers another."**
- referring to openly-Right and phoney "Left" deviations.

The shifting of emphasis, *in October*, was correct. The line then was still a proletarian one.

You continued that argument of yours, Jay, by saying that:

>Within two months, all mention of the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist attempt was dropped and Teng Hsiao-ping was only mentioned in criticizing the "gang of four" or, more exactly, the "gang of four" were criticized for "twisting and overemphasizing" the criticism of Teng.

That in itself is quite correct. In my postings, I also have pointed that out. Only, that was *another* and *later* development, that was the later treason by the Hua Guofeng group, which must not be confused with the October action, as you are doing.

As for the 4-Gang's twisting the criticism of Deng Xiaoping,*that* was an actual fact too. It's necessary to see that there took place a *triangular* battle, with the correct, proletarian line in one of the corners and the two bourgeois deviations in the other two. You constantly, and in part obviously dishonestly, are "eliminating" one of those corners, trying to make people believe that the "corner", the line, of the 4-Gang was that of Mao.

YOUR ARGUMENT 2: "THE 4-GANG WERE VERY IMPORTANT LEADERS" AND "THERE WAS A BIG PURGE".

In your posting 2, Jay, you started out by presenting the "4-Gang members" and those posts they were holding, in great detail, (not that bad as information) and then wrote that

>At the time of the purge, these leaders, now called the "gang of four," were among the ten most important leaders in the Chinese Communist Party. The post-purge criticism was directed at them.

and further:

>However, hundreds or perhaps thousands of other leading cadres were also removed, arrested, or purged, including many of the ministers of the State Council, members of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, and local Party committee members around the country.

What are you trying to argue with this? Probably, that "the capitalist-roaders" did "seize control", in October. But firstly,
Hua Guofeng, *not* yet a capitalist-roader, already *was* the man in top charge, respectively, his supporters were. I've already pointed out your dishonesty in being silent on this fact.

Secondly, your description of the importance of the 4-Gang and of the scope of the purge - at least as far as October is concerned - is not correct. On both counts, you're exaggerating -not necessarily intentionally.

Were the 4-Gang "among the ten most important leaders of the CPC"? If this is judged by the criteria that you yourself set up, that of what posts they were holding (which indeed is *one* of the criteria that its reasonable to go by), then it's a simple question of numbers. According your version, those four people constituted 40% of the top leadership, so to speak.

In reality, numerically speaking, they only constituted some 25% of it. They were all members of the Political Bureau (PB) of the CC of the CPC. That PB, as elected by the 10th Congress in 1973, had 21 members and 4 alternate members. In the meantime, Deng Xiaoping had also been elected to it (Jan '75) but was later dismissed (April '76), and 5 members had died: Mao, Zhou Enlai, Zhu De, Kang Sheng and (his name here in the old transcription :) Tung Pi-wu. Thus the 4-Gang were only a fifth of the total number of 20 PB members and alternate members.

Two of the 4-Gang members were on the PBs Standing Committee too, which as elected in 1973 had 9 members, some of which in October 1976 were deceased. All in all, it would be fair to say that, numerically, the Gang made up one-fourth of the highest CPC leadership.

This doesn't take into account the fact of course that it was Hua Guofeng who held the top post, and not the fact either of the actual influence of various people including Jiang Qing, who of course since a long time back had been Mao's wife, as you pointed out too, Jay - though you gave her, probably by mistake, an extra half-decade in that capacity. All in all, you did blow up the 4-Gang's standing in the CPC quite a bit.

As for governmental posts, which were important too, among the 12 Vice-Premiers elected at the 1st Session of the 4th National People's Congress in January, 1975, there was only one "4-Gang member", Zhang Chunqiao. At that time, Hua Guofeng got one of the 29 ministerial posts, as Minister of Public Security. (In Oct '76 of course he was Premier.) None of the 4-Gang got to head a ministry. Jiang Qing, for instance, whom Mao had already been criticizing most severely, in January 1975 was *not* appointed, e.g., Minister of Culture.

As for a "purge" of other top CPC leaders than the 4-Gang, *in *October '76*, it did *not* take place. Out of the those 12 PB members and 4 alternate members who remained after the passing away of some of those elected in 1973 and after the arrest of the 4-Gang, everybody except one, Liu Po-cheng (rather unknown, probably deceased too in the meantime), was on Tianamen during the rally of 1
million people on 24.10.76 to celebrate the victory over the 4-Gang (acc. to PR #44/76). And at that rally, out of the 12 Vice-Premiers elected in 1975, only those two were missing whom you'd expect to be: Deng Xiaoping and Zhang Chun-qiao.

Of ministers purged in October, I know of no case except for perhaps one, indeed very murky - see below.

As for leaders on somewhat lower levels (next to the top ones), of which there were certainly tens of thousands, it's not strange if some hundreds or even thousands of them were relieved of their posts at that time, as (actual) 4-Gang supporters.

It's also the case of course that *after* the correct striking down of the 4-Gang, in connection with the Hua group's actually committing treason and coalescing with the Deng clique, *other*, and now *unjust* purges took place, hitting adherents of Mao Zedong's proletarian line under the pretext that they were "4-Gang supporters". *This* was the really nasty thing. It may be that some of these actions started even in October.

Despite this, it remains necessary to *distinguish* between the *correct blow* against the Gang, on the one hand, and the *revisionist treason* of the same people who had led it, on the other. In time, the former took place in October '76, the latter (in the main) from November 1976 on.

THE NECESSITY OF DISTINGUISHING EVENTS IN OCTOBER 1976 FROM THOSE (IN THE MAIN) BEGAN IN NOVEMBER.

This is what you are *not* doing, Jay, when you're pointing, in itself quite rightly, at the revisionist decisions eventually made in the summer of 1977 of "rehabilitating", in an impermissible manner, Deng Xiaoping, *then* pretending that the criticism of his Right wind had been "only a product of the 4-Gang".

On that rehabilitation and the lie accompanying it, and on the whole 1976-77 struggle in the CPC, the KPD/ML(NEUE EINHEIT) in Germany in that same summer wrote a correct and quite important analysis, making it clear that revisionists were now in power in China. I have not yet translated and posted that article, but I intend to do so later.

[Note, July 1997: See Info #40en of 13.07.97, parts 2/4 - 3/4, where this 1977 article, "Einige Stellungnahmen..." ("Some Comments...") , was reproduced in translation. - RM]

In my postings, I've been basing myself of that correct analysis by the NE, which as far as I know was the *only* revolutionary party in the world that understood the events in China at that time. On this, see also my Info #12en (08.07.96). In an important statement in October 1978 (reproduced in Info #1en, 23.12. 95), the NE (NEUE EINHEIT) wrote

>Both the big blow against the "Gang of Four" and the discharge
of the hate and fury against the machinations of this grouping
and also the actions of the present Chinese leadership show
how very right Mao Zedong was.

We absolutely repudiate both the line "KPD" / Deng Xiaoping /
Hua Guofeng and also the line "Roter Morgen" / "Gang of Four".
They constitute two deviations which wish once more to act, to
the detriment of the correct line, as opportunist underminers
and pacifiers. They have however already in the main failed,
since Mao Zedong in his last years through his decision against
Deng Xiaoping and also against the "Gang of Four" achieved
that they can only more or less openly today take a stand
against him and no longer can directly refer to him and must
work towards his being "surmounted". We combat this.

YOUR ARGUMENT (??) 3: THE REVEALING MATTER OF THE 4-GANG'S
"PRINCIPLES LAID DOWN" PHRASE, A TYPICAL MUMBO JUMBO AND A FORGERY
WHICH POINTS TO USURPATION PLANS OF THEIRS

I'm not certain whether in fact you intended to put forward this
point as an argument for the false story that "capitalist-roaders
seized power in China in Oct '76", Jay, but in connection with your
mentioning the change of editorship of the PR from issue #/42/76
(15.10.1976) on, you also wrote, in your posting 2:

>With that issue the "principles laid down" phrase associated
>with the "gang of four" line disappears;

This in itself is a quite correct observation. And whatever you
wanted to say with it, that particular point would be an above-the-
board argument too. Only, it so happens that this matter, as you
probably don't know, contains one piece of rather clear evidence,
which can be checked on even today, that the 4-Gang *were* after
seizing state and Party power for themselves. I mean the
*appearance*, in the first place, of that phrase.

In PR #52/76, there's a very detailed article on this matter. Now at
this point in time, the PR has already started becoming less
reliable. But what it has to say on this question in part can even
be confirmed, by means of a look at some earlier PR issues, and so
in this case, it's most likely that it's telling the truth.

What obviously took place was: On 30.04, Mao Zedong wrote down those
3 lines of advice for Hua Guofeng which I've mentioned above under
point =A47, including the line, regarding the concrete situation
then: "Act in line with past principles".

Hua showed the paper in Mao's handwriting to the PB including the 4-
Gang, who later, in September after Mao Zedong's death, altered the
line mentioned to "Act according to the principles laid down" and
propagandized it, in an editorial in the three most important papers
on 16.09 first of all, as "Mao's last words" and "a masterly
generalization and incisive summing-up of the Party's experience".
As such, the phrase is rather empty of course, and, as pointed out in PR #52/76, really a piece of metaphysics. But it did appear, quite suddenly, in PR #39/76, where that editorial was reproduced. And in PR #40/76, it’s reported as having been used in memorial speeches all over the country - 24 of them all contain that almost empty thing as something important. Other articles featuring it as "last words" were being prepared by the 4-Gang too but were stopped after Hua on 02.10 had pointed out that it was a distortion of that piece of advice in April.

What was the point of that action by the 4-Gang? PR #52/76 says, to discredit Hua Guofeng, who in his memorial speech soon after 16.09 did not include it. The Gang planned to make people believe this was a "withholding of Mao's last words", whose real protagonists *they* then would appear to be. And in fact, the manner in which the phrase appears in those PR issues, which is that of a veritable propaganda campaign with some particular motive or other behind it, does support precisely such a theory. So this is a certain piece of evidence, pointing at usurpation plans and foul dealings on the part of the 4-Gang, which everyone can check out today, 20 years later.

ONE MURKY CASE, AS EARLY AS OCT-NOV 1976: THE DISAPPEARANCE OF FOREIGN MINISTER QIAO GUANHUA.

I've repeated that the October blow against the 4-Gang was a correct action, by forces then still following Mao's line, and in Info #22en have pointed out that the people in China massively supported it too, as did the Marxist-Leninist parties in other countries. It was only from November on that a line of treason on the part of the Hua group started, I've added.

And these are the main facts too. But one case on which I have very little information points to there having been some sinister intentions at an early stage: Qiao Guanhua, who on 05.10.76 had delivered an excellent "line speech" at the UN on China's behalf, as he had in 1974 and 1975 too, shortly afterwards suddenly just disappeared. He was not present at an occasion on 12.10 (perhaps not home yet?), nor on one on 16.11, and on 17.12, there's a new Foreign Minister, Huang Hua, PR issues show. Nothing was said about Qiao's (purportedly) having been a 4-Gang follower. This and other things point to his not having been one. In her 1985 book, foreign correspondent Clare Hollingworth wrote he had died (when?, how?). A very murky case. However, the main conclusions it does not alter.

I'm taking the chance, Jay, of your once more completely ignoring what I've written. And of course I'm hoping that others may have some use for it.

Rolf M.

In this posting, I'm quoting from three Peking Review articles,
"Great Historic Victory" in PR #44/76 (already reproduced in full in my "UNITE! Info #22en" (part 7/12) on 03.11.96),

"Launching a New Upsurge in Studying Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and by Chairman Mao" in PR #52/76, and

"Crushing the 'Gang of Four' Was a Wise Decision by Chairman Mao" in PR #3/77.

In October 1976, when PR #44/76 was published, the Chinese leadership were pursuing a correct line in dealing the big blow against the 4-Gang and at the same time continuing the criticism of Deng Xiaoping. They at that time had massive support by the people and by the Marxist-Leninist parties in other countries. The quotes in PR #44/76 most likely are true.

Shortly afterwards however, in November, they started to abandon the correct line and more and more went together with Dengers' clique, overthrowing socialism in China. Towards the end of 1978, a bourgeois dictatorship had been established there.

The PR accordingly became less and less trustworthy. But I don't see much reason to doubt the correctness of the quotes (in part the same as those earlier) in PR #52/76 or #3/77 either, since it must have been known to not so few what Mao Zedong actually had said or not said at those CPC meetings.

First, excerpts from PR #44/76:

'Wang-Chang-Chiang-Yao had long formed a cabal, the "gang of four", engaged in factional activities to split the Party. The great leader Chairman Mao was aware of this long ago and severely criticized and tried to educate them again and again. And he made some arrangements to solve this problem.'

'Chairman Mao criticized them on July 17, 1974, saying: "You'd better be careful; don't let yourselves become a small faction of four."'

'Again, on December 24, Chairman Mao criticized them: "Don't form factions. Those who do so will fall."'

'In November and December of the same year, as the central leading organs were preparing to convene the Fourth National People's Congress, Chairman Mao said:'

'"Chiang Ching has wild ambitions. She wants Wang Hung-wen to be Chairman of the Standing Committee of the People's National Congress and herself to be Chairman of the Party Central Committee."'

'On May 3, 1975, at a meeting of the Political Bureau of the Party Central Committee, Chairman Mao reiterated the basic principles of "three do's and three don'ts", and warned them:'
'Practice Marxism-Leninism, and not revisionism; unite, and don't split; be open and above board, and don't intrigue and conspire. Don't function as a gang of four, don't do it any more, why do you keep doing it?'"*

'That very day Chairman Mao, on this question, gave the instruction that **"if this is not settled in the first half of this year, it should be settled in the second half; if not this year, then next year, if not next year, then the year after."**

And here are some excerpts from PR #52/76 and #3/77; I'm putting the quotes together in chronological order:

'In the days following the Tenth National Party Congress in August, 1973, the Wang-Chang-Chiang-Yao "gang of four" intensified their underhand activities step by step....In early 1974, Chairman Mao initiated and led the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius.....they [the 4-Gang] invented slogans behind Chairman Mao's back....and directed the spearhead of their attack against Premier Chou.....In early 1974, Chairman Mao severely criticized them, pointing out: **"Metaphysics, one-sidedness, is rampant."**

'Because of their reactionary class nature, the Wang-Chang-Chiang-Yao anti-Party clique had an inveterate hatred for Marxist theory. They themselves did not study it at all and extremely feared that Party members and the masses would get a real grasp of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tsetung Thought. They tried by every means to sabotage the mass study movement. On March 20, 1974, Chairman Mao, in great anger, criticized Chiang Ching, saying:'"**"It's better if we don't see each other. You haven't done many of the things I talked to you about over the years. What's the use of seeing each other more often? The works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin are there, my works are there, but you simply refuse to study."**'

'It was Chairman Mao who first criticized their factional activities, calling them the "gang of four". He said on July 17, 1974: **"You'd better be careful; don't let yourselves become a small faction of four."** **"It's hard for you, too, to mend your ways"**, he told Chiang Ching. On December 24 the same year, Chairman Mao again criticized them, saying: **"Don't form factions. Those who do so will fall."**

'Chang Chun-chiao, Yao Wen-yuan and their like who called themselves "Marxist theoreticians", however, only opposed empiricism, not dogmatism....Chairman Mao saw through their plots and criticized them accordingly: **"It seems the formulation should be: Oppose revisionism which includes empiricism and dogmatism. Both revise Marxism-Leninism. Don't mention just one while omitting the other."** **"In my opinion, those who are criticizing empiricism are themselves empiricists."**

[An article in PR #50/76 has the date of this, and reports Mao Zedong's having written it on a report on 23.04.1975. It also adds, as a continuation of it: **"Not many people in our Party really know..."**]
Marxism-Leninism. Some think they know, but in fact know very little about it. They consider themselves always in the right and are ready at all times to lecture others. This in itself is a manifestation of a lack of knowledge of Marxism-Leninism."

'On May 3, 1975, Chairman Mao reiterated the three basic principles at a Political Bureau meeting, criticizing them [the 4-Gang] for having no faith in these principles and having forgotten them altogether. He sounded a warning to them: "Don't function as a gang of four. Don't do it anymore. Why do you keep doing it? Why don't you unite with the more than 200 members of the Party Central Committee? It is no good to keep a small circle of a few. It has always been no good doing so."'

'In the presence of Chairman Mao, they said they "will go according to Chairman Mao's instructions" while behind his back they continued to function as a gang. Without the slightest intention of repenting, they went from bad to worse and slipped farther along the erroneous road.'

'Chairman Mao was thus determined to settle the problem of the "gang of four". In 1975, he exposed Chiang Ching further: "After I die, she will make trouble." On May 3, Chairman Mao gave an instruction on the problem of the gang, saying that "If this is not settled in the first half of this year, it should be settled in the second half; if not this year, then next year, if not next year, then the year after."

Rolf M.

[Omitted section: LIST of Peking Review issues already available on the Internet {Usenet (U), former Marxism list (M1), present Marxism-General list (M-G), World Wide Web (WWW)}]

A COMMENT ON THE DEBATE METHODS OF THE DETCON JAYSUIT (RM, JULY 1997)

Here I shall make some general comments on the methods used in the debate on this question, the one of the 4-gang in China, by Jay Miles of the so-called "Detroit Peru Support Committee" ("Detcom") led by him, an organization whose character must also of course be seen in the light of that of its leader.

In part 1/12 above I pointed out why one, in the light of some fairly recent actions of his above all, must warn people of Jay Miles' in reality being a diehard 4-gang adherent and Avakianist or "RIMler".

His behaviour in this debate in itself already provides some clear reasons for this, as I intend to demonstrate.
That debate (in the forum of, first, the "M1" mailing list and later the "M-G" one managed by the Spoon Collective) started out with a brief exchange in May 1996 (reproduced in the first parts of my Info #22en), continued with that renewed debate in December which has been reproduced above here and, on Jay Miles' part, went on with those postings of his last February which I haven't really replied to until now and which are reproduced below, with some comments by me now, July '97, in brackets [ ].

Above is seen how I in December criticized Jay for his, in my judgement, being at least in part insincere in this debate. I then still hoped that he would basically stand on the side of the proletariat anyway. Later events have dispelled that hope.

In fact the criticism by my ex-comrades in Germany Dr Sendepause & the Klasberries, posted on 30.06.97, of the founder (in 1928) of the PCP in Peru, J.C. Mariategui, an obviously correct criticism - which however, to put it mildly, didn't very much please that phony "PCP ambassador" Adolfo Olaechea, UK, nor that in reality Sancho Panza and co-conman of his, Jay Miles - contains a description of some methods that to me seems to fit very well in on those of the last-mentioned person too. (Another matter is the fact that Dr Sendepause hasn't been a complete stranger himself to similar methods, in recent years.)

This is the description of the methodology of the Jesuits, which, as Sendepause points out (I'd guess) quite correctly, Mariategui by far didn't distance himself sufficiently from.

Here are some quotes from the later part of that criticism:

"Particularly questionable is Mariategui's giving prominence to Jesuitism as an exemplary fruitful colonisator...."

"Jesuits were to place themselves among those at the head of the development of this new knowledge" [that of science, geography etc] "and simultaneously fight it by all means. Jesuits immediately went out into the whole world, in contrast to their Lutheran competitors, started discussions with all directions of science and were eager to confront themselves."

That more primitive bourgeois buffoon Olaechea soon ran away from all debate of the crucial questions with me; Jay Miles at least engaged in *some* discussion and confrontation.

"As fundamental principle we may emphasize what Ignatius of Loyola posed for his disciples...:

"'In order to be sure in everything we must stress constantly: what appears white to my eyes I take for black if the hierarchical church decides so,.......'"

"This basic principle which time and again has been hold out towards the Jesuits shows all the extremes of their conception, their splits, and what is even more, their officially prescribed
institutionalized lying to themselves and to others. This commandment of a true slavish mental obedience is the central key link of the way of thinking of the Jesuits, and it unmasks their claim to be scientific [read today: 'Marxist' or 'Maoist', I permit myself to interpose - RM] which sometimes is being expressed."

Jay Miles in fact has used the following "GENERAL DEBATE PRINCIPLES":

1. Attacking Mao Zedong's line, while pretending to be an adherent and representative of it

2. Concerning crucial facts: Just whisking them away, and inventing new ones too, completely without foundation. On points where he has already been refuted, just forgetting about that whole theme, neither recognizing that he was wrong nor trying to show that he was right.

Relying on purported "principles" that he has invented, out of the blue, and tries to ascribe to Marxists, to Mao Zedong above all. (See also point 4 below.)

3. Utilizing the systematically confusing and misleading Avakianist/openly-bourgeois term "ultra-left" - and this despite my having already informed him of this its nature.

This is so important to him that he also ascribes use of it to others, notwithstanding the fact that all who can read can ascertain the fact that those others never used it. And he on his own part *wallows* in its use. It's a term that *confuses* about the class content of those things which it's supposed to denote.

What does that term, "ultra-left", mean, in Jay Miles' usage? Well, some of the times, it seems to mean, phony "left" - and then all might be "well and good", if he would "just" employ it consistently in that way.

But he doesn't, which of course is the whole point of his usage too: Sometimes, he by "ultra-left" instead means "a *sincerely intended* leftism that just by mistake gets to be counter-productive".

Important here is his failure to admit that there are or may be *bourgeois swindlers* who *insincerely* put up a front, a *false* front, of "leftism", in order to deceive the masses all the better. Precisely in China, there happens to be, in earlier history, a striking example of this: Lin Biao, and his 1971 coup attempt. Jay Miles, basically, pretends he "never heard of it".
4. Saying that "traditional" Rightism, or openly-rightist deviations, is/are "the main danger" under socialism. A too sweeping statement, which also diverts from a concrete study of the facts in each case.

5. Saying or implying that "persons and the assessment of them *never change* with the passing of time".

6. Pretending that he "has some information", in general, or hinting at some source of it - and then *not* showing in *what* that purported information consisted, or else what that "source" did say.

One example of this is Jay Miles' mentioning his having had the opportunity to discuss the 4-gang question with some people of Chinese origin, in the Detroit area, who actually were in China at the crucial point in time. But then, nobody gets to know what they actually said.

(There *was* one exception to this. Jay at one point in a private mail to me mentioned one of the Chinese-origin people as "one you'd like, since she's against 'the four' too". That also showed *some* sincerity, of course, since it "went against" what he himself was arguing. But typically too, he never said anything like that in public, in postings to the M-G list etc.)

7. (Last but not least) Endlessly talking about, in the context, quite irrelevant things, with unnecessary quote upon unnecessary quote upon unnecessary quote.

Debate on China

**Right and "Left" Opportunism: Which is the Main Danger?**

The revolutionary proletariat must battle two kinds of erroneous lines - the Right opportunist revisionist capitalist-road line and the phony "Left" line. These lines have different characteristics and have different roles at different times but they are both counter-revolutionary and are in direct opposition to the proletarian revolutionary line.

[Yes, quite right! So now he does know that. In Dec '96, he had seemed to have forgotten it completely. He later in this posting "forgets" it again; that's essential to his line. - RM, '97 VII]

The essence of the proletarian revolutionary line in carrying forward revolution towards communism is embodied in the Marxist thesis of integrating the theory of uninterrupted revolution with the theory of the development of revolution by stages.

"We are advocates of the Marxist theory of uninterrupted revolution. We hold that things are always moving forward and that socialism and communism are not and defi-
nitely must not be allowed to be separated by a Great Wall. We must persist in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and never stand still. At the same time, we are advocates of the Marxist theory of the development of revolution by stages. We maintain that different stages of development reflect the qualitative change of things, and we should not get confused with the qualitatively different stages, nor go beyond the stage of historical development to do what cannot possibly be accomplished at present."


The general characteristic of Right opportunism is to deny the need for revolutionary change at all and try to reverse it, while the general characteristic of "Left" opportunism is to deny the development of revolutionary change by stages, pushing for everything at once. This makes the goals unattainable, channels the revolutionary energy in the wrong direction and objectively aids Right opportunism by depleting the proletariat's strength and demoralizing it.

[Yes, that's basically correct too. - RM, '97 VII]

"Left" opportunism is essentially petty bourgeois...

[No! A "sincere" such may be typical of some petty bourgeois strata. But history knows many nasty *swindlers* too *faking* a "leftist" line: Lin Biao in China, not least. And the CIA-"RCP"-"RIM" swindle in favour of the 4-gang, the one that JM himself here so fanatically defends as "the truth", certainly is *not* of a "petty-bourgeois" origin. - RM, '97 VII]

... and is opposed to proletarian politics. It must be combated, but it becomes particularly dangerous at certain moments in the revolutionary process.

[Quite right! This then calls for *analysis of the facts of the situation*. But JM *sweeps away* vital such facts. RM, '97 VII]

In 1930 the "Left" dogmatist line of Li Li-san prevailed in the Red Army. He advocated abandoning the base areas to attack key cities and win the revolutionary war with one blow. Many of the Red Army's forces were wiped out before the correct line gained control again. This was one of the three "Left" lines that caused great losses to the revolutionary forces for extended periods. More recently, phony "left" tendencies emerged during the Cultural Revolution. These phony "Leftists" called for (among other things):

(1) a complete readjustment and equalization of wages (an unrealizable objective that directed the struggle towards an equalization of wages instead of their eventual elimination),

(2) an end to *all* rules in factories (as opposed to only those
which unreasonably perpetuated bourgeois right),

(3) ultra-democracy (which would give the bourgeoisie a complete free hand),

(4) "criticizing all and overthrowing everything",

(5) forming a new "Marxist-Leninist" party, and

(6) breaking off all foreign relations.

The phony "Left" was extremely sectarian, dividing the workers and students into many opposing groups, and called for violent struggle in many instances where it was not needed and played a counter-revolutionary divisive role instead of a revolutionary role. It attacked people instead of ideas, thereby robbing the struggle of its political content. Its main fault was to call for continued criticism and struggle without seeing the need for transformation and unity to consolidate the gains of the Cultural Revolution.

Phony "Leftism", because of its "radical" cover, had a large base of support among workers and students during the Cultural Revolution. After the revisionists had largely been defeated (but not vanquished) in 1967, it became the main danger in the struggle. In August, 1967, many such phony "Leftists" were purged from the Cultural Revolution Group (which was formed to give leadership to the revolution) and a campaign was launched to consolidate the gains of the Cultural Revolution, re-educate the workers and students who had been taken in by the phony "Left" line, facilitate the transformation, and unify the Party.

[JM here correctly brings some facts - to argue what? He shows an instance of a *sincere* phony "leftism". - RM '97 VII]

This campaign was led, first and foremost, by Chou En-lai, with the help of the "gang of four"...

[No! The persons in question didn't become - degenerate into -the 4-gang until in 1974-75 of course, though there's also reason to question what actual role they did play much earlier. JM here shows the characteristical point 5 of his reactionary line: "people and the assessment of them never change" (see my comment in part 8/12). - RM, '97 VII]

... Chiang Ching, Chang Chun-chiao, Yao Wen-yuan, Wang Hung-wen (see accounts of the Cultural Revolution in Shanghai in the books by Jean Daubier, Joan Robinson, and Victor Nee), and others who had been active in mobilizing the masses of workers and peasants to defeat the revisionist headquarters and transform industry and education.

However, while it was absolutely necessary to wage a two-front struggle, against both the phony "Left" and the Right, the capitalist-roaders in the Party were only concerned with attacking the proletarian Left (labelling it "ultraLeft")...
[No! Never was such a bourgeois term in use in China then. That's one of JM's inventions, points 2-3 of his method. I already *had* pointed out the facts on this to him. But he has such great need of this confusing term that he just goes on anyway, now thus callously lying. - RM, '97 VII]

...to protect themselves. In 1966, in response to P'eng Chen's report that protected the Right and attacked the Left, Chairman Mao and the Central Committee released the May 16th circular which declared:

"For their own ulterior purposes, the authors of the Report demand a 'rectification campaign' against the staunch Left in a deliberate effort to create confusion, blur class alignments and divert people from the target of struggle. Their main purpose in dishing up the Report in such a hurry was to attack the proletarian Left. They have gone out of their way to build up dossiers about the Left, tried to find all sorts of pretexts for attacking it, and intended to launch further attacks on it by means of a 'rectification campaign', in the vain hope of disintegrating its ranks. They openly resist the policy explicitly put forward by Chairman Mao of protecting and supporting the Left and giving serious attention to building it up and expanding its ranks. They are filled with hatred for the proletariat and love for the bourgeoisie. At a time when the new and fierce struggle of the proletariat against the representatives of the bourgeoisie on the ideological front has only just begun...the Report stresses again and again that the struggle must be conducted 'under direction', 'with prudence', 'with caution', and 'with the approval of the leading bodies concerned'. All this serves to place restrictions on the proletarian LEFT, to impose taboos and commandments in order to tie its hands, and to place all sorts of obstacles in the way of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. In a word, the authors of the Report are rushing to apply the brakes and launch a vindictive counterattack. The Report opposes carrying the socialist revolution through to the end, opposes the line on the cultural revolution pursued by the Central Committee of the Party headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, attacks the proletarian Left and shields the bourgeois Right, thereby preparing public opinion for the restoration of capitalism. It is a reflection of bourgeois ideology in the Party; it is out and out revisionism."

[Yes, but this was about an attack then on the *genuine* left. So this, like so many other parts of JM's "argumentation" which do show up a considerable knowledge on his part of M-L history, is irrelevant to the issue at hand. - RM, '97 VII]

On the surface [!! - RM], the criticisms of the "gang of four" were for Right errors:

[Hua Guofeng and his group in China, who at this moment, Dec 1976, true enough, have already started likewise deviating from Mao Zedong's line, here are being *scolded* by Jay Miles for *not* using *his* own bourgeois/Avakianist confusing terminology but, in itself
correctly, pointing out the essence of the matter of the 4-gang! - RM, '97 VII]

"The Wang-Chang-Chiang-Yao anti-Party clique is a bunch of ultra-Rightists and their counter-revolutionary revisionist line is an ultra-Right line. They are ultra-Rightists, out and out capitalist-roaders, and the most ferocious counter-revolutionaries. The infamous records of Chang Chun-chiao, Chiang Ching and Yao Wen-yuan show that they were linked with the Chain Kai-shek Kuomintang reactionaries in a thousand and one ways. The social basis of this gang is the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and new and old bourgeoisie."

(Hua Kuo-feng in speech to Tachai Agricultural Conference, December 1976, Peking Review #1, 1977, p. 36)

There is overwhelming evidence...

[No, on the contrary; here's an invention again - RM, '97 VII]

...to show that it was completely false to characterize the "gang of four" line as ultra-Right capitalist-roader, the most convincing of which is that those scum in their campaign against the "gang of four", did not attack any of the tendencies of a capitalist-road line. They did not attack the "gang of four" for putting profits or production in command, or for pushing the "theory of productive forces," or for making material incentives the motive force in production, or for pushing that experts should run the factories, or for servility to foreign technology [One *cannot* be "servile" to *technology*! - RM], or for wanting to consolidate the capitalist relations of production in agriculture or industry, or for widening the gaps between manual and mental labor, between worker and peasant, between town and countryside. They were not EVER accused of downplaying class struggle and opposing revolution.

[JM here *denies* that an in reality rightist line *may take the form*, on the part of some capitalist-roaders who're going in for camouflaging themselves, i.e. are *not* sincere, of phony "leftism". He's "forgotten" his own very first paragraph above, where he - it seemed - recognized this. - RM, '97 VII]

The attacks they make on political line are, almost without exception, against ultra-"Left" tendencies and not capitalist-road tendencies.

[JM's "ultra" term again, point 3 of his method. - RM, '97 VII]

For instance, they accuse the "gang of four" of:

(1) advocating "overthrowing all" and encouraging violence when necessary (the article about Chou En-lai and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution definitely portrays them in this ultra-"Left" role [as Jay *must* say - RM], Peking Review #4, 1977),
(2) unrealistically opposing foreign technology, (Peking Review #4, 1977), (3) opposing veteran cadre and trying to promote too many young cadre, (Peking Review #7, 1977),
(4) advocating continual struggle without transformation, and refusing to let mistaken cadre mend their ways (Peking Review #4, 1977),
(5) taking contradictions among the people for contradictions between the people and the enemy (Peking Review #5, 1977),
(6) using opposition to empiricism as a cover for being dogmatists (the actions of the "gang of four" were likened several times to the "Left" dogmatist line of Wang Ming and they were said to be "jackals from the same lair") (Peking Review #50, 1976, p.14),
(7) setting revolution against production, politics against economics, socialist consciousness against intellectual development, and political education against military training (various issues of Peking Review).

Jay Miles, as you can see, really has made some efforts here at studying *some* PR articles. His summary of some of the then criticism in China directed (in the beginning, from a Marxist standpoint, later more and more from - another - revisionist one) against the 4-gang is not that bad as such. Only, these efforts were dedicated at an attempt to *defend* that *swindle* that, in the last instance, emanates from the CIA. In his next sentence, he makes one of those "shifts in terminology" again, which in reality means his arguing something else than before.- RM, '97 VII

All of the above errors are generally phony "Left" in nature and not Right.[!!]

[First he called them "ultra-'left'" - a term that holds the question open, whether they're *phony "left"* or somehow *genu- inely* left. Now he says they *are* of a phony "left" nature. But that means that they basically *are* of a right-wing nature too. He himself has admitted that in his first paragraph above: 'The...proletariat must battle two kinds of erroneous lines - the Right...line and the phony "Left" line. These lines... are both counter-revolutionary...'. This he now denies. We're talking of course, or should be talking, of *insincere* forces here, not people inadvertently making mistakes. - RM, '97 VII]

The charges are thoroughly unbased...

[Here again, a brazen invention by Jay Miles, and one that he - of course - cites not a single fact to support. - RM, '97 VII]

..., but reflect the ultra-Right nature of the attackers, who purposefully try to characterize all the revolutionary elements of the proletarian line as "ultraLeft".

[Again, JM *pretends* that some people in China had been saying so, or perhaps he means that they "should have" been saying it; anyway, his old "ultra"-confusion is here once more, and in addition, he once more just "sweeps away" that vital fact that the criticism, the correct and just part of the criticism, against the 4-gang originated precisely from Mao Zedong. - RM, '97 VII]
Faced with the fact that the campaign against the four is primarily based on attacking "Left" errors, while they are called "capitalist-roaders" and "ultra-Rightists", some people here in the U.S. said: "ultra-Left, ultra-Right... it's all the same!"

This is not correct, it was a fundamental misconception that tries to cover up the weakest point in the criticism of the four. Phony "Left" and Right lines are different. Most importantly, they become the main danger at different times in a revolutionary process.

[And here Jay Miles demonstrates very clearly a basic element in his attempts at deluding people - perhaps including himself. First of all: When those "people in the U.S." were talking of "ultra-left", using that very same term which is so vital to JM himself that he absolutely refuses to let go of it, even after I've pointed out its systematically confusing nature to him - in my debate posting 3, see part 2/12 above - what could they have been meaning?]

Probably, different things in different cases, since that term *does* mean different things. Some people, who weren't very well acquainted with Marxism, may well have meant "a sincerely intended leftist that however somehow goes 'too far' for being productive". That would *not* have been the same as rightism, so *those* people one might say that JM correctly criticized above, if they did equate the two.

As above is how the bourgeoisie likes to describe things. They don't want people to know that there on the one hand are, or may exist, genuine Marxists, who're doing their best to further the interests of the vast majority of people and who of course may make mistakes in that process, and on the other hand, constantly, are some hordes of (in reality precisely bourgeois) swindlers who're just trying to *camouflage* their actions directed against most people by pretending to be "more revolutionary" than everybody else.

Probably some of those "people in the U.S.", when saying "ultra-left, ultra-right, same shit" were referring to *that type of swindlers*. If so, they'd be *quite right*. Against *them*, Jay Miles here is directing a precisely upside-down "criticism". He rants about a "fundamental misconception that tries to cover up" something, while in reality it's precisely he who's trying to cover up his swindle by creating such "fundamental" confusion.

'Phony "Left" and Right lines are different.' JM says. Yes, but they're also basically the same in that both favour the bourgeoisie. He started out his previous posting by admitting that. And his continuing:

'Most importantly, they become the main danger at different times in a revolutionary process.'
is not wrong in itself, but he tries to misuse it, by "arguing" below with generalities, at some length too, instead of looking at the facts of this particular case. - RM, '97 VII]

Comrade Joseph Stalin pointed out:

"...The chief cause of the crisis in the Czech Communist Party, 1925 lay in the difficulties entailed by the transition from a period of revolutionary upsurge to a period of lull. What is the character of the crisis and from where does the danger threaten, from the Left or from the Right?...The danger threatens from both sides...the facts show, however, that the chief danger comes from the Right and not from the Left.

"Why is the danger from the Right the more serious danger at the present time? Firstly, the transition itself from upsurge to lull, by its very nature, increases the chances of danger from the Right. Whereas an upsurge gives rise to revolutionary illusions and causes the Left danger to become the principal one, a lull, on the contrary, gives rise to social democratic reformist illusions and causes the Right danger to become the principal one. In 1920, when the working-class movement was on the upgrade, Lenin wrote his pamphlet 'Left-Wing Communism an Infantile Disorder'. Why did Lenin write this particular pamphlet? Because at that time the Left danger was the more serious danger. I think that if Lenin were alive he would now write another pamphlet entitled 'Right-Wing Communism, an Old-Age Disorder,' because, at the present time, in the period of lull, when illusions about compromise are bound to grow, the Right danger is the most serious danger."

(Joseph Stalin, Speech to the Czechoslav Commission of the ECCI, 1925)

During the period of socialism, Right opportunism, revisionism, and capitalist-roaders are the main danger.

[That's a much too sweeping statement in the first place, and one that Mao Zedong, whom JM tries to portray as the "author" of such a "thesis", never advanced in that manner. And what does he want to argue with it, in the second? Perhaps he just wants to bore the readers, or to impress them with a certain knowledge that he does have. He himself admits, again below, that one must look at the facts of each specific case. - RM]

In specific periods of upheaval...such as the Cultural Revolution after the Right danger had been defeated for the moment, the "Left" danger became temporarily the principal danger.

Marxist-Leninism must always wage a two-front struggle against both Right and phony "Left" lines, but during the overall period of socialism the Right danger is definitely principal. [No,
again, that's a too sweeping statement. - RM] Correctly determin-
ing what is the principal danger at a given time is extremely important and determines the general orientation of the struggle.

[Yes, absolutely! And this means that now, Jay Miles at last is going to look at and discuss the actual facts in this case, the one of the situation in China in April-October 1976? Absolutely not. The readers of this probably will have guessed that too by now. You're in for some more generalities. - RM, '97 VII]

Chairman Mao said:

"At the same time as we criticize dogmatism, we must direct our attention to criticizing revisionism. Revisionism or Right opportunism is a bourgeois trend of thought that is even more dangerous than dogmatism. The revisionists, the Right opportunists, pay lip service to Marxism; they, too, attack "dogmatism". But what they are really attacking is the quintessence of Marxism."

(Mao Tse-tung: Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People, 1957, Selected Readings, p.466)

"Guard against revisionism and especially its emergence in the Central Committee of our Party...What will you do if revisionism emerges in the Central Committee of our Party? This is highly probable and it presents the greatest danger."

(Mao Tse-tung quoted in Peking Review #50, 1976, p.13)

After the upheaval of the Cultural Revolution (from 1969 on), the period of consolidation and transformation necessarily led to the danger of class conciliation and Right opportunism. Realizing this danger and the power that the Right line had already managed to regain in the Party, in late 1975 Chairman Mao launched the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist trend to reverse the correct verdicts of the Cultural Revolution.

[Yes. *And*, as the writer by now *very well knows*, he at CPC party meetings since mid-1974 had already been criticizing very sharply *the other* deviation too, that of the 4-gang. - RM]

This struggle had won some victories, and Teng Hsiao-ping had been removed, but the Rightists had in no way been defeated, even momentarily, and were waging resistance big-time on every front.

[That's a quite distorted and typically Avakianist way of describing the situation from 7 April 1976 on. Of course the rightists had been dealt a very heavy blow indeed. Only, the 4-gang in their indirect way were *helping* them, and quite massively too, by not least the *suppression* of the *basically just* demonstration of the people on Tiananmen on 5 April, a demonstration which they even managed to get
the CC of the CPC to *vilify as counter-revolutionary*, a *non-existent* "crime" on the part of Deng Xiaoping, for which he, thus *in part unjustly*, was also "hung", and so later on at least to some extent could "play the martyr".

The facts of all this I had shown to Jay Miles back in May 1996, pointing out how everybody even then, 20 years later, could confirm them by seeing how the relevant Peking Review issue was *lying*. He just shrugs all these facts off. - RM, '97 VII]

Furthermore, according to the Chinese press at the time, and contrary to what the attackers were saying at the time, the anti-rightist campaign was led by the Party in an orderly disciplined way and was not marked by violence or anti-Party phony "Left" antagonism.[!!]

[The enormous and very disquieting fact of a just masses' demonstration being *suppressed* by the (still) *socialist* government and *vilified* by the very CC of the CPC, things that were undoubtedly caused in the main precisely by the phony "left" 4-gang, according to Jay Miles were "NO" signs of any 'violence or anti-Party phony "Left" antagonism'! - RM, '97 VII]

Nor was production threatened; on the contrary, it increased during the period of struggle (more on this later). [Also false. Precisely in 1976, there was a break in an otherwise very strong upward trend in production. - RM] No one was advocating any of the phony "left" deviations that were widespread at the height of the Cultural Revolution. [Cf above - RM]

The fact is that the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist trend had NOT gone too far; on the contrary, it had not gone far enough, as the events since have proven.

[This "going too far" stuff is the typically *bourgeois* "criticism" and had nothing to do with that by Mao etc. - RM, '97 VII]

Only Teng Hsiao-ping and a few ministers had been removed from their posts. There was mass struggle in many provinces directed at various Party leaders and other local leaders, but there is NOTHING WRONG WITH THIS. Such struggle can only be healthy, to shake up the bureaucratic tendencies.

[Again trying to escape by generalities, and by whisking the facts of the situation away. Of course there was always a need for shaking up various bureaucratic "big bosses" on various levels in China. But "such struggle" *can* be *unhealthy* too, if in itself phony, undertaken unjustifiably and with ulterior motives, and the 4-gang did engage in this. - RM, '97 VII]

Certainly there were many bureaucrats with revisionist leanings on many levels. Chairman Mao and the Communist Party declared on the eve of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution:

"Those representatives of the bourgeoisie who have sneaked into the Party, the Government, the Army and
various spheres of culture are a bunch of counter-revolutionary revisionists. Once conditions are ripe, they will seize political power and turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Some of them we have already seen through, others we have not. Some are trusted by us are being trained as our successors, persons like Khrushchev, for example, who are still nestling beside us. Party committees at all levels must pay full attention to this matter...It is necessary to criticize and repudiate those representatives of the bourgeoisie who have sneaked into the Party, the Government, the Army and all spheres of culture (referring to the Ministry of Culture, the press, etc. before the Cultural Revolution), and to clear them out or transfer some of them to other positions." (May 16 circular)

Chairman Mao declared again in 1967:

"I said at a rally in 1962 that the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism has not yet come to an end and it was quite probable that revisionism would win while we would lose. We reminded everyone of the possibility of defeat in order to help everyone's vigilance against revisionism... If world outlook is not reformed, then although 2000 capitalist-roaders are removed in the current Great Cultural Revolution, 4000 others may appear the next time. The struggle between the two classes and two lines cannot be settled in one, two, three, or four cultural revolutions."

(People's China, Milton, Milton and Shumann, Random House, p.261)

[All this is quite correct, only JM, now that he's going back in history again, takes good care not to mention the particularly nasty case of the traitor Lin Biao, who similarly to the 4-gang camouflaged himself with phony "leftist" phrases and in 1971 suddenly tried a coup détat, which miserably failed. - RM, '97 VII]

The struggle to beat back the Right deviationist trend, launched by Chairman Mao in late 1975, was certainly a legitimate and highly necessary struggle that meant to arouse the masses of people to criticize bureaucracy and revisionism at all levels. This is not a bad thing. It is a good thing. ONLY REVISIONISTS NEEDED TO OPPOSE IT. All those under attack were certainly not all-out counter-revolutionaries, but this can only be determined through struggle.

[Yes. Only, where's Mao's 1974 etc criticism of the 4-gang? RM]

The charge that was constantly made, that the "gang of four" called 70% of the Party cadres "bourgeois democrats and capitalist-roaders" and opposed all veteran cadres is a DECEITFUL LIE and is thoroughly unbased.
[Inventing again. How does JM "know" all this? And that "charge" wasn't made by Mao etc either but only came much later. - RM]

No reference to this can be seen in ANY Chinese documents that have been translated from 1975-1976. [So?!] The truth is that the Chinese press constantly reiterated that 90% of the cadres and masses were good, that when errors are made the "sickness must be cured to save the patient." However, they did advocate resolute struggle against Teng Hsiao-ping and a *handful* of unrepentant capitalist-roaders. No one denies that, as Chairman Mao has often said, 95% of all cadres are basically good [This doesn't apply at *all* times! That's "Miles metaphysics". - RM]; certainly far less than 5%, far less that 1/10 of 1% of all 30,000,000 members of the CCP were purged or demoted during the anti-revisionist struggle of 1975-1976 (In fact, I don't really know of even one person who was purged from the party).

The changes brought about during the anti-revisionist struggle were only a drop in the bucket compared with the flood of the Cultural Revolution. But for Hua and co., "ferreting out Teng's agents" and "inciting the masses to struggle against provincial Party leaders, army commanders, and leading comrades the Party and government" was going too far and "distorting" and "calling their own tune" in the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist trend; it was "confusing contradictions among the people for contradictions with the enemy."

[The facts show that the 4-gang *did* distort the just struggle to beat back that Right deviationist trend of Deng Xiaoping's, did "call their own tune" in it, etc. - RM, '97 VII]

Part 3 of Debate on China;
Right and "Left" Opportunism - Which is the Main Danger?

[It's mainly e.g. at trade union meetings - probably not only in Sweden - that the tactics of talking on unimportant or irrelevant matters for hours on end, in order to lull everybody to sleep, is being utilized by a certain kind of so-called "workers' representatives". But there's no law against people's using that tactics in Marxist-Leninist contexts too, as can be seen e.g. in this posting. - RM, '97 VII]

The basic line in handling contradictions in socialist society was outlined by Chairman Mao in 1957:

"Since they are different in nature, the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and the contradictions among the people must be resolved by different methods. To put it briefly, the former are a matter of drawing a clear distinction between ourselves and the enemy, and the latter a matter of drawing a clear distinction between right and wrong... The people's democratic dictatorship uses two methods. Towards the enemy, it uses
the method of dictatorship...Towards the people, on the contrary, it uses the method not of compulsion but of democracy...

Quite a few people fail to make a clear distinction between these two different types of contradictions - those between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people - and are prone to confuse the two. Many dare not openly admit that contradictions still exist among the people of our country, although it is these very contradictions that are pushing our society forward. Many do not admit that contradictions continue to exist in a socialist society, with the result that they are handicapped and passive when confronted with social contradictions; they do not understand that socialist society will grow more united and consolidated through the ceaseless process of the correct handling and resolving of contradictions...

The question of suppressing counter-revolutionaries is one of a struggle between ourselves and the enemy, a contradiction between ourselves and the enemy...Those with a Rightist way of thinking make no distinction between ourselves and the enemy and take the enemy for our own people. They regard as friends the very persons whom the broad masses regard as enemies. Those with a "Left" way of thinking magnify contradictions between ourselves and the enemy to such an extent that they take certain contradictions among the people for contradictions with the enemy and regard as counter-revolutionaries persons who are actually not counter-revolutionaries. Both these views are wrong."

(Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People," Selected Readings, p. 432-478)

Many people outside China were not able to judge whether or not the "gang of four" and their associates were guilty of "going too far", of "confusing contradictions among the people for antagonistic contradictions," and therefore they relied on the denunciations made by Hua and co.

[Hey, time to wake up! Now he's trying to pull a really fat one over on you. - Or, he might have had a chance perhaps, with readers who hadn't read the other side's posting in that debate. Jay Miles here actually pretends to believe that there were *no other* things for people outside China to go by than just the official statements by the CPC now led by Hua Guofeng!]

These statements, in the first place, at least the initial ones, *were* one not unimportant source of information, and the circumstances pointed to their being basically correct too. But they were by no means the only such source. There were several others, above all those having to do with that *enormous fact*, impossible for anyone to hide at that time, of the *massive and enthusiastic support* by the hundreds of millions of the
Chinese people for the striking down of the 4-gang.

That's one crucial fact which Jay Miles in May 1996 openly contradicted - at that time, this might have been excused by his only having seen the Avakianist later complete falsification of 1976 events in China then. But I soon presented a couple of striking eyewitness reports - of which there of course are many more - see Info #22en part 6/12. After this, e.g now in this February 1997 "debate posting" of his too, *not a beep* was heard from JM on this extremely important question: What *was* the standpoint of the great majority of Chinese?

Instead, he continues here about "how important leaders" were the 4-gang, above all trying to make people forget *who* was basically *in charge* at that point, in early October 1976, and *at whose proposal* that had been too - see below. - RM]

Many of those persons that remained as leaders in the CCP (after the arrest of the revolutionaries[!]), such as Yeh Chien-ying, Hsu Shi-yu, Li Hsien-nien, Wei Kuo-ching, and Su Chen-hua had never led a struggle against revisionism. They had resisted the struggle all along, consistently opposed revolution, and were severely criticized during the Cultural Revolution, barely squeaking through by promising to mend their ways.

[Here Jay Miles rather openly attacks Mao Zedong, accusing him in fact of having "left behind" a CPC Central Committee that had a "core" of "highly doubtful persons" - except for JM's own "four heroes", of course - and in his next sentences, he goes even further in this, by attacking the earlier record of precisely the person whom Mao Zedong, on the basis of that record, had found best suited as his successor as CPC Chairman.-RM, '97 VII]

Biographical articles in Peking Review show that Hua Kuo-feng never played a leading role in arousing mass criticism of revisionism during the Cultural Revolution. He was not involved in the central bodies at the time of the Cultural Revolution, as were these other leaders. Could these people justifiably criticize phony "Leftism" or correctly differentiate between the revolutionary proletarian Left line and the phony "Left's" opportunism?

Those who had never led, but who had always resisted, the mass struggle against revisionism should not have been trusted when they said the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist trend "went too far."

We can be sure that the persons most capable of correctly identifying phony "Leftism" were those seasoned in struggle against Right opportunism and revisionism.

[Meaning, those who in fact since 1974 had been criticized by Mao as the 4-gang, and once more advancing the theory "people and the assessments of them never change". - RM, '97 VII]

When Mao Tse-tung and other veteran revolutionaries who were among the vanguard of the Cultural Revolution, who resolutely took the
initiative to arouse the masses to combat revisionism, criticized phony "Left" tendencies and purged ultra-"Leftists" such as Wang Li from the Cultural Revolution Group, we know that they were not trying to protect revisionism.

When Chang Chun-chiao took the lead in opposing the ultra-"Left" factionalist tactics among the Shanghai workers organizations; the workers could trust him because he had also led the workers' movement to overthrow the revisionist power structure in Shanghai. HOWEVER, when those revisionists who opposed the mass struggles FROM THE BEGINNING such as P'eng Chen, Liu Shao-chi, and Teng Hsiao-ping criticized ultra-"Leftism" and claimed there was "excessive struggle", IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THEY WERE MERELY PROTECTING REVISIONISM.

Teng Hsiao-ping was brought back and those traitors, Hua and co, ...

[Since Hua did start committing treason from November 1976 on, he of course, to Jay Miles who in this debate *always* treats the various individuals as "unchanging constants", "was always" a traitor. JM does rightly attack the Hua of 1977. RM, '97 VII]

...said that the contradiction with him was one "among the people". This is the result of the actions of those traitors who had ABRUPTLY and COMPLETELY halted the campaign against Teng and the struggle to beat back the Right deviationist trend. This was IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION to the unanimous decision of the Central Committee of the CCP (April 76) when it declared that "THE TENG HSAIO-PING PROBLEM HAS BECOME ONE OF ANTAGONISTIC CONTRADICTIONS."

[Yes! And Jay Miles' own "story" also is "IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION" to what was unanimously decided by the CC of the CPC at that 7 April 1976 meeting, namely, to *the other* and even *the first* of the TWO decisions reached then - the one that JM now, although he since long has known of it - *once more* just *whisks away*, as if it "never existed", the one of *appointing Hua Guofeng*, and e.g. no 4-gang member, *First Vice Chairman of the CPC* (etc). - RM, '97 VII]

Those traitors implied that the only antagonistic contradiction in Chinese society was that with the "gang of four" and their supporters. The substance of their criticisms of these people was that they were "ultraLeft". [This bullshit once more! - RM] In other words, Hua and co. held that anyone who has tendencies to encourage professional management and material incentives, increase bourgeois right, the division between mental and manual labor, the differences between town and countryside, to emphasize technique over politics, encourage dependence on foreign technology, the "theory of productive forces", and so on, represented only a "contradiction among the people" (or as they really believed, no contradiction at all). For them, the "class enemies" were those who oppose revisionism "too much". It should be clear that such double-talk was only a weak cover for revisionism.
Right opportunism, revisionism, and capitalist-roaders were the main danger in socialist China. This FACT was put forward so strongly and repeatedly by Chairman Mao that even the traitors in the Party could not deny it.

So they had to in name attack "capitalist-roaders" while in substance they attacked ultra-"Leftism". [Not again! - RM] In reality, they were attacking the proletarian revolutionary line put forward by Chairman Mao. Marxist-Leninists would never, given the nature of the struggle in China and the fact that Right opportunism was the main danger, launch an attack on ultra-"Left" [No! But the ultra-confusionist will not "put down his butcher’s knife and become a Buddha" - RM] tendencies the way Hua and his cohorts did.

REVISIONISTS, on the other hand, due to their ultra-Right nature, from Khrushchev to Brezhnev to Teng Hsiao-ping to Avakian, [Now *why* isn't *he*, Jay Miles' ideological father and staunch partner in his propaganda for that 4-gang, so lucky as to get that nice "ultra-left" label glued on to him by JM? - RM] must launch a vicious attack on the proletarian revolutionary line, slandering it as ultra-"Left" [For the n:th time, most of those people JM *says* have said so actually never did that - RM.]

Analyzing the most important concrete criticisms that have been brought up against the "gang of four"...

[only of course *deleting* *all* the *most important* ones, which "we" absolutely don't want others to even hear of - RM]

..., we see that this is exactly what that rotten Hua bunch were doing.

To confuse Right and "Left" opportunism is to confuse the basic line struggle...

[Totally upside-down. Both kinds are bourgeois, both go against the correct proletarian revolutionary line. JM earlier has admitted as much. *This* distinction is what should rightly be called "the basic line struggle". What if you at some point should be uncertain about how to characterize a certain deviation, whether it's a Right or phony "Left" opportunism? That is not really all that important. But to the phony "left" swindler Jay Miles, matters of course are quite different. - RM '97 VII]

...and cover up the proletarian revolutionary line by mixing the Right and "Left" errors which help to define the correct line.
By confusing the Right and "Left" opportunist lines, they tried to deny that RIGHT OPPORTUNISM, REVISIONISM, IS THE MAIN DANGER DURING THE SOCIALIST PERIOD.

[Note in speaker's manuscript: "Weak argument, raise voice". RM]
[This is *precisely* too what all the *facts* - which JM doesn't even want to hear about, let alone discuss - show that they were, showed was a main motive for their actions. - RM, '97 VII]

If you don't start with that idea, the attack on the "gang of four" doesn't hold together at all. Thus the very essence of the attack on the "gang of four" is based on something which is absolutely unverifiable, now or in the future, to any of the Chinese masses or Marxist-Leninists around the world.

[Isn't that a good one? All those facts, which have been known to quite a number of people now since more than 20 years back, simply "aren't there", "never were there", and "absolutely" "never will be" either. JM orders them to vanish! - RM]

Similarly, their fantastic attempt to link the "gang of four" to Kuomintang reactionaries (Peking Review #19, 1977, pp.36-37) before and after the revolution and call them all "Kuomintang secret agents" is also unverifiable for anyone.

["Nobody knows" about that - not all that distant - history either! - RM, '97 VII]

Chairman Mao, intimately connected with them, was also unaware of these "Kuomintang connections".

[Now suddenly, Jay Miles wants to "support himself" on the standpoint of Mao Zedong concerning some persons. In the much more important case of Hua Guofeng above, he just whisked that standpoint away, respectively, rather clearly attacked it. Mao probably knew a lot about earlier wrongdoings by various people who later at least seemed to have improved. - RM '97 VII]

Major struggles in the Party are two-line struggles and are political in nature. They represent the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. [Quite right! Jay Miles knows this - and in this debate has put in quite a lot of work in order to represent the interests of the bourgeoisie. - RM]

When Chairman Mao challenged the "Left" opportunist line of Wang Ming in 1935 and became leader of the Chinese Communist Party, this was in no way an "opportunist, power-hungry careerist" action because Chairman Mao represented the correct line and Wang Ming the "Left" deviation. Thus all inner-Party struggles must be analyzed on the plane of political line. We must analyze what political line the four represented and what line those who opposed them represented. Political line must be the central aspect of criticism. Chairman Mao has said; "Statements should be based on facts and criticism should center on politics."

[A good quote. In JM's postings, the *facts* are absent. - RM]

The fact that the revisionists diverted the central aspect of criticism to personal attacks, rumours, and unverifiable private conversations between Chairman Mao and Chiang Ching...
[Now here comes what *seems* to be a *very* oblique reference to my collection of quotes, in part 8/12 here, of Mao Zedong criticisms of the 4-gang. But it also contains a *lie*, for *no* "private" conversations were ever referred to but only such exchanges as took place at CPC party (etc) meetings. - RM]

...served as a cover for their real but covert attack on the correct Marxist-Leninist line. It revealed their thoroughly bankrupt revisionist line.

Two documents, Chairman Mao's "On the Ten Major Relationships" and Hua Kuo-feng's speech of December 25, 1976 were promoted for study all over China as the main theoretical documents in the campaign to criticize the "gang of four" (see Peking Review #1, 1977, p.6). "On the Ten Major Relationships" is a speech that Chairman Mao made to the Political Bureau on April 25, 1956, at the time the consolidation of the socialist economic was just being completed. It is a brilliant speech that outlines ten principal aspects of building socialism. However, the class struggle in China at that time was very different than that of 1970's. The People's Communes had not been built, the Great Leap Forward of 1958-59 had not yet occurred. No major struggle against capitalist-road tendencies had yet emerged. Chairman Mao spoke of counter-revolutionaries that carry out attacks on the revolution by killing cattle, burning grain, wrecking factories, stealing information, and putting up reactionary posters. With the development and construction of socialism, the forms that class struggle take had changed considerably. In the struggle against the Right deviation in the 1957 Socialist Education Movement, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, and the struggles to criticize Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping, it was clear that the main target of the class struggle of the proletariat are now the "PARTY PERSONS IN AUTHORITY TAKING THE CAPITALIST ROAD."

There are numerous works of Chairman Mao that profoundly analyze this struggle as well as the problems of socialist construction and revolution that the proletariat in China faced later on. Hua and co. chose instead, to launch a major campaign to study the 1956 work only confirms the fact that the revisionists were unwilling to accept the magnificent strides forward that the Chinese revolution had taken in the 20 years after 1956, particularly the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

[Again, a not unfair criticism of *some* of the critics of the 4-gang, namely — importantly — from that *later* period, *after* October 1976, when they had started openly embarking on a ("traditionally-") capitalist road. Only, again, the *main* critic and criticism are being whisked off the table. - RM]

Chairman Hua's speech, on the other hand, is definitely of the post-Mao era, but it as well does not tell us anything concrete about the present struggle. It does more to confuse than to clarify the nature of the struggle. Anyone reading only this speech would end up knowing little more than that the "gang of four" are an "ultra-Right anti-Party clique" who had been purged.
Although the "gang of four" are called "capitalist-roaders" and "ultra-Rightists", the spearhead of the attack was not directed at anything near the capitalist road or Right deviations. This was true for two reasons:

(1) Yao Wen-yuan, Chiang Ching, Chang Chun-chiao and Wang Hung-wen did NOT push a Right revisionist line and did not cling to the capitalist road.

[Yes, of course they did. Only, a *camouflaged* one. The things that follow immediately below are just a rehash of stuff I already have commented on. - RM, '97 VII]

NEVER in their entire history were any of them characterized by wanting to hang onto the old ways or pushing to consolidate capitalist relations in industry or agriculture. They were among the vanguard of the leaders during the Cultural Revolution and again in the period to beat back the Right were constantly arousing the masses in criticism and revolutionary struggle.

(2) The Hua gang are/were revisionists ["No person ever changes" in Jay Miles' strange world - RM] and therefore even if they could, they would never have launched a campaign to thoroughly study revisionism because it would only have helped expose their own revisionist line.

Since the revisionists have been in power, THERE HAS NOT BEEN AND THERE WILL NEVER BE another major struggle led by the Central Committee against the capitalist-road tendencies such as putting profits and production in command, the "theory of productive forces," material incentives, dependence on specialists, dependence on foreign technology, promoting irrational rules and regulations, increasing the divisions between city and country and between mental and manual labour, promoting examinations to exclude peasants and workers from school and designing schools to train an elite of professional, encouraging a "professional" army, etc. etc. etc. The spearhead of their attack was aimed at the left, and will remain there BECAUSE THEY REPRESENT THE BOURGEOISIE AND DEFEND THE CAPITALIST ROAD LINE.

[And the spearhead of the attacks by Jay Miles too will remain aimed at the *genuine* left, since he represents that very same class too and really very fanatically tries to defend the CIA/Avakianist falsification of recent Chinese history despite the fact that he long since has seen its complete refutation. - RM]

Conclusion of Debate on China 4: Right and "Left" Opportunism

Rolf Martens
Malmoe, SWEDEN