

MAOISM IS JUST THE EXPRESSION OF THE CHINESE BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION AND OF THE PROLETARIAN COUNTERREVOLUTION: THE RECENT CASE OF JASIC TECHNOLOGY IN SHENZHEN

(from El Comunista #62 – April 2019)

www.pcielcomunista.org – pci@pcielcomunista.org

Introduction

During the last months of 2018, several articles were released by the Western bourgeois press regarding the repression by the Chinese bourgeois government to several student groups, labeled as Marxist, linking it to the support they had given to the struggle of the workers of several companies, and notably Jasic Technology in Shenzhen (Canton province).

Regardless of the usual anti-Chinese bias of the Western press, which led it to publicize the situation to some extent and rejoice in the repression of “Marxists” by the “communist” Chinese government, it is certain that the Chinese government, just like any other bourgeois government, persecutes and suppresses any worker attempt to organize, especially when they occur outside the institutions created by the bourgeois state for that purpose, that is, the subsidized trade union apparatus. In this sense, we, as Marxists, must denounce the attacks from the Chinese state, just like any other state, against the attempts of union organization outside the subsidized apparatus.

And this is precisely what happened in Jasic, where the workers in the technological company in Shenzhen tried to organize themselves outside the only legal “trade union” in China, the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, to achieve improvements in their precarious labor conditions, and they were repressed by the company by means of dismissals, which in turn encountered the opposition from the workers, which, facing the last attack, organized several gatherings and mobilizations against the dismissals in front of the factory and in Shenzhen city during several days, events that the state could only end using the force after several confrontations.

It was in this context and after the first clashes, that some groups, apparently emerged from the circles of Marxist studies from some of the Chinese universities, organized committees to support Jasic workers, and even moved there to support the gatherings in front of the company.

They also promoted a campaign of support in the social networks, Chinese and Western, as it may still be noted.

The Maoist (non-Marxist) student circles

In order to keep the hard-to-believe Marxist aura, the Chinese government tolerates and even promotes the existence of Marxism study groups in the universities, as well as it offers “Marxism” lessons in the same institutions, always trying to keep control on their content, at least to some extent. The truth, anyway, is that, what is understood as Marxism in these contexts, as well as in many others internationally, includes not only the classics from Marx, Engels and Lenin (which, on the other hand, are interpreted in the most convenient way for the bourgeois and petty bourgeois political positions of those promoting these circles, warding off their real content), but also a series of pretended Marxists, among which the founder of the modern Chinese state as a people’s republic stands out: Mao Zedong (or Mao Tse-tung in the classic transliteration).

The ideologists of the people’s republic, both in its beginning as well as after Mao’s death, and even now, agree in defending this bourgeois revolutionary, and its alleged Marxist condition, with the Marxism study groups in the Chinese universities.

Then, why does the Chinese government repress the “Marxist” student groups (which we would better classify as Maoist) which support and spread the struggles of worker groups against the subsidized trade union apparatus?

Several factors influence this reality. On one hand, it must be said that the state, in China just as in any country in the world (now capitalist in every corner, after the independence of the last colonies and the creation of the last nation states), has as primary function the defense of the bourgeois *statu quo*, the monopoly of the violence precisely to prevent organized workers imposing their claims over the survival of capitalism. In this sense, it must be noted that the first ones suffering the repression, even

though the Western bourgeois press did not broadcast it likewise, were the Jasic workers, much earlier than the students themselves. On the other hand, the Chinese state is very much aware that the international deterioration of the crisis brings something pressing on the table: the configuration of the blocks in front of the prospective Third World Killing. And in this sense, it is very much committed to fight against the possible internal instability spotlights, which could eventually be exploited, with or without the awareness of their protagonists, by other imperialisms in order to undermine the position of the Chinese state in the global scenario. There are other targets in this precautionary repression, such as the Uighur or the Tibetan minorities, which the Western bourgeois press so much likes to quote, as well as other groups not so much echoed by this press.

Finally, the ongoing fight among the various sectors and tendencies in the Chinese bourgeoisie cannot be neglected, specifically those who might want to promote a bigger liberalization and promotion of the so-called private sector and those who defend, to some degree, the state ownership of the companies (not their obliteration), that is, one of the possible means by which the state may play the ideal collective capitalist role. Indeed, we already referred to this clash of approaches, both of them bourgeois, in our magazine more than 30 years ago: *"The big struggles in China between the two bourgeois tendencies, one of them nationalist and the other one fostering openness, have ended with a victory, at least for the time being, of the latter. The nationalist stream was represented by the "Gang of Four". They aimed to build the national market, and to achieve industrialization by exclusively using Chinese economic resources, with no dependencies to the outside world whatsoever, with an accelerated exploitation of the industrial proletariat. The sole additive received by it, to alleviate its effort, were the political speeches of the great Chinese chauvinists. This will result in that, each time that the supporters of the openness (who were personified in the line of Chu Enlai and Deng) lead the economy, the industrial production grows enormously by means of certain material incentives to production. And the reverse would also be true, when the nationalist rule. These intended, with the so-called "cultural revolution", to take the "big leap forward" of industrialization. Finally, this was just an utter failure of the nationalist, clearing the way to power to the supporters of openness.*

Openness was nothing prepared after Mao's death. In 1969, ineffable Henry Kissinger was already in China preparing the process of restoring the commercial and

diplomatic relations with the USA. Having reached the first agreements in 1971, which set the trip which Nixon would do in 1972, Nixon being received by Mr. Mao, precisely in those days in which the Yankees were throwing hundreds of thousands of tons of bombs over Vietnam and Laos (even though Maoists conveniently forget these facts), from here may the agreements between China and the United States of America be dated back. Deng's government did only put them in practice in line with his openness approach; the foundation had already been put in place by Mr. Mao, as much as his shopworn followers would like to deny. (...)

Back in 1953 our current already said: "If the China emerging from the revolution searches how to accelerate its march towards private capitalism, which cannot be connected yet in a single block operated by an uncompromising military government, like Russia could do, it will have to look for support in the Western economies (Multiple Revolutions, April 1953)." (China: Autarchy, world market or communist revolution?, El Comunista #7, May 1985)

Therefore, there is no real contradiction in that the Chinese state tries to repress and redirect those groups claiming the alleged "original" Maoist values, while it considers itself the heir and guardian of these very same values (the last clashes of the state against the members of the Marxism student groups of the University of Beijing that we know of happened during the celebrations of the 125th anniversary of Mao's birth at the end of December 2018, which both intended to and did celebrate), from the moment in which, in reality, these groups are only ideologically distinguishable from the state which represses them, by, at most, a higher dose of asceticism linked to the period of development of the Chinese capitalism, in the context of the primitive accumulation of capital. A period during which most of Mao's life elapsed, as well as that of the rest of the ideologists which are claimed, a period which has already been widely surpassed and going back to which is not intended.

Contrary to what some of the aforementioned student groups may think, the nature of the Chinese state, just as that of any other modern capitalist states, is not only perfectly compatible with claiming Mao's figure and Maoism, but its birth and existence, precisely in its current situation, are the logical consequence of this approach, and even the consequence that it, very publicly, was and still is after. *"Our current defined Maoism and the Chinese revolution of 1949 as "a French revolution with a delay of a century and a half", "it is a bourgeois revolution in that*

it is aimed against feudalism with the action of the rural masses". Revolution that "has been set to the great construction of the internal capitalist market, ordering itself in a unitary State (Il Programma Comunista #6, 1953)." (Asia – Pacific: China is already a capitalist industrial power, El Comunista #26, May 1993)

From this point of view, it is vain to claim an alleged "pure" or "original" Maoism, confronted with the alleged empty claim of Maoism made by the dominant tendency in the present Chinese state. As we will try to demonstrate below, through a brief historical analysis, Maoism was, from its start, a bourgeois revolutionary ideology, by no means a communist or proletarian ideology, but a mix of rural tendencies, Stalinism and Sunyatsenism (after all, the great bourgeois ideologist Sun Yat-sen, founder of Kuomintang [KMT -or Guomindang, literally "nationalist party"], is worshiped in a mausoleum in Nanjing, People's Republic of China [PRC], and the students in "Marxist" circles like the government itself claim wholeheartedly the Republic of 1911 and the patriotic student movement of the 4th of May 1919) in line with the anti-imperialism sense (against the other imperialisms, not the Chinese, obviously). The perfect ideology to sustain the bourgeois Chinese revolution and the creation and development of a modern capitalist state which allowed China to be positioned at the top of capitalism and the world-wide imperialism, with the highest indexes of industrial production and any other product manufacture (see data in El Comunista #56 and #62) and with one of the largest armies in the world, which is already being deployed internationally, both in international missions in which it participates, and in its own military bases abroad, like the one opened recently in Djibouti.

Historical approach to the question

We do not intend in this article to develop in depth the process of degradation of the Third International, which happened during the twenties of the 20th century, and consequent criticism of which from the beginning is part of the Communist Left legacy (as it may be read in multiple texts of the period and later documents), but we do have to mention it since that historical tragedy is in the basis of the possibility of Stalinism (expression which finally took the democratic-bourgeois revolution in Russia), and later the Maoism (expression which finally took the democratic-bourgeois revolution in China), of fighting the proletarian revolution while hoisting its flags, names and traditions.

The application of the unique political front tactics to countries of advanced capitalism (like, for example,

Germany), the disciplinary imposition of the submission to the center by means of maneuvers like the so-called "Bolshevization" (creation of factory cells, instead of territorial), or the application of the so-called tactics of the "worker government" or "peasant and worker government" (which implied, in practice, the ministerial collaboration with the bourgeois parties), among others, are some of the tactical mistakes committed by the head of the International in those years, which laid the foundation to allow that, the moment in which the counterrevolution felt strong enough, it could happen not only without the need of formally renouncing to Marxism, in which name the most aberrant tactical case files had already been theorized, but precisely by claiming being its biggest advocate, since, just like we said in our text «Mao's thought», a critical text from the Left to Maoism: "... facing the clear confirmation of the Marxist anticipations, the conservative ideological reaction is forced to accept, under certain conditions, the proletarian doctrine. This means that, instead of refusing the whole of it, it mutilates its revolutionary conclusions, as well as its strategic, tactical and organizational consequences." (« Mao's thought»)

And just as we develop in that text, the reading of which we recommend to every militant interested in the question: *"The fact that the national-revolutionary, democratic-bourgeois movements (at least in their most advanced wing) give to their ends, which are the primitive accumulation of capital and the construction of the modern capitalist State, a socialist disguise, is by no means a surprise: this fact is perfectly explained by the social composition of these movements which are essentially recruited in the worker masses, in a rabble, of poor peasants, from workers of more or less recent rural extraction, of semi-proletarians, of coolies, etc.; these layers are the ones which give the bourgeois revolutionary insurrectionist democracy (or its more or less advanced sectors) the, to some extent, «communist» color.*

This is what, in essence, had already happened with the "Enragés" of the great French revolution, with the English Levelers of the time of Cromwell, with the Tai-ping and the populism of Sun Yat-sen in China. Likewise, with «The Peasant War in Germany», Engels had noted that the religious heresy emerging among peasants, and totally independent from the bourgeois heresy of Luther, «expressed directly the needs of the peasants, of the farmers, and was almost always linked to an insurrection»." (« The thought of Mao»)

With the current linked to Stalin having taken control of the International, albeit not having expelled the Russian opposition yet, it only took a small additional twist so that the political united front tactic, which had been applied in the most diverse ways in the West, turned out in China in the theorization of the need of submitting the (still) Communist Party of China (CPC, founded in 1920, even before the CP of Italy) to the bourgeois nationalist party of Kuomintang, forgetting (or rather, forcing to forget) the need, in a context of pending bourgeois revolution, and double revolution, of keeping the organization and, at most, making alliances **with the weapons at hand** (Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League, Marx, 1850), something very different from letting the own party be phagocytized and submitted to the line of the other just like, unfortunately, the Stalinized International, by means of its envoy Borodin, managed to enforce to the Communist Party of China in 1926-1927.

The treason from the International to the Chinese proletarian revolution (which the late attempts of denouncing it by part of the Russian opposition could not stop), was the necessary prelude for the Kuomintang, led by butcher Chiang Kai-Shek (who was even appointed as honorary president of the International, having already admitted the Kuomintang as sympathizer party in 1923) and the international imperialism to annihilate the cream of the crop of the Chinese proletariat (Shanghai, Canton – 1927) and with it the only organized groups of workers which up to now have had anything to do with the Marxism in China. Such treason was committed in parallel to the treason to the strike of the English miners, which was for a few days a general strike (1926), treason which was originated in the Anglo-Russian pact, by which the Russian state agreed in practice to renounce to the international spreading of the revolution, in exchange for investments and technological transfers, as well as in the nefarious politics of the International regarding the Labor Party. All these facts denote the **defeat of the international revolution** which happened then, and of which the defeat of the Chinese revolution is another milestone, since, had the approach of the Thesis about the national and colonial questions for the Second Congress of the Communist International stood regarding England (the center of imperialism then) and China (periphery of capitalism and focus of colonialism then), fact that could not occur precisely due to the counterrevolution in Russia, that could have marked an inflection point in the reflux of the revolutionary surge. The necessary corollary of all that was the permanent expulsion of the Russian opposition from the International (the Communist Left had already

been *de facto* expelled, previously) which followed immediately after, and preceded the repression let loose by the Stalinism to everything resembling proletarian revolution, inside and outside Russia, that is, exactly what it had just supported in China.

The “reconstruction” immediately after of the so-called “Communist” (Maoist) Party of China led by the group of Zhou Enlai (also transliterated as Chu or Chou Enlai) – Mao Zedong takes place within the framework of a complete denial of the Marxist principles and in a complete initial fusion with the interests of the Russian state, which was already in counterrevolutionary hands, from a proletarian point of view (not bourgeois). No ulterior counterrevolution was necessary in China, where not even soviets were built, and the eventual victory of Mao’s party over Chiang Kai-Shek’s (in the present PRC) in the struggle held over the following years and even after the Second World War, aside from the detailed analysis which could be done of it (including several pacts that Mao’s party made with Chiang Kai-Shek’s during the civil war and the clash with Japan), has a lot to do with the most consequent anti-imperialism (Western and Japanese) of the former in relation to the latter, as well as with the international context after the end of the Second World War of clashes between Russia and the USA, and in any way has nothing to do with the alleged “communist” or “proletarian” character of one in relation to the bourgeois character of the other. Both wanted the development of capitalism in China; it is just that one of them wanted it on the lap of the Western imperialisms and the other wanted it through a much more radical democratic-bourgeois revolution, consistently with the Stalinist-Maoist ideology which supported it, and acting more consequently in relation to Sun Yat-Sen than those who hoisted the name of his party. We can see the result of the profound bourgeois revolution which happened in China, which overcame a situation of Asian feudalism which had lasted more than two millennia, in its present situation in the context the international imperialism in contraposition, for example, to India, where the bourgeois revolution happened more faint-heartedly and inconsistently led by the group created around the British agent Gandhi. Indeed: *“Otherwise, this Chinese bourgeoisie, heir of a high culture, also scientific, of the previous dominant classes, has been quickly placed at par with the Western regarding technical knowledge. Moreover, it has done it, except a minority, without surrendering, even if due to a nationalist feeling, to the capitalism of foreign empires. And besides, from 1912, it has fought with weapons and a lot of courage against*

feudalism and against central and provincial despotism, setting itself to the head of the masses in revolt, even getting rid of the terrible inertia.” (Economical and Social Structure of Today’s Russia, point 94.- Russia and China) Just as we wrote in Il Programma Comunista #4 in 1960 (in a moment in which we were the only current saying it): “Asides, China has always been, over the centuries, the greatest Asiatic power. If, after 100 years of eclipse, it would retake the place that the Celestial Empire had among the Asiatic and worldwide powers, under a “communist” regime, only the inexperienced could be surprised of that.”

Summarizing, coming back to the same text quoted above: *“Our thesis is that the Maoist ideology is precisely a result of the revisionism (Stalinist, in this case) and of that socialist disguise of tasks which are tightly national bourgeois. This very same disguise has been, on the other hand, used by Stalinism, both in the international and the inner planes (where it has identified its industrial capitalist draft with the «building of the socialism in a single country»), and so breaking with the Bolshevism, with the doctrine and practice of the international revolution.*

In an ultra-synthetic way, it can be said that «Maoism» and its «theoretical» expression, «Mao’s thought», are the formalism of the Stalinist counterrevolution and the ideology of the democratic bourgeois revolution in China, which has been born tightly linked to the crushing of the Chinese proletariat in 1927, precisely thanks to the good trade of Stalinism, «organizer of defeats» and «gravedigger of the revolution». (...)

The movement which we, for the sake of convenience, call «Maoist», is, therefore, heir of the Stalinist neo-Menshevism, and it is also proclaimed as the continuator of Kuomintang. However, while the Mensheviks, the revolutionary socialists, etc., were waiting for the bourgeois-democratic transformation of the constituent assemblies of the rickety democracy typical from belated areas, and becoming, like Trotsky appropriately highlighted with regard to the revolutionary socialists, in a pure and simple «agency of the imperialist bourgeoisie», Mao’s movement has achieved historically the bourgeois revolution against the mercenary revolution of imperialism, personified in Chiang Kai-Shek, or at least competing against it, although the Stalinist pressed until Mao’s victory in order to subordinate the peasant and plebeian forces to the old responsible of the massacre of workers in Canton and Shanghai, just like in 1927 the proletarian forces were subordinated. (...)

By achieving «its» bourgeois revolution, Maoism has been forced to deviate from Stalinism, precisely because of its nationalism; but just because it was not and could not be internationalist, it has been forced also to follow Stalinist paths (hence its worship to Stalin), with the difference that, since it did not benefit from a vigorous impulse of a revolution like October’s, it was not forced to crush the opposition from a party like the Bolshevik’s party, which did not intend to quit on internationalism or (both things are indissolubly linked) to the «ulterior development» of the democratic revolution on the economic-social level [This in no way means that Maoism did not exterminate the few revolutionary elements which were inspired by the leftist international opposition, like, for example, just to name one, Ciu Li-Ming. On his part, Hô-Chi-Minh had Ta Thu-Tau, protagonist of the Canton Commune, shot].

Indeed, the radical Chinese nationalism in which Maoism consists on was after and created a country just with the same imperialist longings of any other capitalist power. From the beginnings of the PRC we may verify its imperialist character (War of Korea, failed invasion of Vietnam after the American defeat), which concludes with its entry in the UN and the subsequent recognition, by part of all the imperialisms, as just like any other member of the heir of the League of Nations which Lenin called the cave of bandits. Following the same text:

“Maoism wanted to be and has proclaimed itself the heir of Sun Yat-sen and the first Kuomintang... (...)

Lenin proved it very clearly in «Democracy and Narodism in China»:

«This Chinese progressive democrat (Sun Yat-sen) reasons, literally, like a Russian. His resemblance with a Russian populist is such that there is a perfect identity in the basic ideas and in multiple expressions (...). Let us consider, with the example of Sun Yat-sen, which is the social significance of the ideas begotten by the revolutionary movement of hundreds and millions of hundreds of people, which are dragged irreversibly now in the current of the universal capitalist civilization (...). The East has chosen, definitely, the path of the West (...); new hundreds of millions of people will participate from now on in the struggle for the ideals which the West has already made its own. The western bourgeoisie is rotten, already facing its gravedigger, the proletariat. In Asia, on the contrary, there is still a bourgeoisie capable of representing a consistent democracy, honest and militant, a bourgeoisie which is worthy companion of the great preachers and the great men of action of the end of the French 18th century.»

«The main representative or the main prop of this Asiatic bourgeoisie, still capable of a historical progressive task, is the peasant. Near him there exists already a liberal bourgeoisie, the leaders of which like Yuan Shi-kai (we could add Chiang Kai-Shek, ed.) are capable of treason, over all: yesterday, they feared the emperor and they revered him; afterwards, when they have seen the strength, when they have felt the victory of the revolutionary democracy, they have betrayed the emperor; tomorrow, they will betray the democrats in order to deal with some old emperor or some new "constitutional" emperor.»

«Without the great and candid democratic impetus which inflames the worker masses and turns them capable or making miracles (...), the liberation of the Chinese people from its secular slavery would be impossible (...). Such an impetus implies and engenders the most honest sympathy towards the situation of the worker masses, the most burning hatred towards those repressing and exploiting them. But in Europe and America, for the vanguardist Chinese, all the Chinese, in that they have lived that impetus, have taken these liberating ideas, what is already the order of the day is the liberation from the yoke of the bourgeoisie, that is, socialism. Inevitably, that is where the sympathy of the Chinese democrats towards socialism, their subjective socialism (...) derives from. However, what the objective conditions in China, a backward country, agricultural, semi-feudal, make the order of the day, is just the suppression of a specific form, historically defined, of this enslavement and exploitation: feudalism (...).»

«And ideas and programs subjectively socialist of the Chinese democrat give birth in reality to a program of "change of all the legal basis" of the "real state property", just a program of annihilation of the feudal exploitation».

«This theory, when considered from the point of view of the doctrine, is a theory of "socialist" reactionary petty-bourgeois (...). The dialectics of the social relations in China consist solely on that the Chinese democrats, candidly sympathizing with the Socialism in Europe, have transformed it in a reactionary theory, and that over the basis of this reactionary theory of "prevention" of capitalism, they apply an agricultural program purely capitalist, as capitalist as it might get!». (...)

...Maoism has represented in reality a block of petty-bourgeois and peasant forces, which replaces the traditional, national bourgeoisie. (...)

Product and apology of the democratic bourgeois revolution in China, which extent and importance are considerable; «Mao's thought» is, under certain aspects – and not the lesser ones– the child of the philosophy of the Enlightenment. (...)

Indeed, the text from August, 1937: "On Contradiction" (as well as that from 20 years later, "On the correct handling of contradictions among the people") used to justify interclassism, and, above all, the alliance with Kuomintang, which, in 1927, had physically destroyed the Chinese communist movement with the blessings of Stalin. All the more, as we pointed out very often, it was not only a new type of alliance, but more about an adoption of programmatic directives and the role of Kuomintang, by giving them a real demo-revolutionary content, a peasant-revolutionary content, in sum, of a transformation of the pseudo CPC, in a monstrous "two-class" party, in a true Kuomintang." («Mao's thought»)

We also nailed this down in our text "Formation and structures of ancient China. Class and state struggles in the world of non-white peoples. Vital historical field for Marxist revolutionary critique", from where we take the following excerpt:

"The point of fundamental dissension was that of the relations between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang, that is, the party of the democratic revolution; having the International led the former (weakening it and submitting it to the alliance and even confusion with the latter), to defeat and ruin, the moment in which Chiang Kai-shek suddenly attacked and exterminated the Chinese communists, which were, back then, contrary to the present ones, following the path of the classist and revolutionary Marxism. (...)

Indeed, it will be the complete degeneration of the political directives regarding national and colonial matters, which were approved on the II Congress of the International (July-August 1920) what will channel over a mistaken path the movement of peasants and workers controlled by the Communist Party of China, allowing Kuomintang to break the alliance with the CPC with impunity, alliance which, precisely at the end of that period, is reestablished and put into practice. (...)

Stalinist historiography traditionally defines this dramatic development of the first Chinese civil war as the «betrayal» of Chiang Kai-shek. But if the words refer to the content of class of the events, it may be noted that, when talking about «betrayal», it was not the henchmen of Kuomintang which were accused of it, who had

imposed the Communist Party of China (the left wing opposed to it in vain) to totally sacrifice the program of the «double revolution», which had been pursued by Marx and Engels in 1848 in Germany and victoriously put in practice by Lenin in 1917 in Russia. (...)

But the open conflict with KMT is not good for, certainly, putting the CPC over the Platform of the Second Congress of the Communist International. On the contrary, in concomitance with the development of the politics of the Russian state, which moves determined towards the final crushing of Bolshevism, the left wing of the CPC is completely defeated and the direction of the party is assumed by the current of Mao Tse-tung (1934), the same that, facing the victory over the KMT, will have to set up in China the popular Republic founded over the block of the «four classes». (...)

The bourgeois China of Kuomintang, as we have explained, consolidated its position but shifted its program more towards the right, until it preferred, as it was expected, and in the same spirit as the Thiers of Versailles, to have a pact with the Japanese foreigner, over risking a victorious Shanghai or Nanjing Commune.

At this point, the same ones which had betrayed, by trampling the lesson of the international revolutionary Marxism (which easily would have used those who would not have blasphemed yet, by saying that the national paths to socialism are different, and that the socialism in each country is made on its own), represented in front of the world what is boasted as a victory over the Japanese and Chiang Kai-shek, consisting on having expelled him, in order to put his program in practice, that which Kuomintang and Sun Yat-sen started with, for a leftist Chinese bourgeoisie which has renounced its passage to a socialist revolution, with the reason of calling socialism, as in Russia, to a state capitalism in an even inferior degree, since it is not only limited to industry, but also in this sector is self-limited to the 50%, left in hands of a private bourgeoisie, fourth class of the block.

This sour vicissitude shows how the path of bourgeois counterrevolution is not national, nor continental, but the same in Europe and Asia, in France and China, with the difference of phase of a century.” (Formation and structures of ancient China. Class and state struggles in the world of non-white peoples. Vital historical field for Marxist revolutionary critique)

Neither the “great leap forward” nor the so-called “proletarian cultural revolution” had anything to do with communism, both are events which occurred in the

context of the process of primitive accumulation and struggles among different sectors over the control of the state apparatus, over which we, due to space constraints, will have to stop in more detail in another occasion.

Facing the quick conclusion of the primitive accumulation and the need of introducing new technologies, the so-called “openness” led by Deng Xiaoping finally imposed itself. This was a step which, on one hand, has some other parallelisms in the historical struggle between free trade and protectionism in the various capitalist countries, and on the other hand, was made most consistently with the original Maoism, from which it could be sourced with no issues in order to celebrate the benefits of a “socialism with Chinese characteristics”.

The exquisitely capitalist development which followed in the subsequent years, led by the Maoist policy of the Hukou, which allowed (and still partially allows) the most brutal exploitation of ex peasants proletarianized in cities (and in which context the greatest proletarianization en masse in the history of mankind, to date, happened), grouped the population even further in the big cities (for example, Shenzhen grew exponentially during those years, growing from a fishermen town to a metropolis, within the bosom of the free trade zone promoted by Deng Xiaoping) and generated endless tensions which had their zenith in the strike movements occurring all around the country in the dates prior to the so-called Tiananmen massacre in Beijing (June 1989), which were repressed brutally by the government and which, facing the complete absence of any organized communist party and with influence among the masses, were finally defeated. It is important to mention that the movement occurring those days was initially a worker movement, and that the students only joined it later, and following it, albeit managing this way, even if partially inadvertently, feedbacked the strike movement. The government could have tolerated the student protests for months, but decided to trigger the repression at national level, by deploying the army in every corner, the moment in which the strike movement seemed capable of challenging the state (which, in a significant fraction of the cases, was *de facto* and *de jure* the same thing as the employer). We cannot help highlighting the resemblances between the coverage by the western bourgeois press of the events in 1989 and the recent events in Jasic, in regard to the repression to students and specifically, to students in Beijing, tiptoeing around the repression suffered by workers and in many other places.

Back then we wrote: *"With this data we intend to show that the China of 1985 is not the China of 1949, nor the China of 1959, nor that of 1969, nor that of 1979. China got fully into the whirlwind of the worldwide market with its industrial products, and the relations of production and property in agriculture have been revolutionized in such a way, accelerating the ejection of hundreds of millions of poor peasants towards the cities and towards the burghs and villas, that they are the true reasons of the explosive situation lived in May-June 1989. (...)*

That is, a surge of workers in search of any kind of employment. Canton flooded by 2.5 million peasants in a little more than a month. Some figures said more than 50 million people were living in the streets of Chinese cities at the end of April, coming from abandonment and massive ejections in agriculture. That is, coming from the agricultural reform of April 1988 put in practice, and the resulting concentration of the land, accelerated by the bad harvest of the preceding year. These are some of the reasons which provoked the situation of the past Spring. (...)

The student movement

Facing a situation which was socially explosive, such as the one which China lived last March-April, with the familiar and social links shattered in few years, students, together with a fraction of the state and the bourgeoisie, tried to denounce this situation their way and look for the most democratic exit in order to prevent this barrel of gunpowder from exploding and bury them all. (...)

"Like in last 4th of May, during the past two days industrial workers have overcome students in a ratio of ten to one, especially in Beijing, but also in another 21 Chinese cities in which the wave of protests spread..." (Cinco Días, 19 May 1989) This already prevented the end of the spiral of demonstrations and worker strikes, prevented the peaceful end of the incantation which the golden boys had unwittingly set in motion. The government declared martial law, and not precisely against the students. (...)
"The students have asked the workers to come back to their jobs so that the security forces would not have a reason to repress the movement" (El País, 23 May 1989). The workers did not obey the students, whose democratic and institutional "struggle" was circumscribed to the support of the bourgeois faction of Zhao Ziyang, against the no less bourgeois faction of Deng Xiaoping – Li Peng and to denounce the corruption of the rulers and their relatives, and therefore it became necessary for the bourgeois State to impose social peace by force. (...)

The average monthly salary is 100 yuan, around 3,000 peseta, although inflation is constantly eroding it, provoking an explosive situation among the salaried workers: "The protest lost its exclusively student character three days ago and has become a very serious social uprising, which is difficult to channel given the amalgam of different sectors participating in it" (El País, 19 May 1989). Strikes were spreading further, even though the right to strike was illegal, since it was removed from the Constitution of 1982 (Cinco Días, 15 August 1989). And the very "vice director of the Union Federation said last week that the first semester of the current year there have been 49 strikes" (ibid). And, when in 1982 the right to strike was forbidden, it was because the salaried workers were exercising it." (The integration of China in the world market and the dissolution of agricultural family economy are the cause of last May-June clashes, El Comunista #19, November 1989)

The quick development process carried on hand in hand with the brutal proletarianization of the Chinese peasantry:

"The reservation of workforce

The so-called Chinese miracle has been sustained by the massive emigration from the countryside to the cities. In the bourgeois China of Mao and Deng the free circulation of people was forbidden. A transit permit was required, and another one of residence. These controls were not abolished until February-March 2003. There were times in which this fluctuating population, illegal Chinese inner emigration, with no permits, WITH NO PAPERS, had overcome the 200 million salaried workers who had abandoned the agricultural cooperatives (true subsistence economy) to sell their arms in the cities, in the factories, in the construction of dwellings, offices, roads, railways, ports, airports, dams, power plants, etc.

With exhaustive working days, very often sleeping outdoors, with a small backpack as all their belongings (as narrated more than 15 years ago the western chroniclers), millions and millions of modern slaves, with their work and their miseries, have modernized China. The rate of surplus value pulled out from our Chinese class siblings, by yellow, black and white capitalists, has made this leap possible, this modernization of an enormous power which was already dominant during 18 of the last 20 centuries. This experience, this memory of the dominating Chinese classes through history, together with the atomic armament, intercontinental ballistic missiles and their satellites crossing the space, are what have absolutely blocked the massive attack and destruction appetites,

appetites from the North American imperialism. England, by yielding Hong Kong to China, accepted the development of this power, by assuming an important role in the integration of China in the world market. (China: low prices of merchandises overthrow world's borders... preparing the 3rd World War, El Comunista #43, May 2004)

Summarizing: *"The opium wars in the second half of the 19th century blew the stale power of the feudal and pre-feudal Chinese society, while crushing the great radical-democratic revolutionary movement of the Tai Ping during the decades of 1850-60, delaying in 100 years the great bourgeois revolution of 1949, with Mao or Chinese flavor. But having kept China like an English protectorate or Japanese colony.*

The North American and English armadas also forced Japan to open its borders, by systematically bombing its coastline. During the 20s-30s of the 20th century, Japan tried to colonize Asia by expelling the English colonialists. A Japanese attempt which resulted in its defeat during the 2nd World War. Then, from another level, much lower, of the development of the productive forces, Indonesia, India and China took over from Japan.

In 1954, France was defeated in Dien Bien Phu and expelled from Indochina, being taken over by USA which would be, in turn, defeated in 1975 in Saigon and expelled from Indochina. Starting in 1975 the so-called Asian tigers (South Korea – Malaysia – Indonesia – Singapore – Thailand – Taiwan, and later Vietnam) are shaped, and finally the big DRAGON was conformed, that is, China.

The alliance between the USA and the European Union crushed Japan with the costs of the two wars against Iraq, with the limitation of the exports to the USA and UE and with the puncturing of Tokyo's stock market since 1990, with the sudden plunge of the Japanese real estate value, as well as that of the companies and banks, provoking and indebtedness of the Japanese state which is currently equivalent to 160% of the GDP. Here, like in 1945-49, China and Asia take over Japan in the fight of defending the development of the productive forces and the conquest of the world market based on the low prices of their merchandises.

The great development of the productive forces and the commercial exchanges in the geohistorical area of Asia has already granted them the primacy in the world ranking. The relative crisis of overproduction of 1997-98 strongly affected all Asiatic countries but the great DRAGON, China, which carried on with its march towards

the conquest of the industrial and financial world HEGEMONY." (The role of China – Asia in world's production, El Comunista #47, May 2008)

Marx and Engels expected the revolution in China

We do not want to conclude this text without mentioning, even if succinctly, the position of Marx and Engels in regard to the events which happened in China during their lives, from the first opium war, always deemed as imperialistic banditry, to their description of the Tai Ping revolt, and the following two imperialistic interventions (the so-called second and third opium wars, which were followed, after the deaths of Marx and Engels, by the so-called Boxer Rebellion, and imperialistic intervention carried out by a coalition of eight countries), which concluded with the burning of the Summer Palace and led to the treaties of Tien Tsin (Tianjin) first, and then Beijing, which aggravated the consequences of the first Nanjing treaty. We quote again our text "Formation and structures of ancient China":

"The idea that there might be concomitance in the action against capitalism in the white metropolis between the class struggle, inner of workers, and the rebellion of the nations overseas against the incursions and colonial vexation, is not in Marxism, like some might believe, from the times in which Lenin provided his examination of the bourgeois imperialism between the last two centuries, but dates from much earlier, since Engels and Marx.

In the «Neue Rheinische Zeitung» of February 1850, Engels refers to the texts of a well-known Christian missionary, Gutzlaff, which had been in China for more than thirty years in a row, and was returning to Europe during the famous revolt of the Taiping; which exploded among the little peasants against the monarchy of Beijing, caused by the severe crisis which was initiated towards 1840 when England, then followed by other European powers, imposed China the opening of its ports to commerce, particularly to the commerce of opium, severely disturbing the finances of the empire and the economy of the country. The Taiping movement assumed attitudes of disapproval of the private property of the land in general, and not only of attacking the feudal nobility and the state bureaucracy which sustained it. In his great lines, Engels describes this social movement, highlighting that the economic origin of the revolutionary movements is an historical fact, which is also completely verified in that distant nation which is thrown outside millenary immobilism. He concludes: «When, after twenty years of absence, mister Gutzlaff returned among the civilized people and the European, he exclaimed, horrified: Then,

will I not be able to run away from this pernicious doctrine, anywhere? This is precisely the same question which has been preached, by multiple persons, in the Chinese nation for a long time! ».

Engels continues: «It is very likely that Chinese socialism is related to the European as much as Chinese philosophy to Hegel's (the tone is funny, but maybe, some very original positions of the ancient thinker Lao-Tsé could be considered dialectical). However, whatever it is, it is a comforting fact that the oldest and most irremovable Empire on Earth has been set, in a lapse of eight years (by the bales of cotton of the English bourgeoisie) in the verge of a social revolution which must have, absolutely, the most important consequences to the history of civilization. When, finally, our European reactionaries, on their next escape through Asia will reach the great wall, certain that its doors will open over the home of ultra-reaction and ultraconservatism, who knows if they will not read this inscription: Chinese Republic: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity».

With this short note, the great Engels wanted to affirm precisely that in China, just like anywhere else, we also expect that the cycle of social forms will have the same stages, and that the feudal China will be, like in France, followed by a republican capitalist social form, theater of a class struggle for socialism.

Something which has already historically happened, even in 1911, with the revolution of Sun Yat-sen, and after another long series of aggressions from European colonialism on the coasts of the Celestial Empire, drowned in the long struggle. (...)

England, which had interest in establishing an «open doors» regime, triggered the first opium war, from 1839 to 1842, and China had to, with the treaty of Nanjing, surrender and open, in addition to Canton, Amoy, Fu-chow, Ning-po and Shanghai, yielding Hong Kong to Great Britain, which made it its colony.

Meanwhile, the United States and Russia throw their first pretensions, in 1850 the great movement of the Taiping starts, which seized vast provinces and had its capital in Nanjing from 1853 to 1864. The rebels killed landowners and mandarins of the empire, refusing the unbearable rates, refusing the vice from drugs and opium, even when not being against trading with foreigners, threw egalitarian and communist slogans. Mao Tsé-tung, when dealing with the long series of wars of the Chinese peasantry, refers to the agrarian law of the Taiping which, without a doubt, is of true communist content, much more than those thrown by him, Mao, in that it is not about

distribution, nor property, nor exercise: «ALL THE LAND UNDER THE SKY WILL HAVE TO BE FARMED BY ALL THE PEOPLE WHICH ARE UNDER THE SKY... LET THEM ALL FARM IT TOGETHER AND, WHEN THEY HARVEST THE RICE, LET THEM ALL EAT IT TOGETHER». The Taiping were not Utopian: they kept a state which lasted 14 years, brigades of state artisans, laws such as that no person should be malnourished or badly dressed...

In 1856, with an infamous pretext, England and France triggered the second opium war which, after horrible massacres, led to the treaty of Tien-t'sin with England. The war is resumed until the sanguinary conquest and pillage of Beijing, in 1860. China had to make many other concessions to the Europeans in the treaty of Beijing, which worsens that of Tien-t'sin. A joint army of the Emperor and the Europeans, in 1864, crushed the heroic Taiping, and enters Nanjing making rivers of blood run." (Formation and structures of ancient China. Class and state struggles in the world of non-white peoples. Vital historical field for Marxist revolutionary critique)

Conclusions

In China, like in the rest of the world, the distinct groups of proletarians which feel the need of organizing themselves for the immediate struggle, must refuse the line of yellow unionism and assume progressively the task of building the class union, with no subsidies from the patron or the state, even when this task must be clandestine.

And in order to achieve it, these groups of workers must break ideologically with Maoism in its different versions and assume the historical lessons of the degeneration of the International and the disaster of the Chinese revolution (1927), a necessary starting point for resuming the class struggle in a bigger scale, recovering the red thread of true Marxism, truncated in China for so many years and also in most of the world due to the tremendous defeats of those years.

In this recovery of the theory and the defeats of the worker movement, workers must be organized autonomously and must not look for or count on the support from interclassistic movements like that of the "students". Specific individuals coming from these environments might eventually support the proletarian movement, but only under the condition that they abandon completely their original points of view and embrace those of the proletariat, without reservations.

In the present world, like it was a century ago, the reorganization of the Chinese worker movement over

classistic foundations is an essential need of the international proletariat, getting ready to spread the motto of the revolutionary defeatism in the framework of the less and less distant outbreak of the third world

slaughter, only bourgeois exit to the crisis, in which the capitalist and imperialistic Chinese state will have to play a preponderant role in regard to its condition of (already) first economic world power.

For the resumption of the class struggle in China and worldwide!

For the reconstruction of the classistic union!

Let us break the submission to interclassistic movements like that of the students!

For the ideological independence of the working class from bourgeois ideologies like Maoism!