

# Alliance with U.S. Imperialism Bedevils Maoist Conference

Particularly since the war over Angola last winter, China's far-reaching alliance with U.S. imperialism has produced doubts and general discontent among broad radical circles which have until recently been sympathetic to the Maoist movement. The problems this poses to would-be U.S. spokesmen for the Peking regime have now been greatly complicated by the violent power struggle that erupted among Mao's heirs following the death of the venerated oracle of Chinese Stalinism in September.

Among the several Peking-loyal sects in the U.S. these contradictions have weighed most heavily on the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP), whose leaders have been the least willing to sacrifice domestic popularity to capture the elusive Peking franchise. Their excruciating dilemma was clear to all at the Conference on the International Situation initiated and controlled by the RCP and its youth group, the Revolutionary Student Brigade (RSB), which took place at Columbia University in New York City November 20.

Planned as a pep rally in the wake of Mao's death, it became clear after China's new leaders purged the so-called "Gang of Four" that this would be no phony Maoist "unity" feast as had periodically taken place in the past under the auspices of the *Guardian*. Although the RCP leadership has yet to

take a position on the Peking power struggle—thus opening itself to sharp attacks by competing Maoist groups—it evidently decided the malaise among its periphery was so serious that it had best confront it publicly.

In the short term the conference was a success for the RCP, drawing about 1,500 largely sympathetic participants. But in the aftermath, serious elements cannot have failed to notice that the vicious competition for the mantle of Maoist orthodoxy is taking place in a context of massive confusion and disorientation in their ranks. A notable index was the fact that for the first time in recent years the conference organizers could not limit the proceedings to Maoist double-talk by the use of goon squads and thus were forced to confront the Trotskyist politics of the Spartacist League (SL) throughout the day.

The SL, the only organization claiming the Trotskyist tradition to actively participate in the conference, focused on these contradictions in an attempt to persuade the most subjectively revolutionary participants to re-examine their old assumptions, break from the dead-end politics of Maoism and take up the struggle for genuine international working-class revolution.

Although RSBers had initially threatened the SL, blustering that "Trotskyites" would be physically excluded,

pressure by some of the conference's liberal endorsers forced the RCP to reconsider and open up the conference. This unusual openness made it possible for the SL to put forward its politics in discussions, through substantial sales of literature and through the distribution of a leaflet entitled "Questions Maoists Can't Answer." Among those questions are the following:

How is it that the top-ranking "radical" leaders of yesterday's "anti-rightist campaign" are today revealed to have been secret "capitalist roaders" all along and guilty of "unforgivable crimes"?

Why has the "anti-rightist campaign" abruptly ceased, and why is twice-purged Teng Hsiao-ping no longer denounced as a "capitalist roader"?

Why is it that Peking can justify the purge of the "Gang of Four" only through a campaign of personal vilification, and only after the purge was a *fait accompli*?

## The Primary Contradiction

Not only did the opening address by the RCP's Nicholas Unger avoid these critical questions, but it made no mention of China at all! Unlike the October League (OL)—which committed the blunder of sending a message of condolence to Mao's widow immediate-

ly prior to her arrest and condemnation as a "capitalist roader," then abruptly switched gears to parrot the new line emanating from Peking—the RCP is pursuing the cautious policy of "waiting until all the facts are in," undoubtedly reflecting internal disorientation at the purge of those most closely identified with orthodox "radical" Maoism. In the meantime, the RCP has had nothing to say about the "Gang of Four" either in discussions or in its newspaper *Revolution* (whose latest issue has been predictably delayed in appearing).

Unger spoke instead about what a good thing internationalism was and what a bad thing imperialism was, how the world was in turmoil and how all the people of the world want the same things—peace and progress. He also spoke about how terrible the "capitalist" Soviet Union was—just as terrible as the capitalist United States—referring to it as "the hungry dog-enemy of the people of the world" and "the big bad wolf."

There was, in fact, a curiously large number of references to animals of all sorts throughout the conference—sheep and goats, dogs and wolves. William Hinton repeatedly admonished the audience not to let the tiger in the back door while driving the wolf away from the front door, and at one point pro-RCP'er Clark Kissinger told an OLER that if the Chinese Communist Party elected a chimpanzee as chairman,

mer

October League leader Michael Klonsky would no doubt send it a telegram of support!

Despite the repetition of platitudes and the endless, mindless Mao-talk about the main enemy, the main danger, the main target and the main blow, the speeches of Unger and of William Hinton, former national chairperson of the U.S./China People's Friendship Association, did reveal—as they say—the “primary contradiction” facing the Maoist movement in the U.S. today: namely the Maoists' difficulty in either fully embracing China's policy of allying with U.S. imperialism or opposing it.

Hinton, a thoroughly consistent Stalinist and long-time mouthpiece for the Chinese bureaucracy, laid down the Chinese line. Between the two super-powers, one is “more dangerous,” and that one is the Soviet Union. Coming down heavily on the RCP, Hinton also remarked that the OL didn't quite seem to get the picture, and to one degree or another both were still dancing around the necessity of cementing alliances with the “lesser enemy” by maintaining that there are *two* main enemies—the Soviet Union and the United States. The position of two main enemies is, he said, “a strange use of the English language.” There can only be one “*main* enemy.” It

can also cause you trouble if you want to get it on the gravy train for those lavish banquets in the Great Hall of the People.

To make himself perfectly clear, Hinton proceeded to draw an analogy between Chinese foreign policy today and Soviet foreign policy in the 1930's and 1940's. Since the Soviet Union had been unable to take on all the imperialists in the world at once, he explained, it had followed a policy of “uniting all who could be united” against the “main danger,” then Nazi Germany. This lasted until the refusal of Britain and France to be so united made *them* the “main danger,” thus compelling Stalin to ally with Hitler against them!

Similarly, said Hinton, China is now concentrating on building the widest possible coalition (read alliance with U.S. imperialism) to combat the current “main danger”—the “social-fascist” Soviet Union—and the RCP had better accept it. Needless to say, the current situation is subject to change without notice as at the time of the Hitler/Stalin Pact. That's Stalinist “dialectics” for you!

The RCP's present situation is intolerable. To remain in the bidding for the position of “official” American Maoist organization it will have to give the American working class the word that U.S. foreign policy (at least) must be supported as a blow against “Soviet



Morning session of RCP conference November 20

social-imperialism.” On the other hand to break with China but not with Stalinist methodology would mean, i. e. all likelihood, to label China “capitalist” (which is for Maoists not an objective economic category but a judgment of the subjective attitude of the ruling group) and follow Progressive Labor down the road to obscurity and political impotence.

The Trotskyist analysis alone provides a way out of this Stalinist doctrinal impasse and points the way forward. This analysis begins with an understanding of the real nature of both the USSR and China: neither capitalist nor socialist but degenerated and deformed workers states based on proletarian property forms that must be defended unconditionally against imperialist attack yet saddled with parasitic bureaucracies that must be overthrown by workers political revolution.

### Workshops Add to Confusion

The initial presentations were followed by a series of large workshops dealing with different areas of the world.

At the workshop on East and South-

east in practice: after more than a decade of trying, the NLF ultimately found no section of the bourgeoisie with which to form a coalition to take power. It was instead forced to politically and economically expropriate the bourgeoisie, creating a bureaucratically deformed workers state.

Others questioned the present relationship between Vietnam and China in view of Vietnam's greater reliance on the Soviet Union for arms and equipment during the war. It was pointed out that China had, in fact, often refused to allow “revisionist” Soviet supplies to pass through Chinese territory to reach the embattled Vietnamese. As in the other workshops, RCP supporters were unable to answer these facts.

The Angola workshop consisted of a panel discussion between two apologists for the Chinese position and two MPLA supporters. So embarrassing is the Chinese position that George Glasser of the U.S./China People's Friendship Committee was forced to lie about it, maintaining that China gave no aid to any of the nationalist groups after January 1975. The RCP's Dennis O'Neal simply ignored China's role altogether, seeking to cover the imperialist South African invasion by pointing out that Angola is not socialist and that the MPLA in power has suppressed strikes, arrested leftists and welcomed Gulf Oil back to Cabinda.

The first speaker supporting SL view pointed out that support for China's alliance with South Africa in Angola represented a turning point for the Maoist movement. “It means something when an organization which claims to be revolutionary ends up in a bloc with the most racist reactionary regime on earth,” she said. “If you could stomach Angola, you'll buy a bloc with your own imperialists in the next world war. You are taking the same path as the CP tool at the time of World War II. Soon you'll be breaking strikes and turning in CPer and other people to the FBI.”

The second SL supporter noted the myth that was being perpetrated that

WV Photo

east Asia the speakers astonishingly managed to avoid mentioning either the Vietnamese Revolution or the role of China in Asia! Several supporters of the Spartacist League and the Spartacus Youth League (SYL) intervened in the discussion to raise these important subjects. One SL spokesman drew the lessons of the Vietnamese struggle by challenging the Stalinist doctrine of two-stage revolution, which was negat-

China had been neutral in Angola. There were two sides in Angola, he said, and China was on the wrong side—the side of U.S. imperialism and of South Africa. “If you had read the Chinese press,” he said, “you would have seen nothing but attacks on the Soviet Union for its role in Angola. But there was not one word of criticism against the U.S.; they didn’t even mention the South African invasion until nine weeks after it happened.”

As was to occur in other workshops as well, SL speakers were often listened to with interest until the use of some key word like “Stalinist” or “Spartacist” tipped the audience off that the speaker was a “Trot” and triggered a Pavlovian spasm of “Trotskyite”-baiting and references to ice-picks. New recruits to the Maoist movement are kept in such primeval political ignorance that they cannot tell the difference between their line and that of the “critical” Maoists, let alone Trotskyists, until the proper organizational tag is pinned on the speakers!

This use of “Trotskyite” bogeymen to harden up the ranks of a disoriented movement reached its nadir in the

workshop on Chinese foreign policy. Here OL Central Committee member Eileen Klehr got up to announce her “disgust” that “the sponsors of this conference let Trotskyites slander China,” disingenuously claiming that the Trotskyists’ participation in the conference was OL’s reason for refusing to co-sponsor it. When, seconds later, she demanded to know the RCP’s position on the “Gang of Four,” she was herself hooted down with cries of “That’s a Trotskyite question!”

The cries expressed the RCP’s evident embarrassment that it had not yet taken a position on the Peking purge. When an SYL supporter asked RCP chief Bob Avakian to answer “yes or no” whether Chiang Ching was a “capitalist roader,” he replied at first “No!” and then, “I don’t know. I don’t know.”

Through an apparent slip-up in conference planning, the RCP invited Ralph Shoenmann of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation to be a panelist in the Chinese foreign policy workshop. Shoenmann raised a series of Trotskyist-derived criticisms of China and noted from the platform that the expulsion from the party of the “Gang of Four” without so much as a hearing before their lifelong comrades was proof that there was no workers democracy in China. For once the audience understood the political importance of these charges which could not be answered and erupted in anti-Trotskyist fury.

In the USSR workshop, well-known RCP supporter Mike Zweig, reflecting the Chinese bureaucracy’s bias toward peasant autarky, said that the Soviet Union was capitalist because it has a “giant navy” which goes to every part of the world and has “direct economic relations of capitalism with countries all over the world.” The way you can tell that China is socialist, he said, is that it “consciously applies Marxism-Leninism to break down class distinctions.”

When an SL speaker asked Zweig when the counterrevolution which allegedly restored “capitalism” to Russia had taken place, he replied that it had not been necessary to have one but that when Khrushchev went to the Central Committee meetings and Politburo meetings with the “army in his pocket” that could be considered “sort of a coup.” Panelist Bob Coe from the U.S./China People’s Friendship Association dutifully parroted the line that the USSR was the main enemy—except that possibly if one lived in the Panama Canal Zone, perhaps there the U.S. might be the main enemy.

Toward the end of the discussion, the two left-liberal academicians on the panel, Lynn Turgeon and Ben Eklor, who had presented indisputable empirical proofs that the USSR was not capitalist, sharing qualitatively more in

common with China than with the United States, began to get Trotsky-baited. The final SL speaker pointed out that while these two panelists had a firmer grip on reality than most of the people in the room (who had adopted the false consciousness of the Chinese bureaucracy), they were certainly not Trotskyists. The Trotskyist position, which was not expressed by Turgeon and Eklor, he said, begins with unconditional military defense of the gains of the Russian and Chinese revolutions. But even the call for the military defense of China against imperialism, since it came from a Trotskyist, was reflexively booed.

### Avakian Plays with Critical Maoism

The final session of the conference was a bitter confrontation between the RCP’s No. One honcho Robert Avakian and William Hinton about the position U.S. Maoists should take in the event of a third world war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Although it was set up as a three-way debate, the third panelist, outmoded New Left

radical-pacifist Dave Dellinger, stood largely outside the clash, intervening from time to time to vainly protest the sharp right turn in Chinese foreign policy.

Avakian began the evening, drawing wild cheers from the RCP (one RCP supporter was overheard to whisper to another, “I love Bob Avakian. He’s so working class!”) as he strutted across the platform asserting that “we do not stand with either imperialist” and vowing that his organization would reject a bloc with the U.S. In response, Hinton warned repeatedly that the Maoist movement in the U.S. was in for big trouble from China if it refused to toe the line on this crucial question.

Over and over Hinton stressed that “the U.S.S.R. is the main danger,” that the “turn in the world situation requires

...new tactics,” exemplified in the recent struggle in Angola. He insisted that he was speaking for the Chinese leadership. In response to the RCP’s charge that he pulled his politics “out of the air,” Hinton said, “I didn’t create it. It’s the result of the analysis of Mao Tse-tung.”

That Avakian will take this warning seriously, despite his demagogic present “left” posture, was evident by his final

remarks of the evening. While the RCP does have criticisms of the role of the Browderite CPUSA during World War II, he said, he was definitely not ruling out circumstances in which the RCP could bloc with U.S. imperialism in a war.

Continuing loyalty to Peking was also evident in Avakian’s answer to a question posed by an SL supporter in the audience. The SL speaker asked:

“Since the question of the class nature of the Soviet Union is fundamental doesn’t the refusal of the Vietnamese Workers Party to characterize the Soviet Union as capitalist mean by your criterion that the Vietnamese government itself is revisionist and on ‘the capitalist road’?”

Avakian’s response was that confuse people aren’t necessarily enemies. With regard to China, he said that Mao had recognized that the Soviet Union was on the road to capitalism as early as 1956 and had struggled with Khrushchev internally (within what international organization he could not, of course say, since Stalin had long before liquidated the Communist International). Avakian went on to declare bombastically that China had educated a whole generation of revolutionaries and would

with U.S. imperialism lock, stock and barrel.

Dellinger's remarks reflected his growing dismay with the rabidly anti-communist tone of the conference. "How long can we not raise what happened when China supported the military junta in Chile?" he asked. (To this Hinton answered that the Chinese government tries to make peace with every government, blandly adding that the widespread outrage over the Chinese embassy's refusal to accept political refugees at the time of the coup was misdirected; the Chinese refused only because they considered the embassy "unsafe" for refugees!)

"What about China's support for the Shah of Iran?" Dellinger persisted. "Not to bring it up is dereliction of revolutionary duty." Dellinger also complained that he was baffled with "Bob and Bill's insistence that the USSR is capitalist." "You think the arch-enemy is Khrushchev," he said. "You don't want to face up to what happened under Stalin." But Dellinger's own lack of answers to his questions, combined with his pathetic longing for a return to the days of uncomplicated chanting "power to the people," made it impossible for anyone to take him seriously.

The conference revealed that the differences between the two major American Maoist groups today remain quantitative. The RCP states that it will ally with its own imperialist ruling class only under exceptional circumstances; the OL is rather more disposed to this course. However, the OL's Peking-loyalism draws it inexorably toward Hinton's unconditional State Department Maoism. At the same time, the workerist-philistine RCP is certainly capable of following Progressive Labor's path to become a nationally limited, irrelevant Stalinoid sect. In either case, loyalty to Chinese Stalinism, embodied in a treacherous, clique-ridden bureaucracy, will have led the cadre of both organizations very far from the motives and goals which originally inspired their allegiance to socialist politics. ■

**WORKERS VANGUARD**

continue to struggle against all enemies of the revolution, "open and disguised."

Following this, Clark Kissing, (another leading member of the U.S./China People's Friendship Association) maneuvered to get the microphone to argue for the RCP's benefit that Hinton is not the mouthpiece of China, but instead puts words into the mouths of the Chinese. In a particularly demagogic broadside, Kissing asserted that he had been on the same trips to China as Hinton, had sat in on the same discussions in the Great Hall of the People, had visited the same Chinese diplomats at the UN mission in New York and that the Chinese were always "measured in their response," at no time stating that the USSR was the "main danger."

In response, Hinton replied that Kissing was "off the wall." Vehement in his insistence that the Chinese had put words into *his* mouth and not the other way around, Hinton reached down into his briefcase and pulled out a box of file cards. Dramatically waving them in the air he protested that he had here numerous statements from the Chinese press corroborating his arguments.

It is characteristic of the deliberately obscurantist Maoist bureaucracy that its edicts are always indirect, forcing its would-be disciples into contortions over interpretation of line. The Kissing-Hinton exchange resembled nothing so much as two religious disputants from Hellenistic Egypt visiting the oracle of Delphi, to return each proclaiming his own vindication. Nonetheless, behind the RCP's frenzy to dismiss Hinton as a right-wing revisionist is evidence that the ex-New Left Maoist milieu to which Avakian & Co. orient (as does the OL) is still unwilling to swallow an open bloc

# International line debated in NYC

By BEN BEDELL DECEMBER 1, 1976—GUARDIAN

What is the main trend in the world today: the growing danger of world war or national liberation and revolution?

And what are the repercussions of these differing views for the practice of the U.S. left?

A few years ago there was relatively little discussion within the U.S. left on this issue. Now, it is a hotly debated question within the new communist movement that emerged from the mass movements of the 1960s. Sharp lines of demarcation have emerged around the topics of world war, national liberation and the Soviet Union, particularly since the events in Angola.

As part of this developing debate, the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP) organized a conference in New York City Nov. 20 to "take up the questions of the international situation, war, revolution and the international tasks of the working-class movement in the U.S."

The conference drew over 2000 people—mostly young and mostly white—to a day-long series of speeches, workshops, discussions, debates and arguments. On the whole, the conference presented most of the main tendencies around the question of international line and was conducted in a generally principled manner. But much of the argumentation was familiar to close followers of the debate. On several key issues, however, contending views were refined and clarified.

The key participants in last week's conference were the RCP and William Hinton, former chairman of the U.S.-China Peoples Friendship Association (USCPFA). A variety of other speakers and workshop panelists presented viewpoints on the international situation, mostly from a non-Marxist-Leninist perspective. The October League (OL), although not an official participant, made its views heard from the floor of various workshops. It was the object of criticism by various conference participants.

The conference debates congealed around several contending views.

## THE POSITIONS

The first, represented by the RCP, holds that superpower contention and revolution both constitute the main trend, that there is no contradiction in this view. It believes a war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union for imperialist spoils is inevitable and its character will most likely be similar to World War I. In other words, it will be an intrainperialist rivalry for redivision of the world and revolutionaries should not support either side.

The domestic policy of the U.S. left, RCP believes, should be to direct its fire at the U.S. bourgeoisie, while targeting the two superpowers as the equal main enemies of the world's peoples internationally.

An opposing view, represented at the conference by William Hinton, asserts that the growing danger of world war is the main trend today. (Both sides agree, however, that world war is a certainty). Hinton believes that the coming war will be more similar to World War 2, in which a united front including socialist countries and movements was pitted against the fascist imperialism of the Axis countries. In the coming war, the united front would be against the USSR.

Hinton argued that the U.S. movement must direct its main blow at Soviet social imperialism. While not arguing for such a united front under present conditions, Hinton believes there are areas where the revolutionary interests of the world's peoples coincide with those of the U.S. ruling class. This is a new strategic situation that has developed only recently—since about 1973, according to Hinton.

Both sides argue that the Soviet Union is an imperialist state in which capitalism has been fully restored. Both sides say they agree that the principal contradiction in the world is between the peoples of the world on the one hand and the two superpowers on the other.

A third trend is represented by the OL, which declined to sponsor the conference and denounced it as an "opportunist sham." The OL line is similar to Hinton's in that it sees the Soviet Union as the main danger. But each accuses the other of not really having a correct view of the international situation. Hinton faults the OL for "merely exposing" the Soviet Union and not really taking the necessary action to direct its main blow there. The OL, on the other hand, accuses Hinton of "Browderism"—of forgetting altogether the struggle against the U.S. ruling class. On the question of Angola, though, all three views—Hinton's, RCP's and OL's—ended upon the same side of the fence. All denounced, in tandem with the U.S. ruling class, the "Soviet takeover" there.

Another contending view, advanced by the Guardian in the recent period, asserts that revolution continues to be the main feature of this era, even though contention between the superpowers is growing. The principal contradiction is between U.S. imperialism and the people's movements for national liberation, independence and revolution. The Soviet Union is seen as a social-imperialist superpower in the process of restoring capitalism, posing a lesser danger than U.S. imperialism and constituting a secondary threat to the world's peoples. Solidarity with the struggles of the third world against U.S. imperialism is a question of principle for our movement.

While the Guardian declined to become a sponsor of the conference, both RCP and Hinton singled it out for criticism. A few panelists and questioners from the floor defended the Guardian position.

The view that the U.S. should be our prime or only target was represented by various speakers, few of them a part of the Marxist-Leninist movement. Anti-imperialist activist and scholar Eqbal Ahmad and pacifist Dave Dellinger were the prime representatives of this perspective.

A majority of the audience seemed to favor the views advanced by the RCP—largely because the organization brought much of its cadre to the conference. Crammed into the overflowing pews of an old church on the upper west side of Manhattan, they applauded enthusiastically the opening speech of RCP leader Nick Unger. William Hinton received a restrained response and Eqbal Ahmad only a polite patter.

A standing ovation was given to Davis M'gabe, a Zimbabwean active in support work for the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU). M'gabe, declining to place principal emphasis on the question of the Soviet Union or world war, called on everyone in the audience to build a movement against U.S. intervention in Zimbabwe. "The infrastructure of intervention already exists," said M'gabe. "You can help to stop it if the U.S. decides to intervene."

The views of People's Republic of China were a thread running through the entire conference. It was largely People's China that developed many of the ideas on war, revolution and the Soviet Union that were under debate.

A principal assertion of Hinton is that China believes a



William Hinton (above) and Bob Avakian (below) debated at New York City conference Nov. 20.

[OVER]



new strategic situation exists requiring revolutionaries everywhere to aim the main blow at the Soviet Union. The RCP, on the other hand, sought to advance the "aim the main blow at the U.S. thesis" while also claiming to uphold China's position. The RCP took several opportunities to warn against flunkysm, though. The RCP appeared to differ with China on a number of questions, such as opposing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and criticizing "those [unnamed] who assert that the Soviet Union 'singlehandedly' caused the civil war in Angola"—a reference to China's frequently stated view. But the RCP never criticized China by name.

The RCP expanded on its critique of Hinton's thesis. It asserted that he would have the left adopt a united front with the U.S. ruling class before such a policy was necessary. RCP representatives held that a united front should be considered only if the Soviet Union attacks China in the course of the world war.

Defense of China would be the unwavering duty of all revolutionaries, said RCP chairman Bob Avakian. But it is impossible to say in advance what the best strategy for contributing to that defense would be, he said. China may be able to defend itself or we may have a revolutionary situation in this country where it would be possible to seize power, Avakian said.

Hinton countered by saying that an attack on China was a certainty and therefore the working class has a stake in siding with one imperialist power against the other, as in World War 2. Hinton gave some examples of how the U.S. left should advance the movement along this road.

"In some areas of the world, U.S. arms supplies play a positive role because they strengthen a country against the Soviet Union," he said, citing Japan as an example. In reply to a question on internationalism in relation to the defense of the socialist Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the threat the U.S. poses to it from its bases in Japan, Hinton stated that China's view on this issue had changed in 1975, when the Soviet threat to Japan became principal. He urged that anti-imperialists now campaign for more U.S. arms to Japan. Hinton also called for a mass movement to oppose grain shipments, loans and sales of technologically advanced items to the Soviet Union, comparing this to U.S. sales to Japan before World War 2.

The workshops dealt with several areas of controversy. Among the most noteworthy were:

• China's foreign policy. The RCP accused both the Guardian and Hinton of "ripping the revolutionary heart out of China's foreign policy," the Guardian by criticizing China's stand on Angola and Hinton by claiming that China no longer advances the strategy of a united front against the two superpowers. "All of China's official statements say that China's policy is a united front against both superpowers," said USCPFA member Clark Kissinger, one of the panelists, who is closely allied with the RCP position. "I have a whole suitcase full of clippings from Chinese news agencies that indicate China goes beyond the united front against both superpowers," rejoined Hinton. Citing his own discussions with Chinese officials as well as China's actions and statements, Hinton made a convincing argument that China has shifted its views to place principal emphasis on uniting to oppose the Soviet Union.

During the question period, an OE representative demanded that the RCP and Hinton take a stand on the "gang of four" events in China. Hinton said he thought that Chiang Ching was a "legitimate target" because of her "left dogmatism." He said, however, that he thought the campaign against the four should portray them as ultra "leftists" and not simply capitalist roaders.

RCP chairman Avakian, speaking from the floor, said his organization had not yet come to a position on the gang of four, noting that the RCP was still studying the question. Avakian took the opportunity to denounce as flunkysm the OE's "reflex reaction" to the complicated 2-line struggle in China. "They are trying to curry favor, not make a Marxist analysis of events," charged Avakian.

#### SOUTHERN AFRICA KEY DEBATE

• Southern Africa. The discussion focused on the role of the Soviet Union, particularly its military aid to liberation movements. Davis M'gabe of the ZANU Support Committee asserted that "it doesn't make sense to talk about Soviet social-imperialism in Africa today. There are no Soviet multinational corporations or Soviet domination of the African people. One could talk about it only as a possibility in the future." M'gabe added that he "wouldn't want to defend the proposition that the Soviet Union is a socialist country" and said "China provides a good socialist model for us." Other speakers argued that superpower contention was the main aspect of southern African events and that Soviet arms aid was the chief form of Soviet penetration and aggression.

On the question of Soviet arms, M'gabe asserted that "ZANU will get the arms it needs to carry out the struggle from wherever it can. . . . We may get guns from the Soviet Union and we will not apologize to anyone for taking them. We need those guns to defend our people. Just because we take the guns from a country doesn't mean that we are their puppet." M'gabe asserted. He reported that Mozambique had taken aid from the Soviet Union but resisted pressure to grant port facilities to the Soviets.

• Capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union. The RCP put forward little beyond the thesis it argued in Red Papers 7, its major document on the subject. There was some discussion about the absence of unemployment in the USSR. The RCP said that unemployment existed but was disguised as "labor fluidity" (high job turnover), increasing joblessness among women and unemployment and underemployment in the countryside.

• Angola. The RCP repeated its position of "a plague on all houses," i.e. opposing UNITA, FNLA and MPLA as all puppets of one or another superpower. Harold Glasser of the USCPFA "exposed new evidence" showing that Angola is now simultaneously colonized not only by the Soviet Union but by the U.S. and South Africa as well. The evidence? Gulf Oil is still operating its Cabinda wells and construction on the Cunene dam project—which will supply power to South Africa-occupied Namibia—is continuing. (What Glasser did not mention was that Gulf operates under a contract the terms of which were determined by the Angolan government and that it now pays royalties to that government.)

• Latin America. The workshop focused mainly on Cuba. RCP argued it is "capitalism in its highest glory" and a "sugar plantation of the Soviet Union." Other speakers argued that it was socialist and that it was the responsibility of U.S. progressives to defend Cuba from the U.S. threats. "The Soviet colony theory only lends a left cover to the State Department," said panelist Shepherd Bliss, adding, "We should fight to break the boycott . . . and that will be something concrete that will help Cuba be less dependent on the Soviet Union."

The conference ended with an evening debate between William Hinton, Dave Dellinger and Bob Avakian. Avakian reasserted RCP's view that "we should have a policy of all struggle and no unity against our bourgeoisie, while opposing both superpowers internationally." Hinton said a new situation existed, opening up areas of cooperation with the U.S. ruling class against the Soviets. Dellinger said we should fight the U.S. government and not be so preoccupied with the Soviet Union. Dellinger added that he thought we should fight for "socialism with a human face" and rejected the idea that a dictatorship of the proletariat or a vanguard party is necessary.

The conference ended late Saturday night with an exhausted audience heading back home.

Noticeably absent from the day's discussions were proposals for action around international questions. The RCP did call a demonstration for the next day around the slogan "U.S. Out of South Africa" (see page 5). But a strategic plan of action was left for another conference.

While the lines of demarcation were made somewhat sharper within the U.S. left, it will be world events such as Angola, and not conferences, which will put the various political lines to the test.