# Beyond the Crisis of Capitalism

(Excerpt)

From *Mass Line**

...The state capitalist character of these countries and the people's antagonistic contradiction with it were pinpointed by Mao Tsetung back in the 1960s. He had also predicted that the people in these countries will rise up against the neocapitalists. Mao had also equipped the masses and the Marxist-Leninists with the necessary theory and practice to recognise and defeat the danger of capitalist restoration in socialist countries. This is why the Marxist-Leninists who have remained consistent to Mao Tsetung Thought could immediately take up the challenge of bourgeois propaganda on the "collapse of communism". Unlike the CPM-CPI revisionists, who are still groping in the dark, the Marxist-Leninists have waged a determined struggle to clear up the web of lies of the bourgeoisie and propagate Mao Tsetung's teachings which point to the vibrant future of communism.

In this entire activity they have repeatedly stressed the point that the crisis, be it in China, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe or elsewhere, is a "crisis of capitalism". They have pointed out that the upheaval witnessed in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union will erupt in China, Albania, North Korea, Vietnam and Cuba also, even though the social fascists are dominating there today. All this is completely correct. At a time when bourgeois propaganda against Marxism is raging, repeated propagation of the truth and reaffirmation of Marxism is absolutely necessary. Yet the question remains: Is this sufficient? Can the Marxist-Leninists remain satisfied with clearing up misconceptions? Or educating the masses with Mao Tsetung Thought both through propaganda and revolutionary practice?

The Marxist-Leninists need not worry about the unpredictable turn taken by world events. They are not fortune tellers. But they should certainly worry over the fact that a number of aspects of the new world situation were ruled out as *impossible* by most of them just a couple of years back. For example, any talk on an easing of the contradiction between the U.S. and Soviet-led imperialist blocs (let alone talk of the virtual collapse of any bloc without world war) was treated as Kautskian "ultra-imperialism". Strategies and tactics were built up on the bedrock of denying such "impossibilities". Line struggle was waged within parties and between them on such issues. Today, the danger of world war has clearly receded and the dissolution/reconstitution of blocs has come on the agenda. Yet analysis often follows the categories set up in the past. An instance of this is the continued presence of U.S. troops under NATO in Europe. (The Soviet troops of the Warsaw Pact are in the process of getting out.) Can this still be seen as an expression of inter-bloc contradiction? Evidently what we have here is a case of new wine in old bottles. The U.S. troops remain in Europe to protect U.S. interests in Europe. Not against the Soviet Union. But against the rising German power. Similarly, U.S. relations with China should also be viewed in relation to its need to contain Japan.

Recognising new world conditions and reorienting strategies and tactics in accordance to it is one thing. But more important is a deep analysis of the ideological factors which blinded the Marxist-Leninists to such a possibility itself. Marxism has remained fresh and developed to the height of Mao Tsetung Thought precisely because of its capacity to absorb the new and break out of beaten tracks. Its revolutionary dialectics based on its class standpoint has made this possible. But the history of the communist movement is also full of examples of a dead, sterile Marxism. Here materialist dialectics is transformed into a mumbo-jumbo which is used to explain away and tidy up the "mess" stirred up by new developments. It is high time to bury the dead and earnestly promote live, revolutionary Marxism. To take up this task, the upheaval in the former socialist countries must be seen also as an exposure of the as yet unresolved crisis in the international communist movement touching ideological, political and organisational aspects. It is so because these events have shown that the Marxist-Leninists were only partially equipped to grasp the dynamics of the world situation and the crisis in these countries. This is equally true in their efforts to put forward a revolutionary alternative before the peoples of these countries. The structures against which the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union have struggled took root even before Khrushchev and others came to power. A simple going back to pre-Khrushchev positions can never be a revolutionary alternative. In China the situation is qualitatively different because Mao and the Cultural Revolution stand out as revolutionary reference points. But even there Mao's teachings and the Cultural Revolution were only a beginning. Like all beginnings they are not complete and more has to be done to firmly implant the banner of communism once again.

It is completely necessary to expose the "crisis of capitalism" and the solution of bourgeois democracy put forward by the imperialists. But if things are left at that, the defence of Marxism will rapidly turn into a stifling of Marxist thought. It is time to go beyond the "crisis of capitalism" theses and take up the problems of the international communist movement. World developments have posed this on the agenda. □

*Editorial by *Mass Line* (April 1990), a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist monthly in India