

should not be able to cope with counter-revolutionary efforts or should succumb to anarchism or Bonapartism.

In the light of what has happened since the supersession of the Commune by the Triple Alliance and the defeat of the left, it becomes more necessary than ever to examine the basic difference between the Commune and the Triple Alliance.

TRIPLE ALLIANCE LIMITED

Historians friendly to the Cultural Revolution, such as Daubier or William Hinton, in addition to Han Suyin and others, neglect to point out, if they are aware of it at all, that there was a fundamental difference between the Triple Alliance and the Commune. The Triple Alliance is based upon three categories only: representatives of the people designated by them through mass organizations, representatives of the Peoples Liberation Army (PLA), and party cadres. The Triple Alliance was in reality only a coalition.

The Commune is not merely a coalition. In a Commune there can be several coalitions. It is not restricted but is based on the workers, peasants, and mass of the people. The Shanghai Commune had the potential for this had it been given the opportunity to develop and broaden out.

The Triple Alliance presupposes as its nucleus and principal instrument the three forces in the struggle: mass organizations, the army, and the party cadres. The Triple Alliance, therefore, narrows the participation of the broad masses to these three categories.

It is otherwise with the Paris Commune-type of state. For instance, during the era when Lenin was alive, the Soviets were composed of workers, peasants, and soldiers. There was no such thing as a Soviet restricted to mass organizations, army, and cadres.

The Triple Alliance owes its composition first of all to the forging of a coalition from the top. Therein lies a fundamental difference with the Commune, which presupposes elections by workers, peasants, and soldiers, and the institutionalizing of this form, as the basic medium for consummating a proletarian democracy.

The truth of the matter is that the Commune idea was shelved because the rightist forces in the party, who in reality had engulfed the party and the government, were too strong. Therefore a compromise was made whereby the forces which were to be combatted, that is, the rightist, revisionist, bureaucratic, and elitist elements, were really included in the new form of state. The door was left wide open for them to come in through the use of the term "cadres." This

vague formulation meant that the bureaucratic right-wing and the entire governmental apparatus, including the apparatus of the party, could regain entrance simply by affirming that they were for the Mao Tse-tung line.

APPARATUS SUBORDINATE TO THE COMMUNE

In a Paris Commune-type of state, that is, in a workers' parliament, as was originally explained by Marx and used as a popular exposition of the nature of the Commune by Lenin in his **State and Revolution**, the administrators, the bureaucrats, the technical intelligentsia, and so on, were to be **employees** of the workers' parliament to be hired or fired in accordance with the wishes and policy of the government. The entire administrative apparatus, including the party apparatus, was subject to the will of the Commune, of the Soviets, as under Lenin. That was, in a general way, what the left-wing during the Cultural Revolution had envisioned and it must be assumed that that was Mao's position as well, if we are to take the Sixteen-Point Decision as an authentic document, having his approval if not wholly written by him.

In a Paris Commune-type state, the military is subordinate to the Commune. The specter of Bonapartism is if anything less of a danger than in a bureaucratized form of workers' state. The Red Army during Lenin's time was subordinated to the will of the Soviets. During the Paris Commune, the National Guard was subordinated to the Executive Committee and the Commune.

Daubier in a footnote touches on the vital difference between the members of the revolutionary committees, that is, the Triple Alliance, and the Paris Commune. The difference, he says, is that "in the Chinese setup those elected must belong to one of the three categories and only a third of the members can come from any one category." (Daubier, **History of the Cultural Revolution**, p. 160.) That in itself nullifies the very conception of a Paris Commune-type state. It explains why the Chou En-lai forces were so vehemently opposed to the Commune and why their target was precisely the revolutionary left-wing elements who were for it.

Daubier stresses the unquestionable value of the Three-in-One Combination in that it gave impetus to the trend toward centralized leadership in the Cultural Revolution through a method that was democratic and that the revolutionary committees (Triple Alliance) gave the Chinese population greater control over their future