

Amherst College Interlibrary Loan



ILLiad TN: 137338

Borrower: GGC
Lending String: PIT,*AMH,EYM,EYM,VGM

Patron: Littlefield, Sid

Journal Title: Polygraph.

Volume: 15/16 **Issue:** Immanence,
Transcendence, and
Month/Year: 2004**Pages:**

Article Author:
Article Title: Alain Badiou; The Flux and the
Party; In the Margins of Anti-Oedipus

ILL Number: 30271789



Call #: JA1 P64

Location: AC Frost Library no.15-
16 (2004)

5/4/2007 11:48:42 AM

ARIEL

Charge

Maxcost: 25.00IFM

Shipping Address:

Library - ILL/CBX 043

Georgia College and State University

320 North Wayne St.

Milledgeville, GA 31061-0490

Fax:

Ariel: ariel.gcsu.edu

NOTICE:

*This material may be protected by
Copyright Law
(Title 17 U.S. Code)*

uous commentary to my text by Marta

o body, that of a magnetic field, seems to
es its magnetic field, so the brain generates
Emergent Self (Ithaca: Cornell University
d consistency of its own, although it can
here. Does this mean that mind cannot
ther analogy from physics leaves the gate
after a body collapses into a black hole,
f-sustaining gravitational field—so even
at a field generated by a material object
r, 232.)

any: SUNY Press, 2000).

, see Chapter 3 of Slavoj Žižek, *The Pup-*
l. For a popular scientific explanation, see
ix Books, 2001).

d: Oxford University Press, 1994).

matius Press, 1995), 127.

The Flux and the Party: In the Margins of Anti-Oedipus

Alain Badiou

So tempting to give a warm round of applause. Yes, yes! Read on: "It is a question of knowing how a revolutionary potential is realized, in its very relationship with the exploited masses or the 'weakest links' of a given system. Do these masses or these links act in their own place, within the order of causes and ends that promote a new socius, or are they on the contrary the place and the agent of a sudden and unexpected irruption?"¹ Could Deleuze and Guattari be dialecticians? The revolutionary dialectic as theory of discontinuities and of scissions, as logic of catastrophes—that's it, after all: the order of causes assigns no place where a rupture could take hold. No quantitative cumulation incorporates a new quality, or counts the latter's limit among its number of terms, even though quality is, necessarily, produced as the limit.

True, the revolutionary crisis is an irruption of large masses into history.² The revolution is "a sharp turn in the lives of vast popular masses."³ Deleuze-Guattari echo this here, with a touch of pedantry and vain Latinisms that stick to the soles of these nomads weighed under their baggage ("promoting a new socius," you call that cute?).

Any Marxist-Leninist-Maoist learns in school (cadre school,⁴ of course) that the Parisian workers, the soviet people, the Hunan farmers, and the young workers of Sud-Aviation in May '68⁵ one day rose in revolt; and he knows better than anyone that whoever pretends having read, in his mental horoscope, the good news in its precise sequence, merely wants to justify by this lie, after the fact, his personal defeat in the heat of the moment.

Marxists-Leninists precisely base their particular energy and unvarying persistence on two facts:

- "Where there is oppression, there is revolt." But it is the revolt that, at its own hour, passes judgment on the fate of the oppression, not the other way around.

Polygraph 15/16 (2004)

- "One has reason to revolt against reactionaries." The popular and proletarian revolt is the reason of the bourgeois oppression, it is what gives reason, it is our reason.⁶

True class revolt, in essence, surprises. It is a war by surprise, the generic brutality of scission. How could the established rule of the old (including the revolutionary old) put up with a deduction of what tends to break it asunder? How many people have we not seen enraptured by the fact that "no one could have foreseen May '68"! I even suspect that the ascent of the anti-Oedipus and all the fabrications about the pure mysteries of Desire take off from this question. The question is, strictly speaking, stupid. Can one imagine a "foreseen" May '68? And by whom? Who does not see that the unforeseeable constitutes the essential historical power of May '68? To baptize this unforeseeable "irruption of desire" is about as soporific as opium.

This baptism, however, is not innocent. It stages the entrance of the irrational. Unforeseeable, desiring, irrational: follow your drift [*dérive*], my son, and you will make the Revolution.

It's been quite a while now since Marxist-Leninists ceased to identify the rational with the analytically predictable. The dialectic, the primacy of practice, means first and foremost affirming the historical objectivity of ruptures. Masses make History, not Concepts. No one can ever really know precisely how, and in which workshop, a revolutionary (anti-union) strike began. Why Tuesday and not Thursday? The masses' gesture closes one period and opens another. What was dividing itself reversed its terms, the working class viewpoint takes over. A local, dialectical rationality opens for itself a new space of practice. The revolt condenses one rational time and deploys the scission of another. The revolutionary process of organization is itself reworked, recast, penetrated and split by the primacy of practice: "The composition of the leading [*dirigeant*] group ... should not and cannot remain entirely unchanged throughout the initial, middle, and final stages of a great struggle." (Mao).⁷

The material objective base of everything (the revolutionary class practice) is never quite exhausted in that to which it gives rise. Revolutionary history renounces Hegelian circularity, imposes periodization, the uninterrupted by stages: one sequence's rationality cannot absorb the practical rupture from which the sequence deploys itself as such. The rupture can be thought in its dialectical generality. Historically, it is only practiced. Concept, strategy and tactic, organization, all have the solidity of a sequence; but behind them lies the historical new, that which founds the sequence and which the concept within the sequence necessarily leaves outside itself as its remainder. Masses make history—practice comes first in respect to theory. There is, therefore, a leftover of "pure" practice, the historical rupture as such, which historical materialism and theory will not be able, integrally, either to deduce or to organize any longer, because their deductions and their organizing principles presuppose it as fact.

What remains, however, is neither the cause nor the hidden essence.⁸ It is not at all unknowable: it is an infinite historical source, at least throughout a historical period governed by the same principal contradiction (bourgeoisie/proletariat).⁹ The "remainder" is that which, in the periodizing scansion (Commune, October,

Cultural Revolution ...¹⁰), deploys ruptures to come is needed to clarify what sustains and what carries forward the proximity that is itself always split by practice, by the Shanghai workers to the practical, historical, inexhaustible time, the positive development of the revolutionary committee, carries the

From Paris 1871 to Shanghai 1927, the rupture of class. From a just idea distributed there. The furnace of the class breaks [*ni lieu*].

The good fortune of the Marxist-Leninist ability to predict and assign the date of the storm.¹³ Whatever weapons the Marxist organization, doctrine, prevision, must be judged according to his capacities by those who, suddenly rising up, are for later.

The revolt surprises Marxists-Leninists by a new kind of surprise. It is where the surprise will slam right in the face. He never prepares himself for the masses, never be ready enough. Only for his own meaning, since what is ahead is for him to ceaselessly prepares for. But he is not the revolutionary potential of the masses in reserve? The Marxist-Leninist, who has the revolutionary potential at each moment of the revolt's hour.

What is at stake, for the Marxist-Leninist "was for later" of its prevision, an apparatus of the repressive "it's too early" of the

Marx before the Commune: the rupture, but I stand unconditionally by its side through and through the theory of practice, the proletarian uprising, works of prevision, even though it is correct, because

Mao and the peasant revolt of the countryside. Our tactical application of the surrection, must explode into pieces of the demand of the countryside, but the masses' violent rupture carries this with it the countryside.¹⁵

The Marxist-Leninist leader [*dirigeant*]

onaries." The popular and proletarian oppression, it is what gives

var by surprise, the generic brutality of the old (including the revolutionary break it asunder? How many people could one have foreseen May '68"! And all the fabrications about the question. The question is, strictly speaking, '68? And by whom? Who does not the initial historical power of May '68? To what is about as soporific as opium. It stages the entrance of the irrational. It drifts [*dérive*], my son, and you will

Marxists ceased to identify the ratiocentric, the primacy of practice, means the activity of ruptures. Masses make History precisely how, and in which workmen. Why Tuesday and not Thursday? It means another. What was dividing itself that takes over. A local, dialectical rationale. The revolt condenses one rational revolutionary process of organization split by the primacy of practice: "The . . . should not and cannot remain entire, and final stages of a great struggle."

(the revolutionary class practice) is precise. Revolutionary history renounces the uninterrupted by stages: one sequential rupture from which the sequence is sought in its dialectical generality. History and tactic, organization, all have the same historical new, that which founds the sequence necessarily leaves outside the practice comes first in respect to the practice, the historical rupture as such, cannot be able, integrally, either to deduce the conditions and their organizing principles

nor the hidden essence.⁸ It is not a source, at least throughout a historical contradiction (bourgeoisie/proletariat).⁹ The organizing scansion (Commune, October,

Cultural Revolution . . .¹⁰), deploys such force of rupture that the long work of ruptures to come is needed to clarify the historical contribution of the masses, which is what sustains and what carries forward theory and organization, in an infinite approximation that is itself always split (battle of the two roads).¹¹ Who doesn't see that practice, by the Shanghai workers in 1967, of the "workers' commune" slogan returns to the practical, historical, inexhaustibility of the Paris Commune? And at the same time, the positive development of this slogan, in the new form of the three-in-one revolutionary committee, carries this return forward.¹²

From Paris 1871 to Shanghai 1967, revolt is the furnace [*fond*], the great production of class. From a just idea dismembered to a continental rupture, everything is there. The furnace of the class break, revolt, is without hearth and home [*sans feu ni lieu*].

The good fortune of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary has never been his ability to predict and assign the revolt, but rather the irreparable suddenness of its storm.¹³ Whatever weapons the Marxist-Leninist has assembled for the people—of organization, doctrine, prevision, patience, compactness of the proletariat—he will be judged according to his capacity to have them all taken away without warning by those who, suddenly rising up, are indeed destined to have them, but as a rule for later.

The revolt surprises Marxists-Leninists and their organization too. It must surprise, by a new kind of surprise. For the Marxists-Leninists must stand precisely where the surprise will slam right into them. The revolutionary, who professionally prepares himself for the mass rising, for the revolt's irruption, obviously can never be ready enough. Only for him does the historical "not ready" have a rigorous meaning, since what is ahead is for him alone, class struggle professional, what he ceaselessly prepares for. But he is not ready: were he ready, how could he have left the revolutionary potential of the proletariat, the sole asset of this preparation, in reserve? The Marxist-Leninist, who analyzes, predicts, directs, who alone knows the revolutionary potential at each moment, is precisely the one to ask the question of the revolt's hour.

What is at stake, for the Marxist-Leninist organization, is not to change the "it was for later" of its prevision, an approximating reserve of tactical composure, into the repressive "it's too early" of the Right. Here, its identity is played out all at once.

Marx before the Commune: the Parisian proletarian uprising is bound to fail, but I stand unconditionally by its side; its real movement instructs and reworks through and through the theory of my (correct [*juste*]) prevision: the historical failure, the proletarian uprising, works and displaces my prevision. It criticizes my prevision, even though it is correct, because it is correct.¹⁴

Mao and the peasant revolt of 1925–1927: the peasant revolt—very good. Fundamental. Our tactical application of the primacy of the proletariat, as urban insurrection, must explode into pieces. The peasants in revolt teach us that it is not the demand of the countryside, but the proletarian uprising that is premature. The masses' violent rupture carries this rationality to come: the encirclement of cities by the countryside.¹⁵

The Marxist-Leninist leader [*dirigeant*] is the one who sunders and splits him-

self, between the objective form of the rational revolutionary preparation and the unconditional and unconditionally immediate reason of the masses' revolutionary revolt, that which Lenin called the actual moment. May my enlightened preparation break apart and be verified by the fire of irrefutable historical unpreparation: such is the essence of Marxist-Leninist direction, the direction of the party!

There is no other direction but of the new. The old is managed, it is administered, it is not directed.¹⁶ The revolutionary direction scrutinizes the conflicted state of things,¹⁷ the class struggle, the clues accumulated during the proletariat's revolution in process. From there the leadership [*direction*] systematizes a guiding prevision that is both strategic and tactical. Let us take an example: since 1970, the revolt of the O.S.¹⁸ puts to work a dispersed program of class against capitalist hierarchy. Condensing this program as soon as possible, formulating combatant slogans that have its originary class power, we put ourselves forward, granted. But such an advance is but the point where a new assault wave is received and accumulates. Who clings to it too tightly, forever stays behind: with the Renault of '73 when it is about the Renault of '75.¹⁹

The same goes for analytical prevision: there is a capitalist crisis today, there will be an anti-capitalist revolt. This is Marxism. So, let's get ready: propaganda, worker schools, popular committees on anti-capitalist direct action. But where and on what will the masses make their violent judgment bear? This must be studied quite closely, enumerating the practical hypotheses, half-living in the work of the masses. Then and only then will the unexpected breach, armed with this previous work on itself, taking along the skeletal frame of a sketched organization, carrying its directing virtuality [*virtualité dirigeante*], draining and reworking the Marxist-Leninists' strategy, tear down the oppressive web as far as it can.

A correct [*juste*] line is the open road to the most powerful striking force of the proletarian irruption. The party is an instrument of knowledge and of war in an ever-widening space of maneuver and irruption. A correct line, a vanguard organization, an iron discipline, an organic relation [*liaison*] to the popular masses, a constant exercise of Marxist-Leninist analysis,²⁰ reclaimed and unraveled and reworked to the most minute detail, carried forward to the shadow of the trace of the new; the bark of class struggle pressed down to its imperceptible acid; everything interpellated by directives: all of this—the party—is needed for the revolutionary revolt to strike completely, past the meshes [of the situation], into the historical unicity of the new. The directive activity of the party must be tireless, perfect, exhaustive; as the unexpected revolt and the unicity of the revolutionary hour will demand of it that it be split again, beyond anything it could and in fact did foresee, and, inevitably constrained by the new of the class that casts it forward. At which point proletarian thought filters through and gathers anew, itself establishes its kingdom, before destroying it again: "There is no construction without destruction" (Mao).²¹ To which we add: without construction, there is no destruction - before destroying it there where nothing can be deducted or managed any more.

Marxism-Leninism and the idea of the class party go further than the anti-dialectical moralism of the theoreticians of desire. Moralism, yes, and of the dullest kind. Look at the two-column chart with which these jingly subversives would like

us to conclude:

"The two poles are defined, // the desiring-machines to the // large scale under a given form // the inverse subordination and // lar structured aggregates that // those that they retain in code // multiplicities of singularities // as so many useful materials for // integration and territorialization // them back, break them again // in such a way as to produce // nence peculiar to this system // that follow the decoded and // non-figurative breaks or schiz // the coded wall or the territorial // production; and, to summarize // defined by subjugated groups,

And this would be called "beyond all this subversive arm-pumping, and Necessity Evil?

Freedom, and by the way, what Deleuze and Guattari don't hide the with to exorcise the Hegelian ghost

For quite a while, I wondered between the sexual connotations and it up for that materialist feel. Well no less. It's the unconditional: a sensible order of ends, the whole generic energy, energy as such. That old freedom of autonomy, hastily r legitimately demands: some spit on

The rule of the Good, with Del by means of an amusing substituti so that the maxim of your actions to Kant what Marx is to Hegel, Del perative, but a desiring one; the un subject, but like a fluid flux. Sadly, same thing—and Deleuze's first acc and no reverse, that's even its very On the toboggan of Desire, the hea one side from the other, object fro Good or that, Evil is just a reversib always act so that the maxim of you

l revolutionary preparation and the reason of the masses' revolutionary ent. May my enlightened preparation able historical unpreparation: such is direction of the party!

w. The old is managed, it is admin- direction scrutinizes the conflicted accumulated during the proletariat's ip [*direction*] systematizes a guiding t us take an example: since 1970, the program of class against capitalist hier- sible, formulating combatant slogans selves forward, granted. But such an ve is received and accumulates. Who h the Renault of '73 when it is about

ere is a capitalist crisis today, there sm. So, let's get ready: propaganda, pitalist direct action. But where and dgment bear? This must be studied heses, half-living in the work of the ed breach, armed with this previous of a sketched organization, carrying raining and reworking the Marxist- eb as far as it can.

e most powerful striking force of the ment of knowledge and of war in an n. A correct line, a vanguard organi- *liaison*] to the popular masses, a con- claimed and unraveled and reworked e shadow of the trace of the new; the perceptible acid; everything interpel- eeded for the revolutionary revolt to ion], into the historical unicity of the e tireless, perfect, exhaustive; as the utionary hour will demand of it that d in fact did foresee, and, inevitably forward. At which point proletarian f establishes its kingdom, before de- hout destruction" (Mao).²¹ To which truction - before destroying it there y more.

s party go further than the anti-dia- e. Moralism, yes, and of the dullest n these jingly subversives would like

us to conclude:

"The two poles are defined, *the one* by the enslavement of production and the desiring-machines to the gregarious aggregates that they constitute on a large scale under a given form of power or selective sovereignty, *the other* by the inverse subordination and the overthrow of power; *the one* by these molecular structured aggregates that crush singularities, select them, and regularize those that they retain in codes or axiomatics, *the other* by the molecular multiplicities of singularities that on the contrary treat the large aggregates as so many useful materials for their own elaborations; *the one* by the lines of integration and territorialization that arrest the flows, constrict them, turn them back, break them again according to the limits interior to the system, in such a way as to produce the images that come to fill the field of immanence peculiar to this system or this aggregate, *the other* by lines of escape that follow the decoded and deterritorialized flows, inventing their own non-figurative breaks or schizzes that produce new flows, always breaching the coded wall or the territorialized limit that separates them from desiring-production; and, to summarize all the preceding determinations, the one is defined by subjugated groups, the other by subject-groups."²²

And this would be called "beyond Good and Evil" perhaps? All this cultural racket, all this subversive arm-pumping, only to slip us, at the end, that Freedom is Good and Necessity Evil?

Freedom, and by the way, what Freedom? "Subject-group," Freedom as Subject. Deleuze and Guattari don't hide this much: return to Kant, here's what they came up with to exorcise the Hegelian ghost.

For quite a while, I wondered what was this "desire" of theirs, stuck as I was between the sexual connotations and all the machinic, industrial brass they covered it up for that materialist feel. Well, it's the Freedom of Kantian critique, no more, no less. It's the unconditional: a subjective impulse that invisibly escapes the whole sensible order of ends, the whole rational fabric of causes. It's pure, unbound, generic energy, energy as such. That which is law unto itself, or absence of law. The old freedom of autonomy, hastily repainted in the colors of what the youth in revolt legitimately demands: some spit on the bourgeois family.

The rule of the Good, with Deleuze, is the categorical imperative upright again, by means of an amusing substitution of the particular for the universal: always act so that the maxim of your actions be rigorously particular. Deleuze would like to be to Kant what Marx is to Hegel, Deleuze flips Kant upside down: the categorical imperative, but a desiring one; the unconditional, but materialist; the autonomy of the subject, but like a fluid flux. Sadly, turn Kant, and you will find Hume, which is the same thing—and Deleuze's first academic crushes. Critical idealism has no obverse and no reverse, that's even its very definition. This is the Möbius strip of philosophy. On the toboggan of Desire, the head bobs down and up again, until it doesn't know one side from the other, object from subject, any more. All in all, that this be the Good or that, Evil is just a reversible matter of mood, with not much consequence: always act so that the maxim of your action does not, strictly, concern anybody.²³

Marxism-Leninism thinks of otherwise forceful "schizzes," ones that secure themselves otherwise to the material of history. The unity of opposites, the impossibility to grasp the One except as the movement of its own scission; the step-by-step struggle against all figures of reconciliation (two fuse into one: the essence of revisionism in philosophy); the refusal of all static dualisms, such as the moralism of desire, a structuralism full of shame. Yes, this is quite different from the catechism of the System and the Flux, the Despot and the Nomad, the Paranoiac, and the Schizo, all that, under the colorless banner of a freedom, invisibly leaks out [*coule*] its sterile other side.

It is so different that a major historical object, like a class party, completely evades the "schizo" grip precisely since it concentrates dialectical divisions to the extreme. The "schizos" imagine they are done with the concept of representation. The party "represents" the working class: it is Theater, image, territorial subjection. Obviously it must end with the Great Despot.

Bourgeois party, indeed, revised party: one facet, separately undecipherable, of the party as one in two. This theater is a necessary threat from the inside, as the party is itself split. Short of that, it is a cadaver. "If there were no contradictions in the Party and no ideological struggles to resolve them, the Party's life would come to an end" (Mao).²⁴

More than any other historical object, the party is one in two: the unity of the political project of the proletariat, of its state-project, the project of its dictatorship. And in this sense, yes: apparatus, hierarchy, discipline, renunciation. And so much the better. But at once, also, the historical flip side: the essential aspiration of the masses, whose organ, whose iron hand is the party, to the non-State, to communism. Which is what gives the party, as direction, all of its strategic content.

The party directs the withering of what it must direct (the State, the separation of politics). The party's only proletarian reality is the turbulent history of its own self-dissolution. "Concern yourself with the affairs of the State!" says Mao to the vast masses.²⁵ And this is the party's word, as communist party, precisely. The State is the serious matter, the central matter. The petit-bourgeois leftist wallows into the mass movement and parades there with delight. But when matters turn to power, to the State, when matters turn to dictatorship (because all state-power [*étatique*] is dictatorial), see how he gets all furious, clamoring loudly of the Right to Desire. He is even relieved: the shameful electoral rallying of all the "leftists" to the Mitterand-Marchais clique proves this, shows their appetite for bourgeois parliamentary politics, this dictatorship that squashes the people, but in the end lets all the intellectuals babble as they wish. In the end, the "leftist" political daydream is a mass movement that proceeds straight on until it is joyfully proclaimed that the State has quietly faded away. And since confusion belongs, invariably, to the thought of the vacillating classes, it will come as no surprise that this speaks both the true and the false.

The false, for the most part: the State is the only political question. The revolution is a radically new relation of the masses to the State. The State is construction. A rupture without construction is the concrete definition of failure, and most often in the form of a massacre: the Paris Commune, the Canton Commune, the anarchists of Catalonia

The true, nonetheless: it is true dialectic with the State. Between opposites. If the State is a proletarian antagonistic type.²⁶ If it is a State heart. But in either case a contract cannot concern themselves with the State, brutally or organically, toward the masses of the State, city and country, labor, the military and the civilian appearance.²⁷ The masses take hold of [set on] its withering away. Any other takes hold of the masses: bourgeois

Actually, each great revolt of the masses is a revolt against the State. Each revolt is a revolt of another, of one thought as a state revolt, across its specific contents: an anti-state proposition.

This is what puts the party through its own withering: it has no other chance, no other summons it addresses to the party. Here that the party (which, as apparatus, has its own permanent prevision toward the future) is taken into a temporary blindness by another party's state challenge [*sommation*] of the future. The party is always be eager to say "it is too early" what has already opened up, as another

Look at "The Crisis has Matured" passage from "it is too early" to "it is too late" pages where Lenin puts his resignation. Brutally bound together, we have:

1. The unforeseeable constraint of the masses is being practically in days.
2. The rational prevision of the future:
 - a. the wait-and-see approach of the masses (it is too early)
 - b. the Leninist anticipatory prevision of the party of the future: the masses in revolt brood over the future to practice our proper behavior or become nothing. If we wait, next we, the great Bolsheviks

Lenin says: there is a peasant uprising. The alternative "incredible" does not surprise. Kerensky's government protects capitalist interests. The masses that hoped to be liberated.

The true, nonetheless: it is true that the mass movement engages in a necessary dialectic with the State. Between the two there is no continuity, but rather unity of opposites. If the State is a proletarian State, the contradiction can be of the non-antagonistic type.²⁶ If it is a State of exploiters, the contradiction is antagonistic at heart. But in either case a contradiction exists, and a severe one, in that the masses cannot concern themselves with the affairs of the State other than by pushing the State, brutally or organically, towards its own dilution; by pushing the great dichotomies of the State, city and country, agriculture and industry, manual and intellectual labor, the military and the civilians, nation x and nation y , to pure and simple disappearance.²⁷ The masses take hold of the State with the communist design [*visée*] [set on] its withering away. Any other way and we can be sure that it is the State that takes hold of the masses: bourgeois State, party infected by the bourgeoisie.

Actually, each great revolt of the working and popular masses sets them invariably against the State. Each revolt takes position against one power and in the name of another, of one thought as a step toward the dilution of the state. Each extensive revolt, across its specific contents (the school, the country, factory hierarchy), is an anti-state proposition.

This is what puts the party through torture, while the masses' anti-state proposition has no other chance, no other way out than to see its summons succeed, the summons it addresses to the party or to that which takes the party's place. It is here that the party (which, as apparatus, as a real historical object, nourishes its own permanent prevision toward power, toward the State), summoned to fall into temporary blindness by another political thought, the one that brings out the anti-state challenge [*sommation*] of the masses, must overcome its own fear. Here it will always be eager to say "it is too early." And there is barely the time to fall over into what has already opened up, as another sequence of political thought.

Look at "The Crisis has Matured," this literally inspired, work of Lenin.²⁸ The passage from "it is too early" to "it is almost too late" solders in one block these pages where Lenin puts his resignation from the Central Committee on the scales. Brutally bound together, we have:

1. The unforeseeable constraint exerted by the popular uprising, accelerating practically in days.
2. The rational prevision of the party, itself in turn split into:
 - a. the wait-and-see approach [*attentisme*] of the Central Committee majority (it is too early)
 - b. the Leninist anticipation (only immediate insurrection brings the prevision of the party on par with the violent practice of the masses; the masses in revolt broke with the State: they summon us to direct, to practice our proper kind of rupture—the order of insurrection—or become nothing. If we reject the insurrection, from one day to the next we, the great Bolshevik party, become leftover riffraff).

Lenin says: there is a peasant uprising. "It is incredible, but it is a fact."²⁹ This objective "incredible" does not surprise us, Bolsheviks, who analyze the class struggle. Kerensky's government protects capitalists and landowners, it oppresses the peasant masses that hoped to be liberated. But the only revolutionary question is this: will

our broad theoretical prevision (our lack of astonishment) let itself be transformed, revolutionized, by the truly incredible reality of the peasant uprising? How will the party carry forward its correct prevision under the unforeseeable historical constraint of the irruption of popular forces? How will it formulate, in the direction of the vast masses, that which hits it in the face, this divided, sundered, immediate realization of what was given in the organized calm of Marxist knowledge? To this question, Lenin replies: immediate insurrection, whose signal, whose time, whose urgency, are in truth fully fixed by the movement of the masses, by concrete history. Meanwhile, so as not to infringe upon their necessary system of causes, ends and deadlines, the majority in the Central Committee persist in their perpetual "it is too early," sheltering thus their Marxist prevision from the storm. And Lenin, intuitively at the very heart of the popular rising, beside himself with rage, literally slashes through the party, bombards it with all that history demands: "[T]here is a tendency, or an opinion, in our Central Committee and among the leaders of our Party which favors *waiting* for the Congress of Soviets, and is *opposed* to taking power immediately, is *opposed* to an immediate insurrection. That tendency, or opinion, must be *overcome*."

Otherwise, the Bolsheviks will cover themselves with eternal *shame* and *destroy themselves* as a party.

For to miss such a moment and to "wait" for the Congress of Soviets would be *utter idiocy, or sheer treachery*.³⁰

The source of all the party's strength, against "sheer treachery" and self-destruction, lies in this: it is the party to whom history addresses its summons, the party that must remain steadfast as the movement escalates, the party whom the revolt questions as regards direction. You who have foreseen all and were thus at the heels of the irruption, what good is it to us now that you're close by? Will you remain close, or will you let yourself be left behind by this for which you said you were accountable?

Lenin is, here, the question cast from within by the revolutionary practice of the masses (the unforeseen, rupture) to the party's vocation to direct (prevision, project). This is the party as one in two, the working class itself as one in two: its apparatus on one side, its anti-state focus on the State on the other. From one to the other, the vertigo in the movement of history comes from the scission between a settled tactical rationality and a rupture that demands more than political rationality; that demands plunging into what the masses opened. Insurrection, Lenin will say, is an art. Not a science, an art.³¹

The party always directs the proletarian transition. The party is the dialectic. Its proper effect is the creative scission of the masses and the State as a directed process, as dictatorship of the proletariat.

The party is a being of the thresholds [*lisières*]. It holds out amidst the tearing apart [*écartèlement*] of the foreseeable theoretical, and the unforeseeable practical, of the project and the revolt, of the State and the non-State. "Fusion of Marxism-Leninism and the working-class movement," the classics would say.³² "Fusion" is a metaphor, it too must be divided. The party is the process of dialectical division of Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian movement. It is their torn encounter (*ren-*

contre écartelée], always to be re-
tarian movement, there is no co-
nor is there simultaneity; theory
ary revolt is in advance of this ac-
before the Paris Commune. But
a decisive advance on the quest

Yes, between Marxism-Leni-
it is a unity of opposites. The M-
tion [*contrariété*]. The party is t-
own class practice, sorts it out, p-
of its war, a stage realized, howe-
party apprehends is always both
but never exactly on the same p-
organization of the proletarian
assessment.

That is what Mao means to
selves are often childish and ign-
essence of communist direction
and ignorant, if it believes histo-
believes it can sidestep the hero-
irruption, in their practice, with

And Stalin: he emphasizes t-
time it is part of the working clas-
different from representation, it
of an image. The party is what c-
a threshold [*lisière*].

The party has an essential hi-
ened from within by bourgeois
ateness [*separé*] of the party. The
proletariat, is also its latent weak-
of the prevision; smother the no-
ent, give in to the shadows, aban-
the vigorous communism of the
the party's essential instability.

What makes Stalin and Mao
ences, which are enormous, is,
tarian project is ever to be recor-
the conviction that all inertia to
mechanical adjustment. Lenin, S-
tionary mechanism, the pacifist
formism and revisionism. The p-
to its own class practice in terms
be adjusted in turn: since the par-
Against this threat, nothing but
Mao part completely, but this d-

contre écartelée], always to be remade. Between Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian movement, there is no coincidence (neither spontaneism, nor theoreticism), nor is there simultaneity: theory is in advance, but the movement of the revolutionary revolt is in advance of this advance. Marx did say "dictatorship of the proletariat" before the Paris Commune. But the Commune, which enacts this slogan, is no less a decisive advance on the question of this dictatorship.

Yes, between Marxism-Leninism and the workers' movement there is unity, but it is a unity of opposites. The Marxist-Leninist party is the existence of this opposition [*contrariété*]. The party is that blind spot from which the proletariat grasps its own class practice, sorts it out, purifies it, concentrates it and prepares another stage of its war, a stage realized, however, by the masses, not by the party, so that what the party apprehends is always both in front of it (the project) and behind it (the revolt), but never exactly on the same plane. The party is the ever transposable [*déplaçable*] organization of the proletarian present, as the split unity of the prevision and the assessment.

That is what Mao means to say: "The masses are the real heroes, while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant."³³ "The mastery of Marxism-Leninism is the essence of communist direction. It is the solidity of science. But it is also childish and ignorant, if it believes history can be done by delegation, by representation, if it believes it can sidestep the heroic wisdom of the masses, the wisdom given in their irruption, in their practice, without appeal.

And Stalin: he emphasizes that the party certainly does direct, but at the same time it is part of the working class, its detachment.³⁴ Detachment is something quite different from representation, it is the opposite: the proletarian party is the opposite of an image. The party is what cuts, what detaches. It is a body of the class at its cut: a threshold [*lisière*].

The party has an essential historical instability. This is why it is constantly threatened from within by bourgeois forces of restoration, which take hold on the separateness [*separé*] of the party. The party, which concentrates the directive force of the proletariat, is also its latent weakness, its worst threat. Repress the revolt in the name of the prevision; smother the new in the name of legitimacy; crush the living present, give in to the shadows, abandon the mobile threshold; put up the State against the vigorous communism of the masses: the bourgeoisie does not cease to work on the party's essential instability.

What makes Stalin and Mao great proletarian leaders, aside from their differences, which are enormous, is, among other things, the conviction that the proletarian project is ever to be reconquered, ever unstable and corroding from within; the conviction that all inertia tends towards restoration; that there is no place for mechanical adjustment. Lenin, Stalin, Mao critique ever more profoundly the reactionary mechanism, the pacifism, the treachery of wait-and-see in the form of reformism and revisionism. The party, according to which the proletariat adjusts itself to its own class practice in terms of the project, in terms of state-construction, must be adjusted in turn: since the party is where the greatest burdens accumulate as well. Against this threat, nothing but a counter-threat will do. From here on, Stalin and Mao part completely, but this divergence lies within the history of the proletariat,

within the dialectical movement of Marxism-Leninism.

Stalin saw only one possible counter-threat: terror, everywhere. Be tirelessly wary, above all of the party (practically exterminated in the thirties) then of the masses as well, at the slightest suspicion of softness or resistance, during the magnificent industrial upheaval.

Mao set out from the same idea: the transition submits this dialectical object, the party, to a severe test. And it is a long transition: "A very long period of time is needed to decide 'who will win' in the struggle between socialism and capitalism."³⁵ But the answer turns Stalin's upside down. The answer is this: have tireless confidence, above all in the masses (confidence in the masses is the central element of the counter-threat), then in the party too, and especially in the torn correlation of the two: proletarian cultural revolution, which is at the same time an assault of the masses, their anti-state focus on the State, against the reactionary stabilizers of the party, and the reconstitution, regeneration, revolutionization of the party itself as instability, as threshold, as dialectical inductor of communism.³⁶

To these astounding dialectics of history, to these unstable objects, these proletarian risings of unheard-of violence and richness, what do the little professors oppose, from their ambush full of desire?

What do they oppose, here as well, to the toil of prevision and of revolt immersed at the deepest in the workers' divisions, which constitutes the unparalleled affirmative power of Maoist militants? What can they capitalize on against these thoughts, real in themselves, ever recast and traversed through and through by proletarian interpellations? Is there anything of value [equal to] the project of letting the idea of the party be torn from one's hands by the masses, that which, in France, is not yet established, not yet decided upon, but still to be proposed and remade? What kind of "desire" will ever equal the one deployed throughout the profound entanglements and countercurrents of our history, the one Marxist-Leninists formulate: to hand back to the working class the question of its communist party of the new type?³⁷

What is the final word of these hateful adversaries of all organized revolutionary politics? Read: to complete "this process that is always and already complete as it proceeds."³⁸ In effect, to seep out like pus.

In the end, such maxims are innocent. Look at them, these old Kantians who pretend they're playing at scattering the trinkets of Culture. Look at them: the time is nigh, and they're already covered in dust. ■

Translated by Laura Balladur and Simon Krysl. Originally published as "Le flux et le parti: dans les marges de L'Anti-Oedipe," in Alain Badiou and Sylvain Lazarus, eds., La Situation actuelle sur le front philosophique, Cahiers Yenan no. 4 (Paris: Maspero, 1976): 24-41. Having introduced the early '70s philosophical conjecture in France, the collection brings together interventions against Deleuze ("Deleuze en plein"), Lacan and Lacanians ("Sous Lacan"), and Dominique Lecourt for the Althusserians ("La compagnie d'Althusser"). Badiou's essay is the first in the Deleuze intervention. The translators wish to thank Bruno Bosteels, Roland Ferguson, Eva Poskocilova, Ingo Schaefer, and Alberto Toscano, whose help made the translation and the notes possible.

- 1 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (New York: Viking, 1977), 377 [translation]
- 2 The expression is Lev Trotsky's. See (1930) in Max Eastman's translation: trotsky.works/1930-hrr/choo.htm. Badiou's Maoist writings, between the Communist history beyond any slogans, to the words and phrases—Hallward points out the ensuing philosophy—in Badiou: *A Subject to Truth* (49-50.) Rather than to assign—warily, let us merely take note of this
- 3 Lenin, "Lessons of the Revolution" (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964)
- 4 *Ecole de cadres* is a divided term. It is a day school, weekend cadre school, or "May Cadre Schools") of the Cultural Revolution. The 1966 directive on the integration of cadres names "school for managers" or "managerial school" which will change with the historico-political conjuncture.
- 5 The first factory occupation of 1966 was at the Renault factory in Nantes. Here, as in the Shanghai Cotton Textile Mill, workers occupied the factory and declared their independence from union leadership, inaugurating the Cultural Revolution's "big weeks." Control over the city of Shanghai was in the hands of the revolutionary forces. Workers' control or working-class hegemony is accepted as a goal for the whole.—Tr.
- 6 Both quotations attributed to Mao Zedong.
 1. "Where there is oppression, there is revolution" [《哪里有压迫，哪里就有革命》]. For all its future resonance, the phrase in Chinese sources suggest its source in Mao's interview with Richard Nixon in 1971. The phrase in his interview with Nixon is reprinted in Snow, *The Long March* (191-223). The quotation in question is in Badiou's *Communiqué*, see *Peking Review* 9 (March 20, 1972): 35-38. For an analysis of the phrase "the masses" in the Popular Masses" (*Xiangjiang*) in *Collected Works of Mao Tse-Tung* and in Stuart R. Schram, *China in Revolution*, the Chinese original is available online at <http://www.marxists.org/engels/works/collected-works/mao-tse-tung/1972-03-20.htm>.
 2. "One has reason to revolt against the bourgeoisie and the reactionaries" [《对反动派，我们有理由进行革命》].

minism.
 : terror, everywhere. Be tirelessly
 inated in the thirties) then of the
 ess or resistance, during the mag-

on submits this dialectical object,
 ion: "A very long period of time is
 between socialism and capitalism."³⁵
 answer is this: have tireless confi-
 e masses is the central element of
 specially in the torn correlation of
 at the same time an assault of the
 st the reactionary stabilizers of the
 lutionization of the party itself as
 communism.³⁶

these unstable objects, these pro-
 nesses, what do the little professors

of prevision and of revolt immersed
 constitutes the unparalleled affirma-
 capitalize on against these thoughts,
 rough and through by proletarian
 to) the project of letting the idea of
 s, that which, in France, is not yet
 proposed and remade? What kind
 ghout the profound entanglements
 exist-Leninists formulate: to hand
 munist party of the new type?³⁷

aries of all organized revolutionary
 always and already complete as it

at them, these old Kantians who
 of Culture. Look at them: the time

nally published as "Le flux et le parti:
 and Sylvain Lazarus, eds., *La Situation*
 4 (Paris: Maspero, 1976): 24-41. Hav-
 n France, the collection brings together
 an and Lacanians ("Sous Lacan"), and
 ernie d'Althusser"). Badiou's essay is the
 o thank Bruno Bosteels, Roland Fergu-
 o, whose help made the translation and

- 1 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (New York: Viking, 1977), 377 [translation slightly modified].
- 2 The expression is Lev Trotsky's. See "Preface" to the *History of the Russian Revolution* (1930) in Max Eastman's translation (1932) online at <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/works/1930-hrr/choo.htm>. This is not the place to explore the dialectic, in Badiou's Maoist writings, between the radical novelty of the rupture(s) and the continuity of Communist history beyond any single sequence, or between Maoist disregard for mere words (see Badiou's *Théorie de la contradiction*, [Paris: Maspero, 1975], 90) and fidelity to the slogans, to the words and phrases that make up the language of this history. (Peter Hallward points out the ensuing change in Badiou's conception of history—and philosophy—in *Badiou: A Subject to Truth* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), 49-50.) Rather than to assign—were it useful or possible—each element of this vocabulary, let us merely take note of this feature of Badiou's writing.—Tr.
- 3 Lenin, "Lessons of the Revolution" (July 1917), *Collected Works*, 4th English ed., vol. 25 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964), 229 [translation modified].
- 4 *Ecole de cadres* is a divided term. It refers, on the one hand, to "cadre schools" (party Cadre school, weekend cadre school, etc.) or specifically the political reform schools ("7th May Cadre Schools") of the Cultural Revolution, set up in 1968 and named after the May 7, 1966 directive on the integration of intellectual and manual labor; on the other hand, it names "school for managers" or more specifically, "business school." The actual meaning will change with the historico-political conjecture.—Tr.
- 5 The first factory occupation of 1968 France took place on May 14 at Sud-Aviation near Nantes. Here, as in the Shanghai Commune, the proletariat entered the revolution. Workers occupied the factory and declared indefinite strike without consent on control of the union leadership, inaugurating the general strike that swept across France in the following weeks. Control over the city of Nantes passed, effectively if momentarily, into the hands of the revolutionary forces. Whether "co-operation" between workers and students or working-class hegemony is accented will express one's positions on May 1968 as a whole.—Tr.
- 6 Both quotations attributed to Mao Zedong.
 1. "Where there is oppression, there is resistance" [*Nǎ lǐ yǒu yāpò, nǎ lǐ jiù yǒu fǎnkàng*]. For all its future resonance, the origin of the phrase is elusive: some Chinese sources suggest its source may not be in Mao's writings at all. Mao used the phrase in his interview with Edgar Snow (January 9, 1965): it continued to recur during the Cultural Revolution and was forced into—of all places—the Joint Communiqué from Richard Nixon's 1972 visit to China. The interview, "South of the Mountains to North of the Seas," appeared in several newspapers in the West and is reprinted in Snow, *The Long Revolution* (New York: Random House, 1971), 191-223. The quotation in question appears on page 204. For the Joint Communiqué, see *Peking Review* 9 (March 3, 1972): 4-5 and *Department of State Bulletin* (March 20, 1972): 35-38. For an earlier reference, see Mao's "The Great Union of the Popular Masses" (*Xiangjiang pinglun*) 2-4 (July 21-August 4, 1919), translated in *Collected Works of Mao Tse-Tung, 1917-1949*, vol. 1 (Arlington: JPRS, 1978), 26 and in Stuart R. Schram, *China Quarterly* 49 (January-March 1972): 87. The Chinese original is available online at <http://www.gongfa.com/minzhongdalianhe.htm>.
 2. "One has reason to revolt against reactionaries" or "It is justified to revolt against reactionaries" [*Dui fǎndòngpài, zhàofǎn yǒu lǐ*]. Mao coined the phrase in his 1939

"Stalin is our Commander" speech, made in Yanan to celebrate Stalin's 60th birthday: "There are innumerable principles of Marxism, but in the last analysis they can all be summed up in one sentence: 'To rebel is justified.' For thousands of years everyone said: 'Oppression is justified, exploitation is justified, rebellion is not justified.' From the time when Marxism appeared on the scene, this old judgment was turned upside down, and this is a great contribution." (*Renmin ribao*, September 20, 1949, translated in Stuart R. Schram, *The Political Thought of Mao Tse-Tung*, rev. ed. (New York: Praeger, 1969), 427–428.) The thought is attributed to Marx, its elaboration into doctrine and into reality to Stalin. In 1966, the phrase appeared on two big character posters in Beijing (*Peking Review* 37 [September 9, 1966]: 19–21). The extended version used here comes from Mao's reply. ("A Letter to the Red Guards of Tsinghua University Middle School," [August 1, 1966], translated in Stuart Schram, ed. and intro., John Chinnery and Tiejun, trans., *Chairman Mao Talks to the People: Talks and Letters: 1956–1971* [New York: Pantheon, 1974], 260–261.)

See Badiou's analysis of *les trois sens du mot "raison"* [three senses of "reason"] in *Théorie de la contradiction*: "The phrase says all according to the dialectic: a simple that divides itself. What concentrates this division, what supports it, while apparently occulting it, is the word 'reason': there is reason, the revolt has reason, a new reason stands up against the reactionaries. Through the word 'reason,' the phrase says three things, and the articulation of the three makes up the whole" (21). The revolt is reason, practice is primary to theory. Marxism formulates the reason of the revolt, beyond its particular causes: the cumulative wisdom of the masses through history, the antagonism that underlies the obstinacy of the revolt. But the revolt "has reason" also in the practical sense: the proletariat will win. The revolt will "bring to reason" [*rend raison*], settle accounts with the exploiters for all oppression. The phrase bespeaks, then, the split fusion of the objective and the subjective, of wisdom and perspective: the "fusion of Marxism and the real workers' movement" articulates the two. The knowledge (Marxism) summed in this very phrase is the reason of the revolt, the for-itself of the proletariat, where the revolt returns to reinforce itself. That the revolt has reason *against reactionaries* is, finally, the core of the sentence, the "internal condition of truth": not, as it may appear, a selective limit imposed upon it as an afterthought. Revolt has reason in contradiction and scission, in criticism and self-criticism, ever against those who keep things the same.—Tr.

- 7 Mao Zedong, "Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), *Selected Works*, vol. 3 (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1965), 118.—Tr.
- 8 See also Badiou, *Théorie du sujet* (Paris: Seuil, 1982), 217. In Bruno Bosteels's translation: "I posit that there exists no intrinsic unknowable. This can be said clearly with Mao: 'We can learn what we did not know.' Except to add that what we did not know before was determined as leftover from that which just came to be known, at the crossover of the movement without a name by which the real poses a problem and the retroaction, named knowledge, that offers a solution." Mao's quote is from his "Report to the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee of the Communist Party of China" (1949), *Selected Works*, vol. 4 (Beijing: FLP, 1965), 374. We are thankful to Bruno Bosteels for this reference.—Tr.
- 9 See Mao Zedong, *On Contradiction* (1937), chapter 4, "The Principal Contradiction and the Principal Aspect of a Contradiction," *Selected Works*, vol. 1 (Beijing: FLP, 1965), 331–336.—Tr.
- 10 Ellipses here and throughout are Badiou's.—Tr.

- 11 Antagonistic contradictions under party as the battle of two roads (bourgeoisie), and two lines (revolt by peasants and the agricultural de the "23 articles" of January 14, 1965 the capitalist road." (Only much later 23 articles, see Richard Baum and *Movement of 1962–1966* (China Research Studies, 1968), app. F, 120. The content of the CC circular of May 16, 1966 (*People's Daily*), and the CC CCP Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution: Selected Works, 162–182. Being antagonist, the scission "middle" is always on side of the re-
- 12 The 1967 Shanghai People's Commune split the industrial proletariat into the party and the masses as seizure of power. In January, the party initiated the reorganization of the party committees and production teams themselves, from wages to work points, and revolutionary intellectuals of the party and the masses, the rebellion, the Shanghai "direct organs, as well as reannounced in the party in control of revolutionizing the economy.

The Paris Commune example of the 19th century, including the 1966 "Sixteen Point" program, to reannounce this history was also crushed by Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolution. The *Commune*, the local and the universal, fragments the proletariat and the party. In 1967, Real "contradictions among the masses"—peasants or youth forced to create new power structures. Within the party, the revolution remained undecided between various workers' organizations. In Mao's interventions, the Communist Party Central Committee and in the "triple revolution" (the army, and the cadres, the relative work points, sense of "totalitarian expropriation" and isolated), Badiou sees, consistent with his theory, an invention of political form in the

- 13 As Mao writes in "A Single Spark Can Start a Fire": "How then should we interpret the high tide of revolution?" The party is not fortune-tellers. The direction of future development is determined day and the hour in a mechanical fashion. The high tide of revolution in China is a reality which in the words of some pe-

en to celebrate Stalin's 60th birth-
 rxisism, but in the last analysis they
 ebel is justified.' For thousands of
 xploitation is justified, rebellion is
 eared on the scene, this old judg-
 reat contribution." (*Renmin ribao*,
 ram, *The Political Thought of Mao*
 27-428.) The thought is attributed
 eality to Stalin. In 1966, the phrase
 g (*Peking Review* 37 [September 9,
 comes from Mao's reply. ("A Letter
 le School," [August 1, 1966], trans-
 ninner and Tiejun, trans., *Chair-*
 : 1956-1971 [New York: Pantheon,

" [three senses of "reason"] in *Théorie*
 o the dialectic: a simple that divides it-
 s it, while apparently occulting it, is the
 a new reason stands up against the re-
 says three things, and the articulation
 s reason, practice is primary to theory.
 nd its particular causes: the cumulative
 onism that underlies the obstinacy of
 ractical sense: the proletariat will win.
 e accounts with the exploiters for all
 sion of the objective and the subjective,
 n and the real workers' movement" ar-
 ned in this very phrase is the reason of
 e revolt returns to reinforce itself. That
 t, the core of the sentence, the "internal
 ive limit imposed upon it as an after-
 cision, in criticism and self-criticism,

s of Leadership" (June 1, 1943), *Selected*
 65), 118.—Tr.

2), 217. In Bruno Bosteels's translation:
 This can be said clearly with Mao: 'We
 hat what we did not know before was
 to be known, at the crossover of the
 a problem and the retroaction, named
 om his "Report to the Second Plenary
 e Communist Party of China" (1949),
 are thankful to Bruno Bosteels for this

r 4, "The Principal Contradiction and
Works, vol. 1 (Beijing: FLP, 1965), 331-

- 11 Antagonistic contradictions under dictatorship of the proletariat are expressed in the party as the battle of two roads (socialist and capitalist), two classes (proletariat and bourgeoisie), and two lines (revolutionary and revisionist). "Two roads" were first taken by peasants and the agricultural development, in the "socialist education movement." In the "23 articles" of January 14, 1965, Mao spoke of the "power-holders in the party that go the capitalist road." (Only much later were Peng Zhen and Liu Shaoqi named.) For the 23 articles, see Richard Baum and Frederick C. Tewes, *Ssu-Ch'ing: The Socialist Education Movement of 1962-1966* (China Research Monographs, UC Berkeley Center for Chinese Studies, 1968), app. F, 120. The concept is omnipresent in the Cultural Revolution: see the CC circular of May 16, 1966 (*Peking Review*, May 19), as well as the "Decision of the CC CCP Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution," in K.H. Fan, *The Chinese Cultural Revolution: Selected Documents* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1968), 162-182. Being antagonist, the scissions in the party allow no middle road; any "golden middle" is always on side of the reaction.—Tr.
- 12 The 1967 Shanghai People's Commune, announced on February 5, marks the entry of the industrial proletariat into the Cultural Revolution, the beginning of the revolution as seizure of power. In January, the rebel worker groups seized the party paper, forced reorganization of the party committee and proceeded to assume the conditions of production themselves, from wages to organization of labor. (Both Beijing rebel students and revolutionary intellectuals of the Cultural Revolution leadership were at the birth of the rebellion, the Shanghai "directives" were soon affirmed by Mao and the central party organs, as well as reannounced in the central press: a split unity of the workers and the party in control of revolutionizing the state.) For the original texts, see K. H. Fan, *op. cit.*
 The Paris Commune example had been invoked throughout the Cultural Revolution, including the 1966 "Sixteen Point" Central Committee decision (Fan, 169). In Shanghai, to reannounce this history was also to speak of the March 1927 Shanghai Commune, crushed by Chiang Kai-shek's coup. The objective contradiction between *Shanghai* and *Commune*, the local and the universal, the promise of an industrial center that effectively fragments the proletariat and the political demand of workers as workers reappeared in 1967. Real "contradictions among the people" were not resolved in the seizure: temporary workers—peasants or youth forced from the city by lack of work—continued to challenge new power structures. Within the totality of the country (of state power), the chances of the revolution remained undecided: any weakness on its part, continuing inside struggles between various workers' organizations, a failure of production, could and would be used by the structures and tendencies it ruptured. The name lasted a mere three weeks. After Mao's interventions, the Commune's steering committee became "Shanghai Revolutionary Committee" and in the "triple alliance" [sānjiéhé] of mass rebel organizations, the army, and the cadres, the relative weight of the latter two displaced the rebels. Against the sense of "totalitarian expropriation" of a workers' revolt (however abstract, fragmented, and isolated), Badiou sees, consistently with his argument against Deleuze's anarchism, an invention of political form in the concrete conjuncture.—Tr.
- 13 As Mao writes in "A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire" (1930):
 "How then should we interpret the word "soon" in the statement, "there will soon be a high tide of revolution"? This is a common question among comrades. Marxists are not fortune-tellers. They should, and indeed can, only indicate the general direction of future developments and changes; they should not and cannot fix the day and the hour in a mechanistic way. But when I say that there will soon be a high tide of revolution in China, I am emphatically not speaking of something which in the words of some people "is possibly coming," something illusory, un-

attainable and devoid of significance for action. It is like a ship far out at sea whose mast-head can already be seen from the shore; it is like the morning sun in the east whose shimmering rays are visible from a high mountain top; it is like a child about to be born moving restlessly in its mother's womb."

See his *Selected Works*, 1.127.—Tr.

- 14 Aside from *The Civil War in France* (New York: International Publishers, 1988) itself, see Marx's letters to Ludwig Kugelmann on the Paris Commune, April 12 and 17, 1871 (online at www.marxists.org), as well as Lenin's introduction to the letters. In *Commune de Paris: une déclaration politique sur la politique* (Paris: Les Conférences du Rouge-Gorge, 2003), Badiou recapitulates Marx and Brecht on the Commune, as well as the Chinese "reactivation" of the Commune between 1966 and 1971, before proceeding to the "logic of the Commune," in terms of his *Logic of Worlds*. Our thanks to Bruno Bosteels for this information.—Tr.
- 15 On the peasant revolt, see Mao Zedong's "Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan," *Selected Works*, 1.23–59.
 "Encircle the cities by the countryside" [*nóngcūn bāowèi chéngshì*] defines Mao's conception of the guerrilla war. The metaphor, taken from the *weiqi* table game, dates to 1930 or earlier (the struggle against Li Lisan and the tensions with the Comintern); Mao developed it in his 1938 anti-Japanese war writings. (*On Protracted War*, *Selected Works*, vol. 2 [Beijing: FLP, 1965], §54, 146–147; *Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War against Japan*, idem, 79–112; the report to the 6th Plenum of the 6th CC CPC, "On the New Stage," excerpted in Stuart Schram, ed., *The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung*, 288–90.) Lin Biao's "Long Live the Victory of People's War," written to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the victory in the anti-Japanese war (*Renmin Ribao* September 3, 1965; English by Foreign Language Press, 1965) applies it as a global-political directive, in a double sense: everywhere, liberation struggles are peasant struggles, making the Chinese military strategy pertinent generally; through the allegory of "cities and villages of the world," encirclement becomes a sweeping notion of world revolution. The allegory originates with Bukharin and the Comintern program of September, 1928: Mao had projected the strategy's global-political pertinence, in *Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War against Japan* (102), without relying on the trope.—Tr.
- 16 As Bruno Bosteels has pointed out to us, the opposition of management [*gestion*] and politics proper (what here is *direction*) returns in Badiou's later writing, after the Maoist works, as well. See *Saint Paul: The Foundation of Universalism*, trans. Ray Brassier (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 12. Analogous oppositions, or "occlusions," are then posited regarding other truth procedures: sexuality and love, culture and art, technology and science.—Tr.
- 17 The wordplay of "Etat" and "état" ("State" and "state [of the situation]") is prominent in Badiou's later work. The main explanation is found in "L'état de la situation historico-sociale," meditation 9 of *L'Être et l'événement* (Paris: Seuil, 1988), 121–128.—Tr.
- 18 *Ouvriers spécialisés*, unskilled workers. O.S., mostly immigrant workers, were key in the Maoist mobilizations in post-May France.—Tr.
- 19 Strikes of the O.S. at Renault-Billancourt, in March–April 1973 and at Renault, of truck drivers in the spring and of line workers in December, 1975. See Laure Pitti, "Grèves ouvrières versus luttes de l'immigration: une controverse entre historiens," in Sylvain Lazarus, ed., *Anthropologie ouvrière et enquêtes d'usine, Ethnologie française* 31/3 (2001): 465–476. The general context of the change is the incoming economic crisis on the one hand, and the "unity" of the electoral, revisionist Left—long dreamt about and for this reason all the

more disappointing—after 1972 of the rupture between the demand antagonist contradiction, of the negotiable claim to "equal pay for equal work," and the claim that to determine the sequence of production of hierarchies (granting a place of continuing workers' pressure against

- 20 See Lenin, "Left-Wing' Communism," 31 (Moscow: Progress, 1964), 23.—Tr.
- 21 Mao Zedong, "On New Democracy," 20 (Moscow: Progress, 1964), 23.—Tr.
- 22 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Brian Massumi (London: Bantam, 1977), 161. [translation modified].
- 23 The obvious subtext regarding Deleuze's reading of Feuerbach's—and early Marx's—reading of Hegel is Brewster (London: Allen Lane, 1970), 39 and *passim*. The notion of contradiction (*Théorie de contradiction*) of inheritance that links Deleuze's reading of Stirner's "egoism," through Max Stirner's *The German Ideology*, as both aspects of the principal, contradiction of abstract axis of "domination," through the revolution is then possible, just as the place of Stirner's "egoism," through the dialectic and history.—Tr.
- 24 Mao Zedong, *On Contradiction*, 31 (Moscow: Progress, 1964), 23.—Tr.
- 25 Mao's statement at "meeting the workers," 34 (August 19, 1966): 9 [translation modified].
- 26 See Mao Zedong, *On Contradiction*, 31 (Moscow: Progress, 1964), 23.—Tr.
- 27 "Three major distinctions" [*san da chengguo*] in communism. After Marx (in the *Manifesto*), see the "Resolution on the Establishment of the Communist Party," 1958, *Peking Review* 29 (September 1958), 29. Mao's "Talk to the Leaders of the Central Cultural Revolution Commission," 1966, www.maoism.org. In *Théorie du sujet*, Badiou asks: "Are these great millenary structures of the city and country, between industrial and agricultural labor—which it is communism's error to divide—In his forthcoming *Le Siècle*, Badiou asks: "Are these great millenary structures of the city and country, between industrial and agricultural labor—which it is communism's error to divide—In his forthcoming *Le Siècle*, Badiou asks: "Are these great millenary structures of the city and country, between industrial and agricultural labor—which it is communism's error to divide—"

on. It is like a ship far out at sea
shore; it is like the morning sun in
m a high mountain top; it is like a
mother's womb."

International Publishers, 1988) itself, see
Commune, April 12 and 17, 1871 (on-
duction to the letters. In *Commune de
ris: Les Conférences du Rouge-Gorge,*
the Commune, as well as the Chinese
1971, before proceeding to the "logic
Our thanks to Bruno Bosteels for this

rt on an Investigation of the Peasant

in *bāowèi chéngshì*) defines Mao's con-
rom the *weiqi* table game, dates to 1930
nsions with the Comintern); Mao de-
On *Protracted War*, *Selected Works*, vol.
rategy in *Guerrilla War against Japan*,
6th CC CPC, "On the New Stage," ext-
of *Mao Tse-tung*, 288–90.) Lin Biao's
commemorate the 20th anniversary of
September 3, 1965; English by Foreign
al directive, in a double sense: every-
making the Chinese military strategy
and villages of the world," encirclement
The allegory originates with Bukharin
Mao had projected the strategy's global-
rrilla War against Japan (102), without

osition of management [*gestion*] and
Badiou's later writing, after the Mao-
n of *Universalism*, trans. Ray Brassier
alogous oppositions, or "occlusions,"
s: sexuality and love, culture and art,

te [of the situation]") is prominent in
nd in "L'état de la situation historico-
s: *Seuil*, 1988), 121–128.—Tr.

y immigrant workers, were key in the

ch—April 1973 and at Renault, of truck
ber, 1975. See Laure Pitti, "Grèves ouv-
se entre historiens," in Sylvain Lazarus,
nologie française 31/3 (2001): 465–476.
economic crisis on the one hand, and
reamt about and for this reason all the

more disappointing—after 1972 on the other. The victorious 1973 strike brought forward the rupture between the demands and the strategies of the workers and the unions. This antagonist contradiction, of the union demand for *negotiations* and the workers' non-negotiable claim to "equal pay for equal work," the demand for the "objective" standard of hierarchy, and the claim that the workers determine what is equal to what, continued to determine the sequence of proletarian struggle throughout the '70s. Both a refinement of hierarchies (granting a place on a wage ladder to all, including the former O.S.) and a continuing workers' pressure against them ensued from the strike.—Tr.

- 20 See Lenin, "Left-Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder" (1920) *Collected Works*, vol. 31 (Moscow: Progress, 1964), 23.—Tr.
- 21 Mao Zedong, "On New Democracy" (January 1940), *Selected Works*, 2.369 and elsewhere.—Tr.
- 22 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (New York: Viking, 1977), 366–367 [translation modified].
- 23 The obvious subtext regarding Deleuze's turning upside down of Kant is Althusser on Feuerbach's—and early Marx's—reversal of Hegel. See Althusser's *For Marx*, trans. Ben Brewster (London: Allen Lane, 1969), 35–39 and *Reading Capital*, trans. Ben Brewster (London: NLB, 1970), 39 and *passim*. Elsewhere, theorizing with Mao the principal aspect of contradiction (*Théorie de contradiction*, 70–82), Badiou has shown the repressed line of inheritance that links Deleuze—and fellow "postmodern" or petit-bourgeois philosophers of the '68 aftermath—through Luxemburg, Bakunin, and Proudhon to the "Saint Max" Stirner of *The German Ideology*. If principal and secondary contradictions, as well as both aspects of the principal, class contradiction, are articulated in equivalence on the abstract axis of "domination," then there is no logical escape than abstract identity. No revolution is then possible, just subjective "revolt" or, rather, withdrawal. "Desire" takes the place of Stirner's "egoism," structuralism and anarchy mirror each other, opposed to the dialectic and history.—Tr.
- 24 Mao Zedong, *On Contradiction*, *Selected Works*, 1.317.—Tr.
- 25 Mao's statement at "meeting the masses" in Beijing on 10 August, 1966 in *Peking Review* 34 (August 19, 1966): 9 [translation modified].—Tr.
- 26 See Mao Zedong, *On Contradiction*, chapter 6, "The Place of Antagonism in Contradiction," *Selected Works*, 1.343–345.—Tr.
- 27 "Three major distinctions" [*san da chabie*] which shall be overcome on the path to communism. After Marx (in the *Manifesto* and the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*) and Lenin (*State and Revolution*), see the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPC, "Resolution on the Establishment of People's Communes in the Rural Areas," August 29, 1958, *Peking Review* 29 (September 16, 1958): 22, as well as, during the Cultural Revolution, Mao's "Talk to the Leaders of the Centre" (July 21, 1966) or "Talk at the Meeting of the Central Cultural Revolution Group" (January 9, 1967), *Selected Works*, vol. 9, online at www.maoism.org. In *Théorie du sujet*, Badiou writes: "Transversal to class conflicts, there are these great millenary structural invariants, these three 'major differences'—between city and country, between industry and agriculture, between manual and intellectual labor—which it is communism's entire aim to abolish" (in Bruno Bosteels's translation). In his forthcoming *Le Siècle*, Badiou discusses the tendency to reestablish and sharpen the dichotomies—corresponding to the "capitalist road"—in post-Mao China. See "One Divides into Two," trans. Alberto Toscano, online in *Culture Machine* 4,

- chine.tees.ac.uk/Cmach/Backissues/j004/Articles/badiou.htm.—Tr.
- 28 Lenin, "The Crisis Has Matured" (October, 1917), *Collected Works*, trans. Yuri Sdobnikov and George Hanna, 4th English ed. (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964), 74–85. Slavoj Žižek has taken up the play of "too early" and "almost too late" in "Repeating Lenin" (online at www.lacan.com) and in "Georg Lukács as the philosopher of Leninism," his postface to Lukács's *A Defence of "History and Class-Consciousness": Tailism and the Dialectic*, trans. Ester Leslie (London: Verso, 2000), 162–166. See also Badiou's *Théorie du sujet*, 186 and following. The account follows John Reed, *Ten Days that Shook the World*, chap. 3, online at www.bartleby.com.—Tr.
- 29 "In a peasant country, and under a revolutionary, republican government which enjoys the support of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties that only yesterday dominated petty-bourgeois democracy, a peasant revolt is developing. Incredible as this is, it is a fact." "The Crisis has Matured," 77. Lenin uses the phrase many times ("The Agrarian Program of the First Russian Revolution," 1907; "A good resolution but a bad speech," 1913; "Proletarian Revolution and Kautsky the Renegade," 1918, and others).—Tr.
- 30 "The Crisis has Matured," 82. Italics in Lenin's original.—Tr.
- 31 "What has the Party done to *study* the disposition of the troops, etc? What has it done to conduct the insurrection as an art? Mere talk in the Central Executive Committee, and so on!" Lenin's note to "Crisis Has Matured," 83n.—Tr.
- 32 Throughout the history of Marxism after Marx and Engels, "fusion of Marxism and proletarian practice," the Leninist version of the "unity of theory and (revolutionary) practice," punctuates Marxist theory of organization. The latter is the threshold of Marxist thought and Communist politics: here, in the concept of fusion, theory comprehends their scission, their contradiction. Lenin determines the working class party through the fusion of socialism and the working class movement in "The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement" (1900) *Collected Works*, trans. Joe Fineberg and George Hanna, vol. 4 (Moscow: Progress, 1972), 368; "A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy" (1899), *idem.*, 257, and in "Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder," 23–4. Rosa Luxemburg's polemic with Lenin in "Organizational Questions of Russian Social Democracy" concerns the content of this notion above all. See Lenin's "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back: The Crisis in Our Party" *Collected Works*, vol. 7 (Moscow: Progress, 1972), 203–425. Luxemburg's 1904 text, in the 1934 edition, is available online at www.marxists.org. Mao Zedong first discusses the notion in the late '30s ("The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War" [1938], *Selected Works*, 2.209 and *passim*). It comes to the fore in the rectification movement of 1942, a struggle against those who both theorize instead of organizing work and apply foreign, Soviet models onto Chinese practice. The same concept, rather than mere "Sinification" of Marxism, remains at stake: the concrete determination by Chinese revolutionary practice reconstitutes, rather than to negate the universal claim. "Dialecticizing" a concept of the legalist philosopher Han Fei Zi (280–233 BCE), Mao uses the metaphor of the fusion between an *arrow* and a *target* ("Rectify the Party's Style of Work" [February 1, 1942], in *Selected Works*, 3.38, 42). Yet the concept the two characters name is contradiction (*mao dun*): in Han Fei Zi, the logical contradiction of an arrow that pierces anything and a target that cannot be pierced, in Mao, two opposites that both repulse and presuppose each other. As Badiou insists here, "fusion" is not immediate unity, it does not oppose the general dialectical law of "one divides into two" [*yī fēn wèi èr*], to which he has remained faithful. See "One Divides into Two." The concept must be divided: in the major controversy on the Cultural Revolution philosophical front, the revisionist "two

fuse into one" [*hé èr ér yī*] of Yang "one divides into two." The contradiction of the USSR as well as to all "post-revolutionary" practice, the history of Marxism has no tension with it. (Badiou takes up the contradiction, 61–66. See also "No Discussion Concerning Comrade One," *Peking Review* 37 [September 1971]: 6–11.)

In France, the concept of "fusion" was the '60s conjecture: Badiou or Althusser, *For Marx*, 16; Althusser, *Éléments de philosophie dialectique*, vol. 1 [Stock/IMEC, Paris 1965].

In the opening blurb in the *Year of the Flood* and Sylvain Lazarus ask: "from what we are, what is to be retained, and that which is to be taken, here and now, so that the crisis in the original]. New French materialism, *the Spectacle* to Deleuze. Georges Bataille, *La Situation actuelle sur le terrain*," *La Situation actuelle sur le terrain*, "one becomes two," on whose basis the dialectic. We thank Bruno Bosteel.

- 33 Mao Zedong, "Preface and Postscript," *Selected Works*, vol. 1 (Beijing: FLP, 1977), 1.
- 34 Joseph Stalin, "On the Problems of Leninism" (1926), *Collected Works*, vol. 2 (Moscow: Progress, 1972), 132 and *passim*. See www.marx2mao.org. Stalin quotes Lenin in *Collected Works*, vol. 29 (Moscow: Progress, 1972), 132.
- 35 Stalin's theory of transition in "On the Program of the Workers' Party of the Soviet Union" to this effect, *Collected Works*, vol. 5 (Beijing: FLP, 1977), 423 [translated in *Contradictions among the People* (1971), 132].
- 36 "We must have faith in the masses and their fundamental principles. If we doubt these principles, we will lose the masses." *On the Co-operative Transformation of the Countryside*, his "Critique of Stalin's *Economic Problems of Soviet Economics*, trans. Moss (1953), 132. Stalin writes that "Stalin's book from first to last is concerned with people; it considers the interests of the peasants (135)."—Tr.
- 37 Revolutionary, not parliamentary "type" is a constant concern in Badiou's political work from within the *Parti communiste* and E. Terray, *Contribution au programme d'un type nouveau* (Paris: Maspero, 1971), 132. It was developed by Lenin at the 1917 Congress of Western Social Democracy and

badiou.htm.—Tr.

Collected Works, trans. Yuri Sdobnikov
Progress Publishers, 1964), 74–85. Slavoj
Žižek “too late” in “Repeating Lenin” (on-
line philosopher of Leninism,” his post-
consciousness”: *Taoism and the Dialectic*,
See also Badiou’s *Théorie du sujet*, 186
in *Days that Shook the World*, chap. 3.

republican government which enjoys
Menshevik parties that only yesterday
revolt is developing. Incredible as this
in uses the phrase many times (“The
1,” 1907; “A good resolution but a bad
of the Renegade,” 1918, and others).—

inal.—Tr.

of the troops, etc? What has it done to
the Central Executive Committee, and so
r.

Engels, “fusion of Marxism and prole-
of theory and (revolutionary) practice,”
ter is the threshold of Marxist thought
fusion, theory comprehends their scis-
working class party through the fusion
“The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement”
George Hanna, vol. 4 (Moscow: Progress,
Democracy” (1899), idem., 257, and in
23–4. Rosa Luxemburg’s polemic with
Social Democracy” concerns the content
ward, Two Steps Back: The Crisis in Our
1972), 203–425. Luxemburg’s 1904 text,
exists.org. Mao Zedong first discusses
these Communist Party in the National
comes to the fore in the rectification
both theorize instead of organizing work
practice. The same concept, rather than
the concrete determination by Chinese
to negate the universal claim. “Dialec-
Fei Zi (280–233 BCE), Mao uses the
erget (“Rectify the Party’s Style of Work”
the concept the two characters name is
a contradiction of an arrow that pierces
ao, two opposites that both repulse and
ion” is not immediate unity, it does not
into two” [yī fēn wèi èr], to which he
.” The concept must be divided: in the
philosophical front, the revisionist “two

fuse into one” [hé èr ér yī] of Yang Xianzhen stands precisely against the Marxist-Leninist
“one divides into two.” The controversy is relevant to the struggle between two roads, to
the USSR as well as to all “post-capitalism” convergence theories. Regarding theory and
practice, the history of Marxism is full of fusions of opportunist practice and theory in
no tension with it. (Badiou takes up Yang’s philosophy of “reconciliation” in *Théorie de la
contradiction*, 61–66. See also “New Polemic on the Philosophical Front: Report on the
Discussion Concerning Comrade Yang Hsien-chen’s Concept that ‘Two Combine into
One,’” *Peking Review* 37 [September 11, 1964]: 9–12 and “Theory of ‘Combine Two into
One’ is Reactionary Philosophy for Restoring Capitalism,” *Peking Review* 17 [April 23,
1971]: 6–11.)

In France, the concept of “fusion” emerges, as classical, in French Maoism and across
the ’60s conjecture: Badiou or Althusser use it without having to quote. (See note 7 above;
Althusser, *For Marx*, 16; Althusser, “Marx dans ses limites,” *Écrits philosophiques et poli-
tiques*, vol. 1 [Stock/IMEC, Paris 1994], 371–387.)

In the opening blurb in the Yanan collection volumes (not in the present one), Badiou
and Sylvain Lazarus ask: “from what the anti-revisionist struggles in China and Albania
are, what is to be retained, and transformed, to battle revisionism in France? What way is
to be taken, here and now, so that Marxism and the real workers’ movement fuse?” [empha-
sis in the original]. New French misreadings have also appeared, from Debord’s *Society of
the Spectacle* to Deleuze. Georges Peyrol’s “Potato Fascism” (“Le fascisme de la pomme de
terre,” *La Situation actuelle sur le front philosophique*, 42–52) takes up the mistranslation
“one becomes two,” on whose basis Deleuze and Guattari, in “Rhizome,” do away with the
dialectic. We thank Bruno Bosteels for his suggestions on these points.—Tr.

- 33 Mao Zedong, “Preface and Postscript to Rural Surveys” (1941), *Selected Works*, 3.12.—Tr.
- 34 Joseph Stalin, “On the Problems of Leninism” (1926), *Problems of Leninism* (Moscow:
FLP, 1940), chap. 5, 132 and *passim*; online as “Concerning Questions of Leninism” at
www.marx2mao.org. Stalin quotes Lenin’s “Greetings to Hungarian Workers” (1919), *Col-
lected Works*, vol. 29 (Moscow: Progress, 1965), 388.—Tr.
- 35 Stalin’s theory of transition in “On the Problems of Leninism” quotes Lenin’s “Greetings
to Hungarian Workers” to this effect. The quotation here is from Mao Zedong’s “Speech at
the CPC National Conference on Propaganda Work” (March 12, 1957), in *Selected Works*,
vol. 5 (Beijing: FLP, 1977), 423 [translation modified]. See also *On the Correct Handling of
Contradictions among the People* (February 27, 1957), *Selected Works*, 5.409.—Tr.
- 36 “We must have faith in the masses and we must have faith in the Party. These are two car-
dinal principles. If we doubt these principles, we shall accomplish nothing.” Mao Zedong,
On the Co-operative Transformation of Agriculture (July 31, 1955), *Selected Works*, 5.188. In
his “Critique of Stalin’s *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*” (1958), in *A Critique
of Soviet Economics*, trans. Moss Roberts (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977), Mao
writes that “Stalin’s book from first to last says nothing about the superstructure. It is not
concerned with people; it considers things, not people. ... The basic error is mistrust of
the peasants (135).”—Tr.
- 37 Revolutionary, not parliamentary, party as subject. The project of the “party of a new
type” is a constant concern in Badiou’s Maoist, militant thought, beginning from his po-
litical work from within the *Parti socialiste unifié*. See Badiou, H. Jancovici, D. Menetrey
and E. Terray, *Contribution au problème de la construction d’un parti marxiste-léniniste
de type nouveau* (Paris: Maspero, 1970), as well as *Théorie du sujet*, 38. The concept itself
was developed by Lenin at the 1912 Prague party conference that refused the party model
of Western Social Democracy and split the Bolshevik party from the Mensheviks. It has

received its canonic formulation in *History of the CPSU(b): Short Course* (New York: International Publishers, 1939), 138–142, 172. English online at www.marx2mao.org.

The instance and concept of the party, so central here, are put aside in further development of Badiou's philosophy—if indeed the logic of abandoning them does not compel the transformations—as well as in his politics today. See Peter Hallward's "Politics and Philosophy: An Interview with Alain Badiou," app. to Hallward's translation of *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil* (London: Verso, 2001), 95, but also the theses *Qu'est-ce que l'Organisation Politique* (Paris: Le Perroquet, 2001) and online at www.organisation-politique.com.) Yet, (*Groupe pour la Fondation de l'Union des Communistes de France Marxiste-Léniniste*, Badiou's Maoist organization, did not consider itself a party even before it "re-began," shedding some of its Maoist legacy, as *Organisation Politique*. As A. Belden Fields observes in his *Trotskyism and Maoism in France and the United States* (chap. 3, online at www.maoism.org): "The UCFML has made no claim to be a party, as have the other two organizations [*Parti Communiste Marxisie-Léniniste de France*, *PC-MLF*, and *Parti Communiste Révolutionnaire (marxiste-léniniste)*, PCR(m-l)]. In fact, it has not even claimed to be a 'union' yet, but a 'group' for the formation of a 'union.' It has readily admitted that it does not yet have a mass base which would entitle it legitimately to refer to itself as a party. It also questions the legitimacy of the PCMLF and the PCR(m-l) so doing." Many thanks to Bruno Bosteels for his suggestions on this point.—Tr.

38 Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 382.