

ADAM LOUIS KLEIN (New York)

**Peace between Trotskyism and Maoism:
Non-Maoism and Double Superposition**

Abstract

Non-Philosophy is a rigorous practice that can have useful applications for academic researchers and political activists alike. Utilizing its methods and frameworks, it is possible to bring Peace into the endless War of sectarian tendencies in which "the Left" is mired. In the following paper, we apply the technique of Non-Philosophy to Josh Moufawad-Paul's pamphlet "Maoism or Trotskyism," taking it as an instance of occasional material to be transformed. An important aspect of this analysis is a syntactical deployment of Non-Philosophy not always found in non-philosophical texts: here our dualysis proceeds by *double* (and not only single) superposition. We effectuate *two* non-philosophical clones, using the first in order to recursively effectuate a second. First, we transform Trotskyism by isolating its philosophical and auto-positional structure, then we use this radicalized Trotskyism in order to transform Moufawad-Paul's Maoist polemic. The result is a radicalized Maoism-Trotskyism opening the way towards a productive and integrative Peace between Trotskyism and Maoism.

Keywords: François Laruelle, J. Moufawad-Paul, Non-Philosophy, Maoism, Trotskyism, Marxism

Non-Philosophy in-Struggle

Today capitalism is manifesting once again its fundamentally crisis-ridden and thwarted nature. The Crisis cuts the social body and the specters of fascism (not always so spectral) reemerge. Where is the so-called Left, the authentically politicized Left that might herald what Alain Badiou has called "The Idea of Communism," posing it as a real and effective alternative to auto-poetic Capital, relentlessly absorbing the social in both intension and extension? It is often remarked that the specifically and explicitly Marxist or Communist Left has been in shambles for a long time, mired in sectarian squabbles and near-irrelevancy. Might there be an *immanent reason* for this, and could not we locate this reason, not exactly to "transcend" it, but to radicalize its own resources? Indeed, the thinking of Non-Philosophy allows us to isolate *the dogmatic and aporetic structure* that under-

lies sectarianism, and to transform such a structure into an integrative Peace between tendencies, a Peace in-struggle.

In this text, we will isolate such an aporetic and philosophical structure at play in the conflict between Maoism and Trotskyism. We will see how the *polemical form*, here exhibited in Josh Moufawad-Paul's Maoist polemic "Maoism or Trotskyism"¹ articulates an unsolvable circularity that must be transformed if we are to radicalize communist theory and practice. The productive and integrative Peace between Trotskyism and Maoism that emerges will find its concrete image in the figure of the united front.

When bringing together Maoism and Trotskyism, it is true that we cannot deny the deep sectarianism, orthodoxy, and conformism that runs through much of present day Trotskyism, especially in the Anglophone world. In fact, taking up a 'politics of the Real' might already seem to privilege Maoism, and yet a non-philosophical treatment demands that we renounce any transcendent access: any birds-eye view of the two tendencies whereby we might perform a mediating synthesis. We must at all costs avoid a banal, "centrist" Marxism, or even an unrigorous eclecticism. It is necessary to approach Maoism and Trotskyism from a *single side*, that is, uni-versally. This is the side of the foreclosed Real, which allows us to subtract from the conflictual and hierarchical duality of "Trotskyism vs. Maoism." There is no meta-language, in politics especially; nor is there a "balance" between Maoism and Trotskyism. If anything, their only common core is what throws them both into a certain *imbalance*.

Yet such an imbalance can and will show itself to be a productive and integrative discordance, since irreducible to philosophical War: the war of opinions, positions, dogmas, and polemics. It is an imbalance that arises from allowing the Real to be given-without-giveness. In order to achieve such a discordant harmony requires here that we know how to handle the precise, formal operations of the non-philosophical technique that we shall employ. First, however, we must elucidate what we mean by the aporetic structure of the polemic.

Polemic as Aporia and War

Moufawad-Paul's text "Maosim or Trotskyism" is not a vulgar text. As he assures us, "to ask the question 'Maosim or Trotskyism' as a Maoist is to try to investigate Trotsky-

¹ The polemic features as an appendix to Josh Moufawad-Paul's *Continuity and Rupture: Philosophy In The Maoist Terrain* (2016).

ism as a competing ideological current and to perform this investigation not to make sectarian points because of some religious adherence to the signifier 'Maoist' but in order to point out why Maoism rather than Trotskyism is a necessary theoretical rallying point if we want to make revolution" (Moufawad-Paul 2016, 230). For Moufawad-Paul, the question is to determine whether or not Maoism or Trotskyism is better suited as a theory and practice of revolution that has learned from the past and is relevant to the present and future. The real problem is ultimately that Trotskyism is a "theoretical tradition that has so far proven itself incapable of being a revolutionary science" (Moufawad-Paul 2016, 231). This is because, quite simply, Trotskyism is a "dead-end" having shown itself incapable of making revolution, the very *point* of communist politics (Moufawad-Paul 2016, 233). This incapacity, Moufawad-Paul thinks, can be located in the basic Trotskyist theory of Permanent Revolution.

One cannot help but be impressed by Moufawad-Paul's desire to engage the problem from the standpoint of a genuine, ideological line struggle that aims to clarify and strengthen political practice. On top of this, his arguments are persuasive and illuminating. He at least seems to show that within the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution "there is a tension here between the desire to break away from dogmatic applications of historical materialism and the gut reaction to stay within the safe territory of a "pure" Marxism" (Moufawad-Paul 2016, 237). That is, there are indeed *theoretical* reasons that might help us understand contemporary Trotskyist Conformism. However, there are at least several moments in the essay when one cannot help but think a kind of strawman of Trotskyism is emerging, in particular when Moufawad-Paul argues that Trotskyists "examine the failure of the Soviet Union as the result of an evil individual who possessed the power to produce a bureaucracy devoted to his nefarious plans (the kind of analysis that belongs in fairy tales and fantasy fiction), [while] Maoists try to make sense of the failures of the Soviet Union in a historical-materialist manner" (Moufawad-Paul 2016, 254). Surely, a consistent Trotskyist would give a *social* reason for this failure: the backward character of the productive forces, the material conditions.

But let us ask somewhat naively, yet with our non-philosophical goals in mind: how would a strawman *not* end up being produced here? Isn't it the character of these "debates," of these polemics that strive to give a kind of "proof" of their position, demolishing the other side once and for all, that there will always be a last vestige, a last refuge from where to cry "strawman!'"? Indeed, we can even notice, empirically, the proliferation of polemics

that arose in order to counter Moufawad-Paul², and even if we find Moufawad-Paul's "more convincing," do we not see here a kind of ever-present possibility, that of an endless *back-and-forth*?

Non-Philosophy identifies the structure of Philosophy as possessing something like this "back-and-forth" movement of the polemic. A more formal definition of Philosophy will be given below, but suffice it to say that Philosophy encompasses polemic due to three of its features: arbitrariness, auto-position, and totalization.

The arbitrariness of Philosophy indicates the necessity for a "first premise" (which is different from an axiom in the non-philosophical sense), which can also mean the initial *field of operation* that Philosophy takes. Auto-position is correlative to arbitrariness, meaning that it is none other than the position of Philosophy itself which 'Decides' to posit itself there – according to this or that premise, enacting its operations in this or that field. Lastly, totalization accounts for the attempt not only to operate according to a self-positing field, but to *reflectively over-determine* this field, limiting it, enclosing it and securing disclosure and determination according to its own terms.

Relative to polemic this means that, qua arbitrarily positing, the polemicist always "misses" another possible space of position, from which the opponent can then declare a strawman, and also reciprocally auto-position. As auto-position, polemic is incapable of extending towards this outside-space, to exist 'beyond' the original premise or field in which it has anchored itself. Lastly, as totalization, Polemic takes itself to be "demolishing," or once and for all invalidating the other side, though this can only result in a "transcendental appearance" given the relativity of its initial position. These three features collectively determine the philosophical, and thus polemical, structure as being *relative-absolute*, as Laruelle puts it. The arbitrariness of the posit taints Philosophy with inherent relativity, while its pretention to totalization and thus absoluteness gives it a dogmatic form. The "back-and-forth" movement is engendered by the space of "debate" that thus emerges: the possibility of continued auto-position from either side, due to the reproducibility of the aforementioned conditions. This is Polemic's status as War, as *polemos*. This War is aporetic: as long as auto-position is operative, there is no solution to the polemics that will wage "on both sides," and strawmen are constitutively possible, even inevitable.

² See Downing 2016 as well as Goldner 2012.

Formal Exposition of Non-Philosophical Technique

The wager here is that a non-philosophical treatment will allow us to transform, while simultaneously radicalizing, this War, this *polemos*, opening up the possibility of an integrative Peace-in-struggle. We will lay out the Non-Philosophical operations we will employ first of all in a formal manner.

There are three moments to be identified in a non-philosophical process (a dualysis):

1) An axiomatic (non-)positing of the Real. We call this a (non-)positing because it does not start from an "intuitively" given premise. It is stated in an *axiomatic* way, using terms drawn from occasionally provided materials, defined implicitly by their operation. This allows the (non-)posit to act as neutralizing *bracket* or *epoché*, allowing the Real to be *given* (without a horizon of givenness) and undermining Philosophical pretensions. The Real is The One. It is *immanent-(to-)itself*.

2) Philosophical Invariant. The Philosophical Invariant is the auto-positional structure of those practices and discourses that must be transformed by Non-Philosophy. It is a structure based on foundational Decisions that split the Real-One and proceed to mediate and over-determine this split (a 2/3 or 3/2 configuration). The axiomatic (non-)positing of the Real underdetermines the pretensions of such foundational Decisions (1). Such an auto-positional structure can receive other 'names'³: Philosophy, but also World, Capital, Conformism, or Orthodoxy, etc. In this text, we add Polemic.

3) The clone of Philosophy (or of World, Capital, Conformism, etc.). The clone is Non-Philosophy, this thinking itself. It requires materials provided by those practices and discourses that come ready-made in their auto-positional structure (2). Through an axiomatic (non-)positing of the Real (1) the structure of these materials are depotentialized and are opened up for a usage which is in accordance with the Real, or in immanent identity. The practice of Non-Philosophy is simultaneously the isolation and identification of the philosophical invariant (2) and its transformation through the axiomatically (non-) posited given that is the Real (3).

³ The discursive 'stuff' of Non-Philosophy consists of a repository of such names. These involve the names used in the axiomatic statements that (non-)posit the Real, the names which indicate the philosophical invariant, and also the "non" that signals the cloning operation. The relation between such names is an order-relation and non-commutative *syntax* – not graphically, but with respect to conceptual function.

Though we have three moments, Non-Philosophy is a procedure of *dual-ysis*, not a 3/2 structure of dialectical mediation like Philosophy. The outcome of Non-Philosophy consists only of the Real and the clone, which is simply the material first received in auto-positional form, as transformed by the Real. The dual structure is in-One, as the clone is only a relative autonomy determined-in-the-last-instance by the radical autonomy of the Real-One. It is a unilateral duality *without mediation or transcendent synthesis*.

A Case Requiring Double Superposition

How might this method be applied to the Trotskyist-Maoist War? We must analyze a given discourse as material, locate its philosophical structure, and construct from it a clone that will be determined-in-the-last-instance by the Real. Here we are dealing with two discourses as material – Maosim and Trotskyism - and we wish set them into play. For this reason, this text will attempt to engage a non-philosophical process not always found in the existing works of Non-Philosophy –we will produce *two clones* and set these clones in relation to each other.

In order for us to avoid all transcendent mediation and synthesis – any kind of ‘Marxist centrism’ or eclectic Compromise– we must make sure that we do not leave the confines of dualysis. We cannot take two clones and synthesize them by a third term. The key here will be to employ a recursive process that is uni-versal all the way down. Laruelle often represents the cloning operation as a kind of $1+1=1^4$. The clone is added to the Real, but the Real remains unaltered, in immanence and in-One: so the result remains 1. If the idea of $1+1=1$ accounts for a single cloning process, we could say that a recursive use of clones conforms to the idea of $1+1+1=1$. We are dealing with something like an idempotent operation recursively applied to its own results. We arrive at a superpositional fusion of the two clones – let’s call it Maosim-Trotskyism. Such is an operation of double superposition.

Concretely, the strategy we will follow is to first clone Trotskyist discourse, taking as our material Leon Trotsky’s work *The Permanent Revolution*. Our Trotskyist clone will be an Internationalism thwarted by a ‘peasant’ Real. Then, we will superpose this radicalized Trotskyist clone upon J. Moufawad-Paul’s Maoist polemic. The result will be a complex theoretico-discursive object manifesting the atonal unity of a united front.

⁴ As one example, see Laruelle 2012.

Non-Trotskyism as Internationalist Clone

Axiomatic (non-)positing of the Real – Revolutionary Internationalism.

Philosophical Invariant – The Theory of the Permanent Revolution forms an auto-positional doublet in relation to The Theory of Socialism In One Country, or "Stalinism."

Transcendental science-pragmatics – Non-Trotskyism as Internationalist clone.

Here our non-philosophical treatment in a certain sense runs parallel with what Moufawad-Paul has accomplished in his polemic, if only in so far as to locate the tendency to Trotskyist conformism in the nature of the theory of Permanent Revolution. Where it differs is a theoretical treatment whose own form is irreducible to Conformism as such, that is, a form that has subtracted itself from the endless back-and-forth of the strawman. Indeed, what is at issue in Trotskyism's Conformist structure is a doublet whereby the conflict between Trotskyism and "Stalinism" is elevated to a universal position, indeed according to the terms of Trotskyism (3/2 structure). This is perhaps the real core of the monolithic usage of the term "Stalinism" of which Moufawad-Paul complains (Moufawad-Paul 2016, 241). As Trotsky writes, "the theory of socialism in one country, which rose on the yeast of the reaction against October, is the only theory that consistently and to the very end opposes the theory of the permanent revolution" (Leon Trotsky 1931, 143), and at the same time, "the theory of the permanent revolution now demands the greatest attention from every Marxist, for the course of the class and ideological struggle has fully and finally raised this question from the realm of reminiscences over old differences of opinion among Russian Marxists, and converted it into a question of *the character, the inner connections, and methods of the international revolution in general*" (Trotsky 1931, 143) (my emphasis). The doublet of Permanent Revolution and Socialism In One Country is indeed meant to envelop the conflict between communist revolution and its fidelity and counter-revolution understood on a global scale: "the struggle is between the basic ideas of Marx and Lenin on the one side and the eclecticism of the centrists on the other" (ibid., 145).

Indeed, this problem cannot be adequately confronted without understanding the complexities of *fidelity* to revolution, and much of Trotsky's *Permanent Revolution* involves a certain amount of quibbling as to whether or not he and Lenin had always been on the same page regarding the basic notions that the Permanent Revolution expresses, indeed, whether or not his theory his faithful to revolution and to "the basic ideas of Marx and Len-

in." As is historically the case, it is the problematics of fidelity to revolutionary events that originally raises all the problems of splits and divergences within a movement. Following revolutionary change, the basic question becomes: how to move forward? To be fair, we could even see the dyad that envelops Trotsky's discourse as a question of preserving the *singularity* of a revolutionary event that places certain irreconcilable demands on how to bear forth its continuation, thus indeed requiring that "the question of program is in turn inseparable from the question of two *mutually exclusive theories*" (ibid.,145) (my emphasis).

We are thus dealing with a general problem of revolution: the almost necessary fact of splits due to the character of fidelity to a singular event. Even as these splits arise from the authentic desire to carry through such an event –without ceding or comprising on its revolutionary potential –the dyadic nature of the different branches of fidelity harbors the inherent possibility of an ossification into the 3/2 structure of a self-enclosed and Conformist auto-position, as each fidelity attempts to assert itself as the "one true way."

In a world decades after the fall of the Berlin Wall, but wherein the communist program once again must be revived and be put on the order of the day, the question is *how to retain yet reinvigorate* fidelities, such that they might "merge," intersect, and develop without compromise. To preserve this fidelity, let us *axiomatically (non-)posit the Real kernel of Trotskyism, i.e Internationalism*. The core of communist revolution and human emancipation is a worldwide movement: Revolution is Internationalist or it is nothing.

Yet, this internationalism as deployed in Trotsky's work seems to meet its limits in the "problem of the peasantry." It is notable that most of the debate between Trotsky and those grouped behind Stalin centers around the role of the peasantry, and it is this that continues to rage as the point of contention between Trotskyists and Maoists, in so far as Maoists accord a far greater revolutionary potential to the peasants under certain conditions. Here again we have a conflict between two fidelities, this time Maoism and Trotskyism, each in fact claiming a fidelity to Lenin/Marx. One might say whereas Trotsky aims to show his essential concordance with Lenin, Mao develops his theories as a concordance with Lenin that is modulated and transformed by the application to Chinese conditions. *Maoism* then understands this application to have ultimately introduced new and universal elements into Marxism: what J. Moufawad-Paul calls a relationship of "continuity and

rupture."⁵ Is it not that the peasantry forms a kind of symptomal point in the discourse that surrounds the Trotskyist dyad of Permanent Revolution and Socialism In One Country? And is it not this point that allows Trotskyist discourse to operate a kind of exclusion whereby Maoism is invalidated – grouped in with "Stalinism" – *a priori*? Indeed, this is the core of the problem.

Interestingly, Trotsky maintains that in so far as Lenin came to side with him with respect to the question of the peasantry, still for Lenin the relationship of the proletariat and the peasantry "retained a somewhat algebraic character" (ibid., 141). The quantities and proportions of this relationship, as well as its party-political form, were left underdetermined. It is this determination and fixation of algebraic variables that Trotsky provides, ensuring us that he remains faithful to Lenin. The peasant must be definitively subordinated to proletarian leadership, for "no matter how great the revolutionary role of the peasantry may be, it nevertheless cannot be an independent role and even less a leading one" (Leon Trotsky 1931,1451). But is not this algebraic character of Lenin's position exactly the point where there is a *necessary* indeterminacy? In other words, we move in Trotsky from indeterminacy to determinacy. Is this not the moment where a Decision, or at least the possibility of the 3/2 auto-positional structure begins to constitute itself?

A non-philosophical treatment in fact holds itself at the level of this "algebra." It interprets the variables of a problematic 'one time, each time,' admitting that the Real can only ever be *modelled*. In this sense, (non-)positing the Real as Internationalism means that this Internationalism can never be prematurely closed by a too hasty auto-positional determination: a "transition from variables to constants" that would take itself to be more than a simple model which responds to a given conjuncture. Uni-versality, however, arises in this "infinite" possibility of modelization, in so far as "Internationalism" is only ever a "maxim." It is the Real upon which we cannot compromise, but which only *receives its name* from the given material (here, from Trotsky/ism).

Non-Trotskyism, we will say, is an Internationalism, faithful to Lenin, refusing to capitulate to class collaboration and "bureaucratic" degeneration, though always allowing itself to 'rest at' its algebraic character. This so even as at every moment we *must* determine, must act, must *model*, but it is only ever that.

⁵ Per the title of his book *Continuity & Rupture: Philosophy In The Maoist Terrain*, in which "Maoism or Trotskyism" features as an appendix. The concept of "continuity and rupture" accounts for how "Marxist science" must retain fidelity to past events, while at the same time rupturing with outdated theories that must be updated according to practico-revolutionary experience.

It is exactly at this level that there is no contradiction with Maoism. Non-Trotskyism is of an "algebraic" nature, and the class compositions which model it in terms of a present political struggle remain to be "filled in." The process of this filling in and modeling is an experimental practice for which all the works of Trotsky and other Trotskyists can serve as tools.

Application of Double Superposition

Axiomatic (non-)positing of the Real – Cultural Revolution.

Philosophical Invariant – The Polemical Form as auto-positional, reintroducing Capital into the communist movement.

Transcendental science-pragmatics – Continuity-and-rupture-between-Maoism-and-Trotskyism as clone of J. Moufawad-Paul's Maoist polemic. Reinitiating of fidelity in a superposed manner, making use of Non-Trotskyism.

It is time to insert our Non-Trotskyist clone into the problematic of J. Moufawad-Paul's polemic, performing a double superposition. Of course, in the context of Moufawad-Paul's polemic, the polemical form ensures an infinitesimal receding of the strawman relative to Trotskyism. Indeed, Moufawad-Paul's goal is to disqualify Trotskyism, to exclude it once and for all from any hope of fidelity, from any genuine continuity and rupture, which accounts for the dynamics of authentic revolutionary fidelity. Is this discursive operation even possible relative to *Non-Trotskyism*?

It is evident that it is not. In the hands of Non-Trotskyism, The Theory of the Permanent Revolution is more like a set of "maxims" or "principles" which are modelled by Trotskyist materials in the always-conjunctural struggle against Stalinism. Wherever there is something like Stalinism, Non-Trotskyism has the means to intervene and be politically efficacious. Non-

Trotskyism then acts as a basic kind of *resistance* to J. Moufawad-Paul's polemic, for it has side-stepped its very structure. Thus, our Non-Trotskyist clone becomes the starting point for a cloning operation upon Moufawad-Paul's text in a recursive manner.

Moufawad-Paul is intent on showing his reader that while Trotskyism is a "dead-end," Maoism is innovative, and that it has managed to build on past revolutionary experiences to develop new theories with a universal scope: this is part of its "continuity and

rupture" (Moufawad-Paul 2016, 230). Of particular importance are the transformations in theory and practice developed in response to the experience of the Cultural Revolution. The experience of the Cultural Revolution changes communist practice in at least two ways: 1) we now know that class struggle continues under socialism, and in particular expresses itself at the ideological level 2) a "party of a new type"⁶ requires that Cultural Revolution is in a sense there from the beginning, constituting part of a constant line struggle and ideological self-criticism to ensure commitment to the proletarian cause. Whereas according to Moufawad-Paul, Trotskyists attribute the failures of the Soviet Union to an evil individual with nefarious plans (a possible point of entry for a strawman), Maoists have a robust theory of possible degeneration that takes into account class struggle and the role of ideology.

If we take Maoism seriously, we can see to what degree Maoism at least harbors the possibility of admitting a political practice in itself capable of undoing auto-positional structures, in so far as it rests on constant ideological critique and the need to constantly reground itself in the Real of class struggle. Such in fact makes Maoism quite close in spirit to Non-Philosophy. And yet, this does not mean that Maoism has expunged itself of auto-positional circles, as is of course evidenced by Moufawad-Paul's polemic. Here, we attempt to purify and radicalize Maoism using the material that is Moufawad-Paul's polemic. Thus, we are enacting a certain kind of Non-Maoism. A more general non-philosophical treatment of Maoism is also possible.⁷

In order to understand how this will function, we have to understand in which way a homology between Capital and Philosophy is key to Non-Philosophy. The auto-positional structure is an *invariant*, a formal matrix, such that it allows homological identifications between different "contents." Philosophy and Capital are both auto-positional structures⁸ and to this we may add, as already identified, Polemic, or the polemical form. It is in this sense that Moufawad-Paul's polemic falls short of the most radical aspirations of Maoism. It performs – in the very act of its discourse – exactly what Cultural Revolution aims to

⁶ J. Moufawad-Paul asserts that Maoism was first formalized as such by the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement [RIM] in the late 1980's and early 1990's. What is there called a "party of a new type" is a party that would synthesize the lessons of the Cultural Revolution at every moment in its practice (see Revolutionary Internationalist Movement, 1993).

⁷ See Klein 2017 for a preliminary development of Non-Maoism in general, taken up without reference to Trotskyism.

⁸ To understand how Capital acts as auto-positional, we only need to consult Marx's magisterial explanation of the functioning of Capital as "automatic subject" and "positing its own presuppositions" (Marx 1986).

guard against: it reproduces Capital within the communist movement itself, in the form of polemical auto-position.

It is indeed by continuity and rupture that a fidelity is woven to the Real while being able to continue and develop. If we see Non-Trotskyism as a fidelity *constitutively excluded* by the polemic of Moufawad-Paul, we see how such a fidelity – qua excluded – can provide us with the tools to underdetermine the auto-positional machine of the Polemic. The key to a non-philosophical treatment is always to "get outside of" Philosophy, and it is Non-Trotskyism that has provided us with this preliminary side-step.

Non-Trotskyism, as we have developed it, is an algebraic class composition whose maxim is the unavoidable need for proletarian Internationalism. It is a possible modeling of class alliances and tactics that persists in confronting and challenging Stalinism at any given conjuncture. Cultural revolution, on the other hand, demands constant line struggle and self-criticism to maintain the proletarian cause. There is no contradiction here.

This is the point where argument stops, at least in the philosophical sense. We allow the Real to be given-without-giveness, an *axiomatic* (non-)posit. Its name here is *Cultural Revolution*. The two – Non-Trotskyism and Maoism – can now fuse by the cloning of material. Moufawad-Paul's text acts as material from which a *continuity and rupture* results as clone: continuity entwined and entangled with rupture, subtending the relation between Maoism and Trotskyism as two fidelities. In other words, it is their very discordance which allows them to remain conjunctural possibilities of modelization oriented to concrete material, a material equally discordant and diffuse, which in fact demands non-harmonious – ruptural – solutions. At the same time, Maoism and Trotskyism can remain continuous in One. We have "ensured" this via non-philosophical thinking. Continuity and rupture emerges thus as a clone of Moufawad-Paul's text, the non-philosophical Identity of Maoism and Trotskyism. This discordant, atonal, and undulatory fusion of Maoism and Trotskyism, tracing the complex paths of fidelity: let us call it Maoism-Trotskyism, the result of a double superposition.

Concrete Image of Maoism-Trotskyism

It would not be inappropriate for a non-philosophical treatment to end with an image, if only so as to ensure the materiality of its formalisms and theory, the sensibility of its thought, and its status as praxis. What we have attempted here to construct is nothing but a

theoretical apparatus whose form might be modelled by the practice of a *united front*.⁹ This intersection of theory and practice, axioms and model, syntax and semantics, is a relationship that future non-philosophical (and non-political) experimentation could explore. Ultimately, Maoism-Trotskyism does not demand that unity appear, nor does it demand that concrete Trotskyists and Maoists "accept" its argument (it is not exactly one). If anything, it is conjunctural; an experimentation in concrete circumstances, an attempt to think in a manner and according to a technique in which humans themselves might find use: in order to struggle, at last, in Peace.

Adam Louis Klein, *The New School For Social Research, New York,*
Department of Philosophy, adamlouisklein[at]gmail.com

References

Klein, Adam Louis. "Outline of Non-Maoism." 2017. Web. <<http://www.adamlouisklein.com/thought/2017/10/29/outline-of-non-maoism>>.

Downing, Gerry. "In Defense of Revolutionary Socialism, i.e. Trotskyism." *Socialist Fight*, 29 Aug. 2016. Web. <<http://www.socialistfight.com/2016/08/26/in-defence-of-revolutionary-socialism-i-e-trotskyism>>.

Goldner, Loren. "Notes Towards A Critique of Maoism," *Insurgent Notes: Journal of Communist Theory and Practice*, Oct.15, 2012. Web. <<http://www.insurgentnotes.com/2012/10/notes-towards-a-critique-of-maoism>>.

Marx, Karl. *Capital Vol. 1*. London: Penguin Books, 1986.

Moufawad-Paul, Josh. *Continuity and Rupture: Philosophy in the Maoist Terrain*. Croydon: Zero Books, 2016.

Mullarkey, John, and Anthony Paul Smith. *Laruelle and Non-Philosophy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

⁹ For a detailed discussion of the manner in which a theoretical apparatus or "theoretical installation" might take an empirical object or structure as model for its construction, see Laruelle's *Photo-Fiction: A Non-Standard Apparatus* (Laruelle 2012), in which a non-philosophical matrix is construed as a philosophico-photographic apparatus using the physical camera as a model.

Laruelle, François. "Non-Philosophy, Weapon of Last Defense: An Interview with François Laruelle," in Smith, Anthony Paul, and John Mullarkey (eds.). *Laruelle and Non-Philosophy*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2012a. 238-251.

Laruelle, François, and Drew Burk. *Photo-Fiction, A Non-Standard Aesthetics*. Minneapolis: 2012b.

Revolutionary Internationalist Movement [RIM]. "Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!", *BannedThought.net: Struggling Against the Suppression of Ideas*, 26 December 1993. Web. <http://www.bannedthought.net/International/RIM/AWTW/1995-20/II_mlm_20_eng.htm>

Trotsky, Leon. *The Permanent Revolution*. 1931. Scotts Valley: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2014.