

## How The "Friends Of The People" Keep The Working Class In Bondage

There is a deep hatred for theory and theoretical work in the U.S. "movement". This hatred makes the declarations of many who claim to be fighting for the construction of a genuine Communist Party, empty phraseology and a convenient cover to give themselves some legitimacy.

This hatred for revolutionary theory, (for the elaboration of theoretical works, which would do an analysis of the concrete conditions, draw lines of demarcation, in order to lay the foundation for the elaboration of the Party's program,\* derived from Marxist-Leninist theory) brings to the foreground at once the hatred for Leninism expressed by all these so-called "Marxist-Leninists." It is therefore becoming quite clear, why these would-be-communists, many of whom were part of various opportunist groupings, have adopted the same economism and liquidationist line on Party Building, which was held in the middle of the 1970's by "Revolutionary Union" and "October League", claiming today to be "new circles" such as "Wichita Communist Cell", "Kansas City Revolutionary Workers Collective", "Pacific Collective", "Red Dawn" etc. . . . The only "new" aspect about them is the mask they have chosen. It explains why so many of the so-called Marxist-Leninist "workers" circles in the U.S.\*\* hoped for a quick resolution of the differences (more precisely a burying of the differences) which have come forward in the history of the struggle to reaffirm Leninism, that cardinal question which has been so trampled upon. It is by reaffirming Leninism that we will begin laying down the bricks and developing the brick layers capable of constructing the Party along the Bolshevik model.

Thus, despite repeated declarations in regards to the primary task of U.S. Marxist-Leninists i.e. building the Party of the proletariat, deep ideological differences have existed and continue to manifest themselves as to what type of Party we need, in spite of the attempts made to bury these differences. The last ten years have been clear evidence of how the wavering intellectuals and petty-bourgeois radicals have been "helping" the workers in carrying

---

\* Stalin makes absolutely clear the importance of theoretical work in relation to the Party program. "Hence, if it is not to err in policy, the party of the proletariat must both in drafting its program and in its practical activities proceed primarily from the laws of development of production, from the laws of economic development of society." (*History Communist Party Soviet Union-Bolshevik*, Short Course, 1939, International Publishers, p. 121)

\*\* some even claim to be a "party" e.g. "MLOC's-CPUSA/ML".

out the economic struggle and liquidating the struggle to construct the Bolshevik Party. There is absolutely nothing or next to nothing which has even come close to resembling at least an explanation to the workers of the socialist aims and the political tasks of the movement as a whole, nor can there be any scientific explanation as long as matters remain as they presently stand.

In fact under the general heading of the "workers' struggle" or the "workers' demands" what has been quite evident is the bombardment into the working class of the reformist illusions and aspirations of the petty-bourgeoisie and labor aristocrats who have seized hegemony over the workers. This has strengthened that much more the influence of bourgeois ideology over the working class movement. They do this in order that they, the "leaders", may establish a basis for negotiating some reformist demands which the bourgeoisie may be able to grant, as a token of appreciation to the "leaders" who succeed in maintaining the working class ignorant in regard to the source of its exploitation.

This quote from Stalin, brings to the fore one of many reasons, why our pseudo-communists completely disregard Lenin: "Accordingly, Lenin says: All those who worship the spontaneous working class movement and look on with folded arms, those who continuously belittle the importance of Social-Democracy [i.e. of Communist ideology-ed.] and leave the field to the Struves and Zubatovs—all imagine that this movement itself works out scientific socialism. 'But that is a profound mistake.'"<sup>1</sup> Stalin continues to make this very crucial point: "The history of *all countries* [italics ours-ed.] shows that the working-class, exclusively by its own efforts, is able to develop only trade union consciousness, i.e., the conviction that it is necessary to combine in unions, fight the employers and strive to compel the government to pass necessary labor legislation, etc. The theory of Socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical and economic theories that were elaborated by the educated representatives of the propertied classes, the intellectuals."<sup>2</sup> And to stress the importance of this fact that more clearly: "It (Social-Democratic consciousness) could be brought to them only from without."<sup>3</sup> Refusing to accept this Marxist-Leninist truth, stubbornly our pseudo-Marxists, i.e. economists, cling to the idea that the working class of itself will develop this consciousness. If only "Marxist-Leninists" become one with "the masses"! There will be a spontaneous development and the party will drop from the heavens so to speak, without all these bothersome differences. A party so heavenly delightful and polite in its methodology, that it will never offend the bourgeoisie, where each and every individual will do his or her own thing. Naturally such a party is based on the theory of spontaneity and will have no discipline nor any advanced workers. Such a Party is developed in such a smooth and easy way that there is no need to ponder over its formation and consolidation.

Thus, questions in regard to Party Building and Proletarian Revolution are placed in the background to the point that any discussion related to the

dictatorship of the proletariat becomes something merely to talk about at special occasions. Quite obviously from the standpoint of the "leaders" these questions are nothing for the proletariat to concern itself with. After all, the workers should be quite content with waging the economic struggle for immediate and "palpable results". With this line of reasoning our economists have succeeded in adapting themselves to the backward workers who are most entrenched in the narrow confines of the economic struggle for immediate bread and butter demands. Our economists deny it, but they are no different than those whom Lenin fought in the period of the formation and consolidation of the Bolshevik Party.

In his brilliant work *What Is To Be Done*, Lenin had this to say: "But the Social-Democratic worker, the revolutionary worker (and the number of such workers is growing) will indignantly reject all this talk about struggle for demands 'promising palpable results,' etc., because he will understand that this is only a variation of the old song about adding a kopek to the ruble. Such a worker will say to his counsellors from Rabochaya Mysl and Rabocheyo Dyelo: you are busying yourselves in vain, gentlemen, and shirking your proper duties, by meddling with such excessive zeal in a job that we can well manage ourselves."<sup>4</sup>

The zeal of our economists expresses itself in its crudest fashion in their tenacity for engaging in rubbing shoulders with the workers at the workplace. By implanting their "cadres", the parties and organizations of the petty-bourgeoisie have situated themselves in the "industrial concentrated areas", i.e. Detroit, Chicago etc., in order to meddle into those affairs that the workers have been quite accustomed to managing, and have proven themselves capable of managing without the "militant" actions of the counselors, of which there are dozens of "organizations" and a number of "parties" in the U.S. At the heart of the matter, who the economists are out in search of are the labour aristocrats, who are found in the "industrial concentration" centers in the large plants, where organized labor has secured the "better contracts" in favor of the bribed stratum.

It is very crucial that the motivation of the opportunist parties and organizations be understood. The reason that they seek hegemony over the working class is to maintain the proletariat subservient to the bourgeoisie by strengthening the positions of the bribed stratum, which serves as the social-prop of imperialism. These so-called communists preach trade-union politics to the working class, spreading reformist illusions aimed at refashioning society. The opportunists channel the struggle to the narrowest of activities—fight-back committees over bread and butter issues, for pennies and cents. These economists preach to the working class that their concerns are over their particular shop, factory, neighborhood, nationality or sex. By this preaching of the narrowest of interests they keep the proletariat occupied in the channels of "making the system" workable, i.e. begging the bourgeoisie to make certain concessions. By fostering these reformist illusions, the economists function as agents of the bourgeoisie, placing blinders on the working class

and keeping it confined to the chains of wage slavery. In all these anti-communist activities the opportunists spread within the working class the horrendous fallacy that without the bourgeoisie the proletariat can not survive, according to Maoist revisionist dialectics.

Thus a partnership between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is worked out by the economists, whereby the proletariat goes to a certain level of pressuring the bourgeoisie for economic concessions; in return the bourgeoisie must give these concessions, recognizing that these men and women of the petty-bourgeoisie and labor aristocrats are the "leaders" who are diverting the working class away from Proletarian Revolution. Lenin made very clear: "Economic concessions (or pseudo-concessions) are, of course, the cheapest and most advantageous from the government's point of view, because by these means it hopes to win the confidence of the working masses." Thus concluded Lenin: "... we Social-Democrats *must not* under any circumstances or in any way whatever create grounds for the belief (or the misunderstanding) that we attach greater value to economic reforms, or that we regard them as being particularly important, etc."<sup>5</sup>

The spoken or unspoken promise by the economists to the bourgeoisie is to sabotage the struggle for socialist revolution, which has as its aim the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the smashing of the bourgeois state, and the expropriation of all the land, banks, mines, and all means of production, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It stands to reason the bourgeoisie needs these agents—"friends of the people"—within the ranks of the working class to keep the working class from realizing its long-range interest.

These enemies of the proletariat will exist for as long as classes exist, and the fight against them increases with every step of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, which will conclude in the abolition of private property, i.e. communism, the abolition of classes.

Today the sabotage of the revolution is crystalized in the fight the economists are waging against building the Party along the model of the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin. Instead we have the phenomena of many parties, many organizations, which is but the expression of the split in the ranks of the proletariat, with its source being found in the opportunism spread by the representatives of the bourgeoisie. In the U.S. and in all imperialist countries the material source comes from the superprofits of imperialism derived from the exploitation of the colonies and semi-colonies of imperialism. From these superprofits the bourgeoisie has bribed a stratum of workers, bourgeoisified, and at the complete service of the bourgeoisie. These workers, said Lenin: "... are the real *agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class, real channels of reformism and chauvinism. In the civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie they inevitably, [italic ours-ed.] and in no small numbers, take the side of the bourgeoisie, the 'Versaillese' against the 'Communards'.*"<sup>6</sup>

Thus it stands to reason in the U.S.—top dog imperialist great power the

material basis for opportunism is deeply imbedded. The petty-bourgeoisie together with the labor aristocracy in whose class interest it is to maintain bourgeois rule, defend their 'own' bourgeoisie's 'right' to plunder the colonies and semi-colonies, as a way to safeguard their privileged existence. Hence, the parties of the petty-bourgeoisie seek out the labor aristocracy in order to strengthen the influence of this bribed stratum over the proletariat. This stratum of workers, already split from the rest of the proletariat, is the social basis of the parties of the open social-chauvinists and camouflaged social-chauvinists—the "centrists". This explains why our petty-bourgeois radicals of the 1960's have abandoned the student movement, going over in mass to the workers' movement in order to seize hegemony over it. Nothing will be understood if this phenomena is lost sight of.

It is this social basis that made it possible for Maoism to sink roots in the U.S. "anti-revisionist" communist movement. "Mao Zedong Thought" as the "theoretical basis" of all the organizations and parties of the U.S. movement, has expressed itself in every sphere of ideological, political and organizational retardedness, which so aptly describes the horrendous state of affairs of the so-called movement in the U.S.

The revisionist Mao Zedong lays great stress on what he imagined was the basis of knowledge, "struggle for production, scientific experiment, and the class struggle". Mao developed this anti-scientific socialism thesis, succeeding in spreading much confusion internationally. "Who ever wants to know a thing has no way of doing so except by coming into contact with it, that is, by living (practising) in its environment." And what did Mao consider the most important "environment," . . . "Above all, Marxists regard man's activity in production as the most fundamental practical activity, the determinant of all his other activities."<sup>7</sup>

Yet Lenin's precise examination of questions in their depth, speaks of: **"If what our practice confirms is the sole, ultimate and objective truth, then from this must follow the recognition that the only path to this truth is the path of science, which holds the materialist point of view."**<sup>8</sup>

Mao simplified matters to an absurdity. What may seem as outright stupidity, had its purpose. Mao denied that— **"The sole conclusion to be drawn from the opinion of the Marxists that Marx' theory is an objective truth is that by following the path of Marxist theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following any other path we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies."**<sup>9</sup> Mao had a different conception of things, an anti-Marxist conception. When he spoke of Marxist theory he would qualify its importance., "Of course we should study Marxist books, *but* [our emphasis-ed.] this study must be integrated with our countrys' actual conditions".<sup>10</sup> Mao liquidated "the path of science which holds the materialist point of view". *Witness*— ". . . go the rounds of every section placed under your charge and "inquire into everything" as Confucius did, and then you will be able to solve the problems, however little your ability; for although your head may be empty before you go out of

doors, it will be empty no longer when you return but will contain all sorts of material necessary for the solution of the problems, and that is how problems are solved".<sup>11</sup>

The contrast between Mao and Lenin is like night and day— Lenin defended the materialist point of view— Mao defended vulgar materialism arriving at nothing but confusion and lies.

To the petty-bourgeois "leaders" of the "U.S. communist movement," "Mao Zedong Thought" was a natural weapon to attack the need for revolutionary theory. The attacks on Leninism have been mounted wide and far. Thus Lenin's teachings in *What Is To Be Done* and *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* were subordinated to Mao's revisionist essays "On Practice", and "On Contradiction".

To quote Lenin and be guided by his teachings was labelled "dogmatism", "ultra-leftism", and "mechanical application". To quote and apply the revisionist theses of Mao Zedong was termed "creative application", which would then guarantee "being one with the masses", "serving the people" and acquiring real knowledge, developing the "mass line" from the "masses to the masses", etc..etc.. .

Chapter 1, section D of *What Is To Be Done*, was thoroughly skipped over by our economists. Those who claimed they had read *What Is To Be Done*, refused to ponder over the significance of these words of Lenin. **"Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement"**. **"This idea, continued Lenin, "cannot be insisted upon too strongly when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand in hand with an infatuation for the narrowest forms of practical activity."**<sup>12</sup>

Mao Zedong's "On Practice" was precisely an opportunist "classic" glorifying the narrowest of practical activity, reducing theoretical work to something which had no value. To Mao and all Maoists that which became important "above all", was man's activity in production.

His most devoted followers internationally could therefore skip over Lenin's teachings on philosophy and all other of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, taking from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin only as much as would serve to cover up their treacherous deeds. Thus they attacked Marxism-Leninism from within. One such attack is the disdain for the importance of revolutionary theory and the theoretical struggle which have been so totally belittled and placed so far in the background, presented as so insignificant, that the revisionists of all hues have been able to spread ideological poison, causing tremendous confusion, which has served as the ground upon which to trample on Leninism, the Bolshevik model of the Party and Proletarian Revolution. **"Hand in hand" said Lenin "go the fashionable preaching of opportunism" and the "infatuation for the narrowest forms of practical activity"**.

Who can deny that this describes to the tee the fashionable preaching of opportunism in the U.S. movement— an infatuation with Mao, with "practice", and joint narrow activity bordering on idiocy.

That's why Lenin was skipped over, once, twice, three times, 10 years,

(contemporarily speaking) through open attacks.

The revisionists have outdone the bourgeoisie proper, in attacking all the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. This is part and parcel of their role as agents, and we can safely say that among the revisionists Mao ranks amongst the highest in the totem pole. Yet for over 10 years Mao was the leading revisionist "theoretician" retarding the development of the entire communist movement, keeping it at a state of total impotence. Ideological disunity and deep differences were successfully covered up precisely because of the revival of the theory of spontaneity spread by Mao, his "CPC", and their agents internationally. The belittling of theory, of the role of the conscious element, the liquidation of the need for the Party to lead the proletariat in socialist revolution and construction, the anti-Leninist distortions of the theory and tactics of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, were all testimony of the opportunist current which was being spread wide and far. Internationally the worship of spontaneity, which Lenin analyzed to be the ideological root of all opportunism, was no longer being combated. On the contrary it has been elevated to a theory once again and used as the so-called basis upon which to "creatively" apply, and develop the revolution. In fact, it is said that the proletariat can have hegemony without its Marxist-Leninist political party.

Under these circumstances it was not hard for the petty-bourgeoisie and wavering intellectuals to seize control of the "movement" in the U.S., as a way of seeking hegemony over the proletariat.

After all, they merely had to get off the college campus, go into the factory, get involved in production, (many times in highly paid skilled jobs of the labor aristocracy) talk in the "language of workers," live "like the workers", and never forget to use the plural— "We workers", say the economists— "must fight back!" "We workers must make the rich pay!" "We workers must have jobs or income now!" "We workers must strike, picket, demonstrate, demand the improvement of our livelihood, our bread and butter!" The plural goes on and on— In a formula as follows. "our jobs, our children, our workplace, our families, our church, our demands, our country! !" "Our fight back committees, our intermediate workers organizations, our ad-hoc committees, our trade union unity league!" "We demand: 1.end to cutbacks, 2. end to discrimination, 3.end to firings, 4.end to police brutality," and a combination of interchangeable demands appear to be used any time a spontaneous struggle develops. The corresponding forms of organization are developed to worship this or that movement i.e. trade union action committee, the committee to free the five, the committee to free Gary Tyler, the committee to free Joan Little—etc..etc..

Sometimes it gets really broad- and they form an Anti-Bakke Coalition! The coalition against police repression, the coalition against discrimination, and so on and so forth. Sometimes the economists can put aside their petty differences and join hands in "joint practice", and include the union bureaucrats who bring to them whole union locals, etc.

After all is said and done, what has been accomplished? Let's draw a picture of our economist. Gets up in the morning very tired, after being quite active and in late meetings of a committee or two, with an empty head before going outdoors, on his way to work picks up the daily bourgeois paper, reads about the explosion in factory X, and begins to wonder about the possibility of forming a committee of workers who could deal with the explosion, but turns to page 3 and reads about the latest victim of police brutality. This is a problem. Which is more likely to stir up the masses! The problem gets more severe, on page 8 there is news of a firing which has taken place at the university involving some law professors who were against environmental poisoning, which they claim is beyond repair. Our economist is now the victim of deep emotional stress, thoroughly weighted down by the burden of all these events though the head is empty no more. He decided to apply Mao's teaching, "from the masses to the masses!" Beady-eyed and smilingly authoritative, he approaches worker Y, and asks worker Y. "Have you read today's paper?" Worker Y says, "yes some articles". "What did you think?" asks our economist. "I think the Yankees are going to win the world series again". "You must take your stand!" indignantly says our economist! "And walking over to worker Z, asks the same question. Worker Z replies, "its terrible, what's happening." "Umm. . ." thinks our economist, "this worker has anti-imperialist consciousness!" "What do you propose we workers do?" asks our economist. "Bring it up to our union", says the worker. "That's a fine idea," says our economist. "As a matter of fact, say the worker, "why don't you run for shop steward?" The economist becomes that much more interested in the ideas of this worker and proposes, "alright you raise it with the other workers and tell me what they think." "From the masses to the masses". The "investigation" is not yet complete, but our economist anxiously sets about organizing a caucus against firings, police brutality, working conditions, the high cost of living and environmental poisoning.

Few workers attend such meetings, our economist puts out a "shop paper" in the name of the "caucus" (in reality with the help of his "organization" or "party") and like the bourgeois paper which informs him of the conditions "broadly", he informs the workers of the conditions in their plant. He may even call it "On the Line" or "The Conveyor".\* And so it goes on and on, until such time that there is enough "support" to win the shop stewardship, delegate, business agent, or even local president. By taking union positions they can take over the unions and move them to the "Left" by moving themselves into the union bureaucracy or labor aristocrats' positions, thus the petty-bourgeoisie "transforms" into "workers".

The reader, if not acquainted with the history of the economists, may doubt that people who consider themselves "leaders" behave in such a stupid fashion. We ask the readers to review the newspapers of *any* organ-

---

\* Shop paper of the "MLOC," now "CPUSA/ML," at GM Fremont.

izations or so-called party in the U.S. that claims to be communist, and judge for yourself.

We did not have to invent a scenario, this is the reality of the activity for many of the members of every single opportunist organization and “party” in the U.S. It is on the basis of the most backward thinking and sentiments of the most backward workers that the economists develop their reformist programs, and demands. Lets for example refer to the shop newsletter of “CPUSA/ML” above mentioned, “the Conveyor”, as further documentation of the point we are making. “The POM workers have struck every three years since 1960. But, alone in their battles against the corporation (which has plants all over the country), and hampered by the sell out careerists who run their union they have steadily lost ground.”<sup>13</sup> “CPUSA/ML” better known as “Marxist-Leninist Organizing Committee—MLOC,” would do well to go back to Lenin’s *What Is To Be Done*. There is a particular section which we will quote here in full, perhaps “MLOC” may begin to understand why we insist that they are anti-Leninist. Maybe it will enter their narrow skulls that they are identical in politics with Rabochaya Dyelo—the economists which Lenin fought in his days. “**What concrete, real meaning attaches to Martynov’s words when he sets before Social-Democracy the task of ‘lending the economic struggle itself a political character’? The economic struggle is the collective struggle of the workers against their employers for better terms in the sale of their labour power, for better living and working conditions. This struggle is necessarily a trade union struggle, because working conditions differ greatly in different trades, and, consequently, the struggle to improve them can only be conducted on the basis of trade organizations (in the Western countries, through trade unions; in Russia, through temporary trade associations and through leaflets, etc.) Lending the ‘economic struggle itself a political character’ means, therefore, striving to secure satisfaction of these trade demands, the improvement of working conditions in each separate trade by means of ‘legislative and administrative measures’ . . .**”<sup>14</sup>

Perhaps the “CPUSA/ML” did not have time to study this section of *What Is To Be Done*? After all, with few people worshipping spontaneity it is hard to imagine “CPUSA/ML” studying much of anything. What ever the case may be, “CPUSA/ML” is a “party” in name only. But insisting as it does that it is the “Party of the Proletariat”, perhaps it may consider answering our polemic by either defending its views or by trying to prove us wrong. “CPUSA/ML’s” centrist posture has found them deaf and dumb on polemics, which is further proof of their bankruptcy. We certainly hope that this time it will be different, and that “CPUSA/ML” will try to prove how the “party’s” line is not that of “lending the economic struggle itself a political character.”

“CPUSA/ML” is not as crude as Martynov uttering the words—“lend the economic struggle itself a political character” but the essence of its activity is identical to that put forward by the economists whom Lenin fought in his day.

The economists, of “MLOC” (CPUSA/ML) are so petty and narrow that they talk of the contradictions between the workers and the “corporation,” restricting the struggle to one between individual employer and individual employees. “MLOC” compounds this utterly economist point of view by “*instructing*” the workers actually demanding of them to. . . “All USWA members should speak up for their union brothers and sisters in these small locals (which make up the majority of the union) and fight for an industry wide contract for all USWA workers.”<sup>15</sup> “MLOC—CPUSA/ML” are quite militant in their trade union activity, however returning to Stalin we must remind them about the fact that—“**The working class, exclusively by its own efforts, is able to develop only trade union consciousness, i.e., the conclusion that it is necessary to combine in unions, fight the employers and strive to compel the government to pass necessary legislation. etc.**”<sup>16</sup>

“MLOC” with an air of authoritativeness tells the workers something they already know. Something the trade unions have been carrying out for years. “MLOC—CPUSA/ML” proves itself no more capable of giving leadership, than those “careerist” union leaders they claim to be opposed to. In fact by preaching to the workers trade union politics—which remains nothing more nor less than bourgeois ideology, they are no different than the union bureaucrats with the exception that “MLOC” calls itself Marxist-Leninists, and as of December 1978, the “party of the proletariat.” Their pretext of being communists make them that much more treacherous. “CPUSA/ML’s” activity has as its aim the degradation of communist politics. By narrowing the scope of activity, “CPUSA/ML,” like the economists before them, restrict communist propaganda and political agitation, introducing something quite harmless to the bourgeoisie—we must judge this from a Leninist perspective. Lenin explained it as follows: “. . . the British trade unions long ago recognized, and have long been carrying out, the task of ‘lending the economic struggle itself a political character’; they have long been fighting for the right to strike, for the removal of all legal hindrances to the cooperative and trade union movements, for laws to protect women and children, for the improvement of labour conditions by means of health and factory legislation, etc.

Thus, the pompous phrase about ‘lending the economic struggle itself a political character,’ which sounds so ‘terrifically’ profound and revolutionary, serves as a smokescreen to conceal what is in fact the traditional striving to degrade social-democratic politics to the level of trade union politics.”<sup>17</sup> The reader will note how, in fact, “CPUSA/ML” has done exactly what Lenin describes above. Such is the essence of the entire reformist program of the “CPUSA/ML.” It cannot be otherwise, for it is as Lenin said—“**In point of fact, the phrase ‘lending the economic struggle itself a political character’ means nothing more than the struggle for reforms.**”<sup>18</sup>

“CPUSA/ML” chose a slightly different screen to conceal the true meaning of its slavish activity. In so doing, they put both their feet in their mouths and say—“That is why growing numbers of workers are coming to realize that

December 23, 1978, the day their vanguard Party, the "CPUSA/ML," was formed, was a very important turning point in the class struggle. This day marked a qualitative change in the class struggle in the U.S., a day when the spontaneous struggle of the proletariat was transformed into a class conscious struggle." 19\*

"MLOC's qualitative" transformation from a "pre-party" organization of the petty-bourgeoisie into a "party" of the petty-bourgeoisie is a qualitative change for no-one, much less for the proletariat.

Stripping off the ridiculousness of the above egotistical portrait of shameless vanity, we are left with an image of an event which "transformed" the spontaneous struggle of the proletariat into a class conscious struggle, according to "CPUSA/ML." With all due respect to who-ever has been fooled by this utter nonsense we again must stress an essential point made by Lenin—"Those who recognize *only* the class struggle are not yet Marxists, they may be found to be still within the boundaries of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To confine Marxism to the doctrine of the class struggle means cur-tailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something which is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Only he is a Marxist who *extends* the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*." 20 By preaching trade union politics and by giving recognition only to the class struggle, "CPUSA/ML" has long ago embarked upon the reformist path, giving only verbal recognition to the dictatorship of the proletariat, while sabotaging the *real* fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat through the full-scale promotion of liberal labour politics. This factor makes of "CPUSA/ML" a totally legalist party, an appendage of the bourgeoisie. The responsibility of the genuine Marxist-Leninists is— "To explain to the masses the in-avoidability and the necessity of breaking with opportunism, to utilize the experience of the war for the purpose of unmasking the utter vileness of national liberal labour politics and not to cover them up—this is the only Marx-ian line to be pursued in the international labour movement." 21 This is the only consistent Leninist policy. Drawing from the experience of the CPSU—B we must never forget that— "It cannot be regarded as an accident that all

---

\* "The struggle of the workers becomes a class struggle only when all the foremost representatives of the entire working class of the whole country are conscious of themselves as a single working class and launch a struggle that is directed, not against individual employers, but against the *entire class* of capitalists and against the government that supports that class. Only when the individual worker realizes that he is a member of the entire working class, only when he recognises the fact that his petty day-to-day struggle against individual employers and individual government officials is a struggle against the entire bourgeoisie and the entire government, does his struggle become a class struggle." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4, p.215)

the petty-bourgeois parties, which styled themselves 'revolutionary' and 'socialist' parties in order to deceive the people—the Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, anarchists and nationalists—became counter-revolutionary parties even before the October Socialist Revolution and later turned into agents of foreign bourgeois espionage services, into a gang of spies, wreckers, diversionists, assassins and traitors to the country." 22

### The Economists Negate the Vehicle of Science

The économists of all stripes worship the trade union consciousness of the working class movement, and by worshipping the spontaneous movement they strengthen bourgeois ideology over the working class. The economists are so entrenched in the swamp of tailism, that they naturally negate that "socialist consciousness is something introduced into the proletarian class struggle from without and not something that arose within it spontaneously." 23 Negating this Marxist-Leninist truth, every single "big" or "small" "party," "organization" or "circle" in the U.S. has implanted their members into the workplace to record the events of the spontaneous struggle.

In fact they become quite furious when they are reminded how it was Lenin who analyzed that the ideological basis of *all opportunism* is the worship of spontaneity. "And so, we have become convinced that the fundamental error committed by the 'new trend' in Russian Social-Democracy lies in its bowing to spontaneity, and its failure to understand that the spontaneity of the masses demands a mass of *consciousness* [our emphasis-ed.] from us Social-Democrats." 24 Some, quite upfront, state their disagreements with Lenin! They would give up Lenin ten times over before they give up their narrow trade union activity. After all they are all loyal to Mao and it was Mao who said that knowledge comes from "the struggle for production."

The Maoists claim to be protecting the workers when they hide from them that "the vehicle of science is not the proletariat, but the bourgeois intelligence." 25

But in fact who they are protecting and aiding is the bourgeoisie, precisely by belittling the role of the conscious element, overrating the role of the spontaneous movement.

The vehicle for spreading the disdain for scientific socialism, consciousness, and theory is the petty-bourgeoisie, the anti-Leninist intellectuals, and the labor aristocrats. The Maoists in fact claim that there are three ideologies—bourgeois, proletarian and petty-bourgeois. Yet Stalin wrote that ". . . in our times there can be only two ideologies, socialist and bourgeois, and where the former is absent the latter inevitably appears and occupies its place (prove the opposite!)" 26 Mao tried to defy the Marxist-Leninist teachings on this and all questions. In fact he hardly ever addressed the question of socialist ideology with the exception of attacking it. As a matter of fact socialist ideology-scientific socialism was subordinated to something called "anti-imperialist consciousness," the third road: not socialist, not bourgeois, but a third ideology. This sophistry was a convenient little cover, for the anti-Leninist

theory, "Mao Zedong Thought," which is based ideologically on the worship of spontaneity as are all forms of opportunism.

That is why although some like "CPUSA/ML" and "COUSML," claim to have given up Mao, they have as yet given no indication that they have the slightest intention of combatting the worship of spontaneity. Thus they rest content with pointing to the obvious factors which hardly any one (except the open social-chauvinists) can deny, i.e. Mao's revisionist politics, found for anyone who wants to find it in Mao's many classics of revisionism Vol. 1 thru 5. "CPUSA/ML" and "COUSML" have remained deaf and dumb regarding the causes and effects that the spread of the anti-Leninist Maoist propaganda has had on the retardation of the revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat. Consistently what is covered up is how in fact there is a deep ideological crisis in the Marxist-Leninist movement internationally, which is dominated by opportunism. One revealing feature of this crisis is expressed in the total disdain for revolutionary theory.

In fact "Mao Zedong Thought" was a blessing sent from heaven (if we may use the expression) for all opportunist who have refused to base their work on the orthodoxy of Marxism-Leninism. Mao's fantastically opportunist conclusion that the basis for knowledge was primarily the struggle for production was the all-signals-go for the opportunists to place their petty-bourgeois members in the factories, in order that they "transform." Every single anti-Leninist current, be it the social-chauvinist or the centrist current, ascribes to the implantation of "cadres" in the factories, to the theory of spontaneity. In some factories, plants, and mines locking horns in competition for trade union positions, we find them all from the "Revolutionary Communist Party-RCP," "Communist Party-Marxist-Leninist -CPML" to "CPUSA/ML," all the economists outdoing each other in who will be the most successful in taking over the trade unions. Such are the fruits of abandoning Leninism for the "theoretical basis" of "Mao Zedong Thought." All are of the misconception that if they are not implanted, working out the politics of trade unionism, in the "heat of the class struggle," they will miss the boat and pass the so-called "revolutionary upsurge" they claim exists or is "brewing."

By "revolutionary upsurge," they usually mean strikes, demonstrations, rallies, pickets, etc. So they lend the "economic struggle itself a political character," calling it "revolutionary upsurge," and thus, by giving it a radical disguise, the economists at the same time justify their collaboration with the bourgeoisie. Burning incense as the economists do before the spontaneous element, proves just how theoretically and politically inadequate the opportunists truly are. The dominance of opportunism internationally, since Stalin died and capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union, explains how and why "Mao Zedong Thought" has gotten over for so many years without challenge—much less a resemblance of anything which could be called a polemic against such revisionist texts as "On Contradiction" or "On Practice."

Many may claim today that they knew all along that Mao was a revision-

ist. In fact some claim that they knew that the CPC was sham since Mao came to power in 1935. Naturally the question arises, why then were there no open polemics till 1978, and more so, it is an obvious admission to conciliation with the Maoist revisionist line, since Mao was termed a "great", the "greatest," Marxist-Leninist of the "contemporary era! ! "

The centrists have chosen to clean up tracks, disclaiming any responsibility for the state of affairs of the dominance of opportunism in the International Communist Movement. Some promote themselves pure, free of mistakes and consistent to Marxist-Leninist principles, with one Marxist-Leninist line: This is a glaring contradiction—one which brings to the light of day how Leninism has been reduced to bourgeois liberal labour politics. In fact the truth of the matter is that *no* party internationally has defended the orthodoxy of Leninism in face of the many attacks hurled against it by the Krushchevite, Titoite, Eurocommunists and Maoist revisionists. **"History knows not a few Socialists who readily signed all sorts of revolutionary resolutions, just for the sake of satisfying importunate critics. But that does not mean that they carried out these resolutions."** Furthermore, said Stalin, **"Is not this why Lenin taught us to test revolutionary parties, trends and leaders, not by their declarations and resolutions, but by their deeds?"**<sup>27</sup> The policy of the centrists has been one of relying on one revisionist headquarters to attack another.

The stench of international backroom maneuvering and opportunist negotiations has put a heavy burden on the shoulders of the international proletariat. The time has now come to lift this burden and repulse it with an unhesitating struggle against centrism—that camouflaged opportunism, more dangerous than open social-chauvinism, which has snuck its way through to attack Marxism-Leninism from within the international communist movement.

We realize that an elaborate exposure of the centrist current internationally is of extreme importance. All future work by the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks will elaborate much more on this question. The content of this article on the theory of spontaneity, against the economists, could not be narrowed to economism in the U.S., because the theory of spontaneity is the ideological basis of opportunism internationally. In this light the link had to be made between "Mao Zedong Thought" and the conciliation to Maoist revisionism, which up until now has characterized the dominance of opportunism internationally.

In the future we will elaborate further on the centrist current which has served to blunt the split with open social-chauvinism. One example of many may be witnessed in the polemics against the "three world theory," which failed miserably to call this variant of revisionism a social-chauvinist theory. **"No less dangerous to the cause of the proletariat were the covert social-chauvinists, the so-called centrists. The centrists—Kausky, Trotsky, Martov and others—justified and defended the avowed social-chauvinists, thus joining the social-chauvinists in betraying the proletariat; they masked their treachery by 'leftist' talk about combating the war, talk designed to deceive**

the working class.”<sup>28</sup> Today we are witnessing much cheap ‘leftist’ talk and so-called polemics against the “three world theory” with no less a deceitful purpose than yesterday’s centrists.

### Liquidation of the Party of the Proletariat

The damage that the belittlement of the conscious element has caused internationally has been too great to dismiss as mere inexperience or to attempt to analyze over night, without the proper scientific investigation into this matter. However, of one thing we are certain—the movement of the revolutionary proletariat in the U.S. is part of the overall revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat. The trends of opportunism in the U.S. are a reflection of those trends internationally; and the struggle against the theory of spontaneity must take place internationally.

In his famous work *Foundations of Leninism*, Stalin made crystal clear that “The ‘theory’ of spontaneity is the theory of opportunism. It is the theory of deference to the spontaneity of the labour movement, the theory that actually denies to the vanguard of the working class, to the party of the working class, its leading role.”!! Stalin continues to elaborate this Leninist scientific conclusion by showing how the theory of spontaneity—“. . . is opposed to the Party marching at the head of the working class, elevating the masses to the level of class consciousness and leading the movement. It argues that the class conscious elements of the movement should not prevent the movement from taking its own course and that the Party be subservient to the spontaneous movement and follow in its trail.”<sup>29</sup>

The theory of spontaneity, that which negates the vanguard role of the proletariat, and is opposed to the party marching at the head, is precisely at the root cause of why there has been the active sabotage against the creation of a Bolshevik Party in the U.S.

Instead, the interest of the proletariat has been subordinated to national bourgeois elements like Mao Zedong, with the disastrous results that proletarian revolution has been placed in a subservient position to the bourgeoisie, who all along the line has utilized this treachery in its interest to slaughter workers and peasants throughout the world. The proletariat is left disarmed when the role of the conscious element is liquidated. Without its party, without its general staff, the proletariat fights a bourgeoisie armed to the teeth. Thus the proletariat’s heroic battles are turned into defeats without the guidance of its party. Stalin put it explicitly: “Without such a party it is futile to think of overthrowing imperialism and achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat. This new Party is the party of Leninism.”<sup>30</sup>

Yet there is more than ample proof that all the so-called vanguard parties, e.g., the CPC, have been anti-Leninist, allowing things to take their own course and arguing against the development of consciousness, and the need for revolutionary theory, replacing it by something called “creative application” to the concrete conditions of their specific countries. The theory of spontaneity has

been dominating the international communist movement since Stalin died and Khrushchev came to power, restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union. A further Marxist-Leninist analysis of this is desperately needed in order that all distortions of the actual situation may be laid to rest. Stalin made clear that—“The theory of spontaneity is the theory of belittling the role of the class conscious element in the movement, the ideology of ‘dragging at the tail’ of ‘Khvostism’ — the logical basis of *all opportunism*.”<sup>31</sup>

In order that we may change this situation, in the U.S. it means that we must bring together the advanced forces of the proletariat in one centralized Party. Stalin put it plainly—“Our task is to be at the head of the movement and combat tirelessly all those—whether they be foes or ‘friends’—who hinder the accomplishment of this task!”<sup>32</sup>

The economists, by implanting cadres into the working class movement, raise to the level of a theory (the theory of spontaneity) that there are *no* theoretical tasks to accomplish nor advanced workers to rally to Marxism-Leninism. In typical hypocritical fashion, they all speak of the “masses,” expressing a deceptive outcry about “mass organizations,” “democratic rights”, with much empty talk about the offensive against the capitalists, which they brag about leading.

Here again in reference to the use of the term “masses” by the opportunists let us turn to Lenin: “One of the most widespread sophisms of Kautskyism is its reference to the ‘masses.’ They say: We do not want to break away from the masses and mass organizations! But ponder over how Engels approached this question. In the nineteenth century the ‘mass organizations’ of the English Trade Unions were on the side of the bourgeois labour party; but Marx and Engels did not compromise with it on those grounds, but exposed it.” And here in a nutshell is the essential question which must not be lost sight of when exposing the total hypocrisy of our own opportunists. Lenin continued: “They did not forget, [referring to Marx and Engels, Ed.] first, that the trade union organizations directly embraced a minority of the proletariat.”<sup>33</sup>

Under the guise of “majority” and “masses”, it is precisely that minority of workers which the opportunists represent. Thus they lower the politics to the level of trade union politics in order to reach the “masses” really the labor aristocracy, and restrain the development of communist politics, leaving behind tremendous damage wherever they go. The genuine communists must be able to repair this damage in order to bring to the working class scientific socialism, rallying the vanguard to communism, with the purpose of diverting the working class movement from the path of narrow trade unionism, bringing it under the influence of socialist consciousness, and on to the path of proletarian revolution.

There are, however, two historic steps to accomplish this goal. The first is the stage of rallying the vanguard to the side of communism, working out the program, strategy and tactics of the proletarian revolution. This is the period of forming and consolidating the party of the proletariat. Propaganda

in this period is the chief form of activity. In the U.S., where there is nothing which comes near to what could honorably be termed theoretical work, and where there is a great need for the elaboration of Marxist-Leninist theory applied to the concrete situation, there has arisen the urgent necessity of publishing a theoretical journal which will address the theoretical problems of the proletarian revolution. In such a journal work will be devoted to such questions as the National Question, and the question of the oppression of women, as well as elaborating concretely on all such questions pertaining to the development of the Party programme.

Internationally it will delve into such questions as the consequences in all spheres of world economy and politics resulting from the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, etc., The theoretical journal will serve as a vehicle to put forward the political line of U.S. Bolsheviks, as related to the international and domestic situation. It will serve as a vehicle to reach advanced workers, in order to group them into workers' study circles as a form for theoretical and practical training. Laying down the theoretical foundations and developing a network of agents, will lay the basis for the establishment of an Iskra-type newspaper, which will serve as the "scaffolding" as Lenin called it, for the construction of the Party.

The second step is winning the broad masses to the side of the vanguard party of the proletariat. All the economists have found a way to skip the first stage and pretend in a most tiresome way that they have reached the second step.

The economists have great fanfare about a stage which they call "pre-party" period, where the economists play at party building. Really it's a time in which they develop their own cliques in order to seize hegemony over the working class movement. In this period they stress joint activity with other economist groups, and this "joint practice" consists of implanting together; even in some cases forming joint caucuses or coalitions to worship one or another aspect, or one or another pole of the spontaneous movement. In this period, when the proletariat is still weak, right opportunism is the main danger.

In this period a "polemic" or two may appear, usually against "ultra-leftism" reflecting a defense of right opportunism and a fear that they will be exposed by the Marxist-Leninist polemics against them. Any attempt to do any theoretical work is also labelled "ultra-leftist," and heaven forgive us for quoting from the classics of Marxism-Leninism! Differences which undoubtedly arise are immediately linked up with sectarianism which is also neatly placed in the category of "ultra-leftism." During this so-called "pre-party period," we find the economists developing "Party-Building theories," (or as Workers Viewpoint Organization called it "anti-revisionist theoretical premises\*") denying with fanaticism the Bolshevik model as the only model upon

\* Incidentally, many of the "new circles" remain influenced by WVO's line. "Developing party-building theories", as put forward by Wichita Communist Cell, is another attempt at "anti-revisionist theoretical premises". A fate no different than WVO's awaits them.

which to build the party. In reality what lies beneath all this is the call for the "freedom of criticism" which Lenin clearly addresses and ridicules in his famous work *What Is To Be Done?* ". . . the Bernsteinian 'critical' trend, to which the majority of the legal Marxists turned, and deprived the socialists of this opportunity and demoralized the socialist consciousness by vulgarizing Marxism, by advocating the theory of the blunting of social contradictions, by declaring the idea of the social revolution and of the dictatorship of the proletariat to be absurd, by reducing the working-class movement and the class struggle to narrow trade-unionism into a 'realistic' struggle for petty, gradual reforms."<sup>34</sup>

The so-called "particularities" which the economists claim, are not so particular after all, for they in fact repeat the same absurd arguments of the legal Marxists, the economists, the Mensheviks and liquidators which Lenin fought in a ruthlessly scientific manner.

The claims that they are developing "party building theories" and discovering "nationally specific forms" of opportunism goes hand in hand with reducing the working class movement and the class struggle to the narrowest activity of trade unionism! These are active attempts to isolate the U.S. proletariat from the rest of the international proletariat. In actuality the right opportunists of every hue, have a vested interest in maintaining the struggle confined to petty reforms. By so curtailing the struggle of the working class, they are defending privileges already obtained, and others they are out to get. Their socialism in words and chauvinism in deeds is expressed throughout their counter-revolutionary activity, most notably in how they whip up and spread chauvinism overtly, e.g., "CPML," and all the third worldists, or covertly, "CPUSA/ML," "COUSML," the "New Circles" and all the centrists. How many times have we been reminded about the "dangers" of forsaking the "realistic" struggle in the U.S. and trying to copy the Russian experience under Lenin and Stalin? Have we not been abused for forsaking practice for too much theory!! Where is all this theory? Ridiculous in a country shamefully known for belittling theory. Haven't we been bombarded by the hysterical outcries of the petty bourgeoisie, which go like this?

"More-over it is a fight to escalate the struggle for new and more far reaching reforms to extend and protect the democratic rights of oppressed nationalities and women!"<sup>35</sup>

The fight is not for socialist revolution, but to extend and protect bourgeois democracy, according to "CPUSA/ML," which has nothing in common with the fact that reforms are a by-product of revolutionary struggles. We must quote a lengthy passage from Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* in order to bring out where our differences with the reformists lie.

**"Some think that Leninism is opposed to reforms, opposed to compromises and to agreements in general. This is absolutely wrong. Bolsheviks know as well as anybody else that in a certain sense 'every little helps', that under certain conditions reforms, in general, and compromises and agreements in particular, are necessary and useful."**<sup>36</sup> Stalin explains how it is not a matter of reforms or of compromises and agreements, but of the use people make of

reforms and agreements. This is the first point— Then Stalin proceeds to draw a clear line of distinction between a revolutionary and a reformist: “**To a reformist, reforms are everything, while revolutionary work is something incidental, something to talk about, mere eyewash. That is why, with reformists tactics under the conditions of bourgeois rule, reforms are inevitably transformed into an instrument for strengthening that rule, an instrument for disintegrating the revolution!**”<sup>37</sup>

Such has been the outcome of the reformist tactics which every single “party” and so-called communist organization ascribes to in the U.S., which makes of the entire so-called “movement” in the U.S. an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie to strengthen its rule, used as a weapon against proletarian revolution internationally. This is why every single party and so-called Marxist-Leninist group or “organization” of the movement is a legal appendage of the bourgeoisie. Having very little to say about illegal work, all the parties are open looseknit menshevik parties who reject with equal hatred and as poison the work of revolutionaries.

Stalin continues: “**To a revolutionary on the contrary, the main thing is revolutionary work, and not reforms; to him reforms are a by product of the revolution. That is why, with revolutionary tactics under the conditions of the bourgeois rule, reforms are naturally transformed into an instrument for disintegrating that rule, into an instrument for strengthening the revolution, into a strong-point for the further development of the revolutionary movement.**”<sup>38</sup>

This has never been the view of the Mensheviks, of course, for if it were, they would cease to be Mensheviks. The view of the Mensheviks in no way even comes close to an elaboration of revolutionary tactics, which must be derived in the first place and guided by revolutionary theory, which establishes the basis for knowledge of the laws of the movement, knowledge of the laws of the revolution illuminating the practical activity. Parties of peace with the bourgeoisie have no need to—“... accept a reform in order to use it as an aid in combining legal work with illegal work and to intensify, under its cover, the illegal work for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. *That is the essence of making revolutionary use of the reforms* [our emphasis-ed.] **and agreements under the conditions of imperialism.**”<sup>39</sup> A revolutionary therefore never enters into acceptance of reforms with an illusion that the reform struggle will be an end to itself, as if through the reformist path of struggle fundamental change could occur. This is a gross illusion, a dangerous one for the revolution. On the contrary it must be emphasized again and again that reforms are a by-product of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, and that the essence of the matter is utilizing the struggle for reforms as a way to combine legal and illegal work, and that under *the cover* of the legal work communists, intensify the illegal work to prepare the revolutionary struggle of the masses to overthrow the bourgeoisie. Without this condition, i.e., the combination of legal and illegal work, agent provocateur infiltration is a given. Here, too, the econo-

mist minimize the danger of enemy infiltration, treating it as something either non-existent or harmless. However, here too, Lenin stressed that: “**In many countries, including the most advanced, the bourgeoisie is undoubtedly now sending, and will continue to send, agents-provocateurs into the communist parties. One method of combating this peril is the skillfull co-ordination of legal with illegal work.**”<sup>40</sup>

The economists have no intention of preparing the proletariat for the revolutionary struggle, which has as its aim the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. They therefore have no need for revolutionary theory, and renounce the struggle for a revolutionary party of the new type. All without exception sink to the level of claiming that they are the Party, usually according to these steps:

First, they pretend to exercise “democracy” by circulating a “draft party program”, which hardly anyone gets to see much less polemicize against. After a while of playing hide and seek, they come out and inform the workers that they had a Party Congress, adopted Party rules, a constitution and even a Party Program. Now that they claim to be the Party, they can dive more frantically than ever before into the fray of the spontaneous movement covered behind outcries of being the “vanguard Party of the Proletariat”, no longer hiding that they are seeking hegemony over the working class. Nothing changes from when they had the name of some “committees” or “league” or even “workers circle”, to the time they become the “Party”.

There is no summation or analysis of their past mistakes, there is no analysis, no evaluation of the “movement”, either “communist” or “workers movement”, other than to pretend to be different than their rival parties. There is no analysis of the economic essence of the system, no conclusions drawn as to where the movement of the proletariat is headed. Thus what the end result of their program amounts to is a reformist platform.

According to these steps the opportunists claim to have achieved “unity”. Each stabbing the other in the back while putting on the smiling faces, establishing a self-admiration society. Some harsh words may be exchanged, but as a general rule they try to conceal their differences in the eyes of the proletariat. Unity committees are established and negotiations over positions being jockeyed for take place. In contrast to all this rotten atmosphere, Lenin said that: “**The unity of the proletariat can be achieved only by the extreme revolutionary party of Marxism, and only by a relentless struggle against all other parties.**”<sup>41</sup> Such is the long and stubborn fight that confronts the proletariat in the U.S.

We gave two illustrations using “MLOC” as an economist portrait of this centrist party, one *before* it called itself the “Party” and circulated on a wider range “shop newsletters” calling for militant trade union actions; and one *after* it called itself the “CPUSA/ML”, where now it feels ready to address the public at large, where it calls for an escalation of the struggle for “new and more far-reaching reforms.” “MLOC’s” development into a “Party” is a quantitative one, nothing has changed in the economist-reformist politics

of this organization, which also claims to be against the "three world theory" and "Mao Zedong Thought". In fact all centrists are claiming this to be the dividing line. The real change however can only come about by reaffirming and defending orthodox Leninism, and for this to occur there must be a ruthless struggle waged against the theory of spontaneity which expresses itself in all its crudest fashion in economism, the line of implantation and pragmatism.

The economist leaders therefore not only attack the need for revolutionary theory in order that the revolutionary party be built, but sabotage the struggle for the party through many means. Implantation is but one way, where their members are turned away from any possibility of addressing the questions pertaining to the defense of the theory and tactics of Leninism, in the everyday struggle for "palpable results". The ideological backwardness of some of the people they attract even in the exceptional case of a few workers is fostered to the point that many become no better than their leaders.

Those who remain for any extended period of time in this marsh, degenerate into opportunist elements, incapable of breaking with opportunist currents, parties and organizations which are by every possible means defending the interests of the bourgeoisie. Some may be able to discern the anti-Leninist politics from what is truly revolutionary and rally to the call for the reaffirmation and defense of Leninism, split from these "parties", "organizations", or "circles" and take part in the theoretical work and revolutionary practice needed to build the Party along new revolutionary lines. Those who already understand this, cannot permit themselves to wait until everybody catches up. Leading politics capable of rallying the vanguard must be developed, and this necessitates the coming together of Marxist-Leninist theoreticians, propagandists, agitators, and organizers (few in our country) who have demonstrated the willingness and preparedness to make a rupture with the past and start a new fundamentally different and consistent Leninist approach to Party building. The first steps are beginning to take place. And only those who recognize not only that deep differences exist, but who ponder over these differences and approach the question not from the viewpoint of "with whom to go", but from the point of view of "where to go", will prove themselves capable of leading in the struggle to root out all vestiges of the wretched amateurishness which so aptly describes the activity of the communists in the U.S. Thus we must deal with this important question of raising the level of the amateur to that of a professional revolutionary.

#### What Has Been The Main Obstacle?

In order to understand what it all means, there must be the serious study of Lenin's *What Is To Be Done*, and all of Lenin's writings in the Iskra period. In order to apply the teaching of Lenin in the whole period where he led the struggle for the formation of the Bolshevik Party, steps must be taken in accordance with Leninism to develop the plan to build the party from the top down. In order that we may carry out the Leninist plan and

build the Party there must be the welding of a core of professional revolutionaries, ideologically and politically united as one fist, capable of implementing organizationally such a plan.

The main obstacle to the development of a Bolshevik plan and its implementation has been opportunism—right opportunism in the first place camouflaged in a centrist posture. This is an international phenomenon, and the revisionist theories of Mao Zedong based in idealism and metaphysics, rooted in the worship of spontaneity, have been deeply imbedded, causing a tremendous crisis for revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, the struggle for the Party, and proletarian revolution throughout the world.

There must therefore be a radical rupture with the revisionist theories and influence of Mao Zedong and Co., and the conciliation with this variant of revisionism. But this rupture must be in the first place an ideological rupture, through the ideological struggle to draw lines of demarcation. This means that the struggle against the worship of spontaneity and economism must be seen as an all embracing struggle to reaffirm Leninism and Leninist norms. We must put an end to the disdain for polemics and open ideological struggle, which is intended to bury differences.

We must draw lines against the centrists and direct the main blow at this trend, which is obscuring the social-chauvinist essence of the "three worlds theory" and "Mao Zedong Thought". There can be no repudiation of "Mao Zedong Thought" and the "three worlds theory" without a deep investigation of the causes and effects which have resulted from the full-scale support and propagation of this openly social-chauvinist theory, which has been shielded and tacitly supported by the centrists internationally.

The confusion spread by "MLOC" ("CPUSA/ML")\* and "COUSML" on this question, jumping on the bandwagon of the "anti-three worldists" struggle, must be thoroughly exposed. "COUSML" discredits the struggle in its shadowy performances as a clique who has virtually no basis of support in the U.S. or any where else to our knowledge, except from Hardial Bains and the revisionist "Communist Party of Canada, M-L" ("CPC-ML").

"COUSML" has played a hide and seek game for many years primarily by reprinting materials of the classics or other materials which go by the name of Marxism-Leninism, such as when they were spreading "Mao Zedong Thought". "COUSML" has done very little in terms of elaborating any theory independently for their group. The little which they claim their own is always independent of any grounding in Marxism-Leninism, such as their thoroughly bankrupt "analysis" that fascism has been instituted in the U.S. (See the polemic against this lunacy in *Bolshevik*, Vol. 8 No. 5)

"COUSML" has done practically nothing to even give itself the cover that it is engaged in struggle for the party, and has virtually stayed outside this

---

\* See Demarcation No. 1 for a full exposure of "MLOC's" opposition to Leninism

struggle for the party, except for an occasional polemic against "CPML" or "MLOC". This makes "COUSML" a dangerously phantom group which must be addressed and not taken by the nature of its own impotent appearance as unimportant. "COUSML" is changing its behind-closed-door tactics, giving itself a "Party spirit" appearance. There certainly is some evidence that they are moving in the direction of calling themselves the "party", very soon in fact. After all, how long can "COUSML" remain "COUSML" without losing total relevance.

As for "MLOC-CPUSA/ML", these centrists are more consistent with all the characteristics of classical centrism. "MLOC" claimed at one time to be for revolutionary theory, reprinted some things, engaged in some polemics, dressed itself in Marxist-sounding phraseology.

In fact "CP-ML" once analyzed "MLOC" as "the most principled of the 'ultra-leftist groups'." Here we have the social-chauvinists fraternizing with the centrist. Unlike the social-chauvinists of "CP-ML", "The League of Revolutionary Struggle, M-L", "LPR," "CORES" and "Revolutionary Headquarters", "PUL," etc. "MLOC" pretends to be concerned over international politics which sometimes they even call proletarian internationalism. So for example, unlike the social-chauvinists who praised China's imperialist aggression of Vietnam. "CPUSA/ML" condemns China's invasion at least in words. But who in their right mind would support China and still hope to be recognized as a communist? It's not hard at all therefore to take this posture. However, "CPUSA/ML" shows its internationalism is empty cheap talk. This comes through in the position "CPUSA/ML" has taken towards Vietnam. So says "CPUSA/ML", "to the extent that Vietnam was involved in Kampuchea, it was dead wrong."<sup>42</sup> Vagueness is a characteristic feature of opportunism.

Why is "CPUSA/ML" so apologetic to Vietnam? It is known that Vietnam partook actively in the events which led to overthrow of the Chinese-backed government of Pol Pot, making of Vietnam a guilty party in this imperialist war in Indochina.

"CPUSA/ML" leaves this question hanging, in order to cover for Vietnam's collaboration with the Soviet social-imperialists, which "CPUSA/ML" describes in the following way: "As well as to the extent to which Vietnam has now aligned itself with the Soviet Union and Comecon has jeopardized the Vietnamese revolution and damaged the cause of world revolution!"<sup>43</sup> Of course "CPUSA/ML" never spells out to what extent they are talking about, in order to leave it open that somehow the actions of Vietnam are justifiable.

"CPUSA/ML" exhibits its philistine attitude toward the Indochina war. The revolution in Vietnam has already been jeopardized and damaged by the fact that the national bourgeoisie is in power in Vietnam. The collaboration with the Soviet Union is just further proof that it's not the starting point of this but that the bourgeoisie is the class in power in Vietnam, and this is the class basis of the politics that led to the war.

"CPUSA/ML" looks at this war as do all philistines, from the point of view of who attacked first. This position shatters all their pretext of being inter-

nationalists, other than in words. Although "CPUSA/ML's" posture is mounted in left phraseology, even to the point of critically supporting Vietnam, different from other centrists who support it uncritically, the essence however remains the same, internationalism in words, unity with the social-chauvinists in deeds. Here it is in "CPUSA/ML" own words - "But to say Vietnam is a puppet of the Soviet Union like Cuba is the worst demagogy."<sup>44</sup>

Here again "CPUSA/ML" trips all over itself. Cuba is not merely a puppet of the Soviet Union; Cuba is an active partner of the Soviet Union social-imperialist designs. Even though Cuba is subordinated to the Soviet Union, economically enslaved by the Russian Social-Imperialist, a semi-colony of Soviet Social-Imperialism, the revisionists of Cuba led by Fidel Castro are wheeling and dealing with the Soviet Union, and are part of this imperialist bloc.

The semi-colonial Cuban Army is used to carry out counter-revolutionary missions for the Soviet Union such as in Angola, Ethiopia and South Yemen, which Cuba claims to be revolutionary aid but which in no way approximates anything remotely revolutionary. By reducing Cuba to a puppet the revisionist Fidelistas remain unnamed and innocent victims of "superpower bullying" ala "Mao Zedong."

Vietnam's relationship with the Soviet Union in essence is no different. Here "CPUSA/ML" covers up for the Russian imperialist, by leaving open the possibility that Vietnam is economically independent from the Soviet Union, thus Vietnam is justified in seeking an alliance with one great imperialist power against another.

Facts prove Vietnam's semi-colonial status. Allow us to point to just one example. It was reported (in *International Affairs*, No. 9, 1978) that Russia has invested in "94 important economic projects" in Vietnam. Such as primarily in resource development, like hydro-electric power, coal mines, gas and oil. In addition the Soviet Union is investing in Vietnam's agricultural sector, to promote the export of "vegetables, fruits, citrus and industrial crops".

The worst demagogy is coming from the centrists of all stripes who cover up that the Soviet Union exports capital and economically enslaves these countries, stepping in with "aid" as they are waging national liberation struggles against another imperialist great power. The national liberation struggles against imperialist domination are revolutionary, but there is more than ample proof that when these struggles are not led by the proletariat and its Party, the national bourgeoisie comes to power and sells out the revolution to one or another of the imperialist powers, whoever offers the best bid, e.g., Iran.

This is the so-called "demagogy" that "CPUSA/ML" refuses to hear—the truth it wants to prevent other people from hearing—but the soft position on Vietnam is indicative of the view of conciliation to Russian social-imperialism in particular and to imperialism in general.

We gave the above illustration in particular to show how the economists are either open social-chauvinists or centrists. It is crucial that a complete

and thorough rupture be made with the social-chauvinist "theory of three worlds", or whatever other form it takes, by aiming the direction of the main blow against the centrist trend internationally.

The failure to aim the main blow at centrism has been the main stumbling block preventing a thorough rupture will all forms of opportunism. This is one very important reason why the struggle for Marxism-Leninism has been inconsistent, fragmented, and subordinated to the rights internationally with rare exceptions. The centrists are of the anti-Leninist opinion that any model chosen for the Party is fine. The centrists are satisfied with high sounding phrases and "revolutionary" phraseology, written documents, and paper slogans. We are therefore quite certain that if "COUSML" cleans up its act just enough to give itself a better appearance it may receive international recognition (Bains already counts on this.) Contending with "COUSML" for recognition is "CPUSA/ML". The whole thing is devoid of principles. What remains is the stench of opportunism.

However, in terms of class reality there is only one truly revolutionary ideology and organization in the world and that is Bolshevism. No matter how many attractive slogans are advanced, no matter what deceiving words are spoken, deeds will confirm the sincerity, and seriousness of the Parties which claim to be pursuing the only Marxist-Leninist line and claim to be fulfilling their proletarian internationalist obligations to world-wide proletarian revolution.

Either the party of the new type, that one which honorably can claim to be modeled after the Party of Lenin and Stalin, or a Party of the old type of the 2nd International. Here too there is no middle road. Either a Party which is armed with revolutionary theory able to take its stand at the head of the working class, or a party based in the theory of spontaneity, which is the exponent of bourgeois politics, which condemns the proletariat to being a tool, subservient and in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

One or the other, no middle ground has been found anywhere. The centrists try to give the impression that each country develops its own model, own norms, its own interpretation of *What Is To Be Done*, its own "creative application of Marxism-Leninism". Mao's "CPC" recognized many parties in each country, the centrists may recognize only one. However it doesn't matter what that party's activity is, its history, platform or class composition. The centrists internationally are allying in a conspiracy with the bourgeoisie big or small against the proletariat.

Thus it has become clear there must be a thorough split with the centrists and social-chauvinists, class enemies of the proletariat.

At the Third Congress of the Communist International Lenin summed it up like this: "Our first step was to create a real communist party, so as to know whom we were talking to and whom we could fully trust. The slogan of the first and second congresses was 'Down with the Centrists.' We cannot hope to master even the ABC's of communism, unless all along the line and throughout the world we make short shift of the centrists and semi-centrists,

whom in Russia we call Mensheviks. Our first task is to create a genuinely revolutionary party and to break with the Mensheviks."<sup>45</sup> Either orthodox Leninism or Anti-Leninism, there is no middle road.

## Conclusion

It is high time that the U.S. Bolsheviks group into an organization of professional revolutionaries. In order to march in a compact group, we must pursue a split with the social-chauvinists and centrists. In order that this split be a thorough one we must combat the theory of spontaneity.

The general theme of this section reflects the political line of the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks on Party Building, which, like every question of the proletarian revolution, can be understood only from a proletarian internationalist perspective. Throughout, we have drawn the necessary conclusions in regard to the opportunist trends internationally. The model for the Party in each and every country without exception is the Bolshevik model.

The revolutionary theory to guide the construction of the Party in every country, and proletarian revolution which they will lead, is Marxism-Leninism.

By pursuing these urgent questions of our movement, i.e., the creation of a truly revolutionary party, we have begun to draw clear and definite lines of demarcation with all forms of opportunism. We defend the thesis on Party building on the basis of Leninism and from conclusions we have drawn regarding the dominance of opportunism internationally. We must strike the blow at centrism as the main danger and obstacle obstructing the revolutionary path of the international proletariat. In this light the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks has begun to elaborate the political line in relationship to the international communist movement, which will be further elaborated in the political report of the new organization it will found. Very important to this is making known our stance in relation to how we analyze the currents of opportunism internationally.

In order to build truly revolutionary parties a thorough split must be carried out with the ideological, political and organizational influence of the opportunist dominated "international communist movement". Towards this aim of primary importance the U.S. Bolsheviks, by defending and applying orthodox Leninism, are working toward the formation of a genuine revolutionary Party of the proletariat in the U.S. ★

**Down With The Centrists!**

**Long Live Leninism!**

**Long Live International Bolshevism!**

## Notes

1. Stalin, J.V., CW, I, p. 101.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Lenin, V.I., CW, V, p. 415.
5. Ibid. p. 406.
6. Lenin, V.I., *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Foreign Languages Press (FLP), Peking, p. 10.
7. Mao Zedong, "On Practice," SW, Vol. I, FLP, p. 299.
8. Lenin, V.I., *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, FLP, p. 161.
9. Ibid, p. 162.
10. Mao Zedong, "Oppose Book Worship," *Selected Readings*, FLP, p. 42.
11. Ibid.
12. Lenin, V.I., CW, V, p. 369.
13. *Unite*, Vol. 4, No. 16.
14. Lenin, V.I., CW, V, p. 404.
15. *Unite*, Vol. 4, No. 16.
16. Stalin, CW, Vol. I, p. 101.
17. Lenin, CW, V, p. 404.
18. Ibid, p. 405.
19. *Unite*, May 1, 1979, p. 3.
20. Lenin, V.I., *State and Revolution*, FLP, p. 40.
21. Lenin, V.I., *Imperialism and the Split in the Socialist Movement*, CW, Vol. 19, p. 351, International Publishers.
22. *History of the C.P.S.U. (B.)*, International Publishers, 1939, p. 359.
23. Stalin, J.V., CW, Vol. I, p. 114.
24. Lenin, V.I., *What Is To Be Done*, FLP, p. 64.
25. Stalin, J.V., CW, I, p. 101.
26. Ibid, p. 110.
27. Stalin, J.V., "Questions Concerning the History of Bolshevism", Reprinted by Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks, p. 7.
28. *History of the C.P.S.U. (B.)*, p. 165.
29. Stalin, J.V., "Foundations of Leninism", in *Leninism*, International Publishers, p. 28.
30. Ibid, p. 88.
31. Ibid.
32. Stalin, J.V., C.W., Vol. 1, p. 107, Red Star Press
33. Lenin, V.I., CW, Vol. 19, International Publishers, p. 350.
34. Lenin, V.I., CW, Vol. 5, Moscow Edition, p. 363.
35. *Unite*, Vol. 5, No. 5, 3/5/79.
36. Stalin, J.V., *Foundations of Leninism*, FLP, p. 97.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Lenin, V.I., "Left Wing Communism," SW, Vol. 10, p. 86.
41. *History of the C.P.S.U. (B.)* International Publishers, p. 359.
42. *Unite*, March, 1979, p. 11.
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid.
45. Lenin, V.I., C.W, Vol. 32, p. 468, "Speech in Defense of the Tactics of the Communist International."