



*The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.*

**WORKING MEN OF ALL COUNTRIES , UNITE !**

**Manifesto of the Communist Party**

## **In Commemoration of May Day and the 161st Anniversary of the Birth of Karl Marx**

**Speech Given on May 5, 1979**

Comrades,

We are assembled here today to commemorate May 1st, the International Day of the working class, and May 5, which is the 161st anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx, the main founder of scientific socialism. In the tradition of both May Day and Karl Marx's great teachings, this meeting has two inter-related characteristics. First, it is based on proletarian internationalism, and defends first and foremost the unity of the fundamental revolutionary interests of the workers of all countries. As communists in the U.S., we are struggling to build a vanguard Marxist-Leninist Party, a party of the new type built along new revolutionary lines and modeled after the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin. The party we strive to create will not only be the advanced detachment of the U.S. proletariat, but will also be a detachment of the international proletariat.

How are we to be genuine proletarian internationalists? Lenin answered this question in April, 1917, in the midst of the preparations for the seizure of power by the Russian proletariat.

"There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism," he declared, "hard work at developing the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in one's own land, and the support (by propaganda, sympathy, material aid) of such, and only such, struggles and policies in every country without exception."<sup>1</sup>

We of the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks, proudly and openly state that we intend to fulfill our internationalist and revolutionary duties in deeds, both by struggling to overthrow our "own" bourgeoisie and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S., and also by rendering direct aid and support to every revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and oppressed peoples and nations of all countries.

The second characteristic of this meeting is that it is based on scientific socialism and aims at propagating and defending its time-tested principles. The founders of scientific socialism are Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. The correctness of all of their teachings has been confirmed a million times over since their day. The exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, the inherent crises and anarchistic character of the capitalist mode of production, the inevitability that the proletariat will rise up in proletarian revolution, smash the

bourgeois state, and replace it with the dictatorship of the proletariat — these and all the other propositions of Marx and Engels are as fresh, as scientific, and as timely as the day they were first written. In order to emancipate itself, the proletariat must continue to hold high the revolutionary banner of Marx and Engels and uphold the ideology of Marxism as a guide to action for the proletariat of all countries.

Soon after the death of Marx and Engels, around the turn of the century, capitalism entered its highest stage, the stage of imperialism. Competitive capitalism gave way to monopoly capitalism, with the new features of the dominance of finance capital and the emphasis on the export of capital. These new features did not make capitalism benevolent, but only intensified its savage and brutal character. Imperialism is monopolistic, parasitic, moribund capitalism. Alongside the new developments of capitalism were new developments in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. Imperialism itself is the eve of the proletarian revolution. During the first imperialist war, the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 in Russia burst forth, shaking the capitalist world to its foundations. The victorious proletarian revolution made a breach in world capitalism, intensified the general crisis of capitalism, and initiated the epoch of the triumph of socialism and communism. In this new era, a further development of the scientific teachings of Marxism was required. This task was completed by Lenin, the disciple of Marx and Engels. Lenin's teachings, which we call Leninism, were not merely a Russian phenomenon or just applicable to Russian conditions, as all the opportunists claim. Stalin, the most faithful disciple and defender of Lenin and Leninism, wrote that Leninism is "an international phenomenon rooted in the whole of international development," and that "the whole truth about Leninism is that Leninism not only restored Marxism, but also took a step forward, developing Marxism further under the new conditions of capitalism and the class struggle of the proletariat."<sup>2</sup>

Stalin has given us the scientific definition of Leninism: "Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. To be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular."<sup>3</sup>

Leninism is thus the banner of the international proletariat, the Marxism of the present imperialist era, and the guide to action of the proletariat of all countries, without exception. As Stalin taught, "Leninism is an integral theory, which arose in 1903, has passed the test of three revolutions, and is now being carried forward as the battle flag of the world proletariat."<sup>4</sup> Despite the opposition to Leninism by all the revisionists, Trotskyites, Maoists, and all other advocates of "freedom of criticism," the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks is firm in its convictions that to be a Marxist one must be a Leninist, and not just a half-way or part-time Leninist, for there is no such thing, but an *orthodox* Leninist, a bold and militant Leninist. Otherwise, if the scientific teachings of Leninism are not upheld and applied in a consistent and orthodox manner, we will stray from the path of proletarian revolution and end up serving the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Another way all the opportunists unite in opposition to Leninism is by their common hatred and fear of the word Bolshevism. "Why do you call yourselves Bolsheviks?" they all scream in chorus. "You probably think that you are in Russia!" Here these opportunists show their opposition to orthodox Leninism and reveal their denial that Leninism is an international phenomenon. "Bolshevism and Leninism," Stalin has written, "are one. They are two names for one and the same thing."<sup>5</sup>

Thus, to ridicule Bolshevism in any way is actually to ridicule and oppose Leninism, and is actually to attack the science of the proletariat, its treasured compass to the road of emancipation. The Bolshevik Party became the leading revolutionary organization in the world, the party of the new type demarcated from all the old parties of the Second International. It is actually to attack Leninism, to attack the party of the new type, and to build a revisionist party of the old social-democratic type that all these opportunists ridicule Bolshevism. Let us hold high the revolutionary banner of Bolshevism and proletarian internationalism so that the proletariat of all countries can free themselves from the misery of exploitation and oppression, and build a world of socialism and communism.

At present there is a great ideological crisis within Marxism-Leninism. We must fight for the prestige of Marxism-Leninism, defend it consistently, and unswervingly uphold its orthodoxy. The various opportunists are masking themselves, claiming that they, too, are Marxist Leninists. But this cannot erase the fact that they are opportunists and social-chauvinists. In order to understand the tricks of the revisionists, we must not only look at the label they give themselves, but at their deeds. Lenin said, "Everybody swears by internationalism in our day; even chauvinist-defencists, even Messrs. Plekhanov and Potresov, even Kerensky, call themselves internationalists. The more urgent is the duty of the proletarian party to contrast, most clearly, decisively, definitely, internationalism in deed and internationalism in words."<sup>6</sup>

And so it is our task today.

Lenin approached the question of demarcating trends in the international communist and workers' movement from an international perspective. This can only be done correctly by looking at the international situation, since all trends, both Marxist and revisionist, exist internationally. The revisionist trends not only have a common ideology internationally, but also have developed international organizational structures. The international proletariat, while disorganized and scattered, must work for the founding of new communist parties if it is to be consistent in upholding the revolutionary principles of Bolshevism, of Leninism.

Lenin demarcated three trends. The first consists of the social-chauvinists, the second the centrists, and the third the true internationalists. Let us examine these three trends.

The trend of social-chauvinism is the most open and naked opportunist trend. With the advent of imperialism and imperialist war, and the growth and development of the labor aristocracy and the petty-bourgeoisie, opportunism

ripened and consummated into social-chauvinism. No longer did the opportunists merely advocate reforms and trade-unionism. Now they came out openly for the defense of the privileges of their "own" bourgeoisie, for "defense of the fatherland" in the imperialist war, and for the plunder and exploitation of the colonies, and semi-colonies by their "own" bourgeoisie. Lenin called them "socialists in words and chauvinists in fact" and "our class enemies."<sup>7</sup> The social basis of social-chauvinism is the labor aristocracy and the petty-bourgeoisie, who are bribed by the bourgeoisie from the superprofits obtained from plundering the colonies and semi-colonies, and who gets crumbs from the imperialist exploitation.

In recent years, the ranks of social-chauvinism have grown with the rise to power of revisionism in a number of countries and the setting up of several international centers of revisionism and social-chauvinism. The main social-chauvinists today include the Khrushchevite revisionists, the Titoites, the Eurocommunists, and the Maoists. The features of the first three variants of modern revisionism and social-chauvinism are more well known, so we will concentrate our exposure on the counter-revolutionary social-chauvinist nature of Maoism.

Mao Tse-tung's social-chauvinism is most blatantly expressed in his "theory of the three worlds," which preaches an alliance of the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations with the U.S.-led imperialist bloc and all its compradores and lackeys, against Soviet social-imperialism. The "theory of the three worlds" is nothing but socialism in words and chauvinism and imperialism in deeds. It is outright defense of one imperialist bloc against another, open and unashamed support and participation in the plunder and exploitation of the colonies and semi-colonies, and a justification for imperialist war. It is but a new version of all the treachery and social-chauvinist betrayal of the Second International.

There are, as we know, those who claim that the present alliance of the Chinese revisionists with U.S. imperialism and its bloc was not the policy of Mao Tse-tung, but only the dirty work of Teng Hsiao-ping and Co. Such a view is profoundly wrong, both from the standpoint of history and of theory. The alliance between the Chinese revisionists and U.S. imperialism and its bloc is nothing new, but merely the fruits of years of effort by Mao Tse-tung and his brainchild. As far back as 1944, Mao Tse-tung openly made clear that when his so-called "Communist" Party of China came to power, it would make China "one of the bridges between the two camps" of "socialism and imperialism."<sup>8</sup> In other words, instead of leading China into the socialist camp, at that time headed by the Soviet Union under Stalin, Mao wanted to take a so-called "third path." But as all genuine Marxist Leninists know, there is no "third path" between imperialism and socialism, no road of "non-capitalist development." Further, as Lenin said, "Since there can be no talk of an independent ideology being developed by the masses of workers themselves in the process of their movement the *only* choice is: either the bourgeois or the socialist ideology. There is no middle course (for humanity has not created a

"third" ideology, and moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or above-class ideology.) Hence, to belittle the socialist ideology in any way, to turn away from it in the slightest degree means to strengthen bourgeois ideology."<sup>9</sup> This is precisely what Mao Tse-tung did with his "third path," "third ideology," and "theory of three worlds."

Throughout the 1930's and 40's Mao Tse-tung wrote many articles, such as "On New Democracy," "On Coalition Government," and others, and gave a number of interviews, especially to U.S. government officials and journalists. These all gave the same message: Mao wanted an alliance with U.S. imperialism rather than being part of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, he wanted U.S. capital investments and economic "aid", and he would not build socialism or jeopardize the interests of imperialism in China. Was Mao Tse-tung a communist? We will let Mao Tse-tung answer in his own words. In an interview with a U.S. correspondent in 1945, Mao said, "You've seen enough here to confirm what I've been saying, enough to know that we are no longer Communists in the Soviet Russian sense of the word."<sup>10</sup> He continued that the CPC differed from the Bolshevik Party in that "we neither call for nor plan a dictatorship of the proletariat." It shall be no surprise why these quotations from Chairman Mao didn't seem to make it into the little red book. It should also be no surprise why Stalin, the disciple of Lenin, called Mao a "margarine communist,"<sup>11</sup> or why Mao himself recalled that "when we won the war, Stalin suspected that ours was a victory of the Tito type."<sup>12</sup>

Stalin, as we can see, was right on the mark. While the alliance between the Chinese revisionists, led by Mao, and U.S. imperialism didn't actually materialize until Mao and Nixon set it up in 1971, the facts clearly show that Mao held this social-chauvinist line of alliance with and defense of the system of imperialism for decades, that the alliance with U.S. imperialism was a dream come true for Mao, and that the official elaboration of the "theory of three worlds" by Teng and Co. was merely the icing on an old, old cake. So, while all the social-chauvinist and centrist lapdogs of the Chinese imperialists hail Mao Zedong as the "greatest Marxist of our era" and other such nonsense, Mao Tse-tung was actually one of the greatest social chauvinists and revisionists of our era. All the treachery of the Chinese revisionists, from their participation in the imperialist war in Indochina to re-divide that region, to their support of NATO and its war preparations, to their support of neo-colonialism and every reactionary comprador of U.S. imperialism and its allies, are implementations of "Mao Tse-tung Thought" and the "Theory of the three worlds," and most clearly reveal the utter social-chauvinist nature of Maoism.

Mao Tse-tung was the representative of the bourgeoisie and rich peasantry of China. He described his "new democracy" as being explicitly "different in principle from a socialist state under proletarian dictatorship."<sup>13</sup> This is diametrically opposed to the teachings of Lenin that "the transition from capitalism to communism certainly cannot but yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: *the dictatorship of the proletariat.*"<sup>14</sup> Mao Tse-tung's revisionist opposition to the

dictatorship of the proletariat accounts for why he justified the existence of rule in China by many parties, and why one of his supposedly greatest contributions to Marxism-Leninism in his work "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" was his line that in China the contradictions between the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie was non-antagonistic. This is just a slightly different shade of Kautskyism, because it preaches "pure democracy," as much democracy for the proletariat as the bourgeoisie, etc. Mao Tse-tung's line on the peaceful transformation of the bourgeoisie under socialism is a denial of the violent nature of the revolution, a rejection of the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a virtual repeat of the revisionist line of Bukharin on the dying out of the class struggle under socialism. Mao Tse-tung represented the Chinese bourgeoisie, and this is why he promoted so many theories to support them and oppose their suppression and elimination as a class. This is also why Mao said that the CPC's program was the same as Sun Yat-sen's, the previous leader of the Chinese national bourgeoisie and the founder of the Kuomintang. Mao Tse-tung's revisionism was so great that he supported the Khrushchevite revisionists when they came to power because they had the same line on everything, except, of course, for the defense of the Chinese bourgeoisie. Mao Tse-tung sought to impose his revisionist "Mao Tse-tung Thought" as the guiding ideology for the international communist movement, to replace Leninism. And this was not something started by Lin Piao or merely begun during the so-called "cultural revolution," but was a constant theme of the CPC since at least 1945, when its 7th Congress declared "Mao Tse-tung thought" its "guiding principle."<sup>15</sup>

Mao Tse-tung's teachings are thoroughly revisionist. He saw the party as a hotbed of factions engaged in permanent "two-line struggles," and ignored the question of a party congress in his so-called four "rules" of democratic centralism. He opposed the formation of a new communist international and attacked the achievements of the Third Communist International and the role played by Stalin, and especially the teaching that socialism liquidates the bourgeoisie as a class, which Mao saw existing forever and ever under socialism, peacefully and in harmony with the proletariat. Mao also united with Bukharin's line opposing the liquidation of the kulaks, the rich peasants, as a class. Mao's analysis of Stalin as 70% good and 30% bad is actually a 100% attack on Stalin. Mao attacked Stalin as a cover for attacking Lenin and Leninism and for replacing Leninism with Maoism. To attack Stalin on any question is to attack Lenin and Leninism, and is a sure sign of revisionism. Mao's attacks on Leninism also are seen in his denial that the Russian revolution was the model for the revolution in all countries. He instead advocated separate national roads to what he called "socialism". Mao even said that "our theory is an integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution,"<sup>16</sup> thus denying that Marxism-Leninism is the universal theory for the proletariat of all countries. He spread much confusion in the international communist movement by promoting the united front as a strategy, rather

than following the correct teaching of Lenin and Stalin that the united front was a tactic. Mao's "theory of the three worlds" which calls for a so-called "united front against hegemonism," meaning against the Soviet Union, even includes U.S. imperialism. This is but another twist to Kautsky's line of ultra-imperialism and the typical social-chauvinist line of a united front with the so-called "benevolent" and "progressive" imperialists for imperialist war. All of Mao's revisionism and social-chauvinism is readily evident in reading anything in his works, in any of his five volumes.

Mao's philosophical writings, such as "On Practice" and "On Contradiction", are full of all sorts of idealist concepts. "On Contradiction" is a justification for the continuing existence of the bourgeoisie in what the Maoists call "socialism". It denies that under socialism there can be a proletariat without the bourgeoisie. Mao generalizes, "Without the bourgeoisie, there would be no proletariat, without the proletariat there would be no bourgeoisie."<sup>17</sup> While this is true under capitalism, it is not true for socialism or communism. As Marx and Engels said, "the theory of Communism may be summed up in the single sentence: abolition of private property."<sup>18</sup> This was accomplished in the Soviet Union under Stalin. But Mao denies that this is possible by making the existence of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie contingent upon each other in general, in theory, under any social system. This is nothing but a justification of state capitalism, a justification for opposition to the abolition of private property and classes. Further, Mao's theory of knowledge, that all knowledge comes from production and that the party's line and program comes "from the masses, to the masses" denies the teachings of Lenin and Stalin that socialism is a science, that the vehicles of science have been the bourgeois intelligentsia, and that only when this science is brought to the proletariat from outside their spontaneous struggles can the proletariat become conscious of its role and its historic mission. Side by side with his revisionist philosophy was Mao's revisionist political economy. He stood for the peaceful collapse of capitalism and its gradual conversion into socialism through state capitalism. He revised Marxist political economy on every question, and even joined in the attack on Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, which was a polemic against the plans of the Khrushchevites for restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. Not surprisingly, Mao took the same lines as Khrushchev on these questions.

The root of Maoist revisionism is not, as some claim, ancient philosophy. No, Maoism is not a mere national Chinese phenomenon at all, but a variant of modern revisionism, which itself is, as Lenin taught, an international phenomenon. The ideological root of Maoism is the same as all other variants of opportunism, the theory of spontaneity, which is the ideological basis of all opportunism. Maoism is an embellishment on Kautskyism, Bukharinism, Trotskyism, and Titoism, and is an all out counter-revolutionary theory that attacks every fundamental point of Leninism. It raises the banner of "freedom of criticism" against the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, and must be thoroughly rooted out if we are to build the party of the proletariat firmly based on Marxist-Leninist ideology. Maoism succeeded in masking itself for some time because of its opposition to Khrushchevite revisionism, which it at first

supported until the early 1960's, and broke with only after the Soviet Union cut off aid to China. Today it has dropped its mask of opposition to revisionism and Maoism has openly revealed its true features as outright social-chauvinism.

Besides open social-chauvinism, the second revisionist trend Lenin pointed out was the trend of centrism. On defining centrism, Stalin said, "**Centrism must not be regarded as a spatial concept: the rights, say, sitting on one side, the 'lefts' on the other, and the centrists, in between. Centrism is a political concept. Its ideology is one of adaptation, of subordination of the interests of the proletariat to the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie within one common party. This ideology is alien and abhorrent to Leninism.**"<sup>19</sup> Because the centrists try to halt a split with social-chauvinism and adapt to it in one party, they are more dangerous than the open social-chauvinists, and the main blow must be directed against centrism. Stalin pointed out how in the struggle in the Second International, the Bolsheviks had to "**concentrate their main fire on the centrists.**"<sup>20</sup> We must apply this correct teaching to the situation we face today.

Centrism is nothing more than a mask for social-chauvinism. Lenin said, "**The 'centre' is a realm of sweet petty-bourgeois phrases of internationalism in words, cowardly opportunism and fawning before the social-chauvinists in deeds.**"<sup>21</sup> He also said that they are our class enemies, opposed revolutionary struggles, and differed from the open social-chauvinists in that they "**in order to dodge such struggles resort to trite and most 'Marxist' sounding excuses.**"<sup>22</sup> All this means is that the centrists covered up their treachery better than the social-chauvinists did.

The centrists say they are against Maoism and the "theory of the three worlds" only to mask their own class collaborationist, social-chauvinist positions. While the open social-chauvinists call for uniting against the hegemony of one so-called "superpower," the centrists call for unity against both so-called "superpowers", calling for allying with the "small fish" imperialists against the "big fish". The Leninist internationalist line is to oppose the blocs of the great powers, and to expose that in imperialist war every capitalist country, from the largest and strongest to the smallest and weakest, participates in the plunder of the world. All the centrists ended up siding with one side or another in the recent imperialist war in Indochina instigated by the Chinese, Soviet and U.S. Imperialists, and their lackeys. The centrists chant such reformist and revisionist slogans as "peace, democracy, and socialism", two-stage revolution and "independence and socialism" in the so-called "small fish" capitalist countries, and "make the rich pay", all to effect an alliance with their "own" bourgeoisie and to do everything in their power to obstruct the overthrow of their "own" bourgeoisie. While they claim they are "internationalists", they are actually dyed-in-the-wool social chauvinists. They claim they are Leninists, but never talk of international Bolshevism and never upheld the Bolshevik party of Lenin and Stalin as the model for the Marxist-Leninist party. They oppose the upholding of strict Leninist norms, just like

the Maoists and the Khrushchevites, and spread the euphoria that the international communist movement is stronger than ever, which is the same line as the so-called "anti-revisionist communist movement." The centrists never ever say that worshipping spontaneity is the ideological root of all opportunism, as Lenin and Stalin taught. The centrists claim they are against "every hue of revisionism", but never speak of the struggle against social-chauvinism. Nor, naturally, do they ever speak of the struggle against centrism. They thus throw out and attack Lenin's analysis of the trends of international revisionism, and in fact unite with one national variant of revisionism in its so-called "battle" against the other. The Leninist line is to make a complete and absolute rupture with all social-chauvinists and centrists, and not to cover up and unite with them, as the centrists do.

The centrists join hands with the Maoists, the Khrushchevites, the Titoites, the Trotskyites, and all other revisionists in attacking the immortal work of Stalin. They say the trouble with the Maoist view of Stalin as 70 percent good and 30 percent bad is that the Maoists only emphasize the 30, while they instead emphasize the 70! So they fundamentally unite with the attack on Stalin. Only their tactics are different and craftier. But without a defense of Stalin, there is no defense of Lenin and Leninism. The centrists attack Lenin and Leninism with their covered-up but nonetheless complete attack on Stalin. They treat Marx, Engels, and Lenin as perfect, but when it comes to Stalin, all of a sudden there are "questions". This is how the centrists so thinly veil their revisionism. But only by an application of *all* of Stalin's consistently Marxist-Leninist teachings can the revolutionary proletariat chart a victorious revolutionary cause. Any deviation from any of the teachings of Stalin will only result in hardship and losses for the proletariat, just as any deviation from the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin would. Without defending and upholding Stalin, there can be no demarcation from social-chauvinism and centrism. This year, which is the centennial of Stalin's birth, has been declared the "year of Stalin" by the centrists. This is an absolute parody and farce, for the centrists in reality never defend Stalin, not in a year or in a day. Their "year of Stalin" is a mask of orthodoxy to cover their real revisionism. While genuine Marxist-Leninists, class-conscious workers, and millions of others around the world will mark this important occasion, as genuine Bolsheviks, as loyal followers of Comrade Stalin, we do not hesitate to declare that, comrades, *every* year is the year of Stalin. We thus will call activities for Stalin's centennial, and will circulate his works and talk of the contributions of his life. But we will not relegate the application of the teachings of Stalin to just some special occasion or holiday, but will continue in the most ruthless struggle against imperialism and revisionism, inspired and guided by Stalin.

The centrists come out especially anti-Leninist on the character and role of the party. While the open social-chauvinists deny the need for revolution, the centrists deny the necessity for the party to lead the proletariat for the proletariat to gain hegemony of the revolution. While the social-chauvinists preach

“two-line struggle,” and a loose Menshevik party of factions, the centrists say there has always been only one line in the party, that a second line has not and can never appear. The party to the centrists is one big “unity trend”. While the social-chauvinists vulgarize the method of criticism and self-criticism and reduce it to a forum for unprincipled attacks and bourgeois psychology, the centrists deny the need for Bolshevik self-criticism because, according to them, they have made no mistakes and therefore have no need to learn from them. This is diametrically opposed to the teachings of Lenin that “**The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it in practice, fulfills its obligations towards its class and the toiling masses. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the conditions which led to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it – that is the earmark of a serious party, that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the class, and then the masses.**”<sup>23</sup> But the centrists go against this method of learning from mistakes and educating and training the working class.

Another feature of the centrists’ anti-Leninist line on the party is their denial of the need for a party program to be hammered out and accepted by all members of the party. This is tantamount to the Menshevik line of a party of many lines, and that every striker should be in the party. Related to this is that the centrists never raise the question of purging the party of opportunist elements, that the party must be composed of the best elements of the working class, and that the party must have unity of will and iron discipline. They cover their opposition to all these Leninist principles by Marxist-Leninist language. But they cannot conceal the fact that their conception of the party rests on unity with the social-chauvinists in one party, and blocks a split with them. In these ways the centrists preach the line of a party of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, seeking to reconcile different trends, to “unite to demarcate”. while of course, subordinating the lefts to the rights within one party.

The third trend that Lenin spoke of was the true internationalist trend. It made a complete and absolute rupture with both social-chauvinism and centrism. It waged a ruthless struggle against all social-chauvinist and social-pacifist sophistry, worked for the overthrow of their “own” bourgeoisie, and assisted and aided the revolutionary struggle in all countries. Today the true internationalists unhesitatingly work for the creation of new Bolshevik parties. They declare that the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin is the model for the vanguard party in all countries. They uphold Stalin’s teaching that demolition of the theory of spontaneity “**is a preliminary condition for the creation of truly revolutionary parties.**”<sup>24</sup> Their internationalism is not just in words, but also in deeds. The true internationalists do not end up siding with the “small fish” imperialists against the so-called “superpowers”, but instead oppose the entire system of imperialism. They base their actions on orthodox Leninism. In *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin exposed the opportunist nature of those who called for “freedom of Criticism” of Marxism. He said, “**He who does not deliberately close his eyes cannot fail to see that**

the ‘critical’ trend in socialism is nothing more nor less than a new variety of *opportunism*. And if we judge people not by the brilliant uniforms they don, not by the high-sounding appellations they give themselves, but by their actions, and by what they actually advocate, it will be clear that ‘freedom of criticism’ means freedom for an opportunist trend in social-democracy, the freedom to convert social-cemocracy into a democratic party of reform, the freedom to introduce bourgeois ideas and bourgeois elements into socialism. ‘Freedom’ is a grand word, but under the banner of free labor, the toilers were robbed. The modern use of the term ‘freedom of criticism’ contains the same inherent falsehood.”<sup>25</sup> This is why we oppose any and all attempts at “freedom of criticism” of orthodox Leninism because it only results in opportunism and social-chauvinism. The Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks will uphold in an orthodox way the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and strengthen the position of the genuine Marxist-Leninists internationally.

In order to chart a course for the formation of a Bolshevik Party in the U.S. we must take a closer look at why the so-called “anti-revisionist communist movement” in the U.S. failed so miserably and ended up splintering into a batch of social-chauvinist grouplets. The very name this movement gave itself, “anti-revisionist”, should be a clue to the source of its downfall. Its so-called “anti-revisionism” demarcated against the open social-chauvinism of the CPUSA and PLP. It was against those who openly attacked revolution, national liberation struggles, etc., and thus dubbed itself “anti-revisionist” and “anti-trotskyite”. But it never thoroughly broke with these forces because it did not target them as social-chauvinist, did not wage explicit, conscious struggle against social chauvinism and in fact began to conciliate with them. It saw demarcating against revisionism as a spatial concept, arguing that since it opposed the CPUSA on the right and PLP on the “left”, it stood in the middle, upholding Marxism-Leninism, supposedly struggling on two fronts. Most forces thus said that right opportunism was the main danger and “left” opportunism the secondary danger, rejecting Lenin’s analysis of the international division into three trends: social-chauvinist, centrist, and true internationalist.

The forces that comprised this “anti-revisionist communist movement”, which coalesced on a nation-wide scale in the 1970’s, came mainly from the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois student, anti-war, and feminist movements, and from the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalist movements. A number of former members of the CPUSA came to take hegemony of these movements. All these forces brought with them into the “communist movement” all sorts of petty-bourgeois trash. In order to cover up their petty-bourgeois line, they generally adopted a centrist posture. Instead of basing themselves on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, they mainly based their actions on “Mao Tse-tung thought”, with particular hostility to Stalin. This was their opposition to revisionism. They declared that a new Marxist-Leninist party must be built. But they violated every Leninist teaching on the role and character of the party, and on how to build it. It had required a long struggle and splits with the

official “new leftists”, “revolutionary nationalists”, and other such openly petty-bourgeois elements to get even to the point where there was agreement, if only in words, on the need for a new Marxist-Leninist party. And gains had also been made against the openly anti-Marxist-Leninist line of the lumpen as the vanguard, the “new working class”, etc. So when the break was made with the open social-chauvinism of the CPUSA and PLP, and with all the “new left” and nationalist theories, the opportunists in the “anti-revisionist communist movement” were forced to resort to more camouflaged forms of opportunism and social chauvinism.

Under the influence of Mao Tse-tung and the CPUSA, especially William Z. Foster, the opportunists promoted a thoroughly economist line. The line of implantation, of sending the cadre into the factories to supposedly “organize” the workers, became dominant. Beside leading to blatant trade unionism, this denied the Leninist thesis that socialist consciousness must be brought to the working class from outside of the spontaneous struggles. Our so-called “anti-revisionists” also thus denied that socialism was a science, and that it must be studied as such. An utter and naked contempt for theory was displayed by these phoney “anti-revisionists”, as well as a marked anti-intellectualism. This stripped the proletariat of the science of Marxism-Leninism, which the petty-bourgeois opportunists, who were content leading the workers movement down the reformist path of trade unionism, class collaboration, and social-chauvinism, did everything in its power to keep from being propagated to the working class. Stalin said, “The vehicles of science are the intellectuals, including, for example, Marx, Engels, and others who have both the time and opportunity to put themselves in the van of science and work out socialist consciousness. Clearly socialist consciousness is worked out by a few Social-Democratic intellectuals who possess the time and opportunity to do so.”<sup>26</sup> But this does not mean that the intellectuals alone bring this science to the working class. Stalin continues, “Thus, socialist consciousness is worked out by a few Social-Democratic intellectuals. But, this consciousness is introduced into the working class movement by the entire Social-Democracy, which lends the spontaneous proletarian struggle a conscious character.”<sup>27</sup> This task, as Stalin makes clear, is the task of the party as a whole. Needless to say, it has been only a few of the many bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intellectuals who have not kept the science of Marxism-Leninism from the working class. Lenin encountered the same thing in the Russian movement when he pointed out “that it is precisely the extensive participation of an “academic” stratum in the socialist movement in recent years that has secured a rapid spread of Bernsteinism.”<sup>28</sup>

The centrists also denied a host of other teachings by Lenin and Stalin. They negated Lenin’s teaching of two “historical tasks”, the first being the winning over of the class - conscious vanguard of the proletariat to communism, and the second being the winning of the masses to the side of the vanguard. Some gave this formulation lip service, but ripped out its revolutionary essence by claiming that these two tasks took place “simultaneously”, that they “over-lapped” etc. The centrists claimed that Lenin’s teaching on the advanced workers, that

every country brings to the fore a working class intelligentsia that wants to study, study, study, to turn itself into conscious communists, was out of date and invalid for the U.S. While many of them claimed that right opportunism was the main danger in the working class movement, they either said that the “left” was the main danger in the U.S. communist movement, or else directed their main fire against what was supposedly “ultra-leftism”. In fact, what these centrists were really doing was attacking Leninism.

This movement was dominated by the so-called “nation-wide” “pre-party” organizations. The larger organizations had clear hegemonist intentions, and maneuvered and competed against one another in a most devious and unprincipled manner. With a fierce factionalism characteristic of the individualistic petty bourgeoisie, they were neither able to unite, nor did they engage in open and principled polemics. What few polemics they had were generally not related to the party program, which, as Lenin taught, must be introduced into the polemics in order to draw clear lines of demarcation. In fact the question of the program was not raised because these groups already had programs, reformist and revisionist programs borrowed from the CPUSA’s “anti-monopoly coalition”, that were adaptations to opportunism and social-chauvinism. The “united front against imperialism” of RU and OL was a clear offspring of the anti-monopoly coalition, as they all adopted the slogans of the bourgeoisie to “impeach Nixon”, “throw the bum out” and “dump Nixon.” The use of Marxist-Leninist phrases by the supposed “anti-revisionists,” such as dictatorship of the proletariat, gave them their centrist cover. But while they claimed that party building was the central task, their main efforts were of economic agitation and building the spontaneous struggles.

The social basis of this economism was the petty-bourgeoisie and the labor aristocracy, which had a material stake in keeping the movement within “safe”, reformist bounds. The imperialist crisis had thrown many of them into the spontaneous movement. But most of the radicalized petty-bourgeoisie took the liquidationist line that a party was not needed or was not essential. Instead, what was needed was more “movements”. Thus, they focused on their “five spearheads of struggle,” on “fightback committees”, on “coalitions”, on anything but building the party, welding the main core, and winning the vanguard of the proletariat to communism.

The centrism of this movement was not merely characteristic of one or another of the groups that comprised it, but of this movement as a whole. Centrism had become dominant. In this way, the genuine Marxist-Leninists, who were developing within this movement but were in a distinct minority, were submerged to the right opportunists and trapped in a virtual prison of opportunism and social-chauvinism. It was this bitter experience that bought home to them the Leninist teaching that the fight against imperialism is a sham and a humbug unless it is connected with the fight against revisionism.

It was in the battle on the Black national question that the centrists’ mask began to be ripped off, and that social-chauvinism within this movement began to be demarcated against. The RU revealed its outright social-chauvinism by deny-

ing the right of the Black nation to self-determination, that is, the right to secession. Instead, they promoted the theory of the "nation of a new type," the "proletarian nation", and the American exceptionalist pipedream that we were in a "third period" on the national question. The fight against RU raised up the necessity to combat such "freedom of criticism", to uphold Stalin's criterion for a nation, which RU said did not apply to the Black nation, which was supposedly a dispersed nation with no territory. This struggle raised the questions of orthodox Leninism and the struggle against social-chauvinism. While there was no overall victory, there were some gains made. The Lefts existed and developed, even though there were inconsistencies. And while there was some struggle for orthodox Leninism and Bolshevism against Menshevism and social-chauvinism, the influence of Mao Tse-tung prevented a complete rupture with social-chauvinism and helped subordinate the Lefts to the rights.

It was no accident that such a fierce struggle broke out on the Black national question and the social-chauvinism of RU. The Black national question is a key question not only in the U.S. revolution, but, as part of the overall national-colonial question, for the world revolution as a whole. The struggle on the national question involved a whole series of key questions of international significance: the relation of oppressor and oppressed nations, the era of imperialism, the right of oppressed nations to self-determination, that is, the right to secession, superprofits and the bribing of the upper stratum of the proletariat and the petty-bourgeoisie, the struggle against national privileges in the working class, American exceptionalism and imperialist economism versus Leninism, etc. It also raised up the general question of Leninism as Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. The works of Lenin and Stalin began to be vigorously studied, defended and propagated.

To an extent, however limited, the theory and method of Leninism began to be used and some demarcation was made against the loose-knit Second International type parties. The struggle for Leninism also involved party building, and especially exposed RU's bankrupt formulations that party building was the principal task only for a brief period and that the main task was to build the "struggle, unity and consciousness of the working class". RU made no attempt to apply Leninism. Their social-chauvinism exposed, they went off on their own to form their so-called "party", the phoney "RCP".

But there were still many obstacles and dangers lurking under a centrist cover. Many said in words that the 1928 and 1930 Comintern resolutions were correct and still applied, and said they upheld the right of the Black nation in the Black Belt to self-determination. This supposedly set them apart from social chauvinism. Even OL took this centrist cover, although they ripped the revolutionary heart out of it by opposing the right of the Black nation to secession, by tailing after and promoting all sorts of reformist Black bourgeois elements, and by reducing it to a reformist scheme such as "community control", converting the revolutionary slogan of self-determination into an innocent lullaby absolutely harmless to the bourgeoisie. But the strength of the struggle against social-chauvinism and for Leninism forced OL to retreat and cover themselves

more on certain questions. For instance, they originally wanted to form their party without a program, but had to issue a program first and then form their revisionist "CP-ML".

There was an attempt to apply the Leninist line on party building by the genuine Marxist-Leninists. But these efforts were severely hampered by lack of revolutionary training and inexperience and the influence of "Mao Tse-tung thought", and their subordination to the rights. They were as yet unable to regroup on their own, with a line and formation separate and distinct from the centrists and social-chauvinists. Thus, the years following the break with RU were marked by one step forward and five steps back, by determined struggle for Leninism fraught with inconsistency by the Lefts and sabotaged by the centrists. The Lefts were diverted into an alliance with CL, paralyzed in groups dominated by opportunism such as BWC and PRRWO, and submerged in the so-called "revolutionary wing". The bankrupt lines, all under the influence of Mao Tse-tung, of "Iskra as the key link", political line as the key link," "factory nuclei as the key link", etc. all had a debilitating effect. At the same time, there were important positive developments. There was fierce struggle against the worship of spontaneity, for the importance of revolutionary theory, and for the Leninist norm of democratic centralism. BWC and PRRWO, although never monolithically united or consistent in upholding Leninism, and riddled by opportunist elements, nevertheless began to pose more of a serious threat to the bourgeoisie. When this happened they at once became chief targets for police agent activity and disruption. Because of reigning amateurishness and primitivism, the Lefts were left impotent in dealing with the conspiracy to blow up the movement which the bourgeoisie openly bragged about and advertised with reports of COINTELPRO, Operation Chaos, etc. This confirmed once again Lenin's teaching that the art of combating the political police cannot be mastered without an organization of professional revolutionaries. Yet even despite all this, in spite of all the slanders and confusion spread by the bourgeoisie and its paid and unpaid agents, some more progress was made. WVO's so-called "anti-revisionist theoretical premises" were unmasked as pure Menshevism and a total negation of Leninism and the struggle against the theory of spontaneity. All sorts of opportunists were exposed, from MLOC to Resistencia to Workers Congress. Yes, the Lefts still remained captive to the rights and centrism still dominated. But it would be a gross error to negate or ignore the gains that were made in these previous ideological struggles. We must defend what was correctly said and done then, especially since all the opportunists are trying to rewrite history and reverse the verdicts taken against opportunism and social-chauvinism.

It is not in the nature of centrism to remain covered up for very long. Its instability is inherent in its nature of being an adaptation. Often in a crisis its mask comes off. The crisis that marked the conversion of virtually all the centrists of the so-called "anti-revisionist communist movement" into open social-chauvinists revolved around the death of Mao, the rise to power of Teng and Hua, and the promotion by the Chinese revisionists of the "theory of the

three worlds." With this crisis and all its repercussions, the mask was dropped. As usual, OL-CP-ML led the charge in the U.S. waving its banner of "direct the main blow at the Soviet Union." OL had been covered up for some time, especially because of its verbal recognition of the right of the Black nation to self-determination. Now their centrism gave way to open social-chauvinism, to outright and open collaboration with their "own" bourgeoisie. They were joined in this criminal treachery by all the other supporters of the "theory of the three worlds", including ATM and IWK (now the so-called "League of Revolutionary Struggle"), "WC," "WVO," "LPR," "CORES," "RWH," "PUL," "RCL", some "ex-BWC" and "ex-PRRWO" members, and some others. Along with RCP, these forces are openly and thoroughly social-chauvinists.

But centrism did not stop here. There were a number of forces that claimed opposition to Chinese revisionism and the "theory of the three worlds", while persisting in their life-long opposition to Leninism. The difference between these forces and the open social-chauvinists is that, by their opposition to the "theory of the three worlds," these forces remained centrist and continued to wear an internationalist mask. These include "CPUSA(M-L)", and the small circles grouped around the "MULC" conference.

MLOC carried over from the "anti-revisionist communist movement" its utter contempt of theory and economist line. Its line on party building was indistinguishable from that of OL. MLOC openly declared that trade union work was its most important work. They even bragged that the social-chauvinist "CP-ML", with whom they had united for many years, had tailed MLOC on the trade union question, admitting that they have the same line. MLOC attacked the scientific formulation of Lenin and Stalin that propaganda is the chief form of activity during party building as being Trotskyite. Their party program, aside from reflecting a remarkably low theoretical basis, is a work of social-chauvinism. MLOC denies the Leninist thesis on the existence of political privileges for the working class of such a strong imperialist country as the U.S. They consider Hawaii and Alaska to be part of the U.S. because they have been forcibly annexed, and deny them the right to self-determination, that is the right to secession. While they claim adherence to the right of self-determination for the Black nation in their program, they were prepared to bring into their so-called "party" entire circles, such as the Pacific Collective, that openly opposed the Comintern's correct position on the Black national question. This shows that the so-called "CPUSA(ML)" is internationalist in words but social-chauvinist in deeds. On the international situation, while claiming opposition to revisionism, their critical support of Vietnam in the recent war in Indochina shows how "CPUSA(M-L)" covers up the role of the Russian imperialist bloc. Neither "MLOC" nor "CPUSA(ML)" has ever broken with the theory of spontaneity or ever been anything else but completely anti-Leninist.

A competing centrist faction is "COUSML". This sect, created in the image of its maker, the notorious revisionist Hardial Bains of the phoney "Communist Party of Canada (M-L)", became well-known as the most fanatical supporters of "Mao Tse-tung thought" in the U.S. Only a glimpse at their line will show that all COUSML has done of late has been to give a new twist to the

same old Maoist line. COUSML says that the U.S. today is fascist, Nixonite fascism without Nixon. This means a two-stage revolution for the U.S. They attack the Comintern line on the Black National Question, and reduce it to one of "racial discrimination," a phrase copied from Mao Tse-tung himself. They attack raising the Comintern position on the Black nation question as "sectarian" and dub all those who even give it verbal recognition as "knights of the national question." But it is "COUSML" who are the real knights of social-chauvinism and centrism. Instead of directing the main blow at centrism COUSML talks of directing the main blow at social-chauvinism. To them MLOC's big crime was not that their program was revisionist, but that MLOC even had a program in the first place. COUSML to this day still upholds the revisionist William Z. Foster. "COUSML's" anti-Leninism knows no bounds. While they vigorously denounce and creatively reprint, they are a highly dangerous force that has been severely underestimated in years past, especially since they never even gave lip service to the polemics on party building. Bearing many of the same fanatical and fascist traits of the religious cults, "COUSML" must be thoroughly exposed and smashed.

Finally, there are the various circles currently engaged in the "MULC" conference. Almost every one of these circles has leading people that have been around for ten years or more. But they masquerade as "new" circles to cover their previous opportunist stances. These circles are generally characterized by support of "freedom of criticism." They oppose the Leninist line that **"before we can unite and in order that we may unite, we must first of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation,"** and instead promoted the "unite to demarcate" line. They all stand for implantation and economism, defense of Mao Tse-tung, circle spirit and factional maneuvering, and an overall sectarian diplomacy. They have also been engaged in attempts at political blackmail and a campaign of cheap slanders against the U.S. Leninist Core and Demarcation. None of these cowards even bothered to respond to our invitation to then attend this forum and engage in open polemics. We have already gone into a deeper exposure of them in our "Joint Counter-Proposal" to the MULC, and expose their cheap slander in an article, titled "Cheap Slanders Will Never Build a Vanguard Party", published in pamphlet form.\*

We would like to make special note here of two circles that are coming to the fore now. One calls itself the "Comrades in the Bay Area." They have recently published a 400-plus page book attacking the Comintern, especially its Sixth and Seventh Congress, and laying the roots of revisionism at Stalin's doorstep. This neo-trotskyite book will no doubt become the darling of all the anti-Leninists and anti-Stalinists, and deserves a thorough theoretical trouncing.

Another circle rearing its ugly head goes by the name of "Ray O. Light". This circle is not aligned and separate from the "MULC". Their immortal contribution is to inform us that Lenin made two serious errors in *What Is To Be Done*. Lenin was supposedly mistaken when he said that socialism arose as a science from the bourgeois intelligentsia, and not spontaneously from the work-

---

\* To obtain copies of these pamphlets, please see publications page.

ing class movement. They also say that Lenin was wrong when he said there were only two ideologies, bourgeois and socialist, because he left out petty-bourgeois ideology, which was supposedly not bourgeois ideology. All this is just another version of the theory of spontaneity. "Ray O. Light" also promotes such bizarre positions as the existence of an Appalachian nation of coal miners, whose probable reserve is the left wing of the Appalachian national bourgeoisie, while the multinational proletariat is only their possible reserve. Just repeating the absurd positions of these clowns is enough to discredit this sect, which has the nerve to call itself Leninist-Stalinist.

In our investigation of the so-called communist groups in the U.S. after years of struggle, we have come to the conclusion that, except for our two groups, Demarcation and the U.S. Leninist Core,\* every so-called Marxist-Leninist party, every group, and every active circle that we know of is thoroughly and irreconcilably anti-Leninist. They oppose every principle of Leninism, with their anti-Leninist features becoming more pronounced with every passing day. Just witness the open attack by many of the "MULC" circles on Lenin's teachings that the ideological root of all opportunism is bowing to spontaneity, on the two historical steps, on drawing lines of demarcation, their call to develop new "party building theory" rather than being guided by orthodox Leninism, on Bolshevism and Leninism as the guide to the proletariat of all countries, on the Leninist concept of advanced workers, their characterization of Lenin's Iskra as a coalition of diverse trends, and on and on. For every principle of Leninism, we can tell you a batch of organizations that are openly against it.

It is therefore our duty and responsibility to pursue a course of a complete and absolute rupture with all the social-chauvinists and centrists and to aim the main blow at the centrists. In order to do this, we must wage open ideological struggle and polemics in front of all Marxist-Leninists and class conscious workers. Some give lip service to this, but our two groups are the only two in the U.S. that carry this out in practice. Our proud defense of orthodox Leninism is also why we are most attacked and slandered. We cause all the factions to unite in a holy crusade against so-called "ultra-leftism".

It is a Leninist principle that the party is built from the top down, and does not spontaneously develop from below. This means not only rupturing with all the Mensheviks, but also fighting for the hegemony of a correct line, putting forward clear leading politics, of building an organization to carry out that line.

To do all this, to begin to end the crisis that has plagued and crippled the communist movement for decades, a new organization is required. A Marxist-Leninist center cannot be simply declared, but must be actively built. While we are not the center, we openly announce our intentions to consciously weld the center. We are opposed to all those who downplay the struggle to build a center, for this is Menshevism. Rather, we see ourselves as part of the embryo of a Marxist-Leninist center in the U.S.

But we also realize that we are not the only Marxist-Leninists in the U.S.

The genuine Marxist-Leninists and advanced workers have been scattered, split up by opportunism, kept from each other, subordinated to the rights and sometimes demoralized. Opportunism is dominant among the forces in the U.S. that call themselves Marxist-Leninist. This is the present state of affairs. But it is better to have ten Bolsheviks who are ideologically and politically consolidated, who can rally genuine Marxist-Leninists and the vanguard of the proletariat, than to have 100 or 1000 Mensheviks who sabotage the revolution at every step and turn. But we are certainly beginning to move ahead. This forum is one indication of that.

To facilitate the rallying of all genuine Marxist-Leninists and class-conscious workers, and to aid in the strengthening of Marxism-Leninism internationally, a new organization is required. It is the task of the Committee of U.S. Bolsheviks to lay the basis for and build just such an organization. The Committee is a temporary body with this limited task.

The new organization will see propaganda as the chief form of activity for the entire period of party building. The new organization will work out a tactics-as-a-plan for building the party. Such a plan is necessary to guide our party building work consciously and methodically.

The general features of our plan have already been laid out in the Iskra plan of Lenin. An Iskra-type newspaper is a collective propagandist, collective agitator, and collective organizer which can act as a scaffolding around which a party can be built. Around an Iskra-type newspaper will develop an organization based on a network of agents of the newspaper. An Iskra-type newspaper is required to rally the vanguard of the proletariat on a nation-wide scale, train them as revolutionary leaders of the working class, and unite the scattered Marxist-Leninists. But it is impossible to establish such a newspaper right now. What is chiefly holding back this development is that the theoretical foundations for an Iskra-type newspaper have not yet been laid. Before an Iskra-type newspaper can be established, more theoretical work on the burning questions must be addressed. Crucial to this is the national question, and the Black national question in particular, for on this question all the opportunism and social-chauvinism rises to the top. In addition, more polemics with social-chauvinism and centrism are as yet needed, both to further expose the opportunists and also to solidify and broaden the unity of the genuine Marxist-Leninists, to win those honest forces away from the clutches of the Mensheviks. Finally, we must first establish at least the beginnings of a propaganda and agitation apparatus if an Iskra-type newspaper is to succeed in consolidating the advanced workers and building a party organization.

Therefore, at this time, we are putting our major efforts into the development of one Marxist-Leninist theoretical journal, which can become a rallying point at this stage of our development and allow us to fulfill the above tasks and lay the theoretical foundations for an Iskra-type newspaper. The importance of theory cannot be belittled at this time when all the opportunists are engaged in the crudest economist activity and spread the vilest of slanders. Stalin highlighted the great importance of theory by pointing out that "theory,

\* The formation of the C.U.S.B. marked the end of these two groups.

and theory alone, can give the movement confidence, the power of orientation, and an understanding of the inner relation of surrounding events.”<sup>29</sup> All the economists cringe before these words.

It should be pointed out that the new organization we will build will not be a “pre-party” group or a “mini-party”, as were RU, OL, and the rest. These groups merely aimed at quantitative growth before they declared themselves a “party”. Rather, the new organization will be something qualitatively different and new in this country. It will build a real theoretical and practical center that can establish a network of agents across the country. It will be mainly an organization of professional revolutionaries, a concept thrown out by all the Maoists and centrists. An organization of professional revolutionaries is necessary both to develop specialists who, unlike the amateurs we are all familiar with, make the main thing in their lives and become expert at the art of leadership, and also to combat the political police, which is itself an art that needs to be mastered. The Menshevik-Maoshevik theory of implantation negates the need for such an organization of professional revolutionaries and instead builds an organization of trade union bureaucrats and petty-bourgeois hangers-on. Leninism requires that we completely reject this most crippling theory. Finally, the new organization must be based on the Leninist organizational principle of democratic centralism, and must not be riddled with the small circle spirit, autonomism, factionalism, and bureaucracy that has plagued all other groups.

These are tremendous and difficult tasks that lay ahead of us. In order to fight the opportunists on the outside, we cannot have opportunism inside our ranks. This ties our hands and paralyzes us. Besides waging ideological struggle against opportunism, we also oppose the dangerous theory of overcoming opportunism from within. The new organization will wage ruthless struggle against opportunism and purge its ranks of all the proponents of every shade of revisionism.

We realize we’ve gone on for a long time, but we can say for once that we’ve had a Bolshevik May Day. This is not the phoney anti-imperialist coalition of the past. We did not go out to get hundreds and thousands of people to attend, including every trade union bureaucrat who would endorse it. No, this year we’re building the party from the top down. This year we have had a qualitatively different May Day, a day of Proletarian Internationalism in deeds.

We shall close with the final words written by Marx and Engels in *The Communist Manifesto*: “The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of all Countries Unite.”<sup>30</sup> ★

## Notes

1. Lenin, “The Tasks of the Proletariat In Our Revolution”, *The Revolution of 1917*, Book 1, 1929, p.145
2. Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, Peking Ed., p. 2
3. Ibid, p. 2-3
4. Stalin, “Trotskyism or Leninism?”, *On The Opposition*, Peking Ed., p. 133-134
5. Ibid, p. 134
6. Lenin, “Tasks...,” op. cit.
7. Ibid, p. 146
8. Cheng Tien-fong, *A History of Sino-Russian Relations*, 1957, p. 243
9. Lenin, *What Is To Be Done*, Peking Ed., p. 48
10. Harrison Forman, *Report from Red China*, 1945, p. 179
11. *Bolshevik*, Dec., 1978, p. 68
12. Mao, “On the Ten Major Relationships”, SW, Vol. 5, p. 304
13. Mao, “On Coalition Government”, SW, Vol. 3
14. Lenin, *State and Revolution*, Peking Ed., p.41
15. Han Suyin, *The Morning Deluge*, p. 422
16. Mao, “On the Ten Major Relationships”, op. cit.
17. Mao, “On Contradiction”, *Four Essays on Philosophy*, p. 61
18. Marx and Engels, *Manifesto of Communist Party*, Peking Ed., p. 51
19. Stalin, *Industrialization of the Country and the Right Deviation in the CPSU(B)*, Works, Vol. 11, p. 293
20. Ibid, p. 294
21. Lenin, “Tasks...”, op. cit.
22. Ibid,
23. Lenin, *Left Wing Communism An Infantile Disorder*, Peking Ed., p. 50-51
24. Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, p. 26
25. Lenin, *What Is To Be Done*, p. 9-10
26. Stalin, *A Reply to ‘Social-Democrat’*, Works, Vol. 1, p. 164
27. Ibid,
28. Lenin, *What Is To Be Done*, p. 12
29. Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, p. 22
30. Marx and Engels, *Manifesto of The Communist Party*, p. 77