

## VI

### SOME CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE PRESENT PARTY—BUILDING MOVEMENT IN THE USA AND THE TASKS OF MARXIST—LENINISTS

Hopefully, the honest working class reader has come to understand the importance of arming the proletariat and especially its revolutionary party with a materialist conception of history. The failure of the “new communist movement” to develop real vanguard leadership of the struggle of the working class and toiling masses anywhere in the USA is a reflection of the bankruptcy of their idealist conception of history.

1) In opposition to the incorrect proposition and conclusion of the “new communist movement” that the ideas themselves have no requirement of being tested in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism: we must uphold the Leninist method by which our communist ideas, slogans, declarations, etc., are tested in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle of the masses. Only on this basis can the “ideological plane” on which the genuine proletarian elements struggling to build a Party are being taken for a real “ride”, be brought back *down to earth*, where alone real political and organizational unity can be achieved as was so dramatically demonstrated by the experience of the Albanian comrades.

2) Contrary to the incorrect proposition and conclusion of the “new communist movement” that those who possess the ideas are the creative force in society, that they should organize themselves into a party, etc.: those who “possess” the ideas, the petty bourgeois intelligentsia, are *not* the decisive, creative force of society. As Comrade Stalin so precisely describes it:

“...the history of development of society is above all the history of the development of production, the history of the modes of production which succeed each other in the course of centuries, the history of the development of productive forces and people’s relations of production.

“Hence the history of social development is at the same time the history of the producers of material values themselves, the history of the laboring masses who are the chief force in the process of production and who carry on the production of material values necessary for the existence of society.

“Hence, if historical science is to be a real science, it can no longer reduce the history of social development to the actions of kings and generals, to the actions of ‘conquerors’ and ‘subjugators’ of states, but must above all devote itself to the history of the producers of material values, the history of the laboring masses, the history of peoples.” (p. 29-30 *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*)

Hence our approach to party building is that it must be undertaken, *not* from a narrow, petty bourgeois "circle" standpoint, divorced from the "spontaneous" struggle of the class and the masses, but from the standpoint of the class struggle of the proletariat itself.\* Hence those sharp, clear positions which represent a decisive break with "plausible, respectable, petty bourgeois lies" as Lenin described them and which are alone capable of being a powerful weapon for the *revolutionary mobilization of the working class* and toiling masses are *desirable* to the genuine communists and *not* "the mish-mash of critical statements, economic themes," etc. leading to the "eclectic, average socialism" Engels described above, which is the inevitable result of the different "new communist movement" sects trying to "sell" their brand of socialism (to "get over") to as many "thinkers" as will "buy" their product. Hence, the principal basis for establishing communist unity is not through the "negotiations of leaders", party building forums, *ad nauseum* etc. but through unity of action of the militant communists active in the class struggle and their political unity based on the common assessment of past *practical* leadership of the *class struggle of the proletariat*, and fundamental agreement on such *practical* leadership for the future.

3) In opposition to the incorrect proposition and conclusion of the "new communist movement" that the party is everything and the class struggle of the proletariat and toiling masses is nothing: we must affirm what the history of the experience of the Leninist Parties that were successfully built in the USA, the USSR, China, and Albania all teach us; namely, that a broad and deep "spontaneous" struggle of the proletariat and masses of these countries was in process and, to the extent that the Communists played an active, leading role in their "spontaneous" movement, laid the material conditions for the establishment of these parties at the time of their "creation". Hence a *narrow, sectarian strategy* of carrying out mass and vanguard work *for the sake of recruitment* to the Party (or pre-party group, etc.), the "numbers game" by which the group with the most members is the most legitimate and authoritative, etc. leads us no closer to the establishment of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party, but in fact leads us further away from this goal due to the disruptive *objective* role played by the sectarians calling themselves "communists" pushing "recruitment" within the "spontaneous movement" *at its expense*. Hence the need for the pre-party group to be very selective in admitting into the group only honest and serious elements primarily to be found in the proletariat itself, to ensure that the group has the "largeness of mind and spirit" so that its strategy for struggle against international capital both in the mass and vanguard level activity

\* Contrary to what the "new communist movement" believes and *practices*, i.e., that the working class and toiling masses are the property of the Party, the building of the Leninist Party and the party itself are the property of the working class.

is carried out to the maximum advance possible for the immediate and especially, of course, the long run interests of the *working class* (*not the "group"*). On the basis of concretely advancing the class struggle against capital, recruitment of the best elements of the working class will proceed on an honest and principled basis, which will in turn deepen the honesty, principles, and the proletarian character of the Party or pre-Party group itself.

4) Contrary to the incorrect proposition and conclusion of the "new communist movement," the concrete ongoing struggle of the masses far from being "nothing," is in reality the *decisive* thing. For as Comrade Stalin pointed out,

"Some day, of course, after long wanderings and sufferings, the spontaneous movement would come into its own, would arrive at the gates of the social revolution, without the aid of Social-Democracy, because 'the working class *spontaneously* gravitates towards socialism.'" (p. 70, *Works Vol I*, Stalin's emphasis)

And as Comrade Hoxha pointed out, "socialism is built by the masses, the Party makes them conscious."

Hence, "a concrete analysis of the concrete conditions," as Lenin used to say, is one of the most important requirements for all our work, it is "the beginning of all wisdom" for the revolutionary proletariat. Without such a concrete analysis, the proletarian vanguard cannot even begin to carry out its tactical leadership tasks, i.e. "to enable the vast masses to realize from their own experience the inevitability of the overthrow of the old regime, to promote such methods of struggle and forms of organization as will make it easier for the masses to learn from experience to recognize the correctness of the revolutionary slogans." (p. 99 *Foundations*). Without such concrete analysis, the proletarian vanguard cannot even begin the task of "fusing" socialism with the working class movement. Hence only by making "a concrete analysis of the concrete conditions" can we begin in earnest the work which will bring us not only the "rudiments of a real proletarian party" in the USA, but the creation of such a party itself.

5) Contrary to the incorrect proposition and conclusion of the "new communist movement" that those who possess the ideas (i.e. party members) and especially the masters of these ideas (i.e. the party leaders) are the only force worth analyzing and struggling with: Leninists believe that the masses of the working class and the people have creative initiative in the revolutionary historical process and they *they* therefore have *responsibility* for what happens in their life, the life of their society, its role in the world, etc. Hence in the process of winning the hearts and minds of the working class for the cause of socialism and communism we must tell the proletariat the truth, bitter or sweet, as Comrade Lenin did.

Lenin said,

"We do not minimise the dangers. We look them straight in the face. We say to the workers and peasants: The danger is great; more solidarity, more endurance, more coolness; ...

"The danger is great. The enemy is far stronger than we are economically, just as yesterday he was stronger than we were in the military sense. We know that, and in that knowledge lies our strength. (p. 247, *Selected Works, Vol. IX*)

Comrade Lenin taught, "...the proletariat needs the truth and there is nothing so harmful to its cause, as plausible, respectable petty-bourgeois lies." It is impermissible of the proletarian vanguard (the leaders) to "con" the non-party masses, to attempt to manipulate them into making the revolution by exaggerating the present level of the revolutionary struggle of the class, by false praise of the class and masses, and by lack of criticism when criticism is necessary to move the class forward. For example, the role of the German people as participants having some responsibility in the German fascist bestiality against the Jewish people and against the peoples of Eastern Europe during the 30's and 40's is an established fact. Yet *the role of the people of the US*, their responsibility for the carrying out of the barbaric US imperialist war against the Indo-Chinese peoples is never mentioned by the "new communist movement." It is no accident that the "new communist movement" has now slid even further into the morass of social chauvinism by omitting almost any mention of the US imperialist war in Vietnam *at all* (including the responsibility of the US imperialists) from any of its activities!! Such "Leninists" heap slander on the name of Great Lenin.

Hence, the "new communist movement" shows its lack of respect for the class and the masses by refusing to analyze and struggle with *the people* around the question of the Vietnamese War. They conceal rather than teach the lessons (e.g. concerning our own responsibility for the war, the criminal nature of US imperialism, etc.) which the US proletariat and toiling masses need to know in order to become capable of breaking with US imperialism and ultimately of waging successful warfare against US imperialism\*

Furthermore, if the non-party masses have no responsibility for their actions because they lack the advanced ideas, etc., then the rank and file members of communist groups, pre-party collectives, etc., of the "new communist movement", who lack the mas-

\*Our mass experience taught us that at the very moment when US direct involvement in Vietnam was about to end, when a proletarian revolutionary raised in a meeting of 1,000 workers that the working class in this country could never earn the title "friend of the Vietnamese people" until the Vietnamese leaders and people told us the *truth* about what we had really been and done to them during the war, *the US and mainly white* workers strongly applauded the vanguard force telling *them* the bitter truth about themselves!

tery of these great ideas of Marxist theory that their "leaders" possess, thereby, relatively speaking, are also devoid of any responsibility for the well being of the party, for its fighting readiness, for its connection with the masses, for its role in the "spontaneous movement." This leads to the ideological, political and organizational liberalism that Comrade Mao warned about so well as being precisely that corrosive which ultimately can destroy a proletarian vanguard organization.

*Hence, the need for rank and file communists to recognize the historic mission and the creative initiative of the working class; and hence also the need for the rank and file communists to recognize their own responsibilities for their actions in the class struggle of the proletariat and in the internal struggle of their vanguard organization in the party building process. Marxist-Leninists must understand the dialectical relationship that exists among the masses, the class, the party and the leaders.*

6) *What Is To Be Done?* by Comrade Lenin has made a great practical and theoretical contribution to the proletarian revolution. However this does *not* mean that the book has no theoretical weaknesses. Yet even where the few theoretical weaknesses appear (i.e. a certain one-sidedness due in part to lack of experience of the working class movement at that time with particular features of the materialist conception of history), Comrade Lenin grasped the principal aspect of even those features and therefore objectively pushed the *concrete* situation forward. But the emphasis on those very points of weakness and the mechanical transposition by the "new communist movement" of the time, place, and condition which Lenin faced, in the name of being "faithful" to Lenin, is a sham and a fraud, and betrays Lenin and especially his cause, the cause of the proletarian revolution and communism.

7) As Comrade Stalin said, "Theory is the experience of the working class movement in all countries taken in its general aspect," and the experience of the working class movement in all countries has continued for almost 75 years since Comrade Lenin wrote *What Is To Be Done?* . As historical materialists, the historical experience of the international proletariat in Party-building in the USA, USSR, China and Albania teaches us the essence of the historical process of Party-building much more profoundly than any single book or thought or intention of a great leader functioning at the time. This rich historical experience exposes the utter bankruptcy of the "new communist movement's" idealist conception of party building.

8) If honest elements presently involved in the "new communist movement" are to become part of a genuine communist movement in this country, they will have to break with their political origins in the New Left. The essence of the present practice of the "new communist movement" *objectively* continues to serve to undermine

the proletarian revolutionary cause and to strengthen US imperialism and international capital, as did their "New Left" practice in their "non communist" past. Whether practicing open reformism or adventurism, these cadre are objectively holding back not only the "spontaneous" movement, but the struggle for the Proletarian Party as well.

9) Such honest elements in the "new communist movement" will have to break on a principled basis with the opportunist leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, since the beginning of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution".

Unlike Comrade Stalin, who was still an active anti-revisionist at the time of his death, Comrade Mao had for over a decade prior to his death co-existed with left and right opportunism as well as centrist revisionism practiced by Chou En-lai. Hence along with our sadness at Mao's passing, we are optimistic that the opportunists who have abused his deserved prestige by blowing it out of all (Marxist-Leninist) proportions as a smokescreen for their counter-revolutionary activity in the past will no longer be able to so effectively use the cover of "Mao's Thought" to hide their reactionary deeds. The present rift, so soon after Mao's death, between the ultra-left faction headed by Chiang Ching and the (moderate) rightist wing headed by Hua Kuo-feng signals the beginning of a clearing up of the confusion and mystery behind which the national bourgeoisie has come to power in the People's Republic of China.

It is in this light that the "new communist movement" 's honest elements will more easily be able to break on a principled basis with the opportunist leadership which the Chinese leadership has offered the oppressed peoples, the US working class, and the international working class in the decade since the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" began.\*

---

\*We want to pose the following question to those in the "new communist movement" who now claim to be upholders *not* of Marxism-Leninism, but of Marxism-Leninism-*Mao Tse-Tung Thought*.: In the Introduction to *Foundations of Leninism*, Comrade Stalin answers the question what is Leninism? He says,

"Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and of the 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. Marx and Engels pursued their activities in the pre-revolutionary period (we have the proletarian revolution in mind), when developed imperialism did not yet exist, in the period of the proletarians' preparation for a revolution, in the period when the proletarian revolution was not yet a direct, practical inevitability. Lenin, however, the disciple of Marx and Engels, pursued his activities in the period of developed imperialism, in the period of the unfolding proletarian revolution, when the proletarian revolution had already triumphed in one country, had smashed bourgeois democracy and had ushered in the era of proletarian democracy, the era of the Soviets.

10) Finally, Comrade Lenin taught, "... that the distinction between oppressing and oppressed nations . . . is the essence of imperialism." (p. 68, *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*)

All honest revolutionary elements in the "new communist movement" have to make a decisive break with their economic-social privileges derived from their position (in the main) as privileged members of the chief oppressor nation in the world. Only on this basis can they cease to be petty bourgeois democrats who are the "extreme left wing of the imperialist bourgeoisie."

\* \* \* \* \*

We urge all honest working class elements to take up the struggle against international capital, headed by US imperialism, in a serious, disciplined, and above all principled fashion.

The following (tentative) program is offered as a guide to action, as a basis from which our struggle in combination with the rest of the working class and toiling masses, in unity with the international proletariat and oppressed peoples, can lead to the creation of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party or Parties in the US multinational state, and can advance our cause to the great victories of the proletarian revolution—Socialism and Communism.

September-November, 1976

---

"That is why Leninism is the further development of Marxism." (pp. 10-11)

Has concrete historical development in the period of Mao Tse-tung's leadership role in the class and national struggle, so fundamentally moved forward from the "period of developed imperialism," "unfolding proletarian revolution," "the era of proletarian democracy", "the era of the Soviets," etc. to justify the addition of "Mao Tse-Tung Thought" to the very name of the science of the revolutionary proletariat? We think not. And if not, then let us dispense with the conception, "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-Tung thought."