

# "Marxism-Leninism" — A Reactionary "Theory"

(A Reprint)

(The following article contains excerpts from an earlier article which appeared in the Vanguard of April-May, 1973 entitled "Base and Superstructure in Class Society, Article II.")

This article begins with an examination of the "miraculous" transfiguration of Eldridge Cleaver and Huey Newton from prophets of the "lumpen revolution" into "respectable Marxist-Leninists.")

To the politically naive, Huey Newton's and Eldridge Cleaver's "conversion to Marxism-Leninism" may appear as unusual if not astonishing. But there is nothing extraordinary and most certainly, nothing revolutionary in their rapid transmutation from petty-bourgeois lumpen demagogues to petty-bourgeois "Marxist-Leninist" theorists.

Indeed, the number of intellectuals and embryo-intellectuals who make a living as "Marxist-Leninist" ideologues reaches into hundreds of thousands throughout the world. This army of "revolutionary" ideologues constitutes an international as well as multifarious conglomeration of agents of the "Entente" imperialist powers and their allies, who in every known language and in a wide variety of political and ideological disguises peddle an identical brand of "revolutionary" reformism.

The entire catalogue of intellectual charlatanism and "learned" sophistry is represented in this "massive" mobilization of petty-bourgeois myrmidons of the bourgeoisie. At the head of the pack the "leaders" of the "Marxist-Leninist" parties and organizations are to be found. They are a homogeneous lot, basically speaking. Their vaunted and much cackled "differences," their supposed heterogeneity, is a simple matter of identification with the specific division of labor assigned to them as individuals or as groups of individuals. They may respond to the particular denomination of "Stalinist," "Trotskyite," "Maoist," "Khrushchevite," "Castroite" or what-have-you. But essentially in their social background, in their ideology and in their politics they are one indivisible entity.

It is a particularly important characteristic and feature of their ideological and political personality that they all, as individuals and groups, answer to the generic term "Marxist-Leninist."

This term ("Marxist-Leninist") was adopted by each and every opportunist pseudo-communist who fought Lenin while he was living and made claim to his "ideological mantle and theoretical heritage" as soon as he died in 1924. In fact the term "Leninist" when Lenin was still alive was used negatively and derisively by Trotsky, Stalin, Kamenev, et. al. This flock of political vultures, which included Joseph Stalin, (who now has become the dead horse and defunct whipping boy of most "Marxist-Leninists" and "liberals"); Leon Trotsky (whom Lenin constantly reviled as "Judas Trotsky" and "chameleon Trotsky"); Karl Radek, the pompous Polish "Marxist-Leninist intellectual"; Lev Kamenev against whom (together with Stalin) Lenin had to direct the main barbs of his slashing polemics in his famous "April Thesis"; Grigory Zinoviev, who (together

with Kamenev) attempted to sabotage the call for armed struggle on the eve of the October Revolution; Nicolai Bukharin, another bloated self-anointed "theoretician" of the October Revolution as well as the hordes of "literary" personages parading as "titans of the October Revolution" such as the twin God-seekers Maxim Gorki and Anatoly Lunacharsky, etc., etc. Nor should one forget for one moment the new avatar of Buddha, the Chinese narcissist, the self-styled "Lenin of the present era," the "great thought" himself — Mao Tse-tung.

That the term "Leninism" up till the time of Lenin's death was used "derisively" is something that Lenin himself was quite aware of and we might add just as proud of that fact. In his book "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution," Lenin showed how the bourgeoisie was using the term Leninist with quotation marks borrowed from the Martovs, Trotskys, Martynovs, Plekhanovs and later on by the Lunacharskys, Gorkys, Bogdanovs, etc.:

"The articles entitled 'The Split in Russian Social-Democracy' and 'The Triumph of Common Sense' (Ozbozhdeniye, No. 72) set forth the opinion on Social-Democracy held by the representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie, an opinion which is of remarkable value for class-conscious proletarians. We cannot too strongly recommend every Social-Democrat to read these articles in full and to ponder over every sentence in them. We shall reproduce first of all the most important propositions contained in both these articles.

"It is fairly difficult," writes the Ozbozhdeniye, 'for an outside observer to grasp the real political meaning of the disagreements that have split the Social-Democratic Party into two factions. A definition of the "Majority" faction as the more radical and unswerving, as distinct from the "Minority" which allows of certain compromises in the interests of the cause, would not be quite exact, and in any case would not provide an exhaustive characterization. At any rate the traditional dogmas of Marxian orthodoxy are observed by the Minority faction with even greater zeal perhaps than by the Lenin faction. The following characterization would appear to us to be more accurate. The fundamental political temper of the "Majority" is ab-

stract revolutionism, rebellion for the sake of rebellion, an eagerness to stir up insurrection among the popular masses by any and every means and to seize power immediately in their name; to a certain extent this brings the 'Leninists' close to the Socialist Revolutionaries and overshadows in their minds the idea of the class struggle with the idea of a Russian revolution involving the whole people; while abjuring in practice much of the narrow-mindedness of the Social-Democratic doctrine, the "Leninists" are, on the other hand, thoroughly imbued with the narrow-mindedness of revolutionism, renounce all practical work except the preparation of an immediate insurrection, ignore on principle all forms of legal and semi-legal agitation and every species of practically-useful compromise with other oppositional trends. The Minority, on the contrary, while steadfastly adhering to the doctrine of Marxism, at the same time preserves the realistic elements of the Marxian world outlook." (Postscript, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in Democratic Revolution, published July, 1905, Selected Works, Volume I.)

Lenin never, but never even hinted at anything resembling a claim to a special recognition as a Marxist. Regardless of his great contributions to the proletarian revolution Lenin understood that he had never made one single basic contribution to the science of Marxism that was not already in existence long before he became a Marxist. He was a real great of the proletarian revolution and felt no need for bourgeois "recognition" as an "independent" Marxist and least of all as a "Leninist."

Lenin regarded Engels as a great Marxist but he never referred to the existence of any proletarian science called "Engelism." In fact he was well acquainted with Engels' objective and humble speech on the occasion of Karl Marx's burial whose main proposition was "I always played second fiddle to Marx." He was also acquainted with Frederick Engels' significant note appended to his "Lud-

## V. I. Lenin



No "Marxist-Leninist" — just a great Marxist!

wig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy" which read as follows:

"Here I may be permitted to make a personal explanation. Lately repeated reference has been made to my share in this theory, and so I can hardly avoid saying a few words here to settle this point. I cannot deny that both before and during my forty years' collaboration with Marx I had a certain independent share in laying the foundations of the theory, and more particularly in its elaboration. But the greater part of its leading basic principles, especially in the realm of economics and history, and, above all, their final trenchant formulation, belong to Marx. What I contributed — at any rate with the exception of my work in a few special fields — Marx could very well have done without me. What Marx accomplished I would not have achieved. Marx stood higher, saw further, and took a wider and quicker view than all the rest of us. Marx was a genius; we others were at best talented. Without him the theory would not be by far what it is today. It therefore rightly bears his name." (Footnote on Engels' "Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy," Marx-Engels Selected Works, Vol. II p. 386)

Lenin obviously thought so too. But those political opportunists and theoretical pygmies that better than anyone else realized their abysmal insignificance designed and executed the plan of elevating Lenin to the pedestal of Marx as an "independent" Marxist and then claiming the "Marxist-Leninist mantle" for themselves.

That the invention of the term "Marxist-Leninist" represented a deliberate act on the part of the petty-bourgeois opportunist leadership inside of "Lenin's party" (the Bolshevik Party) is irrefutable and more than obvious to any objective observer. However, in order to prove this point beyond the remotest possibility of doubt permit us to quote from one of the most authoritative institutions in the Russian "communist" superstructure — the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

In a philosophical dictionary elaborated by some of the most prominent "professors and scholars" of that exalted body, the term "Marxist-Leninist" is spelled out in its fullest political and ideological context. The quote follows:

"Marxism-Leninism, a term used to signalize the fact that Lenin enriched, and developed, for the era of imperialism and socialist revolution, the teachings of Marx and Engels in such a way as to create something new, which is yet inseparable from the old. Thus it can be described as the theory of the proletarian movement for the emancipation of society from capitalist oppression embodying the strategy and tactics of the proletarian socialist revolution, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the theory and practice of building socialism and of the transition to communism. . . .

. . . After the death of Marx and Engels, first Lenin and later Stalin not only exposed opportunists of every stripe and defended Marxism from various perversions, but also carried forward this science, enriching it, under new conditions of the class struggle, with new evidence and experience. They

demonstrated in practice the creative strength of Marxism. Marx and Engels lived in the period of industrial capitalism, capitalism which was still expanding and growing stronger, in the period when the proletariat was beginning to prepare for revolution. Lenin and Stalin, on the other hand, belong to the period of imperialism, of declining capitalism, and the period therein, the proletarian revolution has already been victorious in one country, thus opening the Soviet era of proletarian democracy and the construction of socialism. 'That is why,' as Stalin points out, 'Leninism is the further development of Marxism. Leninism is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution.' (Stalin, Leninism, Vol. I, pp. 8-9, 1933 ed.) . . .

"Further, Lenin developed the Marxist concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, having discovered the significance of Soviets as the state form of this dictatorship. Lenin defined the dictatorship of the proletariat as a special form of class union of the proletariat with the exploited non-proletarian classes (peasants and others); he showed that this dictatorship is a higher type of democracy than that which exists in class society. Lenin established the possibility of the construction of socialist society in a country of proletarian dictatorship, even though encircled by capitalism, on condition that such a country not be strangled by armed intervention. Lenin devoted particular attention to the concrete ways and means of socialist construction, demonstrating that the Soviet Union possessed all that was necessary to this end. He further developed the Marxist idea of the hegemony of the proletariat. He organized these ideas into a system of proletarian leadership of the masses of the toilers in town and country not only in the fight for the overthrow of tsarism and capitalism, but also in the work of building up socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat.' (Ibid. pp. 361-62.) . . .

"The theory of Marx, Engels, and Lenin received further development in the works of Stalin, who relentlessly exposed the enemies of Leninism and defended the unity, strength, and integrity of the party. Stalin carried further Lenin's teachings concerning the possibility of the initial victory of socialism in but a few countries, or even one, and the impossibility, under imperialist conditions, of a simultaneous victory of socialism in all countries. He also developed further the pivotal ideas of Lenin in regard to the industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture, worked out methods of socialist reconstruction in the countryside and of the liquidation of the kulaks as a class through general collectivization. The problem of the state under socialism is another of the basic questions dealt with by Marx, Engels, and Lenin which received further treatment in the work of Stalin, especially in relation to the conditions of capitalist encirclement. He armed the party and the Soviet people with a knowledge of the laws of class struggle under new conditions and pointed out the role of the proletarian state in the defense of emerging communism. In parti-

(Continued on Page 9)

# An Estimate Of Marx By International Liberalism

(In March of 1908 Lenin wrote a short article exposing the "liberals'" methodology of adulterating Marxism. That article is full of relevance in these days when the practice of revising Marx and Marxism has become worldwide and massive. Following we reprint the article in unabridged form.)

"Marxists would do well to cast a glance at the comments made on the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of Marx by influential political organs in various countries, especially in the liberal and 'democratic' bourgeois newspapers, which combine the possibility of influencing the masses of readers with the right to speak on behalf of official, titular professorial scholarship.

"We shall begin our review with *Russkiye Vedomosti*. This is the most sedate (and dullest), the most scientific (and farthest removed from real life) of professorial newspapers. Its short article on the twenty-fifth anniversary of Karl Marx's death (No. 51, March 1) is written in a predominantly dry wooden tone—'objectivity,' as it is called in the language of professors 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary.' The writer of the article tries to confine himself to facts and trifling facts. As an impartial historian, he is prepared to give Marx his due—at least as far as the past is concerned, a past which is already dead and can be spoken of in a lifeless way. *Russkiye Vedomosti* admits Marx to be a 'remarkable figure,' a 'great man of science,' an 'outstanding leader of the proletariat,' an organizer of the masses. But this recognition applies to the past: today, says the newspaper, 'new paths are really necessary,' i.e., new paths for the labour movement and socialism unlike the 'old Marxism.' What these new paths are, the paper does not say in so many words—that is too live a subject for professors and too 'injudicious' a theme for virtuosi in the art of 'tactful silence'. But broad hints are dropped: 'Many of his [Marx's] constructions have been destroyed by scientific analysis and the merciless critique of events. Among scientists there are practically no adherents faithful to his system as a whole; Marx's spiritual child—German Social-Democracy—has

deviated a good deal from the revolutionary path which the founders of German socialism had mapped out.' As you see, the writer leaves very little unsaid in his desire to rectify Marx in the revisionist way.

"Another influential paper, *Rech*, the organ of a political party, which plays first fiddle in the concert of Russian liberalism, gives a much more lively appraisal of Marx. The tendency is, of course, the same as *Russkiye Vedomosti*, but whereas there we saw a preface to a fat volume, here we have political slogans, that are the immediate guide for many a speech from the parliamentary rostrum, in dealing with all current events and topics of the day. The article 'Karl Marx and Russia' (No. 53, March 2) is written by the notorious renegade Mr. Izgoev, a specimen of those Russian intellectuals, who between the ages of twenty-five and thirty 'try to pose as Marxists', between thirty-five and forty play at being liberals, and after that end up as Black Hundreds.

"Mr. Izgoev deserted the Social-Democrats for the liberals (as he himself has declared and as that arch-renegade Mr. Struve said of him) just when the revolution, after its first staggering successes, entered a difficult period of a long and hard struggle against the growing counter-revolution. Indeed, Mr. Izgoev is highly typical in this respect. He is splendid at making it clear who stands to gain by professorial affectation in

appraising Marx, and whose work this official 'scholarship' is doing. 'Marx the tactician of political intrigue,' Izgoev thunders, 'was a considerable hindrance to Marx the great scientist, and caused him to commit many mistakes.' The chief mistake, of course, was that in addition to the correct, reasonable 'evolutionary Marxism' accepted by the 'majority' (the majority of philistines?) there was born a mischievous, unscientific, fantastic revolutionary Marxism, 'adulterated by home-brewed Narodism.' What our liberal especially resents is the role of this Marxism in the Russian revolution. Would you believe it—they go to the length of talking of a dictatorship of the proletariat to carry out this very same 'bourgeois revolution', or even of a 'dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry'—which is absolutely fantastic in the mouths of Marxists. 'No wonder that revolutionary Marxism in the form in which it was adopted in Russia by the Bolsheviks of all shades has completely failed.' . . . 'They are having to think of establishing an ordinary "bourgeois" [the ironical quotation marks are Mr. Izgoev's] constitution.'

"There you have an ideologically ready made and politically mature Octobrist, who is quite convinced that it is Marxism and revolutionary tactics that have failed, and not the Cadet tactics of compromise, betrayal, and treachery!

"To proceed. From the Russian we shall pass to the German press, which operates in a free atmosphere, face to face with a legal socialist party, and which expresses its views in dozens of daily newspapers. The *Frankfurter Zeitung*, one of the wealthiest, most widely read and most 'democratic' bourgeois newspapers in Germany, devotes a big leading article to the twenty-fifth anniversary of Marx's death (No. 76, March 16, New Style, evening edition). The German 'democrats' at once take

the bull by the horns. 'One can understand the Social-Democratic press having honored its teacher on this day in numerous articles,' we are told. 'But Marx has been recognized as a great man even in an influential national liberal paper, although with the usual reservations. Yes, of course, he was great, but he was a great corrupter.'

"This newspaper, representing the pick of that brand of Black Hundred ideology known as European liberalism, explains that it does not in the least question Marx's personal honesty, but that his theories have caused incalculable harm. By introducing the conception of determinism and objective law in the sphere of social phenomena, by denying the significance of morality and the relative conditional nature of our knowledge, Marx founded an anti-scientific utopia and a real 'Church' of his sectarian disciples. But his most harmful idea is—the class struggle. Herein lies all the evil! Marx treated seriously the old aphorism about two nations, about the existence of two nations within every civilized nation—a nation of 'exploiters' and a nation of 'exploited' (the newspaper puts these unscientific terms in deadly ironical quotation marks). Marx forgot the clear, obvious truth that is plain to all healthy people, namely, that in social life 'the aim is not struggle but agreement.' Marx 'tore the nation asunder, for he hammered it into the heads of his people that there was nothing in common between them and the rest of the people, that they were deadly enemies.'

"What could be more natural,' the newspaper asks, 'than that Social-Democracy, agreeing as it does with many of the bourgeoisie on a number of practical issues, should seek closer alignment with them? But that does not happen precisely because of Marxist theory. Social-Democracy has condemned itself to isolation. For a time it seemed as though a fundamental change was going to take place in this respect. It was when the revisionists began their campaign. But it turned out to be a mistake, and the difference between the revisionists and ourselves consisted, among other things, in that we understood this mistake while they

did not. The revisionists believed, and still believe, that it is possible somehow to keep to Marx and yet become a different party. Vain hopes. Marx has either to be swallowed whole or completely rejected. A half-hearted course is of no use here.' . . .

"Quite right, gentlemen of the liberal fold! You do sometimes come out with the truth by accident.

"So long as Social-Democracy honors Marx it will not be able to rid itself of the idea of the class struggle and of all those other things that make living with it so difficult—the scientific world is agreed that not one of the politico-economic theories of Marxism has been proved true.' . . .

"Well, well, gentlemen. You have admirably expressed the essence of bourgeois science, of bourgeois liberalism, and its entire policy. You have grasped the fact that Marx cannot be swallowed piecemeal. This is something that the Izgoevs and the Russian liberals have not yet understood. But even they will, before long.

"And here, in conclusion, is *Journal des Debats* the conservative organ of the bourgeois republic. In its issue of March 15, it writes, on the occasion of the anniversary, that the socialists, whose 'wild equalitarians,' preach the cult of their great men, that the chief evil of the teachings of Marx, who 'hated the bourgeoisie,' is the theory of the struggle of classes. 'He preached to the working class not temporary conflicts alternating with periods of truce, but a holy war, a war of extermination, of expropriation, a war for the promised land of collectivism . . . a monstrous utopia.' . . .

"The bourgeois papers write well when stung to the quick. Life becomes a more cheerful thing when you see this growing ideological unity among the liberal enemies of the proletariat all over the world, for this unity is one of the guarantees of the unification of the millions of the international proletariat, which will win for itself its promised land, come what may." (Lenin, March 12, 1908, article titled "An Estimate of Marx by International Liberalism.")

(End of Article)

(Continued from Page 8)

cular the writings of Stalin on the national-colonial question have contributed some of the best pages in all the literature of Marxism in this field.

"Working on the problem of the relation of the epoch of socialism to that of communism, Stalin has shown the conditions necessary for the transition from socialism to communism. Under the leadership of Stalin the basic conditions of scientific communism have already been established in practice and have received explicit formulation in the present constitution of the U.S.S.R. This Stalinist constitution sums up the momentous experience of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., where the basic aspects of such difficult problems involved in the transition from socialism to communism as the liquidation of the antagonisms between town and country and between physical and mental labor have been

practically solved." (*Handbook of Philosophy*, pp. 71-73.)

Permit us to call the reader's attention to the following points made by the Russian "academicians." First the statement that "Marx and Engels lived in a period of industrial capitalism." The obvious inference is that capitalism is divided into two distinct epochs during one of which (industrial capitalism) Marx and Engels lived and another (imperialism) under which Lenin lived. But this would be characterized as stupid if it wasn't for the fact that it is downright counter-revolutionary for who doesn't know that Lenin had already joined the socialist movement in Russia before Engels died in 1895? How could anybody assert that they lived in two different periods of capitalism? This business of Marx and Engels living in the "epoch of industrial capitalism" sounds more like the "original" of those "theories" of the "liberal" ideologists of the bourgeoisie who insist that Marx explained "only and only the social relations of

Victorian capitalism" (C. Wright Mills) among others.

Note also that in the Russian "Marxist-Leninist" version of the history of Marxism Lenin supersedes Marx and finally obliterates him altogether—but for an historical moment only. Soon enough Stalin supersedes both and from there on as history has proven Stalinism and its "loyal opposition" Trotskyism surface as the two main currents representing "Marxism-Leninism."

Of course, the Soviet Academy of Sciences does not quote Stalin anymore. They don't even quote anything from the "Bolshevik that smote down Stalin the tyrant"—Nikita Khrushchev, these days. Now they quote Brezhnev and Kosygin instead. And that is all very logical and understandable.

But the fact remains that "Stalin's crowd," "Khrushchev's gang," and "Brezhnev's clique" all worship at the altar of the same counter-revolutionary deity "Marxism-Leninism."

Three years ago the *Marxist*

*Vanguard* wrote a series of articles entitled "Entente' Imperialists Attempt to 'Canonize' the Great Lenin." In those articles we exposed the ideological collusion between the "Marxist-Leninist" and the "liberal" ideologists of the "Entente" powers. We direct the attention of the reader to the basic identity of the conception of Lenin's role embodied in the definition of the Soviet Academy of Sciences quoted above and those of the "liberal" apologists of American finance capital:

"The methodology of the distorters of Marxism exhibits a variety of forms.

Some of these forms include converting Lenin into a revisionist "opposer" of Marx and Marxism. It also includes the more familiar method of misquoting, quoting out of context etc., so common to "Marxist-Leninists" of all epochs and of all hues.

But what is happening to Lenin's teachings is not new in a historical sense. Lenin himself exposed the distortions of Marx's teachings and the methods used

by the revisionists of his time to accomplish such perversion of revolutionary theory and practice.

Once again we will quote this exposure of the distorters of Marxism by Lenin as it appeared in his pamphlet *The State and Revolution*, disregarding the obvious danger of becoming repetitive.

"What is now happening to Marx's teaching has in the course of history, happened repeatedly to the teachings of revolutionary thinkers and leaders of oppressed classes struggling for emancipation. During the lifetime of great revolutionaries, the oppressing classes constantly hounded them, received their teachings with the most savage malice, the most furious hatred and the most unscrupulous campaigns of lies and slanders. After their death, attempts are made to convert them into harmless icons, to canonize them, so to say, and to surround their names with a

(Continued on Page 10)

(Continued from Page 9)

certain halo for the 'consolation' of the oppressed classes and with the object of duping the latter, while at the same time emasculating the essence of the revolutionary teaching, blunting its revolutionary edge and vulgarizing it. At the present time, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the working class movement concur in the 'doctoring' of Marxism. They omit, obliterate and distort the revolutionary side of this teaching, its revolutionary soul. They push to the foreground and extol what is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie. All the social-chauvinists are now 'Marxists' (don't laugh!). And more and more frequently, German bourgeois scholars, but yesterday specialists in the annihilation of Marxism, are speaking of the 'national-German' Marx, who, they aver, educated the workers' unions which are 'so splendidly organized for the purpose of conducting a predatory war!' (Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, pp. 11-12.)

Lenin's most revolutionary task as a Marxist was precisely that of restoring the revolutionary substance of Marx's teachings which the Bernsteins and the Millerands and the ideologists of the bourgeoisie in general had adulterated.

Now Lenin himself has become the subject of "iconization" and ideological and political castration.

As an initial, concrete example of the method of distorting Lenin's contributions to the science of the proletarian revolution, Marxism, we present excerpts from an article which appeared in the *New York Times* of March 18, 1970 under the by-line of Harrison E. Salisbury and entitled "Misattribution of Foe's Idea to Lenin Stirs Moscow." The article in question stated in part:

"An ideological embarrassment has emerged in Moscow over the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birth next month.

"The original version of the 6,000-word keynote document issued by the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party last December attributes to Lenin a statement made by Otto Bauer, the Austrian Socialist leader and long-time antagonist of Lenin.

"The quotation was published by Pravda and other leading Soviet newspapers on Dec. 23, a few days after the theses, as the document is called, had been read, discussed and approved by the Central Committee.

"According to reports reaching the United States the error was not discovered in Moscow. It went undetected until Walter Ulbricht, the East German leader, read the theses in his party newspaper, *Neues Deutschland*. He is said to have telephoned immediately in a state of outrage.

"There has been no public mention of the incident in Moscow although it was said to be the talk of the town. When the theses were published in pamphlet form by the State Political Publishing House a few days after their appearance in Pravda the mistaken quotation

was simply dropped from the document.

"The occasion at which Lenin attacked Bauer was the Second Congress of the Comintern, the Soviet-led Communist international organization, in July, 1920.

"Quoting a passage from a book by Bauer, Lenin said sarcastically that the 'book will be a useful, if peculiar, supplement to the textbooks on communism' and suggested that the party use as a test of Communist knowledge 'any paragraph, any argument' in Bauer's book.

"If you cannot answer the question," he said, 'you are not yet a Communist and should not join the Communist party.'

"He then went on to quote Bauer's view that the 'social factors of force,' which determine the relative strength of various elements in society, were: 'Number; the degree of organization; the place held in the process of production and distribution; activity and education.'

"He told his audience: 'You may think that this sounds queer and unintelligible. It is an example of what Marxism has been reduced to, of the kind of banality and defense of the exploiters to which the most revolutionary theory can be reduced.'

"The erroneous Pravda version of the theses, in the third paragraph of the 14th Point of Section III, contains this language:

"In the draft of the report on the international situation and the basic tasks of the Comintern, Lenin noted five "social factors of force" of the working class: 1. Number; 2. Organization; 3. Place in the process of production and distribution; 4. Activity; 5. Education.

"At the present time, just as Lenin expressed this thought, the strength of the working class has sharply increased, inevitably heightening its organization and political activity, its educational and professional preparation."

"The theses thus used the Bauer formula, which had been mentioned by Lenin only for purposes of ridicule, as the framework for a contemporary analysis of the strength of the working class.

"In the pamphlet version of the theses the editors dropped all reference to the Bauer principles mistakenly attributed to Lenin, but did not change their own argument. They simply begin the paragraph:

"In our time the strength of the working class has sharply increased inevitably heightening its organization and political activity, its educational and professional preparation."

"The wrong attribution represented an embarrassment because of the authority of Lenin's words and the seriousness with which the 100th anniversary of his birth is being celebrated April 22." (*New York Times*, March 18, 1970.)

According to Salisbury, Walter Ulbricht was "outraged" in discovering the distortion of Lenin's theories. But how could a "Marxist-Leninist" flunky of the Russian social-imperialists such as Ulbricht dare to be "outraged" by his master's "error"? Nope! "Marxist-Leninist" Ul-

bright was not "outraged," he was simply alarmed by the fact that the distortion was too crude and "amateurish." He merely alerted his bosses to the danger of exposure involved in using such a well known polemic of Lenin's against the pseudo-Marxist theories of Otto Bauer.

Note that there wasn't the least effort at self-criticism on the part of those who "made the error." They compound the crime of this "error" by the crime of the surreptitious way in which they withdrew the incriminating evidence.

May we suggest that we apply the test that Lenin proposed back in 1920 to the opportunists in Russia that dare speak in the name of Lenin? Let's see if the Russian social-imperialists qualify as members of Lenin's "monolithic Party of the working class."

The prerequisites for membership in such a Party as gauged by Lenin in connection with understanding and reacting to the treacherous pseudo-theories of Otto Bauer hinged on being able to answer or react to "any paragraph, any argument. . . ."

"... if you cannot answer the question . . . you are not yet a Communist and should not join the Party."

What could be said, in this regard, to people that react to Bauer's opportunistic pseudo-theories by ascribing them to Lenin himself? They do not belong and they are not in Lenin's "monolithic Party of the working class," since no such Party exists either in Russia or anywhere in the world! . . .

The same ambivalent method of "analyzing" the social and historical role of Karl Marx is now being utilized by the hired ideologists of the "Entente" to describe Lenin. Lenin the "saint" and Lenin the "devil" as images of the same personality

are being projected today. For instance Harry Schwartz, one of the *New York Times*' best known "Kremlinologists" "contributes" to the propaganda efforts by creating an image of Lenin as an "opponent" to Karl Marx and "Leninism" as a "negation" of Marxism.

This splintering of two of the world's greatest revolutionaries is attempted by Schwartz precisely to divide the social-historical unity of the ideology of the working class — Marxism.

From the pages of the *New York Times Encyclopedic Almanac, 1970*, we extract the following excerpts from Harry Schwartz's "contribution."

"... it can be argued, Karl Marx originated the basic body of doctrine that Lenin later modified and employed. . . .

"... As a theoretician, he irrevocably modified Marxism by adding key features that enabled this ideology to play the role it has since 1917. In the realm of practical affairs, Lenin was a master politician, and he set a model for political flexibility that has stood his successors in very good stead indeed.

"... Marx gave no tactical, detailed instruction for accomplishing such a revolution. For most of his life, he paid little attention to the undeveloped and underdeveloped countries of the world, where the great bulk of the population consisted of peasants living in pre-industrial societies. Marx expected little constructive revolutionary achievements from such backward peoples. . . .

"It is immediately apparent, however, that the Communist nations today . . . were almost all primarily peasant societies when conquered. . . . The most highly developed industrial nations of the world . . . have remained free of Communist rule.

It is as though history has played a colossal joke on Marx and his followers.

"Lenin can be rightfully credited with perpetrating this historical irony, because he actively demonstrated that Marxists could gain power in countries that failed to meet Marx's revolutionary specifications. . . .

"Lenin's first major contribution to Marxism was devising the mechanism for gaining power. It was he who conceived of a Communist party that would bring about the revolution; a tightly knit group of dedicated men and women, working under central direction and militaristic discipline. In the Communist party envisaged by Lenin, members would be trained to become the revolution's commissioned officers and NCOs. . . .

"Lenin's second contribution was an outright revision of fundamental Marxist doctrine. When Tsar Nicholas II was overthrown in March 1917, Russia's orthodox Marxists — the Mensheviks and their allies — might have seized power but deliberately did not. It was inconceivable to them that this backward agrarian country was ready for Marxist rule. They believed that Russia first had to experience capitalism and develop a much larger working class before the Marxists could take power.

"Lenin was then out of the country but, upon his return (April 1917), he quickly brushed aside these theories and began steering Bolshevik policies toward the seizure of power. To attain that objective, he deliberately set out to win over the peasants with the slogan: "All land to the peasants." That slogan was decidedly un-Marxist, because it gave the impression that Lenin's party favored millions of peasants owning their own land. . . .

"Lenin's third contribution was the example he gave of policies based on the principle that the ends justify the means; any tactic is permissible that serves the immediate needs of the Communist state. Early in 1918, he willingly signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk that amounted to almost unconditional surrender to Germany. (In 1962 supporters of Khrushchev pointed to Lenin's action, seeking to justify the premier's surrender in the Cuban missile crisis to President Kennedy.)

"Even more important was Lenin's breathtaking position reversal in 1921, when he introduced the New Economic Policy (NEP) to stave off economic collapse. During the NEP era, Lenin permitted the revival of private industry and trade and the use of money and other 'capitalist' devices that had been outlawed since 1918.

"To many contemporaries, Lenin seemed to be abandoning Marxism for capitalism; however, he was simply assuring the continuance of Communist rule by retreating from unworkable utopianism. . . .

"Most clearly, Lenin's historic greatness stems from his refusal to be a slavish follower of Marx. . . . By his ideological flexibility, Lenin provided the essential precedent for those who followed him to the height of Kremlin power. His example per-

**The Three Top "Marxist-Leninists"— Counter-Revolutionaries All**



Mao Tse-tung

Joseph Stalin

Leon Trotsky

(Continued on Page 16)

(Continued from Page 15)

the train of the "national movement," which means nothing more nor less than following the imperialist bourgeoisie and their colonial and semi-colonial overseers and agents;

"Over a half century ago Lenin had already analyzed the political and historical role of the national bourgeoisie in the epoch of imperialism, and clearly projected the main guidelines for a Communist approach to the national liberation struggles.

"In his pamphlet, 'The Right of Nations to Self-Determination,' written in 1914, Lenin spelled out the correct tactics in regards to possible alliances with the bourgeoisie of oppressed nations. Said Lenin:

"The bourgeoisie, which naturally comes out as the hegemon (leader) in the beginning of every national movement, terms the support of all national aspirations "practical". But the policy of the proletariat in the national question (as in other questions) supports the bourgeoisie only in a definite direction; it never coincides with the policy of the bourgeoisie . . . Therefore, precisely against the practicalness of the bourgeoisie the proletarians advance their principles in the national question; they always give the bourgeoisie only conditional support. . . ."

"The bourgeoisie is most interested in the "practicability" of the given demand—hence the perennial policy of coming to terms with the bourgeoisie of other nations to the detriment of the proletariat. For the proletariat, however, the important thing is to strengthen its class against the bourgeoisie and to educate the masses in the spirit

of consistent democracy and Socialism.

"This may not be "practical" for the opportunists, but it is the only real guarantee of a maximum of national equality and peace, in spite of the feudal landlords and the nationalist bourgeoisie.

"The whole task of the proletariat in the national question is "impractical" from the standpoint of the nationalist bourgeoisie of every nation, because, being opposed to all nationalism, the proletarians demand "abstract" equality, they demand that on principle there shall be no privileges, however slight.' . . . The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations will call upon the proletariat to support its aspirations unconditionally on the plea that its demands are "practical."

"The proletariat is opposed to such "practicalness." While recognizing equality and an equal right to a national state, it values above all, and places above all, the alliance of the proletarians of all nations, and evaluates every national demand, every national separation, from the angle of the class struggle of the workers. This call for practicalness is merely a call for the uncritical acceptance of bourgeois aspirations," (Lenin, "Rights of Nations to Self-Determination," *Selected Works*, Volume I, Part II, pp. 333, 334, 335).

"And again:

"The interests of the working class and of its struggle against capitalism demand complete solidarity and the closest unity of the workers of all nations; they demand that the nationalistic policy of the bourgeoisie of every nationality be repelled . . .

It makes no difference to the wage worker whether he is exploited chiefly by the Great Russian bourgeoisie rather than by the non-Russian bourgeoisie, or by the Polish bourgeoisie rather than by the Jewish bourgeoisie, etc. The wage worker who has come to understand his class interests is equally indifferent to the state privileges of the Great-Russian capitalists and to the promises of the Polish or Ukrainian capitalists to set up an earthly paradise when they obtain state privileges. Capitalism is developing and will continue to develop, in one way or another, both in united heterogeneous states and in separate national states." (*Ibid.*, p. 350-351)

"Six years later (June-July 1920), Lenin concretized those Marxist guidelines to the National and Colonial Question when he stated:

"In conformity with its fundamental tasks of fighting against bourgeois democracy and of exposing its falsity and hypocrisy the Communist Party, as the conscious expression of the struggle of the proletariat for the overthrow of the yoke of the bourgeoisie, must put as the cornerstone in the national question not abstract and formal principles, but, firstly, an exact estimation of the historically concrete situation and, primarily, the economic situation secondly, it must distinctly single out the interests of the oppressed classes, of the toilers, of the exploited, from the general concept of national interests as a whole, which implies the interests of the ruling class; . . ."

" . . . it is necessary to wage a determined struggle against painting the bourgeois-democratic liberation trend in backward

countries in Communist colors; the Communist International must support the bourgeois-democratic movements in the colonial and backward countries only on the condition that the elements of future proletarian parties existing in all backward countries, which are not merely communist in name, shall be grouped together and trained to appreciate their special tasks, viz, the tasks of fighting the bourgeois-democratic movements within their own nations; the Communist International must enter into a temporary alliance with bourgeois democracy in colonial and backward countries, but must not merge with it, and must unconditionally preserve the independence of the proletarian movement even in its most rudimentary form. . . ." (Lenin, "Preliminary Draft of Thesis on the National and Colonial Question"—for the Second Congress of the Communist International, *Selected Works*, Volume 10, pp. 232, 236, 237).

"And further:

"There is not the slightest doubt that every nationalist movement can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement, for the bulk of the population in backward countries are peasants who represent bourgeois-capitalist relations. It would be utopian to think that proletarian parties, if indeed they can arise in such countries, could pursue Communist tactics and a Communist policy in these backward countries without having definite relations with the peasant movement and without effectively supporting it. But it was argued if we speak about the bourgeois-democratic movement all distinction between reformist and revolutionary movements

will be obliterated; whereas in recent times this distinction has been fully and clearly revealed in the backward and colonial countries, for the imperialist bourgeoisie is trying with all its might to implant the reformist movement also among the oppressed nations. A certain rapprochement has been brought about between the bourgeoisie of the exploiting countries and those of the colonial countries, so that very often, even in the majority of cases, perhaps, where the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries does support the national movement, it simultaneously works in harmony with the imperialist bourgeoisie, i.e., it joins the latter in fighting against all revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes.

"In the commission this was proved irrefutably, and we came to the conclusion that the only correct thing to do was to take this distinction into consideration and nearly everywhere to substitute the term "nationalist-revolutionary" for the term "bourgeois - democratic." The meaning of this change is that we Communists should and will, support bourgeois liberation movements in the colonial countries only when these movements do not hinder us in training and organizing the peasants and the broad masses of the exploited in a revolutionary spirit." (From—"The Report of the Commission on the National and Colonial Question at the Second Congress of the Communist International"—July 26, 1920—Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 10.) ("Further On the Line of the Founding Congress" — *Vanguard*, Dec.1968-Jan., 1969)

(End of Article)

## "Leninism" . . .

(Continued from Page 10)

mitted them to zigzag ideologically, whenever a party line change became expedient: an eminently successful policy in terms of power.

"Whether this flexibility is Marxism, as Karl Marx and his first-generation followers conceived it, remains another, moot issue. . . ." (Harry Schwartz, *New York Times Encyclopedic Almanac*, 1970.)

In Harry Schwartz's distortion of Marx, Lenin, and Marxism, the Mensheviks appear as the genuine Marxists and the real followers of Marx. On the other hand, Stalin, Molotov, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Kosygin, Suslov, Mao Tse-tung and Gus Hall are supposed to be the true direct descendants of V. I. Lenin. Lenin is painted as the iconoclast of Marxism, as the unorthodox variant of the species.

Hence, according to scribbler Harry Schwartz, the most genuine continuator of Marx, and in fact the revolutionary that rescued and restored the revolutionary kernel of Marxism buried by the opportunists of the Second International, represents nothing but the antipode of Karl Marx. To Harry Schwartz Lenin's conception of the peasant question represented a negation of Marxism. Lenin's policies on the peasant question — in fact, the most fundamental and decisive question of proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat — was based on the unity of the working class and the poor peasantry. And that revolutionary

alliance has social-political origins in Marx's conception of the proletarian revolution together with a "new version of the peasant war."

To suggest "dichotomy" and "negation" between Marx and Lenin on the peasant question and indeed to charge Marx with disregard of the peasant question goes beyond the realm of error and enters into the realm of philistinism and demagoguery.

Harry Schwartz deliberately ignores the great contributions made by Marx and Engels, not just on the peasant question as such, but precisely on the historical factors of revolutionary unity between the working class and the vast majority of the rural producers—the poor peasants.

Two decades of social and historical experience within which time two great Revolutions occurred (the Revolution of 1848 and 1871) permitted Marx and Engels to make the basic and initial formulation of the revolutionary alliance of the working class and the peasantry — the social-historical ingredients of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Referring to the lessons of Revolution of 1848, Marx wrote in *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*:

" . . . the interests of the peasants no longer coincide, as during the reign of the first Napoleon, with the interests of the bourgeoisie, with the interests of capital. There is now a conflict of interests. The peasants, therefore, find their natural allies and leaders in the urban proletariat, whose mission it is to subvert the bourgeois order of

society. . . ." (Karl Marx, *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, p. 137.)

That ought to be enough to give the lie to the *New York Times*' scribbler, Harry Schwartz. But almost twenty years after this was written and as a result of the great lessons of the Paris Commune, Marx returned to the subject of the revolutionary relationship between the working class and the peasantry as follows:

" . . . In reality, the Communal Constitution brought the rural producers under the intellectual lead of the central towns of their districts, and these secured to them, in the working men, the natural trustees of their interests. . . ."

"The Commune was perfectly right in telling the peasants that 'its victory was their only hope.' Of all the lies hatched at Versailles and re-echoed by the glorious European penny-a-liner, one of the most tremendous was that the Rurals represented the French peasantry. Think only of the love of the French peasant for the men to whom, after 1815, he had to pay the milliard of indemnity. In the eyes of the French peasant, the very existence of a great landed proprietor is in itself an encroachment on his conquests of 1789. The bourgeois, in 1848, had burdened his plot of land with the additional tax of forty-five cents in the franc; but then he did so in the name of the revolution; while now he had fomented a civil war against the revolution, to shift on to the peasant's shoulders the chief load of the five milliards of indemnity to be paid to the Prussian. The

Commune, on the other hand, in one of its first proclamations, declared that the true originators of the war would be made to pay its cost. The Commune would have delivered the peasant of the blood tax—would have given him a cheap government—transformed his present blood-suckers, the notary, advocate, executor, and other judicial vampires, into salaried communal agents, elected by, and responsible to, himself. It would have freed him of the tyranny of the *garde champetre*, the gendarme, the prefect; would have put enlightenment by the schoolmaster in the place of stultification by the priest. And the French peasant is, above all, a man of reckoning. He would find it extremely reasonable that the pay of the priest, instead of being extorted by the taxgatherer, should only depend upon the spontaneous action of the parishioners' religious instincts. Such were the great immediate boons which the rule of the Commune—and that rule alone—held out to the French peasantry. . . ."

" . . . The peasant was a Bonapartist, because the great Revolution, with all its benefits to him, was, in his eyes, personified in Napoleon. This delusion, rapidly breaking down under the Second Empire and in its very nature hostile to the Rurals, this prejudice of the past, how could it have withstood the appeal of the Commune to the living interests and urgent wants of the peasantry?"

"The Rurals — this was, in fact, their chief apprehension — knew that three months' free communication of Communal Paris with the provinces would

bring about a general rising of the peasants, and hence their anxiety to establish a police blockade around Paris, so as to stop the spread of the rinderpest." (Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France*, pp 93, 99-101.)

When the pen-prostitute Harry Schwartz speaks about Lenin's "refusal to be a slavish follower of Marx" he's merely advancing the rationale for Stalin, Molotov, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Mao Tse-tung's refusal to be "slavish followers of Lenin."

Marxism is not an ideology with two sides or two parts. Marxism is the social-historical creation of the only revolutionary class in the world, the working class, and Karl Marx and Vladimir Ilyich Lenin are not expressions of anti-thesis, but on the contrary, an indestructible, inseparable synthesis of the ideology of the proletariat.

Note the apology for the counter-revolutionary action and collusive criminality of the Russian social-imperialists contained in the infamous "Cuban situation" of October, 1962.

The use of the Cuban counter-revolution to beat back the whole Latin American Revolution, which was, in essence, all that the Cuban hoax ever represented, is equated to Lenin's tactics in the signing of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Again we see that in every case, every distortion of Lenin represents a rationale, an apology for the counter-revolutionary actions and policies of the Russian social-imperialists." (*Marxist Vanguard*, April-May, 1970.)

(*Vanguard*. "Base and Superstructure in Class Society, Article II," April-May, 1973)