

One constant, salient fact is apparent from the revisionists and opportunists. They either renounce or revise the dictatorship of the proletariat. The goal of Marxism-Leninism, in this stage, is the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This goal forms the very need and purpose of the Party:

"The Party is not only the highest form of class association of the proletarians; it is at the same time an instrument in the hands of the proletariat for achieving the dictatorship when that has not yet been achieved and for consolidating and expanding the dictatorship when it has already been achieved."

(Foundations of Leninism,
p. 111, Peking)

Stalin recognizes the dictatorship of the proletariat as both an instrument of the proletarian revolution and as the rule of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie. The proletarian revolution does not cease with the overthrow of the bourgeoisie:

"For many reasons, the bourgeoisie that is overthrown in one country remains for a long time stronger than the proletariat which has overthrown it."

(Foundations of Leninism,
p. 41, Peking)

The revisionists and opportunists renounce and revise the dictatorship of the proletariat because it is the embodiment of the power and force of the proletariat, the "flesh and blood" of the proletariat. It is the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a concept, which brings to the surface the petty-bourgeois influence of the revisionists and opportunists. No other question seems to have this power.

The present attacks on CL and MCLL by the RU-Guardian forces, and others, tie into revisionism around

the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Carl Davidson's column in the June 26, 1974, issue of the Guardian is of particular importance in this respect. After the distortions, after the mindless attack on CL, what is Davidson really saying? China, Albania, North Vietnam and North Korea do not constitute a contradiction with imperialism. That is what Davidson is saying. Davidson denies the contradiction between imperialism and those states which have established the dictatorship of the proletariat. Davidson denies the dictatorship of the proletariat as an instrument of the proletarian revolution. For the present, these revisionists accept the concept of a "future" dictatorship of the proletariat. But, they refuse to give theoretical support to the contradiction between the existing dictatorships of the proletariat and imperialism. That contradiction arises out of the very purpose of the dictatorship of the proletariat as an instrument of the proletarian revolution.

The RU-Guardian revisionists are more sophisticated and less honest than the Economists of Russia. They use the right words, "imperialism," "proletarianize," "national liberation." They quote Marx and Lenin, and even Stalin. But, they are carefully laying the seeds to oppose the Party and ultimately efforts to establish a genuine dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.N.A. They are laying the seeds to take the movement back to the bourgeois ideology.

"To locate at any given moment the particular link in the chain of processes which, if grasped, will enable us to keep hold of the whole chain and to prepare the conditions for achieving strategic success."

(Foundations of Leninism,
p. 95, Peking)

During the past 25 years we have often touched that link, but the revisionists and opportunists have again and again prevented us from "grasping" it. The two best examples of this process are the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960's and the Anti-War Movement. In the Civil Rights Movement the C.P.U.S.A. placed the "link" back into the hands of the comprador bourgeoisie. Today, in Mississippi, Aaron Henry, one-time leader of the Miss. Freedom Democratic Party, and Bill Waller, the moderate segregationist governor of Miss., are co-chairmen of the state's delegation to the upcoming mini-convention of the Democratic Party, to be held in Kansas City. Henry admits, really brags, that Waller has a "man" in his office whose sole function is that of liason between Waller and Henry. In Alabama, the "black" mayor of Tuskegee, Johnny Ford, openly supports George Wallace. In Hattiesburg, there are now "black" police, but, as one woman puts it "they still only beat up black people." These are the fruits of "black power" in the Negro Nation.

The Anti-War Movement in the U.S.N.A. has a parallel history. The revisionists and opportunists, the Trotskyists and C.P.U.S.A. dissipated its revolutionary potential. Compare the anti-war movement in Russia from the February Revolution of 1917 to the October Revolution—
(see Foundations, p.62.)

Here, the Anti-War Movement became the bulwark for those revisionists who claim that there can be a peaceful transition to socialism. Moralism and social pacivism became the cover for those who led the Anti-War Movement back to the bourgeois ideology.

Comrades who have been following the Guardian and the RU are aware that these forces, after refusing to discuss party-building in any specific terms or even mention the existence of CL for years, have suddenly burst forth with regular and fully "developed" attacks on CL and the Continuations Committee. Additionally, although the Guardian, RU, OL and like forces have supposedly "grave differences" between them, their attacks on Marxism-Leninism have remarkable uniformity. The material basis for these attacks is clear--after years of publicly proclaiming themselves the leadership of the "new communist movement", but refusing to concretely develop a strategy for building the party and the United Front Against Fascism, these ideological leaders of the remnants of the "New Left" are everywhere being abandoned by honest Marxist-Leninists and their careerist dreams are being shattered.

To be drawn into protracted ideological struggle with these elements would divert us from these real tasks, but we need to understand and reject the last gasps of the New Left as we move on.

First, we must understand the class base of these attackers. Three things are important about their social base and composition:

1. They are petit-bourgeois in origin.
2. They have no base in the proletariat except insofar as they have "injected" themselves in miniscule numbers in the mass of workers and wage-slaves.
3. They are almost exclusively Anglo-American, having failed to win even a healthy token number of revolutionaries from the oppressed nations and national minorities to their line.

With these characteristics in mind, it is easier to detect and understand them as "Legal Marxists" on their way to becoming a "coherent" body of revisionists and social-chauvinists.

The particular danger they represent is that they have played an apparently progressive role in the past few years and continue to stand as a shield for the main revisionist enemy of the class (the CPUSA) by apparently criticizing the USSR and its

sycophantic CP's. They cover this activity by showing dogged devotion to the Communist Party of the People's Republic of China and mechanically adopting what they believe to be the line of the CPC to the USNA. Is it not clear that out of the pacifism, anarchism, ultra-leftism, reformism, Trotskyism and anti-Communism of the New Left, somebody would discover Marxism-Leninism? And is it not just as clear that numerous honest, but bewildered activists would flock to the M-L standard without the theoretical grounding necessary to see the revisionism of the RU, OL, Guardian, etc.?

Now that the dust is settling from the "shaking out" of the New Left, we see that the RU firmly clings its "nation of a new type" theory of the Negro-National Colonial Question, the OL actively supports the CP in the political struggle inside the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF) and the Guardian weekly worships the spontaneous struggle of the masses while attempting to "paper over" the divergences in the "new Communist movement", establishing "Bureau's" everywhere to achieve hegemony therein (from Detroit--

James Forman has a column addressed to Black America and Jim Jacobs is the chief correspondent). These activities do nothing to build the Party, clarify line and program or build a "stable network of agents" to bind the Party to the class and win the masses to Marxist-Leninism.

What they do is shield the CPUSA (which is rooted in the class) from the all-out attack which must be conducted against it on detente, social-imperialism and revisionism at a time when the CPUSA itself has singled out "recruitment to the party of shop workers in basic industry as the key to implementing the anti-monopoly united front movement." Daily World, 7/5/74, p.2. With this understanding, we must look at the specific attacks which claim the CL is reactionary, counter-revolutionary, Trotskyist, pro-USSR, anti-Chinese and anti-working class.

Party-Building

This part of the debate has been concluded.* RU agrees that now is the time to build the Party, and in fact is going to make one in August. Their only gripe is that CL, because it stood for building the Party all along, is getting a lot of undue attention in this "unique" period although it "stood apart from the mass movement" in the party-building process. Things are tough for the RU--but it's too late.

Specifically this criticism exposes RU's basic: a. Economism, revisionism and worship of spontaneity; b. Opportunism.

The Negro National Colonial Question

In view of our recent study, it is enough to say that RU's "Nation of a New Type", which consists of the Black Belt and the "culturally" connected non-Southern urban concentrations of "Black people" is easily identifiable as an update of the CPUSA's "nation within a nation" with the same Anglo-American chauvinist consequences.

The United Front of the Working Class Against Fascism

Here the RU slanders the CL as being anti-working class because they claim that the CL identifies the industrial proletariat as the social base of fascism. Further, they contend that there is no need to build a working class United Front Against Fascism. The RU says that the question facing the proletariat of the USNA is not fascism or revolution, that the call for the United Front Against Fascism is an incorrect defensive strategy, that the United Front by definition calls for unity with the Social-Democrats and that the CL calls for unity with the NAACP and PUSH.

The slander that CL is anti-working class and identifies the industrial proletariat as the social base of fascism is simply appended to a picture on CL Supp., page 5 and not supported in the text. To this we say -

*It should be noted here that I am primarily responding to the RU-- particularly their 10 page supplement in the June 1974 issue of Revolution attacking CL. I might also mention the June 12, 26 and July 10, 1974 "Which Side are you on?" written by Carl Davidson in the Guardian and the Supplement to the April 15, 1974 issue of Peking Review containing Teng Hsiao-Peng's UN speech on April 10, 1974.

MAKE EVERY FACTORY OUR FORTRESS!

SMASH REVISIONISM!

For the rest, Comrades should read People's Tribune, March-74, "United Front--Bridge to Revolution." Throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America western-style democracies have given way to totalitarian regimes. The governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Portugal, Germany, Canada, etc. have fallen in the past year (with differing trends). The USNA is in a prolonged governmental crisis. Israel, Japan, Germany and Egypt have been whipped into line with the oil crisis. Everywhere aggressive and everywhere attacked, the USNA imperialists are the most powerful enemy of the world's people, but are faced with grave internal crises.

The USNA imperialists have begun their drive toward fascism and begun to prepare the proletariat for it. ENA, SLA, Zebra, Capital Punishment, Academic Racism, UAW Elections, Mack Avenue, Dodge Truck, Supreme Court destruction of the Bill of Rights, Runaway shops, Police Armament, Secret Police, George Wallace and Teddy Kennedy (populism). The question before the proletariat of the USNA is revolution or fascism. And the key to combatting fascism is the struggle against national chauvinism.

The RU says that "by definition the United Front calls for compromise with the reformist Social Semocrats." CL Supp. page 5. Our definition of a United Front of the working class against fascism is (PT, March-74, p. 10):

"In the USNA we must build a united front from below. What does this mean concretely? In the 1930's in Europe there were many working class parties who all had formed or had linked to them trade unions. Thus, in building a united front there at that time the political parties pledged to support each other and the trade unions were immediately drawn into the coalition. However, we have no working class parties presently in the USNA and the trade unions are tied to the bourgeoisie through the union mis-leaders. Thus, it is impossible for us to build a united front from the top.

This means that we must enter the working class organizations and trade unions from below and push them into joint anti-fascist struggle."

As for "uniting with the NAACP, PUSH, etc.", we are prepared to enter all trade unions and non-plant based working class organizations to build the united front against fascism.

The United Front Against Imperialism
The Three-World Theory and
The Socialist Camp.

The RU devotes an entire half of its "CL Supplement"

to the international situation and attempting to prove that the
"CL is anti-Chinese and pro-USSR. So that it is clear--

A. "Is the Soviet Union social-imperialist and does it promote a revision of Marxism-Leninism? We assert that the answer is yes, the USSR is revision incarnate."

MCLL Line, page 1

B. The great Communist Party of China has covered itself with glory in the military and ideological battles of the past five decades. It has emerged as the leader, the most experienced and most consistent standard bearer of the revolution. On this May Day we greet this great party, vanguard of the world Communist movement. Especially we send our greetings to Mao Tse-tung and other party leaders. China has been and shall remain the reliable bastion and base area for the international proletariat.

People's Tribune, May-1974, p. 13.

We agree.

The RU upholds the "Three Worlds" theory: the first world being the "superpowers", the USNA and the USSR; the second being the "developed" nations of Europe; and the third being the rest of the world--the colonial, neo-colonial and developing countries. They advocate uniting the third world on a state basis (i.e.--with the "progressive" national bourgeois) into a united front against imperialism and against the "hegemonism" of the superpowers. Indeed, by forming the united front, developing economic relationships and carrying out national development under the leadership of the national bourgeois, the RU believes that the "third world" can exploit the contradictions between the "superpowers" and advance to that economic independence which is the prerequisite of true political independence.

The reason that the RU believes that national bourgeoisie of the "third world" states can be brought into the United Front is because their interests are in contradiction to those of the "superpowers". This Three World-Superpowers theory of the international struggle against imperialism even leads the RU to dream about the Second World, or they say in the "CL Supp.",
page 11:

"In today's world the imperialist camp is clearly dominated by the two superpowers--and their military superiority is even more decisive than their economic superiority over the other imperialists. In this situation, they not only contend for hegemony in the Third World, but for domination over the other, lesser imperialist countries centered in Europe--and this latter contention is the focal point of the two superpowers contention now. This provides the basis for uniting with these countries of the "Second World" in their resistance to superpower domination."

3
The RU generally shows as profound an ignorance of Trotskyism as they do Marxism-Leninism). Examples of direct colonialism and wars of national liberation (e.g.--Portugal) are not numerous. The imperialists have largely shifted their mode of international domination to neo-colonialism: either bourgeois-democratic or openly fascist dictatorships of the bourgeoisie economically dependent on the imperialists (and social-imperialists, or course). To propose a united front of the "Third World" states against imperialism with a program of economic development is to lead the workers and oppressed peoples of the world into the grasp of the traitors who made the "neo-colonial deal." This is a smoother, disguised form of the world-wide "peaceful transition" to socialism. This is revisionism and counter-revolution. This question is discussed more fully at the end of this paper.

Does this mean that we oppose the development of national economies or see the anti-imperialist components of the struggles the national bourgeois as harmful to the interests of the world's peoples? Of course not! Under the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence it is perfectly right and proper for the socialist, colonial and neo-colonial nations and countries to participate in international political and economic intercourse and organization. Insofar as this activity deepens the crisis of imperialism, the conditions for world revolution are further prepared. But to take this trend, the secondary aspect of the contradictions of imperialism, is one-sided, non-dialectical and unscientific.

One of the bases for the RU's revisionist theory of the anti-imperialist united front and world revolution is the proposition that although there are socialist countries (China, Albania, North Vietnam, North Korea), there is no socialist camp. This theory is based on the fact of the rise of revisionism and counter-revolution in the USSR and the "disintegration" of the "Western" imperialist camp. The RU believes that these "developments" have brought about a "new epoch" which validates the "Three Worlds" theory. But we have only to look at the first three paragraphs of the Declaration of the Constitution of a USSR (Selections from Lenin and Stalin On the National Colonial Question, Calcutta Book House, 1970, page 137):

"Since the formation of the Soviet republics the states of the world have been split into two camps: the camp of capitalism and the camp of socialism.

There, in the camp of capitalism, we have national animosity and inequality, colonial slavery and chauvinism, national oppression and pogroms, imperialist brutalities and wars.

Here, in the camp of socialism, we have mutual confidence and peace, national freedom and equality, the peaceful co-existence and fraternal collaboration of peoples."

Now we must ask the RU, is this still the age of imperialism or not? Isn't Leninism still "Marxism in the age of imperialism"? We do not need "new theories" - we need Marxism-Leninism. There are only two ideologies - bourgeois and proletarian. The attempt to create a "third ideology" is just as fool-

ish as the theory of "Three Worlds" and is bound to sink into revisionism, opportunism, chauvinism and counter-revolution.

The RU takes their "Three Worlds" line from the UN speech of Teng-Hsiao-Ping, Vice Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China. They go on to accuse the CL of attacking China and siding with social imperialism for pointing out the incorrectness of the "Three Worlds" theory. Our question is this- is sycophancy and sectarian dogma the mode of relationship between Marxist-Leninist parties and socialist states? Does the class struggle not continue under the dictatorship of the proletariat? Have the toiling masses of China and the CPC, under the leadership of Chairman Mao, not had to conduct ceaseless struggle against revision, opportunism and capitalist restoration? Is that struggle not precisely what is involved in the current criticism of Lin Piao? Wasn't Teng-Hsiao-Ping one of Liu Shiao-chi's chief henchmen?

We must be careful, comrades ! We must firmly support the Chinese revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in China. We must hail the People's Republic as the leader of the socialist camp. But we must also be alert to the continuing "two-line struggle" and unswervingly uphold Marxism-Leninism, correctly criticizing deviations whenever they appear and carry out principled and comradely struggle. Let the RU wallow in the quicksand of dogmatic sycophancy, chauvinism and opportunism.

We stand with Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao in pointing out the correct path to anti-imperialist national liberation and socialist revolution.

LOVE THE CLASS, HATE THE ENEMY

FREE THE NEGRO NATION

SMASH REVISIONISM !!!

BUILD PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM :

WORKERS AND OPPRESSED PEOPLES OF THE WORLD, UNITE !