

1111111

(This paper is being distributed to cadre by the regional leadership. It represents the views of three comrades. Regional leadership ~~wishes~~ feels that the cadre should study this paper and decide what they think about the questions raised. These questions are all very important in the revolutionary movement today.

This paper is exactly as written by the three comrades except for three sentences on page one which were deleted because of security reasons.)

STATEMENT OF VIEWS OF THREE WEST COAST R.U. MEMBERS

Introduction

Some time ago, we put out a preliminary statement of views on a number of questions, entitled, "A call for a broad, open, inner-organization struggle---." The attached "Statement" is an amplification of these views, but was mostly, though not entirely, written before a number of recent events: a reply to our "call" from the national secretariat, knowledge that the second central committee meeting had just taken place, and receiving the national RU paper, "Marxism vs Bundism: A reply to the BWC 'Criticism of...'" The presently central question of party-building and the National Question have, in a way, been made clearer by these events, and we therefore ~~wish~~ wish to deal with them in this introduction, as well as replying to the secretariat's reply to us.

First, our general reply to the national secretariat's reply is that we disagree with it; that is: just as said by the N.S. about our call, we say, "We want to stress that we disagree with almost all of what you say..." Later we will deal with relations with BWC and PRRWO, the national question and partybuilding, but first we want to make clear several questions of fact. The secretariat says: "You also say that Bulletin #13 'has no significant support' from Black cadres in the organization. We again have no idea on what you base such an ~~and~~ assertion, but it, too, stands things upside down. The truth is that the Black and third world members of our organization strongly support bulletin #13, which in fact is just a further development of our line on the national question and class struggle in the US. For example; many Black and other third world members of our organization attended a recent conference called by the BWC and PRRWO, at which they were completely united in putting forward our organization's line on the national question and proletarian revolution in the US, as further developed in bulletin #13."

⊗ / Note from regional leadership: in the following paragraph we have deleted three sentences in which these three comrades put forward their subjective impressions of the number of Black cadre in our organization, both in the Bay Area and nationally. For obvious reasons, this violation of security cannot be printed in an organization document.

.....Since we assumed that is the case out here, we "assumed" that at least something similar exists in the rest of the country.....Moreover at the time the secretariat received our "call" they must have been aware of the situation in this area. They certainly were aware of it at the time of the BWC-PRRWO conference since those comrades were at the conference. We were not talking about third world comrades other than Black.

lish ment of the Party, and that, in fact, it was through the various communist organizations uniting as closely as possible to carry our this work, andxxxxxxx ~~(ILLEGIBLE)~~ AND conducting ideological struggle in this context, that the basis for the Party would be laid." (emphasis ours, HH&H)

And further, on page 31, the key to building the party is given as the development of a program:

"---We believe that the development of the Programme, and the founding of the Party on the basis of unity around a correct Programme, is the key link in this period---."

And further, on page 34, the reasons for the RU leadership's party proposal to the BWC and PRRWO are given:

(read paragraph 5 on page 34 of "Marxism v.s. Bundism" beginning this with "The 'party proposal' on the part of ...") ~~For see bottom pg 8 paper~~

The method of building the party is laid out in the next two paragraphs on pages 34 and 35.

Before analyzing the meaning and essence of the above, let's see what the BWC and PRRWO response was. From page 35:

"The opposition of BWC and PRRWO to this proposal was mainly expressed in the form of arguing that the RU was essentially a 'white petty-bourgeois organization', and that bringing in 'independent collectives would only make the character of the party more 'white petty-bourgeois.'" [In addition, the BWC and PRRWO say, "we (all three organizations - HH&H) should concentrate our ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ proletariat" (pg 14, BWC and PRRWO paper)] /attention on the industrial/

"---The BWC and PRRWO did not reject outright the idea of moving to the Party in about a year's time, but they rejected the essence of our proposal for developing the Party, and proposed instead, as it is put in the BWC

~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ paper, to 'strengthen the role and work of the BWC and PRRWO in the revolutionary national movements and as Communist organizations as a first step towards party building'." ~~xx~~ [In addition, the BWC and PRRWO say, "The RU disagreed with this view saying that the time was now to form the party before other 'opportunist elements' (meaning CL and OL) formed the party first." (pg.14, BWC and PRRWO paper)]

Since the paper "Marxism vs. Bundism" neither disputed nor referred to the BWC and PRRWO statements given in brackets above, we take them as true.

So, on the question of why the time was ripe, 6 months ago, for putting ~~xx~~ forward creating the party, as the central task, and consequently for making the 'party proposal' to the BWC and PRRWO at that time, the reasons boil down to the following:

(1) We and others, have made significant advances in linking up with, and carrying out revolutionary work in, the struggles of the masses in the past several years.

(2) There was unity (or apparent unity), between us and BWC and PRRWO, enough to be the basis of winning over other honest Marxist-Leninists!

(3) We (RU, BWC, PRRWO) better move on this and seize the time, before opportunist elements beat us to the punch.

The other reasons put forward, about international developments, national developments, and so forth, have no special significance independent of the above.

And what was to be the essence of the method of forming the party? Develop a draft program, and adopt the (ILLEGIBLE) and elect leadership at a founding congress where representation would be numerical, 1 member for so many members, etc., and "from the bottom up, as opposed to the top down, by involving & relying on all the members of these organizations and forces"; (the forces being misc. Marxist-Leninists and collectives), our emphasis.

And what was the reply of BWC and PRRWO? It was: The party should not be launched now, and in the way you propose, because:

(1) There should be a preparatory stage in which we, (BWC & PRRWO) build ~~xx~~ our role and work in the revolutionary nationalist movements and strengthen ourselves as communist organizations.

(2) The RU is mostly white, Petty Bourgeois, and other 'independent collectives' would mostly be the same, and thus the party would be preponderantly so.

(3) We should all concentrate on industrial workers (in a preparatory stage presumably).

In addition to the differences over the party proposed, there had been developing some differences over "revolutionary nationalism" and the slogan "Black workers take the lead".

Under the circumstances, and by our own criteria, of the basis to move forward to a party, the response was perfectly reasonable and natural. First, the unity of the three organizations was then shown obviously not to be strong enough, and seemed, the BWC and PRRWO did not feel that they as yet had made significant advances in "linking up with, and carrying out work in, the strug-

gle of the masses". This, of course, is over and above the questions of whether we, ourselves, had had sufficient experience, a sufficient working class composition, or to put it in plain English, a sufficient base in the working class and masses. It is also over and above the question of relationships with (a) OL (b) CL (c) La Raza Labor Committee and (d) others.

What does it mean when we characterize the BWC and PRRWO response to our party proposal as follows, (on pg. 35, of "Marxism vs. Bundism"):

"...It is their insistence on continuing to develop separate national forms of communist organization when the possibility of forming the party exists that characterize an essential aspect of their bundist line, (emphasis ours). Why can't we all -- the white and "third world" comrades of the RU, BWC, PRRWO, and others -- unite as Marxist-Leninists into a single Party to lead the class and to develop most fully the role of communists in the national movements -- recognizing, of course, that it will be communists (party members) of the oppressed nationalities who will carry out the practical (emphasis ours) work of the party in this area."

It means that we, and we alone, will decide when it is appropriate for the party to be formed (not based on any of the criteria we ourselves claimed to base our "central task" position on), and we will decide when the existence, or continued existence, of national forms of communist organization, is justified. In effect we are going forward on our own toward the party and have changed the criteria from all the above to "we have the correct line" and the correct line (or program) is key to the party.

Just two short years ago, we said in RP 5, on Pg. 4:

"And because U.S. history and the present teems with racial and national oppression, there are other third world revolutionaries who, while recognizing the need for an eventual single party of the proletariat, feel that they can best serve the revolutionary movement by joining and building national forms of organization that carry forward both the national struggle and the struggle of the entire proletariat."

And further on Pg. 5:

"...As revolutionary organization developed among third world groups, they were correctly concerned to develop independent leadership in their national and their political leadership in the revolutionary struggle as a whole.

"It was undoubtedly inevitable, given the historical circumstance of super exploitation and acute oppression and the relatively low level of political understanding of white workers of the source and purpose of racism, that third world revolutionaries have developed their own revolutionary organizations. Having been dominated, often misled and accorded, at best, token representation in most organizations set up by white people, they demand the right to formulate their own program, determine priorities and exercise control.

"This is a correct aspect of self-determination...." (all emphasis ours).

If the above means anything at all, it means that only as the mutual confidence, trust, unity and common political line and joint engagement in mass work develop sufficiently between national forms of communist organizations and predominantly white forms, will they be able to, and should they, merge into a single party. It also, and obviously, means that only as the white communists recognize the need to, and begin to practice, a serious struggle against overt and covert white chauvinism both among the white masses and themselves, will such merges take place and have the seeds of success.

We ask the secretariat: Are the above quotes from RP5 valid? or do they also baggage inherited from the student movement? or do they stand for a previous primitiveness?

We do not know who first put forward, between us and BWC, difference over the national question on "revolutionary nationalism" and "Black workers take the lead", but as they did arise, and as the differences over the road to a party showed themselves, if we were really free, or relatively free, of arrogance, "center-of-the-universism", and white chauvinism, these would ~~have~~ have been gigantic red warning flags to us, and the last thing we would, or should, have done, was to "focus and sharpen ideological struggle", especially in the extensive and "public" manner of national bulletin 13. When we say, in the beginning of "Marxism vs Bundism" that NB 13 was not written as a polemic against BWC and PRRWO--- "(It) was an internal document of our organization", this is "student-type" sophistry, because in effect it was a polemic, and a ~~very~~ very sharp one at that, against them. This is fully acknowledged by the statement in "Marxism vs Bundism" that "---it (NB 13) did touch on ideological and political questions with which these two organizations were very much concerned and on relations between our organization and them. Further, we hoped it would help to focus and sharpen ideological struggle around the questions of revolutionary nationalism and 'Black workers take the lead', which were supposed to be held in the framework of the national liaison meetings (emphasis ours)---".

The politically correct ~~thingxxxx~~ line would have been, and should have been, to accept the BWC and PRRWO proposal, (or to find some ~~proper~~ compromise with it), to develop our own work further, attempting to create a more solid base in the working class in the closest cooperation and collaboration with the Black and Puerto Rican comrades of BWC and PRRWO; and to seriously examine and question whether indeed it was the past line of laying great stress on the revolutionary nature - and the leading ~~role~~ - of the national liberation struggle - and the Black liberation struggle in particular - which constituted pragmatism, or "petty-bourgeois baggage", or whether our present "line" of stressing the "danger" of "bourgeois nationalism" and "bundism" is a pragmatic reflection of the apparent "lull" in the Black liberation struggles.

Even if our current ~~line~~ on the national question were a correct application of Marxism-Leninism to the US, and we do not think it is; even if the BWC and PRRWO were subjectively being "narrow nationalist" and "bundist", and we do not think that they were, it is not the correct attitude for white communists - and white communists are both communists and members of the oppressing nation - to raise and press the struggle against oppressed nation "narrow nationalism". Only the oppressed nation communists can, and should, carry on that task. This is an absolutely correct and long standing proletarian international~~ist~~ position in the communist movement - and there are at least 2 people in our national leadership who are, or should be, well aware of that.

The position is raised, or implied, in national documents and elsewhere, that perhaps this is the case among the masses, or in the mass struggle, but between communists all are "equal" as Marxist-Leninists, or even that the proletarian stand is "demanding equality between all ~~all~~ nationalities." That is the way it is put in the second, or third, paragraph from the bottom of page 31 of the recent political report from the N.C.C. But this is completely incorrect and is in effect, itself, a form of "liquidation of the ~~maxim~~ national question"; it is certainly not a proletarian stand. Lenin pointed this out in many different ways at many times, and referred to it specifically in 1922, in connection with mistakes on this question by Stalin and others in the Soviet Union. We would ~~likw ro~~ quote from Lenin's statement at length because of its importance. From, "The Question of Nationalities or Autonomization," by Lenin, collected works, volume 36, page 606:

"---I think that Stalin's haste and his infatuation with pure administration, together with his spite against the notorious "nationalist-socialism", played a fateful role here. In politics spite generally plays the basest of roles.---"

And in connection with this, Lenin says: (Pg 607)

(Note from typist: inserted quote missing here, but a crossed out footnote says: insert here the entire section from Lenin from page 607 to Pg 609, ending: ---towards the oppressor (our great) nation," and underline the two entire paragraphs on pg 608 beginning, "That is--- and ending, ---in the past.")

Stalin apparently did not agree with Lenin on this, and called the views we have underlined above, a "figure of speech", and it is Stalin's point of view on this that is quoted in the NCC political report on the bottom ~~of~~ page 31.

We are not trying to play Lenin against Stalin here and "count" on Lenin's greater prestige; that would be demagogy. There were times when Lenin and Stalin disagreed, and sometimes sharply, when Stalin was right, and not Lenin, according to Lenin himself. But we are convinced that Lenin was right then, and even ~~more~~ more, that his proletarian attitude on this question is fully applicable and necessary in relations between white and Black communists in this country.

We would like to point out a second correct example of how communists of the oppressor nation should and must relate to the communists of the oppressed nation, how they must seriously oppose white supremacy, white "domination" over Black, and even give organizational guarantees of this, if necessary, and at the same time build ~~the~~ the unity of white and Black. This example is from the organizational relation of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party to the Jewish Bund, in 1903. We think that the following quotation from Lenin is self-explanatory; (from Lenin, collected works, Volume 6, Pg 334):

"---"Autonomy" under the Rules adopted in 1898 provides the Jewish working class movement with all its needs: propoganda and agitation in Yiddish, its own literature and congresses, the right to advance separate demands to supplement a single general Social-Democratic programme and to satisfy local needs and requirements arising out of the special features of Jewish life. In everything else there must be complete fusion with the Russian proletariat, in the interests of the struggle waged by the entire proletariat

of Russia. As for the fear of being 'steam-rolled' in the event of such fusion, the very nature of the case makes it groundless, since it is autonomy that is a guarantee against all 'steam-rolling' in matters pertaining specifically to the Jewish movement, while in matters pertaining to the struggle against the autocracy, the struggle against the bourgeoisie of Russia as a whole, we must act as a single and centralized militant organization,---". (emphasis ours, HH&H)

And Lenin, replying to the Bund's questioning of 'guarantees', says: "Further, Comrade Lieber has asked us in moving tones how it can be proved that autonomy is able to guarantee to the Jewish workers' movement that independence which is absolutely essential to it. A strange question, indeed! How can it be proved that one of the several paths suggested is the right one? The only way is to try it and see. My reply to Comrade Lieber's question is: March with us, and we undertake to prove ~~to~~ you ~~to~~ in practice that all legitimate demands for independence are gratified in full." (emphasis Lenin's) (from Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 6, page 488)

And so Lenin's answer to the Bund, was not, and course could not have been, "you don't need any guarantees against steam-rolling", and "you don't have an independent role"- "we are all equal Marxist-Leninists and together we can build whatever has to be built, etc.", because that would actually have denied the significance of oppression on Jews in Tsarist Russia and the significance of the Jewish question there.

In view of all the above, it is clear that the NCC political report putting forward party building as the central task "for a brief period ahead" is putting forward this central task in an ~~incorrect~~ manner, and this reflects "center-of-the-universism" and regarding oneself -alone- as the vanguard. With a still skimpy and fragile base in the working class, with a negligible base among Black people in general and Black workers in particular, with poor or non-existent relations with other communist forces, and the BWC in particular, with only the beginnings of development of a long range strategy and short range tactics of work in the workplace and in the trade-unions, not to mention the communities and other spheres, and including the question of how to go about ~~raising~~ raising the level of struggle for day to day demands to a significant level of political struggle against the ruling class - to put forward the immediate task of turning ourself into the "general staff" is highly sectarian-and highly divisive.

2. The National Question of Black Liberation

The Black liberation struggle is a profoundly popular and profoundly revolutionary struggle, one that involves the Black masses: working class, petit-bourgeois, lumpen, farmers, and agricultural workers. It is a struggle for the emancipation of the Black people from national ~~oppression~~ oppression, and is therefore not identical with, or the same thing as, the multinational working class struggle*~~by~~ by its very nature of being "profoundly popular and profoundly revolutionary" it is "part of the general question of the proletarian revolution, a part of the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat." This is the case today, and also was the case 30, 40 and 50 years ago. This is because in the world as a whole since that time with the domination and decay of the imperialist stage of capitalism, the proletarian revolution has come to the fore as the fundamental question of our time and the critical question, again on a world scale, has evolved, changed, from being basically part of the bourgeois democratic revolution to being basically part of the socialist revolution. This is the central meaning of the famous "first" and "second" stages in the Marxist-Leninist outlook on the national question. In the first stage the national question had its particular and peculiar concreteness in different countries and at different times, but it was still basically part of the bourgeois democratic revolution; and now, and in the past 50 years, it likewise has its concrete differences in different areas, countries, and situations, but is generally part ~~of~~ and parcel of the proletarian revolution.

Thus, the Black liberation struggle is not a component part of the proletarian revolution because the Black people in the US are a "nation of a new type", or because in their majority the Blacks are proletarians and not peasants, or because there is a fairly great dispersion of Black people in the US, or because Black proletarians are part of a single multi-national working class. Was not the Black liberation struggle a component part of the US proletarian revolution 40 years ago, when the Black people were a nation in the Black Belt south? when there was a very high proportion of peasants (sharecroppers) in the Black nation? when the Blacks were less dispersed, and were a lesser proportion proletarian? Of course it was. Why? Because it

*Nor is it in any way in contradiction with the working class struggle because,

was basically a "profoundly popular and profoundly revolutionary" struggle of the Black masses against the US ruling class for the "emancipation of the Black people."

It is important to understand that when Stalin said that the national question is "in essence a peasant question", as for example in "Concerning the National Question in Yugoslavia", (1925, Stalin, Collected Works, Vol. 7, pg. 71) he pointed out that the agrarian question and the peasant question were two different things; that is, the struggle of the peasants against the landlords for land was the agrarian question, while the national question was "in essence a peasant question" because the masses, on whom its "profoundly popular and ~~XXXXX~~ profoundly revolutionary" character was based, were peasant masses. And it was then, when it was "in essence a peasant question", also, a component part of the Yugoslav proletarian revolution.

Thus it is wrong for us, (and leads to liquidation of the Black national question as a revolutionary question in its own right) to contrast a U.S. "third stage" with the Marxist-leninist worldwide "second stage". Both the Black national liberation struggle in the U.S., and the Vietnamese liberation struggle, for example, are "second stage", each with their own concrete particularities, but both directed against U.S. imperialism, and both "component parts of the proletarian revolution". The particular differences are clear: for the Vietnamese people, self-determination means separation and only separation from the U.S; it is accomplished only by revolutionary war against U.S. imperialism, and defeating it, and ejecting it from Vietnam, as a first stage; and going on to complete the socialist revolution as a second stage, but in a continuous and uninterrupted fashion. For Black people in the U.S., self-determination means the right to determine their own destiny as a nation... (ILEGIBLE)... separation, or any form of "non-separation", from the dominant "white" nation; to exercise this right on the territory which is the recognized birthplace and historic homeland of the Black Nation, that is the Black Belt area of the South. Under our particular U.S. conditions, that self-determination, which is the natural right of the Black nation, as of any nation, cannot be exercised -- cannot be won--unless the U.S. system of monopoly capitalism is overthrown and replaced with a system of socialism. Any talk of the possibility of the Black people emancipating themselves without the overthrow of the capitalist system is false--and that is why Mao said, "Only by overthrowing the reactionary rule of the U.S. monopoly capitalist class and destroying the colonialist and imperialist system can the Black people in the U.S. win complete emancipation".

Thus the Black national question, as the question of the emancipation of the Black people, and the "class question" taken in its narrow sense, as the emancipation of the working class, are entirely separate and distinct questions which are linked together and intertwined by an absolute steel-like bond: Monopoly capitalism is the one common enemy of both. Both are therefore class questions, in essence, and both form part of the overall class struggle. The Black liberation struggle and the workers struggle will therefore link up, intertwine, and merge to the degree that each is, or becomes, revolutionary and interacts on each other. Neither will be dissolved into the other nor will either be replaced by the other.

Because the Black workers are on the one hand part of a single multinational working class, and on the other hand, part of, and the basic part of the Black nation, they are subjected to both class exploitation and national oppression, and this by a single, white, monopoly ruling class. They will therefore obviously be the physical direct link between the Black emancipation struggle and the multinational working class struggle, and they can play a dual role ~~and~~ of leadership of the first struggle and being a most vital component part of the second. Obviously they can be the direct bridge through which "merger" takes place.

Of course, this, like everything else, does not happen automatically. Only as significant sections of the Black workers are "revolutionized", contend for, and win, the leading role in the Black liberation struggle, will this happen. And this is intimately bound up with the development of a multinational communist party that is part and parcel of both the workers struggle and the Black liberation struggle.

This is the main essence, we feel, of how we should view the national question or "revolutionary nationalism". Unfortunately the "thrust", the "argument", the "center of gravity" of NB 13, "Marxism vs. Bundism", and the NCC report, is opposed to this essence. This is most clearly seen in the first 7, or so pages of NB 13, but... (ILEGIBLE). Opposition to the view of the independent "profoundly popular and profoundly revolutionary" nature of the Black national struggle is expressed again and again. It is expressed in many ways: in the form of seeing "nationalism" as a threat to the unity of the working class, or seeing the "national aspect" as being in opposition to the "revolutionary aspect in the formula, or in saying that all nationalism is in the final analysis "bourgeois".

(And this is not to say that real bourgeois nationalism, "race against race" Black vs. white - or - white vs. Black, is not a threat both to the unity of the class and to the Black liberation struggle, and to their combined unity against monopoly capital.)

It is expressed by creating a "third period", which negates the "second period" (the period in which the national struggle is a component part of the proletarian revolution), and brings back the first period (in which the national struggle is a component part of the bourgeois-democratic movement) at a "higher level" (the negation of the negation).

It is expressed by reducing the significance of the upholding of the right to self-determination not only to below that which it held and holds, in general in the second period, but even below that which it held in the first period, by mentioning it only to deny that it has any significance at all, and by other ways.

What the documents are really saying, in essence, is that the Black masses in the U.S. are simply subjected to a somewhat higher level of exploitation and/or oppression than the white masses, and that the sole content of the struggle against this extra oppression and exploitation is to "build the unity of the multinational working class", and place the struggle on the "worker vs. boss" road. This of course is a liquidation of the independent essence of the national question. It is dangerously close to, if not identical with, the doctrine of "fight racism to unite the class".

The above of course is not a comprehensive exposition of the Black national question, nor a point-by-point analysis of the material on that question in NB 13, "Marxism vs. Bundism", or the NCC report, but we believe it is the major significance of our differences on this question with those documents.

(The quote below is for page 3, near the top, of this paper...the typist.)

"The party proposal on the part of the RU leadership was based on several factors: the growing difficulties of U.S. imperialism, at home and abroad, and the general turmoil in the imperialist camp as a whole, which could all be taken advantage of much more fully if the class and the masses had a unified general staff at their head; the apparent unity of the RU, BWC, and PRRWO, which, despite whatever differences seemed to remain, was strong enough, we felt to serve as the basis for wimming over and uniting with as many honest Marxist-leninist forces as possible to form the party, while isolating any die-hard opportunists; and the fact that the RU leadership had summed up as a serious error the tendency in our own org., and other sections of the communist movement, to almost make a principle out of not having a party. We felt that, on the basis of the (apparent) unity of the 3 organizations, we could seize the time to build a genuine party and resolve any remaining differences--of immediate importance--in the course of moving to the party. We know that, even with the party, there are and will always be differences, but we felt that the unity was ~~the~~ great enough to resolve these differences best in the context of a single party".

Signed: H,H, and H.