

WE ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE !

The July/August 1979 issue of Revolution contains in the article "A Wrong Phrase" a challenge to the COUSML to publicly demolish the "RCP, USA's" shameless, gangster-style article "Beat Back the Dogmato-Revisionist Attack on Mao Tsetung Thought; Comments on Enver Hoxha's Imperialism and the Revolution." We accept the challenge. We consider it our duty as revolutionary Marxist-Leninists to publicly denounce the anti-communist, "three worldist" poison coming from Mr. Avakian and co. We call on all progressive people to do the same. The "RCP" leadership is nothing but a bunch of diehard "three worlders". They are serving as the front men for the Chinese social-imperialists in their attacks on the bastion of world revolution, heroic socialist Albania. In this issue of The Workers' Advocate there are several major articles ripping to shreds the theoretical absurdities and conscious confusion-mongering of the foul-mouthed "RCP" leadership and of its theoretical basis, Chinese revisionism and Mao Zedong Thought. The introduction to the article "For Marxism-Leninism, Against the 'Three Worlds' Theorists" shows that on fundamental issues Mr. Avakian and Mr. Klonsky are twin brothers. The article "Mao Zedong Thought Cannot Dull the Brilliance of the Great October Socialist Revolution" exposes that the Chinese revisionists put forward Mao Zedong Thought in order to negate the most fundamental teachings of Marxism-Leninism and replace them with the so-called "Yenan way". The article against the "united front with 'three worlders'" exposes some of the crimes of the Chinese revisionists in undermining the struggle against modern Khrushchovite revisionism and denounces the path of allying with one faction of "three worlders" against the other faction of "three worlders". And in this article we shall proceed to point to the "RCP's" negation of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the party, which leads them to defend the Trotskyite formula of the "dictatorship of the party".

Actually, the COUSML has been publicly refuting the "three worldist" monstrosities of the "RCP" leadership in the pages of The Workers' Advocate since early 1978. Our articles included "Why Did the 'RCP, USA' Split?", "Does the 'RCP, USA' Oppose the Theory of 'Three Worlds'?", "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism" and others. It is Mr. Avakian and co. who have stayed miles away from even attempting an open reply to these powerful articles. In challenging us to reply to them, the "RCP" leadership is knocking at an open door.

In their article "A Wrong Phrase", the "RCP" finally makes its first feeble attempt at an open reply to our polemics. This article is in fact a particularly pathetic example of attempting to avoid the serious issues at stake. "A Wrong Phrase" is in fact a comment on our article "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism, Part 3" (The Workers' Advocate, July 1, 1979). Our article shows in great detail and with many convincing proofs that the "RCP"

neo-revisionists always negated the Party concept and the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the Party, counterposed "building the mass movement" to "building the party", opposed the vital task of party-building with such theses as that of the "pre-party collectives", and so forth. Unable to give any serious argument in favor of their anti-Marxist theses, the "RCP" leadership reduces everything to being allegedly only a question of a single "wrong phrase". The "RCP" says that their use of the Trotskyite phrase "the dictatorship of the party" was simply a typographical error, and that they meant to say "the party must exercise leadership (rather than all-round dictatorship) in every sphere of society..." And that settles everything, according to the "RCP".

But when the article "A Wrong Phrase" is read through to the end, it turns out that the article actually justifies the use of the phrase "dictatorship of the party". The article says that it is the same as talking about "Marxist-Leninists who have come to power", which is clearly unobjectionable. The article even quotes from Comrade Stalin's writings denouncing the phrase "dictatorship of the party" in order to prove that the "RCP" is correct in its use of this phrase. This is amazing, but it is true. In the very article in which the "RCP" tries to wash its hands of this Trotskyite rubbish, it finds it impossible to dissociate itself from it. This is because, irrespective of whether or not this phrase occurs in any particular place in "RCP's" writings or not, the ideas behind this phrase are deeply embedded in the "RCP's" whole ideological and theoretical outlook. It follows from the fact that, as we pointed out in "U.S. Neo-Revisionism, Part 3", "the 'RCP's' negation of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the party has led it to the most mechanical, bureaucratic, administrative and bourgeois dictatorial teachings on the leading role of the party." It is not a matter of "a wrong phrase", but of the whole outlook and practice of the "RCP" leadership.

THE NATURE OF THE FORMULA "THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PARTY"

What is the nature of the formula of "the dictatorship of the party" and why does the "RCP" defend it? The article "U.S. Neo-Revisionism, Part 3" explained it as follows:

"For years the neo-revisionists denounced the Marxist-Leninists as sectarians and dogmatists for working for a single Marxist-Leninist center. But it is now proven for all to see that it is the neo-revisionists, those who lack all sense of party concept, who conceive of party leadership and proletarian hegemony in the most sectarian and factionalist manner. While it is the Marxist-Leninists who uphold the interests of the class and who use the Marxist-Leninist organization to uphold the revolutionary unity of the fighting masses. Thus the 'RCP, USA' in their gangster-style article '...Dogmato-Revisionism...' fume up and down about how such concepts as 'the 'party'"

Continued on next page; see CHALLENGE

CHALLENGE

Continued from previous page

of the party and of Marxism-Leninism' and the "monolithic unity" in the party' are undialectical and bureaucratic (The Communist, Number 5, May 1979, pp. 66-70). The article eulogizes the negation of the leading role of the party as 'relying directly on the masses' (Ibid., p. 52). But simultaneously the article puts forward as the correct definition of the role of the party the arch-bureaucratic and Trotskyite formula '... the party must exercise all-round dictatorship in every sphere of society, ...' (Ibid., p. 86). (This formula)... is a totally anti-Leninist formula, a formula that negates the dictatorship of the proletariat and replaces the leading role of the party with respect to the working class with the dictate by force over the working class. The formula of the 'dictatorship of the party', used in the way the 'RCP, USA' does, in fact implies the dictate of the top leadership of the party over all of society through forcible administrative means. Comrade Stalin showed in detail that this formula about the 'dictatorship of the party' has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism, that this formula is at best only inexact and figurative, hence is almost never used in Marxist literature, ... Stalin showed how equating the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' with the 'dictatorship of the party' then gives rise to further equating it with the 'dictatorship of the leaders'."

Comrade Stalin's teachings on the question can be found in the article Concerning Questions of Leninism, Section V. "The Party and the Working Class in the System of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" (which is in the book Problems of Leninism and in Vol. 8 of Stalin's Works).

The "RCP" has always negated the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the central role of party-building, the party concept and the leading role of the party. It is not possible here to repeat all the careful analysis of the historical experience of the U.S. Marxist-Leninist movement from "U.S. Neo-Revisionism, Part 3". That article showed that the "RCP's" predecessors began with the theory of the "pre-party collectives", a theory which openly negated the very need for the party. Then the "RCP" changed to the theory that party-building was a task that was important only for a brief period prior to the declaration of the party. The "RCP" could not and can not understand the importance of the constant strengthening of the party, the bolshevizing of the party, the constant attention to the development of the party concept both inside the party and among the proletariat and progressive masses. The "RCP" has as one of its basic ideological foundations the theory of counterposing "building the mass movement" to "building the party". They share this theory with the Chinese revisionists. Both of them do not understand how the initiative of the masses is released through the leading role of the party. They have the bourgeois individualist ideas about the contradiction between "free" will and party discipline.

This bureaucratic counterposing of the initiative and action of the masses to the leading role of the party gives rise to many serious revisionist errors. First of all, the negation of the role of the party inevitably leads to the ideas and practice of tailing the spontaneity of the masses. This tailism comprises both anarchistic ideas and economist ideas. Indeed, much of the practice and ideology of the "RCP" can be characterized as anarcho-economism. And secondly, the negation of the role of the party is also associated with mechanical and extreme bureaucratic ideas and practices, such as those expressed in the idea of "the dictatorship of the party".

The "RCP's" mechanical, bureaucratic ideas are expressed in their criticism of Comrade Hoxha. The "RCP" hot-shot theoreticians pontificate, thinking that they are saying something very deep and profound when in reality they are repeating the most shallow ideas of the ordinary bourgeois, that party leadership in the Cultural Revolution would simply have reduced it to "... merely reshuffling the makeup of the key bodies of the Party and putting out a directive or two..." ("Dogmato-Revisionism", p. 54) The "RCP" pretends to be a "communist party", yet look at its contemptuous, bourgeois idea of what the role of the party is. According to the "RCP", if the communist party leads an action, then it is merely "putting out a directive or two". Of course, this may very well be how the "RCP" operates. We have no doubt that such concepts reflect the ultra-bureaucratic atmosphere and the practice of unbridled Bonapartism and individualism inside the "RCP" itself. And such concepts certainly reflect the practice of the Communist Party of China, which talks big words about a "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" but can only end up by "merely reshuffling" the ultra-revisionist Deng Xiaoping up and down a few times. But when a genuine Marxist-Leninist party leads the masses, it releases their initiative and is in the forefront of the battle. Its directives are eagerly awaited fighting orders of the day that arouse the enthusiasm of the masses. And it wages a serious fight against bureaucratic mist and revisionist elements and does not elevate the enemies of the people to the top leadership.

This whole bureaucratic and bourgeois individualist view of the leadership and discipline of the party being in contradiction to the initiative and action of the masses permeates Avakian's work Mao Tsetung's Immortal Contributions from one end to the other. In the section on the Cultural Revolution, Mr. Avakian stresses that "And, again, the form, the method, that was found was basically reliance upon the masses." (emphasis as in the original, p. 285) According to Mr.

Avakian, "such a rectification of the Party was, ... completely unprecedented." (Ibid.) Thus Mr. Avakian is saying that the party purges conducted by Lenin and the Bolsheviks after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the methods of the workers' and peasants' control, the great struggles against deviations, and so forth, were all basically administrative methods from above, while the Cultural Revolution was "unprecedented" because it allegedly acted from below. Thus Mr. Avakian, following Mao Zedong Thought, contemptuously dismisses the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the party, attacks Comrades Lenin and Stalin as allegedly bureaucratic administrators, and slanders the entire experience of the world Marxist-Leninist movement. And the great new revelation that Mao and Avakian bring to the world is that anything led by the party is by definition "done from above" while it is necessary to negate the party and even to act against the party to have the label of acting from below and of "relying upon the masses".

Thus Mr. Avakian firmly believes that the party must be bureaucratic. He is absolutely incapable of even imagining a Leninist party. So he can only conclude from Comrade Hoxha's criticism of the Chinese revisionist theses negating the party that Comrade Hoxha must therefore allegedly be for bureaucracy and administrative measures. Anyone who examines the basic Albanian literature, such works as The History of the Party of Labor of Albania, the speeches and writings of Comrade Hoxha, and so forth, will see with what vigor and enthusiasm the Party of Labor of Albania tackled the job of fighting bureaucratic rust, what profound and effective ideological and organizational measures it took, and how consistent its orientation was and is. But all this is irrelevant to Mr. Avakian and co. In their polemical articles the "RCP" does not even discuss the measures taken by the Party of Labor of Albania. The "RCP" is blind to reality, because it is absolutely impossible for it to even conceive of a party as anything but a bureaucratic, administrative apparatus, anything other than a damper on the revolution. Hence, with the deep profundity of the bourgeois ignoramus, the "RCP" writes: "But for Hoxha, the dynamic role of youth... is really more of a liability than an asset, something to be attacked and stifled unless it can be 'led' (by which he really means controlled) by the working class and its party." The writer goes on to stress that the issue is "whether to lead or to stifle the initiative of the youth." ("Dogmato-Revisionism", p. 56) Clearly, for the "RCP's" theoretical big shots, the leadership of the party is synonymous with the stifling, damping and attacking of the dynamic role of the masses.

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE PARTY IS REPLACED BY THE "DICTATORSHIP OF THE LEADERS"

Consequently the article "Dogmato-Revisionism" was completely in the Avakian spirit when in the passage in question it discussed the party as "objectively an administrative apparatus". The "RCP" is unable to imagine how a genuine communist party exercises its leading role in the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "RCP's" image of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the one denounced by Stalin when, relating Trotsky, he declared: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is not simply a governmental top stratum 'skillfully' 'selected' by the careful hand of an 'experienced strategist,' and 'judiciously relying' on the support of one section or another of the population." (Stalin, "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists", On the Opposition, p. 144)

But just read Mr. Avakian's speech "The Loss in China and the Revolutionary Legacy of Mao Tsetung". Here we are promised an inside look at Mao's new, "unprecedented" methods, which are allegedly better than those ever applied by Lenin or Stalin, which allegedly are the first methods ever used by communists that actually relied on the masses. What we find is a sordid tale of personal maneuvering by Mao, as related by a most sympathetic writer, Mr. Avakian. We are told that "... Mao saw the need to bring new forces forward into the top leadership.... So Mao passes over most of these people (the 'old guard'— ed.) in forming a leading group to carry forward the Cultural Revolution" (p. 45). Thus Mao apparently usurps the party's power, acts individually with the sure hand of the "experienced strategist", and sets up an ill-defined group to replace the leadership of the party. We are told to believe that he has enough power to do this, "passing over" those who disagree, yet still for some reason he hears all the bad elements in their former position for use in future maneuvering. The nature of the "leading group" Mao forms is also left vague. Mr. Avakian doesn't specify what it is. From the point of view of Mr. Avakian's contempt for the party, only the personalistic count. Mr. Avakian describes Mao on pages 55-56 as wisely deciding that Chen Li and Zhou Enlai should be overthrown. The "RCP" does not have a very high opinion of Zhou Enlai at all, who indeed was a very bad element, but Mr. Avakian approves of making use of Zhou Enlai, as it is necessary to counterbalance Lin Biao. It is also said that "no doubt Mao hoped he could even win over Zhou Enlai" (p. 57). Furthermore, "apparently, he (Mao — ed.) even agreed to Tang's rehabilitation, because of the necessity of clearing up after the Lin Biao affair." (p. 62) Here we have come full circle. First Lin Biao is used against Liu and Deng, despite the fact that allegedly as early as 1966 Mao had warned of him (p. 52). Then Deng is brought back to or-

der to deal with the mess after Lin Biao's death. How unbureaucratic, what masterful reliance on the masses, what a careful avoidance of administrative methods and constant shuffling and reshuffling of top positions! Mao has just previously dissolved the party and the mass organizations and thrown society into an uproar in order to get rid of Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping. And indeed these ultra-revisionist elements are counter-revolutionary elements. But now Mao agrees to bring Deng back and Mr. Avakian agrees, nonchalantly explaining that everything is alright because "Mao did not trust Deng." (p. 62) The world's revolutionary Marxist-Leninists really wished to see Liu and Deng and the Chinese ultra-revisionists overthrown and to see a true victory of the Cultural Revolution, but to the Chinese it is all a game. Someone is called a revisionist and a counter-revolutionary and tomorrow it is said that such an element is useful and even essential to run China. But Mr. Avakian goes on enthusiastically about Mao's struggle, which is waged this time "by analogy, not directly," (p. 67). All this is not a new, unprecedented method. It is the old, old game of personal maneuvering and unprincipled factionalism, it is parliamentary leapfrog, it is anything you like, but it is not revolution.

Mr. Avakian zealously praises this method of Mao's and says "Mao's approach has always been — and correctly so — to go after the line of the opportunists and arm the masses with an understanding of this first, win over those in the opportunist camp who are not die-hards to the extent possible, create splits in their ranks, ... but rely on the masses, politically armed and politically mobilized." (p. 67) In short, fancy talk about going after the line and mobilizing the masses, combined with the most sordid practice of maneuver, of "winning" over those in the opportunist camp". And the "unprecedentedly" mobilized masses were not consulted about such basic decisions as bringing Teng back. Indeed, even apart from the sordid forms of political maneuver at the top, we find that many of the forms of mobilizing the masses from below, these forms of allegedly spontaneous action of the masses, were in fact highly organized. The putting out of big character posters, the attacks on this or that leading personality, were not so spontaneous as the Chinese pretended. Both in China and outside, the Chinese revisionists love to arrange matters by whispering this or that in someone's ear. Instead of the clear orientation of a party, one has whispers and gossip. Finally the army itself is called in in order to bring order out of the chaos in China. The party methods are denounced as bureaucratic, but the army is carefully protected from chaos and then brought in as the decisive force. Here indeed we have the last word in the "unprecedented" anti-bureaucratic, most highly democratic methods of organizing from below — the naked rule of the army.

Thus Mr. Avakian goes to great extremes to laud and exalt the picture of Mao acting outside the norms and the discipline of the party. In fact, Mr. Avakian replaces the role of the party with the role of the leader. In the question and answer period after Mr. Avakian's speech, as reproduced in the pamphlet "The Loss in China...", Mr. Avakian is asked "What role did the masses have besides making banners and following Mao? ..." (p. 127) To answer this, Mr. Avakian goes into a big discussion of "the role of leaders". He has replaced the leading role of the party with the exaltation of the arbitrary action of the top leaders. Marxism-Leninism recognizes and correctly defines the role of leaders and of great individuals, but never concedes that they should be elevated above the party. When Mr. Avakian negates the party in favor of the exaltation of the role of leading individuals, he is showing that he follows the theory of the "dictatorship of the party." For Stalin, in criticizing the formula of "the dictatorship of the party", pointed out that: "This formula, taken without reservations, says, as it were, ... to the top leadership of the Party: you may indulge in the luxury of a certain amount of complacency, you may even become conceited, for we have the dictatorship of the Party, and 'consequently', the dictatorship of the leaders." (Stalin, "Concerning Questions of Leninism", Problems of Leninism, p. 286)

HOW THE ARTICLE "A WRONG PHRASE" OPENLY DEFENDS THE FORMULA OF "THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PARTY"

In fact the article "A Wrong Phrase" openly defends the Trotskyite formulation "the dictatorship of the party". The first way it does this is by claiming that Lenin used this phrase. They state that "For while it is true that Stalin correctly criticizes the slogan 'dictatorship of the Party', it is in the course of fighting opportunists who used the fact that Lenin had on several occasions himself used the disputed phrase..." The "RCP" wants to compare its use of the phrase to that of Lenin. But this argument can only further expose the anti-Leninist positions of the "RCP". Stalin explains Lenin's use of this formula as follows: "On a few occasions that Lenin was obliged, in controversy with opponents, to speak of the dictatorship of the Party, he usually referred to the 'dictatorship of one party', i.e. to the fact that our Party holds power alone, that it does not share power with other parties." (Ibid., p. 285) Thus the phrase "dictatorship of the (or of one) party" was very rarely used by Lenin. Stalin says that he has "presumably" only five uses in which he (Lenin — ed.) touches, in passing, on the question of the dictatorship of the Party." (Ibid., p. 284) And Lenin generally was referring with this formulation to the undivided leadership of the party, to the fact that the party does not share power with other parties.

But Mao Zedong Thought is opposed to the undivided leadership of the party. Mao held that there can and should be several parties sharing the state power. Besides the Communist Party, there were several bourgeois parties that took part in the government in China. These parties were pampered and given great rights. Mao stated: "Which is better, to have just one party or several? As we see it now, it's perhaps better to have several parties. This has been true in the past and may well be so for the future; it means long-term coexistence and mutual supervision." And he adds that he is talking about "the various democratic parties, consisting primarily of the national bourgeoisie and its intellectuals". ("On the Ten Major Relationships", Selected Works of Mao Tsetung, Vol. V, p. 296)

The "RCP", flying in the face of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, justifies the Chinese revisionist practice of fostering the growth of bourgeois parties in the government of what was called "the dictatorship of the proletariat". The "RCP" agrees with Mao's social-democratic ideas about the bourgeoisie growing into socialism. They twist and turn to justify Mao's policy of fostering the growth of the bourgeois parties and even resort to that favorable trick of all "three worlds": using the crudest historical parallels between situations which don't bear the slightest resemblance. Just as the Klonkskites justify the warmongering U.S.-China alliance through fake historical parallels with World War II, so the "RCP" tries to justify the existence of the bourgeois parties in the dictatorship of the proletariat by drawing a historical parallel to the very short-lived collaboration between the Left Socialist-Revolutionary Party and the Bolshevik Party. We will go into this in more detail at another time. For now it suffices to note that this is ridiculous. Lenin, in an article dealing with the question of an alliance with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries to the peasantry. He rules out any possibility of an alliance with bourgeois parties. He stated: "On the contrary, a coalition (alliance) between the working and exploited classes, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie, on the other, cannot be an honest coalition because of the radical divergence of interests between these classes." (Lenin, "Alliance Between the Workers and the Working and Exploited Peasants, A Letter to Pravda", Collected Works, Vol. 26, p. 232, emphasis as in the original) Thus Lenin has denounced the class collaborationism of Mao Zedong Thought in advance.

The "RCP" is so zealous to defend Mao that it twists and turns and states: "In fact, the democratic parties largely ceased to exist during the Cultural Revolution... It was clear that in Mao's view and the view of those who made up his revolutionary headquarters, the historical conditions which had required cooperation with the democratic parties no longer existed (except, perhaps, in some limited way in relation to Taiwan)." ("Dogmato-Revisionism", p. 48) This sophistry is utterly shameful. First the "RCP" defends Mao's ultra-opportunist practice, then it turns around and tries to reassure everyone by saying that it doesn't matter anyway, the parties were eventually eliminated. But it turns out that the parties weren't eliminated. Whether or not the bourgeois parties functioned during the Cultural Revolution means little, as the Communist Party, the mass organizations, many state bodies and so forth also largely ceased to function. The "RCP's" speculation on Mao's views is completely unsupported. The evidence of the most important documents, instead of all the published documents and speeches of which we are aware, is that no such decision was taken against the bourgeois parties. And, in fact, after the main turmoil of the Cultural Revolution subsided, the bourgeois parties were still there, ready at hand for the use of the ultra-revisionists.

Thus an examination of the context in which Lenin made his extremely rare use of the formulation "dictatorship of the party" only serves to further expose the revisionist nature of Mao Zedong Thought.

Another argument by the "RCP" in defense of the formulation "the dictatorship of the party", is that Comrade Hoxha uses the phrase "We Marxist-Leninists who have come to power..." With this argument the article "A Wrong Phrase" proves that it is the "RCP" revision-mongers who shout and scream about this or that sacred phrase torn completely out of context. In the passage at stake Comrade Hoxha is not discussing anything at all related to the point at issue. But no matter, Comrade Hoxha's phrase is completely unobjectionable, and the "RCP" is only exposing its dishonest defense of the formulation "dictatorship of the party" by comparing it to Comrade Hoxha's phrase. The "RCP" dances and leaps and demands that the COMEML must criticize Comrade Hoxha in order to remain "consistent" with the COMEML's criticism of the "RCP". What rot! The deep, profound, heavy thinkers of the "RCP" have forgotten only a mere trifle, namely, that what the issue is, with the formula of the "dictatorship of the party" is not that Marxist-Leninists should turn to power. On the contrary, the issue is: how do the Marxist-Leninists make use of this power. The issue is to correctly define the leading role of the party, the role of the mass organizations, the methods of mobilizing the masses, and so forth. This is what Comrade Stalin does in the section of Concerning Questions of Leninism which discusses the question of "the dictatorship of the party". The issue is, in part if not fully, the bureau-

Continued on page 14; see CHALLENGE

CHALLENGE

Continued from page 12

cratic and Trotskyite conception of the leading role of the party, a conception shared by Mao and Avakian, versus the Marxist-Leninist conception of the leading role of the party. For the "RCP" hot-shots to confuse this question with that of whether the Marxist-Leninists should come to power, that is, with whether the Marxist-Leninist party should be the ruling party, is amazing. It is to issue themselves a certificate of ideological bankruptcy. What is the "RCP" trying to hide with this crude sophistry anyway? Are they trying to claim that Comrades Lenin and Stalin were opposed to Marxist-Leninists coming to power? On the contrary, Marxism-Leninism holds that the party should have undivided leadership in the dictatorship of the proletariat. The honor for such a position as advocating that Marxist-Leninists should not come to power can only belong to the Chinese revisionists and Mao, who advocate the replacement of the undivided leadership of the communist party with the "long-term coexistence and mutual supervision" with bourgeois parties.

So we see that the article "A Wrong Phrase" provides yet further proof that the "RCP" has an utterly mechanical, bureaucratic conception of the role of the party, just as "U.S. Neo-Revisionism, Part 3" pointed out. The "RCP" cannot even disassociate itself from the Trotskyite conception of the "dictatorship of the party". And it is no wonder. How hollow is all the "RCP's" talk about Mao's "great immortal contributions" and "unprecedented" new methods for "relying on the masses" and his "great contributions theoretically and practically to combatting efforts to

transform the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship of party bureaucrats (actually a new capitalist class)." ("A Wrong Phrase") The only conception that Mr. Avakian or Mao Zedong have of the party is precisely that of "a dictatorship of party bureaucrats", a handful of leaders "skilfully selected by a master strategist". The new methods that are being trumpeted up and down as better than those of Lenin and Stalin turn out to consist of negating the leading role of the party, throwing mud at the party concept, repeating the bourgeois criticism of the idea of a monolithic party, compromising the struggle against opportunism, etc. That is why the "RCP", in following Mao Zedong Thought, has made a career out of opposing the party concept, back from the days that they reveled in the "pre-party collective" thesis to today when they fall and stumble backward over the "dictatorship of the party". The "RCP's" great "theoretical struggle" against the "dictatorship of party bureaucrats" collapses into a struggle against the Marxist-Leninist conception of the leading, mobilizing and energizing role of the Marxist-Leninist party of the proletariat. □

Read:

TWO SERIES IN "THE WORKERS' ADVOCATE" AGAINST THE OPPORTUNIST TREND OF NEO-REVISIONISM

■ "U.S. Neo-Revisionism as the American Expression of the International Opportunist Trend of Chinese Revisionism", Parts 1, 2, and 3.

Published in Vol.9, Nos.2, 4 and 6. 75¢ each

■ "Does the 'RCP, USA' Oppose the Theory of 'Three Worlds'?", Parts 1 and 2.

Published in Vol.9, Nos.2 and 3. 75¢ each

Order from: COUSML P.O. Box 11942
Fort Dearborn Station Chicago, IL 60611

Enver Hoxha Reflections on China

VOLUME I

Reflections on China consists of excerpts from the Political Diary of Comrade Enver Hoxha. The notes included in this volume belong to the period 1962-1972.

In these notes the zigzags of the Chinese leadership, its revisionist, anti-socialist and anti-Albanian course are revealed.

From these notes and others which may be published later, the reader will be able to see the analysis the PLA has made and the principled stands it has taken in defense of Marxism-Leninism.

The complete text of the official Albanian English-language edition is reprinted and available:

In Proletarian Internationalism, numbers 4 and 5, \$4.00 for the set

In Paperback Book Edition \$6.50

The official Spanish-language edition is reprinted in Internacionalismo Proletario \$4.00

(Bulk rates available for orders of 10 or more)

Order from: COUSML P.O. Box 11942
Fort Dearborn Station Chicago, IL 60611