
Union of Marxist-Leninist Struggle

On the ML parties as heirs of the errors of the period 1935-1956

First Published: August 1984; republished in *Revolucion Obrera* September 21 2018

Transcription, Editing and Markup: Paul Saba and Sam Richards. Copyright: This work is in the Public Domain under the Creative Commons Common Deed. You can freely copy, distribute and display this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Please credit the Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line as your source, include the url to this work, and note any of the transcribers, editors & proofreaders above.



Foreword by **Union Obrera Comunista (MLM)**

Today, after the collapse of the RIM and when Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties and organizations around the world work for the unity and construction of a new international organization of the Communists, the study and analysis of the origins of contemporary revisionism It is still of vital importance to deepen our understanding of the mistakes made and their sources and to draw up a general line for the International Communist Movement.

We reproduce below, considering it of interest and difficult to access at present, the text "On the ml parties as heirs of the errors of the period 1935-1956", published within the work entitled "Our era is that of the proletarian revolution "(Second Part), edited by the now defunct Union of Marxist-Leninist Struggle, August 1984, p. 1-3. The transcription of this text has been made by the Great March Towards Communism.



Madrid, October 2013.

**ON THE ML PARTIES AS HEIRS OF THE ERRORS OF THE PERIOD
1935-1956**

"In a post-World War II period, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the parties of some Eastern European countries set aside the fundamental principles of Marxism. They spread a cloak of silence about the class struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leadership of the Party, democratic centralism, the links of the Party with the masses, etc., and the atmosphere that was lived there was of little interest for these things. "

Mao Tsetung (1977) Selected Works, Volume V. Beijing: Foreign Language Press, p. 412

The failure of the ML parties created in the 60s (except for notable exceptions, but minority), which in many cases became revisionist within a few years, has one of its causes in the development of the inheritance assumed without self-criticism of the last errors period of the Stalin era. Indeed, many ml parties had already degenerated in 1973-1976 and this explains why they enthusiastically accepted such things as the "theory of the three worlds", the fascist military coup of 1976 [in the People's Republic of China] or the dogmatic-revisionist arguments of the senile Hoxha. After the VII Congress of the IC (1935) in the ICM there was a mixture of correct positions (especially those held by the Chinese PC) and serious errors, many of them frontally opposed to the essentials of scientific socialism. In those years only the most blatantly revisionist theses, Trotskyism, Tito or Browder's line in the US were fought, while allowing for the existence and development of other, less obvious, but no less dangerous manifestations.

The most significant errors of the period are:

-The right opportunism, the abandonment of Marxist theory about the state, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. This happened from the VII Congress of the CI onwards (1935). The famous Dimitrov Report contained in itself a dangerous ambiguity regarding Popular Front politics and could be interpreted as a

tactical alliance against fascism (correctly) or as a strategic alliance to defend bourgeois democracy (the wrong version). And the latter is the one that prevailed in most PCs. The same Report cannot be accepted by the principle that for the working class all ambiguity is fatal. The PCE was debated in confusion from 1935 to the Extended Plenary of the CC of March 1937 where two lines were defined, one, supported mainly by D. Ibárruri, completely revisionist, of continuity with the bourgeois republic of 1931. The other more correct (perhaps it would be better to say less erroneous) was directed by José Díaz, but he was never able to fight rightism and in the name of "peace in the party" and "unity" was reconciled and left to do. This is the fundamental cause of the loss of war.

The right opportunism, bourgeois democratism like the Kautsky, dominated equally in the PCF, PCI and other parties that turned the anti-Nazi struggle into a defense of the bourgeois republic, being auxiliary forces of the respective big bourgeoisies. The same happened with the Greek PC and these errors are possibly the determinants in his defeat in the civil war in 1946-49. In Latin America, the opportunism of right-wing products of the VII Congress of the CI affected especially the Chilean CP.

The PCE since the period of the civil war has never surpassed right-wing opportunism, never returned to a truly Marxist policy. Thus, in the important Plenary Session of the PCE of December 1945, Ibárruri presented a Report (which was approved almost unanimously) to which one can, with certainty, qualify as basically revisionist. This was maintained until the 1960s when the revisionist line became explicit and clear with Carrillo's "pact for freedom" policy.

These errors, which affect the essentials of Marxism, were maintained by the ml of the e. Spanish emerged in the 60s. Its most typical manifestation is the defense of the republic of April 14 and its support for the opportunist version of the Popular Front. All this made crisis in the Transition becoming a right opportunism as painful as liquidator.

After World War II and the dissolution of the IC, the Cominform made a surprising "retouch" of Leninist politics regarding imperialism, militarism and war. In the founding act of the Cominform (1947) the delegation of the USSR in its report

defined that the defense of "peace" against militaristic imperialism was the fundamental task of the workers' movement. It was no longer correct, therefore, for the Leninist thesis that only the revolution can prevent war (or put an end to it if it breaks down in spite of everything). This is wrong and here lies the current basis of bourgeois pacifism, with its dream of a permanent peace under imperialism. At that time the USSR outlined an international policy not very different from the "theory of the three worlds".

-The cult of spontaneity, the most stultifying workerism, had already appeared in the CI in the 30s, but it was after World War II that it developed to incredible proportions. Trade unionism and the struggle for reforms became the fundamental practical task of many PCs. These, in fact, renounced their leading role, to be the vanguard party. The PCE in the civil war was a sample of it, with its inability to direct in the political, military, economic and ideological war against fascism.

-In the beginning of the VII Congress, an opportunist version of what the tactics of a workers' party should be was quickly extended by many PCs. They forgot the Leninist proposals and turned to Bernstein with the usual contempt for the final objectives (so criticized by Engels) and his obsession with the current movement. The political life of the PCs became a succession of "astute" manoeuvres, cult by the conjuncturalism, the little things of the day, etc. The ml emerged here clearly showed those tendencies in the Transition.

-The bourgeois nationalism, which had such disastrous consequences among the ml of here (with its Spanishness and "forgetfulness" of the oppressed nations by the Spanish platform) was also inherited from the past. Thus, in the aforementioned Ibárruri report in 1945, Spain is presented as a "nation" and the right to self-determination is completely excluded, which is replaced by a "democratic federation of the Hispanic peoples (sic)" which in other texts is identified with the statutes of autonomy of the republic of April 14. This, as we know well, inherited it as the ml of the 60s and is maintained today in the ICM by the USA PCR and others, who oppose the correct Leninist formula, the right of Self-determination (as the right to separation) to the oppressed nations.

-In the ideological terrain dogmato-revisionism prevailed; Empiricism, the most heated subjectivism (in the aforementioned report Ibárruri describes as "precarious" the state of the fascist regime, as it would continue to do in the next 30 years ...) the disinterest in the study of reality (in the documents of the PCE of that period is characterized to the Spanish state of "feudal regime"), the most serious contempt for dialectical materialism. The voluntarism, the constant appeals to the feelings with forgetfulness of the rationality and the thought, made of the PCs some strange places full of nerves and vacuums of ... scientific analysis.

-The construction of socialism was understood, both in the USSR and in the PCs that were not in power, as a simple economic growth. It ignored what was exposed by the classics of scientific socialism about it. Here the errors of the CPSU and Stalin were very serious.

These problems define a very significant picture, although they existed along with a considerable number of correct positions in theory and in practice. The Chinese CP avoided the aforementioned errors, knew correctly the fundamental problems of the Chinese revolution and did not suffer defeat in the civil war as the PCs of Spain and Greece. But the important thing for our subject now is that those mistakes WERE INHERITED INTACT by the ml of many countries.

In light of this we can interpret the XX Congress of the CPSU as a qualitative leap from the quantitative errors accumulated previously, although this process was not linear. Thus, in 1947, in the Cominform constitutive session, the PCI and PCF were criticized for not having maintained a correct line in the Resistance and for having fallen into rightist deviations. But these attempts at rectification never amounted to a war to the death, but rather skirmishes that could not eradicate revisionism and about to overflow. The same can be said of the self-criticism made by Stalin in the XIX Congress of the CPSU (1952) and his writings of that time.

In the Spanish state the ml of the 60 never made a complete balance of the revisionist line of the PCE, in order to locate the fundamental points of rupture. They concentrated on some problems, the peaceful path to socialism, Stalin, etc., and

assumed the old errors in their entirety in the rest. Even those who played did so in a very partial way. Therefore, they could not be sustained for long and as soon as some serious problems arose, they sank.

The inability shown by many of the ML parties that arose in the 1960s to make a self-critical balance of the past is all the more remarkable as the Chinese CP did partial attempts in that direction. For example, in his article *ONCE AGAIN ON THE DIVERGENCIAS BETWEEN THE CAMARADA TOGLIATTI AND US* (1963) certain errors of the PCI are criticized in the period 1944-46. This could have been considered as a first step towards a complete self-critical balance, but one such thing happened. The fiction that revisionism appeared "suddenly" in the 20th Congress of the CPSU, in 1956, completely anti-dialectic thesis (denying that any qualitative leap has been inevitably preceded by a quantitative accumulation) that the PT of Albania and the related sects defended.

The many criticisms of the Chinese CP to the errors of the Stalin era contained in the *HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT* (1956), *AGAIN AGAINST THE HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT* (1956), *SPEECH BY MAO TSETUNG DEL 27-1-57* and *ON THE PROBLEM OF STALIN* (1963), among others, were in fact ignored by a good part of the newly constituted parties. Here he continued to model the PCE of José Díaz, much less correct and glorious in reality than was intended and logically, his many and serious errors were copied. Significantly of the period 1932-35, when the PCE was more correct, and, also, when it laid the foundations for its implantation in the labour movement, there was barely any talk (the PCE line in the Asturian Commune of 1934 was forgotten, for example), while the whole 1935-1956 period was mythicized, basically deviationist.

With the present notes we do not intend to make a complete analysis of the history of the ICM in that period, we only present some points to encourage reflection: the global analysis is still pending.

THE REAL HERITAGE OF THE III INTERNATIONAL ASSUMED BY THE ML PARTIES

On January 24, 2018 was reproduced by the *Red Dazibao Blog* the article "[ON THE ML PARTIES AS HEIRS OF THE ERRORS OF THE PERIOD 1935-1956](#)", in turn transcribed by the *Great March Blog towards Communism* that without public explanation ceased activities since July 22, 2015. It is said that the aforementioned article is the authorship of the *Leninist Union of Marxist Struggle* organization, which has also disappeared in the Spanish State since August 1984.

The article is inserted by the *Red Dazibao Blog* under the heading "*Documents of the history of the Maoist communist movement*", as a contribution "to the formation and understanding of MLM history" by the "various organizations and Maoist parties" that "advance towards the constitution a [sic] new international center ».

As recognized by the Founding Declaration of the *Revolutionary Internationalist MRI Movement* in 1984, the *Communist Workers Union (mlm)* of Colombia in its *Proposal to Formulate a General Line for the Unity of the International Communist Movement* reaffirms: "*the historical experience that , being marked by the incessant combat of opportunism, makes its assessment a ground of acute line struggle » .*

The assessment of the historical experience of the role of the Third International has been a matter of demarcation between Leninism and Trotskyism, between Marxism-Leninism and Khrushchevite revisionism, between Marxism-Leninism Maoism and neo-revisionist Avakianism. Inevitably such assessment and demarcation have also been concomitant with the assessment of Comrade Stalin's role. The article "*ON THE ML PARTIES AS HEIRS OF THE ERRORS OF THE PERIOD 1935-1956*" does not escape to tertiary in that struggle of lines. After his lapidary title the appointment of Mao Tse-tung is inserted "*In a post-World War II period, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the parties of some Eastern European countries set aside the fundamental principles of Marxism. They spread a cloak of silence about the class struggle, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leadership of the Party, democratic centralism, the links of the Party with the masses, etc., and the atmosphere that was lived there was of little interest for these things.* " That subliminally creates in the reader the idea that Mao Tse-tung referred to the " ML Parties, "when in reality he referred to the revisionist line that matures and becomes predominant at the 20th Congress of the CPSU

in 1956. Quotation is part of a speech in 1957, already in full effervescence of the line struggle between the Marxist-Leninists led by the Chinese Communist Party PCCH and the Khrushchevite revisionists led by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union PCUS.

The article's approach is erroneous because it loses sight of the main line struggle in the years immediately before and after the 20th Congress of the CPSU: the struggle between Marxism-Leninism Maoism and Khrushchev revisionism. The struggle of Marxism-Leninism at that time was, in essence, against the foundations of all revisionism, under the exact form of Khrushchevite revisionism, a characteristic that is not even mentioned in the article in question.

Although such a blurring is the common thread of the whole article, the confusion is evident in formulations like this: *"In those years only the most blatantly revisionist theses were fought, Trotskyism, Tito or the Browder line in the US, allowing at the same time the existence and development of other manifestations less evident, but no less dangerous »* . It places on the same level various forms of opportunism, avoiding the main character of the struggle against the Khrushchevite revisionism in which the opportunist schism in the International Communist Movement finds itself in the most essential sense of opportunism: to reconcile the antagonism, the antagonism between the two systems, the socialist and the imperialist whose contradiction was the main one of the world at that time. From the Khrushchevite revisionism were preamble, ideological and political fertilization, the theories of Trotskyism that had long served as support and allied to other forms of opportunism such as Menshevism and Kautskyism, and that later became the parapet of attack of international opportunism against the Bolshevik Party of the USSR, against the Third International and against Comrade Stalin; the Browderist theories of the Communist Party of the United States, a living example of how the correct tactical orientation of the Third International on the Popular Front or United Front against Fascism, based on the unity and hegemony of the revolutionary proletariat, was opportunistically distorted and executed. in maintaining the class independence of the labor movement; and the theories not exclusively of Tito, but of the leading clique of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, immediate forerunners of Khrushchevite revisionism at the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

The confusion of the article is ratified, when next to the affirmation *"while allowing the existence and development of other less evident manifestations, but no less dangerous"* , it enumerates thus *"the most significant errors of the period"* : *"The opportunism of rights, the*

abandonment of the Marxist theory on the state, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat » , « After World War II and the dissolution of the CI, the Cominform made a surprising «retouch» of the Leninist policy regarding imperialism, the militarism and war » , « The cult of spontaneity » , « From the VII Congress quickly spread by many PCs an opportunistic version of what should be the tactics of a workers party » , « Bourgeois nationalism » , « In the ideological terrain prevailed the dogmato-revisionism; empiricism, the most heated subjectivism " , " The building of socialism was understood, both in the USSR and in the PCs that were not in power, as a simple economic growth. It ignored what was exposed by the classics of scientific socialism about it. Here the errors of the CPSU and Stalin were very serious » .

Does this list refer to the "most significant errors" of the Third International? Or the "most significant errors" of the revisionist line? Or are they the "most significant errors" of what the article calls *"other manifestations less obvious, but no less dangerous"* ?

According to the purpose of the article from the title itself such are the "most significant errors" of the Third International and Comrade Stalin, and therefore, are "the errors inherited by the ML Parties." Ardid of unhealthy intellectual to confuse unsuspecting!

Except for the "dogmato-revisionism", eclectic denomination emerged in RIM as part of the arsenal of the neo-revisionist line to point out to those like the Communist Workers Union (mlm), in struggle against the prachandista and avakianist opportunism that declared the principles of Marxism Leninism Maoism to consider them "insufficient" to solve the problems of the class struggle in the XXI century, in struggle against the subsequent post-mlm "new synthesis" ... we firmly assume the defense of the principles and the full validity of the Marxism Leninism Maoism. Just as classically the revisionists, the defenders of the "freedom to criticize" Marxism, described as "dogmatic" the Marxists who fought against them, also in these times the neo-revisionist pseudo-mlm, they apply the qualification of "dogmato-revisionism" to the authentic Marxist Leninist Maoists. And that is swallowed up by the authors of the article and those who reproduce it.

If in addition the question of the construction of socialism in the USSR and the errors of Comrade Stalin, already judged by the Marxist-Leninists considering that in the struggle of lines were the Bolsheviks and Comrade Stalin the representatives of the Marxist line not of the opportunistic line, where their merits weighed more than their errors; considering the

inexperience of the International Communist Movement in this new and marvelous task, where it was the practice of the Great Chinese Cultural Revolution which, despite its defeat, could correctly understand and advance a distance in solving the problems of the construction of socialism. Even so, within the Marxist Leninist Maoists since the time of the RIM, there is no agreement on the assessment made on the role of Comrade Stalin by the Marxist-Leninists led by the Communist Party of China and led by President Mao Tse-tung. There is no agreement because the overlapping attack of Avakianism against Engels and Stalin confused not a few parties and organizations and suppressed them in the symbol with the effigies of the great masters of the world proletariat. And it is evident that among the confused are the authors of the article and those who reproduce them who quote it, hypocritically dismiss the balance of the ML on Comrade Stalin, but also judge their self-criticism at the XIX Congress of the CPSU in 1950, as the self-criticism of the revisionist chief philistine of the CPSU, not of the teacher of the proletariat. They endilgan to the ML Parties the hoxhista defense to slit table of the errors of Stalin. In articles like the one mentioned, good allies have the Trotskyists to muddy Stalin. Its authors and those who reproduce it are Maoists who "overlook" issues of Maoism such as this: *"Regarding the XX Congress of the CPSU, I would like to say something. In my opinion, there are two 'swords': One is Lenin and the other is Stalin. Now, one of those swords, Stalin, has been abandoned by the Russians. Gomulka and some Hungarians have used it to fall on the Soviet Union and fight the so-called Stalinism. The Communist Parties of many European countries are also criticizing the Soviet Union, and it is Togliatti who leads the way. The imperialists, in turn, make use of this sword to kill people. Dulles, for example, brandished it for a while. What happened with this sword is not that it was given on loan, but simply thrown away. The Chinese have not abandoned it. As a first point, we defend Stalin and, as a second, criticize his mistakes; that is why we have written the article 'On the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat'. Unlike those people who denigrate and liquidate Stalin, we treat him according to reality "* 1 .

1. Mao Tse-tung - Discurso pronunciado en la II Sesión Plenaria del VIII Comité Central del Partido Comunista de China. 15 de noviembre de 1956.

The other "most significant errors" listed in the article correspond precisely to the "new" theories of the Khrushchevist revisionist line. And therefore, they can no longer be considered "errors" but revisionist theories, opportunist theories against which criticism and persuasion do not work, but frank denunciation and the theoretical struggle to shatter the rotten "new" theories. Such "most significant errors" do not belong to the inheritance

assumed by the ML Parties as infamously stated in the article, but to the opportunist heritage embraced by the Khrushchevist revisionist parties.

Of course, the great line struggle of the 60s between the Leninist Marxists and the Khrushchevite revisionists was incubated in the Third International, with *"vacillations, germ of a division within the International: a line of the right that interpreted these formulations as a claudication against the antifascist bourgeoisie, an implantation of reformism and class conciliation, and the Marxist-Leninist line that struggled to achieve the immediate objectives of the workers' movement (the defeat of fascism) without sacrificing the vital and ultimate interests of the movement » 2* , but it is a struggle of lines whose demarcation did not mature within the III International, nor immediately after its dissolution. Its full development was highlighted by the 20th Congress of the CPSU where the "secret report" of Khrushchev, in the form, directed against Comrade Stalin, but in the content against Marxism Leninism, against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and socialism in the USSR, "Secret report" endorsed and applauded by international Trotskyism.

2. Revista Contradicción No. 16 - Artículo Hacia la Internacional de Nuevo Tipo basada en el Marxismo Leninismo Maoísmo - Septiembre de 1995.

The article in question considers the political orientation of the Third International on the Popular Front "ambiguous". Crass error of the columnists! The origin of the revisionist interpretation of the Popular Front policy, is not in the orientation of the VII Congress of the III International, but in the line of right that was already manifested within the International and in its practical application by the parties in which prevailed such a revisionist line. Against the experience in Spain and the United States, for example, where the revisionist line was the standard bearer of an erroneous practice of the Popular Front policy, is the experience of China where the Marxist-Leninist line put it into practice consistently and achieved the victory of the New Democracy Revolution in 1949.

Therefore the revisionist parties were the heirs of the rigged embryonic right-wing line in the III International, not the ML Parties that did inherit their correct Marxist-Leninist line, in open struggle against the revisionist Khrushchevist parties that by abjuring Marxism and Leninism adopted a line ideological and bourgeois politics in all aspects of political activity, including the problem of the Popular Front or the United Front. Togliatti and Thorez were not the leaders of new ML Parties, but the renegades of the violent revolution and the leaders

of the revisionist degeneration of the old Communist Parties in Italy and France, whose "new" theories were opposed by the ML Parties at the head of the Communist Party of China. It was a struggle, a demarcation and an international division, and just as the Marxist-Leninist line prevailed in parties like the Communist Party of Peru, in many countries new ML Parties emerged in historical struggle against the old revisionist parties. We witnessed in Colombia where the old Communist Party founded in 1930 was divided in two in 1965: the Communist Party of Colombia revisionist Khrushchevist and the new Communist Party of Colombia (ML) which had close camaraderie relations with its contemporaries. countries like China, Albania, Spain, Portugal, Brazil, Ecuador and Chile, also emerged in combat to the revisionist parties. The loss of the thread of this struggle of international lines, leads the authors of the article to make statements such as *"In Latin America right opportunism product of the VII Congress of the CI especially affected the Chilean PC" ... "But the important thing for our subject now is that those errors were INTENTLY INHERITED by the ml of many countries "*, endorsing to the VII Congress the opportunism of the revisionist parties, and presenting them as if they were the ML Parties to conclude: the ML Parties were overwhelmingly dens that embraced the right opportunist line of the III International. All of which, as the Chinese communist comrades said, is "passing dog meat under the skin of a lamb," a contraband supported and whitened by those who uncritically reproduce the article and exalt it as a contribution to the unity of the communists.

After the triumph of Marxism Leninism over the Khrushchevite revisionism in the Moscow Declarations in 1957 and 1960 and suddenly in 1963 with the *Proposition About the General Line of the International Communist Movement* also known as the *Charter of 25 Points*, a new general crisis ensued of the International Communist Movement unleashed by the defeat of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and with it, the defeat of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in China, and with them, the early decline of almost all the ML Parties with notable exceptions such as the PCP. New line struggles emerged in the ML Parties of which the Hoxhista attack of the Albanian Labor Party against the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution against the Communist Party of China against President Mao was a precursor. It is within these new line struggles that some declining ML Parties accept the revisionist "theory of the three worlds" whose mention is short-sighted in the article, since such a theory is still accepted by organizations and Marxist-Leninist parties, Maoist or Maoist. dry, in their analyzes of the world situation; and the most serious: they attribute their authorship to President Mao Tse-tung. This is a living manifestation of the current confusion within the

Marxist Leninist Maoists. As part of these new line struggles in the ML Parties, in several the opportunism of "left" was imposed as a tendency already warned by Lenin of atonement for the sins of right opportunism in the movement. In Colombia we also witnessed this hard blow to the proletariat and the revolution, where it was not right opportunism, revisionist, but its obverse, the opportunism of "left", which split and virtually liquidated the ML Party with only 10 years of existence, leaving a redoubt that with the same name ended by hoxhism and ended prostrate before the bourgeoisie as the old revisionist party.

And this is where the confusion of the article in question and its rejection of the Third International, again come to the surface, showing that they completely lost the thread of the line struggle, by directly awarding, in essence, to the Third International, the new and deep crisis of the International Communist Movement and its disastrous consequences on the ML Parties, of which after 50 years, despite the great attempt led by the RIM, the movement is still not recovered. Under various forms of opportunism adapted to reconcile the main antagonism in each epoch, the essence of the revisionist theories, has prevailed from Bernstein to Avakian.

How on earth could that article absurdity be endorsed to contribute to the advance towards a new international center? To unite it on the basis of confusion? »To serve the formation and understanding of MLM history»?

Confusion, lack of definition, dispersion are the current characteristics of the International Communist Movement. Unity can not be the product of eclecticism, nor of sectarianism, much less conciliation with opportunist theories of the right or of the «left». The international unity of the communists demands the theoretical defeat of revisionism and centrism, demands a clear demarcation between Marxism, Leninism, Maoism and all forms of opportunism.

Such is the basis and foundation of our contribution to face the problem, contribution that we have published in the *Negation of the Negation* Magazine No. 5, under the title *Proposal of Formulation of a General Line for the Unity of the International Communist Movement* .

Proposal that in its Chapter V deals with the problem of the historical experience of the III International, its Congresses and their dissolution, the insert of which is set out below.

ON THE HISTORICAL BALANCE OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

In the current struggle for the construction of an international organization, indispensable headquarters of the World Proletarian Revolution, the critical balance of the great accumulated experience of the Workers and Communist Movement is inescapable; historical experience that, being marked by the incessant battle against opportunism, makes its assessment a ground of acute line struggle.

The international character of the workers movement demands that its communist organization be international. The **International Workers' Association**³ or **Ist International** had two objectives: to deny the socialist or semisocialist sects, with a real organization of the working class to fight for the emancipation of the workers, and to reunite in an immense single army the whole working class combative Europe and North America. All the development of the First International was, on the one hand, the complete triumph of Marxism in the workers' movement and the decline of sectarianism; and on the other hand, the learning of the world proletariat of Marxist tactics in terms of its forms of struggle and organization, on the basis of its own experience, the instruction of the Congresses and the guidance of the General Council, a centralized management body of the entire International, exercised in a frontal struggle against the Bakuninist anarchism, a special form of sectarianism that tried to break through and impose itself within the Association.

3. Fue fundada en 1864 sobre un terreno internacionalista abonado por el trabajo de su precursora: La Liga de los Comunistas, que desde 1848 había publicado El Manifiesto del Partido Comunista, escrito por Marx y Engels.

The defeat of the Paris Commune, the persecution of the leaders of the International and the intrigues of the Bakuninists led to its dissolution. To have fulfilled its mission of creating the conditions for the workers movement to enter a new period of political struggle for its class dictatorship, learning that *without its own political party, the working class is impotent in the class struggle*, it was the main reason that made his existence unnecessary. The International Workers' Association paved the way and created the foundations of the international organization necessary to lead the proletariat in its historic mission: to bury capitalism.

The extension of the workers' movement, in the form of socialist workers' parties in the various countries, made necessary the **Socialist International** or **II International - the new**

instrument for the international action of the proletariat, of which Lenin said *"has done useful work in the organization of proletarian masses in the long peaceful period of the worst capitalist slavery, in the course of the last third of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century* - and at the same time, it was a condition for the emergence of the tendency towards federal organization and the tolerance of defects opportunists apparently very "typical" of each country, two manifestations of bourgeois nationalism within the labor movement, not corrected in time and with disastrous consequences for the World Proletarian Revolution. Likewise, the struggle for reforms and the parliamentary struggle, which played an important role in the peaceful period of the revolution, gave rise to parliamentarism and pacifism as an opportunist tendency in the socialist parties that, not being fought correctly and energetically, it imposed the entire international workers movement corroding, turning the Second International into an unusable instrument for the moment in which the intensification of the contradictions of capitalism in its imperialist phase created the conditions for the revolutionary triumph of the proletariat.

The beginning of the first imperialist world war revealed in all its magnitude the betrayal of the leaders of the Second International: nationalist confrontation of the workers in defense of the "fatherland", renouncing proletarian internationalism; it helps the imperialist workers' massacre, instead of transforming the imperialist war into revolutionary civil war; social peace, in rejection of the class struggle; it helps the bourgeoisie, instead of destroying its reactionary State and implanting the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. All this forced Lenin to declare: *"The Second International is dead, defeated by opportunism. Down with opportunism and live the Third International, disengaged from the renegades and opportunism »* .

The Communist International or III International was the first world party of the proletarian revolution in the epoch of imperialism, historical successor of the best traditions of the First and Second International; leader of the revolutionary action of the masses, of their revolutions and important struggles all over the world, under the banner of *Proletarians of All the Unile Countries!* In Lenin's words: *"The Third International has reaped the fruits of the work of the Second International, has amputated the corrupted, opportunist, social-chauvinist, bourgeois and petit bourgeois parties and has **begun to implement the Dictatorship of the Proletariat** . "*

From its foundation until its dissolution, it was the role of the Communist International to combat the opportunist errors of the Second International and to assume on a new basis the objectives of *«the creation of a combat organization, in charge of coordinating and directing the movement of the Communist International and to realize the subordination of the interests of the movements in the different countries to the interests of the international revolution »* , in essence, the same objectives of the International Workers' Association. The Communist International became a theoretical and practical leader of the world proletariat, analyzing the international economic and political situation and characterizing it in the different periods, denouncing the offensive of the imperialist bourgeoisie against the workers' movement, promoting the formation of new Communist Parties; supporting the proletarian struggles in the different countries, the revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies; orienting the tasks of the communists in their struggle against imperialism, particularly against fascism during the second imperialist world war; supporting the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the USSR and directing its defense as the basis of the World Proletarian Revolution.

The First Congress of the Third International examined decisive questions for the world workers movement: bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the different socialist currents, the international situation. He outlined the specific tasks of the International: generalize the revolutionary experience of the working class; purify the movement of impure mixtures of opportunism and social-patriotism; unite the forces of all truly revolutionary parties of the world proletariat; facilitate and accelerate the victory of the communist revolution in the whole world. And he posed in a new way the struggle of the working class in the colonies: *"From now on, in the more developed colonies, the struggle is no longer waged only under the banner of national liberation; it immediately takes on a more or less clearly defined social character »* .

The Second Congress in its resolutions delimited fields with opportunism, recognized the split of the workers' movement caused by the labor aristocracy, and built a new unit for the action of the revolutionary communists of all countries regarding the role of the party, the work of the communists in the unions - against the yellow union international -, the participation in the elections, the 21 conditions of admission to the International. He also reaffirmed the principled position of the First International: *"The emancipation of workers is not, in any way, a local or national task; it is a social and international task "* , and the need for the centralization of the workers movement worldwide: *" The Communist International*

does not ignore, in any way, that to achieve victory, the International Workers' Association, which fights for the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of communism, it must have a strongly centralized organization » . And, in his final manifesto, he declared: "The Communist International is the party of the insurrection of the world revolutionary proletariat . "

The Third Congress devised the tactic for a new period of reflux in the face of revolutionary defeats by bourgeois governments in the hands of social-democratic, social-traitor opportunists. It was a tactic to consolidate positions won in an orderly withdrawal of the international workers movement, centered on issues such as the Red Trade Union International, work in workers' cooperatives, Youth International, the Women's Movement, the issue of the East; getting with it, grow to 60 sections, three million members and 700 newspapers.

In its resolutions, the Fourth Congress specified the class content of the slogans "Single Proletarian Front" and "Single Anti-imperialist Front"; analyzed the cycles of crisis and expansion of capitalism *"that [...] Until his death will be caught by these cyclical fluctuations. Only the seizure of power by the proletariat and the socialist world revolution can save humanity from this permanent catastrophe caused by the persistence of modern capitalism "* ; and reaffirmed the form of World Party of the International, in correspondence with the international character of the workers and communist movement, governed in its operation by democratic centralism and assimilating the experiences: the benefit of the World Party that was largely the First International, and the detrimental one of the II International, based on the federation of national parties. Only a Party of the world proletariat will be able to realize the deepest demand of internationalism: that not only the revolution in each country be put at the service of the world revolution, but that it subordinate its interests to the interests and needs of the world revolution of the proletariat.

The Fifth Congress oriented the Bolshevization of the Communist Parties - the Communist Party of China was an example, in practice, of constant and successful rectification campaigns -, the purification of coexistence with tendencies and opportunist elements in the communist parties, their organization in democratic centralism; its construction, not for bourgeois parliamentarism but to lead the workers in the revolution that liquidates capitalism and conquer power, so the communist parties must be built based on the proletarians, in the factory mainly and other workplaces .

The Sixth Congress - held in full rise of fascism and the growing danger of a second world war - approved the *"International campaign against the imperialist war and the defense of the Soviet Union"* , establishing in the Program:

The international proletariat, which has its only homeland in Russia, the bastion of its conquests and the essential factor of its international liberation, must contribute to the success of the building of socialism in the USSR and defend it with all its means from the attacks of the powers capitalists .

This was an entirely revolutionary communist program, a superior expression of the historical experience of the proletariat, in which the struggle for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Socialism and World Communism was at the forefront.

The Seventh and last Congress of the Communist International -following the correct policy of the Frente Único and the orientations for the formation of Popular Fronts, maintaining the class independence of the workers movement- oriented the policy of the Antifascist United Front, a policy that led to the heroic triumph of the USSR over fascism and Nazism; it was practiced victoriously in the New Democracy Revolution in China but not in Spain, in whose civil war, although a Popular Front was formed, class independence was lost in its direction, leaving it in the hands of bourgeois republicanism, which was constituted in one of the causes of defeat. The line of the VII Congress was constituted in a matter of frontal divergence between the Leninist Marxists and the international Trotskyism and, at the moment, it divides and is reason of discussion between the Marxist Leninist Maoists.

On the policy of the Single Front and Popular Fronts, there were already vacillations and the germ of a division within the Third International: on the one hand there was a right-wing line that interpreted these formulations as a claudication against the antifascist bourgeoisie, the establishment of reformism and the conciliation of classes; On the other hand, there was the Marxist-Leninist line that struggled to achieve the immediate objectives of the workers' movement - the defeat of fascism - without sacrificing the vital and final interests of the movement. Such struggle of lines was veiled in the VII Congress that did not expressly condemn the tendency to renounce the independence of class in the Front; it did not clearly delimit the borders between Marxism and opportunism in that question, tolerating the eclecticism that ultimately favored an opportunist application of the line of the International by many communist parties, and that degenerated frankly towards the Browderist conception, according to which the struggle against fascism it suppresses the class struggle in each

country - renounce the struggle against the anti-fascist bourgeoisie - and considers anti-fascist imperialism as progressive, hiding the reactionary and predatory character of all imperialism - whether fascist or not - diverting the workers movement towards social-democratic conciliation of classes and the renunciation of the anti-imperialist struggle. Two diametrically opposed interpretations of the Frente Único and Frente Popular, where the communists had formal unity in orientation, but real division in its understanding and practical application.

The call of the Third International in defense of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics - URUS - in the face of imperialist aggression was correct:

"This was not merely a matter of solidarity towards a victim of aggression, but of the deep conviction that the defense of the Soviet Union was at the same time the defense of the socialist base of support for the world revolution" ⁴ .

4. Declaración del MRI/RIM 1984

The Executive Committee did not clarify in depth in the movement, the nature of the USSR's commitments to the United States, Great Britain and France, explaining that "*Such commitments do not require that the peoples of the countries of the capitalist world make equal commitments in their respective countries* » ⁵ .

5. Palabras del Presidente Mao en 1946, citadas en la Declaración del MRI/RIM - 1984.

For its part, the hypocritical imperialist policy of "non-intervention" in the Spanish Civil War, was actually a screen to turn that Civil War into the preamble of the Second World War; such a policy was not apprehended in this dimension by the Executive Committee of the Third International, for which reason, the magnificent campaign of the International - of denouncing the imperialist violations of "neutrality"; against the supplies of arms to the fascists; for solidarity and help the Republicans with food, medicine and weapons mainly by the USSR; of mobilization and training of antifascist volunteers organized in the International Brigades with 35,000 combatants from 54 countries - militarily it was extremely weak before the intervention of an army of 300,000 soldiers and fascist officers from Italy and Germany.

In a general statement, the RIM Declaration in 1984 correctly indicated three deviations that were presented within the III International:

First, the distinction between fascism and bourgeois democracy in the imperialist countries ... tended to make an absolute difference between these two forms of bourgeois dictatorship and also to make the fight against fascism a separate strategic stage. Second, a thesis was developed that argued that the growing pauperization of the proletariat would create the material basis for remedying the division of the working class in the advanced countries ... Third, when fascism was defined as the regime of the most reactionary sector of the monopolist bourgeoisie in the imperialist countries, this left the door open to the dangerous reformist and pacifist tendency to identify a sector of the monopolist bourgeoisie as progressive [...]

His general assessment was also correct:

While it is necessary to take stock of these errors and learn from them, it is equally necessary to recognize the Communist International, including during this period, as part of the heritage of the revolutionary struggle for communism and reject the liquidationist and Trotskyist attempts to take advantage of the errors real to draw reactionary conclusions ⁶ .

6. Declaración del MRI/RIM 1984

On May 22, 1943, by Resolution of the Presidium of the Executive Committee -not by an imposition of Stalin as presented by the Trotskyist opportunism-, the III International was dissolved, in a circumstantial measure by the new conditions created by the war, to facilitate a common front against fascism and defend the Socialist Homeland. However, the Third International was already divided into a struggle between the Marxist-Leninist line and right-wing opportunist tendencies.

The objective cause of the vacillations, of the tendency to reconcile with the bourgeoisie and imperialism - manifested since the VII Congress - was in the world situation of the time: the war being prepared by the imperialists was "an unjust, reactionary, imperialist war" , but also, as Stalin clarified:

The Second World War against the Axis States, unlike the first, took from the beginning the character of an anti-fascist and liberating war, one of whose objectives was the restoration of democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis powers

could not but reinforce, and in fact reinforced, the antifascist and liberating character of the Second World War .

This duality of the character of the war was the material basis for the emergence of right-wing opportunism, which, in its extreme version, reached the point of Browderism.

The main subjective cause of the persistence and subsequent consolidation of right-wing opportunism and its evolution towards revisionism was in the misunderstanding of the dialectic of the struggle of lines within the International Communist Movement. In the VII Congress formally defeated, the tendencies of right, in the organizational field, but not in the ideological terrain. The resolution of dissolution, by the circumstances of the Second World War, where many communist parties were decimated by the reaction, did not have favorable conditions to take the struggle of two lines to the bottom, to the exact delineation of boundaries between the opportunists right-nationalists supporters of the complete liquidation of the International- and internationalists, for whom it was acceptable a temporary dissolution but not a liquidation of this vital instrument of struggle that materialized proletarian internationalism.

Since for opportunism a world party of the proletariat under a Marxist leadership was untenable, ⁷ the bourgeois nationalism prevailed in the International Communist Movement, in terms of the organizational form of its international unity, this is confirmed by the decision of the Presidium of the Committee Executive:

7. En el extinto MRI, fue manifiesta la oposición al carácter de Partido Mundial que debe tener una Internacional que de veras marche a la vanguardia de la Revolución Proletaria Mundial. El Partido Comunista de la India (ML) Naxalbari – antes de unificarse con el Partido Comunista de la India (Maoísta)– lo expresó con claridad, y de paso evidenció que la denominación “nuevo tipo” referida a la Internacional, es ecléctica. Dice así: “El comité [del MRI] se concibió como un centro político embrionario. Esto se ajustó al objetivo declarado de trabajar hacia la formación de una Internacional de nuevo tipo. La denominación “nuevo tipo” fue incorporada precisamente para distanciar esta futura Internacional de la concepción del Comintern de ser “el partido del proletariado mundial”. Apéndice 2 de la Revista Naxalbari No. 4 “Sobre la situación actual del movimiento revolucionario internacionalista y el desafío de reagrupar a los partidos maoístas a nivel internacional” – Agosto 2010. [Contra el Avakianismo - Informe del PC de la India \(ML\) NAXALBARI “Sobre la Situación Actual del MRI y el Desafío de Agrupar a los Partidos Maoístas a Nivel Internacional” \(Agosto 2010\)](#)

The organic form of association of the workers, elected by the First Congress of the Communist International, which responded to the needs of the initial period of rebirth of the workers' movement, has been increasingly obsolete as that movement grows and its tasks in

the different countries, until becoming a hindrance for a greater consolidation of the workers' parties .

The dissolution of the Third International remained in appearance as a product only of the harsh circumstances; the argument of facilitating the unity of the antifascist forces in the facts did not facilitate such unity but it weakened the international unity of the proletariat. The alliance of the anti-fascist forces was not incorrect, the incorrect thing was to do it at the cost of losing the independence of the workers movement, definitively liquidating its international organization. The way to dissolve the III International was imposed, unforeseen and incorrect; the correct thing would have been to dissolve it temporarily by the conditions of force imposed by the war, or definitively by the impossibility of coexisting in the same organization with the nationalist opportunism or that the internationalist revolutionaries withdrew - as the Bolsheviks did in the II International when it entered bankrupt by the predominance of social-chauvinist opportunism - but without sacrificing the need for the international organization of the Workers' and Communist Movement, as indeed it happened since then, and even worse, harboring "the autonomy" of the parties against the centralized leadership with arguments as :

* The national ascent and the mobilization of the masses with a view to the rapid victory over the enemy can be realized in a better and more fruitful way with the efforts of the vanguard of the workers' movement of each country in the framework of their own State ⁸ . "

8. Revista La Internacional Comunista - 1943, No. 5 y 6.

Arguments that years later were more openly explained by leaders of the International:
The growth of the communist parties, the need to solve quickly and operationally the concrete problems of the antifascist activity and the height of the role of the communists in the struggle for the interests of The whole nation demanded much more than before that the parties were autonomous and dynamic, that they renounce the forms of management from a single center, because they had become an obstacle to their development ⁹ .

9. Así se lee en el Compendio de historia de la Internacional Comunista preparado por el Instituto de Marxismo-Leninismo anexo al CC del PCUS, con participación y ayuda de dirigentes de la IC o colaboradores de sus instituciones y órganos de prensa: WALTER ULBRICHT, DOLORES IBARRURI, JACQUES DUCLOS, TIM BUCK, HALED BAGDACHE, VICTORIO CODOVILLA, GEORGES COGNIOT, INKERI LEHTINEN, BORIS PONOMARIOV, PALME DUTT, DEZSO NEMES, FRIEDL FURNBERG, EMILIO SERENI, RUBEN AVRAMOV, ANDREW ROTHSTEIN, y que fue publicado, al parecer, en los años 60 por Editorial Progreso de Moscú, sobre lo cual es necesario expresar reserva respecto a la veracidad de esta fuente, dada la dirección revisionista de la Editorial.

The successes of the Communist International weigh more than their mistakes and the Marxist Leninist Maoists - as did their predecessors in the 60s and 80s of the twentieth century - recognize their history and their undeniable contributions to the advance of the World Proletarian Revolution. The experience of the Third International is an invaluable patrimony of the International Labor and Communist Movement and therefore the Marxist-Leninist Maoists reject any attempt to take advantage of their mistakes, to deny and renege openly and secretly the Communist International.

The Communist Party of China ¹⁰ fulfilled its internationalist duties, highlighting the great struggle that led against the Khrushchevite revisionism, in fact the continuation and development of the two-line struggle that had already emerged at the end of the Third International; two-line fight successfully developed and crowned with the *Proposition About the General Line for the International Communist Movement*, better known as *the 25-Point Letter*, but which is preceded by Declarations voted at the Moscow Conferences of 1957 and 1960, *The Charter of the 25 Points* is sustained exclusively by the Communist Party of China, and did not immediately lead to an international regrouping of the Leninist Marxist Parties. The idea of giving priority to the "autonomy" of the Parties over their international centralization had been profound. The judgment of RIM in its Declaration also denotes the struggle of two lines against the problem of centralization, on the one hand it correctly states:

10. El citado Compendio de historia de la Internacional Comunista, dice que frente al apoyo de los partidos a la propuesta de disolución de la IC, la única excepción fue una Declaración del CC del Partido Comunista de China, citando en una nota la Revista La Internacional Comunista - 1943, No. 5 y 6 pag. 23.

While the CCP paid great attention to the development of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties in opposition to the revisionists, it did not find the forms or the ways necessary to develop the international unity of the Communists. Despite contributions to ideological and political unity, this was not reflected in efforts to build the organizational unit on a global scale .

On the other hand, in the text that follows from that same Declaration:

The CCP had an exaggerated conception of the negative aspects of the Comintern, mainly those that were caused by too much centralization, which led to the crushing of the initiative and independence of the Comintern. the constituent communist parties. Although the CCP correctly criticized the concept of the father party, pointing out the harmful influence it had had within the international communist movement and emphasizing the principles of

fraternal relations between parties, the lack of an organized forum to debate opinions and arrive at a common conception It did not help solve this problem but in fact it exacerbated it .

The RIM mistakenly endorsed the opportunist idea contrary to the complete and maximum centralization of the international communist organization, whose form must be that of a world party of the proletariat and not a world federation of proletarian parties.