



# GUARDIAN CLUBS STUDY GUIDE

“Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement.”—Lenin (“What Is To Be Done?”)

In taking up the Guardian's party-building supplement of June 1977 for extended study, it would be well to keep in mind Lenin's statement quoted above. Not only was Lenin emphasizing the critical nature of theoretical tasks, he emphasized the practical nature of these tasks. That is, settling certain theoretical questions was indispensable to the process of getting something “done”—namely the building of a revolutionary party of a new type.

This is the spirit in which this study guide is prepared and in which, we hope, the study itself will proceed.

The Guardian's party-building supplement and the 29 “principles of unity for a new party” have been selected as a point of concentrated study for a definite reason. These principles embrace both the fundamental propositions of Marxism-Leninism which draw a line of demarcation between Marxist-Leninists and revisionism, Trotskyism, anarchism and social democracy as well as propositions which draw a line of demarcation between Marxist-Leninists and various dogmatist, ultra-“left” and flunkeyist groups on the U.S. left. In addition, the principles begin to take up some of the basic questions facing the working-class movement in the U.S. from an independent standpoint not defined

primarily by our opposition to other tendencies.

These principles, then, represent a contribution to the ideological struggle which must, of necessity, develop among all those groups who have heretofore roughly defined themselves as an “antirevisionist, antidogmatist” tendency. Within this tendency are to be found groups like the Philadelphia Workers Organizing Committee (PWOC) and others who are in the “trend” (now an Organizing Committee for the formation of a National Ideological Center); the Guardian and Guardian Clubs; other Marxist-Leninist organizations; independent collectives and study groups, and many Marxist-Leninists not presently in a communist organization.

The Guardian has put forward these 29 principles as constituting, in our opinion, a proper basis for the unity of Marxist-Leninists **at this time**. Obviously, we do not expect that all Marxist-Leninists will necessarily agree with our positions on each and every question. Nor do we hold that at the proper time only agreement with every formulation contained in the supplement is the condition for unity. But we believe that these positions should be taken up and contrary positions on the same questions advanced in opposition so that a clear-cut political debate can take place.

An important step in this broader process, therefore, is for the Guardian Clubs themselves to take up these questions in an organized, collective and serious spirit. This means proper preparation.

organization, commitment and continuity. Clubs should feel free to adapt these questions to their purposes, and to add questions where appropriate.

We propose the following procedure:

1. Study of the party-building supplement must proceed under the direct political leadership of the Club steering committee. Particular responsibility for organizing the study work, assigning cadre to lead discussions, checking up on preparations and supervising the work on a week in and week out basis is in the hands of the Club educational director.

2. All members must purchase a copy of the Study Guide which will include reproductions of articles from the Guardian. Club leaderships should make special arrangements in cases of financial hardship.

3. Attendance at study group sessions is mandatory for all Club members.

4. A responsible member of the Club should be appointed to take notes at each study session. From these notes should be extracted any unresolved questions from the discussions, points of disagreement with the 29 principles or between Club members, statements of unity with different points in the party-building supplement and any amplifications on the principles that are deemed important. These final notes should be reviewed by the education committee and sent to the center in New York.

In addition to discussing the content of each principle of unity, Clubs should take up the following questions:

1. Why has this particular principle been put forward as necessary to the unity of Marxist-Leninists at this time?

2. What arguments are there for not making any particular principle a principle of unity at this time? What would be the consequences—theoretically, politically and organizationally—of dropping or modifying a particular principle?

3. What are the views of other left, socialist and Marxist-Leninist groups on each particular principle? In particular, how does each principle help draw a line of demarcation in the existing movement of the U.S. left between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, neo-social democracy, anarchism, Trotskyism and the chief organizations of the "new communist movement"? Understanding that the Guardian sees the political and theoretical contradictions between its views and the positions of the groups cited above as "antagonistic," what differences are there on these propositions between the Guardian and "nonantagonistic" groups and organizations such as those in the "trend"?

4. What might be the application of this principle in practice or in formulating the strategy and tactics of a U.S. communist party?

5. In studying the classics, the following should be kept in mind: (a) What were the circumstances under which this work was written in the first place and why did (Lenin or Mao or whoever) write it? (b) Why are we studying it today? What is its particular relevance for us? (c) What is the main point of this

work? (d) What are the secondary points? (e) What points made by the author are unclear? (f) What points made by the author are either wrong (in my opinion) or are no longer applicable?

## PREPARATION

The entire Club should discuss all of the material up to this point. We recommend that this be discussed point by point, after which concrete steps should be taken to implement the procedures. Other overall questions to be kept in mind should be raised. The whole question of the approach to this study should be taken up.

Members should have copies of the Guardian study group pamphlet, "Grasping Revolutionary Theory."

## INTRODUCTION

The Guardian's position is that the objective conditions needed for the creation and building of a revolutionary working-class party already exist in the U.S.—in fact, that they have existed for more than half a century—but that it is the subjective conditions which are lagging behind. The task, then, is to concentrate on the subjective factor in the context of the prevailing objective conditions.

What does all this mean?

What are the "objective conditions" and what are the "subjective conditions"?

In general, by "objective conditions" we mean the level of development of productive forces, prevailing class relations, principal political features and character of class and political struggles as they exist **independently of the role and organized intervention of the left.**

Among these are: The extent of concentration of capital and socialization of production in the U.S. today.

The relationship between nonmonopoly sectors of capital and the monopoly sectors; which is dominant?

The objective relationship between the working class and the bourgeoisie in the U.S. today.

What are the principal classes in U.S. society today? What are their relative strengths? Which classes are rising and which on the decline?

What are the principal contradictions within the ruling class? What is their material base?

What are the principal contradictions facing U.S. monopoly capital internationally?

What is the objective state of the U.S. working class? Where does it live? Where, and in what industries, is it concentrated? What is its composition: skilled and unskilled, white and third world, male and female, native-born and foreign-born (including undocumented workers), employed and unemployed, organized and unorganized?

What is the state of the working-class movement—particularly the trade unions? Where do the unions stand in relation to monopoly capital, the bourgeois state, etc.? Who exercises ideological hegemony within the working class? Political

hegemony? What are the principal contradictions within the trade union movement?

What is the objective relationship between U.S. monopoly capital and the oppressed nationalities? Who are the oppressed nationalities? What is their relative size, relationship to production, geographical location? What is the level of development of the principal mass movements among the oppressed nationalities? Identify those mass movements or mass organizations which at present represent the leading force among each of the oppressed nationalities.

What is the objective relationship between U.S. monopoly capital and the masses of women? How has the relationship of women to the means of production and to class forces in general changed in recent years? What is the character, breadth and political outlook of the women's movement?

Which are the principal spontaneous mass movements for reform and democratic rights? How large are they? How influential? What class leads in them and what is the dominant political line of each?

What is the condition of the bourgeoisie's chief instruments for political control? The government? The two-party system? The military forces? The police and law-enforcement authorities?

We do not expect that precise or definitive answers to most of these questions can be given by the Guardian Clubs. These questions are listed here, rather, to indicate the scope of what is meant by "objective conditions" and to lay out some of the principal tasks before the communists if they are to become a serious political force capable of making—and acting upon—a scientific analysis of society today.

Each of the questions asked above might well constitute a course of study in its own right. A communist party would likely assign teams of cadres to undertake such studies as a basis for developing the party's general line and putting forward its program. For our purposes, however, it is enough to understand the magnitude and complexity of what are called "objective conditions" and to arrive at approximate answers to many of them sufficient to enable us to move forward with our party-building work and to at least make a proper location of the principal class and political forces in the U.S. today.

Of more immediate concern are the "subjective factors" that must be taken into account in relation to party-building. The largest portion of the introductory section to the party-building supplement deals with the "subjective factor." By "subjective factor" here we mean primarily the conscious role of Marxist-Leninist forces. In this context, the following questions should be taken up:

The centrality of the "subjective factor" in party-building and its relationship to the objective conditions.

History of Marxism in the U.S., particularly since the founding of the U.S. Communist Party; history, manifestations and roots of revisionism.

Influence of Trotskyism, anarchism and social

democracy on the left.

The role of and attitude toward Marxist-Leninist theory in the history of the U.S. left; domination of pragmatism and influence of dogmatism; chief manifestations of each.

The historical relationship between the communist movement and the struggles of the working class; extent of proletarianization of communist forces at different historical periods; relationship of the communists to other classes.

The historical relationship between the communist movement and the oppressed nationalities; multinational character of parties in the past; relationship between white communists and communists of the oppressed nationalities historically and today.

Impact of socialist countries and revolutionary struggles on the U.S. communist movement: Soviet Union, China, Cuba, Vietnam, Korea, Albania, Southern Africa, Middle East, Latin America, etc.

Significance of the 1960s for the communist forces: the mass antiwar movement, Black liberation movement, the New Left, the Old Left, the youth rebellion and "counterculture," the women's movement, the gay movement, the environmental movement, rank-and-file trade union developments, etc.

The emergency of the "new communist" movement; its principal accomplishments and errors and the significance of the struggle around international line.

The emergence of an "antirevisionist, antidogmatist" tendency.

## THEORY NOT SPONTANEOUS

This guide is primarily intended to focus on the theoretical tasks required in party-building—but simply stringing together quotations from past Marxist-Leninist theories won't do. If it did, we would undoubtedly have won socialism by now.

For example, every U.S. Marxist-Leninist is undoubtedly familiar with Lenin's famous comment, "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement."

Not too many people recall as readily the sentence following, in which Lenin contrasts this point of view with those who have "an infatuation for the narrowest forms of practical activity." To which, in our present circumstances, we might also warn against an infatuation for the narrowest forms of theoretical activity.

Of course, making a revolution is in the first place and primarily a "practical" activity. Only religious and secular mystics believe that "the revolution is in your head." Revolution is the struggle for power and this is a most practical activity involving large numbers of people taking actions and employing force. Nevertheless, that revolutionary activity will not succeed—indeed those engaged will not even have a clear idea of their objectives—unless the process is guided by a scientific theory manifesting itself in a political program and a strategic plan.

But where will all this come from? A scientific theory capable of giving intelligent direction to the activity of millions will not develop spontaneously out of daily life—no matter how much in a condition of oppression that daily life might be. In fact, the very state of oppression prevents correct theory from emerging because any deep-going plan that embraces all aspects of social life requires rigorous investigation and debate before it can be conceived, and wide application of it is to be properly tested. And the conditions of life among the most oppressed work against their developing the time, energy, faculties and facilities to enable them to do it on their own.

Nor will a scientific theory for revolution emerge out of a disparate group of intellectuals consulting with each other on the basis of vaguely defined common assumptions or a general agreement on methodology.

We can say that only a Marxist-Leninist party can produce the basic principles, long-term strategy and political program which might deserve to be called "scientific" theory. But for us today, this really begs the question since the task of bringing that party into being remains before us.

What then is the strategic concept that should guide communists in this period when the forming of a Marxist-Leninist party must be the objective that guides their political work?

#### PRINCIPAL TASK THEORETICAL

We have said that the principal aspect of this work at this time is theoretical. This is true, but the formulation is rapidly becoming inadequate. Now we must begin to define more precisely the nature of those theoretical tasks. In the process we may help overcome some of the mystique that tends to surround theory in our movement and locate our theoretical work in a more practical context.

It should also be emphasized that in locating theoretical work as "principal" at the present time, we in no way rule out the necessity for ongoing practical political activity. The spontaneous movements of struggle among the masses as well as the practical—even though limited—initiatives that communist groups can undertake at this time likewise provide a school for the training and development of communist cadre. And, naturally enough, all theory must be tested and shaped by practical activity.

First, of course, is the question of study. Marxism-Leninism is a world view embracing the realm of traditional philosophy, human history, political economy and revolutionary change. It views the world dialectically and not empirically—that is, it looks at all phenomena in their motion and not simply as they are at a given moment. As developed by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao and many others, Marxism-Leninism has been a way of both understanding the world and changing it. In fact, many of the richest contributions to the body of thought called Marxism-Leninism have been developed in

the course of urgent revolutionary struggle.

Knowledge and mastery of this great theoretical legacy should be an objective of all revolutionaries. Classical theory will not solve the problems of the present, but it provides the theoretical underpinning for understanding contemporary phenomena and also supplies the developing cadre with the ideological equipment they will need in order to develop their own necessary theoretical work.

To strive for knowledge and mastery of Marxism-Leninism, however, is a lifelong task. Likewise, there will always be new people coming into the movement with only a limited knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory. Therefore, while study may be the principal theoretical task before communists at a particular period, this must be a relatively brief period. Not that study comes to an end. But after an initial period, the study of classical Marxism-Leninism must become subordinate to other theoretical and practical work.

#### MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANIZATIONS

Is the study of Marxism-Leninism today, therefore, the principal theoretical task of the communists? Although it was for several years, we must say that this is no longer the case. Evidence for this is to be found in the fact that the study group form has, by and large, become outmoded in our movement. Study groups, of course, continue to exist. And new ones are constantly coming into being. But while this was the new and rising phenomenon of a few years ago, it is no longer the case. Today, the new and rising phenomenon is in organizations of Marxist-Leninists. Some of these are national organizations, some local. But it is obvious that there are thousands of Marxist-Leninists in the U.S. who are now demanding a higher organizational form than the study group. Hopefully, however, systematic and guided study of Marxism-Leninism will go on in these organizations.

Another critical theoretical task before the Marxist-Leninists has been the necessity to draw the lines of ideological demarcation between themselves and various expressions of bourgeois ideology in the ranks of the left—first of all revisionism, but also Trotskyism, anarchism and social democracy. While this task is far from being completed, we can say that in broad outline its principal objectives have been accomplished. There does exist today a widely held critique of the principal errors of these retrograde tendencies. It is also true that these tendencies, in varying degrees, continue to exercise a dangerous influence on our movement. But these take more of a hidden or indirect form than an explicit attack on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. Although much of the theoretical work exposing revisionism has been accomplished, the struggle against this deviation from Marxism-Leninism is the key political task within the revolutionary movement. This remains true within the ranks of the various anti-revisionist, anti-dogmatist groups now most active in the party-

building movement.

We must also recognize that the whole study group phenomenon was itself a significant manifestation of the struggle against revisionism and the other tendencies mentioned. Thousands of people went back to the work of Marx and Lenin (in particular) as well as other revolutionary thinkers precisely because their ideas and discoveries had been abandoned or distorted or slandered by the dominant left tendencies of the sixties.

At the same time, no Marxist-Leninist can be satisfied with the level of understanding reached so far around these questions. All too often the critique of these tendencies is ritualistic and superficial—making it all the more possible for their ideas to come into the movement again wearing less obvious clothes. A correct definition of our theoretical tasks in this area, then, is the necessity to deepen our critique of these incorrect tendencies—with particular emphasis on revisionism.

### 'LEFT' OPPORTUNISM

A third important theoretical challenge to Marxist-Leninists has been the struggle against what has variously been called dogmatism, "left" opportunism and flunkeyism in our movement. This struggle has led to an outright organizational break between those forces upholding a proletarian internationalist line and those following an objectively class-collaborationist path based upon their adherence to China's foreign policy.

But while the internationalist wing of the Marxist-Leninist forces, to its great credit, refused to follow the path that led others to becoming the objective allies of their own bourgeoisies, we cannot say that it has thoroughly resolved some of the important theoretical questions which this struggle brought to the fore. Chief among these, of course, is an independent Marxist-Leninist analysis of the Soviet Union.

The dire consequences of China's international line were reason enough to exercise caution on the thesis of capitalist restoration in the USSR. But this, in turn, has led to an increasingly embarrassing silence on the question of the Soviet Union. It has also led, in some quarters, to an underestimation of the Soviet Union's role as a hegemonist superpower in the world today as well as to a let-up in the struggle against revisionism.

A definition of our movement's principal theoretical task in this area, then, might be the necessity to strengthen our critique of China's foreign policy from a firm antirevisionist perspective, guarding especially against the tendency to make right opportunist errors or to adopt an eclectic view which does not sharply differentiate among different incorrect tendencies.

A second necessary theoretical task is the summing up of the principal errors made by the principal groups and tendencies who at one time composed the "new communist movement." There has been considerable debate as to how this task should be approached, but Mao's sage advice that "the cor-

rectness or otherwise of the ideological and political line decides everything" offers sound guidance in this respect.

Still, even this is not our movement's principal theoretical task—although clearly it must be pursued.

### SOMETHING NEW EMERGING

All that has been mentioned so far is old business—however uncompleted it may be. But something else is now emerging. A new urgency is beginning to make itself felt—although it is barely recognized as such yet. It comes out of the felt needs of the study groups, the settling of accounts with ideological deviations and incorrect lines, and it comes out of the beginning forms of organization toward a new communist party.

And it is the necessity to begin to formulate the rudiments of the general political line on which the new (or reconstituted) communist party will be founded. Involved in this are the thorough and concrete investigations and analysis of the objective conditions of U.S. monopoly capitalism today and its interaction with the rest of the world. Our forces must begin to study and make scientific appraisals—and not simply in an agitational way—of the current status and long-term prospects of the U.S. economy, the bourgeois political parties, class relationships and strengths in the U.S., political realities and currents in the working class, main political trends in the movements of the oppressed nationalities, tendencies toward fascism and much more.

### NEED FOR ANALYSIS OF U.S. WORKERS

Especially important is an in-depth analysis of the U.S. working class today, with particular attention to the industrial proletariat. Such an analysis must take up the multinational character of the working class, role of women workers, status of the unemployed, movements towards organizing the unorganized, role of the trade unions and the trade union bureaucracy and some estimate of the nature of backward consciousness in the working class—particularly in relation to racism, sexism and anticommunism.

This investigation and analysis is, of course, only one aspect of the formulation of a general line. And many other questions are involved—including an historical assessment of the communist movement in the U.S. Space does not permit a further elaboration at this time of the many specific tasks connected to the development of a general political line for a Marxist-Leninist party.

Suffice it to say that what is being put forward here is an attempt to give concrete and "practical" definition to what is meant in saying that theoretical work is primary in our party-building work today.

#### Reading:

Fan the Flames, 5/18/77. "M-L Theory Must Guide Workers;" Radical Forum, 6/8/77 (E. 12th St. Study Group); Fan the Flames, 6/8/77. "Spontaneity Can't Replace Theory."



### PRINCIPLE #1

This principle is the very first because it (1) emphasizes the leading role of revolutionary theory in the party-building process and (2) defines precisely who it is we are attempting to unite. Is it possible for a group of communists to form a Marxist-Leninist organization—that is, an organization composed of Marxist-Leninists—without making this a principle of unity?

Discuss the phrases "science," "concentrated expression of the world outlook of the international proletariat" and "fundamental theoretical base of communist organization" as used in this principle. What do these mean?

In general, what is the relationship between theory and practice? The essence of the materialist world outlook is to understand the primacy of practice. However, when and under what circumstances is theory primary?

#### Reading:

Marx: "Preface to the Critique of Political Economy" (beginning with middle of the fourth paragraph: "In the social production of their life...." to the end of the paragraph.) Marx and Engels, Selected Works in One Volume, International Publishers, p. 182. (This book will subsequently be referred to as M & E.) Mao: "On Contradiction" (next to last full paragraph in Chapter 4); "On Practice." Engels: "Karl Marx" (last four paragraphs), M & E, p. 374. Lenin: "Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism," M & E, p. 23.

### PRINCIPLE #2 and PRINCIPLE #6

Take up these two principles together. How do Marxists define social classes? Why are classes in contradiction with each other? Why should class struggle be a more important force in determining historical change than other factors—such as political or military factors? Why is the struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat the principal form of class struggle under capitalism? What other forms of class struggle exist under capitalism?

Embodied in principle #2 are some of the fundamental conclusions of Marxist political economy. What is the significance of Marx's theory of "surplus value" and why did Lenin call it "the cornerstone of Marx's economic theory"? Why is socialism seen as the fundamental objective of the working class? Don't other classes have an interest in overthrowing capitalism?

Discuss the significance of the following phrases: "the fundamental economic distinction between capitalism and socialism"; "the working class, in alliance with and at the head of other laboring classes"; "the real and ultimate source of all the other political and social conflicts," etc. In light of

this last phrase, discuss the difference between Marxism and economic determinism. Give some examples of economic determinism historically. Can we find examples of an economic determinist way of looking at phenomena in the party-building movement?

#### Reading:

Marx and Engels: "The Communist Manifesto," Section I, M & E, pp. 35-46. Engels: "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific," Section III, M & E, pp. 417-434; Letter to J. Bloch, M & E, pp. 692-3; Letter to C. Schmidt, M & E, pp. 694-9.

### PRINCIPLE #3 and PRINCIPLE #5

Take up these two principles together. These principles are essential so that we may scientifically define the present historical epoch and thereby help the working class understand the nature of its tasks and against whom its "main blow" must be directed. What are the major characteristics of imperialism? Why does Lenin say that the "economic essence of imperialism is monopoly capitalism"? In what way does imperialism represent a qualitative change from the era of "free enterprise" capitalism? In what way does it not?

What is the difference between imperialism and colonialism? Between colonialism and neocolonialism? What is the significance of saying that imperialism is a system based upon laws which operate independently of human will rather than a policy of the bourgeoisie? How does the thesis of the CPUSA on imperialism (quoted in principle #5) reflect the general revisionist perspective and what would such a thesis lead to in practice?

How does the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee (PFOC) sum up imperialism—and why? What programmatic conclusions does this lead to?

Can it be demonstrated both analytically and empirically that "the U.S. is the chief imperialist country in the world and the most powerful"?

#### Reading:

Lenin: "Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism," Chapters 9 and 10. (pp. 248-263 in Lenin, Selected Works in One Volume, International Publishers). Stalin: "Foundations of Leninism," Section III (Theory), Part 3, "The Theory of Proletarian Revolution" (up to "...who have not understood imperialism and who fear revolution like the plague."): Fan the Flames, 8/7/77, "Prairie Fire Attacks the Guardian" and 8/24/77, "PFOC's Line Sows Disunity," Ruling Class, 10/26/76, "Colonialism and Imperialism," Guardian Viewpoint, 12/1/76, "Directing the Main Blow," Monthly Review, June 1970, "International Solidarity of Workers: Two Views," Breakthrough (PFOC journal), June-July 1977, "The Guardian Sets Out to Build Itself a Party."

#### PRINCIPLE #4

Revisionists argue that the principal contradiction in the world today is between socialism and imperialism. By this they mean, more concretely, the "forces of socialism headed by the Soviet Union" and "world imperialism headed by the U.S."

China's position today appears to be that there are two principal contradictions at the present time: that between the second and third worlds on the one hand and the two superpowers on the other, within which the "main blow should be directed" at the Soviet Union; and the contradiction between the two superpowers themselves.

Albania's position is that there are four main contradictions in the world at the present time, without specifying which is principal: (1) the contradiction between the two opposing systems—socialism and capitalism; (2) the contradiction between labor and capital in the capitalist countries; (3) the contradiction between the oppressed peoples and nations and imperialism, and (4) the contradictions among imperialist powers.

The "trend" does not put this proposition in terms of contradictions, but says instead that "U.S. imperialism is the chief enemy of the world's peoples." In this connection, take up principle #20.

Contrast each of these positions with principle #4 in the Guardian party-building supplement. Discuss the significance of the differences in the various positions. What are the implications for Marxist-Leninists in the U.S. of holding the different positions?

#### Reading:

"Chairman Mao's Theory of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism," Peking, Foreign Languages Press (or Peking Review #45, 1977). Guardian Viewpoint, 9/8/76, "Aim the Main Blow at U.S. Imperialism." Guardian articles: 6/30/76, "Is the U.S. a Second Rate Power?" and 7/27/77, "Albania Party Challenges Chinese Thesis of the 'Three Worlds.'" Fan the Flames, 2/1/78, 2/8/78 and 2/15/78, "China and the Three Worlds." Vietnam Courier, February 1977, "The Party's Line on Foreign Relations." Kim Il Sung, "On the International Situation and Some Problems Arising in the International Communist Movement," pp. 470-494 (up to "...internationalist duties at the present time.") in "On Juche in Our Revolution," Vol. I.

#### PRINCIPLE #7

Is the U.S. working class a revolutionary class? What is its revolutionary character based upon? What is the significance of singling out "the industrial proletariat as its core"? Has the working class in advanced monopoly capitalism been "bought off" so that it is incapable of fulfilling a revolutionary function? If not the working class, then

whom?

Why are the upholders of "white skin privilege" theories obliged to deny the revolutionary role of the working class?

Discuss the following alternatives to this principle?

1. Oppressed nationalities are the leading revolutionary force in the U.S.

2. Women are the leading revolutionary force in the U.S.

3. The working class is the main revolutionary force, but who this working class is must be redefined because, in effect, there is a "new" working class and its most radicalized sectors are not in the industrial proletariat but elsewhere.

4. The working class is the main revolutionary force, but it is incorrect to think in terms of a "strategic sector," such as the industrial proletariat.

5. There is no one strategic center or revolutionary force in the U.S. At times it will be workers, at other times it will be Blacks, at still other times women, Native Americans, gays, environmentalists, etc. It is "elitist" to designate any one group as the leading force.

6. The real revolutionary force in U.S. society is in its advanced technology and scientific knowledge.

Discuss concretely the statement that "the principal contradiction in the U.S. is between the monopoly-capitalist bourgeoisie and the multinational working class."

#### Reading:

Marx and Engels: "The Communist Manifesto," Section 1, M & E, pp. 41-46. Lenin: "Our Program," Lenin anthology, pp. 33-36. "Party and Class: The Continuing Debate," by Ackerman, Boyte and Silber (NAM pamphlet). Fan the Flames, 8/17/77 and 8/24/77 (referred to under pts. 3 and 5); 1/8/78, "Workers' Unity a Communist Task." William Z. Foster, "American Trade Unionism," pp. 280-288 (on industrial concentration).

#### PRINCIPLES #8, #9, #10, #11

These four principles should be taken up as a unit. They are inextricably linked together. Basically, they revolve around the question of the nature of the state, the strategic aim of the working class in relation to seizing state power, the methodology of struggle (the "road to socialism") and the nature of working-class rule.

Historically, these are the questions around which revisionism has traditionally broken with Marxism—from Bernstein to Kautsky to Browder to Krushchev to the modern Eurocommunists. These principles, therefore, represent the most critical of our lines of demarcation with the CPUSA and neo-social democracy.

What are the principal revisionist doctrines in relation to the state? Why is the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the state the critical theoretical underpinning enabling communists to differentiate

between reformism and revolution? How can the bourgeois democratic republic be, at the same time, the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie"?

Marxists view economic questions as ultimately the fundamental ones which determine the course of development of all other questions. Why then do they see political questions—rather than economic questions—as decisive to the revolutionary process? In particular, why is revolutionary strategy aimed at "the seizure of state power" rather than "the construction of a socialist society"?

What are the chief instruments of state power?

Discuss the following:

"In the West, the revolution will be democratic, peaceful, legal and gradual or it will not take place at all." —Jean Ellenstein, leading theoretician of the French Communist Party.

Discuss the practical implications of "democratic," "peaceful," "legal" and "gradual."

Revisionists are not opposed to "seizing" state power. They balk at "smashing" the old state power. Anarchists, on the other hand, are all in favor of "smashing" the old state power, but they are opposed to "seizing" state power. Discuss why Marxist-Leninists differ with both of these views.

Why does Lenin see the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the main point in Marxist revolutionary theory?

Some people say that they favor the dictatorship of the proletariat, but they don't like the words. Most people, they say, think that "dictatorship" is bad and "proletariat" is not a word widely used in the U.S. Should there be a more popular term saying the same thing? Should communists take the position that both workers and capitalists will have the same reaction to the term "dictatorship"?

Others argue that the dictatorship of the proletariat as a concept grew out of the conditions of absolutist Russia but that in countries with Western "democratic" forms, a different political form is possible under socialism.

Discuss the connection between the "road" to socialism and the consequent form of political rule. Why do the Eurocommunists make so much out of dropping the phrase? What is the significance of their doing it? On what basis does the CPSU say that the "state of the whole people" has replaced the dictatorship of the proletariat? What does this actually reflect about the state of affairs in the USSR? (This question should be discussed more fully under principle #20.)

Does the dictatorship of the proletariat mean that socialism does not uphold such democratic rights as freedom of speech, the press, assembly, election of leadership, etc.? What liberties do prevail under proletarian dictatorship? For whom? Which "liberties" are abolished?

Why is mass armed struggle the most likely and in any event the deciding factor in the struggle for political power? Is this true in the U.S.?

What is the significance of Marx having once said that in England and the U.S. there might be a

peaceful transition to socialism? If not mass armed struggle, what?

What is the difference between the Marxist principle of mass armed struggle and a strategy of terrorism?

Discuss the following:

"Will the working class win power by violence or in the peaceful parliamentary way? Our party thinks that in regard to this matter, we should be prepared for both eventualities, and we should be well prepared especially for taking power by violence, for if we are well prepared for this, the other possibility has more chance of success."—Enver Hoxha, Albanian Party of Labor.

Reading:

Lenin: "State and Revolution," Chapters 1 and 2; Chapter 3, Sections 1 and 2 (Lenin anthology, pp. 266-295); "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky" (This is the most forthright elucidation of Lenin's view of the dictatorship of the proletariat in all his writings. It is available in pamphlet form, Foreign Languages Press.) Fan the Flames, 2/5/76 (on the French CP); 4/21/76 (on CPUSA); 4/6/77, "Making Socialism 'Respectable'"; 12/21/77, "Marxism-Leninism 'Optional'?" Guardian Viewpoint, 11/9/77, "Terrorism: Contempt for the Masses."

#### PRINCIPLE #12

Discuss the following phrases in this principle:

- (a) "The cornerstone of the united front is the alliance between the multinational working class and the nationally oppressed peoples of the U.S."
  - (b) "Under working-class leadership"
  - (c) "All classes and sectors who stand in varying degrees in contradiction with the imperialist system"
  - (d) "Building alliances" with other sectors (women's movement, etc.) and how is this different from the "cornerstone alliance"?
  - (e) "Contradictions within the ruling class"
  - (f) "Neutralize wherever possible," etc.
- How is the "united front against imperialism" different from the CPUSA's call for an "antimonopoly coalition"?

Reading:

Fan the Flames, 5/21/75 (on the united front). Political Affairs (organ of the CPUSA), January 1978, "Why a Left-Center Coalition?" Gus Hall, "The Crisis of U.S. Capitalism and the Fight Back," pp. 69-78 (on the antimonopoly coalition).

#### PRINCIPLE #13

Discussion on this principle should be broken down into two parts: (1) the "fusion" strategy for party-building, and (2) the principal content of "fusion" based upon an appraisal of the main immediate questions in the working-class movement



and the long-range objectives of the communists.

Most Clubs have engaged in some discussions on the fusion strategy already. However, since this is the principal point of difference between the Guardian and the majority of the "trend" groups, it is important to understand the respective positions and why we attach so much importance to the question.

The following particular questions should be addressed:

What is meant by "make Marxist-Leninist theory into a material force in the class and political struggles of the present period"? Do we mean the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism? What about the general line of U.S. communists—is that also Marxist-Leninist theory?

Can Marxist-Leninist theory become a material force in these struggles—particularly in the working-class movement—without a party? Why?

The second portion of this principle (which lists "certain particular questions which communists should address at this time") represents the Guardian's views on helping to develop what will ultimately be the party's general line in relation to work in the trade unions and in the spontaneous working-class movement generally. In this context, the following questions should be taken up:

The trade unions "as the primary arena for political struggle in the working-class movement."

Trade unions as "the principal defense organizations of the working class."

Within the trade unions, directing "the main blow at the reactionary trade union bureaucrats." Discuss the principal left and right errors stemming from applying this principle mechanically, or failing to apply it.

The relationship of communists to the economic struggle of the working class.

The Guardian lists four "particular questions" as being of special importance at this time. What is the significance of these four questions? Are there others?

What is meant in "the struggle against racism" by the particular task of white communists and the particular task of communists of the nationally oppressed? How would this work in practice? Is this a correct "division of labor"? To what extent does it overlap? Can white workers be won to the support of affirmative action programs? On what basis?

In "the struggle against sexism," what is the significance of the phrase "bringing the entire female sex into public industry"? Why is this deemed so important? What are the connections between this objective and the concrete political demands listed here?

What is the significance of "the struggle for union democracy"? Why is it an important part of the working-class movement today? Why should we not expect the unions today to become "revolutionary" organizations? Isn't it reformist to make the struggle for union democracy a key question if we don't expect the unions to become revolutionary organiza-

tions?

What is the historic significance of "organizing the unorganized"? Why does this remain an important question today? What percentage of the working class are we talking about when we discuss the unorganized? To what extent are these workers in the industrial proletariat? Who are these workers—race, nationality, sex, legal status, age, location?

Do trade unions always act in the best interests of the working class as a whole? When do they not? What part of the working class belongs to the "labor aristocracy" as defined by Lenin? Why does Lenin call them "more bourgeois than the bourgeoisie"?

#### Reading:

Lenin: "What Is To Be Done?", (1973 Peking edition) pp. 28-29; 35-37; 46-48; 122-23; 137-41; "Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder," Chapter 6, "Should Revolutionaries Work in Reactionary Trade Unions?", Lenin anthology, pp. 536-44. Fan the Flames, 12/29/76, "Party-building: 'Precondition' ". Radical Forum, 2/23/77, "Pre-conditions of Party Formation" (PSO). Fan the Flames, 3/2/77, "Political Line Must Be Primary"; 3/16/77, "Party-building and Trade Unions." Radical Forum, 4/13/77, "On Combatting 'Straw Men' " (PWOC). Fan the Flames, 5/4/77, "Economism Blocks Party-building"; 5/18/77, "M-L Theory Must Guide Workers" (cited under introduction). Guardian Viewpoints, 6/8/77, "Supreme Court Ruling Affirms Racism, Sexism"; 9/14/77, "Blacks Want Jobs, Carter Gives Rhetoric"; 1/10/77, "Support Sadlowskil". Guardian article, 9/14/77, "What Strategy in the Unions?." Supplementary Reading: "Racism and the Workers' Movement" by PWOC (pamphlet).

#### PRINCIPLE #14

Historically, how have Marxists viewed the relationship of the national question to the class struggle? What are the principal positions held by U.S. Marxist-Leninists in relation to the national question in the U.S., particularly those positions which attempt to characterize Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans and other oppressed nationalities as "nations" or "national minorities"?

Principle #14 does not put forward a summed-up theoretical position on the national question. The Guardian believes that the position stated here is adequate at the present time as a basis of unity for Marxist-Leninists. Is this correct? Is a more thorough delineation of a position on the national question necessary before a Marxist-Leninist Party can be formed? What would be the political and organizational consequences of imposing a higher level of unity on this question at this time? (The Guardian believes that a far greater number of Marxist-Leninists from the oppressed nationalities should be involved in the party-building movement

generally and in the formulation of a position on this question in particular before a final position is arrived at.)

Why are the oppressed nationalities and national minorities seen as "revolutionary allies" of the working class? Should this be stated the other way around?

What is the material basis for national oppression within the U.S.? Is white racism in the working class principally the result of material benefits accruing to the white workers, or is it principally the result of false consciousness? What role does false consciousness, particularly among white workers, play in perpetuating national oppression? Doesn't this false consciousness become a material force in the form of racism?

Why does the Guardian make a point of saying that "Black people as a whole are the victims of national oppression"—and not just the Black workers or farmers? What is a "Black united front"? Can we think of any examples of it in life? Who has led the "Black united front" in the past—and up to now? What are the principal tendencies and organizations in the Black community and what role do they play? What are the principal mass questions that have emerged in the spontaneous struggles of the Black masses today?

Why does the Guardian say that "the just demands of the Black masses" cannot be realized without proletarian revolution? Why not?

Why does the burden for achieving Black-white unity rest primarily on whites taking up the demands of Blacks? Isn't this another form of "guilt-tripping"? Shouldn't the forging of this unity be seen as a two-way street?

#### Reading:

Lenin: *The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, Lenin anthology, pp. 157-68. Ruling Class, 3/29/78, "Beyond Bourgeois 'Equal Rights' ". Guardian Viewpoints, 10/27/76, "Colonial Legacy"; 9/28/77, "Bakke Case: Legalizing Racism"; 1/25/78, "Racism: Capitalism's Indispensable Prop." "In Defense of the Right to Self-Determination," Liberator Press (debate between Carl Davidson and Irwin Silber that originally appeared in the Guardian). Supplementary Readings: "Against Dogmatism on the National Question," by PWOC (pamphlet). "For a Revolutionary Position on the National Question" by Harry Haywood (Liberator Press).

#### PRINCIPLE #15

Historically, the communist movement has been associated with the principle of women's emancipation. At the same time, independent women's movements have developed in the past, particularly in the advanced capitalist countries. Historically, what have been the chief expressions of the mass and spontaneous upsurge of women in capitalist countries?

The Guardian believes that there is a connection between the mass democratic women's movement in the U.S. today and the fact that women in ever greater numbers have "entered into public industry." Is this correct? What would the connection be?

How should the "woman question" be viewed strategically by Marxist-Leninists and the working-class movement? What is the meaning of the statement that "the struggle for the emancipation of women is one that is democratic in form and revolutionary in content"? How does this express itself in life?

Is women's oppression the same across race and class lines? Is there a contradiction between the struggle for women's equality and the struggles of national minorities in the U.S.?

Are women oppressed in the U.S. solely as super-exploited workers? What is the connection between the "social" aspects of women's oppression (e.g. abortion and sterilization, child care, sexism in the media) with the economic base of capitalism?

Is there a role for an "autonomous women's movement" in the class struggle for socialism? If so, in what form?

Do men benefit from sexism?

What are the weaknesses of the mass women's movement in the U.S. today?

Discuss in full the next-to-last paragraph of principle #15 relating to the "principal contradiction," the "nonantagonistic contradiction between women and men" and the different expressions of opportunism.

Some groups that describe themselves as Marxist-Leninists and some feminist groups hold that the family is a repressive institution, the main aspect of which is to perpetuate male supremacy and serve the interests of monopoly capital. The Guardian says that communists should "defend the working-class family from attacks on it by the monopoly capitalists." Which of these positions is correct? Are they mutually exclusive? If the family is the repressive institution described above, why would the monopoly capitalists attack it? Do they really? What are these attacks?

Why is a special responsibility placed on the male workers to take up the task of fighting male supremacy and, more concretely, fighting for the special demands of women?

What is the significance of certain particular democratic questions before the women's movement—the Equal Rights Amendment, abortion rights, daycare, affirmative action programs?

#### Reading:

Lenin: "The Tasks of the Working Women's Movement," from "Lenin on the Emancipation of Women," International Publishers, pp. 66-72; "International Working Women's Day," pp. 80-82. Voices of Revolution, 12/27/76, "Engels on Capitalism, Women's Oppression." Guardian

Viewpoints, 3/9/77, "The Fight for Women's Emancipation"; 12/21/77, "Houston: Seed for Militant Women's Struggle?" Ruling Class, 10/31/76, "The Capitalist Attack on Daycare." Socialist Revolution, October-December 1975, Speech by Barbara Ehrenreich and Berkeley-Oakland Women's Union Speech, from National Conference on Socialist Feminism.

#### PRINCIPLE #16

Why is the struggle against revisionism "the starting point" for uniting Marxist-Leninists today? Shouldn't the starting point be the struggle against monopoly capitalism? Or the struggle against dogmatism? What are the other expressions of revisionism in the U.S. today—aside from the CPUSA?

Which fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism have the revisionists abandoned or "revised"? What are the arguments they use to justify their position? What is the practical manifestation in political line and program of this departure from Marxism-Leninism?

Is it true that the class base of revisionism in the U.S. is the labor aristocracy? Explain.

Is it still true that the Soviet Union is the "seat of revisionism" internationally? What are the origins of this view? What were the main points of difference that emerged in the ideological struggle of 1957-1963 between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (and its supporters) on the one hand and the communist parties of China and Albania on the other?

Discuss the significance and practical application of the last paragraph of principle #16. Why is revisionism the principal danger in the workers' movement today?

#### Reading:

(On this point refer to the section, "The Time Has Come for a New Beginning" in the introduction to the party-building supplement.) Lenin: "Marxism and Revisionism," Lenin anthology, pp. 25-32. Fan the Flames, 4/19/78, "Nationalism and Expropriation." "Unite the Many, Defeat the Few," by Jack A. Smith, pp. 10-23 (on the history of the Sino-Soviet split and the Chinese view of Soviet revisionism). Kim, "On Juche," Vol. 2, pp. 1-15 (on the transition from capitalism to socialism). Supplementary Readings: "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement," by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (1963). (Reprint of Foreign Languages Press pamphlet available.) "Toward Peace, Freedom and Socialism," CPUSA political resolution, 1975.

#### PRINCIPLE #17

This principle relates to the break in the "new communist movement" between those forces variously described as "dogmatist," "ultra-'left'",

"left' opportunist," "sectarian" and "flunkeyist" and groups sharing many of the same political perspectives as the Guardian and/or some of the "trend" organizations such as the PWOC. What are some of the reasons that factionalism and sectarianism became so predominant in the new communist movement? How can the antidogmatist party-building movement avoid these errors?

The Guardian believes that "class collaboration around international line" has been the principal manifestation of the incorrect line taken by most of the groups of the new communist movement. How did this manifest itself in line and practice? How do other groups—such as PWOC, Proletarian Unity League, Bay Area Communist Union—sum up these errors? What is the significance of these different estimates? What is the particular significance of flunkeyism in relation to this question? What is the historical basis for flunkeyism in the communist movement?

The Guardian says that in the new party-building trend of which, in a very broad sense, it is a part, the main danger comes from the right in the form of pragmatism, economism and conciliation with revisionism. Is this correct? What do others argue?

#### Reading:

Fan the Flames, 12/24/75 (on OL's international line); 10/19/77 (on PUL). "The Two Superpowers: Main Enemies of the Peoples of the World," an interview with Michael Klonsky, Liberator Press.

#### PRINCIPLE #18

If the principal task of each communist party is the overthrow of its own bourgeoisie, what relationship does proletarian internationalism have to this task? What is the historical and political significance of the formulation of the Comintern calling for "workers of the world and oppressed peoples" to unite? What is the difference—in practical terms as well as theoretical—between this formulation and the view put forward in the theory of the "three worlds" calling for unity of the second and third worlds against the superpowers—in particular the Soviet Union?

What is the difference between the "first period" of the national question and the second?

#### Reading:

Stalin: "New Features of the National Question" (1921).

#### PRINCIPLE #19

What is the concrete content and practical manifestation of this statement? What relationship does this concept have to the necessity for the proletariat in each country to make its own revolution? Has there, in fact, been a "qualitative weakening of U.S. hegemony" in recent years? What is the factual basis for seeing the struggle in

Southern Africa as "the international proletariat's first line of struggle against imperialism"? Isn't this position "third worldism"? Isn't the first line of struggle the class struggle in the imperialist countries, particularly the U.S.?

**Reading:**

Guardian Viewpoints, 1/7/76, "Anti-imperialist Fight Sharpens"; 12/22/76, "Imperialism's Africa Strategy"; 6/22/77, "The Spirit of Soweto"; 11/26/75, "Angola: Support the MPLA"; 8/25/76, "In Southern Africa as in Indochina."

**PRINCIPLES #20, #21, #22**

All three of these principles relate, one way or another, to our view of the Soviet Union. Principle #20 sees the Soviet Union as a "social-imperialist superpower" but reaffirms that U.S. imperialism is the primary and most powerful enemy of the world's peoples. Is this a correct way of characterizing both "the primary enemy" and the USSR? Is there a difference between imperialism and "social-imperialism"? What is the actual content of the phrase "social-imperialism" as used by the Guardian?

How does the Guardian's use of the term differ from the meaning given it by China, the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) or the Revolutionary Communist Party?

Give some examples of Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of other nations and of relations with other countries conducted on the basis of narrow, national self-interest.

What evidence is there that the USSR is on a "capitalist road"? What are the main questions that would need to be answered by a "full scientific analysis of class relations in the USSR and the fundamental characteristics of its economic system"?

In principle #21, the Guardian sees the content of the slogan "united front against both superpowers" as being a call for independence and self-reliance by other countries—especially third world countries—and also as a means of uniting the struggle against imperialism with the struggle against opportunism, basing itself on Lenin's remark that "the struggle against imperialism is a sham and a humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the struggle against opportunism." Is the content here correct? Does the slogan itself correspond to that content?

In principle #22, the Guardian discusses the relationship between the two superpowers and concludes that while there is both collusion and contention, contention is the principal aspect of their relationship. Is this true? Have there been periods when collusion seemed to be the principal aspect? What are the particular manifestations of both collusion and contention?

The Guardian sees Soviet backing to liberation struggles based primarily on narrow national considerations of what is in the best "interest" of the Soviet state rather than as expressions of proletarian internationalism. Is this correct? Examples?

**Reading:**

Fan the Flames, 5/16/73 (on Soviet hegemonism). Voices of Revolution, 1/5/77, "Hoxha on Revisionism". Guardian article, 6/17/76, "950 Hear Guardian Editor on U.S. Left" (specifically, the part under the subheading "Capitalist Restoration"). "Unite the Many, Defeat the Few", pp. 1-5, 23-26, 36-38 (Note: since this pamphlet was written, China's position has changed considerably). "Social Imperialism: Socialism in Words, Imperialism in Deeds", reprints from Peking Review, Yanan Books. Supplementary Readings: "The Restoration of Capitalism in the USSR", by Martin Nicolaus (out of print) "Red Papers 7: How Capitalism Has Been Restored in the USSR", by the RCP. "The Class Character of the USSR", by Sam Marcy, World View Publications (Workers World Party).

**PRINCIPLE #23**

The Guardian sees the principal danger of war coming from U.S. counterrevolutionary efforts to suppress national liberation struggles or struggles of peoples for independence and national sovereignty. Is this correct? The Guardian also sees the danger of war between the superpowers but says that this is not inevitable. Is this correct?

The Guardian calls for mobilizing "the peace sentiment of the U.S. people" as a part of the mass line of a communist party, while utilizing a mass peace movement as a means of educating about the nature of imperialist war. Discuss the theoretical and practical manifestations of this position.

What is the significance of communists targeting their "own" bourgeoisie in the struggle against war? What are some examples historically and in the present of a contrary position? When might it be correct to target the "enemy" bourgeoisie?

**PRINCIPLE #24**

What are the principal internal contradictions of the world capitalist system today? What role does intercapitalist rivalry play in the crisis of world capitalism? What are the dimensions and manifestations of the world capitalist crisis in particular countries? In which capitalist countries does this manifest itself most sharply?

The Guardian says that the objective conditions for revolution are developing rapidly in a number of capitalist countries but that the hegemony of revisionist communist parties over the working class holds back the outbreak of revolution. Is this correct? Why have antirevisionist parties not been able to break the hegemony of the revisionist parties over the working-class movements of Europe and Japan?

**Reading:**

Guardian article, 6/1/77, "Can Carter's Foreign Policy Save U.S. Imperialism?" Guardian Viewpoint, 5/18/77, "London Summit Bound to Fail". Monthly Review, December 1977, "The Trilateral

Commission."

#### PRINCIPLE #25

Solidarity with socialist countries in the struggle against imperialism as a mark of proletarian internationalism ought to be self-evident. However, are there examples of "socialist" countries which did not stand with other socialist countries under these circumstances? Discuss the role of the Soviet Union in relation to the struggle between India and China, the U.S. and Cambodia.

In what ways would communists express solidarity with socialist countries in the struggle against social-imperialism (China, Albania), counterrevolution (suppression of bourgeois intellectuals under the dictatorship of the proletariat) and revisionism (cultural revolution in China)? What is the correct relationship between solidarity with and criticism of socialist countries?

(The five principles of peaceful coexistence between nations referred to in this principle are: mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; mutual non-aggression; mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs; equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence.)

#### PRINCIPLE #26

U.S. communists must become completely knowledgeable about the chief expression of colonialism by the U.S. bourgeoisie. The Club should prepare a special educational discussion aimed at providing basic information about Puerto Rico, its status, the independence movement, its relations with the U.S., to Club members.

The independence movement calls for "independence and self-determination" for Puerto Rico, in that order, meaning that the U.S. must completely withdraw from Puerto Rico before Puerto Ricans can freely exercise their right of self-determination. Should Marxists support this slogan? Why—or why not? What is the status of the 2 million Puerto Ricans living in the U.S. What significance does this question have for estimating the multinational character of the U.S. working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard party?

#### Reading:

Guardian Viewpoint, 8/17/77, "Puerto Rico: 'Freely Associated' Colony". Supplementary Reading: "The Socialist Alternative", PSP program.

#### PRINCIPLE #27

The Guardian believes that the present situation in the international communist movement is virtually without precedent. Except for a few brief periods, communists have seen themselves as part of an international organization with a leading center. In the days before the Bolshevik revolution, there were the First and then the Second Internationals. When Lenin broke with the Second International, he helped bring into being the Third International (Comintern) in which the CPSU played

a leading role. The Comintern was formally dissolved during the wartime antifascist alliance with the bourgeois democracies, but communists throughout the world continued to see themselves as an international movement with close organic ties and with the Soviet party as its leading force.

In our view, the Sino-Soviet split brought this entire period to an end. The revisionist parties still maintain a loose organizational center of sorts, although this has been considerably weakened by the development of Eurocommunism. The antirevisionist parties, however, have not created an alternative center. Some socialist countries do not align themselves with either side in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

The Guardian believes that in the present circumstances and for the foreseeable future, a U.S. communist party must be independent and "non-aligned" with any other communist party or group of parties except as an autonomous equal with the likelihood of having different views on particular questions. Is this a correct estimate of the present situation? Is this a correct stand?

#### Reading:

Fan the Flames, 12/10/75 (on party building; specifically, section under subheading "Developing Independent Line.") Kim Il Sung, "On the International Situation and Some Problems Arising in the International Communist Movement", pp. 494-501 of "On Juche in Our Revolution", Vol. 1.

#### PRINCIPLE #28

This principle is a reaffirmation of the Leninist line on the role and form of the vanguard revolutionary party. It emphasizes the following key characteristics of the party: it is a "vanguard" party; it is a multinational party; it is the single party of the multinational working class; it is a democratic centralist party. All of these particular points should be discussed in some detail both theoretically and in their practical manifestations.

#### Reading:

Lenin: "On Organization", Proletarian Publishers, pp. 127-191 (From "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back"). Fan the Flames, 12/8/76, "The Party Must Be Multinational." Liberation, December 1973, "A Party of the People", by Arthur Kinoy.

#### PRINCIPLE #29

Is this statement correct? If not, what is the central task of U.S. Marxist-Leninists today? What are the practical implications of declaring that party-building is the central task for U.S. Marxist-Leninists today? How does this affect the work and character of the Guardian Clubs?

#### Reading:

Fan the Flames, 6/16/76 and 6/30/76, "On Party-Building."