

THE BUILDING OF THE  
VANGUARD PARTY OF THE  
U.S. PROLETARIAT

written for:

The Multilateral Conference  
On Party Building

June 30-July 2, 1979

submitted jointly by:

Kansas City Revolutionary  
Workers Collective

and

Wichita Communist Cell

May 26, 1979

## CONTENTS

- I. History of Groups
- A. Kansas City Revolutionary Workers Collective (KCRWC) p. 1
1. Out of Afro-American and community struggles of early '70's. In RWL in 1974. Began studying Marxism and developing more proletarian outlook. Had problems with bureaucracy and lack of Bolshevization. Those who formed KCRWC quit RWL.
  2. KCRWC formed Feb. 1975. Tailed larger economist organizations and negated own contributions. Drawn into "Wing" through WVO and old RWL contacts.
  3. Began to see need to develop theoretically and rely on own efforts, and develop organizational unity on basis of ideological and political unity. Struggled with smaller circles. KCPR and WCC affected development.
- B. Wichita Communist Cell (WCC) p. 7
1. Out of anti-war--VVAW/WSO and other spontaneous movements. Formed M-L study group fall 1975. Struggle in study group. Splits. KCRWC affected development.
  2. WCC formed fall 1976 on basis of MLMTT. Saw revisionist take-over in China in early 1977, studied party building and put forward shallow and incorrect analysis. Made ultra-left errors in analysis and work. No work in working class.
  3. Began rectification late 1977. 1977-1978 worked with 2 workers but saw as advanced when they were average-backward. Did not set up factory nuclei. 1978 developing unity with KCRWC and plans to merge. Joint line on party building developed. KCRWC does not carry out joint line and bows to spontaneous movement so merger plans off. Developed better understanding of international situation and PLA's leading role in struggle against "three worlds theory". Began criticizing Mao's line on party after subjectivity pointed out by KCRWC. Unity developing with KCRWC as they are correcting errors.
- II. Type of Party
- A. General Principles of the Bolshevik-Type Party. Need revolutionary theory, professional revolutionary cadre, democratic centralism and iron discipline, links with the masses mainly through factory nuclei. Cadre developed through education, training, criticism and self-criticism and opportunist elements must be purged from the party. Must have only 1 line carried out. Factions are incompatible with the M-L development of the party. p. 16

B. Defeat Mao Tse-tung Thought on the Character of the Party. Mao did not uphold Bolshevik norms in the area of iron discipline. He allowed and justified 2 lines being practiced in the party. He did not promote the purging of opportunist elements and allowed the existence of factions in the party. p. 22

C. Deviations From Developing the Bolshevik-Type Party in Our Movement. We need to be developing Bolshevik characteristics now to help build a Bolshevik party. The right tendency, dominant in our movement, negates the ability and need to develop Bolshevik characteristics, and there are misconceptions and deviations in developing revolutionary theory, professionalizing our ranks, democratic centralism, iron discipline, factory nuclei. p. 34

### III. How To Build the Party

A. Must be a conscious effort. Must develop theory, plan p. 40

B. Must use dialectical materialism which includes the experience of others, drawing out principles and applied to our experience. p. 46

C. Experiences show the need to understand motion, tasks and key strategic task, and elaborate tactical ways to achieve strategic success (the key link). Experiences show the need for the advanced line to come to the fore and be struggled for and for the party to be built from the top down. p. 47

D. In the Russian movement, when the movement had already developed, had M-L theory and rudimentary program, and was fusing with the working-class movement, and the period of ideological, political, and organizational disunity developed and amateurishness and economism justified, Lenin concentrated on developing centralized leadership, with Iskra as the tactical way to do so. p.50

E. In our movement, the level of fusion is low and we lack much M-L theory and a program, but, similar to the Russian movement, we have ideological, political and organizational disunity and amateurishness, and make deviations of sectarianism towards and tailing of the working-class movement. Developing centralized leadership will develop our movement. p. 53

### IV. Concrete Steps

A. The Albanian and Russian tactics for building the center are different than ours due to the different conditions. We do not have unity on programmatic, practical and burning questions to develop a joint newspaper such as Iskra or joint activity in the spontaneous movements such as in the Albanian experience. We need to develop more unity around line first. p. 64

B. But developing unity around line can carry out practical tasks such as uniting M-L's, developing centralized M-L leadership if done jointly and with centralized leadership. p. 66

C. The key thing needed in our movement, the thing that will move other tasks forward, especially the key strategic task of building the center, is a joint study with a journal and headed by a committee. p. 66

1. The joint study will use the method of dialectical materialism, will study the experience of other parties to apply to our own, and will take in the experience of groups in the U.S. to learn our own history. The study needs to be on the most immediate issues connected with party building. We feel these are: the type of party, how to build the party, and burning questions which are becoming lines of demarcation.

2. The journal will concentrate on the above subjects and will provide for discussion of different views, but will promote the development of the M-L line and the drawing of lines of demarcation.

3. The committee will guide and organize the study and edit the journal, will provide M-L centralized leadership to the extent possible at this time. The committee (composed of members of groups participating in the study and financed by the groups) will develop the M-L leadership, professional revolutionary character and principled unity of the movement.

4. The Principles of Unity needed for this are p. 70

a. unity on the plan and purpose of the plan

b. unity on the method of the study, journal and committee

c. unity on line--general Marxist-Leninist theory, our aims, and method, ideology, tasks, that fusion is at a low level and the subjective reasons why, that party building is our central task, that it must be worked at consciously using M-L theory to guide our practice, that the type of party we are striving to build is a Bolshevik-type (general principles), main danger historically.

5. We need a meeting of groups close to our line on this to struggle out differences and begin implementing such a plan. This should be discussed and preparations begun at the MULC

D. The study, journal, committee is only a beginning step, and many more steps must be taken before the party can be formed and consolidated.

## I. History of Our Groups

### A. Kansas City Revolutionary Workers Collective (KCRWC)

Our collective has its roots in the Afro-American student and community struggles of the early 1970's. The organizational forms that our work took were Black Student Unions, national liberation support groups (such as African Liberation Support Committee), and national formations such as the Youth Organization for Black Unity (YOBU). Through our work and study in YOBU, we became acquainted with an amalgam of theories and theoreticians--Marxism, Trotskyism, Ché, Pan-Africanism, Mao, etc. This eclectic development was a result of not having a genuine Marxist-Leninist party in existence that could win developing revolutionaries to the movement on the basis of a sound proletarian ideology.

As YOBU developed nationally, it and some other organizations came more into contact with the anti-revisionist communist movement. This brought about a major schism within the Black Liberation Movement (BLM). One section of the BLM continued to develop into Marxists. Another section clung to the old narrow nationalist and African nationalist outlook.

Those of us tending toward Marxism began to study more and attempt to apply the basic features of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought (MLMTT). We shed many of our narrow nationalist tendencies, abandoned the campuses and headed for the urban areas and urban proletariat. We also began to seek out others from the old BLM who were tending toward MLMTT. In early 1974, a Black M-L organization was formed from several existing groups (YOBU, Malcom X Liberation University, People's College, Lynn Eusan Institute, and some individuals). This organization would later be known as the Revolutionary Workers League (RWL). Several districts were organized, including one in Kansas City. The student/youth organization became the February First Movement (FFM).

We should point out that although we recognized Marxism-Leninism as the most revolutionary theory, we still retained aspects of our old world outlook. Our world outlook contained MTT which we have not summed up yet, but which at this time we can see is revisionist on crucial questions regarding M-L organizational principles on inner party life. Thus we remained a Black organization for sometime, and most of the work was focused on community and student struggles. Another negative factor was that the pre-

dominant contact with the communist movement was with the October League (OL) and the Revolutionary Union (RU).

Internally, there was very little systematic study of Marxism-Leninism. Although we were organized employing the principles of democratic centralism, in many districts little democracy existed. This was especially true in the Kansas City district. Without the necessary theoretical work, cadres could not know on what principles the organization was based, and could not exercise fully their democratic duty of discussing and helping to develop the line. Thus, in our district, bureaucratic elitism developed into a major problem. This and other deviations were a reflection of the lack of remolding of the petty bourgeois world outlook. As well, there was never a process of Bolshevization in the organization. People had been admitted to the organization on the basis of their work in the student and community struggles. But many were unfit for the disciplined, self-sacrificing life required of a proletarian revolutionary. Thus, during the struggle against bureaucratic elitism and the other deviations, many cadre quit the movement entirely. Others, including those who formed KCRWC, quit the organization. We later summed up our resignations as being incorrect. This, again, reflected our petty bourgeois tendencies such as liberalism, lack of daring in struggle, hopelessness in face of hard struggle, etc. In fact, our view was later upheld inside the organization and some honest cadre remained.

In February, 1975, KCRWC was formed. We were a small group made up of inexperienced cadre. Our theoretical and political development was at a low level. We had no concrete contact with the rest of the communist movement. Because of our inadequacies, our line on building the party was not complex--join one of the existing national organizations. Because of our state of development we did not feel that we could make any independent contribution to the movement.

The organization which we contacted initially was the RU. We had initial unity with some of their criticism of the OL, and had decided that the Black Workers Congress/Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization (BWC/PRRWO) trend was "dogmatic." As well, we were impressed with the militant spirit exhibited by the RU, and their disdain for idle "theoreticians." After some initial discussions, which were almost entirely around the economist plant work we were doing, they began promoting their draft programme (Spring, 1975). We took part in some programme discuss-

ion committees they set up. Our main disagreements with the RU were over the Afro-American national question (nation of a new type), the manner in which they were building the party (central task for the brief period ahead), and their refusal to deal seriously with our criticisms and disagreements. They encouraged us to join the party with our differences and they would be struggled out internally. Eventually we were given an ultimatum by the RU-- join the party now or be prepared to sever relations. Because of our lingering questions, we did not join the newly formed RCP. We should point out, though, that although we broke with the RU organizationally, ideologically and politically we continued the RU's economism and liquidation of party building tasks.

In reexamining the movement, we sought to develop unity with a group that would place more emphasis on theory, and that upheld party building as the central task. Of course, because we failed to sum our RU experiences on the basis of M-L, we could not be sure exactly what we were opposed to in our opposition to economism, nor what tasks were required in carrying out the central task. As a consequence, we developed ties with another group which we eventually summed up as right opportunist. This group was the Workers Viewpoint Organization (WVO), whom we established relations with in the Fall of 1975. We were also influenced in seeking out WVO by their newly established relationship with our old friends of the RWL.

In our struggle with WVO we adopted much of their line. This wholesale adoption included such noted WVO gems as the anti-revisionist premises, two contending trends, unite in order to expose, proletariat shaped like a football, etc. This unity was achieved on the basis of shallow study and again reflected our right opportunist, liquidationist attitude on building the party. In our petty bourgeois haste to liquidate our circle, we continually denied the need for our collective to develop some independent views, based on our own study of M-L theory, on how to proceed on building the party. Without this basis, we had no concrete idea of how a genuine party should be developed and thus did not have the ability to distinguish genuine from sham.

At this time, WVO, RWL, ATM, and PRRWO had assembled in what was called the "Revolutionary Wing" of the communist movement. Other smaller groups such as ourselves were also associated with the "Wing." However, it was never fully agreed upon who all was in or out of the "Wing." For our part, our unity was with the WVO/RWL

motion. Those two organizations had agreed to merge and invited us to join the merger process. Finally, we thought, our search for a parent organization was over. The unity between WVO and RWL, however, was shortlived. A split occurred in early 1976 and WVO was purged from the "Wing."

What followed immediately was some of the most heated and unprincipled struggle to date in the movement. For our group, because of the unprincipled unity we had achieved with the "Wing" in the first place, we had much difficulty in trying to distinguish genuine from sham. We vacillated a great deal and united with first one, then another, of the tendencies. In the main, because of our previous right line, we were attracted more to the line of the WVO. However, because of increasing differences we never reached a state of general unity. Although still at a low level, our understanding of some questions was beginning to develop. For example, we came to realize that much theoretical work needed to be completed before a party programme could be developed. Thus, we could not unite that "The party is a settled question." Also, we were beginning to have differences with WVO's version of the "three worlds theory"--in particular, their support for the "second world" bourgeoisie. We raised several criticisms to WVO and they refused to give them serious consideration. Our relationship ended in February, 1977.

At this time, we were becoming more aware that our approach to building the party was all wrong. We saw that we could not establish unity with any of the major national organizations, and that would have to rely mainly on our own efforts in understanding our tasks in building the party. We also summed up that organizational unity was something that had to be worked for in protracted struggle. Although we were aware of these problems, they were not yet eliminated, and errors were still being made.

With the rejection of the national organizations, we decided to seek out and become acquainted with the smaller circles. We developed relations with both the Colorado Organization For Revolutionary Struggle (CORS) and the League for Proletarian Revolution (LPR). Through our discussions with LPR, we felt that we had some unity on certain line questions. However, when we began to take a stand against the "three worlds theory," our relationship deteriorated.

We would like to mention two other circles which affected our development during 1977-78, Kansas Collective for Proletarian Rev-



olution (KCPR) and WCC.

KCPR was formed in 1977. It was made up of cadre who had also once been a part of the old RWL in the Kansas City district, and of the FFM. From the beginning, their development was closely intertwined with ours, as we established joint commissions and held common positions. Since our actual practice was that of one organization, we began to function under the name of one group. This merger process was to be summed up and put forward to other comrades in the movement. The problem, however, was that we still did not properly understand what constituted a principled merger process. Thus, although we held similar political positions, our internal basis of unity was not as strong. Specifically, there had not been sufficient Bolshevization of the ranks in either group, and this task was not undertaken as a part of our merger process. As a result, there was no assurance that our groups were made up of only the most dedicated, self-sacrificing and persevering cadre--the type of cadre that we must have in our organizations. This problem was coupled with a lack of strong leadership in developing the unity of the groups and putting the combined group on a sound footing. Hence, when problems arose, many cadre did not have the necessary commitment and leadership to see them through hard times. Several cadre, including those of KCPR, left the movement. As we learn more about how to carry out principled merger, the KCPR experience will be summed up more.

We first came in contact with comrades who would form WCC in late 1975. We have had a fairly close relationship with these comrades since that time. We will not detail our entire relationship with WCC here but would like to mention two aspects important to the development of KCRWC. One was the concretization of the revisionist leadership in China. At the time this occurred, our group vacillated on whether or not China was actually under revisionist leadership. We vacillated even through evidence was becoming conclusive showing that a revisionist line was being promoted. Through struggle with WCC we were able to combat our internal petty bourgeois philistinism and take a definite stand against the revisionist CPC leadership.

Second, after we produced "Let's Move Party Building Forward" jointly with WCC (and KCPR), our party building line actually went backward. We returned to our old practice of liquidating party building tasks and tailing the spontaneous movement. Again, through

struggle with WCC we were made aware of our retrogression and are now working and studying harder to adhere to our party building line. In sum, our relationship with WCC has been mutually beneficial and a great deal of unity exists on important questions.

In conclusion, we think KCRWC has made some positive motion over the years and that our understanding of many questions is much greater. We can identify three major historical problems which we must continue to work on:

1. Continue to adhere in practice to our central task of building the party. In past years, as we have shown, we have not had a correct orientation on our party building tasks. What we need to do is clearly identify our tasks, grasp the key link, and boldly make our contribution to the development of a genuine party.
2. Bolshevize our collective. We need to build a truly professional organization of dedicated revolutionaries. This means that we must strive to rid our ranks of the lingering petty-bourgeois baggage of individualism, liberalism, and other such deviations.
3. Develop strong leadership capabilities. Internally and in our relationship with others, we must develop and exhibit more the characteristics of strong proletarian leadership.

This sums up the basic development of our collective. We hope that this presentation has given comrades a clearer picture of who we are.

## B. Wichita Communist Cell (WCC)

WCC developed out of the petty-bourgeois led spontaneous movements of the '60's and '70's in general, and out of Vietnam Veterans Against the War/Winter Soldier Organization (VVAW/WSO) in particular. At one time, in the early stage of its development, when it was VVAW, the organization had a social basis mainly of working class origin. Later, with the decline of the spontaneous movements in the early '70's, VVAW/WSO was captured by the then Revolutionary Union\*. The ebb in the spontaneous movement, eclectic nature of VVAW/WSO, and bureaucratic measures of RU, splintered VVAW/WSO and resulted in most of the members leaving, including the present members of WCC. Before and after leaving VVAW/WSO, the present members of WCC were heavily involved in other spontaneous struggles: prison struggles and defense committees; anti-Police repression and anti-Klan struggles; Native American struggle work. After the victory of the national liberation struggles in Indochina, with the spontaneous movement locally at a low ebb in the late summer of 1975, and after having been involved in one spontaneous struggle after another without seeing how any of these efforts were actually leading to an end to imperialism and our utopian concept of socialism, we decided revolutionary theory was needed to guide our practice. Thus for the first time, we started to study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought (MLMTT) seriously. In our activity in the spontaneous movements: ideologically, we were "guided" by the theory of spontaneity, whose altar we worshipped at daily and hourly; politically, we advocated various forms of petty bourgeois anti-imperialism, with some utopian socialism mixed in, but the essence of this activity was militant reformism. The social roots of the members of the WCC are the labor aristocracy and lower-middle farmer sector of the petty bourgeoisie, while the social basis as adults is the intelligentsia and technical stratum (either labor aristocracy or lower petty bourgeoisie). It was our revolutionary sentiments and our practical experiences that led us to gravitate toward scientific socialism.

The M-L study group that started in the Fall of 1975 was formed on the basis of the need for revolutionary theory to guide practice, that theoretical study would be followed by practical application,

\* The RU subsequently renamed itself the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP), VVAW/WSO became VVAW again, and to this day the latter remains one of the RCP's militant economist fingers, which is "IN STEP WITH THE WORKING CLASS" (The Veteran, Aug.-Sept., '76, p. 16), in their united front "against" imperialism.

and was organized by one of the present WCC members and a Communist Workers Group (CWG)\* cadre. This cadre played a mainly positive role at the outset, but left to form another study group without consultation, for which he was criticized, and he fell into some opportunism by following CWG's line and instructions. At the time, we saw this opportunism mainly in reducing women's oppression entirely to economic oppression, and lying. CWG held their cadre was only a "sympathizer" to avoid any blame for this latter opportunism, and criticized this person in such a way that it shattered him. He then left the communist movement altogether. Nevertheless, CWG's line had an effect on the future WCC as will be seen shortly. The KCRWC positively influenced the study group's direction politically mainly through occasional meetings with one of the future WCC members. After about 7-8 months of study, there was struggle in the study group as to where we should be going. One line held we needed to take up the different programmatic and political line questions and openly held party building wasn't the central task. These same advocates also were unwilling to dedicate themselves to proletarian revolution, did not want to form a democratic-centralist organization, were opposed to making communist work the main-thing in their lives. The other line held that of all the questions facing us, the central question or central task was party building since without a genuine M-L party "...it is useless to even think of overthrowing imperialism, of achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat.\*\* The study group members holding this latter line went on to form the WCC, while most of the other members dropped out of even the spontaneous movements, with one consolidating himself as a social prop (he was and is a low level Trade Union Bureaucrat in the lower stratum of the petty bourgeoisie) and another becoming a trotskyite. One of the study group members who did not continue is a working woman who keeps in touch and is regarded as a sympathizer. After studying theory (MLMTT) for a year and struggling over the basic direction practice should take, Principles of Unity (POU's) were developed and the WCC formed in September of 1976.

\* CWG at this time held that the CPC and PLA were the leading M-L parties in the world, although they deviated toward ultra-leftism. Later, CWG went over to neo-trotskyism and apparently has disintegrated organizationally. Now CWG (what's left) apparently adheres to the trotskyite "theory of cadres" since they have holed up in themselves.

\*\* J. V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, FLP Peking edition, p. 103

At the time, two of our POL's--which we had a very weak grasp of ideologically--were that: The CPC and the PLA are the leading M-L parties in the international communist movement; We take MLMTT as our guide to revolutionary action. The events in China after Mao Tse-tung's death caused considerable alarm and disorientation in WCC. The internal line of the CPC, which we had associated with Mao Tse-tung through the pages of Peking Review and believed to be M-L, had been overthrown. Mainly this, coupled with the ludicrous argumentation against the so-called "gang of four," led us to believe, in late December of 1976, that there had been a revisionist take-over in China. In the last quarter of '76, we also began party building discussions with KCRWC, worked out a joint division of labor on theoretical questions, with progress reports to be prepared and struggle around line to follow. In the first quarter of '77, we prepared two papers, "The Situation in the U.S. Communist Movement"\* and "Against the Revisionist Take-Over in China: In Defense of MLMTT and Proletarian Revolution"\*\* for the March, 1977, Denver Forum on Party Building. The alarm and disorientation we spoke of earlier, plus small-circle spirit, led us to attempt to analyze why the revisionists had seized power in China. On the basis of an insufficient investigation and analysis, we wrote an internal paper in which we drew the conclusion that the roots of revisionism were in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) (CPSU-(B)) during the 1930's, which had not been properly understood and corrected. Both the CPC\*\*\* and the PLA\*\*\*\* talk about bureaucracy and failing to rely on the masses, with the CPC stating that M-L was not applied to social development. We also saw the "theory" of the productive forces, "bourgeois right," and the forerunner to the "state of the whole people," in the CPSU(B). Initially, our paper on China was entitled "...In Defense of M-L..." instead of "...In Defense of MLMTT..." while our paper "On the Situation..."

---

\*We are no longer distributing this paper as our line has undergone some qualitative changes since then, some aspects were incorrect, and other aspects will be reevaluated when the joint study (which we discuss elsewhere in this paper) takes place. It was helpful in clarifying to us some aspects of party building. See "Let's Move Party Building Forward," p. 1.

\*\*The "Preface..." to this paper, June, 1978, goes into the errors we saw at the time and a method of correction which is much deeper than this sum-up.

\*\*\*See "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," and "On Khrushchov's Phoney Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World."

\*\*\*\*See "Socialism is Built by the Masses, the Party..." by Enver Hoxha

had the incorrectly arrived at conclusion that there were revisionist roots in the international communist movement for over 40 years which had not been properly appreciated. KCRWC convinced us that our study was not thorough or all-sided, therefore, our conclusions were not scientific conclusions, so we changed these two aspects in our public papers. Later, we summed up that the line of CWG, and petty bourgeois intellectualism influenced us during this time. KCRWC initially united with the line of a revisionist take-over but backed away from this and united with the Colorado Organization for Revolutionary Struggle (CORS) and the League for Proletarian Revolution (LPR) who opportunistically excluded us from the Party Building Forum.\*

Relations with KCRWC deteriorated following the 1977 Forum, until after the PLA attacked the "theory of the three worlds" in The Theory and Practice of the Revolution and it became apparent that Deng Hsiao-ping would formally be brought back to CPC leadership. KCRWC began to look at the situation in China objectively, and admitted they were incorrect for participating in excluding us from the Forum, while we united with KCRWC's criticism of us for calling for an immediate (organizational) "break" with the CPC, and that our criticisms of Stalin and the CPSU(B), and Mao Tse-tung and the CPC were not based on a scientific investigation. After studying The Theory and Practice of the Revolution (in conjunction with restudying some of Lenin and Stalin's works on imperialism and the national-colonial question), we came to the conclusion that this PLA document was M-L and the "theory of the three worlds" counter-revolutionary and revisionist. It also became clear to us that we should have concentrated on struggling against the "theory of the three worlds" instead of the internal situation in China, and that we didn't follow our POU on the PLA as a leading M-L party in the world. Now, we believe that not looking to the PLA for leadership was mainly due to an insufficient ideological basis for politically declaring the PLA to be a leading party. In the summer of 1977, we also began to see that although we theoretically held winning advanced workers to be a major party building task, we were doing no practical work in the working class movement. Based on our ultra-left errors (e.g. calling for an immediate "break" with the CPC; criticizing Stalin and the CPSU(B), and Mao Tse-tung and the CPC from an insufficient investigation and analysis; no work in the working class movement), we decided to institute a rectif-

\* See KCRWC-WCC Speech, "In Defense of Marxism-Leninism on the International Situation," Feb., 3, 1979, p. 1-3, for a deeper explanation.

ication campaign to correct our mistakes ideologically. We realized in general that if ideological remoulding did not take place, the same type of errors would occur again in another situation, in a different form. Since then, this has been driven home to us in particular instances, both within WCC and in other comrades' practice. Being able to politically admit our errors and do self-criticism, while a positive first step, needed to be followed up by ideological remoulding, through study, in practice.

Internally, we initiated study of philosophy and trotskyism. We also initiated a study on party building with a worker we knew from our spontaneous days when he conducted a study group on Puerto Rico. This worker was very active at the time, but under the influence of the Progressive Labor Party (PL) who he would also criticize and disunite with on certain questions and their practice. We struggled with him around bowing to spontaneity and economism (which PL combines with adventurism). We also struggled against PL's trotskyite line on the national question, and began a study on the national-colonial question applied to Puerto Rico with this worker. We steadily won this worker away from PL's influence as their local cadre could parrot the line but not defend it. We proposed a closed debate with PL in which a few workers would attend. PL replied that one of the WCC members was a police agent and they refused to debate. We demanded they produce proof of this serious accusation. None was forthcoming. WCC and the worker-contact summed up that PL resorted to this opportunist slander and objective agent-provocateur activity\* to avoid principled struggle around line in practice which they couldn't defend. This worker remained active for a while, but became depressed when his wife decided not to take up M-L study (she was also a worker and came from the working class too) and other family problems developed. He then started drinking heavily again and withdrew. We had thought this worker was essentially an advanced worker (he did have some difficulty with complicated theoretical questions) according to the general characteristics Lenin lays out in "A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social Democracy," (Collected Works, Vol. 4, p. 255-285) which we believed and still believe applies to the U.S. today, even if we haven't found any practically yet.

We made a similar mistake in overrating an individual one of

\* See "On the Struggle Against the Activities of the Agent-Provocateurs," p. 6, WCC reprint entitled On the Struggle Against Agent-Provocateurs

the WCC members had worked with in VVAW/WSO, and struggled with through correspondence and occasional meetings for years. This person had started an M-L study group, done union organizing at his workplace, professed to be devoted to proletarian revolution, became a candidate member of WCC, and engaged in mainly theoretical study for months. But when his wife (who was from the labor aristocracy and still closely tied to it) left after several months of M-L study stating her priorities were "me first, my child second, and the proletariat last," he became depressed (his daughter also left). Shortly thereafter, he questioned his role in the revolution, vacillated several times on leaving the collective, fell into denying past statements were made, dropped out of the communist movement entirely and joined the ranks of backward workers by caving into liberalism and petty bourgeois selfishness. He then returned to heavy alcohol and drug use.

During the time of intense theoretical work and ideological struggle, and practical work with these people, which spanned a year until the summer of '78, we also carried out propaganda and agitation in the working class movement in Wichita, Kansas, and were preparing to develop factory nuclei. As we mentioned above, we overrated these people in thinking and working with them as if they were advanced workers (the latter person talked about above, did mislead us as to his social origins). On the one hand, as workers, both these people, to a limited extent, led other workers, struggled against economic exploitation and political and social oppression, accepted scientific socialism and tried to propagate it, although their efforts were not systematic or consistent. On the other hand, workers in their factories (one of them in large plants) were fairly lethargic in struggling and did not accept scientific socialism in practice, that is, to the point of study and the hard struggle to apply it. In our work with these people, we drew the conclusion that we prematurely considered them to be advanced workers. What was needed was work and struggle with them over a fairly long period of time to see if they could become independent working class leaders. They were basically average workers, with hints of advanced in them but many more backward characteristics, which gained the upper hand when personal problems and personal sacrifices came to the fore. An inability to cope properly with personal problems (with collective help), accept difficult personal sacrifices are not characteristics of advanced workers, or genuine Marxist-Leninists for that matter. Our experiences with the present spontaneous working class movement (we view th's movement to be at a



low level but rising), other comrades' experiences, particularly KCRWC, and our initial observations of the U.S. working class movement nation-wide, are leading us to consider these phenomena theoretically.

Returning to the last quarter of '77 and struggle in the U.S. communist movement, relations with KCRWC improved as a result of mutual self-criticism and closer views on party building and the international situation. KCRWC united that there had been a revisionist take-over in China, and KCRWC and WCC agreed that the PLA was elaborating the M-L line on the international situation, most notably in The Theory and Practice of the Revolution, against the "theory of the three worlds" led by the CPC revisionists. We had our first meeting with the Kansas Collective for Proletarian Revolution (KCPR) at this time. KCPR leaned toward the above views but were still studying the questions.

During this same period of summer '77 - summer '78, we, KCPR, and KCRWC improved our understanding of party building. We independently came up with similar analysis on party building due to our experiences and study. WCC, by summer of '77, was beginning to see how we, or any other small group for that matter, could not develop correct lines on all the burning questions in the movement by ourselves. We had tried to do a few analyses by ourselves, and did poorly in them, as we have already stated. In doing these analyses and making the errors we did, we began to realize the poor quality of what work we were able to do and the large amount of questions needing answering. This is what made us start thinking about the need for a M-L center to push forward the development of M-L lines on all questions and develop organization to aid the development of M-L lines and unity. We began discussion with KCPR and KCRWC around this which eventually led to joint issuance of "Let's Move Party Building Forward," July, 1978. During the first half of '78, KCPR and KCRWC vacillated on the need for national joint study on party building, while we were liberal at first in not struggling for our views on this question, but "Let's Move..." came out with the need for national joint study on party building. WCC developed new POU's in January, 1978. KCRWC later developed points for POU's adding to and criticizing some of our POU's, which we united with. In theory then, there were no outstanding differences of principle between KCRWC and WCC. Discussion took place around what organizational form was needed to contain our (apparently) relatively high level of unity. At the time, KCPR and KCRWC were well on the road to merging, which the KCRWC comrades explained. In the

summer of '78, it was jointly agreed in principle to merge KCRWC and WCC, with joint theoretical commissions to be established, joint practical work to be carried out, with the location question to be decided. However, shortly thereafter, KCRWC and KCPR, through their members on the party building commission, did not uphold in practice the basic line in "Let's Move...", e.g. raising up for discussion again the need for national joint study on party building, and proposing nation-wide, joint national liberation support committee work. Efforts to jointly implement the line in "Let's Move..." on a national basis were paralyzed throughout the latter part of 1978. Joint practical work did not materialize either as KCRWC (KCPR went up to Kansas City) bowed to spontaneity and immersed themselves in the local spontaneous movements, and based their practical activity in community organizational forms. Mainly in view of the above, we summarized our relations with KCRWC, criticizing them and ourselves in the process, and broke off merger plans as 1978 drew to a close.

In December, 1978, we began to implement the basic line in "Let's Move Party Building Forward." Tactically, we began to organize for a multilateral meeting on party building which was proposed in general in July of '78 in the KCPR-KCRWC-WCC Joint Response to Marxist-Leninist Collective's (MLC's) June ('78) Letter. The Multilateral Conference (MULC) on Party Building is still in progress and remains to be summed up on a collective basis, so we will not deal with it in particular here. In January of '79, KCRWC began to see how bowing to spontaneity had led to the political problems we spoke of earlier. With the Denver Forum on the International Situation scheduled for February 3, 1979, we agreed to work jointly with KCRWC on a presentation which resulted in a joint speech. Again, the Denver Forum is in the process of being summed up collectively so we will not address it further in particular, except to say that for this, and for our involvement in the Pacific Collective's (PC's) attempt to organize a response to the Unite! articles on the small circles, we recognize the need to improve our method of struggle. In general, we think Demarcation's organization of the "Joint Statement in Opposition to the Cutting Off Of Aid To Socialist Albania By The Government of China" (which we participated in), the Denver Forum, PC's attempt to organize a response, and the MULC illustrate the importance and need to build up M-L centralized leadership, which we view as the principal contradiction in party building. During the Spring of this year, we produced three pamphlets ("How Lenin Fought...Centrism," "On the Struggle Against Agent-Provocateurs," and "The Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties of the Capitalist Countries By Means of Overcoming Social-Democratic Traditions") which consist chiefly of Comintern reprints

on subjects we believe are topical and important for the party building movement. We have been working on a polemic against MLOC/CPUSA (M-L) which has been delayed several times for the other work we are doing. Our relations with KCRWC have steadily improved throughout 1979 by uniting through line in practice, with our joint paper here the chief theoretical and practical result. If we continue developing on the same course, higher organizational forms of unity should follow.

Up until recently, we have always held that Mao Tse-tung was a great M-L. In preparations for the MULC, we made a superficial investigation of Mao (and the CPC) and did not see how Mao theoretically revised basic M-L organizational principles on the party. Through studying the results of a deeper study KCRWC had done, and further study on our part, we found that Mao theoretically justifies in the party: factions and "two-line struggle" (in practice), instead of the M-L practice of eliminating factions and a single, M-L line in practice; leaving the "bourgeoisie right in the party," instead of purging opportunist elements after ideological struggle. Mao's line and practice on these questions is centrist and revisionist, and on this basis we no longer consider him a great M-L. We have not completely negated Mao Tse-tung's line and practice as we need to study and analyze further the historical experience of the CPC. But one thing is clear: to move forward in M-L party building, all of Mao Tse-tung's erroneous lines and practice must be repudiated in practice which requires an extensive summation of the past. We think this applies to all genuine Marxist-Leninists.

We look forward to the time when we can put an end to our wretched, narrow and amateurish existence as a small circle but recognize we can only do this through uniting on a principled basis with other comrades in the struggle to carry out the central task of U.S. M-L's and advanced workers, the building of a vanguard party of the U.S. proletariat. We have made our share of errors in the past mainly stemming from errors in method of investigation and analysis and method of struggle which reflect bourgeois ideology. We must work to overcome mistakes and shortcomings ideologically, through study, in practice.

We hope that this short history of the WCC provides comrades with some insight into our ideological, political, and organizational development. It's just a beginning, in a long series of beginnings. We look forward to receiving criticisms from other comrades because constructive criticism, and self-criticism ideologically in practice is essential to continue general development along the M-L path, the path of proletarian revolution.

## II. Type of Party

### A. General Principles of the Bolshevik-Type Party

What kind of party is needed for victory of the proletariat? A vanguard party, a professional revolutionary party, the advanced, organized detachment of the working class. The first working class revolution in history, the Russian, Bolshevik revolution, proved this. V.I. Lenin summed up that "absolute centralization and the strictest discipline of the proletariat constitute one of the fundamental conditions for victory over the bourgeoisie."\* In Foundations of Leninism Stalin also shows the experience of the Bolshevik party as the type of party needed by the proletariat to overthrow imperialism and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. The characteristics of such a party are that it is composed of the best elements of the working class, it is armed with revolutionary theory, it is highly disciplined, and is closely linked to the masses. "The party must stand at the head of the working class, it must see farther than the working class, it must lead the proletariat, and not drag at the tail of the spontaneous movement."\*\* The only way the party can lead the working class is if it is the vanguard section of the class and yet is part of the class.

This type of party can only come about if members of the party are professional revolutionaries, guided by revolutionary theory and active in the party's work, if the party is organized under democratic centralism and if the basic organization of the party is factory or workplace nuclei.

The party must be guided by revolutionary theory, "with a knowledge of the laws of the movement, with a knowledge of the laws of revolution."\*\*\* First, the party must be formed on the basis of M-L ideology--dialectical materialism, which is the outlook and method of the party and the basis of the development of all its theory. The party must be formed with an understanding of the objective conditions internationally and nationally, an understanding of the Marxist political economy in general and how it applies to the current epoch of imperialism and socialist revolution (Leninism), and our particular situation internationally and in our particular country. It is formed with an analysis of the classes in our society, their attitude toward the rising class of the proletariat and declining class of the bourgeoisie. And the party is formed with a program (based on this understanding of the objective conditions) which defines the aim of the rising class and

\* Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, Pek. ed. p. 6

\*\* Foundations... Pek ed. p. 103

\*\*\* Foundations... Pek ed. p. 103

its attitude to the interests and strivings of the other classes in society. Then, the party must elaborate correct strategy and tactics flowing from its theory and program. In all its development of theory to guide practice, whether in regards to the development of lines to guide work within the party or among the masses, it must follow and use dialectical materialism. The theory which is needed to guide practice, always arises from problems and questions in practical work.

Professional revolutionaries are trained, skilled revolutionary leaders, comrades developed from among the best, tested mass leaders who devote their whole lives to revolutionary struggle. We want the party to be mainly composed of professional revolutionaries since we need the skill, experience and devotion. But it would be idealist to think that everyone in the party would be a professional revolutionary in the full sense of the word. Those newly admitted to the party will not have had a lot of experience doing communist work and certainly are not as theoretically developed as long standing party members. However, we think that the element of devotion, the desire to give one's life for the cause of the proletariat must be there for admission to the party, and this must have been shown in practice. If the devotion is there, the comrade will develop into a professional revolutionary. Those workers and other elements who wish to engage in struggle but are not this dedicated, should be worked with to raise their level of consciousness before they are brought into the party. In addition to the need to have a core of professional revolutionaries, all party members must be active in its work. We should not find "members" who do not belong to a party organization and take part in its day-to-day activities.

The party must be democratic centralist because only democratic centralism ensures the development of correct lines and that the line of the party and it alone is carried out by members. The proletariat needs unity of will and unity of action, and democratic centralism is the way this is brought about. Democratic centralism means the party's line is decided democratically through study, discussion of all members and through centralized leadership giving guidance to study and discussion. After proper study and discussion has gone down and the decision made through the majority view, all party members must adhere to the line and carry it out. The minority view in the decision submits to the majority. In carrying out the party's line the members sum-up their work and this is centralized in order to sum-up the correctness or incorrectness of the party's line, and make improvements where necessary. Under democratic centralism, a leading body is elected (or under conditions of illegality co-opted) which gives leadership to decision making, sums up decisions, puts forward the centralized line of the party, and also makes decisions based on the basic line of the party in between congresses. The lower bodies of the party must adhere to decisions made by the higher bodies such as the central committee. The lower

bodies must take the initiative and carry out the party's line under the local conditions, regularly summing up the work done in reports.

Unity of will and unity of action, democratic centralism as the way to ensure this, does not mean that there is not struggle in the party. Stalin says that, on the contrary, unity of will and unity of action presupposes the struggle between opposing views, but once there has been a full and open airing of views, and a majority line decided, all must carry out this line.\* If this majority line is incorrect, this will be brought out in practice.

We have already shown how party members will have uneven development. The party must take care to educate and train cadre, and cadre must also have the spirit of self-education and training and learning from positive and negative example. Party leadership strives to raise the level of consciousness and develop the skills of cadre through study and active work in party organizations. Shortcomings and deviations of cadre should be struggled with to overcome. This involves the use of Marxist-Leninist criticism and self-criticism. Here criticism given comrades is constructive--it gets to the ideological root of the error and the comrade is helped to change in practice, after the initial criticism is given the person making the error is worked with and checked up on to make sure he is changing in practice. Self-criticism, to be M-L, means the error is understood ideologically and is changed in practice, the person must actively work to change.

Only comrades who refuse to change in practice after being correctly criticized and given the chance to change, who do not submit to democratic centralism, who violate the basic line of the party, should be considered opportunist or revisionist and purged from the party. The party must purge opportunist and revisionist elements because these elements, if allowed to remain, are the source of a lot of problems in the party; for one, they can be the source of factions in the party.

Factions are members of the party who form an opposition grouping, whom elaborate an independent platform and carry out lines in opposition to the party's. Factions denote the development of two or more centers which undermines the unity of will and unity of action of the proletarian party. Factions are incompatible with the M-L functioning of the party. Factions have arisen in all M-L parties, so it seems that they will arise, but they must not be allowed to exist once they have been discovered. So that the arising of factions is not common, we should try to eliminate the conditions which give rise to them such as allowing opportunist and revisionist elements to remain in the party, or allowing the development of bureaucracy. Factions must dissolve under the pain of expulsion from the party. It must be distinguished

\*J. V. Stalin, Foundations... Pek ed. p. 114

between opportunist and revisionist leaders of factions, who should be expelled, and leaders or members involved in factionalizing who are making deviations but can be changed. These later comrades must be given a chance to put their views forward, and discussion should occur within the party over these views. The way the party should handle the struggle to win the factionalists away from their incorrect lines and practice is to first, require the dissolution of the faction, "to recognize the propaganda of these ideas as being incompatible with membership"\* in the party, while at the same time, providing a way for discussion to occur, "special publications, symposiums, etc. can and should provide space for a most comprehensive exchange of opinion between party members on all the questions herein indicated."\* While active propagating of the factional line in the day-to-day activities of the party, within or outside the party, is a direct violation of the unity of will and unity of action of the party, the properly organized discussion within the party of the question is the way to struggle out deviations having developed into factions.

Besides members being professional revolutionaries, a unity of will and action through democratic centralism, the party must be closely linked with the masses and this is best done through its factory nuclei, or workplace nuclei. The factory nuclei or workplace nuclei (factory, mine, farm, office, military) are the basic organizations of the party. They are where the party's line is carried out day-to-day, where cadre are trained, new members won, propaganda and agitation taken to the broad masses. They are the basic links with the struggles of the masses. Workplace nuclei in general are important because of the day-to-day contact with the masses, the ability to do propaganda and agitation, the ability to lead the struggles in the workplace. Factory nuclei in the large strategic industries are especially important because of the socialized (highly developed and organized) nature of workers there, and the control of the economy possible. Having factory nuclei in the large strategic industry increases our ability to win the vanguard and the broad masses, and develop worker control in strategic areas, prerequisites for the overthrow of capitalism.

The factory nuclei must be illegal, they must function out of the eyes of the bourgeoisie and the state. The illegal activities of the factory nuclei to engage in agitation and propaganda, to seek out active and dedicated workers, build the party membership, aid the workers in their struggles, all without the bourgeoisie and state knowing exactly who the members of the factory nuclei are, is complimented by the legal propaganda and agitation and organizing such as at the factory gates and the party press. Just because the factory nuclei are illegal does not mean that the members do not propagate the party's line. Not

\* "10th. Congress of the RCP(B)" V.I. Lenin CW Vol 32 p. 255

putting forth communist leadership on questions is liberalism rather than factory nuclei work. Members of factory nuclei must find ways to put forward the party's line and communist leadership without exposing themselves as members of the party.

In addition to workplace and factory nuclei, the party has street cells which organize community struggles, housewives, the unorganized, take care of parliamentary struggle, but these must be seen as secondary to the workplace nuclei since parliamentary work should never be the major activity of the party and community work cannot develop as great a number of the masses (the workers of a given factory live in different communities and therefore using the factory as the starting place for propaganda and agitation and organizing influences more people than concentrating on community work) and does not necessarily involve advanced workers as factory nuclei work in large strategic industry does. Other party organizations are fractions in mass organizations and party mass organizations. In the trade unions, the members of fractions are also members of the factory nuclei in the various factories, but the guidance for the work of the fractions in trade unions comes from a higher body than the factory nuclei when the trade unions are national organizations. The party also forms fractions in mass organizations in particular factories such as factory committees. The factory nuclei guide the work of such fractions. Fractions are also formed in sport and cultural societies, etc. In all the party organizations, the task is to raise the consciousness and develop the organization of the working class, to win the vanguard to communism and the broad masses to the side of communism. This can only be done through active work in the struggles of the masses, leading the struggles and developing the struggles to a higher level.

The Russian experience, the Bolshevik party, has been taken as a model for the type of party needed for the proletariat to achieve victory. This is correct because it was the Bolshevik party which was first able to overthrow the autocracy, seize state power and build socialism. The fact that this party later on developed incorrect lines culminating in a revisionist take-over, does not prevent us from basing our party on the correct general characteristics of it. What needs to be looked at yet is the ways in which the Bolshevik party turned from Bolshevism so to prevent us from doing the same. But we do not negate that the Bolshevik party laid down correct principles which other communist parties have attempted to take up or have taken up to a lesser or greater degree. The Comintern's history was a striving to transform the communist parties into Bolshevik parties. As far as other parties' experience, we also learn from the good and bad, but when learning from the good, we are still learning from some application of the Bolshevik party. We need to take the experiences of other parties in order to



learn how the principles of a Bolshevik party were developed and applied in that particular country. There is some confusion around whether the Bolshevik party is our "sole model" or whether we model ourselves after "the best features of all the communist parties whose history we assimilate."\* The latter is eclectic since any features correct enough for us to assimilate into a model are Bolshevik features, and any features not of the Leninist, Bolshevik type party are not something we would model ourselves after, so we are still modeling ourselves after the Bolshevik party. There is also confusion around whether we take in the experience of other parties--it has been held that we only need to study the Bolshevik party, not only for the type of party we need, but also for how to build the party.\*\* We will go into the incorrectness of the latter in the next section, and the former is also incorrect. This is a dogmatic outlook which does not view the need for the particular conditions to be taken into account in each country. Both the view that there is no tested model and that there is no need to apply the model to particular conditions, if followed, would not lead to a vanguard party being formed.

*absurd!*

---

\* Some Comrades, "Response to WCC's Initial Sum-up and Sum-up of Late Responses and to Demarcation-USLC's Counter-Proposal" p. 12  
 \*\* Demarcation- U.S. Leninist Core, "A Joint Counter-Proposal to the Multilateral Conference Proposal on Party Building" March 1979, p. 10

## B. Defeat Mao Tse-tung Thought on the Character of Our Party

"...the Communist Party is the monolithic party of the proletariat, and not the party of a bloc of heterogeneous class elements."\*

The question of the character and internal life of a Marxist-Leninist party is a most serious question. As history has shown, parties not built upon Leninist foundations are wrought with internal strife and enervating discord, and inevitably degenerate into revisionism and Social-Democracy. At the heart of the problem was the development of non-proletarian, revisionist lines and practice. A major contributing factor was the inability of the M-L elements in the parties to mold an organization with a single, M-L line able to fight tooth and nail against bureaucracy, liberalism, and other petty-bourgeois characteristics alien to Marxism-Leninism. Any liberalism towards anti-proletarian deviations will lead to full-blown oppositional lines inside the party, and liberalism of this type is bound to lead to revisionist degeneration. What we must have, as Stalin advises, is a united, monolithic party of the proletariat.

The question of party unity and internal party life has come to the fore with particular force since the criticism of Mao Tse-tung and the CPC by the PLA and comrade Enver Hoxha. We see the criticisms raised by the PLA as being very serious, and it is the duty of all M-L's to study this question and take up the correct line. KCRWC and WCC have done some initial study of the question and we present our initial conclusions below.

To begin, we see that the lines of the PLA under Hoxha, and the CPC under Mao on the struggle between the capitalist and socialist road in the party, and on the development of factions, represent two opposing lines--one Marxist-Leninist, the other metaphysical and revisionist. We hold that the PLA has developed a correct line on opposing the development of factions in the party, and on the need to adhere to a single, Marxist-Leninist line. Mao's line is fundamentally opposed to the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the building of a Bolshevik party. Further, we see that the CPC under Mao was never a truly Marxist-Leninist party, but one constantly racked by factions and without the steel-like unity so necessary to successfully wage struggle against internal and external enemies. We should point out here that we are not now able to pass judgment on Mao's entire line. To do this will require much more study and in-

---

\* Stalin, "Industrialisation and the Right Deviation," Works, Vol. 11, p. 295

vestigation than we've done. But we do know that the leading factor in successfully continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat is the party, and Mao's revisionist line on the party must be reflected in how he saw socialist construction in China. A non-Bolshevik party could not have consistently implemented a M-L line on continuing the revolution. Thus, we disagree with those who say that this was Mao's great contribution. Mao's line on the party also raises serious questions around his line on dialectics and contradictions, as we believe his line on "two-line struggle" reflects metaphysical thinking.

What are the Leninist norms governing the internal growth and development of the party? Why is it necessary that the party have monolithic unity? What is the correct way to deal with factions, deviations, opposing lines, and opportunist elements within the party? We see that answers to these and related questions are essential in order to assess the correctness and incorrectness of the lines of Hoxha and Mao. Based on our understanding of the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, we will summarize our views on these questions.

A communist party, whether it is just now forming and getting on its feet, leading the masses in the armed struggle, or consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, is constantly threatened by class enemies--internal and external. This is because until we achieve communism--a classless society--worldwide, there will be elements hostile to the proletariat and its interests. These elements will fight with all their resolve to smash the communist party completely, or turn it into a harmless body acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Such is the nature of class struggle.

In order to consistently and successfully combat class enemies, our party must have unity of will and action. Stalin said:

"...unity of will and unity of action of all Party members are the necessary conditions without which neither Party unity nor iron discipline in the Party is conceivable."\*

With the party constantly faced with internal and external enemies, any weakening of its iron discipline can prove disastrous. Iron discipline, of course, does not mean that conflicts of opinion will not appear within the party. In fact, unity of will and action presupposes criticism and conflict of opinion. However, once decisions are made, all in the party must act as one under the leadership of the party center.

\* Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, FLP Peking edition, p. 114

In order to properly implement unity of action and will, there can only be single, Marxist-Leninist line allowed to exist inside the party. If more than one line is being put into practice, we do not have the monolithic unity that Stalin teaches is so necessary. We should point out that by a line, we mean the existence of a party center with its own platform which is being put into practice. We acknowledge that struggle occurs inside the party between opposing class viewpoints. As of late there has been much discussion of whether a genuine party has a single M-L line, or whether there is the "struggle between two lines." We see it as being most instructive to examine the line of Lenin and the Bolshevik party on this issue. In particular, we will examine the 10th Party Congress of the Russian Communist Party. At this Congress Lenin advanced the Marxist line on party unity, factions in the party, and the need for a single Marxist line to guide party activity.

Before the Congress, signs of factionalism had become apparent. Certain groups had developed their own platforms and were striving to create separate centers. Lenin was quite clear on the question of factionalism:

"All class-conscious workers must clearly realise that factionalism of any kind is harmful and impermissible, for no matter how members of individual groups may desire to safeguard Party unity, factionalism in practice inevitably leads to the weakening of team-work and to intensified and repeated attempts by the enemies of the governing Party, who have wormed their way into it, to widen the cleavage and to use it for counter-revolutionary purposes."\*

As an organizational measure to deal with factionalism, the Party passed a resolution ordering the immediate dissolution of all factions formed on the basis of oppositional platforms, under penalty of expulsion from the party.

At the same time, the deviations in the views of the oppositional blocs posed ideological and political questions. Lenin did not hesitate to take up these questions for discussion, as disunities will always appear inside the party. What is instructive is the method used by Lenin to ideologically defeat the opposition. It should first be pointed out that the views of the oppositional blocs, in particular the Workers' Opposition, had not crystallized into a separate line being implemented by an oppositional party center. Lenin characterized their

\* Lenin, LCW, Vol. 32, p. 241

views as "deviations," which he regarded as having not yet "crystalized and (not) absolutely and fully defined, but merely as the beginning of a political trend of which the Party must give its appraisal."\* As well, he described the members of the Workers' Opposition as good comrades in the main. As long as they liquidated their faction, discontinued to propagandize their ideas, and implemented the line of the party, they would remain as members of the party. The propagandizing of lines opposed to the party line, however, was "incompatible with membership of the R.C.P."\*\* (our emphasis)

As stated above, Lenin recommended that the views of the Workers' Opposition be discussed since they had been brought to light. But it is critical that we understand how anti-Party views are discussed in a communist party. Lenin advocated carrying out the necessary theoretical discussion. This was to be done in special publications precisely for this purpose. But the oppositional views could not be introduced into the political struggle--the struggle around the party's line and platform, which is already decided. The political struggle concerns questions of implementation of the single line of the party, not questions of which line to implement. Opposition to the party's line can only come from those who are opposed to the party. If these people are allowed to propagandize their line within the party, the party's unity is disrupted, and the necessary iron discipline cannot exist. Lenin is quite clear on this point:

"But a theoretical discussion is one thing, and the Party's political line--a political struggle is another. We are not a debating society. Of course, we are able to publish symposiums and special publication and will continue to do so, but our first duty is to carry on the fight against great odds, and that needs unity. If we are to have proposals, like organizing an 'All-Russian Congress of Producers' (The Workers' Opposition line--ed.), introduced into the political discussion and struggle, we shall be unable to march forward united and in step...Do you not see--you all who are agitators and propagandists in one way or another--the difference between the propaganda of ideas within political parties engaged in struggle, and the exchange of opinion in special publications and symposiums?...We shall publish two and three big collections--that is useful and absolutely necessary. But is this anything like the propaganda of ideas, or a conflict of platforms?"\*\*\* (our emphasis)

\*Lenin, LCW, Vol. 32, p. 249

\*\*Ibid, p. 243

\*\*\*Ibid, p. 252-253, 255

Thus, Lenin is clear that we can not allow the existence of conflicting platforms, or lines, in a Marxist-Leninist party. There can be no two lines, and "two-line struggle" in the party. There can only be a single Marxist-Leninist line, and that line must be adhered to by all party cadre. The only time that there is struggle over a different platform is in the event of disagreement on fundamental issues. Even this, according to Lenin, is "regrettable," but it must be allowed.\*

A final word on factions. As Stalin says, the source of factionalism in the Party is its opportunist elements. These are party cadre who have proven themselves to be in opposition to the interests of the proletariat and the revolution. The only method for dealing with such anti-proletarian elements is expulsion from the party. Stalin's admonishment here is well-known:

"The theory of 'defeating' opportunist elements by ideological struggle within the Party, the theory of 'overcoming' these elements within the confines of a single party, is a rotten and dangerous theory, which threatens to condemn the Party to paralysis and chronic infirmity, threatens to make the Party a prey to opportunism, threatens to leave the proletariat without a revolutionary party, threatens to deprive the proletariat of its main weapon in the fight against imperialism."\*\*

Stalin is clear--if opportunists are allowed to remain in the party, they will eventually organize around an anti-party line and create a separate platform and center. Thus, their activity must be nipped in the bud. The struggle waged against deviations is first of all ideological, when the tendency initially appears. But if party cadre persist in propagandizing an opposition line, expulsion is the unconditional result.

This summarizes the Leninist line on the development of factions and on combatting two lines in the party. We should point out that there are many more aspects of internal party life that must be studied. Questions such as how decisions are arrived at in the party, how bureaucracy develops and how to combat it, "bourgeois right" in the party and how to prevent it, how the party's form and content interrelate and act on each other--all these questions must be given scientific treatment in the future.

\* Lenin, LCW, Vol. 32, p. 261

\*\* Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, FLP Peking edition, p. 116

We would suggest that comrades study closely two articles: "The PLA Has Always Pursued A Single Marxist-Leninist Line" (Albania Today, No. 2, 1977), and "The Class Struggle Within the Party--A Guarantee that the Party Will Always Remain a Revolutionary Party of the Working Class" (Albania Today, No. 1, 1978). We see that these two articles show the Leninist line on eliminating factions and purging opportunist elements. We think that the PLA, unlike the CPC, has followed a basically correct line on these basic questions for some time. The PLA was founded in November of 1941. Barely six months later, opportunists had managed to create a separate platform in opposition to the party center. Enver Hoxha and the party central committee recognized quickly that without sound ideological and organizational unity, and without steel-like discipline, victory over the enemy could not be achieved and the party would be crushed. Thus, a special party conference was called to deal specifically with the elimination of factions and establishment of unity within the party. Consistent with the Leninist line, the conference decided that in order to insure the unity and consolidation of the party, it was necessary to immediately purge the party of all incorrigible factionalists.

The PLA has always been clear on the need for iron unity within the party. The party's 7th Congress recognized its steel-like ideological and organizational unity as one of the main factors enabling the PLA to ensure its leading role within the working class in strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat. As well, the PLA is clear on the anti-Leninist concept of "two-line struggle" within the party. Plasari states:

"A Marxist-Leninist party which is respected as such, says comrade Enver Hoxha, cannot allow the existence of two lines in the party; thus it cannot permit the existence of one or more factions. And if such a thing does occur, the party cannot and must not allow their existence even for a short time."\*

The PLA attributes its continued monolithic unity to its ability to nip factional activity in the bud. Because the party exists amid classes other than the proletariat, alien concepts will undoubtedly arise within the party. These ideas can form the basis of a developing anti-party faction. The PLA, however, recognizing this danger, wages vigorous ideological struggle against all deviations from the party line. If the ideological struggle does not entirely root out

\* "The PLA Has Always Pursued a Single M-L Line," Albania Today, No. 2, 1977, p. 9

the line and set erring comrades on the right path, then organizational methods will be employed. Thus, the PLA has not allowed revisionists to seize power in the party and turn the PLA into a revisionist party.

We also see that the PLA has a correct understanding of how the class struggle is reflected inside the party. First of all, the PLA notes that:

"The struggle between two roads should not be confused with the struggle between two lines. The struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road of development, which includes the struggle between the proletarian ideology and the revisionist ideology is an objective law, whereas the struggle between opposing political lines is a subjective phenomenon, which emerges and develops only in certain conditions, when the party allows factional trends and anti-Marxist lines to be created in its ranks. Such opposing revisionist trends and lines usually manage to crystallize when the party of the working class does not wage a correct, determined and consistent class struggle within its ranks all the time."\* (our emphasis)

This is the Leninist line on the class struggle within the party. It is not inevitable that the crystallization of opposing factions and lines will take place. If fought against correctly, they can be defeated and unity can be preserved. Therefore, the class struggle inside the party can not be characterized as "the struggle between two lines." This is not an objective phenomenon. For the PLA, the internal struggle is for the "defence, implementation and enrichment, in the heat of revolutionary action, of a single Marxist-Leninist line, and has not been a struggle between two lines,"\*\*

Unfortunately, the same can not be said for the Communist Party of China under Mao. Since its inception, and especially since liberation. The CPC has been afflicted by having two or more centers, and has been characterized by what Enver Hoxha calls the "rises and falls of this or that group in the leadership...each of which had its own platform opposed to the others..."\*\*\* There has never been any true M-L unity of thought and action in the CPC. The main reason for such a chaotic party internal life has been the revisionist line of Mao on the bourgeoisie inside the party. Let's briefly examine this line by Mao and what it has meant in practice.

\* "The Class Struggle Within the Party," Albania Today, No. 1, '78, p.13

\*\* Ibid, p. 13

\*\*\* Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, World View Pub., p. 390



At the basis of the CPC's problem has been Mao's line on the co-existence of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie--each with its own line--inside the same communist party. Mao has espoused such anti-Leninist gems as:

"Outside any party there are other parties, inside it, there are groupings; this has always been so." "A grouping is one wing of a class."\*

and also:

"You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party --Those in power taking the capitalist road."\*\*

Mao's line is that class struggle is reflected within a communist party by the struggle between two lines, and that this is objective law. Yet when we examine the "two-line struggles" that have occurred within the CPC, it is clear that this struggle is not limited to the theoretical struggle as Lenin advised. What has happened consistently in the CPC has been the existence of separate centers, or "independent kingdoms," each in competition with the others, each implementing its own political line. This has always been the case. With this type of internal division, how can there be unity of action and unity of will? Rather than being the monolithic party of the proletariat, the CPC has been the party of blocs of various class elements.

With Mao's line, the bourgeoisie will remain inside the party and continue to implement its line. But as the Albanian comrades point out, this is a subjective phenomenon. Given a correct attitude towards party unity and the necessity to eliminate opposing lines, it is not inevitable that bourgeois lines will be able to take root, build a base in the party, and implement lines in opposition to the party's line. By this time, it is usually too late to speak of waging "two-line struggle." The party is already paralyzed by its divisiveness.

It is clear to us that Mao's "dialectics" advocates two lines in the party, and that this is something independent of human's will. When speaking of the Cultural Revolution he said:

"The present great cultural revolution is only the first; there will inevitably be many more in the future. The issue of who

\* "Capitalist Roaders Are the Bourgeoisie Inside the Party," Peking Review, #25, 1976, p. 10

\*\* Ibid, p. 7

will win in the revolution can only be settled over a long historical period. If things are not properly handled, it is possible for a capitalist restoration to take place at any time. It should not be thought by any Party member or any one of the people in our country that everything will be all right after one or two great cultural revolutions or even three or four. We must be very much on the alert and never lose vigilance."\*

Let's examine what Mao is saying here. The cultural revolution was carried out to root out all the capitalist-roaders in power. There is no question that rightists had entrenched themselves in leadership in the party and state, implemented lines in opposition to Mao's, and wielded considerable power. The reason for this is that Mao never had a correct line on liquidating factions, and saw the emergence of the rights to power as something unavoidable. But with the Cultural Revolution does he see the elimination of the right line? Does he see the struggle resulting in strengthening the party unity? No. In fact, he predicts that incorrect lines and capitalist-roaders will be able to usurp power time and time again. Thus, the need for several cultural revolutions. According to Mao, it is not possible to nip factional activity in the bud. It is not possible to have a party with a single platform, which Lenin advocated. With this line, it is no wonder that CPC history is full of "major line struggles" where various and sundry opportunists have been able to seize significant portions of party and state power.

The history of the CPC is a valuable teacher, by negative example, of the danger of liberalism within the party. Mao has virtually ignored Stalin's great teaching on the danger of "'defeating' opportunist elements by ideological struggle within the Party," and thus such notorious capitalist-roaders as Liu Shao-chi, Chou En-lai, Yeh Chien-ying, and Teng Hsiao-ping were allowed to subvert the party's line for several years. In fact, the majority of the capitalist-roaders were never removed from the party.

As we said earlier, Mao's handling of the bourgeoisie in the CPC raises questions about his whole concept of dialectics, since his idea of the inevitability of "two-line struggle" is supposedly "dialectical." What we see in Mao's line is not a progressive dialectical development, but a cyclical phenomenon. There is not the "abolition of the old and the emergence of the new" that Lenin speaks of.

\* Peking Review, No. 22, '67, p. 38

Enver Hoxha says:

"...in essence Mao Tse-tung negates the internal contradictions inherent in things and phenomena and treats development as simple repetition, as a chain of unchangeable states in which the same opposites and the same relationship between them are observed. The mutual transformation of the opposites into each other, understood as a mere exchange of places and not as a resolution of the contradiction and a qualitative change of the very phenomenon which comprises these opposites, is used by Mao Tse-tung as a formal pattern to which everything is subject."\*

Thus, we get from Mao the need for several cultural revolutions. There is not the progressive development into a monolithic party, free of independent factions and opposing lines. *despite?*

The best way to assess Mao's line on the party is to see what politically it led to. Lenin once said:

"The experience of all revolutions in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries shows most clearly and convincingly that the only possible result of these vacillations--if the unity, strength and influence of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat is weakened in the slightest degree--will be the restoration of the power and property of the capitalists and landowners."\*\* (our emphasis)

Mao's line led to the weakening of the unity and strength of the CPC. It was Mao's line on rehabilitating such unrepentant capitalist-road-ers as Teng, and the refusal of the CPC to purge him from the party, that led to him being able to continually, over a period of several years, usurp power and leadership in the state and party. Liu Shao-chi, who had advanced the line of the dying out of the class struggle at the 8th Party Congress, held high posts in the party several years after he had proven himself to be a revisionist. Because of this type of liberalism, the right line grew and developed inside the CPC. In spite of all claims to the contrary, the right line dominated more often than not in the CPC. As an example, of the 21 members of the Political Bureau of the C.C. at the 10th Party Congress, at least 14 were confirmed capitalist-road-ers. With this type of leadership, it is little wonder that the line of the Congress, which was heavily influenced by Mao, was never implemented. Without purging the party of

\* Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, WVP, p. 41<sup>f</sup>

\*\* Lenin, LCW, Vol. 32, p. 248

capitalist-roaders and defeating their influence, it was inevitable that the rightists would eventually assume complete control of the party and state. This complete take-over by the capitalist-roaders was a direct result of Mao's line on "two-line struggle" and the "bourgeoisie right in the party."

We've seen where some comrades have actually realized the dominance of the capitalist-roaders in the CPC, and Mao's inability to defeat them. But rather than drawing the correct conclusions, they attribute Mao's problems to certain "conditions" such as the complexity of the nature of Chinese political life, the number of cadre in the party, the difficulty in carrying out a purge, he was in the minority, and other such phenomenon. By taking this line of reasoning, comrades are elevating conditions to be the leading factor, rather than line. This is not to say that we shouldn't attempt to understand certain important conditions that existed in China. We are thinking here of the struggle for socialism in a backward country and the party having gone through a two-stage revolution. First, the existence of petty production engenders capitalist elements, capitalist ideas, and petty production is rampant in an underdeveloped country like China. Then, when going through the two-stage revolution, when having a long first-stage of national liberation and anti-fuedal wars, the party, as the advanced fighter for deomcracy and liberation, is bound to pick up bourgeois and petty bourgeois elements who really only want to go as far as the frist stage. When the second stage is entered they try to pull the party back through various conscious or unconscious means. It is not always easy to discover these people or always know immediately whether they are capable of changing and developing proletarian attitudes and practice. But these and other difficulties cannot be used to justify factions and allowing opportunist elements to remain in the party once the evidence is clear. No amount of conditions should cause genuine Marxist-Leninists to abandon Marxist-Leninist principles. If Mao felt that the CPC had become dominated by the right, which it was, and his struggle to defeat them was not bearing fruit, which is wasn't, then it was his responsibility to openly advocate a split--to group around him the staunch Marxist-Leninists in an organization with a single Marxist-Leninist line. Under the circumstances this may have been the best way to carry out the struggle against the right. But instead, Mao opted to "defeat the opportunists from within," to play games with factions, to relish in the "two-line struggle," and eventually to head the party in the direction of total degeneration.

The degeneration of the CPC, comrades, is a major legacy of "Mao Tse-tung Thought." We can not close our eyes to this fact. On this question so far in the movement we have seen several attempts to rationalize and justify Mao's line and practice on the party. This won't do. This question must be struggled out scientifically, for it has major implications for the party we are trying to build. We urge comrades to cast aside all subjectivity and adopt a scientific attitude and method. Such an approach is essential in order to rectify deviations and errors in our circles, to correctly wage the class struggle to build the vanguard party of the U.S. proletariat.

C. Deviations from Developing the Bolshevik-Type Party in Our Movement

On all of the aspects of the type of party needed, there have been deviations in our movement. First, we want to combat the view that the things we have talked about are not applicable now, because we don't have a party. With this line, we never develop a party because we never develop within the embryo of the party the requisites for its existence. On the other hand, we also wish to combat the line that we can strongly develop these things in our current conditions. With this line, we doom ourselves to failure, because it is impossible to have such a degree of development at this time. In talking about the development of the iron discipline in the party, Lenin says:

"The first questions to arise are: how is the discipline of the proletariat's revolutionary party maintained? How is it tested? How is it reinforced? First, by the class-consciousness of the proletarian vanguard and by its devotion to the revolution, by its tenacity, self-sacrifice and heroism. Second, by its ability to link up, maintain the closest contact, and--if you wish--merge, in certain measure, with the broadest masses of the working people--primarily with the proletariat, but also with the non-proletarian masses of working people. Third, by the correctness of the political leadership exercised by this vanguard, by the correctness of its political strategy and tactics, provided the broad masses have seen, from their own experience, that they are correct. Without these conditions, all attempts to establish discipline inevitably fall flat and end up in phrase-mongering and clowning. On the other hand, these conditions cannot emerge at once. They are created only by prolonged effort and hard-won experience. Their creation is facilitated by a correct revolutionary theory, which, in its turn, is not a dogma, but assumes final shape only in close connection with the practical activity of a truly mass and truly revolutionary movement." ("Left Wing" Communism, Pek ed. p. 6-7; the above passage from Selected Works, Vol. 3, p. 352)

The correct line is that we need to be developing the character of the future party now, to whatever degree we can, because without this development, the party will not come into being, and with this development, we will move forward party building. We are specifically talking about the need to develop revolutionary theory, to professionalize our ranks, develop professional revolutionaries, develop democratic centralist norms in our organizations, develop centralized leadership in the movement overall, improve our cadre development, purge our ranks of opportunists and revisionists, develop factory nuclei. We

are talking about how this should be a protracted and careful development, identifying right and "left" errors we were making in the past and trying not to make them in the future.

In combatting the right tendency (the dominant one in our movement) to negate the ability and need to develop these characteristics to a degree, we want to bring out misconceptions and deviations which may exist. One misconception in the area of the development of revolutionary theory is that a political economy is not needed in the U.S. This view sees the class analysis as the only analysis needed of the objective conditions. But a class analysis is impossible without an understanding of the motion of the economy. For example, Lenin did not understand the split in the working class until he understood imperialism and the effects of the superprofits on the working class. Here in the U.S., we cannot understand the split in the working class until we have a grasp of the development of U.S. imperialism in particular. The question of the petty bourgeoisie and the stratum and sectors within it, for example, farmers, cannot be understood without an understanding of the motion of the U.S. economy in particular. Thus we cannot bypass a political economy and to do so would be to develop programs of the CP (M-L), RCP, CPUSA, etc. type.

A misconception may be that professional revolutionaries don't hold a job. Professional revolutionaries may or may not work, depending on what the party (in our case circle) needs at the time. The whole point is that the professional revolutionary is willing to go where the Party needs him or her to go and is able to carry out whatever tasks the Party needs carrying out. The main thing is the devotion, and with further study and training, the skill and knowledge. However, comrades are needed who don't work at a job for periods of time. If we truly hold that theory is principal in this period, the only way to adhere to this in practice is to make it possible to do more theoretical work. This cannot be done properly when all members of an organization work. Extensive theoretical work such as a political economy, class analysis, requires a lot of time, it requires large blocks of time, not just bits and pieces "after work," it requires someone who is not always exhausted from trying to do practical factory work and keep up theoretically. Some comrades, in all organizations should not work in order to devote themselves to the extensive theoretical work. Of course all members of the organization should keep up theoretically, should study and develop theory, but the extensive theoretical work requires more than comrades catching time here and there to study the question, it requires comrades fulltime. Also, comrades are needed to do propaganda, agitation and organizing fulltime (to write and distribute literature, speak, lead study groups, travel, etc.) Currently, in the absence of factory nuclei, we have the comrades who are working do

these things, but as we establish illegal factory nuclei, we need to develop also the legal apparatus of literature distribution, speaking, etc., and we need fulltime people to do this. An aspect of professionalizing our ranks is to make available comrades who do not hold jobs. If we cannot begin to do this now, how will we ever finance a whole central committee? Transforming our organizations into ones with dedicated, skilled members, with members who are free to take up the extensive theoretical work as well as members who are skilled at propagandizing and agitating will really be a step forward in building a vanguard party. Our movement needs to move forward on this. Can anyone deny this? If not, then let's move forward on it, have more discussions on the development of professional revolutionaries, sum-up experience, find ways to develop ourselves into professional revolutionaries!

Another misconception may be that developing democratic centralism is wrong for three reasons: democratic centralism in the small circles leads to sectarianism, democratic centralism in the small circles means higher and lower bodies, developing centralized leadership in the movement means formal democratic centralism. Developing democratic centralism in the small circles is not the source of sectarianism. First, the existence of the separate diffused circles and the petty bourgeois composition of them is the objective basis for sectarianism. Groups bow to the separate existence and their petty bourgeois careerism and individualism. Democratic centralism is an antipode to sectarianism. Democratic centralism teaches us how to have principled organization, it fights individualism and careerism which produce both ultra-democracy and bureaucracy, and teaches the need for unity into a M-L party. Democratic centralism cannot be blamed for the sectarianism. In fact, a group like Some Comrades, openly not organized on a democratic centralist basis, exhibits sectarianism, as does Demarcation (much sectarianism) whom Red Dawn Committee has criticized as ultra-democratic and not wanting to submit to democratic centralism. The lack of democratic centralism in groups promotes the individualist and careerist petty bourgeois ideology and practice which is the subjective source of sectarianism. Lack of democratic centralism also promotes another bad deviation in the movement of equalitarianism. Both sectarianism and equalitarianism are two sides of the coin of small circle spirit. While sectarianism does not lead to principled unity through refusal to engage in principled struggle, equalitarianism also does not lead to principled unity through uniting on an unprincipled basis, through not struggling for the correct line because all lines are "equal." Democratic centralism combats equalitarianism because it teaches that while everyone has an equal right to put views forward, not all the views can be correct, not all views are "equal" in respect of correctness, and once the majority decision is made on something, the minority view is not "equal" with the majority, adherers of the minority view cannot continue to propagate it, but must put the majority view into practice.



and may criticize the majority view if it proves to be wrong in practice. Democratic centralism also teaches there is not an equality of organizations--that there are different levels of development, that some organizations, by being able to sum-up the views of other organizations, by having an advanced understanding of the situation, by putting forward guiding lines, become the leadership.

So if democratic centralism in the organizations does not lead to sectarianism (or equalitarianism) but rather combats it, then what of the view that our organizations are too small for higher and lower bodies? Democratic centralism does not necessarily mean higher and lower bodies. Democratic centralism has many forms, one of which is higher and lower bodies. Another form democratic centralism takes is that of members of an organization with a political secretary to lead and coordinate the activities (see Mao, "Methods of Work of Party Committees"). Are our organizations too small for a political secretary to centralize things?

The last misconception we have seen or heard concerning democratic centralism is that developing centralized leadership in the movement means formal democratic centralism. Was Iskra formal democratic centralism? Did groups have to adhere to the lines of Iskra and have to carry out instructions that the Iskra group gave them? Of course not. And yet Iskra developed centralized leadership. Since groups had not yet joined together formally into the Party, the democratic centralism of Iskra could only be informal. The difference is: when the party is formed, members voluntarily join and voluntarily agree to democratic centralism because they agree with the program and method of the party, and in doing this they agree to abide by majority decisions and the decisions of the higher body; when groups join in a plan to centralize the movement, they also do so voluntarily, but there is not binding organization on them. Centralized leadership in the absence of formal democratic centralism means leadership by reason of correct line and practice, and developing centralized leadership means developing the centralization of M-L line through the participation of groups in the movement and the centralization of such participation.

Also, there are deviations around unity of will and action in terms of how we deal with those who commit errors and how we deal with opportunism within our organizations. Here the "left" errors of bureaucratic purging of comrades who should be struggled with more, of not setting up ways for comrades to put their views forward, stifling discussion of views, along with the right errors of allowing opportunist elements to remain in the organization, liberalism, allowing different lines to exist without one being put into practice by all, are ingrained in our movement, and as far as our understanding of the movement goes, the right errors being dominant. The right errors of

allowing opportunists to remain in our organizations, liberalism, allowing the existence of two lines being carried out, are all interconnected with the movement's following of Mao Tse-tung Thought on the inner life of the party. Therefore this tendency of our movement must be understood ideologically and historically. We must look into how our petty bourgeois ideology gravitated toward Mao's lines on the party. We must also strive to correct these errors in practice. In combatting both the right and "left" we need to learn when someone is opportunist and get rid of him and when the person isn't and remold him. This is hard to do but needs to be learned. We need to provide forms for cadre development, inner group discussion, but we also need to learn how to enforce discipline, insure the carrying out of a single line.

We see very little discussion of factory nuclei in the movement, and this initially tells us that groups do not overall organize themselves on such a basis. Our movement has similar problems as the Third International had in developing factory nuclei. As the Third International developed out of the Second International which had as its work predominately parliamentary work and organized this along community lines, so our movement developed out of the national liberation and anti-war work which was organized mainly along community lines (this is not to negate the Detroit experience--DRUM, etc.). We have had and will have the same difficulty the Third International had in transforming our organizations onto the factory nuclei basis, and we should realize this and make increased efforts now to effect the transformation.

An important thing about setting up factory nuclei is that they be factory nuclei in content and not just in form. It is not enough to put three comrades together in a factory, and call that a factory nucleus. These comrades must be actively carrying out propaganda and agitation and organizing, must be carrying out the line of the organization and summing it up, regular meetings of the nucleus must be held. The work of the factory nucleus needs to move forward the consciousness and organization of the proletariat and not tail the spontaneous struggles.

We have not yet heard of anyone holding this, but could it be said that our movement is not yet ready for factory nuclei? That groups setting up factory nuclei would further the sectarianism in the movement? If factory nuclei are the basic organization of the party and the party will be welded from the small circles which escape the opportunism and revisionism of other parties and groups around them, then the small circles setting up factory nuclei can only help create the basis for the party. The establishment of factory nuclei will draw

advanced workers into our organizations, will be a common organizational form we all use (this facilitates any joint work done between groups), the factory nuclei will be better able to sum-up each organization's line from the practical application, thus improving our lines and helping develop the M-L line on questions. We definitely need to develop factory nuclei!

*[The following text is extremely faint and largely illegible due to fading and bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. It appears to be a continuation of the discussion on organizational structure and factory nuclei.]*

## III. How to Build the Party

## A. Party Building is a Task Which Must Be Conscious, Planned

"Marxism teaches--and this tenet has not only been formally endorsed by the whole of the Communist International in the decisions of the Second (1920) Congress of the Comintern on the role of the political party of the proletariat, but has also been confirmed in practice by our revolution--that only the political party of the working class, i.e. the Communist Party, is capable of uniting, training and organising a vanguard of the proletariat and of the whole mass of the working people that alone will be capable of withstanding the inevitable petty-bourgeois vacillations of this mass and the inevitable traditions and relapses of narrow craft unionism or craft prejudices among the proletariat, and of guiding all the united activities of the whole of the proletariat, i.e. of leading it politically, and through it, the whole mass of the working people. Without this the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible." ("10th Congress of the RCP(B)," V. I. Lenin, LCW, Vol. 32, p. 246)

In the U.S. the proletariat is still without such a vanguard party. There are many parties calling themselves such--Communist Party USA, Progressive Labor Party, Communist Labor Party, Revolutionary Communist Party USA, Communist Party(M-L), Communist Party USA(M-L)--but none of these are vanguard proletarian parties, they all basically tail the spontaneous working-class movement and most are completely revisionist.<sup>?</sup> With the developing imperialist crisis world wide, heightening inter-imperialist contradictions and the possibility of imperialist war, the formation of a vanguard party becomes both more of a possibility and necessity. The working-class movement, which had been in an ebb period since World War II until recently, had not brought forth a vanguard party. Communists did not win advanced workers, did not really begin to fuse with the working-class movement, but remained separate or tailed behind the working-class movement. Now that the working-class movement is on the rise, advanced workers will be coming to the fore, communists will be winning advanced workers and the communist organizations will become linked with the proletariat and will be able to form a truly vanguard party. The proletariat needs its vanguard party so that its spontaneous movement is transformed into conscious class struggle. The formation of the party, the fusion of the communists and advanced workers into an organized conscious party, is the biggest step in fusing communism with the working-class movement, in developing the consciousness and organization of the working class. The fusion of communism with the working-class movement is also developed through winning the

majority of the working class to the side of the vanguard (or the party). At a time which the vanguard (the party) is not consolidated, this is a secondary task of communists, as is the task of winning the broad masses in general. There is a special urgency to the need for a vanguard party in the U.S. due to the inter-imperialist contradictions, war preparations, the increasing removal of democratic rights.

But the fact that we can see that the ability and need to form the party is developing and intensifying, this is not enough. It is not our task merely to interpret the world, but to change it. That is why, when recognizing the ability and need to build the party, we say party building is a task. In fact, our movement has long held theoretically that party building is our central task, meaning the one we should focus or concentrate on. A task is something we carry out, we work at. Therefore, we realize that party building is not spontaneous, the party does not develop spontaneously, but is worked at through hard effort, and that if it is the central thing, we concentrate our effort on it. Furthermore, it is realized that since party building is a practical task which we must carry out, we must develop revolutionary theory to guide our practice. Theory on party building is recognized as important, and it follows that if party building is our central task, then party building theory must be the theory we concentrate on developing. All this is recognized by some groups and somewhat recognized by others, but a few groups do not really even recognize these basic facts. While talking about party building they engage in everything else but--the mass movement, theoretical work *guess!* not very related to party building, and any kind of discussion of how *who!* to build the party is opposed and boycotted, peripheral issues raised keeps discussion off important problems of party building. This is the kind of practice of some groups on party building. The lines that are beginning to come to the fore to support such practice are that (implicitly) party building is simple, it is not composed of many interconnected tasks, it is not complicated, and that therefore we do not need theory to guide party building or the theory has already been developed. Could party building somehow be a task we carry out which is simple, not complicated, theory has already been developed or doesn't need to be developed, and we just go along as we have been and the party will be developed?

Building a vanguard party is definitely not simple. There are many things which need to happen in order for such a party to be built. The party needs a revolutionary theory and program. We are a long way from this since we do not yet have a political economy and class analysis, the basis of the program, and there are many complicated programmatic questions. The party needs to be the result of fusing communism

with the advanced workers, we need advanced workers in our organizations. We have not gone far here either. The separate circles must be united. The vanguard party cannot be formed out of one or two local organizations, we must have party organizations in all the major industrial cities. The leadership of the party must be developed, the core must be welded, and this is not really being developed either. In addition, all these "needs," are interconnected--without a program it is hard to lead working-class struggles, our links with advanced workers is not promoted, but without advanced workers in our organizations, we tend toward opportunist programs. And yet some groups refuse to discuss these things and only talk about, for example, developing the program and drawing lines of demarcation, as if this was all there was to building a vanguard party of the proletariat. How this simple view of party building will result in meeting all the needs of the development of the party, how developing the program and drawing lines of demarcation alone will build the party, we don't know. This negation of tasks of party building, this view of the simplicity and self-evident nature of party building, boils down to the view that party building is largely spontaneous.

We do know that with the view that party building is largely spontaneous, the view that we don't need theory or we have all the theory we need, follows. Some groups lately have questioned the need for party building theory. Even if party building were a simple task, which it is not, we cannot deny the need for theory to guide our practice of party building. Even if party building were only developing the program and drawing lines of demarcation, which it is much more, we would have to have theory on how to do this. We can begin to see that those who hold to the simplicity of party building, to its being largely spontaneous, when they deny even the need for theory to guide their own practice in party building, they deny any planned, conscious character to party building whatsoever. This out-and-out denial of a need for party building theory is the clearest indication of the denial of the planned character to party building. It is plain bowing to spontaneity to hold that we can build the party without theory.

Then there are those who do not deny the need for party building theory outright, but state that party building theory has already been developed. Since this is not the case, they too deny theory and bow to spontaneity. It is true that many bankrupt theories on party building have been developed--the "Wing" theory, the premises theory of WVO, the five pragmatic steps theory of MLOC for example--but where is our M-L theory? What is needed for an M-L theory on party building is a correct analysis of the development of party building in this country (and not just the experience of our small group, but that of the move-

ment as a whole), where we have come from, where we are at, where we need to go, and how do we get there. We use the experience of other parties to learn how to evaluate our movement, what things we can do to move party building forward given where we are at and need to go. When we have M-L theory on party building we will understand the character of the party, the motion of the working class and communist movements, what the tasks are to fuse the two movements, what our party building tasks are as the principal way to fuse the two movements, how to carry out our party building tasks, what the key strategic task is and how to carry it out, plus where we are at in carrying out our tasks.

The only way to know how to do something is to study the experience of others and apply it to our own experience. In studying the experience of others we look at both the positive and negative experience, drawing out principles and studying the applications of principles in the different countries so to apply the principles to our own conditions. We have already discussed how the Bolshevik party is the model for the type of party we are trying to build. The experiences of the Bolsheviks in building the party are also the main guidelines for us to follow in building ours. We study especially the Bolshevik party and Lenin because of the consistency of the M-L lines under Lenin which led to the development of the Bolshevik party, and also because the particularities of its development were that they were under more advanced capitalism than the PLA or CPC, thus closer to our particularities. Also, studying the experience of the PLA in building their party is helpful in continuing to draw out principles involved and in seeing the different conditions and the particularities of its development. The CPC also should be studied mainly in order to learn from negative example because of the deviations away from the Bolshevik type party. The same with our CPUSA. They party had some M-L motion, but mainly opportunist and revisionist motion, so we would mainly learn from negative example. But the CPUSA is a very important party to study since it was built in our own country with conditions most like our own today than any of the other parties. Of all these parties, it is necessary to understand the entire history in order to learn, for example, the character of the party, how to struggle against revisionism or centrism, how to deal with inner party life, how to lead the masses, etc., but we are most concerned with and concentrate on how these are interconnected with party building and on learning how to build the party; through carrying out what tasks, engaging in what struggles, did these parties develop? What errors were made that we don't want to make over again, how did the leaders of these parties sum-up their early party building experience? (We don't know of any summation of the early party building experience of the CPC.) The similarities in the way these

parties developed, the general motion and principles should be drawn out, and dissimilarities and particularities noted, along with the general conditions which existed for the similarities and principles, and the particular conditions which existed for the particularities and dissimilarities. This then, is applied to our conditions in the U.S., the general experience is used directly as a guide and the particularities are analyzed as to their validity for, or partial application to, our conditions. In analyzing our own conditions, we must study the many experiences and views, compare these to our own experience and view, look historically at the motion, drawing out the reality of the conditions. This is the dialectical materialist development of party building.

Two types of errors can be made in the development of knowledge. One is to overemphasize one's own conditions and experience and not take in the experience of others, thus not broadening our narrow understanding of things and not forming complete or rational knowledge--the empiricist error. In the development of knowledge on how to build the party this is manifest in not taking into account the experience of the other parties and groups within our own movement. This has been the main deviation in the movement. A careful study of the experience of other parties and groups is rarely done when lines are developed. The other error which also keeps us from developing rational knowledge is mechanically transporting another experience to ours, using the experience of others only, not applying the experience of others to our own concrete situation--the dogmatist error. We have seen this lately with this line that party building theory "has already been developed, applied and tested, and it is for those of us to either uphold and apply, or to discard and oppose,"\* the theory being What is to be done? and One Step Forward, Two Steps Back. WCC has made empiricist errors and continues to make them to some degree. Our biggest problem is in not looking at other groups' experience within our own movement. We have also had a hard time getting away from a dogmatic view of party building and really getting down to a study of our conditions. KCRWC has mainly made empiricist errors in our history, both in not studying the experience of the other parties and in not studying the experience of other groups in the movement.

Do groups know of a dialectical materialist development of theory on party building? KCRWC and WCC had tried to do such an analysis a few years ago and did not do too well at it. We still had too much metaphysical method in our work to really come up with a dialectical materialist analysis of party building, although our analysis did help us understand some of the history of the movement and made us realize

\* Demarcation-U.S. Leninist Core, "A Joint Counter-Proposal to the Multilateral Conference Proposal on Party Building" March 1979 p. 10



how little we really did now, and how empiricist and dogmatist we had been in our analysis. We know of no other attempt to examine how to build the party to the extent we show above.

The fact that no fully developed M-L theory on party building exists does not mean that groups do not follow a party building theory. But following a party building theory does not ensure that it is M-L, that it is not mainly incorrect or only partially incorrect. Spontaneously we develop petty bourgeois or bourgeois lines since these ideologies are dominant in society and especially in the class many M-L's come from--the petty bourgeoisie. It takes extreme care and effort to overcome petty bourgeois and bourgeois ideology and develop proletarian lines on questions. This is why careful dialectical materialist analysis is needed on all questions in order to have a proletarian line. Incorrect theory can be developed by agreeing for the need for M-L theory but in practice not taking it up, thus we will follow a bourgeois or petty bourgeois theory since none of us spontaneously emit proletarian lines. We can also develop incorrect lines by actually trying to develop theory on party building, but not being careful and scientific enough, but not using dialectical materialism to develop it, thus bowing to the bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideology dominant in society.

All this does not mean that groups who are trying to develop theory on building the party are necessarily bowing to spontaneity, but that our theory is not complete and will have aspects of incorrectness and spontaneity in it unless the appropriate analysis is done. Just because we have not done a complete analysis doesn't mean that we don't have some idea of the actual reality and the M-L solution. The important thing here is recognizing the limits of our knowledge, seeing the degree to which we are still spontaneous, and striving to change this. Therefore, the analysis we put forward below is limited and we admit this and continue to put forward the need for more study on party building, for the development of M-L theory to guide party building practice, for a corresponding plan to move forward party building.

## B. Initial Study and Analysis of Party Building in the U.S.

In developing an understanding of a process one uses certain philosophical principles, whether conscious or unconscious. In order to prevent slipping into idealism and metaphysics through force of habit, we need to consciously use dialectical materialism in studying party building.

Proletarian revolution, party building, tasks of party building are all complex processes which contain contradictions. In order to understand these processes we must identify the particular contradictions, the interconnections between the contradictions, and the principal contradiction in each process. Plus, in the contradictions, the principal aspect of the contradiction plays the leading role in the development of the contradiction. The resolving of contradictions, especially the principal one, through transforming the principal aspect of the contradiction to the secondary one, moves a process forward. In proletarian revolution, there are many contradictions of the objective and subjective conditions, but the one which determines the development of proletarian revolution, the principal contradiction at this time, is the contradiction between the presence and absence of the vanguard party. The resolving of the contradiction through transforming the principal aspect of the lack of a party to the secondary aspect, and the presence of the party to the principal aspect, will further proletarian revolution. In our examination of the development of the party, we must look at the contradictions in building the party and find the principal one, and then work to resolve the contradictions, especially the principal contradiction. The tasks of party building, which we will bring out in a bit, are tasks related to these contradictions. Therefore, these tasks must be identified and the principal task, or key strategic task must be found, and carried out. Since the contradictions and tasks in party building (such as the contradiction between the disunity and unity of M-L's and the task of uniting M-L's) are complex processes themselves, they too, contain contradictions and a principal contradiction, tasks and a key task to carry out. This involves the tactical ways the party is built. The key tactical task was called the key link by Lenin and Stalin.\* In our discussion that follows, in order to provide more clarity on our examination of party building, we refer to the key strategic task as such, and the key tactical task as the key link. While it is through understanding the contradictions, principal contradictions in party building, the strategic tasks and key

\* V. I. Lenin, What is to be done?, Chapter V, Peking edition, p. 201, "Where to Begin?", LCW, Vol. 5, p. 20; J. V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, Peking edition, p. 95-96.

strategic task, that the key link is identified, it is through grasping the key link and implementing it that the way is prepared for strategic success, the resolving of contradictions, and the process is moved forward. Stalin explains the key link as:

"To locate at any given moment the particular link in the chain of processes which, if grasped, will enable us to keep hold of the whole chain and to prepare the conditions for achieving strategic success...The point here is to single out from all the tasks confronting the Party the particular immediate task, the fulfillment of which constitutes the central point, and the accomplishment of which ensures the successful fulfillment of the other immediate tasks." (Foundations... Pek ed. p. 95)

It is with this dialectical materialist method of dissecting party building that we will eventually develop an understanding of how to move party building forward. But there are other guides to help us. The experience of other parties--the universality and particularity of such experience--should help us. The universality of parties' experience gives us the principles which we can directly apply to our movement, whereas the particularities are applied to whatever extent they correspond to our own particularities.

In our study of the experiences of other parties we have drawn out certain principles and guidelines to help us develop a line on party building. First, it is clear that in the PLA and Bolshevik party building experiences (there is nothing written on the CPC and we have not studied the CPUSA), the development of the understanding of what needed to be done to move party building forward (theory) and corresponding plan of action came to the fore before the party could actually be formed and consolidated. Second, this theory and plan was carried out in the movement before the party could be formed and consolidated. The History of the PLA brings out how some of the communists in Albania such as Ali Kelmendi, and the Comintern were able to sum-up the situation in Albania and put forward guiding lines, but that the lines were not taken up for a long time in practice. The separate circles in Albania were shut up, did not engage in work to fuse with advanced workers and the toiling masses and were sectarian towards each other and had a wait and see attitude toward revolution. Kelmendi and the Comintern held that the circles needed to base themselves in the masses and unite into a party, and an important way to do this was to set up an organizational centre. In Albania, the lines of how to move forward and build the party were really taken up when Albania was invaded by Italian fascist troops. In the Bolshevik Experience, the first attempt to unite into a party failed when the autocracy crushed the org-

anizational unity of the Social-Democrats. This and other things such as the rise of economism brought about the political and even ideological degeneration to the Social-Democrats. Only when Lenin summed up the situation and put forward what needed to be done from "Our Program," "Our Immediate Task," "An Urgent Question," to "Where to Begin?" when a corresponding plan was initially elaborated, and culminating in What is to be done?, where the state of the movement, problems, solutions and plan were laid out in particular, was the Russian Social-Democratic movement able to actually form the party. Without Lenin's "theory" on party building and his "plan" for creating the conditions for the party, without his determined struggle to unite the Social-Democrats around his line and his line being carried out by more and more Social-Democrats, the Second Congress would not have occurred in 1903. Of course, in both these party building experiences, new problems arose which necessitated new theory and new plans, but we brought this particularity out because the period we discuss here in both these experiences was a major one to go through in order to form the party which is what we are trying to do.

How was the understanding of the movement, the theory on what needed to be done and a corresponding plan developed? The History of the PLA does not provide as clear an answer to this question as the History of the CPSU(B) and Lenin's writings do. Prominent in the History of the CPSU(B) and in Lenin's writings, 1894-1903, are an analysis of the motion of the Social-Democratic and working-class movement. First, the state of the working-class and communist movement and the affects they have on each other and on fusion between the two are brought out, and correspondingly what the task of communists are to effect fusion are brought out. The rise of the working-class movement brings to the fore advanced workers, Lenin says. As long as the communist movement remained separate from the working-class movement the degree of fusion was low, but when communists went to the working class, since advanced workers were already being brought to the fore from the spontaneous movement, fusion began to take place. Two things are needed for fusion: a rising working-class movement with advanced workers coming to the fore; and a communist movement which goes to the working-class movement with communist consciousness and organization. However, when the communists go into the working-class movement they are also brought into contact with the less advanced workers involved in the spontaneous struggles. Many of the Social-Democrats began lowering their propaganda and agitation and organization to what was "acceptable" to the less advanced workers, began tailing the less advanced workers rather than raising their consciousness. This threatened the continued development of fusing communism with the working-class movement and had to be combated. Lenin saw that the principal task was to strengthen fusion; but he also looked into what this entailed--the development of a vanguard

proletarian party in all countries was the biggest step in fusion in that the party was the organized embodiment of the advanced, conscious, (communist) proletarian movement, so organizing and consolidating the party was the principal task of all communist and class conscious workers in strengthening fusion. (See "A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy," LCW, Vol. 4, p. 255-285)

In retrospect Lenin and Stalin have summed up the universality of the party which we should use in our development of our party. There are two major stages\* in the development of the party before taking power. These are the first stage of the formation, creation of the party and the second stage of winning the broad working masses to the side of the party. The first stage is the one in which the organizing and consolidating of the party is the principal task of communist and advanced workers. In this stage the main thing is to "win the vanguard to the side of communism," to form the vanguard (i.e. the party) of the proletariat; tasks of this being to weld the core, build up cadres, work out the programme, the principles of tactics, create the party; the principal activity being progaganda. This stage lasts until the party has been formed and firmly consolidated. In the Russian experience this was until 1905\*\*. Within this first stage of the party's development, Lenin shows periods which are a breakdown of this first stage (see "The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats," LCW, Vol. 2; What is to be done? Conclusion; and "Preface to 'Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats,'" LCW, Vol. 6). Breaking a large period of time, in which many different things happen and different tasks and key tasks exist, down into smaller units as Lenin does is necessary to finding the way forward. It does us very little good to say we are in the first stage of winning the vanguard (forming the vanguard, i.e. the party) if we do not know where we are at in that stage and the corresponding tasks (strategic) and key strategic task are not known. Until this is known we cannot elaborate the key link or key tactical task or plan which will move us forward.

Lenin, at the time, went on to identify what was needed in order to consolidate and organize the party. In order to do this he looked

- \* Lenin and Stalin do not have similar terminology as to what the larger block of time and small blocks of time within the large block of time are to be called. In the interest of uniformity we chose Lenin's definition of periods in WITBD? as the smaller blocks of time, so Stalin's periods in "The Party Before and After..." etc. (See \*\* below becomes stages.)
- \*\* J. V. Stalin, "The Political Strategy and Tactics of the RC's," and "The Party Before and After Taking Power," Stalin: On Strategy and Tactics, LPR ed., p. 14, 24, 29, 53-57; or see Works, Vol. 5

at the motion of Social-Democracy. He divided the Social-Democratic (we would now say communist) movement into distinct periods where he shows the characteristics of each period, accomplishments, degree of fusion, tasks, problems, deviations which occurred and were currently occurring.

The distinctness of the periods are that they each had a certain character which underwent a change in passing to the next period. Lenin draws out whether a period was marked by unity and clarity or disunity and unclarity in the movement. Correspondingly, in the contradiction between theory and practice, when the communist movement is in a period where theoretical questions have been settled, practice will be the principal aspect of the work, but if the movement is in a period of disunity or has theoretical work which is holding back its practical work, then theory will become principal. In the Russian Social-Democratic movement the first period was one of the consolidation of the theory and programme. The theoretical work was principal (1884-1894). After this was consolidated, practice became principal in the second period (1894-1898). The struggle against ideological, political and organizational deviations comprised the third period (1898-1902) where theory again became the leading activity. After the deviations were crushed and correct M-L theory reasserted and developed, they entered another period of practical work. Lenin also notes the development of fusion between communism and the working-class movement, how it was low in the first period, developed rapidly in the second, degenerated some in the third, and rose again in the fourth. Another thing to note of the periods and motion of Social-Democracy is the development from ideological to organizational unity. The first period concentrated on developing ideological unity progressing on to the development of organizational unity in the fourth period when the Second Congress occurred. In between the first and fourth periods, political and organizational unity was developed in second period as an addition to the already existing ideological unity, while in the third period, ideological disunity appeared and the development of ideological, political and organizational unity became important. These characteristics of periods can be used by us in analyzing the development of our own communist movement, what periods we have been through.

But the whole purpose in knowing what periods the communist movement has been through is to know the tasks accomplished, tasks left to accomplish, problems and deviations being encountered in the current period, and key link for moving forward. In analyzing the periods Lenin shows how the basic theory and program was consolidated in the first period, how connections between communists and advanced workers were developed in the second and third period. In fact, at the time, Lenin

always pointed out the tasks of the time. In What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats, Lenin pointed out the theoretical tasks of the first period which they were in. In the second period, Lenin showed the practical tasks of that period in "Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats." At the time in which they were in the third period, Lenin in What is to be done? brought out the problem and deviations of the period (where economism became widespread, the ideology of Marxism questioned, organizational disunity and fragmentation and amateurishness dominated), the conditions giving rise to these (dominance of bourgeois ideology and bowing to it, scatteredness of the movement, the illegality of the S-D's due to the autocracy, the rise of the working-class movement), showed the tasks to be a continuation of the theoretical and practical work the Social-Democrats were engaging in and brought to the fore the tasks of uniting the local circles into the party, of developing the professional revolutionary character of the Social-Democrats. All this required the development of a core of professional revolutionaries, of building up the center. In practice, in this third period Lenin brought out building the center as the key strategic task. Developing centralized leadership, the centralized line of the future party, smashing the non M-L trends such as the economists, further developing and consolidating the program, uniting the local groups ideologically, politically and organizationally, developing professional cadre, a national scope to propaganda and agitation in order to develop the consciousness of the working class, had to be done before the Social-Democrats could unite on a principled basis into the party, and this could only be done if groups were to concentrate on building the center. Building the center means developing M-L centralized leadership which in effect, means developing M-L lines on questions, smashing incorrect lines and tendencies, uniting ideologically, politically, and organizationally around the central leadership, developing national propaganda and agitation. When Lenin saw the key strategic task needed for party building was building the center, he elaborated the tactical way, a plan, to help achieve this. In elaborating this plan, he saw it only as the first step and did not put forward that his plan would take them up to the founding congress. Lenin's plan for carrying out the tasks, particularly the key strategic task, was to set up an all-Russian newspaper. This newspaper was to address burning issues of Russian Social-Democracy, allowing different views to come forward but criticizing the incorrect views and putting forward the correct view, thus developing M-L theory and centralizing it, smashing incorrect lines and uniting groups around the correct line. The newspaper was to promote a national scope to propaganda and agitation, thus transforming the localness of issues into national ones. And the newspaper was to be an organizer--it was to develop the cadres in Russia into professional revolutionaries, develop the illegal apparatus, unite the groups organiza-

tionally. And Iskra accomplished all these things. Thus, as we can see, it is not enough to know contradictions in party building, one must know the principal contradiction, it is not enough to know tasks, one must know the main task both strategic (e.g. welding the core) and tactical (e.g. Iskra).

The understanding of the degree of fusion, the principal task of party building when no party exists, the two stages in the development of the party, the periods, tasks and key task and key tactical link in the first stage of the development of the party (the stage of the formation and consolidation of the party, party building), the elaboration of a plan to move things forward, is a necessity if we are to be able to move forward party building. But these things historically (in the RSDLP and PLA) were understood by one or only a few communists at first. We can see that it was necessary that the M-L understanding of party building be developed and the practical plan taken up by other communists and advanced workers. It was the task of those who developed the higher understanding of party building to put this forward, to struggle for their views and to see that the movement understood the task and carrying out the practical plan. Lenin actively propagandized and agitated around his views and plan for several years before it actually was taken up by Social-Democratic groups. And Lenin's views were not taken up at the same time, but gradually by winning a few groups and then others. In the Albanian experience, the advanced views of Kelmendi and the Comintern were struggled for by Kelmendi for three years in exile, until his death, and his views which entered Albania took two years before they were really actively carried out, with Enver Hoxha taking up the leadership of the struggle. The groups in Albania remained quite sectarian for some time and the leadership in many groups played a negative role.

When it is said that the party is built from the top down, what is meant is that through struggle in the communist and working-class movement, in the struggle to fuse the two movements through the building of the vanguard party, the advanced line on how to move forward comes to the fore and groups are won to this line. Building the party from the top down does not necessarily mean getting the leadership of the groups together first, or that the leadership of groups necessarily are the ones with the best line, because some leaders of groups are not the "top"; it means that the party is built with the "top" line, it means very few people holding this line at first, it means struggling hard against other lines and gradually winning others to this line, it means winning over whole groups or only part of groups, it means creating the real, truly M-L, leadership for the future party (welding the core) and developing professional revolutionary cadre.



Let us look at the U.S. communist movement in light of these universalities, these principles and guidelines, and also bring out the particularities in development, whether similar or different.

We have already talked about fusion in the U.S. and how it is at a low level. This is due to several interconnected things. The working class movement in the U.S. has been in an ebb period since World War II because of the U.S. capitalists' ability to bribe the upper stratum with the superprofits obtained in the superexploitation of the oppressed nations and colonies, and hand out reforms to the working class as a whole (some call this temporary privileges or benefits). The development of advanced workers in the working class is lessened due to these effects of imperialism. In addition, imperialism creates a more privileged intelligentsia, the sector of the petty bourgeoisie the communist movement originates from. Opportunism and revisionism has been dominant in the communist movement due to privileges of the intelligentsia. Thus, when the communist movement has gone to the working class, it has taken opportunism and revisionism to the working-class movement. This, plus the few number of advanced workers has meant that very little fusion of communism with the working-class movement has taken place. The low level of fusion has potentiated the development of opportunism and revisionism in the communist movement. There has not been the development of a vanguard party of the class. The world imperialist system however, has been in a general crisis all along (since the October Revolution in 1917 when imperialism lost a sphere of its market to socialism) and this period of stability has only been relative. A periodic economic crisis rocked the imperialist countries in 1973 and there has never been a recovery. This economic crisis combined with the general crisis (shrinking of markets due to national liberation struggles, development of socialism, inter-imperialist rivalry) deepens the general crisis. The reforms handed out after World War II are being taken back. The condition of the lower stratum of the working class is worsening. The working-class movement is on the rise again and advanced workers coming to the fore. Thus the working-class movement approximates where the Russian working class was in the first period.

The communist movement having been dominated by opportunism and revisionism sports a small section of small circles which have not been completely overcome by opportunism and revisionism, but these circles are disunited ideologically, politically and organizationally and have not fused very much with the working-class movement. Within these more genuine forces there have been deviations of both sectarianism towards the working-class movement and economism with economism the main deviation. Both these deviations have prevented fusion from devel-

oping. We would say the degree of fusion between the working class and communist (really communist) movement is very low and approximates the first period of the Russian Social-Democracy. However, the motion is to enter the "second period," where the working-class movement develops rapidly and the communist movement has difficulty keeping up with it. It is important to be watchful of this and fight against an already present tendency to overemphasize the economic struggle, the struggle for immediate needs, and against entering a "third period" of economism as in the Russian experience.

We do not mean to imply that we are in the "first period" of development of the party. The U.S. has developed differently than the Russian experience and we should mainly use the Russian experience as a guideline for understanding ours. The main thing to be drawn out so far is that a high degree of fusion does not exist and that it is important to develop this fusion, the main way being through building the party.

In fact, we have not scientifically analyzed what periods our movement has been through and is in, and this is an important thing needed in order to be real clear on where we are at in carrying out tasks and what the key strategic task is. We do have some understanding of the historical development of the movement though. We can see that the current communist movement arose with the ideological and political struggle against Soviet social-imperialism and revisionism. The communist movement developed under the leadership of the CPC and PLA and basically blindly followed the lines of these parties rather than consolidating the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and looking critically at the ideological, political, and organizational lines of these parties. As a result, organizations later failed to see the incorrect lines of the CPC on the international situation and followed the revisionist "theory of the three worlds." Currently, groups have trouble developing the correct M-L understanding of the Leninist norms of the party and seeing where the CPC violated these historically. With the criticism of Mao and the CPC by the PLA, new ideological, political and organizational questions, with corresponding unclarity and disunity come to the fore. In fact, basic ideological questions (whether Mao's philosophy is M-L) are being brought up in the international communist movement. This has similarities with the Russian Social-Democratic third period in that the international rise of Bernsteinism, added to the developing economism in Russia led to ideological, political and organizational disunity after they had already had ideological and political unity (and even briefly organizational unity). In the U.S., organizations have failed to develop the M-L theory of political economy, class analysis of the U.S. and programmatic questions

and principles of tactics, but have bowed to the spontaneous mass movements. However, instead of openly stating their desire to tail the masses, they covered it by forming a party which formally justified their concentration on the spontaneous movement. But these parties lack the basic theory of M-L, an M-L program and principles of tactics to guide them and have not won advanced workers to M-L. The groups remaining at this time which have not consolidated themselves around revisionist ideology or an opportunist tailing of the mass movement, remain without M-L theory, program, advanced workers, the unity of the movement, professional revolutionary cadre and centralized leadership. In this respect we are much further behind theoretically and practically than the Russian experience.

Our movement has some similarities to the Albanian experience in that a high degree of sectarianism has existed in our movement which fosters the disunity. Also, the possibility of imperialist war puts us in a position similar to Albania. Under conditions of fascist invasion, they were forced to iron out differences and form the party. As inter-imperialist contradictions increase, we will be forced to move forward in party building. We may be forced to iron out differences between the genuine forces on the eve of imperialist war or under conditions of illegality because of imperialist war.

Although we do not have a scientific understanding of periods (an essential study which needs to be done), we have been able to develop some understanding of where we are at in party building, especially tasks we have accomplished, tasks left to accomplish, problems and deviations we are encountering in this period, and have some clarity on what needs to be done, including what the key strategic task is and a tactical plan. In gaining an understanding of tasks in party building, we look at what Stalin laid out as tasks in the Russian experience-- working out theory and program, principles of tactics, welding the core, building up cadres, creating the party. We also look at what formulation our movement has had on tasks. A common formulation has been-- uniting M-L's and winning advanced workers. All the tasks Stalin lists must be included in these then, for these to be correct. We feel that in reality, seeing just these two tasks narrows our tasks by not clearly seeing the importance of say, the development of theory and program, the development of centralized leadership. In addition, uniting M-L's has been taken to be a non-practical task. In other words, only work in the working-class movement is practical, and since theory is principal in periods where we lack theory to guide practice, uniting M-L's becomes principal over winning advanced workers. This is a dangerous theory which can lead to both sectarianism and economism in the working-class

movement: either we really concentrate more on goings-on in the communist movement and don't engage in much work in the working-class movement, or we continue to engage in work in the working-class movement and in other spontaneous movements and do not consider winning advanced workers to be the main thing in our work in spontaneous movements. No, as far as practical work, meaning any struggle in the communist movement, any uniting of M-L's, welding the core, professionalizing ourselves, or any propaganda and agitation or development of organization such as factory nuclei in the working class, any time we put theory into practice, neither the communist movement or working-class movement is more important. What is important is the fusion of the two movements which will not occur if the development of either one is neglected.

Although we think that the formulation winning advanced workers and uniting M-L's are the tasks (only) of party building, with uniting M-L's principal, has led to problems and deviations in the movement, the formulation does elaborate some tasks of party building. We think the tasks which need to be added are welding the core, developing theory, program, principles of tactics, professionalizing our ranks. When we accomplish these tasks, when we have developed M-L theory on major questions, the program, principles of tactics, brought advanced workers into our organizations, united M-L circles in major industrial cities, developed the leadership and professionalized ourselves; we will be ready to form the party. And we have a long way to go in all these party building tasks in order to accomplish this.

Within these tasks, of course, are many tasks. We have come a small way in some tasks. In developing theory we have been unable to keep up with the rapidly changing international situation but we have been able to deepen our grasp of M-L on the theory of proletarian revolution and strategy and tactics for the international proletariat, we have rejected the social-chauvinist "theory of the three worlds." A part of developing M-L theory is the development of a political economy and class analysis of the U.S.--what is the particular development of U.S. imperialism, the interconnections with world imperialism, the development of classes in the U.S. Here we have begun to look at the split in the working class (MLC's Proletarian Revolution and the Split in the Working Class) which Lenin calls the fundamental question of modern socialism. More theory is needed on the history of the development of the U.S. proletariat in this century, the problems with revisionism, the revisionist take-overs, revisionism in the U.S. especially. As we have said, theory is needed on party building itself and we feel groups such as Pacific Collective, Red Dawn Committee, and ourselves have contributed to this.

But in all the theoretical work, so much is left: ideologically, Mao's philosophical works are being questioned and whether socialism existed in China. The international situation still presents many questions to us--we need to know more on proletarian strategy and tactics, imperialist war, for example. So much political economy and class analysis needs to be done and the national and woman questions need examining. And party building theory is so weak that party building is shamefully actually "largely spontaneous." All of our theoretical tasks have suffered due to the deviation of bowing to spontaneity. The U.S. historically has had a disdain for theory. Even though we say the above theoretical tasks are "principal" we cannot seem to find the time or resources to do so. Complicating the disdain for theory is our actual organizational drawbacks to developing theory, our scatteredness, lack of division of labor, our duplication of effort. The program flows from M-L theory and it stands to reason that the development of an M-L program is at a very low level. Similarly, principles of tactics have not been developed. Small-circle spirit--the view that each group must develop lines on its own and struggle over them in the movement--has contributed to our low theoretical level through not promoting M-L centralized leadership, division of labor, but has promoted a duplication of effort and the continued development of non M-L lines on questions (through each group not taking the time to do thorough study and not being able to get rid of their specific deviations.)

The duplication of effort and continued development of non M-L lines involved with small-circle spirit can be shown by some recent historical irony. Some Comrades recently came out with a large book on revisionism, their goal of which was to discover the roots of revisionism. In the Introduction they say they got together in late 1976, so the research would have been started sometime after that. In March, 1977, WCC held a line that the main thing which would move party building forward was understanding revisionism and that in order to understand revisionism a study had to be done. We even began doing the study (we started out with the working-class movement and communist movement in the U.S. from the 1850's on) and soon found it would take up years working alone to do such a study well (if international revisionism was also to be examined), and come to M-L conclusions, plus practical work of propagandaizing and agitating, winning advanced workers, developing cadre, struggle in the communist movement, etc., needed to be done. This actual attempt to do a study on revisionism and seeing all the implications of such a practice led us to our line on building the center is the key link which we showed in the history section. Some Comrades, on the other hand, went ahead and did a similar study. However, we did not even know of Some Comrades until last Spring ('78). What if both our groups had done this study simultaneously, with no

coordination. Regardless of the differences which would have emerged in the analysis, the amount of time and effort spent in gathering the facts alone would have been a gross duplication of effort. In fact, had we known at the time that Some Comrades were doing this study, we could have sent them some of our thoughts on what to examine, what needs answers to, what kind of emphasis to give the study, method of doing, could have maybe helped with some of the study. But none of this happened: fortunately we saw the error of concentrating all our forces on a study of revisionism when other forces could be enlisted and a division of labor developed to take it and other theoretical work up; while unfortunately we did not know of Some Comrades to be able to engage in any joint work. Such are the results of fragmentation and the fruits of small-circle spirit.

Already our theoretical deficiencies are reflected in problems in winning advanced workers. Because we are slow in developing M-L lines on winning advanced workers, developing professional revolutionaries, what M-L propaganda and agitation consists of, factory nuclei, trade union fractions and on the M-L theory needed for political exposures (political economy, class analysis, program, strategy and tactics, National Question, Woman Question) our work in the working class movement tends to tail the working-class movement--our work is economist and reformist. We need answers to many of the theoretical and programmatic questions in order to really be actively winning advanced workers to the extent they are coming to the fore. In addition, we have made other deviations in winning advanced workers both sectarian and economist, mainly economist. We have been bowing to the objective conditions: because very few advanced workers have existed in the U.S. since World War II, rather than accept this fact and continue to keep a high level of propaganda and agitation and organization, and seek out advanced workers while at the same time raising the level of average and backward workers, we have either remained aloof from the working class or have lowered our propaganda and agitation and organization to that of the average and backward. We have elaborated whole theories of how the advanced have only some of the characteristics Lenin elaborated, or how "our" advanced workers admittedly are not like Lenin's, or how they are "advanced trade unionists" in order to justify lowering our propaganda and agitation and organization. Rather than seeing the effects of the superprofits on the working-class movement and that the ebb in the working-class movement, which has made advanced workers hard to find, is coming to a close and more advanced workers will be coming to the fore, we have been content to pacify ourselves with thinking the average and backward workers we are working with are advanced. We have been bowing to our Social-Democratic traditions of community work (national liberation and anti-war student) which has also resulted in not building up

strong illegal factory nuclei in strategic industry where advanced workers are most likely to be found. We cannot win advanced workers unless we set up factory nuclei in particular, and workplace nuclei in general. The theoretical and practical deficiencies we have are enhanced by our local, small circle outlook. We do not fully share our experiences and engage in struggle over questions of winning advanced workers, which causes us to lag behind in developing and consolidating M-L theory on this. The lack of national propaganda and agitation also hinders the development of class consciousness among workers, the struggle of workers against the capitalists tends to remain individual, thus not raising the level of consciousness of the less developed workers, also an economist deviation.

The unity of M-L's exists to a small degree of course, and in particular was developing in the struggle against the "three worlds theory" but questions of the CPC and Mao Tse-tung, and the PLA and Hoxha are causing disunity and a division to develop. The movement tends to remain in the separate small circles, struggle over questions is not great and when it occurs, it is often not thorough or deep, resulting in what we call artificial lines of demarcation where neither group has really consolidated their position and later on the whole issue comes up again for discussion. The reemergence of right opportunism is the main danger as a question, and the question around Mao are examples of this, of old lines of demarcation having to be drawn. In addition, opportunism and revisionism remain important problems among the genuine forces which hold back the development of M-L unity. Developing M-L unity means the development of M-L lines on questions, struggle between the M-L line and non M-L lines, drawing lines of demarcation on major questions, developing into higher forms of organizational unity. Problems in developing unity stem from ideological and political unclarity on questions, the absence of M-L lines on questions and the continued presence of opportunist and revisionist lines, from the fragmentation of the movement, the difficulties we have in struggling with each other due to distance, lack of ways to struggle effectively such as forums, meetings, illegal communication and a national journal and/or newspaper. The unity of M-L's develops from the ideological to the organizational. We definitely need to develop the M-L line on major questions in order to have principled organizational unity. But this does not mean that developing certain forms of organization doesn't help develop ideological and political unity. An example of how improving our organization improves the development of struggle and unity is the MJLC. Before the struggle began on the MJLC, groups had very little idea of each others line on many questions, especially on party building. Now, before the party building papers and documentation of existing views are even sent out, we already know much more about each other. After the MJLC the development of M-L unity will be higher. In addition to being encumbered by ideological and political

uncertainty and organizational problems, our ideological and political deviations also hold back M-L unity. Our petty bourgeois individualism, careerism, small-circle spirit, manifested politically in sectarianism and equalitarianism, are severe drags on principled struggle for unity around the M-L line. We think that the MJLC is an example of this also. The fact that some have wished to drag out for months struggle over how the MJLC will proceed because of their own interests, has held back the actual MJLC and the development of unity which will come out of the MJLC. These acts are tied to the small-circle spirit view that the party is built through struggle over political line. While the development of political line is very important, its development in one or another small circle is not. What is important is that M-L lines on ideological, political, and organizational questions come to the fore, from whatever group, and that other groups take up the line and carry it out in practice. Also, as Red Dawn Committee has said, concentrating on political line doesn't get to the ideological root of deviations because deviations are always examined from the standpoint of political line only. What is important is that we make it possible to develop ideological, political, and organizational M-L lines through a division of labor and development of centralized leadership.

We have already written about professionalizing our ranks in the section "Type of Party." This remains an important task in building the party. Without a struggle against amateurishness in our legal work, without the development of illegal work, especially factory nuclei, we cannot move forward party building. We need comrades who are developed theoretically, skilled in propagandizing and agitating and organizing, we need a division of labor on tasks, specialization, we need an illegal apparatus with illegal factory nuclei. We need people who are dedicated to proletarian revolution in our organizations so that the sympathizers who also have something to offer proletarian revolution can be best utilized. All these needs are interconnected with other tasks such as developing theory and program, winning advanced workers (whom we need to develop into professional revolutionaries), uniting M-L's (a division of labor, etc.), and welding the core, the task we have not yet talked about.

Our movement has the task of developing the core, developing centralized leadership, building the center. Developing the core or centralized leadership or center involves ideological, political and organizational leadership. It means working toward developing the M-L line on ideological, political and organizational questions, and bringing the circles together under this leadership. This includes, but is not only, developing higher organizational forms such as higher forms for struggle over questions (forums, journals, conferences), developing a division of labor, network (legal and illegal). It includes finding ways to develop leadership in the



movement. It is obvious that our movement basically lacks centralized leadership. Developing centralized leadership will affect all our other work. Centralized leadership will help in developing theory and program, both from the advanced ideological, political, and organizational lines, and also the superior forms of organization like a division of labor, a network and a journal. If the movement was centralized under correct M-L leadership the struggle against the "three worlds" Theory and CPC revisionism would have begun much earlier, and the movement would have developed unity and clarity on this much sooner. Other burning questions such as around Mao and the PLA could be struggled out better under M-L leadership. Winning advanced workers will be improved from the improved theory, development of programmatic questions, thus better propaganda and agitation. The centralization of experience will help develop better lines and practice on winning advanced workers which will also become uniform throughout the movement; in other words, the summing up of experiences in winning advanced workers will develop M-L lines on this which will then be struggled over through improved ways of struggling, and will be taken up in practice by several circles. Also, the national scope which could develop in our propaganda and agitation will help in winning advanced workers and raising the level of other workers. The development of M-L lines and improved ways to struggle will of course develop the principled unity of M-L's. The struggle against opportunism and revisionism will be aided by the development of centralized leadership. And the professionalizing of our ranks is directly tied to the development of M-L centralized leadership. The development of centralized leadership helps get rid of amateurishness. For all the good centralized leadership will do us, groups have had the most spontaneous attitude toward this task. Groups seem to think the center will just happen eventually.

Of these tasks which are all strategic to party building, what is the key task? By now groups know our line is that welding the core or building the center is the key strategic task. This is related to our analysis that of the problems (contradictions) in building the party (such as low theoretical level, lack of program, disunity, fragmentation, few advanced workers in our organization, amateurishness, lack of centralized leadership) the contradiction between the presence and absence of centralized leadership is the principal contradiction. The principal aspect of this contradiction, the lack of centralized leadership influences the development of all other contradictions, and resolving this contradiction will lead to the resolving of others. Will not the development of centralized M-L leadership mean a greater ability to develop M-L theory and program, unite M-L's, win advanced workers, professionalize the ranks for reasons we list above? Can the same be said of any

other task: can we say the developing M-L theory will move forward all our other tasks when the theory is developed separately in each group, with the particular deviations of each group coming out in the theory and no assurance of relatively complete M-L theory being developed, how long this will take, how it will get struggled over in the movement, how it will get carried out uniformly? Can we say uniting M-L's is the key task when we are not assured of developing M-L theory, when, as we have already said, there are not ways to struggle questions out? Is winning advanced workers the key task when winning them depends on M-L theory, better organization, better communication, professionalizing our ranks? Can we professionalize our ranks without strong M-L leadership? No, carrying out all our tasks is dependent on the development of M-L centralized leadership, on building the M-L center.

Just as in the Russian experience when the center was needed to overcome economism, develop and consolidate the ideology, political line needed to form the party, unite the scattered groups around the correct line and unite them organizationally, develop professional revolutionary cadre, so the center is needed in our situation, and even more so since we lack M-L theory and program. The fact that we lack M-L theory and program does not negate the need for the center in our experience. The difference we see is that it will take us much longer to develop the center since we will have to develop it while developing M-L theory and program. And we must be clear that an M-L tendency will not exist and an M-L center cannot be built without the development of this theory and program. But the question is one of orientation. Do we develop theory and program in our old small circle way, where no circle or group of individuals leads and very little is done collectively, or do we try to find those circles or individuals with the most consistency and most advanced line to date to lead the development of theory and program and try to develop collective effort in this. These are the questions which must be looked at in trying to find the key strategic task at this time.

While the organizational aspects of building the center are very important to our movement, building the center is not organizational only. The center is a higher organizational form than our movement has experienced (in an M-L way). But this will not be developed overnight either. The development of the center will take many intermediate organizational forms. And yes, the development of connections between groups (legal and illegal), of forms for struggle, a division of labor on theoretical work and even practical work, which is part of developing centralized leadership, will move tasks forward in the movement. But without the centralized ideological and political leadership, the

development of M-L lines and practice out of this improved organization will not occur. Building the center as the key link is not "organization is key link." The center is ideological, political, and organizational leadership, and this is why it is exactly what is needed at a time of ideological, political, and organizational disunity. However, if it seems that we are making "organization the key link," look closer. Perhaps it seems this way because we do talk about improving organization, and the movement has tended to negate the importance of organization (some have overemphasized organization). Organization is essential in all things and we feel we only are putting it in its proper place. In order to really understand the center, one must look both at the content of it (its ability to centralize the M-L line and develop the unity of the movement and improve practice), and its form (the improved organization we talk about above).

In order to try to show comrades in a more concrete way what we mean by building the center, let us elaborate some particularities of this, let us show the key link within building the center, the tactical key link. As Lenin said:

"What we need at the present moment, however, is not a solution of the problem in principle but a practical solution. We should not only be clear on the nature of the organization that is needed and its precise purpose, but we must elaborate a definite plan for an organization, so that its formation may be undertaken from all aspects. In view of the pressing importance of the question, we, on our part, take the liberty of submitting to the comrades a skeleton plan to be developed in greater detail in a pamphlet now in preparation for print."  
 ("Where to Begin," LCW, Vol. 5, p. 20)

#### IV. Concrete Steps to Move Party Building Forward

In trying to find a proper plan of action to develop centralized leadership and move forward the other party building tasks, we again look to other experiences for help. The Albanian plan, due to the urgency of the time, was a call to dissolve the cells and reorganize on a party basis after having established sound foundations among the masses. This was not carried out by much of the established leadership of the cells because of the Trotskyite theory of cadres line and corresponding incorrect program. Some of the leaders continued to struggle for the correct plan but the plan was actually put into effect by the urgently needed joint action by communists to fight fascism. This experience shows us the importance of joint practical work when it is around a correct program. The problem here is that we have not developed an M-L program. In addition, our movement does not have unity on the work of communists in the spontaneous movements, on how to build the party and the type of party we want to build, which would be needed for joint work in the spontaneous movements. In the Russian experience, Lenin put forward a tactical plan designed to overcome the fragmentation, ideological, political and organizational disunity, to centralize their movement. He held that an all-Russian newspaper was the thing which would be the first step in welding the core and in further developing the other party building tasks in order to form the party. The newspaper was to be written out of Russia, out of the hands of the Tzar and smuggled to Russia and gotten to the other groups through an illegal network of agents. This would develop the professional revolutionaries and unite groups practically. The newspaper was to transform local issues into national ones and was to struggle out questions of Social-Democracy. Articles could be written by the local groups for the newspaper, but the editorial board exercised centralized leadership in the articles printed and discussion that went down in the newspaper. Thus the development of M-L lines and centralizing this, drawing lines of demarcation between the genuine and sham Marxists was furthered and the ideological, political and organizational unity of the M-L's developed. This experience shows the need for a newspaper and illegal network and centralized leadership in developing M-L lines and centralizing them, developing ideological, political and organizational unity in the movement, drawing lines of demarcation, and developing national scope to work. The difference here with our movement is similar to the difference with the Albanian in that a basic program already existed, although it needed to be developed and consolidated, and our movement does not have a basic program, nor has a political economy or class analysis been done to develop a basic program. The propaganda and agitation involved in a newspaper would come from

correct M-L lines on programmatic questions, on the work of communists in the spontaneous movements, on how to build the party and the type of party we are trying to build, and on other burning questions which come to the fore. There is not basic unity on these things at this point. Therefore, looking at the concrete situation of our movement, we do not feel that centralized joint action in the spontaneous movements or a joint centralized newspaper is the first step in developing centralized leadership and moving forward the other tasks. It seems that some other steps must be taken before these are the tactical things that move us forward.

These things such as joint action in the spontaneous movements, a national newspaper, are part of developing centralized leadership and move forward other tasks, but it is a question of how soon, of when these can happen. The movement should have more unity around fundamental programmatic questions, including the national and woman questions, and on important burning questions before joint practical action in the spontaneous movements can take place on a regular basis (such as regular propaganda and agitation in a newspaper or a national mass organization). In order to do joint work in the spontaneous movements, we need to have unity on how it relates to party building and we need to agree on the type of party we are trying to build. Especially important to do any initial joint work is unity around where the work will be concentrated, and although we have unity in theory that we should concentrate in the working class, this is not always the case in practice, and unity would have to be developed some in this basic area. Then, there would have to be some unity on the split in the working class, what industries and locations we should concentrate our forces in. Also, there must be more unity on what the joint work would consist of. For example, we would hold that setting up a national mass organization or a national newspaper before we have unity on what the work of communists should consist of--the content of propaganda and agitation and what organization, mainly factory nuclei or mainly community work, etc--would be premature. By content of propaganda and agitation we mean unity on what M-L propaganda and agitation is, what would be drawn out in addressing issues, what draws out advanced workers and develops the consciousness of the masses. If we don't even have unity on whether we should concentrate on setting up functioning illegal factory nuclei, on what the factory nuclei should be doing, where they should be at, the character of advanced workers, how to win them, what other organizational forms we should use, on the content of our propaganda and agitation, how can we be doing joint work of regular propaganda and agitation and organizing? Of course occasional joint work can occur on some specific issues, but this could not be consistent, and

until the M-L line is developed more on work in the spontaneous movements, may not even be the type of joint work we mainly should be trying to develop (we hold that we should try to develop joint work on the factory nuclei basis as more important than community work or support committee work, etc.).

It seems that what we need to do is develop our unity on line which will allow us to develop joint propaganda and agitation and organization. The unity needed to do joint propaganda, agitation and organizing is in the areas of how to build the party, the character of the party, the activities of communists in the spontaneous movements, political economy, class analysis, programmatic and burning questions. We should first develop unity on how to build the party, the character of the party, the activities of communists in the spontaneous movements, and at least some aspects of political economy, class analysis, program, principles of tactics, and some burning questions. Thus, party building tasks and the key task of centralized leadership would be promoted through the development of unity around line. As the unity around line develops, so should the joint propaganda and agitation and organization which will further party building and winning the broad masses even more.

But the actual process of developing unity around line can have a practical aspect to it. If organized properly, the process of the development of unity around line can develop the centralized leadership of the movement and unite M-L's practically. If the development of unity of line is taken out of its old way of developing in the separate, isolated circles, and we develop the unity jointly with a network which includes a division of labor, and under centralized leadership, centralizing the experiences of the movement, we will be taking a practical step towards building the center and uniting M-L's.

We think there are three interconnected ways to go about accomplishing joint development of unity, with a network and a division of labor and under centralized leadership: through joint study, connected to a journal and headed by a committee.

As far as the joint study goes, there are many different areas to be studied (we already listed how to build the party, type of party, the activity of communists in the spontaneous movement, the political economy, class analysis, programmatic questions, including the national and woman questions, principles of tactics, plus a study on revisionism would be helpful in developing correct lines in these areas and lines on the international situation and other burning questions around Mao, the CPC and PLA, are interconnected with these questions), so we see

finding a starting point as important. The starting point should be a study and developing unity on the character of the party we are trying to build, how to build the party, and burning questions which are becoming lines of demarcation (such as Mao, the CPC, PLA). These are the most immediate questions in party building, and firm principled unity on them will allow the further development of unity on other questions such as programmatic ones and other burning questions. Without M-L unity on the character of the party, we would be doing joint work with groups who do not uphold the Leninist party and splits would eventually occur over this basic principle. Without unity on how to build the party, we would not be able to proceed in a unified way in carrying out party building tasks and our ability to take up other questions would suffer. Without taking up questions around which lines of demarcation are developing, groups will split before these questions have been properly studied and struggled out. Once we have unity on the character of the party, how to build the party and questions involving lines of demarcation we will have the unity necessary to jointly study political economy, class analysis, other burning questions such as the international situation, the history of the world proletarian movement and the influence of revisionism, etc.

On the character of the party, we need to develop unity on the particular things which make up the Bolshevik party, on the historical experiences of parties such as our CPUSA, the CPC and PLA and lines the Comintern held. It will be decided how we can begin developing such characteristics now and the current lines and practice of groups will be brought out in particular and deviations struggled against. On how to build the party, we will develop an understanding of the motion of the working-class and communist movements, what the tasks are to fuse the two movements, what our party building tasks are as the principal way to fuse the two movements and how to carry out our party building tasks, what the key strategic task is and how to carry it out, including where we are at in carrying out tasks and the key link (key tactical task). This means developing the M-L line on finding ways to tackle the theoretical work which needs to be done and decide what needs to be done and priorities in doing, finding ways to build centralized leadership (building the center), professionalizing our ranks (developing cadre), win advanced workers (the character of advanced workers, how to win and develop them, including where they are found, the need and how to set up factory nuclei), unite M-L's (what unities and disunities exist and how to struggle out the disunities, what lines of demarcation exist and what will need to exist in order to unite on a principled basis into the party). On the burning questions which are becoming lines of demarcation, we will first have to clarify what these questions are, what in particular can be examined now, to what degree lines of demarcation can be drawn at this time and what will insure

that a proper study and struggle has gone down in order to draw lines of demarcation (i.e. how to prevent, if at all possible and to whatever degree, subjective decisions being made such as the way Colorado Organization for Revolutionary Struggle and the League for Proletarian Revolution made decisions regarding the "three worlds theory"). For example, regarding the questions of Mao, such questions of clarification involve: what is important to know at this time? Are the lines of demarcation primarily around upholding Mao as a great M-L or a non M-L, or are there several lines of demarcation on the line and practice of Mao which leads to a line of demarcation around Mao? What lines and practice of Mao are important to examine now? Which lines of demarcation around Mao's line and practice will lead to an evaluation of him as an M-L or non M-L? What are the main things we should learn from the PLA's criticism of Mao and our study of his lines and practice?

The method of such a study would be based on a dialectical materialist study of the questions involved using the experience of other parties and applying it to our experience. The experience and lines of groups on these questions must be brought out, deviations brought to the fore and struggled against and correct tendencies and lines developed. Through taking in the experience of several groups, we are better able to develop the M-L line on questions and expose the incorrect ones, thus drawing lines of demarcation on these key questions. Then, when groups put the lines into practice, they are able to sum-up the lines and criticize any incorrect aspects of it.

The joint study must have some way to distribute the study and lines being developed both to those groups involved in the study and those not, receive comments and criticisms and improvement of line, from both those involved and those not, to struggle with others not involved over the study and line. We suggest that accompanying the study be a newsletter or journal which would keep the movement up-to-date on the study and struggle over the lines being developed, etc. A journal would print important articles by local groups on important questions and would print the developing joint lines coming out of the study. We consider important articles by local groups to be discussion of important line questions (the type of party, how to build the party, burning questions becoming lines of demarcation) and summations of their past and present work in these areas (developing democratic centralism, factory nuclei, professionalizing the ranks, work in the working class and spontaneous movements, especially in relation to winning advanced workers, the theoretical work being done, the work being done on the burning questions and past practice around the burning questions). A large part of the journal will be the printing of the developing lines of the joint study. These M-L lines coming out of the



study will provide M-L centralized leadership to the groups involved in the study and other groups outside of the study. The journal then while providing a forum for the discussion and struggle of views, also centralizes the views, smashing the non M-L ones, and consolidating the M-L ones. As with Lenin's Iskra, the journal is not a hodge-podge of views, but while allowing for an airing of views, promotes the development of the M-L line on questions and the drawing of lines of demarcation.

The journal is indispensable to the study as the study is to the journal. Without the journal, the study does not have a good form to develop its line, get it to others and receive criticism of it. Without the study, a journal lacks direction and a way in which to develop the line in a joint way.

How should the study and journal be organized so that a division of labor exists and centralized leadership developed? First, groups agreeing to the principles of unity, which we will discuss in a bit, will all be involved in carrying out the study, and after investigation as to the abilities and existing lines of groups, a network, including a division of labor where possible and necessary, between groups will be established. Second, this itself, can only be done under centralism, i.e. some group of communists has to do this survey and put forward the suggestion for the network and division of labor. In addition, continued checking up on the study while in progress, tying together the different studies, centralizing the experiences and reports of groups which should be coming in will need to be done. We propose a party building committee to head the study and journal. Rather than it being a group that forms the committee, the committee should be composed of members from all groups participating in the study and journal. Doing it this way will begin to break down some of the small circle spirit which exists in all our groups and we will develop more of a spirit of striving to unite into a party. The committee also should not be scattered, the members of it should not remain in their local collectives, but should get together in one city. This too, will develop the collective spirit of groups and will also promote the professionalization of us in that we will have to make available a comrade or comrades for fulltime work on this committee. Interconnected to this is the need for this committee to be supported so that members do not have to work. The groups participating in the study and journal should support the committee. This also promotes the professionalizing of our movement. In looking toward the future continued centralization of our movement, the committee would best be set up in a major industrial city. The committee then, organizes the study (suggests a network and possible division of labor among groups after surveying the situation, leads the study in putting forward

suggestions to how the study should go), actually takes part in doing the study, edits the journal (previews articles submitted by the local groups, making decisions as to what should be printed, what should be printed with a reply, edits the sum-ups of the study, resumming up some of them in order to combine them or improve on them), provides ideological and political leadership in the study and centralizes the views of groups participating, and keeps an eye on the study to see if it is being carried out in a dialectical materialist way. The committee has no formal control of groups, but will exercise ideological, political and organizational influence. We realize that our exposition of the committee leaves out details of the internal functioning of the committee and its relation to groups, which we plan to develop for the MULC. The main thing we want to emphasize now is the need for centralized M-L leadership for the study and journal which can only occur through a functioning full-time committee.

Those who by now are scornful of any good coming from developing the leadership from a mixing of the groups and the different tendencies should think about this: two things are involved here; one is how leadership is developed, and the other is how M-L leadership is developed and how deviations are struggled against. First, leadership does not develop spontaneously. We have to train our comrades to be leaders, they have to learn leadership through hard struggle. Putting someone who has potential for leadership in a position of leadership will develop that comrade's leadership qualities. Then, the M-L nature of leadership needs to be developed. This cannot occur spontaneously either. The key question here is will M-L tendencies develop separately or through collective effort and development. It is true that the committee would contain all the deviations and incorrect tendencies among the more genuine forces, but there are also good, M-L tendencies in the groups who would be a part of the committee, and there are varying degree of this. Those groups who have more M-L development should take the ideological leadership within the committee, helping those less developed to develop, and all must struggle against deviations and incorrect tendencies. We feel that the committee is a collective effort at developing M-L leadership, and that as long as the groups participating in the study, journal and committee have proper principles of unity, centralized leadership through collective effort is possible to develop at this time.

What kind of unity between groups is needed in order to undertake such a study, journal and committee? The principles of unity should be in three areas:

1. Groups would have to agree with the plan and the purpose of the plan itself, that the plan, the study, journal and committee is the way to further our party building tasks. In this respect, groups

participating must see the principled unity of M-L's as very important and be struggling against small circle spirit. Also, the need for centralized leadership would have to be felt by groups participating.

2. Groups would have to agree with the method, that dialectical materialism must be used in the study and that this will be checked up on at all times, that a network with a division of labor and specialization when possible, local initiative and utilization of local abilities along with centralization of the line of the local groups must occur, and while no group is bound by any lines developed by the study and journal and put forward by the committee, they are encouraged to put the lines into practice and sum them up to the committee. Here groups will have to promote the professionalization of our ranks and centralization of line. Organizations will need to financially support the committee and will need to make comrades available for the study, journal, committee, network, and will need to develop secure communications.

3. Groups would have to have a certain level of unity around ideological and political line. This level of unity must be reflective of major lines of demarcation which have been drawn between genuine and sham, in order to promote the most advanced fighters of the proletariat at this time being in the study, journal and committee. This does not mean that every line one or another group thinks is a line of demarcation will be included, but those which form the basis of communist activity, communist principles, and those which have been struggled over in the movement and proved scientifically to be lines of demarcation. We feel the POU's should center around general Marxist-Leninist theory, our aims, and method, ideology, tasks, central task of building the party and the type of party we are trying to build. The following are initial POU's for the study, journal and committee:

A. Imperialism is the highest stage of development of capitalism where capital has become international linking the different countries to each other economically, and industry has become highly concentrated and socialized. The people of the world are unable to reap the benefits of this highly productive system since the industry and capital is privately owned by a handful of people. The conditions of the toiling masses are worsening economically through low wages and high cost of living, and politically through the growth of militarism, frequent wars, increase of reaction, strengthening and extension of national oppression and colonial plunder. The resistance of the toiling masses to the exploitation and oppression results in movements for national liberation (political independence) and socialist revolution (overthrowing the capitalist system and instituting the dictatorship of the proletariat--

the ownership and control of the means of production by the proletariat and genuine democracy for the exploited and oppressed and dictatorship over the exploiters and oppressors, as a transition to classless society and the elimination of all exploitation and oppression). The national liberation movements, in order to be fully successful, must proceed on to socialist revolution, otherwise the country is in the control of internal and external exploiters and oppressors since the internal bourgeoisie are dependent, to varying degrees, on one or another imperialist power. The socialist revolution cannot be successful unless it carries out democratic tasks, of which the right of nations to self-determination, the liquidation of national oppression and women's oppression are major aspects. The struggle for socialism has already led to the establishment of socialist countries which, combined with the national liberation struggles, the struggle for socialism and the contradictions between imperialists, gives rise to a general crisis of the imperialist system in this epoch. Thus, all the objective prerequisites exist for the achievement of socialism internationally, and the toiling masses are pushing this forward. Imperialism is thus also capitalism in decline and decay, the final stage of capitalism and the eve of socialist revolution.

B. The leading force in the struggle for socialism is the proletariat, the only thoroughly revolutionary class in society, the class which owns no means of production and has nothing to lose but its chains, which is interested in the elimination of exploitation and oppression and a classless society world-wide. Other strata of classes may rally around the proletariat at certain stages in the movement toward and through socialism to communism. The proletariat first and foremost is internationalist; that is, it does not confine its tasks to its "own" country, but makes the interests of the proletariat in all countries its cornerstone, and supports the development of the proletarian movement in all countries, which includes support for national liberation and national democratic struggles, socialist revolution and socialist construction (defense of the dictatorship of the proletariat where it has been won). Due to the uneven economic development of different countries, the proletariat of these countries are faced with different tasks in advancing to and through socialist revolution to communism. The task of the proletariat in the socialist countries is to build socialism, progress towards communism and act as the vanguard of the international proletariat in the struggle for national liberation and socialism through its ideological, political and organizational leadership. Albania is the only socialist country in the world at this time and the PLA is the leading party of the world proletariat, although we do not necessarily have

unity with all of the lines and practice of the PLA. The task of the proletariat in the advanced capitalist countries is to carry out proletarian socialist revolution and to support the development of the international proletarian movement. In the imperialist countries, such as the U.S., a sector of the proletariat is bribed through the superprofits attained by the imperialist plunder and oppression of the oppressed colonies and nations. This sector, the upper stratum of the proletariat, generally takes the side of the bourgeoisie in the class struggle and is therefore counter-revolutionary. Only the lower stratum of the working class is the revolutionary sector which leads and pushes forward socialist revolution in that country and is internationalist. The proletariat in the countries and nations oppressed and exploited by imperialism must first achieve political independence for their countries and nations before they will be able to further advance towards socialism. In countries where full or partial political independence has been acquired, the neo-colonial countries, the tasks may be either proletarian revolution or national liberation. The proletariat in the colonial, neo-colonial countries and oppressed nations supports the proletarian movement in other countries. In some countries, the proletariat is faced with a struggle for democracy which must occur before the proletariat is able to lead the struggle for socialism (such as where fascism is in control). Here the proletariat's immediate task is the national democratic revolution. In addition, in countries such as the Soviet Union and China, revisionists (the bourgeoisie in M-L guise) have gained control of the state. The proletariat in these countries has the task of overthrowing the revisionist bourgeoisie. Because the socialist revolution and the struggle for national liberation and the national democratic struggles are struggling against the common imperialist enemy, these struggles must form a revolutionary alliance to facilitate the downfall of world imperialism.

C. It is the immediate aim of the U.S. proletariat to seize state power, smash the bourgeois state, expropriate the capitalist class and begin organization of socialist construction. It is the task of the U.S. proletariat to lead the struggle for socialism in the U.S. and to support the international proletariat, the interests of the revolution in other countries. The proletariat recognizes the need for armed struggle in the seizure of power, and for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the carrying out of socialist construction.

D. In order to carry out its historic tasks, the proletariat must be armed with revolutionary theory to guide its practice. The basic outlook and method of the proletariat was developed by Marx

and Engels and further developed by Lenin. The basic revolutionary theory of the proletariat is Marxism-Leninism. Historically, bourgeois theories and actions under the guise of M-L have developed. These have been in the form of revisions of Marxism-Leninism (revisionism) or in the forsaking of the interests of the proletariat as a whole for short term, individual interests (opportunism). All forms of revisionism and opportunism are irreconcilably hostile to the class interests of the international proletariat and must be combatted and defeated. The main international revisionist trends are: Soviet revisionism (the peaceful road to socialism, the state and party of the whole people--negation of of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the productive forces theory--negation of socialist construction); Chinese revisionism (the theory of the three worlds--denial of the revolution everywhere by tailing after the bourgeoisie, notably social-chauvinism, and the productive forces theory), Yugoslav revisionism (self-administrative socialism, in addition to Soviet revisionism), Eurocommunism (a variant of Soviet revisionism), Social-Democracy (reducing class struggle to parliamentarism, negation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, peaceful road to socialism), Trotskyism (theory of permanent revolution, negation of the two stage revolution, theory of no compromises, theory of cadres).

E. Because the proletariat is not spontaneously conscious of its historic mission, our task, as communists, having first developed this consciousness, is to organize and lead the class struggle of the proletariat. It is our task to fuse communist consciousness and organization with the spontaneous working-class movement as the main way to organize and lead the class struggle. This is done first and foremost through winning the vanguard of the proletariat to communism. In proportion to the winning of the vanguard, the vanguard must win the broad masses of the proletariat to its side and also win the broad masses of toilers to the side of the proletariat. At the appropriate time, it must organize and lead the armed struggle to overthrow capitalist rule, organize socialist society and lead the forward development towards communism. In the U.S. the fusion of communism or the communist movement with the working-class movement is at a low level; the subjective reasons being belittling the development of M-L theory to guide practice, resulting in developing or following opportunist or revisionist lines, including the remnants of petty bourgeois ideology such as individualism, careerism, self-interest, which manifests itself as sectarianism toward and tailing the working-class movement, and small circle spirit in the work in the communist movement.

F. Winning the vanguard to communism means developing the revolutionary theory and program, principles of tactics, winning advanced workers, developing cadre, creating the political party of the proletariat. Winning the vanguard to communism means developing, forming and consolidating a revolutionary Bolshevik party to lead the class and toiling masses in the struggle for socialism. The development, formation and consolidation of the party is the biggest step in fusion as it is the fusion of communism with the advanced section of the class which can deepen fusion through winning the broad masses of workers and can win the broad masses of toilers. The character of the Bolshevik-type party includes: 1) an M-L program for proletarian revolution in the U.S. which scientifically reflects the concrete economic, social, and political development of U.S. imperialism and U.S. society; 2) a corresponding general strategic plan for proletarian revolution in the U.S.-- strategic aim, main enemy, direct reserves of the proletariat and indirect reserves, main blow, etc.; 3) principles of tactics and practical experience which permits a wide range of forms of struggle and rapid change in these forms in conformity with the ebb and flow of the spontaneous movement and other changing conditions, in order to further strategic success; 4) the party is the advanced, organized detachment of the proletariat which is bound up with the class through a thousand-and-one threads, and leads the class based on the proven correctness of the party's ideological and political line and organization which the class verifies and clarifies through its own experiences; 5) the party is composed chiefly of professional revolutionaries, the most conscious and tested leaders of the class who devote their entire lines to the international proletariat's historical mission and struggle to liberate itself and all mankind from all forms of exploitation and oppression; 6) the party, in combatting the bourgeoisie, reactionaries, and agent-provocateurs, has an illegal and legal apparatus and carries out illegal and legal forms of struggle, with the party based in illegal workplace cells or factory nuclei, creates community or street cells which must be a secondary organizational form, has fractions in mass organizations, particularly the trade unions; 7) the party is organized according to democratic centralism, with higher and lower bodies, centralization of line and leadership, proletarian democracy in deciding basic questions, local initiative, and mutual self-control. The struggle between the two roads, the capitalist and socialist road is objective, and finds its expression, in differing class views on various questions. The M-L view must defeat various non M-L views politically through ideological struggle and organizationally through purging revisionist and opportunist elements. Errors, mistakes and shortcomings must be

corrected ideologically in practice through constructive criticism and self-criticism. The party must have a unity of will and unity of action, the minority submitting to the majority, and iron discipline which is incompatible with the existence of factions, i.e. a grouping with a separate platform and line which it seeks to propagate and put into practice.

G. At a time in which the vanguard has not been won, in which the party has not been formed and consolidated, this is the principal task of advanced workers and communists. In the U.S. there is not a genuine proletarian party or a genuine M-L center, and so building such a party is our principal task. Party building is not spontaneous, but must be worked at consciously using M-L theory to guide practice. There are several general party building tasks such as developing centralized leadership (building the center), professionalizing our ranks (developing cadre), winning advanced workers, uniting M-L's, developing theory, program, principles of tactics, and the key task and key link in party building must be grasped in order to be moving forward in party building. Theoretical work is principal in this period where we lack considerable M-L theory to guide practice, and practical work must be carried out simultaneously, in indissoluble connection with theory. M-L theory is needed to guide practice, and practice in turn serves to further develop theory. Propaganda is the chief form of activity in the communist and working-class movements in a period in which the vanguard needs to be consolidated.

H. The main danger in the U.S. working-class movement has been right opportunism and in the communist movement revisionsism and right opportunism historically. As to the particularities of this, the main and secondary deviations among the more genuine forces in the U.S. communist movement, these will be scientifically investigated in the study and the correct line will be developed and struggled around.

This level of unity does not exist at this time, even among a few circles. First, there is not unity on the character of the party we are trying to build. Then, groups do not have strong unity over what general tasks there are in party building and there would need to be struggle over this. An example of an area of struggle would be over winning advanced workers. We see Pacific Collective's line that this is not the main task in the spontaneous movements as incorrect. We would each have to clarify our positions more and have struggle over this before we could engage in joint study. Secondly, this tactical plan of ours has not been fully elaborated to the movement until now (although we put forward some ideas on the joint study last summer). Discussion and struggle must go down around this. Connected to this,



a group like PC has, although similar to our plan, a different tactical plan they have already been doing a lot of thinking about, Therefore, we can see that PC probably would not accept our plan overnight, especially since our skills at polemicizing and propagandizing our views are still developing and we don't always explain things as best we should. Struggle will have to go down around the plan itself.

Therefore, we propose that a meeting be held of those groups wanting to develop a practical plan of action to further party building, who at least see value in our plan, the goal of the meeting being to come to agreement on such a plan and to struggle over such differences in POU's which stand in the way of principled joint action in carrying out the plan. Preparations for this meeting should be made at the Multilateral Conference (MULC). Groups should come to the MULC with a line on whether they have enough unity or are close enough to our views to be a part of such a meeting and should have some ideas on when, where and how it should occur. In lesson of the immense amount of time and energies involved in struggling out the MULC through the mail, we should try to get as much of the preparation for the meeting decided as possible at the MULC, either in the plenum on concrete steps or in some meetings afterwards.

For those who by now are ready to label our key tactical task, the key link we have singled out, as anti-Leninist, and as putting organization before drawing lines of demarcation, we will try to explain our views further. When the Russian movement was in the throes of ideological, and political confusion and disunity, when the program still needed to be developed and consolidated, when lines of demarcation needed to be drawn around Bernsteinism, economism, programmatic and organizational questions, Lenin put forward a higher form of organization as the way to help draw these lines of demarcation. What must be grasped is that while 'in order to unite...we must first and foremost draw firm lines of demarcation', in order to draw lines of demarcation we must have the proper organization. In fact, this favorite quote of some groups was written in Iskra which was developed partially to draw lines of demarcation through a higher organizational level. The Iskra organization's purpose was to develop the centralized leadership of the movement--to develop the M-L line on questions, to have ways to struggle with non M-L lines, draw lines of demarcation and unite around the M-L line, and also to develop the organizational unity of the movement, to develop national scope to propaganda and agitation, organizational ties between groups and a way in which to struggle questions out. The movement cannot move forward without the development of the M-L line and drawing lines of demarcation, and the M-L line and drawing lines of demarcation cannot develop without proper organization. The Iskra organization combined M-L line and content with M-L organization. This is what our tactical

plan is attempting to do. With proper principles of unity, certain groups can develop joint study and a journal and set up a committee to head it, and can develop the M-L line and M-L organization of the movement. This organizational form does not leap ahead if we do not neglect the level of unity needed and line content of the study, journal and committee (insist that the answers to questions are M-L, the journal comes from an M-L stand and develops in an M-L way, and the committee's leadership is M-L).

The study, journal, committee is only a step which furthers the building of the party through developing theory, programmatic and burning questions, unites M-L's through the struggle for the M-L line, drawing lines of demarcation and uniting groups around the M-L line, improving our winning of advanced workers, professionalizing our ranks, and building the center. It is a step which brings us closer to principled unity in a vanguard party. Hopefully, the study, journal, and committee will be able to develop other ways to move party building forward when its goal is reached. Perhaps by then, we will be ready for a regular newspaper, we will be able to have more conferences on different programmatic and burning questions, the committee will develop more leadership skills, we will have developed illegal communication, distribution, will have functioning illegal factory nuclei and will be winning more advanced workers, all of which would indicate we have made progress in party building. To our way of thinking this is how we promote our party building tasks and the key strategic task of building the center.

Although we put forward the study, journal and committee as the key tactical link in furthering party building, we do not negate other concrete steps which can further our party building tasks. We believe that such things as bilateral meetings, forums, conferences and joint practical work where line unity exists can and should take place now. In particular, in the near future, we support a conference on the international situation, which could take up subjects which our forces are weak in (the main danger, main blow, united front, the leadership of the PLA, and questions of Mao Tse-tung and the CPC, etc.). But we still emphasize that our movement needs the joint study, journal and committee by those forces with the proper level of unity as the main way to further building the vanguard party of the U.S. proletariat.

## REFERENCES

## II. Type of Party

## A. General Characteristics of the Bolshevik Party

overall--J.V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism "The Party"

## 1. Revolutionary Theory

J.V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism "Theory" and "The Party"

V.I. Lenin, What the "Friends of the People" are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats, LCW Vol. 1 p. 266, 296  
What is to Be Done? "Dogmatism and 'Freedom of Criticism'", "The Spontaneity of the Masses and the Consciousness of the Social-Democracy", Pek ed. p. 6-65.

"Our Programme" LCW Vol. 4, p. 210-214.

"Letters on Tactics" LCW Vol. 24 p. 42-54

## 2. Party of professional revolutionaries

V.I. Lenin, What Is To Be Done? "The Amateurishness of the Economists and an Organization of Revolutionaries", Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back

C.I. Document, "Thesis on the Organization and Structure of the Communist Parties," adopted at the Third Congress of the Communist International 1921

## 3. Unity of Will and Unity of Action--Democratic Centralism

V.I. Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder Pek ed. p. 5-8.

"10th. Congress of the RCP(B)" LCW Vol. 32, p. 241-261

J.V. Stalin, History of the CPSU(B) Chapters 9, 10, 11, 12, Conclusion

Foundations of Leninism "The Party"

"Industrialization and the Right Deviation", SCW, Vol. 11, p. 288-302

## 4. Factory Nuclei as Basic Organization of the Party

V.I. Lenin, "Letter to a Comrade" LCW Vol. 6

"To P.G. Smidovich" LCW Vol. 34 p. 108-9.

Piatnitsky, "The Bolshevization of the CP's" C.I. Doc. 1932 (WCC reprint)

1924 Comintern Resolution on Factory Nuclei (Reprinted in Unite! Aug. 1975)

"The Work of Factory Nuclei" Comintern Document 1930? (Reprinted in The Communist Vol. 1 #9

- B. Mao's Revisionist Line and Practice on Party Discipline  
A Basic Understanding of the Communist Party of China  
 Shanghai 1974, published by Norman Bethune Ins., printed  
 by People's Canada Publishing House, distributed by National  
 Publications Centre Toronto, Ontario, Canada, see pg's 46-  
 52, 78- 80, 190, 200-203  
Peking Review, "Capitalist Roaders Are the Bourgeoisie Inside  
 the Party" June 18, 1976, "Inner Party Struggle and Party  
 Development" August 20, 1976, "Build the Party in the Course  
 of Struggle" July 2, 1976
- C. The PLA's M-L Line on Party Discipline  
History of the PLA p. 113-119, 556-682  
The PLA On the Building and the Life of the Party  
Albania Today, "The Vanguard of the Revolution and Socialist  
 Construction" 1972, "The Relations Between the Cadres and the  
 Masses and the Struggle Against Bureaucracy" 5 (30) 76,  
 "The PLA Has Always Pursued a Single Marxist-Leninist Line"  
 No. 2 1977, "The Class Struggle Within the Party" No. 1 1978,  
 "The Organizational Degeneration of the Revisionist Parties  
 and Its Consequences" No. 3, 1978  
 Enver Hoxha, Imperialism and the Revolution, COUSML ed. p.  
 108-110.

### III. How to Build the Party

- A. Must be conscious effort -- see references under II Type of  
 Party, 1. Revolutionary Theory
- B. Must use dialectical materialism, experience of other parties  
 V.I. Lenin, "Our Immediate Task" Vol 4 LCW p. 217  
 "Karl Marx" Vol 21 LCW p. 50-55  
 "On the Question of Dialectics" LCW Vol 38 p. 355-363  
 Mao Tse-tung, "On Contradiction" Pek ed.  
 V. Adoratsky, Dialectical Materialism, "Materialist Dia-  
 lectics as the Theoretical Foundation of Marxism-Leninism"  
 Proletarian Publishers
- C. Experiences show the need to understand motion, tasks, key  
 strategic task, key tactical task (key link)
1. Motion--periods  
 V.I. Lenin, "Conclusion" of What is to be Done?, "Tasks  
 of Russian Social-Democrats" Vol 2 LCW p. 327, Pre-  
 face to "Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats" Vol. 6,  
LCW, p. 210  
 J.V. Stalin, "The Party Before and After Taking Power"  
 and "Political Strategy and Tactics of the Russian  
 Communists" On Strategy and Tactics LPR Ed.

p. 14, 29, 30, 53-55, History of the CPSU(B), p. 1-53 <sup>81</sup>  
History of the PLA p. 1-98

2. Tasks: general understanding of, J.V. Stalin, "Political Strategy and Tactics", "the Party Before and After Taking Power" On Strategy and Tactics, LPR ed. p. 24, 54. For particularities of tasks see MJLC Announcement from WCC
3. Key Strategic Task: "The Vanguard of the Revolution and Socialist Construction" Albania Today 1972
4. Key Tactical Task or Key Link: V.I. Lenin, "Where to Begin" Vol.5 LCW, What Is To Be Done? Pek. ed. p. 201, J.V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, p. 95-97 Pek ed., V. Adoratsky, Dialectical Materialism, Prol. Pub. p. 24
- D. Russian movement's experience of building the center and Iskra V.I. Lenin, "Our Immediate Task," "An Urgent Question," "Draft Declaration of Iskra and Zarya," Vol 4 LCW, What Is To Be Done? Sec.'s IV, V, and p. 201, "Where to Begin" Vol.5

#### IV. Concrete Steps

References for the POU's.

1. General principles, aim, method  
V.I. Lenin, Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Imperialism and the Split in Socialism Vol.23 LCW, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination," LCW Vol 22, The Emancipation of Women International Pub., "Draft and Explanation of a Programme for the Social-Democratic Party" LCW vol.2, J.V. Stalin, Foundations of Leninism  
The Theory and Practice of the Revolution by the PLA  
V.I. Lenin, "Karl Marx" LCW Vol.21
2. Task of fusion  
V.I. Lenin, "Our Immediate Task," "A Retrograde Trend...," "The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement," "Apropos of the Profession de Foi", Vol.4 LCW, J.V. Stalin, "The Party Before and After Taking Power," On Strategy and Tactics LPR ed. p. 53-57.
3. Main Danger  
J.V. Stalin, Problems of Leninism, "The Right Danger in the CPSU(B)" Pek. ed. p. 309 or Works, Vol 11, p. 307.  
V.I. Lenin, "What is There in Common Between Economism and Terrorism?", "The Spontaneity of the Masses and the Consciousness of the Social-Democrats" What Is To Be Done?, p. 92-96 and 34-65.

Kansas City Revolutionary  
Workers Collective:  
Boxholder  
P.O. Box 1565  
Kansas City, Mo. 64141

Wichita Communist Cell:  
Boxholder  
P.O. Box 493  
Wichita, Ks. 67201