

Ideology and methods of work

At our national conference, six comrades disagreed with the decision on the ideological differences. Each of them, however, stated they did not agree with the methods used by the Soviet leaders in using state measures against China and Albania. But they could not agree that erroneous methods of work were an indicator of incorrect ideology. Because this question is a very vital one for all Communists and has a very great significance for the development of our work in New Zealand, it is raised in this discussion.

There is an old injunction: "Judge a man by his deeds, not by words." It has a sound basis in Marx's introduction to his "Critique of Political Economy." Marx says: "Our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself." So also in our Party we have said many times in connection with our struggle to consciously remould ourselves: "We are not what we think we are; we are what our practice (our actions) prove us to be." Consequently when we observe in the practice of other comrades or ourselves, bureaucratic methods, commandism, "my kingdom" attitude, intolerance, arrogance, steamroller tactics, a "know-all" attitude, inability to delegate responsibility, etc., we are able to recognise such manifestations as hangovers of bourgeois individualism.

No matter how earnestly we may wish to serve the Party and the class, we cannot help but harm the cause so long as our ideological condition precludes us from seeing and correcting the errors in our practice. One may be able to talk at length on the mass line method of work. But unless one understands its roots, that it is a necessity (a law) of Party development, and consciously tries to make one's practice conform to that law, one cannot but fall repeatedly into bourgeois methods of work, leadership and organisation which creates a road block to building the Party.

The method of work disclosed by the Soviet leaders in using economic pressure against socialist countries to force them to accept an anti-Marxist-Leninist position was not confined to the cutting off of aid and the withdrawal of experts in the case of Albania and China. The wrong method of work are evident in a whole series of actions. Here are some:—

The unilateral action in regard to Yugoslavia in breach of the 81 Parties' Statement.

The action in supplying arms and armament factories and missile sites to India who had committed aggression against China.

The breaking off of diplomatic relations with Albania.

The open attack on Albania at the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. which sparked off the public polemics.

The justification of public polemics as a correct Marxist-Leninist method on this and other occasions.

The frantic concern at the continuation of public polemics today and the demand for their immediate cessation.

The presentation of only the views of the Soviet leaders to the Soviet Party membership.

The committal of Cuba in negotiations without consultation with Cuba.

The absence of self-criticism in the connection with the so-called exposure of Stalin.

The one-sided and complete negation of Stalin.

The intolerance of and failure to examine criticism.

The use of the occasion of the Bucharest

Congress to launch an attack on the Chinese Party before fraternal delegates.

Ignoring the free equal and independent status of fraternal parties.

Failure to make use of the procedure laid down for settling disputes.

Unilateral formulations affecting world Parties without consultation.

The subjective reaction to principled criticism and the failure to substantiate theoretically their replies to such criticism.

Unilateral breach of the world Parties' decisions and Appeal to the Peoples of the World for priority in the banning of nuclear weapons.

All these and many other actions of Soviet leaders are on record for all who care to verify. They make a clear pattern of contradiction with Marxist-Leninist methods of work. They offend against the principles of collective discussion and decision and are a radical break with the proletarian class stand, the historical materialist viewpoint (that masses are the makers of history) and the dialectical method of thinking—which constitute the main content of proletarian ideology. On the contrary, are they not a very clear illustration of bourgeois individualism in the ideological outlook of these leaders? The philosophical roots of bourgeois individualism are found in subjective idealism.

Consequently, does it not become clear that these leaders' actions show them to be neither materialist nor dialectical in their world outlook? Does this not lead to the conclusion that the actions referred to are not mere accidental mistakes, but are the result of the ideological departure of the Soviet leaders from the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism? Is this not the explanation of the vacillations and inconsistency which marks the policy, speeches and actions of the Soviet leaders and their inability to consistently adhere to and rely upon the revolutionary principles that permeate the basic documents of the world Communist movement?

Consequently, should we be surprised that in their hands the struggle against the so-called "cult of the individual" has turned into its opposite and now exposes to public view the naked, ugly, bourgeois individualism of its originators?

LEFT SECTARIANISM AND DOGMATISM

We have dealt so far with right wing manifestations of bourgeois ideology within Communist Parties and the world movement. This is correct because, as the world Parties' documents stress: "Revisionism remains the main danger." But the 81 Parties' Statement also emphasises the need to conduct determined struggle against opportunism on two fronts—against revisionism and against dogmatism and sectarianism. It is necessary for all comrades to give close attention to section six of the 81 Parties' Statement (page 55 and following) which deals with the dangers of both aspects.

Our Party has much experience of the serious losses which arise from dogmatism

According to the P.P.P. Mirror of 4.8.63, "Guarantee Treaty will Rid Fears." Dr. Jagan has said that "a guarantee treaty should lay to rest the fears of this country. . . . That its territorial integrity and sovereignty should be guaranteed by treaty with the great powers." He quoted Belgium, Switzerland, Austria and Cyprus, and went on, "Similarly under the Cyprus Treaty the U.K., Greece and Turkey guarantee and undertake to ensure the maintenance of the independence, territorial integrity and security of Cyprus. A Treaty somewhat along these lines . . . should reassure those sections of public opinion who need to be reassured and the governments who are opposing independence for British Guyana."

We say that we do not believe at all that the Cypriot workers and people were pleased with the treaty they have had, which they have now abrogated.

Jagan on the Test Ban Treaty: "I welcome the nuclear test ban agreement reached last week in Moscow between the Soviet Union, Britain and the U.S.A. and which brings to an end nuclear testing by these powers in the atmosphere and under water. I welcome this treaty not because it has achieved much but because it might be a first step towards complete disarmament. It is clear that only the vast resources released by disarmament can provide aid on the scale necessary to bring about an increase in the rate of growth of the poorer parts of the world. . . . Diminished world tension might well lead to a greater

and left sectarian trends in our Party approach. We know they are still manifested in much of our work. We also know that many workers do not regard left sectarianism as an expression of bourgeois ideology. Too often it is regarded as a correct expression of a militant proletarian outlook. For this very reason we must pay serious attention to its manifestations in our approach and methods. Unless we do so we will not be able to take full advantage of the favourable conditions for the building of the Communist Party, extend our influence among the industrial workers and assist the building of the

broadest movements of the people against foreign monopoly (imperialism) and for peace.

As with right trends, so also with left sectarianism, the only way to overcome them is the struggle against them within the Party itself. And that struggle can be successful only if we constantly raise our ideological level and deepen our ability to expose the bourgeois ideological roots of both manifestations of opportunism.

Reprinted from National Inner-Party discussion material of the Communist Party of New Zealand, April, 1964.

ESSENTIAL READING FOR ALL COMMUNISTS

PHILOSOPHY :

ON CONTRADICTION
ON PRACTICE

Mao Tse-Tung

DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Stalin

HISTORY :

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

Marx & Engels

SOCIALISM, UTOPIAN & SCIENTIFIC

Engels

ECONOMICS :

WAGE, LABOUR & CAPITAL

Marx

VALUE, PRICE & PROFIT

Marx

POLITICS :

AGAINST REVISIONISM

Lenin

A Selection from Lenin's main political writings
STATE & REVOLUTION

Lenin

LEFT WING COMMUNISM

An Infantile Disorder

Lenin

You can help to develop the struggle against modern revisionism

by

1. Winning annual subscribers to "Vanguard".
2. Helping to sell "Vanguard" at public meetings.
3. Asking your local newsagent to display "Vanguard".
4. Contributing reports or articles to "Vanguard" on any aspect of the class struggle in Britain and internationally. (We need reporters in every main industrial centre, and every main industry.)

If you wish to help please contact one of the following addresses:

A. Major, 57 Manchester Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy,
MANCHESTER 21.

A. Cross, Flat 3, 33 Anson Road, LONDON, N.7.

K. Houlison, 21 Castle Road, Newton Mearns, GLASGOW.

M. Baker, 29 Lingham Crescent, Scarborough, YORKS.

C. Roberts, 14 Caerau Park Road, Ely, Cardiff, SOUTH WALES.

continued from page 13

Dr. Jagan: Let me put it this way. There is, in my view, a difference between politics and economics. In the political field my objective obviously is national independence for my country. In the economic field, I am wedded, dedicated to parliamentary democracy. In the economic field I do not believe in capitalism. I do not believe that free enterprise, which may have been wonderful for, say, the United States of America, will in present circumstances develop either my country or an underdeveloped country in the world generally. . . .

We say that Dr. Jagan has been masquerading as a Socialist for too long, it is clear that he doesn't even understand the basic ABC fundamentals of scientific socialism and does not even behave before the imperialist propaganda machinery like a dedicated nationalist.

Labour Monthly, Sept. 1963. Jagan: "British Guyana may well decide whether the road to the future will be peaceful or violent. For many years, long before the advent of Premier Khrushchev, the P.P.P. has been advocating the peaceful parliamentary road to Socialism."

Jagan and other members of the P.P.P. have also been dabbling in a most disastrous manner in international affairs and have brought Guyana into direct conflict with the correct line being carried forward by revolutionary workers' governments. Even before Guyana gains its independence he wants to tie our hands in a treaty with the big imperialist powers.

movement of private capital into the underdeveloped countries." Mirror, 4.8.63.

P.P.P. Mirror Editorial, 4.8.63: "The Test Ban Treaty to be signed in Moscow tomorrow by Russia, the United States and Britain, must be regarded not only as an important political event and an historical turning point in East-West relations, but also as a triumph for socialism and peaceful coexistence."

On the India-China Border Dispute: "There can be no justification of the Chinese invasion of India. But truth and justice will hold out and India shall be the victor. British Guyana is far away from the battlefield, but the people are sympathetic and can appreciate how grievous is the struggle." Dr. Fenton Ramsahoye, Attorney General, a Member and Minister in the P.P.P. Government. Graphic, 28.1.63.

We say this was clear pandering to Guyanese of Indian origin and this address was delivered at the celebrations of the Independence of India. The P.P.P. did not utter a single word against this vicious slander until ten months after.

George Bowman, Parliamentary Secretary, P.P.P. Thunder, October 1963—India/China Border question: "When the issue first raised its ugly head the P.P.P. took up a peculiar policy—peculiar only to our enemies. But we thought this was right and proper in the circumstances, we worked towards bringing about a settlement in the dispute. For we felt the following: That the spirit of Bandung would be destroyed. . . . That

the leadership of India in South-East Asia would be shaken and socialism would have suffered a great setback."

There are a number of other extremely serious matters that can be exposed; like the brand of "socialism" being peddled by Richard Hart, a P.P.P. socialist and editor of Mirror, in his book, What is Socialism, which we have re-named Hart's Disease, and denounced as rubbish.

But before we leave the "socialists (sic)" of the P.P.P., let us examine finally what Jagan had to say after he had sold the workers' movement out and the imperialist enemy given a blank cheque to do whatever they liked. They have set up a Colonial Governor's Dictatorship, raped the country of its constitutional government authority, and with the backing of thousands of British troops are arresting and imprisoning without charge or trial.

Having given our imperialist enemy the blank cheque, which encouraged all this, what did Jagan have to say, according to the G.I.S. No. 42 Bulletin: "For my part, I am disappointed because I felt that good sense would have prevailed and that the opportunity would have been taken by the Secretary of State to heal racial differences and bring our peoples together, and a compromise solution put forward. I did not expect a complete and utter capitulation to the Opposition and to the United States. I would normally have resigned in protest but I have been persuaded to remain in office."

to be continued